

disastrous ascendancy of party has led to the use of its phraseology for want of a better. Those who prefer country to the interests of faction, have been styled, and in default of a happier term, have sometimes styled themselves, a party. It should be clear to Mr. Edgar and those who think with him, however, that those who denounce party spirit as being inimical to patriotism, cannot, in strictness, be called a party. So far from separating from either of the existing parties, their great object is to induce the thoughtful men on both sides to sit loose to party ties. Nationalism has its adherents, more or less committed to its leading principle, in both the so-called parties. So that if the question be put—"Where is your party?" the answer is, we have not the vestige of a party; but if we are asked for those who are pledged to our principles, we can point to them in office and out of it, Reformers as well as Conservatives. It is one of the many mischiefs wrought by partyism that it cannot fancy the existence of a powerful principle unless it be formulated in political creeds and catechisms, enrolled in hostile sects and making great demonstrations of a schismatic nature at the polls. Let it be understood, then, that Nationalism consists in principle without party, as Gritism and Conservatism are parties without principle. When Mr. Edgar shall have realised this fact, it will lead him to a cognate one: that we are opposed neither to this nor to that party, but to the party-spirit which animates both, to the manifest injury of the country's best interests. Like most party men, Mr. Edgar is fond of pointing to what his party achieved in by-gone days, and Conservatives do the same when they desire to appeal to popular favour. This is a virtual admission that they have no claim to preference because of anything they are now achieving or can promise to achieve. The services of both may be acknowledged without any concession from us. It is not with the past we have to do; but with the present and the future. When we find one rough gouging out the eye of another in a brawl, we do not accept as an excuse the fact that he once paid a butcher's bill or saved a child from drowning. The *laudator temporis acti* is not of much use to his generation; he is for the most part either an elegant trifler, an impervious obdurate, or a politician by trade. For a party to look

back is stagnation and death. The moment the "Reform" party is convinced that it must live on the interest of past debts due to it by the people, it is superannuated by its own confession—out of race and reckoning in active political life. That the old leaders of this party have either betrayed it or are ready to abdicate is evident from a feeble protest against "Canada First" in a late issue of the *Globe*. That "mischievous little snake in the grass," as the organ, with characteristic elegance of diction, terms it, has had the impudence to call itself Liberal. No one is entitled to the name, it would appear, who is not also Grit, greedy of place, subservient and docile under the party whip. Then follow a claim to unity and infallibility and a profession of faith, perhaps the most humiliating ever put forth by a Reform journal: "There were no real differences, no real divisions, but one common purpose and determination to resist all attempts to unsettle the political system their past efforts and struggles had originated." In short, the Reform party has turned Conservative. Like Mr. Disraeli and Lord Salisbury it is opposed to any more legislation of an "exciting and sensational" kind. Its creed is thus avowedly negative, since "no change and no reform" is the only article in it. Its leaders are now "finality Johns," simply because they have secured place and power, and their motto is "rest and be thankful" or else "*nous avons l'avantage, profitons en*"—the latter bequeathed to them by Sir George Cartier. As for the affectation that there are no differences or divisions in the party, everybody knows, and no one better than the *Globe*, that it is a false and hollow pretence. No doubt matters would be more pleasant if the self-appointed leader could issue such a bulletin as French generals put forth under the Empire—"France is tranquil." Its policy is coercion and terrorism, and it may be policy to shut its eyes to inconvenient facts; still the *Globe* should not expose its mendacity with so unblushing a face. The "party" is not united, nor is it likely to be whilst a portion of it succumbs to backstairs influence. Last session Messrs. Mackenzie, Blake, Moss and Mills, with the bulk of Reformers at their back, declared their intention of "unsettling the political system" by re-organizing the Senate. Has the *Globe* assurance enough to whisper that the "party," cowed by newspaper brow-beat-