

this branch of the project, and while we are unable to see just how periodical competitions for scholarships, however useful in themselves, could, if conducted in all parts of the Empire, do much to further the great end proposed, it does seem to us that the periodical meeting of "a consultative and informal council, representing not merely the political opinions of the people, but thoroughly representative of the racial aspirations and pursuits," which Mr. Astley Cooper suggests as a subsidiary part of his scheme, might become a most valuable means to the chief end, the essential and perhaps ultimately the organic unity of the various members of the Empire, or even of the English-speaking world—a still larger idea. The condemnation of the Imperial Federation scheme is, seemingly, in the opinion of almost every one of the influential organs which have discussed Mr. Astley Cooper's proposal, that it aims at substituting for the elastic and yet powerfully tenacious bond of family and racial affinity, which is the ideal and even now in a considerable degree the actual tie to hold together in unity of interest and sentiment the Empire and its scattered and powerful colonies, the rigid, and, as experience might too soon prove, brittle clasp of a formal, written constitution. Sir Theophilus Shepstone, of Natal, says well that he approves of the scheme "because the principle of it is strictly in accordance with family usage; it corresponds with family gatherings, whether for grief or for joy; these are the outcome of family sentiment, and tend to strengthen the family tie. Gatherings of this kind, free and unfettered, will, I think," says he, "do more to unite the hearts and sympathies and interests of the British Empire than any artificial scheme can accomplish. It is hard, as the Zulus say, for a man to forget the house he was born in." Again, as its propounder says, the scheme involves no political or commercial antagonism, either international or intranational, while containing tremendous possibilities of political and commercial importance if effected; and by emphasizing the brotherhood of race and promoting sentiments of union it may prepare the way for both closer political and commercial relationship when the colonies are more fully developed. As we have often intimated, it is, in our opinion, essential to the success and permanence, if not to the formation, of any federation compact, that the parties entering it should negotiate on terms of perfect freedom and equality. But it is difficult to see how this is possible as between colonies and the nation to which they owe allegiance. If under the operation of some such informal and free confraternal arrangement as that under discussion the Colonies and the Mother Country could be gradually brought into closer and still closer contact, without either party being made to feel the pressure or galling of any inelastic band, while at the same time the former are constantly progressing in the direction of complete independence, it is easy to conceive that when the moment of emancipating adulthood arrives both parties may be found prepared to supersede it, by mutual consent, with a federal union, that will be voluntary, cordial and free from the danger of friction to which all co-partnerships, even between members of the same family, are liable, if entered into without a clear understanding of all that is involved. There are, no doubt, tremendous difficulties in the way of successfully carrying out Mr. Astley Cooper's idea, but we see no reason to regard it or a modification of it as wholly impracticable, and we shall be somewhat disappointed if a good deal more is not heard of it within the next few years.

THE strange and appalling tragedy enacted last week in the office of Mr. Russell Sage, of New York, calls attention once more to the terrible agents of destruction which modern science has put within reach of every miscreant who has a little knowledge of the application of practical chemistry to the compounding of explosives, or who may even have means for employing the services of those who have such knowledge. As a matter of fact, all that was really necessary for the perpetration of the deed in this case was, we suppose, the command of sufficient money to purchase the small amount of dynamite required. The fact that in this case the perpetrator involved himself in the destruction intended for his victims points to insanity; but this very fact adds, if anything, to the terror of the situation, by showing to how great an extent the lives of individuals and of assemblies are at the mercy of any demented or desperate wretch who may take a fancy to try the effect of an explosion. We do not know that there is any possibility of guarding to any great extent against the danger. The proper industrial uses of

dynamite, probably the most powerful as well as one of the most easily procurable of all the explosive compounds in common use, are now so many and so constantly multiplying that restrictions upon the sale, sufficiently severe to be effective, would be either impracticable, or productive of greater evils than the danger to life against which they were intended to guard. Nothing remains, we suppose, but to accept the situation with all the horrible possibilities it involves as philosophically as possible, only taking care to avoid, as far as in us may lie, those conditions and actions which are most likely to prompt any acquisitive or revengeful desperado to attempt our taking off in any such disagreeable fashion. The one moral to which this particular case most emphatically points is one which has been a favourite with poets and moralists in all ages, but which men will now as ever, and perhaps more than in any previous age, be slow to heed—the folly and danger of acquiring great possessions.

PATRIOTISM AND HISTORICAL SOCIETIES.*

IN considering a subject on which to speak to you it occurred to me that the old but ever new statement of patriotism would serve our purpose best, and, as you know, one of the great lights of literature has lately, according to a custom of his, been decrying the sentiment at least for Canadians, it may be well to look at this his last public utterance—as he announced it to be at the meeting.

In the *Empire* of November 10, Professor Goldwin Smith is reported to have said to the Young Liberal Club, whose members he was addressing, that he "agreed with the movement to erect a monument to the heroes of Lundy's Lane, but desired that it should be a monument of reconciliation rather than to perpetuate the enmities which had existed between the two nations taking part in that event." Mr. Smith concluded his address by stating that "annexation was the inevitable destiny of Canada."

Certainly, if Canada's people consisted of Goldwin Smiths, annexation to the United States would be inevitable; it might, however, even in that case be impossible, for no astute and patriotic Government would be anxious to admit into the national life a people that did not believe in itself, thus confessing that it knew not even the very first element of progress. As Canada has not yet arrived at such an emasculated condition we may safely leave Professor Goldwin Smith's opinion to work out its own destiny.

It is, however, the same bloodless timid condition of mind that would carry Canada into annexation that dictates Mr. Smith's objection to national monuments. He would have them international, like the statue of "Liberty Enlightening the World," at New York harbour—for which, however, no American would admit that any other proper site could be found than one furnished by American soil.

A statue of Jupiter or Venus would serve Professor Goldwin Smith's idea of the character that ought to mark our national monuments just as well as a statue of Brant or Brock; nay, much better, since these heroes of our past have left traces upon our history which can never be dissociated from them. According to such a view never ought a memorial to the patriotic and loyal Tecumseh arise in our valley of the Thames; nor another to De Salaberry on the field of Chateauguay. Laura Secord ought still to lie unnoticed and unknown in Drummondville Cemetery, and our monument to the men who fell at Ridgeway ought no longer to remain to affront the sensibilities of any stray Fenian sympathizer who may find his way into the Queen's Park at Toronto.

But the ground on which Professor Goldwin Smith bases his approval of his nondescript monuments requires our attention and is found on examination to be wholly untenable. He speaks of "perpetuating the enmities that had existed between the two nations taking part in the event."

Here Mr. Smith joins Canada and England as *one*, to which we do not object, as Canada is part and parcel of England. But what does he mean by "the enmities which had existed between the two nations"? If he goes back to the period of the thirteen colonies—there were then no enmities—the nation was at one, and the revolution sprung out of a disagreement which, irritated and inflamed by the interference of meddling interlopers, became at the last a bitter quarrel, out of which indeed enmities sprang. But those enmities were limited entirely to the two sections of the disagreeing colonists; England had no part in them, as her forbearance, generosity and self-sacrifice plainly show, study subsequent events which way we will. Thus, therefore, it only remains to charge enmity on the United Empire Loyalists who, with bitter feelings in their hearts, born of the persecutions, losses and evictions that had been inflicted on them by their fellow-colonists, had sadly forsaken the land of their birth or adoption and had retired to the shelter of the flag they loved though it waved over a virgin forest; where they whose hands had built up a country, its governments, judiciary,

* A paper read before the Wentworth Pioneer and Historical Society, November 18, 1891, by Mrs. S. A. Curzon.

commerce, universities, churches and homes in the land they left should have to begin again at the very A B C of life; take again the axe, the plough and the spinning-wheel and once more lay the foundations of a new England, a new Britain, to be the boast, the pride of all time to come.

Enmity! yes, no doubt there was enmity in many a Loyalist breast as he contemplated the losses he had endured, as he looked at his wife driven to the roughest toil, at his children ill-clad and untaught. But did it make the Loyalist a guerilla, a bandit? No; he was content to toil, to strive, to suffer, to hope. All he asked was to be let alone. All he expected was to be allowed to work out his future unmolested. Not his the hand that took the sword, not his the foot that invaded another's territory. The war of 1812 was no collision of angry neighbours burning to be at each other's throats. It was an assault of the weak by the strong. It was a deliberate invasion of peaceful territory by an inimical Government. It was an expression of enmity to England by an attack upon her defenceless offspring.

God defended the right; British pluck and bull-dog tenacity won the day. Canada was saved. But she dyed her soil with her own blood. She gave her sons and her daughters a sacrifice for her freedom. She fought for every foot of ground she holds. And when the invaders were driven ignominiously back to their own territory she set her house once more in order and turned again to her task of providing for her children and opening out a future for them.

But we are not to remember all this lest our neighbours be offended, lest our memorials of that heroic time remind them unpleasantly of their sins. Do we think they will respect us any the more for our subserviency?

Why, they themselves are erecting monuments to their heroes of 1812, and are we going to be offended? Why should they not if it pleases them? They often gave us "foemen worthy of our steel," and we give one of them to-day a quiet and not unhonoured resting-place upon the field where his country was worsted, and where we hope yet to place a monument commemorative of our victory in our own defence.

During the last summer a friend sent me a little newspaper called the *Creston Commonwealth*, for July 31, 1891, published in Creston, Iowa, and in it I find under the heading, "Some Historic Spots," an account of a local movement for the erection of national monuments at various points. The article opens thus: "The national movements to mark by appropriate monuments points of historical interest have suggested to the citizens of North-western Ohio and North-eastern Indiana the preservation of the sites of the battle-fields and forts along the Maumee River rendered conspicuous in the early history of the North-West Territory by the memorable campaign of General Wayne against the Indians, and the subsequent campaigns of the war of 1812."

Wayne's career is so sketched as to show the points about to be commemorated, all uncertain or unpleasant memories of broken treaties, a few whippings, etc., being conveniently dropped. The cost of sites, monuments, etc., is liberally named. That of the Battle of Fallen Timbers, where Wayne scattered a few Indians, is cited at about \$5,000, and others at similar rates.

"The two other points determined upon for commemoration," the article goes on to say, "Fort Meigs and the Put-in-Bay burial ground, belong to the period of the war of 1812, when the Maumee Valley became again the scene of military operations."

The writer of the article has a pretty sketchy style, and combines Fort Meigs, the battle of the Thames and Tecumseh with General Harrison in a most captivating way. The British Arms and Colonel Procter have no place within his horizon. "The victory," he airily remarks, "was with General Harrison, and Tecumseh was killed during the war."

At Fort Meigs fifty-five acres of land, embracing the fort and the burial ground, are to be purchased for \$100 per acre. One large monument is to be erected at Fort Meigs, at a cost of \$10,000, three others at \$5,000, each to mark the burial places, make up a total of \$25,000 at one spot.

At Put-in-Bay, the scene of poor Barclay's disaster, the burial ground upon the island where Perry is said to have buried his dead, a granite shaft, at a cost of \$2,500, is to be erected to mark the graves: "the site being already enclosed and in the possession of the corporation in trust for the public," having been given under a conveyance, by Mr. J. D. Rivera, which assured the spot against obliteration.

"The Maumee Valley Monumental Association," with headquarters at Toledo, Ohio, and with Rutherford B. Hayes as President, has "introduced a Bill into the United States Senate by Senator Sherman, calling for an appropriation sufficient to preserve these old landmarks of the early history of the country, as indicated above. The total cost would be \$60,000."

I have quoted the above account, as constituting an all-sufficient answer to Professor Goldwin Smith. If Canadians want an incentive to keep the memory of their own history green beyond that warm love of country that distinguishes every patriot heart, they may find it in the action and example of the very people we are to be so careful lest we offend by the erection of monuments to our victories. Victories over them, to be sure, but that we cannot help!

Why, what a country would Canada be if she followed