

QUEEN'S COLLEGE JOURNAL.

VOL. XVI.

KINGSTON, CANADA, JUNE 26th, 1889.

No. 12.

* Queen's College Journal *

Published by the ALMA MATER SOCIETY of Queen's University in TWELVE FORTNIGHTLY NUMBERS during the Academic year.

C. J. CAMERON, M.A., - *Editor in Chief.*
H. A. LAVELL, B.A., - *Managing Editor.*

STAFF:

W. J. PATTERSON, B.A.	M. MCKENZIE, B.A.
JOHN FINDLAY, M.A.	DONALD G. MCPHAIL, '89.
O. L. KILBORN, B.A.	JOHN SHARPE, '89.
A. GANDIER (Med.)	J. W. MUIRHEAD, '89.
E. S. GRIFFIN, '89.	DAN'L STRACHAN, '89.
A. G. HAY, '89.	A. BETHUNE, '90.
JAS. BINNIE, '89.	JOHN BELL, '90.
N. CARMICHAEL, '90.	G. J. NEISH (Med.)
T. H. FARRELL, '89, <i>Secretary-Treasurer.</i>	

The annual subscription is \$1.00, payable before the end of January.

All literary contributions should be addressed to the Editor, Drawer 1104, Kingston, Ont.

All communications of a business nature should be addressed to the Managing Editor.

WE present our readers in this number with a clever review of Cameron's "Lyrics," by W. Harry Watts, of King's College, Windsor, Nova Scotia. At times he gets very near to the young poet's heart, and in almost all cases seems to have that sensitive spirit without which there is no criticism worthy of the name. There are, however, a couple of places in which his remarks need special notice. Mr. Watts asks, "Can any Canadian—true to his birthright—deny his obligation, forget his country's welfare, cavil at the fact that England, as expressed in the word 'Throne,' has acted other than as an Alma Mater to her young charge?" The critic has confused here several ideas which are of themselves distinct. No Canadian, true to his birthright, can "forget his country's welfare." But Mr. Watts may find it difficult to prove that our country's "welfare" is "forgotten" by those who disclaim British connection. In the olden times such an opinion would have been considered conclusive. But we live in an age, unfortunately, when nothing is taken for granted. It rests with Mr.

Watts to show that the Throne is responsible for what little national prosperity Canada possesses. A great many people, we fancy, would be ignorant and thoughtless enough to say that she has attained to whatever good she has, not by virtue of our connection with the Throne, but in despite of such connection.

* * *

When he asks "if any Canadian—true to his birthright—can deny his obligation," we ask, What obligation? If he answers, To Great Britain,—we reply that we think the obligation entirely on the other side. This is, doubtless, a very shocking way of looking at the matter, but nevertheless it is our way—and the way of a great many very patriotic spirits, both on this and on the other side of the Atlantic. Supposing the worst possible alternative—that Great Britain had let us go our own way at the same time she let the United States go hers, shortly after 1776—what would have been the result? Judging from what has happened to our southern sister, we would at the present moment have had something like thirty or forty million of a population, and a corresponding amount of wealth. This is a very horrible alternative, but we fancy that most Canadians would be able to endure it.

But how would it be with the Mother Country. Without a naval station in the Western Atlantic north of the West Indies; without a supply centre in the Eastern Pacific north of the Equator; without the Canadian Pacific to transport troops and munitions to Asia in case of a Russo-Anglic war; without a benefit from fish and furs which is not equally open to every other nation; without five million of Celtic and Anglo-Saxon subjects in North America, etc., etc., etc., what sort of a position would she have and hold among the powers of Europe? We would like to ask Mr. Watts and the Imperial Federationists who would be the loser in the event of the dissolution of British connection? They are eternally telling us that the loss would be Canada's. Do they really think so? Because, if they do, we fear that their much learning hath made them mad, and yet more, that their fellow-Canadians will not take long to find it out. No. The obligation, like the profit, is mainly on England's side, so that it is possible, quite possible, that a Canadian should be true to his birthright and yet no admirer of British connection. His birthright includes no obligation to the Throne, but the reverse. Loyalty—to a Canadian—is not devotion to the interests of England, but devotion to the interests and welfare of Canada. Further,