

are for the poor alone, and private hospitals are for the well-to-do.

That some arrangements satisfactory to all parties will before long be arrived at, we have no doubt. There is, however, one point which seems to have been overlooked so far; and that is, that the intentions of those who have built, those who have endowed, and those who have, and those who are still contributing to the maintenance of our splendid hospitals, were and are to extend charity in one of its noblest forms to the sick poor of Montreal. Anything that interferes with the enjoyment by the sick poor of this very meritorious beneficence is surely a breach of faith with those benefactors. Steps should certainly be taken to prevent—or, if this is impracticable, to lessen, at all events—"hospital abuse." But care should be exercised so that nothing suggestive of analyzing the hungry orphan's tears before giving it the food of which it stands in urgent need, should be done. The doctors who recommend patients to the public wards may be trusted not to encourage the abuse to which reference has been made. As to poor patients outside the city, there are those who would question whether the sphere of charity or philanthropy should be circumscribed by municipal boundaries. The Golden Rule might be held to have a bearing upon the question.

IMPERIALISM IN THE BLOOD OF BRITISH RACES

The world has now before it the unprecedented spectacle of the two greatest nations of civilization being about to enter upon an election, the question at issue in both cases being "Imperialism." This country also is in a similar position, to some extent, as the same question is a prominent one as that on which the Parliamentary election will turn in Great Britain, and the Presidential one in the United States. The rise of this question, Imperialism, into such prominence has been very generally spoken of as a new portent in the world's affairs; it is discussed as a political novelty, an invention of the age, like steam traction and telegraphy. This view ignores the history of the people of Great Britain, whose record for at least seventeen centuries shows that they have imperialism in their blood—it is a British instinct. While the Romans were in the old land, an officer of the Roman legions who, in race, was more English than Roman, proclaimed himself Emperor of Britain in the year 286. In 383, a Briton was proclaimed Emperor by the legions in Britain, and he settled what is now Brittany in France, with British colonists. After the Romans retired, the old land was ruled by a number of kings whose kingdoms were of somewhat indefinite area. The imperialistic spirit led to one of these bringing the

weaker ones into subjection, and to him was given title "Bretwalda," which conveys the same idea as that of Emperor, as he was king of kings. The story is too long for recital here, but it was out of this imperialistic spirit, that was so strong an instinct in those who successively ruled in England, that at last there was evolved the unity of England as one nation. Consider how familiar the whole people in those early days must have been with imperialism, by contact and conflict with and subjection to the legions of the Empire of Rome; and later by seeing the ruler of England also the king of several countries across the sea. The eight crusades, made between 1096 and 1270, were strongly tinged with imperialism, as, in the name of religion, part of the territory of a foreign monarch was made subject to British influence and British laws. Consider also how thoroughly ingrained in the minds of the British merchants must have been the belief in their right to control the people of other lands, when, in the Baltic and on the coast of Denmark, seven, centuries ago, the English had established trading ports practically under English rule. The way in which England's rulers compelled the Scots and the Irish to pay homage to the Crown of England long before the three Kingdoms became united, is another illustration of the early imperialism. It has a strange sound in these days to hear of the French in Gascony rising to oppose the war taxation of a ruler who, being King of England, styled himself also "King of France." It is significant that this King, Edmond III, is styled by a great historian, "The Father of English Commerce," and he was the first person to summon a commercial assembly to discuss questions of trade. Our Boards of Trade owe their origin to the greatest imperialistic ruler of England, who imposed his authority as sovereign over a very large part of France. Long years of civil war so desolated the old land that the tentacles by which foreign parts were held had to be relaxed. The range became enormously wider for displaying the great characteristics of the British race, the thirst for Dominion and the genius for colonizing and wisely governing dependencies. In 1505 England struck her first blow at Spain by extorting a favorable commercial treaty from the King of Castile. About this time the Philippines, Cuba, Japan and other eastern places were discovered, out of whose affairs there arose several centuries of disputes of an imperialistic character. Any one who desires to have a profound impression made upon him regarding the intense force of the imperialistic spirit of the British people, should read the story of England's conflicts with Spain, Portugal, Holland and France, the outcome of which was the establishment of her sovereignty over the widest and most varied Empire that has