THE PROBLEM OF EMPIRE BUILDING

By the Hon. Sir Charles Tupper, Bart., G.C.M.G.

The Nineteenth Century, in its May issue, gives especial prominence to the following article from the pen of the Hon. Sir Charles Tupper, Bart., G. C. M. G., ex-prime minister of Canada and late high commissioner for Canada in London:

My distinguished successor in the prime ministership of Canada has during these few memorable days asserted with a persuasiveness all his own that the British Empire "rests upon foundations firmer than the rock and as endurable as the ages." It is a comforting reflection, but none the less, looking back over a long public career in this country and in Canada, am I convinced that it is only by a tenacious hold upon central British ideals and by a steadfast pursuit of the policy these suggest that the British Empire can be preserved from the disintegrating influences that have overwhelmed so many of the empires of the past.

Sir John Seeley has asserted that the British Empire was won in a "fit of absentedmindedness," and we are ready enough to believe that in some way or other we shall continue to "muddle through" and persist as a governing idealising force in the world. We trust to the seemingly inevitable trend of British and Colonial tendencies towards closer unity. That the "inevitable trend" is there we may thankfully believe, but the more we learn of the inner history of former times the more we realize how much method there also was in the "absentedmindedness" of the empire-builders of the days of Queen Elizabeth and William Pitt. And the guiding hand of statesmanship is as surely necessary now as then.

Outside the British Empire, Germany and the United States are recognized as the most progressive and enlightened industrial nations, and it is not unprofitable at times to see ourselves as others see us. Professor Carl Johannes Fuchs, professor of political economy in the University of Freiburg, one of the most distinguished of German economists, in his great work on the trade policy of various countries declares that "the British Empire, more than any other nation in Europe, is capable of becoming a self-sufficient commercial state, and the political and commercial issues are so bound together that it might be advisable for the Mother Country to purchase political advantages even at the cost of some economic sacrifices. On political and economical grounds (he adds) England needs now more than ever to retain her great Colonial Empire. Owing to the numerous and active centrifugal forces of today, this can only be done by a closer union, which will be worth any cost."

And writing in 1891 he makes the following striking prophetic declaration: "It remains to be seen whether time will raise up to England a statesman who possesses clear-sightedness, courage, energy, and tact enough to bring this question to a happy issue—a question which is of so much importance for the future of England, as well for her position among nations as for her trade. But it must be soon, or it will be for ever too late."

It would be easy to find confirmation of Professor Fuch's diagnosis in the recent policy of Germany, and especially her determined though happily frustrated effort to compel Canada to extend to her the tariff preference granted in 1897 to the United Kingdom. It is enough to quote what was said in the course of a speech to the German "Intellectuals" at Berlin on the 12th of January, 1907, when Herr Dernburg, colonial director, urged that Germany must develop, and develop forthwith, a trade policy applicable to the whole German empire similar to that policy of Imperial reciprocity which is now before the British people.

Look from Germany to the United States, and we find J. J. Hill, the well known railway president, and one of the master minds of the United States of today, declaring in a speech at the Merchants' club, Chicago, on the 10th of November, 1906, that the overthrow of Imperial preference at the British general election of 1906 had given the United States one further chance. Had that policy been ratified, he said, "had England really granted to the colonies a preference in its markets for their products based on reciprocal advantages, this country (the United States) would have felt the double thrust in a decline of business with its greatest and its third greatest customers on two sides of the Atlantic. The defeat of the plan has not greatly disappointed the dependencies (he went on to say), but it has assured them that for the present they must seek commercial alliances elsewhere."

And he added: "It is, perhaps, the time when (United states) reciprocity with Canada may be considered with more favor than it ever can be again. For no man who understands industrial conditions in Great Britain will believe that the issue raised by Chamberlain is permanently settled, or that unrest and distress there will not at some future time bring it again to the front with better prospects of success."

These are pregnant words, and if we turn to the history of the movement for the consolidation of the Empire we see how full that history is both of encouragement and warning. We realize at once how free the movement was in its earlier stages from political partizanship. It was Mr. W. E. Forster, the cabinet colleague of Gladstone and Bright, who organized the momentous meeting of 1884, and it was Mr. W. H. Smith, the Conservative first lord of the treasury, who moved, and Lord Rosebery, the Liberal prime minister of later years, who seconded, the unanimous resolution "that in order to secure the permanent unity of the Empire, some form of federation is essential." In consequence of that resolution the Imperial Federation league came to birth. It thrived for a time on aspirations and eloquence and did the Empire this decisive service—by an exhaustive examination of the question and after communicating with leading men throughout the Empire it proved the impracticability of parliamentary federation. That rock of disunion was for the future clearly marked on the chart of empire. The league met its end when several of its members proposed to weld the British Empire together by a policy of Imperial defence based upon proportionate colonial contributions to the navy. The recent debate in the British House of Commons shows that this policy has its advocates today. Can they hope to fare better than did their predecessors of twenty years ago?

It so happens that at a dinner of the Imperial Federation league in 1889, before I became a member of it, when asked my opinion, I ventured to suggest that a conference should be invited from the self-governing colonies to discuss with the Imperial government the subject of federation, and I added that I hoped the result would be that it might be found practicable to adopt a fiscal policy that would be mutually beneficial to the Mother Country and the colonies. Lord Rosebery, then president of the league, consulted the prime minister, Lord Salisbury, and it was decided to postpone such conference, pending the efforts then being made to confederate Australia.

The next step forward was taken some time afterwards when, in response to an appeal from the United Empire Trade league, Lord Salisbury said: "Before we can formulate any propositions or before we can invite our colonies to any kind of federation, what it is we have to know is how far the people of this country would be disposed to support a policy of which I imagine the most prominent features are preferential taxes on corn, meat and wool. Some people may say you can have these preferential taxes without any increase of prices to the consumer. On these matters public opinion must be formed before any government can act. No government can impose its own opinion on the people of the country in these matters. It is the duty of those who feel themselves to be the leaders of such a movement and the apostles of such a doctrine, to go forth and fight for it, and when they have convinced the people of the country the battle will be won."

Lord Salisbury's advice was taken, and it is only necessary to contemplate the main theme of the colonial conference of 1907 and the recent proceedings of such representative commercial bodies as the Chambers of Commerce of the United Kingdom and of the whole Empire, to appreciate the undiminished vigor with which the fight is still being waged and the steady advance that has been made.

In 1892 the second congress of Chambers of Commerce of the Empire rejected by a large majority, after two days' debate the preferential resolution which I had the privilege of moving, and which Sir Donald A. Smith (now Lord Strathcona) seconded. It called for "a slight differential duty by the Imperial and Colonial governments in favor of the home productions against the imported foreign article." Two years later, in 1894, the Colonial Conference held at Ottawa, with Lord Jersey as the representative of the imperial government, pronounced in favor of mutual preferential trade between the United Kingdom and the colonies. Again in 1896, when I was prime minister of Canada, the question was made one of the most important issues in my appeal to the electors.

The sequel is instructive and suggestive. Mr. Laurier (now the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier), the leader of the opposition, publicly declared himself to be as strongly in favor of mutual preferential trade as I was, and from that time it ceased to be an issue in Canada, where all parties are united in its support. Few as the remaining years of my life must be, I hope to see the day when the same may be said of the United Kingdom.

The enactment of the Canadian preference followed, and the abrogation of the Belgian and German treaties brought the question within the imperial arena. By his budget of 1901 Sir Michael Hicks-Beach restored the registration duty of one shilling per hundredweight on imported corn, and thereby enriched the British treasury by an increased revenue of 2½ millions sterling without a suggestion of inconvenience to the British consumer. The Canadian offer of 1902 followed. At the Colonial Conference of that year Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Fielding, the finance minister, offered to increase the preference of 33 1-3 per cent accorded to the United Kingdom if Canada were exempted from the registration duties and any similar future duties, and stated that if this modicum of response to Canada's preference were refused, Canada would feel at liberty to review the whole question. We know how, in the absence of Mr. Chamberlain in South Africa, Mr. Ritchie, as chancellor of the exchequer, induced the British Cabinet to neglect Canada's offer and repeal the duties.

Then it was that Mr. Chamberlain in his historic speech at Birmingham on the 16th of May, 1902, committed himself irrevocably to the policy of preference and resigned his high office in the ministry, that he might more effectively advocate what he knew to be essential to the unity of the empire. Severe illness, the result of his Herculean labors, has for the time deprived the movement of his inspiring leadership, but in his New Year message to the people of Canada, through the medium of that constant friend of the empire, the Montreal Star, Mr. Chamberlain has again affirmed his profound conviction that "of all the bonds that can unite nations, the bond of commerce is the strongest, and the perception of that fact will, I feel assured, ultimately lead to the closer union between Great Britain and her colonies, which I conceive to be the only foundation for a great empire."

Idealism and enlightened self-interest form an unconquerable partnership, and the movement goes forward to certain victory. The defeat in the Congress of Chambers of the Empire in 1902 was turned into overwhelming victory in the congress of 1906, when 105 chambers of commerce and boards of trade representing every part of the empire supported, and only forty-one chambers rejected, the policy of reciprocal preference as a matter of "present practical importance." Among the twenty-one neutral chambers was the London chamber of commerce, but in March of this year at a meeting of over 200 members its neutrality was turned into an emphatic adherence, and at the subsequent poll 1,077 votes were recorded for and 472 against the proposal of commercial unity on a preferential basis and such revenue duties on imported manufactures as would safeguard British industries from the unfair competition of foreign countries.

Thus the progress of the movement is apparent. All the self-governing colonies are now united, and there is abundant evidence of the change in British public opinion. I admit the difficulty caused by the attitude of the Liberal party, but we cannot doubt the desire of the present government to go as far as they can to meet the wishes of the colonies. As Lord Milner has pointed out, the government are in no way committed to oppose a reduction of existing taxation in favor of the colonies. They might thus give a preference to all the colonies except Canada, and a restoration of the registration duty on corn, the preferential admission of which would of course bring Canada and India into the scheme, would in no way conflict with the principles of free trade as Peel, Gladstone, and members of the present government have understood and approved of them. Nor would the interests of the consumer be prejudiced, for it is a curious fact that the price of wheat was greater both in the year before Sir Michael Hicks-Beach imposed his duties and in the year after Mr. Ritchie repealed them than while they were in operation. No one pretends that the registration duties would advance the price of bread, and their restoration while increasing the revenue would enable the government to meet the demand of Sir Wilfrid Laurier quite consistently with their principles.

Moreover, discrimination between "foreign" and "colonial" is not new in the fiscal relations of Colony and Mother Country. I do not now refer to the tariff preferences of Corn Law days, but to the acceptance of the principle by both Liberal and Unionist chancellors of the exchequer of our own time. When Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, as chancellor of the exchequer, brought in a bill to increase from 2s. 6d. to 10s. the tax on securities, we, the representatives of the self-governing colonies, waited upon him and pointed out that the loans were used to develop portions of the empire, and he amended the bill by exempting the colonies from that additional taxation—thus establishing discrimination in favor of the colonies, and in doing so removing the stigma from the act which characterized colonists as foreigners. Again when Sir William Harcourt brought in his message increasing the succession duties, the representatives of the colonies, after two lengthy interviews, succeeded in inducing him to amend the bill in respect to colonists domiciled in Great Britain by providing that only the balance after deducting the colonial duty should be claimed. It was moreover declared that no writ for the collection of these taxes should run in a British colony.

It has been suggested in authoritative quarters that the admission of the principle of preference would be the thin edge of the wedge. I have shown that the principle has already been admitted by both Liberal and Conservative statesmen, and is now a part of the law of England. May I also urge, as others have urged, that there is another wedge with a thin end—a wedge that is calculated to drive the colonies further from the United Kingdom in a commercial sense, and nearer to the foreigner, whose natural aim it is to displace more and more the British manufacturer and artisan? It is needless to do more than quote the formal announcement made in the Canadian senate so recently as the 11th of April last by Sir Richard Cartwright, acting prime minister in the absence of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. He then declared that "after the Imperial Conference, Canadian ministers would take the opportunity to approach several European countries in an endeavor to improve trade relations. This would be the first use of the recently passed intermediate tariff." The effect of the intermediate tariff enactment is twofold. It permits Canadian ministers to negotiate and conclude reciprocity with foreign nations without recourse to the agency of the Imperial government, and even without reference to their own parliament; and it automatically admits these foreign nations to a part of the preference in Canadian markets now enjoyed by the United Kingdom. Moreover, it is more than conceivable that in the course of negotiation with the astute industrial rivals of the United Kingdom, Canada may be led so to fix and limit the margin of British preference as to bar the way to any further arrangement of mutual preference within the empire.

Need more be said to prove the danger of the policy of drift? Is it conceivable that, with these perfectly natural developments of Colonial commercial policy staring her in the face, the Mother Country will persist in her refusal of reciprocity? In the words of Profesor Fuchs, "it must be soon or it will be for ever too late."

Passing to another of the main subjects of imperial discussion, namely, the constitution and perpetuation of the Imperial Conference, I find myself in substantial agreement with what I conceive to be the views of Canadian Ministers. The term "Council" is liable to misconstruction as applied to a body which does no more than confer, and has no executive functions, and I cannot see why anyone should object to the word "Conference." It is essentially an Imperial Conference inasmuch as the Colonies are invited by the Imperial Government to confer with them. Nor can I see any valid objection to Sir Wilfrid Laurier's claim that other members of his Government should take part in the conference with the full status of membership. The object of the conference is obviously a discussion between the Imperial and Colonial governments in order to arrive at results on important questions between them. The presence, therefore, of important members of his government would enable the Prime Minister of each Colony to act with more confidence and arrive at results which would otherwise have to be postponed. They are all sworn members of government, and their presence as members of the conference can only be beneficial. I canot indeed see why all the members of the Imperial government and all the members of the Colonial governments should not be members of the Imperial Conference. The question of voting does not arise, and if and when it does arise it can be settled by the conference itself.

I am also in agreement with Sir Wilfrid Laurier in the attitude of opposition he is assumed to take up respecting the active agitation carried on for some time in favor, ostensibly, of effecting the continuity of the conference during the intervals between its meetings. The appointment of a permanent commission in London has been advocated for the following reasons:

"After a few crowded weeks of activity its members (i.e. the members of the conference) separate and the organisation remains in abeyance for several years. During these years Imperial questions which may be delicate and even critical may arise from time to time, and no special and adequate machinery set up for discussing them or even enquiring into them can be resorted to. But no guarantee exists for the full and regular exchange of opinion on any question by the division of the Empire interested therein. There is no such thing as a department of the Empire in which English and Colonial knowledge, experience and thinking power can meet to examine Imperial problems and co-operate to solve them."

These and many more or less similar fallacies have been constantly reiterated. If they were not fallacies the condition of communication between the Imperial and Colonial governments has been and is deplorable indeed.

I propose to state briefly some of the facts within my own knowledge which show the inaccuracy of these statements? The self-governing Colonies have for many years past been represented in London by Agents-General or High Commissioners who with a staff of able men under them have maintained communication between the Imperial and Colonial governments.

I had the honor of representing Canada as High Commissioner for thirteen years. During that time there were several changes of government here, and I am bound to say that whichever government was in power the representatives of the Colonial governments received the prompt and attentive consideration from not only the Colonial Minister of the day but all the other ministers including the Prime Minister, whenever the occasion required us to communicate with them. If it were a matter affecting one Colony, it was dealt with by the representative of that Colony, but if it were a question affecting the other colonies as well, all the colonial representatives met at the Canadian office and having agreed on the line to be taken we went in a body to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, or where the question affected another department an interview would be arranged for us there.

It is of vital importance at this moment of suggested changes to bear these pertinent facts in mind. The purpose in view in the formation of a new and permanent Commission has for many years been practically accomplished through existing channels with a signal absence of friction and a signal measure of success. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and other colonial ministers have pointed to one instance and another in British diplomacy in which Colonial interests have not been sufficiently safeguarded. It would need more space than I have at command to analyse each of these cases, but it may be stated as a general proposition that in not a few of them other influences and in some of them Colonial influences and the action of Colonial ministers themselves must bear their share of the responsibility of subsequent failure. It is doubtful if any permanent council or commission sitting in London would have bettered the result, but it is certain that the result would in each of the matters of Colonial complaint have been most materially and beneficially affected had full and free use been made of the existing means of direct and confidential relations between the Imperial and Colonial Governments.

I will give a few of the illustrations that have come under my immediate observation.

When my predecessor, the late Sir A. T. Galt, was high commissioner, the government of Canada applied to the Imperial government to arrange for his presence at negotiations with foreign governments relating to Canadian trade. The request was refused. Upon my succession to the high commissionership, I took the question up with the government here, with the result that I was appointed by her Majesty to negotiate in conjunction with Sir Clare Ford, a treaty between Spain and Canada, and Lord Salisbury's instructions were that the negotiations should be conducted by the Canadian high commissioner with all the aid that the British Ambassador could give. The right to negotiate commercial treaties by the autonomous Cofonies was thus established.

Lord Rosebery as Foreign Minister, gave similar instructions when Lord Dufferin and I were appointed plenipotentiaries by her Majesty to negotiate the Franco-Canadian Treaty which was subsequently ratified by the French chambers and the Canadian parliament.

As far back as 1890—that is, seven years before the Canadian preference—the representatives of all the colonies urged upon the Imperial government the abrogation of the Belgian and German treaties, and were assured that they would be modified on the first opportunity that offered. At the Colonial Conference of 1897 and at the instance of Mr. Chamberlain all the colonies united in a resolution, and, as we know, the treaties were subsequently abrogated. Again the demand of the colonial representatives that the law preventing mutual trade arrangements between the Australian governments should be repealed was complied with.

At the International conference held at Paris for the protection of submarine cables, in which twenty-five Powers took part, I was appointed to represent Canada, and I was clothed with as independent an authority as the Ambassador who represented Germany. Indeed, on one important point I felt it my duty as the representative of Canada to vote with certain of the foreign Powers against the whole of the British delegation. Moreover all the representatives of the colonies in London took part in the International Customs Conference held at Brussels, and the International Postal and other conferences. Nor is it to be forgotten that the position of the colonial representatives was recognized in most effective manner at the time of the Colonial and Indian exhibition of 1886. The colonial representatives were made members of the Royal Commission of which his Majesty (then Prince of Wales) was the executive-president and was untiring in his personal devotion to the work of administration. The financial results of the exhibition were most gratifying; six millions of people visited it, and it brought a new revelation of Colonial resources and potentialities.

I have already referred to the effective intervention of the colonial representatives with successive Chancellors of the Exchequer in regard to the tax on securities and the incidence of the succession duties. Many other illustrations might be given of the close contact between the Colonial and Imperial administrations which is afforded through the medium of the colonial high commissioners and Agents-General. The subjects in respect of the co-operation has been thus effected or promoted include the addition of colonial securities to the Trust fund list, the Pacific cable, the Imperial recognition of the Canadian mail route to the Far East, and many more.

It is peculiar genius of the British race to build upon what has gone before, to broaden down from precedent to precedent, and the foregoing illustrations of the usefulness of the machinery we already possess surely carry their own moral. In the Review of February, 1885, that far-sighted statesman, Mr. W. E. Forster, said:

"Lord Grey has repeated in the Pall Mall Gazette the suggestions which he made in this Review in 1879, viz. the appointment of the agents of the colonies as Privy Councillors and their constitution as a board to advice and assist the cabinet and especially to the colonial secretary in the management of colonial affairs; and Lord Lorne has defined this suggestion and given excellent arguments in support. It would be difficult to find any proposal supported by so great an weight of experience as this agreement between the veteran minister, who has an unmatched experience of the Colonial Office, and the man who has just returned from successful government of our largest colony."

The late Lord Thring, who spoke with peculiar authority, in his brochure on the "Consolidation of the British Empire," said, "The direct intervention of a colony may be secured by elevating the position of an Agent-General to one more akin to that of a foreign State and giving him a facility of access to the British government."

Having served during four years represented Canada as high commissioner while I at the same time held a seat in the Canadian cabinet, I found in discussing matters with the Imperial government the additional weight to my representations from the fact that I was not only a representative of the Canadian government but also a member of it. Would it not be to the obvious and great advantage of all parties concerned if the offices of the high commissioners of Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa when confederated, were made departments of their respective Colonial governments and held by members of their respective cabinets? I see that the suggestion is one that commends itself to Lord Milner after his long and brilliant career as a Proconsul. For obvious reasons the connexion of these great outlying portions of the Empire with the Mother Country must be diplomatic, and to be successful of the most secret and confidential character.

The conference composed of all the members of all the cabinets including the high commissioners could employ any experts they desired to collect or collate information on any special subject, and looking at the suggestion as a whole, I fail to see in what way the continuity of the proceedings of the conference could be more effectively carried on.

There remains the question of defence. It is known that from the outset I have felt the interests of Canada and the true interests of the Empire to be opposed to the demand for colonial contributions to the Imperial navy. Those loudest in that demand admit that a voice in administration by the colony contributing its essential and all the naval experts concur in the opinion that any division of authority would be fatal.

But this is not for one moment to say that each colony should not contribute to the extent of its ability to the defence of the Empire. I hold strongly that it should, and, I maintain that Canada has discharged that duty in the manner most conducive to Imperial interests.

It is essential to make quite clear what is a colony's duty in this matter of Imperial defence. Upon that point there is no greater authority than the Duke of Devonshire, who, when the Imperial government appointed a colonial defence committee, was placed at its head. When the Duke delivered his inaugural address as President of the British Empire League, he laid down in the most ex cathedra manner the relative duties of the Imperial and the colonial governments in regard to the defence of the Empire. Here are his words, and they are vital to the present discussion:

"A body is now in existence—has been for many years in existence—called the Colonial Defence Committee, composed of representatives of the Admiralty, the War Office, and the Colonial Office; that body has made a complete study of the question of colonial defence as it effects every colony of the British Empire. It has studied the question from the point of view of each colony; and every colony, whether it be a Crown colony or a self-governing colony, is now in possession of the views of her Majesty's government as to the nature of the attack—the possible attack—to which any of them may be exposed, and as to the means of defence which it is possible to oppose to such attack. Every colonial government now knows what the Imperial government is prepared to undertake in their defence, and what must be left to themselves to undertake. Now, although the instructions to this committee, and the plans which this committee has prepared, are, and must be, to a very great extent, of a confidential character, yet I am permitted to make a public announcement of the principles upon which those plans are based; so that not only the public at home, but every one of our colonial fellow-subjects should know how much it is that the government are prepared to undertake in the defence of the colonies, and the duties which in their turn they think ought to be undertaken by the colonies themselves. These principles are as follows: The maintenance of sea supremacy has been assumed as the basis of the system of Imperial Defence against attack over the sea. This is the determining factor in shaping the whole defensive policy of the Empire, and is fully recognized by the Admiralty, who have accepted the responsibility of protecting all British territory abroad against organized invasion from the sea."

This speech was made in the Guildhall on the 3rd of December, 1896, and provides the foundation of Imperial Defence policy. On the 29th of the following April, the Duke delivered an address to the British Empire League at Eastbourne in which he said:

"We have undertaken, we are undertaking, and we shall I believe continue to undertake and maintain our navy so as to be of sufficient strength, not only to defend our own island, but all our possessions in every part of the world. But we cannot undertake to provide for the land defences of our colonies, especially when they attain the dimensions of the Australian colonies."

Now I ask in what regard has Canada failed to discharge the duty allotted to her by the Colonial Defence Committee of the British government, and with the president of that committee stated he had been permitted to announce to the world as the well considered and settled policy of the Imperial government?

Canada protects her fisheries by her own cruisers, and when the Imperial government expressed a wish to be relieved of the expense of maintaining the strategic points at the harbors of Halifax and Esquimalt, the Canadian government at once relieved them of that large expenditure amounting to £135,000 per annum, and assumed it themselves. The Empire can be best defended by strengthening its weakest part. What did the Hon. Elihu Root, the secretary of State of the United States, say a few weeks ago at Ottawa? "It is full forty years since I paid my first visit to Canada. During that time what wonderful things we have seen. We have seen feeble, ill-compacted, separate dependent colonies growing into a great and vigorous nation." It is pertinent to ask by what means and whose charge that great change has been brought about.

The Canadian history of the past four decades is full of reminders of such difficulties which had to be overcome in the pursuit of the policy from which Canada and the Empire at large are now reaping such ample fruit. As recently as 1880 the Hon. Edward Blake, then leader of the Opposition to Sir John Macdonald's government, moved a resolution in the Canadian House of Commons to compel the government to suspend the construction of the railway on the eastern side of the Rocky Mountains, and implored the House not to ruin Canada for the sake of 10,000 white people in British Columbia. He had the justification that the line of railway as then located did not intersect any community of 100 white men from Ontario to the Pacific ocean. Yet in six years from that date Canada had an unbroken line of rail communication from Halifax on the Atlantic to Vancouver on the Pacific. What was then a desert, the abode of Indians and wild animals, has become one of the world's granaries and last year yielded a revenue to the Canadian Pacific Railway company of over sixty-one million dollars. Two other transcontinental railways are now being vigorously prosecuted, while Canada as a whole has today a larger mileage of railway per head of her population than the United States and this year will add 7,000 miles more to that already constructed.

Earl Grey, the distinguished governor-general, said at a banquet given to him in Winnipeg, "You have this year raised in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta, ninety million bushels of wheat, and he would be a bold man who would venture the statement that you have not ten acres of equally good land left for one that supplied those ninety million bushels." Hundreds of thousands of hardy settlers are annually pouring into that country, which will soon become the world's greatest food reservoir, and it is no vain boast to say that the child is already born who will live to see Canada furnish happy British homes for as large a population as Great Britain now possesses.

So much has already been accomplished in the creation of a virile and compact British community in Canada, and the work of national and Imperial upbuilding still goes on.

That accomplished soldier, Lord Dundonald, delivered an address at the Canadian club in Ottawa, a few years ago, in which he outlined a system of citizen soldiery in all its details; a system which, he asserted, would when completed enable Canada to defend herself against even the United States. This policy is being steadily pursued by the present government. Canadians rejoice that the utmost good feeling exists between the two nations who divide the north American continent, and hope that good feeling will ever continue, but the ability to defend is the primary element of national life. It is a pleasant to every free man—and Canada is a land of free men—to be obliged to feel that he owes the security of his property, his liberty, and his life, to the good nature of a foreign country.

In view of these facts am I not justified in saying that in no portion of the British Empire has more been done to strengthen its weakest part than in Canada?

Need I further remind you that during the unhappy Transvaal war, Canada contributed 8,000 men to the support of the British arms. The quarrel was not of Canada's making; no part of any resultant material benefit could possibly be hers; but the Motherland was involved and the cause of Empire was imperilled, and that was enough. In the course of the year 1899 it was my good fortune to address fifty-six large meetings in Canada, extending from Sydney in the east to Victoria on the Pacific coast, and in every one there were cheers to the echo of the statement that when parliament met I would move that the entire cost of that force should be paid by Canada. Only the action of the Prime Minister in laying on the table of the House evidence that the Imperial government would not permit Canada to pay the whole cost prevented me from redeeming that pledge and doing what an overwhelming majority of the Canadian people would have desired. When a motion was made in the House of Commons disapproving of the aid given by Canada in that struggle, after an eloquent speech by Sir Wilfrid Laurier only three votes in a House of 215 members could be found in support of the motion. Such indeed was the national spirit that a wealthy Canadian friend, who will not allow me to disclose his name enabled me to insure the lives and limbs of the first contingent of a thousand men to the extent of a million dollars, and forty thousand dollars were subsequently paid to the sufferers under that insurance. Three hundred thousand dollars were subscribed and paid in addition out of the Minto Fund to the other sufferers.

Remembering all this, who will venture to say that Canada has failed in her duty to the Empire? And by the past the future may be confidently forecast.

Mr. Balfour told a vast audience in the Albert hall last month that he would have the British people think of the self-governing communities of the Empire as a family, and the parallel is true. May I, as one who has spent a lifetime in the public service of the senior member of that family outside the United Kingdom, be allowed to claim that in her own sphere and in respect especially of trade and defence, Canada has done what in her lies to realize the family ideal? Indeed did not all the Colonies receive the other day from the greatest colonial administrator of modern times—I refer to Mr. Chamberlain—his testimony to the fact that if the union of the British Empire is now brought within the range of practical politics "this great development we owe more to the sister states than we do to ourselves. They," he added, in his letter of the 13th of April, 1907, "have seen further and more clearly than we have how necessary it is that we should go forward if we would not go back."

Mr. Chamberlain in penning that testimony may perhaps have had in mind the undoubted fact that the spontaneous support given to the Mother Country at the time of the Boer war by the outlying portions of the Empire was a potent factor in preventing an intervention on the part of foreign powers with results which it is not pleasant to contemplate. The colonies make their general and consistent acceptance of the family ideal the basis of no claim—they would spurn to do so; but it does entitle their counsel as to the future of the Empire to the full and sympathetic consideration of the government and people of this country. We live in moving times; the issues of today are of the gravest import; and if the Colonial Conference of 1907 has done nothing else it has evinced the deep anxiety of the men of our blood overseas who share with the British people what Lord Rosebery has called "the title-deeds of the race that nothing shall now be done and nothing now be left undone to jeopardise for them and their children's children the right to share with Sir John Macdonald the proud distinction "A British subject I was born, a British subject I will die."

What Will Make You Glad

When the years have slipped by and memory runs back over the path you have come, you will be glad you stopped to speak to every friend you met, and left them all with a warmer feeling in their hearts because you did so.

And you will be glad that you were happy when doing the small, everyday things of life, that you served the best you could in earth's lowly round.

You will be glad that men have said all along your way: "I know I can trust him, he is as true as steel."

You will be glad there have been some rainy days in your life. Clouds and storms are not the worst things in life. If there were no storms, the fountains would dry up, the sky would be filled with poisonous vapors, and life would cease.

You will be glad that you stopped long enough every day to read carefully, and with a prayer in your heart some part of God's message to those He loves.

You will be glad that you shut your ears tight against all the evil things men said about one another and tried the best you could to stay her words, winged with poison.

You will be glad that you have met all the hard things which have come to you with a hearty handshake, never dodging one of them, but turning them all to the best possible account.

Wilhelm—Well, old man, I haven't seen you for an age. And how does matrimony suit you?

Johann (sighing)—It's an expensive joke. If I had only known what I had to pay in milliners' bills—

Wilhelm—You would have remained single, eh?

Johann—No; I would have married the milliner.—Lustige Blaetter.