

comparisons had been attempted had there not already existed a strong British Canadian sentiment. Comparisons are proverbially odious, and revelations of political jobbery even now before us should make every true and thoughtful Canadian hesitate at casting a stone elsewhere. What need of hunting for reasons against annexation, when the one great reason prevails—we are British, British in origin, association, tradition, and we are not ashamed of our connection. The blood of men who were driven from their homes because of their loyalty to the old flag, mingles with that of others who, when called upon to emigrate, chose to remain still where that flag floated in the breeze; why should we seek to barter our birthright or seek a foreign shore? Patriotism is surely not such a weakness that we should be ashamed to confess that it guides our actions, moulds our thoughts and demands loyalty to our Queen and the Empire. An old catechism some of us learned in early years, which taught us as to our neighbourly relations that their obligations were fulfilled by doing our duty in that sphere of life in which it hath pleased God to call us, exactly indicates the true basis upon which our Canadian loyalty rests. As far as we can see, the causes which divided the Anglo-Saxon race on this continent are to be deplored, and we would hail with joy the reunion; yes, we gladly would hasten the day when all battle flags shall be “furled in the parliament of men, the federation of the world,” but that consummation is not now; many steps must be taken and honoured graves filled ere that glad day can come. Meanwhile, remembering that Britain is the Anglo-Saxon home land, we believe severance therefrom, which annexation would require, will only perpetuate the schism, and lead to fresh bitternesses; hence as Canadians, with British connection, we would do our duty where God has placed us, and seek to bring into still closer union the colonies with each other and with the mother land. This is our business, and not annexation, and only when the annexation fad is pressed upon us, do such considerations as Mr. Hopkins presents rise to repel the advances of the charmer.

Since patriotism no more than filial love can be made a matter for argument, and as we confess to a pretty strong sentiment thereon, we are prepared to sympathise sufficiently with Mr. Fréchette as not to bitterly resent the position he as a French Canadian feels called upon to hold. He speaks of what he believes to be the real attitude of his French Canadian fellow citizens as rapidly tending annexationward. The present condition he describes as one of unrest, Imperial Federation, or any similar movement, has no enthusiasm for those whose national traditions are antagonistic to British supremacy; Canadian independence, on the other hand, would only place them at the mercy of an English-speaking majority; while annexation, he thinks, would give them all the privileges of a practically independent state, in union with sister states. Let us not too hastily resent this putting of the case, not even when Mr. Fréchette says, “our mother country is France. If ever a conflict should arise between her and England, which God forbid—it is hard for me to say so, but it is true—we should be for France.” This sentiment can be understood by those who most truly know what patriotism is, and by such can be sympathetically met. Let the manner be indicated, and reason, not passion reign. The Saxon

eventually forgot the Norman Conquest, and the England of to-day owes much of its strength to the fusion of the rival tribes. Would not Canada, as such, be the stronger for a hearty acceptance of a condition inherited and loyally accepted, and a complete fusion of the now diverse peoples? Has Louisiana or Florida as states lost anything worth preserving by being merged in the practically Anglo-Saxon community of states? The schism of the English-speaking race a century past is to be accepted by all who would most surely work for ultimate peace, so the cession by France of her Canadian domain three generations past is to be accepted by those who would obliterate race hatred and religious rancour from this northern half of the North American Continent. The past we inherit, we did not make; the present is, and the future much as we make it. A New France is an impossibility now on these shores, an isolated French settlement is not to be thought of; were annexation to be a *fait accompli*, our fellow citizens would have to yield eventually their language, for certainly the United States would never allow a dual language State in perpetuity, nor any recognized religious caste: indeed we fail to see what Quebec has to gain either in the way of national sentiment or of material advantage in being separated from the general interests of British North America, where, by the events of a period long past, she is now placed.

A final word on Canadian duty and privilege. And here at this moment a personal experience made vivid by sorrow may give emphasis to a principle we would enforce. The writer misses from his side the companion of by far the larger part of his life and experience. Her parents were born on Canadian soil, three of her grandparents also; she, too, lived and died in this Province. Giving in the returns for the registration of death to the undertaker, the nationality was asked. Could any other answer be expected than that first given—Canadian? The answer was that the Dominion authorities would not accept Canadian as a nationality, the return must be either English, French, Scotch, Irish, American—anything but Canadian. And yet is not, and should not Canadian be truly national to men of Canadian birth or parentage? Far be it from us to cultivate a patriotism which thrives on comparisons drawn unfavourable to others, or on memories of mere victories on the one hand which mean defeat on the other. Wolfe and Montcalm, Cartier and Nelson, are names no nationality need despise. Is not Canada the stronger by ability to twine them all within one wreath of maple leaves? This is our task, to build up Canada, and Canada can be strong under the free flag of Britain; for us, Canada first, not defiantly strong in national antipathies, but real and true to the home God has given us, none fairer, freer. We may cherish a just pride in those lines in which she excels. We ought to be jealous of her honour and integrity, and determined to make her as we may, pre-eminent for justice, toleration, industry and truth. There can be no higher ambition for a true statesman than the endeavour to cement in one harmonious whole the varied elements of our Dominion, “Gaining strength from the fusion, as there can be no more foolish pursuit than continually hankering for green fields far away, and no more devilish work than that of the mere politician, who to gain votes for his party sets race against race, creed

against creed, till like the fool who trifles with fire, prejudices and passions are aroused which only brute force at last can quell.”

JOHN BURTON.

## GLIMPSES AT THINGS.

### DANGEROUS PRECEDENTS.

In an article upon the habitual lynching of Negro violators, in the November Forum, Mr. W. H. Page sensibly observes that “the gravest significance of this whole matter lies not in the first violation of law, nor in the crime of lynching, but in the danger that Southern public sentiment itself, under the stress of this new and horrible phase of the race-problem, will lose the true perspective of civilization. \* \* Are men’s deserts to be dealt out to them by mobs? Then the more righteous the mob, the fewer will be spared; and a really righteous mob, if it were not to encounter a stronger mob of a different mind, might go forth and clear the earth for the coming of the just. But it would meet another mob, and there would be as many mobs as men had impulses.” Most Southerners have shrunk from speaking against the hanging and burning of brutal negroes; they have naturally feared being taunted with palliating brutality, just as many people who have opposed prohibition on principle have been unworthily charged with championing rum-sellers. The result is that lynchers are growing bolder, crueller and more reckless in the South, and that their bad example is affecting the North, where not only does Judge Lynch seem to be enlarging his jurisdictions, but also White Caps and other lawless if self-righteous organizations take upon themselves to punish even minor breaches of their moral creeds. “The brief and bloody code of lynch-law,” observes Chief Justice Bleckley, also in the November Forum, “translated into plain English, reads thus: ‘Let past crime be met with present crime in order that future crime may be prevented.’ Its principle is to check crime by the commission of crime. Can any civilization stand this?”

“All bad precedents spring from good beginnings,” said Julius Cæsar, in his speech reported by Sallust; “but when wicked or ignorant persons dominate, these precedents, fair at first, are transferred from proper and deserving objects to such as are not so.” The thirty Lacedæmonian governors of Athens, he pointed out, began their regime by executing without trial some particularly vile and universally hated individuals. The silly populace applauded the justice of their despotic rulers, who, when they had by degrees established their lawless authority, slaughtered good and bad without distinction. When Sulla became master of Rome he first put to death persons who had enriched themselves by the misfortunes of their country, and everybody praised his arbitrary justice. “Yet this was the introduction to a bloody massacre. For whoever coveted his fellow-citizen’s house, either in town or country, nay even any curious piece of plate or fine raiment, took care to have the possessor of it placed upon the list of the proscribed. Thus they who had rejoiced at the punishment of Damasippus were soon after dragged to death themselves.”

Legislation exceeding its proper sphere may form a precedent as harmful as the inflict-