

in America to make any party pause before entering on a causeless and wicked policy—one, too, which would certainly be resultless, as regards the ends aimed at, though productive of evil results in rich abundance.

(1) With regard to the first question, we can only be astonished that there should be any occasion for putting it, even in a hypothetical way. It is not simply that there are five millions of people on one side of the line and sixty-five millions on the other side, a relative strength that ensures our peaceableness, but that even the veriest tyro should know by this time the real attitude of the British Empire towards the United States. That attitude is now as fixed as the pillars of Hercules, and it has all the repose and conscious strength of the navy, who said of the railings and the broomstickings of his wife, "It pleases her and it don't hurt I." The tone may have in it a tinge of contempt, but that is unavoidable, as long as the poor woman takes her pleasure in so crude a fashion. There is not a British statesman on either side, of the first, second, or third rank, whose mind is not made up on the point that a war with the United States would be such an outrage on the facts of past and present, and on the hopes of the future, that it would be his duty to risk misconception all round and retire into private life, rather than consent to it; that the Mother Country ought to be patient, to the point of humiliation, and to suffer loss indefinitely, rather than break with her own children; and that nothing but actual invasion of her territory on land or sea, or something equally outrageous, would warrant a declaration of war from Great Britain. It is therefore manifest that our connection with the Empire is in the interest of peace. If we stood alone, there are half a dozen subjects, anyone of which would likely lead to friction, irritation, and possible attempts at conquest, attempts which would be ruinous to the American political party which tried them, and which would sow seeds of hatred in the Canadian mind, sure to prevent that moral unification to which we all look forward. For instance, the memories of the war of 1812-15 do more than anything else, to this day, to separate Canada from the United States. Professor Murray is therefore undoubtedly right when he says that the connection of Canada with Great Britain, instead of being a menace to the peace of the United States, is a far stronger safeguard against any hostile collision between the two countries, than could possibly be secured by independence."

But it is the fact that Britain is "monarchical" which makes her so terrible as well as odious in Mr. Carnegie's eyes. Canada owes "allegiance to a foreign power founded on monarchical institutions"! The word monarchical is as accursed in itself, as the word Mesopotamia is blessed. It is certainly true that the empire has in its monarch a fixed symbol of the unity and continuity of the national life; and Mr. Carnegie has evidently much the same idea as Mr. Pogram had of the powers of Queen Victoria and of the barbarous way in which she exercises them. He trembles as he thinks of the torture chambers beneath the drawing room of Windsor Castle, and he thanks God that he is in a free country where—surrounded by hundreds of hired Pinkerton men—he can bid defiance to her Beef-eaters. Were his emotions sincere it would be right to point out to him that Britain—under monarchical forms—is more truly Republican than the United States; that Britain has been the home and bulwark of freedom for as many centuries as the Republic has seen decades; that the House of Commons is based on a suffrage as wide as that on which Congress rests; that the House of Lords cannot dictate the tariff to be adopted as the Senate can and does; and that the mind of the British people finds expression almost weekly, not only indirectly through the press, but directly—whenever any one of the 670 members of the House of Commons dies or resigns, and that this expression has to be noted by the Government of the day. It is unnecessary, however, to point out these and other facts. They are as well known to Mr. Carnegie as to the readers of THE WEEK. But he imagines that they are not known to millions of his countrymen, and in that imagination he is perfectly correct. He, therefore, shakes the red rag "monarchical," hoping thereby to turn away the rage of the monster which is beginning to eye him doubtfully, to the more congenial object of an aggressive and monarchical Canada. He is a shrewd politician, but he is playing a game in which it is well for him that he cannot succeed, for success would be infamy.

(2) The answer to the second question can be given by history or common sense, as positively as concerning anything in the future. Even granting that the industrial life of Canada could be paralyzed by the United States raising its tariff wall against us to a greater height than ever Major McKinley dreamed, could or would Canada be thereby coerced to separate from Britain? Anyone who knows human nature will answer that the result would be the very opposite. Of course we do not really grant that our commercial and industrial life is at the mercy of the United States. Our frontier marches with hers for thousands of miles. She has a greater wealth of natural resources than any other other country, China alone excepted. Her people are born traders. In a commercial war, as in every war, both parties to the folly suffer. We have suffered in the past, we are suffering now, because of her belated Protectionism, whether that is the result of what she considers commercial wisdom or what Mr. Carnegie considers "high politics." We have suffered even more, because in our selfishness we have paid her the foolish compliment of a sickly imitation. But, if a new glacial epoch covered the whole Republic from the Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico with an ice-cap hundreds of feet thick, Canada left by nature in her present state could live and live well. But Professor Murray properly looks at the case from the worst possible point of view, and he shows what would be the immediate and the ultimate results of the hostile action proposed.

"It is," he says, "a matter of serious concern with many Canadians that the Provinces of their Dominion are so divided, not only by geographical situation, but by racial, linguistic, and religious differences, that it is difficult to evoke or sustain among them a sentiment of national union. Is it not just possible that the storm of indignation, stirred by a deliberate attempt at foreign coercion, might fan the national sentiment, smouldering in the heart of Young Canada, into a fierce white heat, such as would fuse all differences into one resolute will: 'We may differ in opinion as to what the future of our country should be, but there is one point on which we are all agreed: our future, whatever it is to be, shall be decided by our own free election; it shall not be forced upon us by the dictation of a foreign power.' And there is no genuine American who would not generously acknowledge, that the Canadians resisting coercion, not the politicians adopting it, were the true representatives of the spirit that animated the heroes of the Revolution. Of course Mr. Carnegie may question whether there is a sufficient number of heroic natures in Canada to accept the poverty inflicted by his policy in preference to national humiliation. On that I hazard no rash assertion. But men have often, before this, preferred poverty with honour to riches with disgrace; and they can do it again. The advocates of coercion must therefore calculate on the possibility of being confronted with a competent number of ardent leaders in Canada, who would refuse to sell their birthright as free men for any mess of the richest pottage which the markets of the United States could supply."

Two thoughts rose in my mind as I read Professor Murray's article. First, how are the Canadians in the United States likely to regard a party which declares that its policy is to crush Canada? The weapons to be used are not bows and arrows of the olden times, nor the more terrible equipment of modern armies; but the object is the same. Our factories are to be silenced and our people starved till they surrender. Of course, we are told that the rod is to be used "not in anger but in love." That was what Torquemada told his victims. No inquisitor ever handed over a poor racked wretch to the civil authorities, without beseeching them to have mercy on him and without giving him "benefit of clergy." All that goes for nothing. What I wish to point out, however, is that Mr. Carnegie's threats ought to prove a boomerang to his party, and that they will, just to the extent that the Canadians in the United States have preserved their self-respect. There are a million of them, and they can have neither part nor lot with any party which professes itself determined to war with Canada. They have a duty to do, and it is for them to decide how to do it most effectually. But, in the next place, is it not time that Canadians at home should set their house in order, before the threatened war actually comes upon them? Some may cry, Peace, peace. They may tell us that "threatened men live long." They may say that Senator Lodge and Mr. Carnegie speak only for themselves and not for the Republican party. So they said till the day