

by any people who have adopted the modern ideas of liberty and equal rights.

But the question is: How are we to deal with such a state of things? It has been said that we should tolerate everything except intolerance, and this is a quite intelligible theory; but is it a workable one? There can be no doubt that the Roman Catholic Church is an intolerant one, that it persecutes wherever it has the power. There is no doubt that the Jesuits have been always the encouragers and promoters of persecution wherever it could be carried out. Are we then prepared to say that we will not tolerate the Church of Rome, and that, above all, we will refuse toleration to the Jesuits? We may say, every one will say, that we have no thought of such a thing. Roman Catholics and Jesuits, as long as they do not break the laws of the land, are as free to live among us as any other class of people or religious community.

As a general principle, no one will call this in question. But its application does not seem to be quite so simple. And many persons are now maintaining that Jesuits may live among us, individually or in community, and may teach among us to their hearts' content, but that they must not be incorporated. If this meant only that there is a doubt as to the legality of the incorporation of the Jesuits, that this doubt should be resolved, and that the incorporation should be quashed if found to be illegal, we should have nothing to say against it. But we confess that we are unable to go further and say that it is the duty of the Dominion Government, or of the Governor-General, to veto the unanimous decision of the Legislature of Quebec to incorporate the Jesuit Order. We doubt gravely our right to do this; but we have no doubt at all as to the inexpediency of such an interposition. As we are here, apparently, at variance with a considerable number of our fellow-citizens, it is necessary that we should make our meaning perfectly clear, and give some reasons for our opinion.

Let us then, first, distinctly recognize the fact that Quebec is a Roman Catholic Province, containing a population perhaps more absolutely devoted to the Papal See than any other population in the world. This may be very lamentable; and it is quite right and reasonable that we should wish it to be otherwise, and that we should take every lawful means of delivering these people from opinions and influences which we regard as erroneous and mischievous. But what can we do? Certain concessions have been made to the inhabitants of Quebec, with respect to their language and their religion, wisely or unwisely. Some persons think most unwisely, and moreover are of opinion that they should be withdrawn. But this means civil war; and we do not find that any of the speeches at these public meetings go so far as this.

What right have we, then, to say that the Roman Catholics of Quebec shall not carry out their religious enterprises in their own ways, and after their own methods? We do not propose to enter largely into the question of the endowment of the Order. They get no more than the share apportioned to them by their own Church, by the absolute master of their own Church. Apart altogether from the fact that the money distributed was originally Jesuit property, the distribution was made according to the proportions of Romanists and Protestants in the Province. The Protestants were offered their share, and they took it and said nothing against the distribution until the fire broke out in Ontario. The money was appropriated to the education of the people, and it does not appear that this principle has been departed from. But we do not care, at this moment, to discuss the money question. If that must be discussed, it can be taken by itself.

Nor do we care to discuss the interposition of the Papal See in this question, although a great deal of nonsense has been spoken and written on this part of the subject. Only a word or two may now be said on this point. We quite believe that Mr. Mercier's manner of approaching the Pope was servile and offensive, and that it was even unbecoming in one who was an official under the British Government; but this is very much a matter of taste. The real essence of the matter is the necessity for having a final settlement of the Jesuit claims. It is quite easy to say that they have no claims; but a great many of the people whom Mr. Mercier has to satisfy think that they have claims. This is the opinion of a great many of the people who determine whether M. Mercier or another shall be Prime Minister of Quebec; and M. Mercier must give effect to the opinions of the people, or he must prepare to abdicate. And the question of these claims could not be

finally settled until the Pope became a party to the settlement.

Now, as we said, the first question for us to determine is our right to refuse to the people of Quebec leave to manage their own affairs in their own way and according to their own mind. There is a difference of opinion among us as to the extent of Provincial rights, as to the point at which the Dominion may say to the Province, You shall not do this or that, and it is by no means easy to settle that doubt. We might, of course, say that the Dominion has a right to interfere whenever the point in question affects the interests of the whole country, and not merely of the Province, and this would seem to be a reasonable opinion; but then again there is hardly a question about which a doubt may not arise as to the extent of its influence. At any rate, it comes to this that the right of veto depends upon the view which we take of its expediency; and the question of expediency cannot be determined merely by the opinions of those who are outside the Province of Quebec, but also by the feelings of the inhabitants of that Province.

We are now face to face with the essential question. The sentiment involved in this agitation arises from the conviction that the aggressions of the Roman Church constitute a real danger to the Dominion of Canada, and that the Jesuit incorporation is an extreme case of such aggression. We are not much disposed to quarrel with this view or sentiment. In a general way we are quite sure that the Roman Church will get all that it can, by any means which will not hurt itself, and also that the Jesuits are the most devoted and energetic department of the Papal army. To be more particular, we believe that there are signs in some parts of our legislation that the Romans are resolved, if possible, to get more than they are entitled to, and that they have partially succeeded in this. Our friends, who are agitating for the disallowance of the Jesuit Act, will hardly go further than this. So far, then, we and they are substantially agreed. The only question that really remains to consider is this: Shall we check the aggressions or weaken the power of the Roman hierarchy by quashing the incorporation of the Jesuits? The agitators say, Yes. We venture, emphatically, to say, No; quite the contrary. And we proceed briefly, but plainly, to give our reasons for this opinion.

In the first place, the refusal of incorporation will make no practical difference to the Jesuits. They can still hold property by means of trustees, and they can live in community. Even if they were suppressed, individually as well as socially (a quite inconceivable contingency), they could get drafted into other orders, and yet keep their own rule. We cannot get rid of them. But, if we could, we cannot get rid of their principles, for those are the principles of the Church of Rome. What, then, is the gain, if the utmost that is asked for by the new Crusaders should be attained? We declare that we cannot see any good likely to result from it.

But we can see much evil. We say nothing more of the doubtfulness of the policy of interference. We say nothing of the possibility of a day coming when Ontario shall be unable to complain of her internal affairs being interfered with by Quebec, seeing that she has herself set the bad example. This is a point not unworthy of consideration. But there is something much more serious in the case. There is involved in this demand a war of religions and of races. Let there be no mistake on this subject. Let us understand the clear alternative which is presented to us. Are we contented to live side by side, each of us minding our own business, each of us leaving the other to go his own way, so long as he does not interfere with ourselves? or is this state of things to cease; and are we going to tell our neighbours what they shall believe, how they shall worship, and how they shall live? This is the alternative, however it may be hidden in the floods of rhetoric and in the fallacies of generalities.

What will be the consequence of any attack made by the English-speaking Protestants of Canada upon the French-speaking Romans of Quebec? One which is simple, certain, inevitable. The latter will be driven into one solid mass. As citizens, they will become less loyal; as religionists, they will become more fanatical. They will regard these attacks as the persecutions of another race and another faith; and they will cling more closely to the traditions of their race and the tenets of their faith. If we desired that Quebec should be for ever a "New France," and not a portion of the Canadian Dominion, we should help onward this agitation. If we desire to consolidate the Roman Catholic Church in Quebec, to make it dearer to the hearts of its people, to set up a barrier

against the reception of biblical truth and a larger religious and human liberty, then we should help forward this agitation. For undoubtedly such will be its effects. We do not want, as some one has said, to have a new Ireland in Canada, especially an Ireland which might get the upper hand. But, if we would guard against such an evil, we must beware of the least appearance of unfairness or intolerance. By all means, let the proceedings of the Roman Church be closely watched. There is much need to watch them. By all means let the measures introduced into our legislative assemblies be closely scrutinized, as well as the votes by which they are carried or rejected. But let us keep clear of the charge of injustice. "Equal rights" must be our motto. Whatever we demand for ourselves we concede to others—no more and no less.

PAYING THE INSURANCE.

IN an editorial note upon Imperial Federation in THE WEEK, of June 28, the following sentence occurs: "The only condition which could commend the scheme, on grounds of self-interest, to the British people—viz., that of the colonies undertaking to bear their share of the tremendous cost of Imperial armaments and possible wars—is the very condition which the colonies, happily free from the turmoil and danger of European complications, would be most loath to accept." I do not imagine for a moment that so high-minded a journal as THE WEEK can favour the idea of Canada's remaining a dependency for ever, shirking in perpetuity the obligation which devolves on adult nations, as on adult individuals, of bearing the burden of their own defence. I infer, therefore, that you object to the Dominion assuming that obligation by the particular method of becoming a full paying partner in the empire, because she is now "happily free from the turmoil and danger of European complications," in which, you fear, she would then become involved. But this favourite bugbear of anti-federationists seems to me to be quite imaginary. In the first place, suppose England should be drawn into a "European complication," our coasts and our commerce are as much in danger and are less powerfully protected now than they would be under Imperial Federation. In the second place, as we federationists believe, the chances of our being involved in a "European complication" would be reduced to a minimum by the federation of the empire. The Britannic empire would then be an oceanic world-power. Reinforced by the contributions of her new and growing partners, Britain could afford to withdraw wholly from the European system, caring little whether Sultan or Czar reigned at Constantinople, and less whether the balance of power were preserved or disturbed on the Continent. We should simply have to go on strengthening the vulnerable part of the Indian frontier by railroads and fortifications; and we might soon ask the Russians whether they would prefer to have India now or to wait till they got it.

But the strongest argument for Imperial Federation, for Canadians at least, is the present danger of a war with the United States over some of the bones of contention which now exist between us, and which American political leaders persistently decline to have removed. Those who say there is no danger of our quarrelling over our disputes seem simply to think that causes cannot produce effects. Another American flag hauled down by the captain of a Canadian cruiser, a man or two killed by a cruiser's gun in a runaway fishing schooner, or the resistance of a sealer to capture in Behring Sea, may lead to a war in which we may lose more cash than would pay our imperial contributions for fifty years, not to speak of the deaths of friends and relatives and possible national humiliation, which are mainly matters of sentiment. If the killing of a breadwinner is a material loss to those dependent on him, it must not be forgotten that these are only women and children, who, having no votes, are unworthy the consideration of practical politicians.

There are other expedients than federation by which we might avert war with the United States. One—annexation—would be a certain success, but it does not seem practicable. Two others—the policy of persistent caving in and "Commercial Union"—while they are about equally impracticable, would not be so surely efficacious. Early independence would increase our danger and our burdens manifold; and neither Canada nor the empire can prudently wait in its present precarious condition until the former is rich and strong enough for independence. There are at least a few aspirants for ultimate independence who hold that the only practicable way to it is through an intermediate period of Imperial Federation. But is Imperial Federation itself practicable? I have no more right to say it is than some self-confident gentlemen of the press and some provincial politicians have to say it is not, simply because no faultless scheme has occurred spontaneously to their creative brains. But I do believe that if the will becomes general, the way will be found.

And will Imperial Federation make our American neighbours more disposed to settle the questions in dispute between us? I should certainly fancy so, for it would give them an assurance, which they do not generally feel now, that Britain will fight for Canadian rights, and not Britain alone, but Britain plus Australia, plus New Zealand, plus South Africa, etc. Politicians will probably find it impossible to make political capital by bullying Canada and worrying Britain, when their constituents clearly see war staring them in the face. For this increased security from