

must not forget that common thoughts and common feelings are the only foundations on which differences can safely rest. Political consensus must underlie political partyism. The instability and the volcanic nature of politics in France and Italy are due to the fact that there is little political consensus in those countries. In England, the calm and regular course of politics is due to the fact that there is much political consensus. In England, the principles of the tariff, of taxation, the main principles of foreign policy are common principles, and these are being continually added to, as witness the ready acceptance by all of the principle of local Government for Ireland. It is true that some regard this as a final measure, while others regard it only as a first step. The local Government for Ireland is no longer a party question.

"These thoughts lead me to this conclusion, that we should endeavor to find points of agreement rather than points of difference. This is the practical ideal we should substitute for the ideal of conflict. Everything with which we can honestly agree it is our duty to publicly accept. In this way only can we add to that fund of community upon which our strength and safety depends. In this way only will all the people at the same time take the same step, which is progress.

"I am conscious that I have very imperfectly established this thesis, and have only imperfectly stated it, and that many considerations on both sides should receive attention I cannot now give them; but I am confident that a fuller treatment would only strengthen the position, and, indeed, I do not anticipate much serious disagreement.

"What stands more in the way than anything else of our accepting this as a standard of action is considerations of business or party policy. A newspaper is published for reasons which are probably never found unmixed or single, but which can be classified according to the element that predominates. A rough classification of reasons would be:

- "1. To make money.
- "2. To forward the interests of an individual or party.
- "3. To serve the best interests of society as a whole.

"If radical antagonism is the attitude adopted, it must be explained on the ground of our belief that it suits the public, and so sells the paper; that it forwards the interest of a party, or that it best serves those of the public as a whole. We have seen that this attitude is certainly not in the national interest. Is it in the interest of a party, and is there such a large number in favor of it that it is commercially a good policy? I do not believe it is, in the long run, in the interest of any party to oppose everything another party does; and I believe that in time the public would support the paper that took a higher stand very much better than the other. Did Lord Rosebery weaken himself or his party by his unqualified support of Lord Salisbury on the Fashoda question? And I believe that any man and any paper will be equally strengthened by a similar course. But you may say that was in England and not in Canada. Human nature is the same everywhere. And even if it is not good policy for the moment in Canada, because of the state of public opinion, we are still not absolved from the obligation to follow the higher course, because we can alter public opinion, and, in any event, it is our duty to live up to our national responsibility.

"Absolute antagonism of attitude is weak: 1. If honest, it shows such a divergence in thought, purpose and ideas that it reveals a great public danger. If the amount of antagonism often shown is honest, then it is time for public men and journalists to get together to find points of agreement, if they would save the State. 2. If there is no such real divergence, then the antagonism is not honest, and will not convince. 3. It is weak, because opposition to everything largely fails of its object, since it confuses the public mind, which can only grasp one or two points at a time. By expressing agreement with anything we can honestly accept we

tend to remove that point from party politics altogether. We practically say: 'We would have done the same thing, and it is, therefore, no particular credit to you.' What is then left about which we honestly differ can be readily seized by the public and can be made to tell against our opponents. We need not fear that agreeing on some point to-day will deprive us of a subject of difference to-morrow. If we agree upon everything to-day, we will have plenty to differ about to-morrow, only we shall be a great step in advance.

"I have no desire to inquire how far journalism in Canada is working toward the false ideal of natural interest and commercial policy to which I have tried to draw your attention. As a young Canadian I am not satisfied that our public men and our press are doing their full duty to the country. If an undesirable condition exists to-day its remedy will be found after thought upon the true principles of natural life and citizen's duty. I put in a plea for a careful reconsideration of this matter by us all. We have glorious possibilities as a people, but the extent to which these are realized will depend more than anything else upon our attitude toward each other and toward our country's work."

Vice-President Dingman: "After a paper of this class, a short discussion might reasonably be in order. We have some gentlemen here that might entertain us with some elaboration of the ideas brought out by Mr. Evans. I am sure you will be pleased to know that Principal Grant is in the room." (Applause.) "Possibly he might contribute something."

Principal Grant: "I understood that I was to speak to-night, and thought that absolved me from being called upon this afternoon, or I think I should not have put in an appearance." (Laughter.) "It is exceedingly pleasant to listen to a paper and feel that you haven't to say anything at the close." (Laughter.) "As to the subject, well, there is no doubt that theoretically Mr. Sanford Evans is all right. The practical application of it might be somewhat difficult, and sometimes theories are made for Heaven and not for earth; for Great Britain or some far away country and not for the country in which we happen to live. I doubt if there is a single man in this room who would dispute the principles, and I doubt if there are many who would agree to carry them out." (Laughter.) "I think Mr. Evans has been more a preacher to-day than a journalist, because ministers are not expected to talk on practical subjects." (Laughter.) "Their duty is only to prepare people for being good in a distant hereafter—or to get there." (Laughter.) "But, I am afraid the reader of this paper would not feel congratulated at being likened to a minister. He would rather remain as a journalist, and I believe thoroughly, that, like most ministers, he meant every word he said. The great difficulty, however, sir, is to harmonize these contraries that he put before us. Though the whole truth on a subject is always the union of two contraries which are not contradictories, it is very, very difficult to get into that higher region, where you stand, and are able to stand, and combine the two. I could supplement a great deal of what was said in the paper along the same line, but then, you see, I have never had to run a paper, and I might not be able to carry out my theories if I had a paper. I, therefore, feel that I am not really competent to speak on this subject, because I do not know the actual difficulties and temptations in the way. I must confess I have seen very little in Canada of the ideal conditions pictured in the paper. I have seen very little of it, and it is because I feel from the bottom of my heart that what he says is right that I hesitate to impress it any further. I feel that there must be immense difficulty in the work of harmonizing, or we would see more of it. And why do not we see more of it? I think the reason is just this, the same which exists in the United States, and why we see more of it in Great Britain than in any other country under the sun. There