

in nothing but failure. Did he fail with conciliation in 1896? Mr. Skelton says:

"Amendments to the provincial law were effected which removed the more serious grievances of the minority. . . . The settlement was

accepted generally in the country as a reasonable ending of the strife—as the best that could be done in the circumstances. Edward Blake, counsel for the Catholic minority declared it more advantageous than any legislation which could have been secured by coercion. . . . By the Catholic authorities, however, the compromise was not accepted. Voters in by-election were told that they had to choose between Christ and Satan. The leading Liberal newspaper of Quebec City, *L'Electeur*, was formally interdicted."

Finally, however, a papal envoy came to Quebec and stopped this folly for the time. But it is evident that Laurier has over and over again shown courage in his own province. He settled interprovincial antagonisms by reasonable compromise, and we may trust him to play fair in our present military difficulties. He is always as good as his word. He says now, "I am for voluntary service."

THE LIFE OF SIR WILFRID LAURIER—6

Previous extracts have shown Professor Skelton's high commendation of Laurier's Liberalism, his function as a conciliator and harmonizer of race and religion in Canada, and his magnificent work as the builder of our national prosperity. But Laurier built not only a material prosperity in this country. He raised the national dignity of Canada.

Having secured the denunciation by Great Britain of the Belgian and German treaties which blocked the way to British preference and the complete control by Canada of her tariff policy, Laurier took that action in the Boer War which laid the foundation stone of the new imperialism of co-operation. "Daughter am I in my mother's house, but mistress in my own," wrote Kipling of Canada about that time, approving the trend of Laurier's policy. As the Canadian premier said in a reply to attacks by Bourassa on his participation in the Boer war, "on that day (of Paardeburg) it was revealed to the world that a new power had arisen in the west." And that power was British, a daughter nation. Laurier urged, further, that the English and French-Canadians fighting side by side in Africa would be drawn into a closer unity (p. 192). He must feel the same, only more so, about the present, greater war. He wants his French-Canadians to be beside their English brothers in the trenches, and they will go there for the old chief.

After the Alaskan boundary award, Sir Wilfrid "contended that the lesson was that Canada should have independent treaty-making power. 'It is important,' he said, 'that we should ask the British Parliament for more extensive powers, so that if ever we have to deal with matters of a similar nature again, we shall deal with them in our own way, in our own fashion, according to the best light we have.' The demand was not pressed. The change desired, at least in respect to the United States, did come in fact a few years later, though as usual in British countries, much of the old forms remained."

"In 1909, following Australia's example, Canada established a department of external affairs, for 'the conduct and management of international or intercolonial negotiations, so far as they may appertain to the government of Canada.' In introducing this measure Sir Wilfrid declared: 'All governments have found it necessary to have a department whose only business will be to deal with relations with foreign countries. . . . We have now reached a standard as a nation which necessitates the establishment of a department of external affairs. On Sir Robert Borden's accession to power one of his first steps was to increase the importance of this department by giving it a minister as well as a deputy, attaching the portfolio to