

arch quoted above, "to raise a small and inconsiderable state to glory and greatness," and "to reconcile the several Grecian states to each other."

Sir John had two ends in view, to govern the Canadian people, and at the same time to weld the provinces into a whole. He had no great principle ever at stake. He never went out of office for a principle. But he had for rival a man who was always talking of a principle or principles, to wit, Mr. George Brown. George Brown got hold of the ideas of representation by population, of free trade, of the severance of church and state; and of these and other "principles" he was ever writing, ever talking, ever berating others for 'not seeing them just in the same light as he did. To all his principles, Mr. Brown imparted a moral significance, and regarded those who did not see them in his way as immoral and enemies of the public well-being. To misapply an excellent phrase from the German, he delighted in "the castigation of the moral principle." Not that his methods were much if at all superior to Sir John Macdonald's, but he was always declaiming and writing about the principles he wished to see realized, and attacking those who would not agree with him. Whoever disagreed with him, he thought dishonest. But he himself, he asked the people to think, was, like Aristides, always just.

Such a man as George Brown is not a statesman. He is not one to be entrusted with administering a state, or carrying on the government. Such men are much more than agitators; they are excellent citizens; perhaps of a higher type of mind, but they are not statesmen. They have their place, they confer great benefit on their fellows, and they fill a public function; they regulate and keep up to their work the men who are able and competent, by the possession of political sagacity, to carry on the affairs of the country. Sir John Macdonald, much as he might deny it, would have never

been the man he was, or accomplished what he did, had it not been for George Brown. And it is just here where Mr. Pope is weak: he does not give George Brown his proper measure; he belittles him and his powers, exaggerates his weaknesses and errors. George Brown was a wonderful force, was the stimulus John A. Macdonald needed, and was heart and soul for Canada as his light went: he rendered her magnificent services, but comes not within the category of statesmen. George Brown, in a word, had no political sagacity. Nor has Hon. Edward Blake, the Canadian public man who has displayed, away and above all others, the greatest intellectual force. Mr. Mackenzie had a good deal of political sagacity, but George Brown frightened it out of him. Sir Oliver Mowat has plenty of it. His admirers imagine that Hon. Mr. Laurier is similarly endowed, because he is a parliamentarian and a finished orator, has an attractive personage and engaging manners. But none of these constitute political sagacity, though they often accompany it.

Of what, then, did Sir John Macdonald's political sagacity consist? First of all, as I have said above, in a knowledge of the Canadian people and of their representative individuals, and how to handle them. Next, in a thorough recognition of the fact that Canadians were of two tongues, English and French: of more races, Irish and Scotch as well: of two creeds, Protestant and Roman Catholic; and that in regard to race and creed, on which they were likely often to divide, they divided almost equally, and that, consequently, government was only possible on the lines of compromise, and still better realized by conciliation, rather than by the one-sided enforcement of what George Brown and William Lyon Mackenzie before him, would call a principle. Sir John Macdonald was always compromising, always conciliating, and *par consequence* always violating one or more, often