

Our fundamental proposition implies that its basis must be wide as the English-speaking race, for all the divisions of this imperial race are self-governing, and, in the next place, wide enough to underlie all nations that, in accordance with the principles of modern society, are governed by representatives who express the will of the people.

Think of the influence that the school might exert if it realized that its mission was to educate the children in all our English-speaking lands "so that we might again become as one people." This was the expression used by John Jay, one of the American commissioners who negotiated the settlement of peace and reconciliation with the mother country in 1783. This was the keynote struck by Jay, Adams and Franklin, and it was adopted on the British side by the Prime Minister, Lord Shelburne, with a frankness and generosity that disconcerted the sinister designs of France and Spain at the time, and led to far-reaching consequences that are only now being understood by the world. If the facts concerning the history of this settlement of 1783, that are revealed in Fitzmaurice's *Life of Lord Shelburne* and the *Critical History of Justin Winslow*, the librarian of Harvard, had been known to past generations of school teachers on this continent, the war of 1812-15 would not have taken place, and the game of twisting the lion's tail would not be so popular in the United States as it still is in a good many places from Congress downwards and upwards. Read the summary of these facts presented by Mr. O. A. Howland in that noble work of his just published in Toronto with the suggestive title of *The New Empire*, and then let us explain to the millions of future citizens on both sides of the line and across the Atlantic and the Pacific what were the inspiring ideals

of the men who, after seven years' fighting, thought not only of peace, but of permanent reconciliation, absolute freedom of trade and the promotion of each other's prosperity. Would there be any further waving of a bloody shirt that is more than a century old? The men who try to keep up hatred between north and south because of battles that took place a quarter of a century ago are estimated aright. What should be thought of those who would rake up the ashes of old feuds that were buried in 1783? Is it not time that that very ancient bloody shirt should be reverently laid aside? It should now be well understood that at the close of the war France repudiated the idea of the United States being allowed to practically monopolize the continent. The thirteen colonies were to be restricted to their own narrow boundaries, between the Atlantic and the Alleghanies. Spain had joined the alliance on this condition. Great Britain was expected, as a matter of course, to have the same views, for the great west, from the Ohio to the Mississippi, belonged to the province of Quebec or Canada, and was, of course, to be conceded to her, while the remainder of the continent was to be the share of Spain. Against such a combination the feeble states, exhausted by the long war, would have been helpless, even had they been willing to fight for empty spaces of which they knew nothing. But, as Mr. Jay said, "the one government which had the power to determine the boundaries" was Great Britain, and the young republic found then, as subsequently in a more recent crisis when Napoleon III. was the tempter, that in the opinion of British statesmen "blood was thicker than water." England in 1783 "endowed" the United States, to use Jay's words, with the great west, to the unbounded amazement of France and Spain, and