

the Democrats. The Americans are a proud and sensitive people, and their President and his advisers have cunningly placed them in such a position that to withdraw means the world's ridicule, and that they cannot and will not stand. The alternative with them now is, "My country, right or wrong." We have only to put ourselves in their place to judge what their answer will be. Our people must not be deluded. In 1895 as in 1812, the New England States are protesting. In 1812 their protests were unavailing. In 1895 the South and West are again clamouring for war. Because the people of Boston and some isolated New England papers are commencing to hesitate, do not let England or Canada imagine that the policy of exasperation will not be followed out. We warn our readers as we warned them before. They must be prepared to face the worst. A most serious element in the complication is that the United States may not be single-handed. Do not deceive yourselves, Canadians, or Englishmen, on this head. The cost has been counted and the lines laid. England's friends are few. It may be only a very short time before news is received from the East as startling as Cleveland's message. Canadians have been like people living on the slopes of Vesuvius. They cultivate their vineyards in seeming forgetfulness of the sleeping fires beneath them. Alarmist editorials are out of place in any journal such as is *THE WEEK* except in the most extreme necessity. That necessity has arisen, and it would be criminal folly to close our eyes and ears to its gravity. The information we have is trustworthy and fits in with the march of events. The feeling so far here and in England has been satisfactory. But England and Canada must act, not talk. Let other people do the talking—One thing only is clear. Not a day should be lost.

* * *

Cost and Profit of Liberty.—IV.

IN former articles it was pointed out, (1) that though National Liberty costs a citizen of the United States seventeen times as much as a Canadian has to pay, yet no American grudges the cost, the profit of National Life being felt to be worth it all and more; (2) that this fact is enough to put annexation out of the question, seeing that the average Canadian would never dream of voluntarily putting himself under such a yoke; (3) that a separate Canadian national existence would probably cost more, with the further objection that in such a case there would be little or nothing to show in return for our money; (4) that, therefore, the only hope for a worthy Canadian future lies along the lines of Imperial Unity, that is, along lines determined by our historical evolution.

I took the liberty of suggesting that honest critics ought to begin their criticism by pointing out which of those primary positions they dissent from, and that they should also state frankly what, in their view, is the ideal at which we should aim. No matter what the goal may be, or how long it may take us to reach our goal, we must—if we are men—set our faces in the right direction. If we do that, we shall get there in time, even though the pace be that of a snail. Carping at this or that detail is easy, but it is a paltry business and not worthy of men who undertake the serious task of instructing and leading the people.

The next question was, What ought to be done now towards securing full national freedom? Any man, whose answer consists in producing a brand new constitution for the British Empire, must be somewhat conceited or very ignorant of history. Yet, strange to say, those who favour normal development in opposition to revolution, are the men who are expected to have a new constitution pigeon-holed, or it may be to have as many constitutions up their sleeves as Ah Sin had aces. We must never forget that a great social organism develops slowly. Its natural history is not that of a mushroom. Its day may be a hundred or a

thousand years. The longer the better, for according to the length of its day is the entire life of the organism. In dealing with its future, we should try to stand on the Mount of God and see with His eyes, in whose vision time is dissolved, and only the principles and great instruments of righteousness stand out, and with little reference to our chronology.

Still, the brief day of each generation brings its duties with it, and in doing these our children are prepared for those which shall come in their day. At our present stage of national life, Canada is, perhaps, called on to do little which it would not have to do in fuller measure, if separated from the Empire. In one word, lovers of Imperial Unity, like good engineers, think that Canada should move along the lines of least resistance. For instance, it is to the interest of Canada as well as to the interest of the Empire that we should, as the *Montreal Star* puts it: "take our militia more seriously." The way to do that is to insist on genuine drill every year, to something of the same extent as that which the British militia gets. The Mother Country has four lines of defence, each line, too, of diminishing importance—the navy, the regulars, the volunteers and the militia. We have only one line, the one which in England is considered of least importance. Surely then, it is not business to have that portion of the militia on which most dependence ought to be placed, namely, the country corps, inadequately drilled, armed, equipped and officered. Or, to provide a military college and then limit the entrance to the sons of one small class of the community; to pay some \$4,000 each for the education of Cadets, and then make a present of these well-trained young gentlemen to other countries, does not strike even a non-professional man or a bystander as business.

I had intended in this article to discuss another duty of the hour, one, too, of far more importance both to our ordinary life and to Imperial Unity than the militia, but the communication of the Honourable the Attorney-General of Nova Scotia, in which he addresses a definite question to Dr. Parkin and to myself, demands immediate attention. Let us hope that Dr. Parkin may see fit to answer it from his point of view, were it only that *THE WEEK* may have the pleasure of counting him among its contributors. As for myself, I gladly delay my intended article to give an answer, because it is a source of so much pleasure to find a man occupying Mr. Longley's high position who is not afraid to come out into the open and discuss a question which, though not affecting to-day's harvest of votes, does affect the very roots of our life. Joseph Howe, whose writings Mr. Longley has studied thoroughly, was a practical politician, but just because he drew his inspiration from great thoughts and had a policy wide as the Empire, with its base in his native city and province, does he still live in the hearts of his countrymen. May all who represent Nova Scotia be filled with his spirit!

Here is Mr. Longley's question:—"Should the Parliament of Canada adopt a resolution, agreeing to the fullest extent to the policy of Imperial Federation and offering to accept a proportionate share of the expenses of the Imperial service, on condition that she should have proportionate representation in the British Parliament and Cabinet, would that be accepted by the Imperial Government?" My answer is:—That the Imperial Government is at present better prepared to consider such a proposal favourably and would be much more likely to accept it than Canada is prepared to make any proposal of the kind. I may add that, though I have lived seven years in Great Britain, Dr. Parkin is much more competent to answer the question than I, or, indeed, than anyone else in Canada.

Having thus answered frankly, may I be allowed to put certain questions? (1) Does Mr. Longley think that Canada is prepared at present to undertake a share of Imperial burdens, proportionate to her population or wealth? I do not think so. (2) Until Canada is prepared, would it not be merely playing a game of bluff to make overtures to the Imperial Government for constitutional rearrangements, which have not been discussed and which we are not in a position to accept? Why should we cut before the point? (3) In what way can any man be assured that "a generous reception in Britain" will await overtures from Canada, save by study of our own past history and knowledge of the attitude of the present leaders of British opinion? Does not