

him at all times the most serious anxiety, since it is one which has always been a source of danger to British North American unity. It is the growth of an aggressive provincialism. The union of 1841 was effected for the purpose of putting an end to this provincial feeling, with which were mingled racial and religious prejudices. But the very means adopted to put an end to the evil were the cause, as so often happens in politics, of its perpetuation and growth. The representation of both Provinces — nay, even the representation of geographical sections of the same Province — in the cabinet; the establishment for a considerable period of the double-majority practice; the development of the agitation for representation by population, — all these things tended inevitably to perpetuate provincialism, and render unity quite out of the question. These tendencies were intensified by the maintenance — the necessary and proper maintenance, under the faith and guarantee of treaties entered into between Great Britain and France — of a separate set of laws and institutions and another language in the Province of Quebec. The establishment of the Dominion of Canada, with added territory, a larger constitution, a fuller measure of freedom in self-government, would, it was hoped, have a tendency to suppress provincialism; but provincialism has become more powerful, more aggressive, than ever. And now that death has removed the one man whose great reputation and whose incalculable personal influence could add overwhelming force to his appeals to national sentiment, the danger arising from the aggressive character of the Provinces becomes serious. Provincial representation in the cabinet, provincial representation in the public service, provincial apportionment of the expenditure, provincial grievances regarding railways and public works, provincial attacks on the stability of the federal ministry, provincial demands for the abo-

lition of the veto power, provincial interests in the arrangement of the tariff, — these are some of the characteristic dangers which menace the maintenance of what was intended by the fathers of the confederation to be a strong central government. But it is the business of statesmen to overcome difficulties; and the death of Sir John Macdonald leaves us still with men of the first rank, capable, it may be hoped, of carrying out his policy and completing his work.

At this point we may abandon for a time the direct line of development of Canadian history to examine briefly Sir John Macdonald's attitude towards Great Britain and towards the United States.

Great Britain, or, one may say, the Queen, never had a more loyal subject. In these days when personal devotion to the crown, to a constitution, even to a country, has become merely a charming legend to some, a cause of scorn and mockery to others, the chivalric devotion of Sir John Macdonald to the honor and interests of the empire and the Queen is most interesting. But at the same time he was modern in his views respecting the needs, interests, and policy of all colonies. He was conservative of the power of the crown, but he never allowed the representative of the crown in Canada to act against the advice of his responsible ministers; and when Lord Lorne, in discussing the Lettellier case in 1878-79, exerted some personal influence against his ministers, and hesitated about following their advice, Sir John Macdonald prepared a minute which was accepted by the colonial office as true constitutional doctrine, and which made it impossible thereafter for any governor of a colony to refuse to follow the advice of ministers who are guiltless of political high crimes, who have an ascertained majority in the legislature, or who are willing to go to the country on the advice which they have tendered to the crown. Having thus maintained the position of responsible ministers