

**CIHM  
Microfiche  
Series  
(Monographs)**

**ICMH  
Collection de  
microfiches  
(monographies)**



**Canadian Institute for Historical Microreproductions / Institut canadien de microreproductions historiques**

**© 1994**

# Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

- ☒ Coloured covers/  
Couverture de couleur
- ☐ Covers damaged/  
Couverture endommagée
- ☐ Covers restored and/or laminated/  
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- ☐ Cover title missing/  
Le titre de couverture manque
- ☐ Coloured maps/  
Cartes géographiques en couleur
- ☒ Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/  
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- ☐ Coloured plates and/or illustrations/  
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- ☐ Bound with other material/  
Relié avec d'autres documents
- ☒ Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion  
along interior margin/  
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la  
distorsion le long de la marge intérieure
- ☐ Blank leaves added during restoration may appear  
within the text. Whenever possible, these have  
been omitted from filming/  
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées  
lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte,  
mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont  
pas été filmées.

☐ Additional comments: /  
Commentaires supplémentaires:

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below /  
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	14X	18X	22X	26X	30X
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12X	16X	20X	24X	28X	32X

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- ☐ Coloured pages/  
Pages de couleur
- ☐ Pages damaged/  
Pages endommagées
- ☐ Pages restored and/or laminated/  
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- ☒ Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/  
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- ☐ Pages detached/  
Pages détachées
- ☒ Showthrough/  
Transparence
- ☒ Quality of print varies/  
Qualité inégale de l'impression
- ☐ Continuous pagination/  
Pagination continue
- ☐ Includes index(es)/  
Comprend un (des) index

Title on header taken from: /  
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:

- ☐ Title page of issue/  
Page de titre de la livraison
- ☐ Caption of issue/  
Titre de départ de la livraison
- ☐ Masthead/  
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

The copy filmed here has been reproduced thanks to the generosity of:


National Library of Canada

The images appearing here are the best quality possible considering the condition and legibility of the original copy and in keeping with the filming contract specifications.

Original copies in printed paper covers are filmed beginning with the front cover and ending on the last page with a printed or illustrated impression, or the back cover when appropriate. All other original copies are filmed beginning on the first page with a printed or illustrated impression, and ending on the last page with a printed or illustrated impression.

The last recorded frame on each microfiche sheet contains the symbol  $\rightarrow$  (meaning "CONTINUED"), or the symbol  $\nabla$  (meaning "END"), whichever applies.

Maps, plates, charts, etc., may be filmed at different reduction ratios. Those too large to be entirely included in one exposure are filmed beginning in the upper left hand corner, left to right and top to bottom, as many frames as required. The following diagrams illustrate the method:



L'exemplaire filmé fut reproduit grâce à la générosité de:


Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Les images suivantes ont été reproduites avec le plus grand soin, compte tenu de la condition et de la netteté de l'exemplaire filmé, et en conformité avec les conditions du contrat de filmage.

Les exemplaires originaux dont la couverture en papier est imprimée sont filmés en commençant par le premier plat et en terminant soit par la dernière page qui comporte une empreinte d'impression ou d'illustration, soit par le second plat, selon le cas. Tous les autres exemplaires originaux sont filmés en commençant par la première page qui comporte une empreinte d'impression ou d'illustration et en terminent par la dernière page qui comporte une telle empreinte.


Un des symboles suivants apparaîtra sur la dernière image de chaque microfiche, selon le cas: le symbole  $\rightarrow$  signifie "A SUIVRE", le symbole  $\nabla$  signifie "FIN".

Les cartes, planches, tableaux, etc., peuvent être filmés à des taux de réduction différents. Lorsque le document est trop grand pour être reproduit en un seul cliché, il est filmé à partir de l'angle supérieur gauche, de gauche à droite, et de haut en bas, en prenant le nombre d'images nécessaire. Les diagrammes suivants illustrent la méthode.



# MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART

(ANSI and ISO TEST CHART No. 2)



**APPLIED IMAGE Inc**


1853 East Main Street  
Rochester, New York 14609 USA  
(716) 482 - 0300 - Phone  
(716) 288 - 5989 - Fax

# SPEECHES IN CANADA

By  
VISCOUNT MILNER

Vol. 1-3  
1893

A



**SPEECHES DELIVERED  
IN CANADA**

**IN THE AUTUMN OF 1908**

---

**By  
VISCOUNT MILNER**

---

**TORONTO :  
WILLIAM TYRRELL & CO.**

**1909**



DAIR

M48

140800

MILNER, V.

COPYRIGHT, CANADA, 1909

BY


WM. TYRRELL & COMPANY

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL

**SPEECHES IN CANADA**

**BY**

**VISCOUNT MILNER**



## *PREFACE.*

At the request of some of my Canadian friends, I have consented to the publication of the addresses which I delivered in Canada—mostly to Canadian Clubs—during my recent visit to that country.

The only speech of any length delivered by me at any public meeting in Canada, which is not reprinted here, is my speech at the dinner of the British Empire League in Toronto on October 28th.

This omission is not made because I desire in any way to modify that speech, still less because I fail to appreciate the importance of the occasion upon which it was delivered.

The audience at the British Empire League dinner was as representative and influential as any I had the honor of addressing during my whole visit, and Colonel Denison's speech on that occasion would have been alone sufficient to make the meeting a memorable one. But the conditions of an after-dinner speech are necessarily not the most favorable for the discussion of a complicated and somewhat technical subject like that of Imperial Preference, and, as a matter of fact, I dealt with precisely the same questions, but at greater length and with more elaboration, a few days later in my address to the Board of Trade of Montreal, which is included in this volume. I did not wish to weary my

readers by presenting them with what is in substance the same speech, twice over.

I have only one word to say in extenuation of the very rough and fragmentary character of the material now submitted to the public. The addresses contained in this volume are not a series of lectures, nor do they represent a premeditated effort of any kind. I was simply caught at various stages in a somewhat hurried and arduous journey, and compelled, *nolens volens*, to speak. And so I just did the best I could, always with inadequate preparation, and sometimes without any. Under the circumstances, any little value which these speeches may possess must be attributed to the fact that the subject which was uppermost in my mind at the time—namely, the future relations of Canada and the other self-governing dominions to the United Kingdom and to one another—is one to which for years I have given a good deal of thought; and that, in speaking about it, I was drawing on a certain fund of experience. I should be the last to claim that my treatment of it in these pages was by any means exhaustive. But they may nevertheless contain suggestions of some interest to other workers in the same field.

MILNER.

S.S. "Victorian," Nov. 10th, 1908.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS.

---

1. IMPERIAL UNITY. EXTERNAL ADVANTAGES.  
*Canadian Club, Vancouver.....October 9th*
2. IMPERIAL UNITY. INTERNAL BENEFITS.  
*Canadian Club, Winnipeg.....October 15th*
3. PRACTICAL SUGGESTIONS.  
*Canadian Club, Toronto.....October 27th*
4. SOUTH AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT.  
*Canadian Club, Ottawa.....October 31st*
5. PREFERENTIAL TRADE.  
*Board of Trade, Montreal.....Nov. 1st*
6. IMPERIALISM AND SOCIAL REFORM.  
*Women's Canadian Club, Montreal.....Nov. 2nd*
7. CONDITIONS OF CLOSER UNION.  
*Canadian Club, Montreal.....Nov. 3rd*



# I.

## THE CANADIAN CLUB, VANCOUVER, OCTOBER 9TH.

This is the first time I have had the privilege of addressing one of those Canadian Clubs, which now I believe exist in most of the great towns of the Dominion, and which, according as they give free expression to every form of opinion, are calculated to exercise a most important influence on the development of the intellectual and social, and, using the word in its best sense, the political life of Canada. I am very grateful for the opportunity you have afforded me, but I hope you will not expect a long or momentous oration. I am not by training an orator, but an administrator, and I have come to Canada not to preach, but to learn. For many years I have heard and read a great deal about this country. It is one which looms large and ever larger in the thought and interest of all those who care about the British Empire. It is destined to take a very important place, perhaps in time even the first place, in the world-wide group of sister nations, which we designate by that term.

Now ever since I have thought about such things at all, I have striven to be a devoted citizen of Greater Britain. I have spent the best years of my life in its service, and now that I am out of official harness I have



no higher ambition than to be regarded as a man, who, though he may live almost entirely in the Old Country, does not belong to it exclusively, but belongs to the whole Empire; one who, at any rate, is capable of understanding and sympathizing with the people of what I may call the younger nations of the Empire; who realizes their difficulties, sympathizes with their aspirations, and who can always be relied upon to take a fair, an intelligent and a helpful view of any questions affecting them in their relations to the United Kingdom or to one another.

Now, that you will say is a tall order. I am quite aware of it. I know that it is a big ambition to be an all-round British citizen, not to say an all-round British statesman. I daresay I may make a great mess of it—perhaps no man living can make a complete success in that field, but whether I succeed or whether I fail, it is an honorable ambition and one with which I think you are bound to sympathize.

At any rate, you will see why it was a matter of supreme interest to me to become better acquainted with Canada. Though I have long been a student of Canadian affairs, though I have many Canadian friends, made in the Old Country, and made perhaps more especially in South Africa, I have never actually been in Canada till the last three weeks. It is just twenty days to-day since I landed at Quebec, and I have never felt more than during my present journey what an enormous difference it

makes, however much you may have studied a subject or thought about it, to be able to see things for yourself. It is true that I have only rushed through the Dominion; I am the last man to think that so hasty a visit entitles me to pose as an authority on Canadian affairs. Nothing could be more intolerable—don't I know it?—than the globe trotter who dashes through a country in a few days, and then thinks he knows all about it, when all he really knows is the inside of two or three hotels. I assure you, gentlemen, I have suffered from him in my time just as much as any of you, and I am not going to imitate him.

Take British Columbia alone. It would take months to go through it, and years to know it. But for all that I do know it a great deal better than I did a week ago. And this is true of all my experiences in this country. I feel I realize with greater vividness than I expected, not only the vastness and the immense possibilities of the Dominion, but also the differences, I might almost say the contrasts, which exist between different parts of it.

That is, so far, the dominant impression left upon my mind. I may be entirely wrong; you will not be hard upon me if I am. First impressions are often wrong, and I am merely telling you frankly, as I believe you would wish me to speak, how the matter strikes me, not in any dogmatic way, but because it is sometimes interesting and useful to know how things, with which one is very familiar, so familiar perhaps that one has

ceased to think about them, strike a man who sees them for the first time.

I have been deeply impressed not only by the extent of the country, but by the fact that I seem to have been travelling not through one, but through four different countries. And that although, to my great regret, I have not been able to visit, and I fear shall not be able to visit, on this occasion, the Maritime Provinces on the far Atlantic. And so I realize better than ever, how bold was the conception of those who first grasped the idea of moulding all Canada from Cape Breton to Vancouver Island into one great Confederation. They were great political architects, who leaped the intervening wilderness, as it then was, between Ontario and British Columbia. Of course, it was only the common flag, it was only the fact that that flag had been kept flying in British Columbia here on the shores of the Pacific, which made that union possible in the first instance. Had you and those who came before you not kept that flag flying here, as I believe you always will keep it flying, that great transcontinental state, the creation of which presented such difficulties in any case, would have been a sheer impossibility. The old Crown colony of British Columbia, that outpost of Empire, has therefore an importance in world history which is not generally recognized.

But, after all, the common flag, in this as in other cases, was only a great opportunity. It may mean every-

thing or it may mean very little, according as the opportunity is neglected or developed. In this case, human genius and energy made the most of the opportunity, and the success was beyond all human anticipation. The builders builded better than they knew. But it is one thing to bring several distant and diverse communities into one political union; it is another to inspire them with a common soul. Many people doubted when the Confederation was first formed, whether it was possible for the British communities of North America, with all their differences of race, with all the physical obstacles to their intercourse, with all the external attractions drawing them away from one another, to develop a common national life. The event has proved that this fear was unfounded.

Immense as has been the development of the material resources of the country, and it is only just beginning, there is another development, not less important, not less momentous, though it has perhaps attracted less attention in the world, I mean the growth of a common devotion to their common country among the inhabitants of all parts of Canada; the growth of a Canadian spirit, a Canadian patriotism. And that without any loss of individuality in the several communities. If men had sought to ignore the differences of character and history, if they had sought to force what are now the provinces of Canada into one common mould, Confederation would have been a failure. It was only by recognizing local

life and local independence, it was only by combining independence in local affairs, with an effective union for common affairs, by unity in diversity, that this country has been built up. Canadian patriotism has not grown at the expense of local patriotism, but in addition to it.

And there is a greater and wider lesson in that. How will this growth of Canadian patriotism affect Imperial interests? There are people, perhaps many people, who think that Canadian patriotism will tend to draw Canada away from the sister nations into an isolated existence, isolated though no doubt powerful. I do not, myself, share that feeling. May I tell you how I have heard it put more than once during my visit to Canada? People have said to me, people whose opinion I feel bound to respect, "Canada is a land inhabited by people of various races and of different origin and traditions; it is possible to make them all good Canadians, but it is not possible to make them all good Britishers:" and, in a sense, no doubt, that is true; but I for my part shall be satisfied if they all become good Canadians. I do not, myself, fear that the growth of a distinct Canadian type of character, of a strong Canadian patriotism, is going to be a danger to the unity of the Empire.

My faith in the British Empire, which is something different from an Empire of England, or even of the United Kingdom, is stronger than that. It is not reasonable to expect that men who are not of British race, or who, though originally of British race, may have become

alienated from British traditions, should be Imperialists from love of Great Britain. But I think the time will come when they may be Imperialists from love of Canada. Let them only learn to love Canada, the country of their adoption, or in the next generation the country of their birth, let them care greatly for Canada, and let them and those Canadians who are of British birth unite in the development of a strong local patriotism. The more they all care for Canada, the more ambitious they are for her, the more proud they are of her, the more I believe they will appreciate the position of world-wide influence and power which is open to her as a member of the British Empire.

I am not speaking of what exists to-day. I am thinking of the future. How are these things going to work out? Canada is going to be a great country in any case, one of the great countries of the world. But she will not be unique in that. There are some other countries her equals in extent, and which, even with her vast development, will be far more than her equals in population. The time will come when with the growth of her population and trade she will have interests in every part of the world. How is she going to defend them? Sooner or later she will have to enter the field of world-politics. What will she find there? Nations, not a few now, and there are going to be more, who count their armed men by millions, and their giant battleships by scores. Is she going to compete on that scale with the armaments of

the great world-Powers? Or is she going to take a back seat, and a back seat, mind you, not only in war but in peace? Wars between great nations are going to be rarer and rarer as times passes. But every year and every day, not only on the rare occasions when nations actually fight, the power of fighting exercises its silent, decisive influence on the history of the world. It is like the cash reserve of some great solvent bank. How often is it necessary actually to disburse those millions, the existence of which, in the background, nevertheless affects the bank and everybody who deals with it all the time? It is credit which determines the power and influence of nations just as it does the fate of any business. Credit in business rests ultimately on the possession or command of cash, though the owners may never actually have to produce it. And so the influence and authority of a nation, its power to defend its rightful interests, depend ultimately on that fighting strength in war, which it nevertheless may never be called upon to use. See what is happening in Europe to-day. International boundaries are being altered. Solemn treaties are being torn up. Yet not a shot has been fired, probably not a shot will be. The strong will prevail and the weak will go to the wall without any such necessity.

Is Canada, as she grows and her external relations increase, going to allow herself, I will not say to be invaded, but just to be hustled and pushed off the pavement, whenever it suits any stronger power?



Or is she going to rely for protection on some friendly neighbor such as the United States? I do not think that either course would be consonant with the dignity or self-respect of Canadians. But are they, then, to be compelled to compete in armaments with the great world powers, to turn aside from the development of this great country, which demands all the energies and resources of a far larger population than it has, in order to build up great armies and navies? Not at all. There is another alternative, easier, much easier, much more natural and much more effective. I have said that Canada is not unique in being a great country. But she is unique in being one of a group of countries, which has a strong foothold in every corner of the world. That group only needs to hold together and to be properly organized, in order to command, with a comparatively small cost to its individual members, all the credit and all the respect, and, therefore, all the power and all the security, which credit and respect alone can give a nation among the nations of the world. No doubt Canada, if she is to take her place in such a union, will have to develop, as I believe she will desire to develop, her own fighting strength. But not to a greater extent than would be necessary in any case for the adequate development of Canadian self-respect, or beneficial to the manhood of her people, and certainly nothing like to the same extent as would be absolutely inevitable if she desired to stand alone. Without any loss of individuality, without any exces-



sive strain upon her resources, it is within her power to enjoy all the glory and all the benefits of that great position, not only on this continent, but throughout the world, in which every self-governing community under the British Crown is equally entitled to participate. Canada would be greater, far greater, as a member, perhaps in time the leading member of that group of powerful though pacific nations, than she ever could be in isolation.

One word in conclusion, to obviate any misunderstanding. If I contemplate a future in which Canada will contribute more than she does to-day to the maintenance of Imperial power, do not suppose that I underestimate what Canadians have already done, or what they are even now doing for the common cause. I ought to be the last to forget, and I never shall forget what Canadians did at a supreme crisis in the history of the Empire in South Africa; and I fully realize that the mere development of a great country like this within the Empire must of itself tend constantly to enhance the prestige and potential strength of the Empire as a whole. The last thing that would occur to me would be to lecture Canadians on their duty. It is in no such spirit that I have ventured to point out, that the greatness of the Empire to which they belong is a matter of deep concern to Canadians as Canadians, whether they be of British origin or not, and that there is no contrast, but rather a necessary connection, between Canadian and Imperial

patriotism. Let that once be recognized, and I have no doubt whatever that the people of Canada will draw for themselves the inferences which their interest and their dignity alike dictate. They will claim, and rightly claim, to have a greater voice in controlling the policy of the whole Empire. In my opinion that will be an unmitigated advantage all round. I could quote instances, but it would take me too long, in which, as I think, Imperial policy would never have gone astray, if the opinion of the younger nations could have been brought to bear upon it. It is high time that those who guide the destiny of the Empire should learn to look at international problems, not only from the point of view of the United Kingdom and its immediate dependencies, but from that of the Empire at large. The younger nations will wish to make their voices heard, and the sooner they do it the better. And in proportion as they claim an influence on Imperial policy they will recognize of themselves the necessity of increasing Imperial strength.

I thank you for the kindness and patience with which you have listened to me. I hope I have not trespassed too much upon your time. The questions I have discussed are questions about which there must be great differences of opinion here, as in any other portion of the Empire. I have stated my own position, and have stated it frankly, and I now leave these two matters with you for your own consideration: first, the necessity of national strength not only for purposes of war, but for

purposes of peace and peaceful development; and, second, the evidence which your own history affords, that there is no incompatibility between local and national patriotism, as there is, in my opinion, no incompatibility between Canadian national patriotism and the wider patriotism of the Empire.

## II.

### THE CANADIAN CLUB, WINNIPEG, OCTOBER 15TH.

Speaking last week to the Canadian Club of Vancouver, I dwelt at some length upon what I conceive to be the advantages which Canada and other members of the British Imperial family, such as Australia, New Zealand, or, for that matter, the United Kingdom itself, derive to-day, and may derive in still larger measure in the future, from facing the world as a single great power. If anyone is sufficiently interested in the matter, and cares to see what I said then, there is a full report of my remarks, not indeed a faultless one, but a wonderfully good one, in the Vancouver *Daily News-Advertiser* of October 10th. I do not wish to repeat myself, and I shall deal with quite a different aspect of the life of the Empire to-day. But there are just one or two things which I must repeat, though I shall do so as briefly as I can, in order to explain to you from what point of view I approach the subject.

The word British, as applied to the Empire, does not mean English, nor yet English, Scotch and Irish all together. The Empire is not something belonging to the United Kingdom any more than to Canada, or to Australia, or to any other single portion of it. All the subjects of the King ought to be equal sharers in it, and so to

regard themselves. For my own part, I firmly refuse, and shall always refuse, to regard any quarter of the Empire as otherwise than a part of my country, or its inhabitants otherwise than as my fellow-citizens, my fellow-countrymen, and that not because I happen to be an Englishman. If I were a Canadian, I should feel, and be entitled to feel, precisely the same. No doubt since the Empire has tumbled up in a very casual manner, and its organization is still very imperfect, this view is to-day somewhat a "counsel of perfection." The people of the United Kingdom do in fact at the present time control the foreign policy of the Empire, and provide for its defence, in a very different measure from the inhabitants of other parts of it. But that is a state of affairs which I hope to see gradually altered, as it has been to some extent altered already. A good deal has been said recently about the self-governing states of the Empire, other than the United Kingdom, taking a greater share in Imperial defence. I think that is right, and I believe that they recognize it. But from my point of view it is no less essential that they should take their part in moulding Imperial policy. For instance, and by way of illustration only, they all contributed to our success in the South African war. It was right that they should do so, for the great issue at stake there was not of local but of general interest. But though they took part in the war, their participation in South African affairs ended with its conclusion. It was

regarded as a matter of course that the United Kingdom alone should deal with the situation in South Africa as the war left it. In my opinion, the policy to be adopted after the war should have been, like the war itself, the business of the whole Empire, and not of the United Kingdom only. If Canada, Australia, New Zealand had had a voice in it, if the organization of the Empire had been sufficiently advanced to make that course practicable, I think we should see a more satisfactory state of affairs in South Africa than we do to-day.

That, then, is my position, the position of an Imperial Unionist, using that word in its broadest and in no party sense—a Unionist in that I wish to see all our common affairs the subject of common management in peace as much as in war. If wars were altogether to cease, as we all hope and believe that they will grow less and less frequent, I should not on that account attach less importance to a united Empire.

And now only one more reference to what I said at Vancouver. In answer to those who hold that the growth of a Canadian spirit, of Canadian patriotism, in which I rejoice, is incompatible with the Imperial idea, I tried to point out how decisively the history of this country itself belies such fears. There are no greater contrasts within the British Empire to-day, or at any rate within the self-governing states, than existed in Canada before Confederation, and indeed still exist. You had physical distance and inaccessibility. Nova Scotia is farther from

British Columbia than from Great Britain, and the then unbridged prairies and Rocky Mountains were out and away a greater obstacle to intercourse than the Atlantic Ocean. You had likewise differences of race. But in spite of all these, United Canada is a great accomplished fact to-day. And it has become so without loss of individuality in the several and very diverse states which compose it, and without violence being done to their distinctive character and traditions. The principles which have been so satisfactory in the making of Canada are applicable in a wider field.

And Canada is not the only example. The history of our race and of other kindred races for hundreds of years shows many instances in which, never, indeed, without doubt, opposition, and criticism at the outset, but with complete success in the end, independent communities, intensely jealous of their independence, have nevertheless solved the problem of effective and enduring union for common purposes without injury to their individual characters and patriotism. There is nothing at all new in the idea. What is novel is the largeness of the scale on which it is sought to realize it. But then the novel conditions of human life, the great and progressive improvement in the means of travel and communication, the triumphs of science over distance—what has been called the “shrinkage of the world”—are favorable to political architecture on a large scale. Imperialists are only men who realise the facts of the world they live in, who have

grasped the bearing and consequences of the changes, to which I have referred, rather sooner than other people. And now, gentlemen, I have done with my recapitulation. I am going to break new ground. Enough has been said, for the moment, about the value of Imperial unity for purposes of external protection. Let us look at it to-day in its bearing on internal development. We Imperialists are frequently represented as people who think only of national power, of armies and navies, and of cutting a big figure in the world; in fact, in one word, of the material and external aspect of national life. Most emphatically do I enter my protest against any such misconception. Give me that political organism, be it small or large, which affords to its members the best opportunities of self-development, of a healthy and many-sided human existence. I believe that the close association of the several peoples under the British Crown, their leading a common national life, tends to promote these things, and that there would be a distinct and immense loss, if the tie were broken, alike to the various communities as wholes and to all the individuals who compose them.

Take first the individual. We live in a migratory age, and mankind, as far as one can foresee, is likely to become more rather than less migratory. Men find the older countries too crowded, and go forth to seek fresh opportunities and more elbow room in the new, or they go for purposes of business and study, or from mere inclination, from the new to the old. Again there is a



growing intercourse, this for business reasons mainly, between the tropic and the temperate zones, and generally between countries of diverse climate and products. The economic interdependence of the different parts of the world is constantly increasing this tendency.

Now, in this constant movement, so characteristic of our age, the citizens of a worldwide state have a great advantage. The British Empire, comprising, as it does, so large an area in both hemispheres, and in every continent on the globe, containing every variety of climate and product, and almost every form of human activity and enterprise, offers to every born subject of the King, of European race, a varied choice of domicile within its own borders, and opportunities of migration without expatriation, which no other state in the world affords. The United States probably come nearest to it in this respect, but the United States are not its equal in the number and variety of the opportunities which they offer to their citizens in the confines of their own country.

It is no exaggeration to say that, without exception, British citizenship is the most valuable citizenship in the whole world. Regarded as a free pass, it has the widest currency. The man of white race who is born a British subject can find a home in every portion of the world where he can live under his own flag, enjoying the same absolute freedom, and the same protection for person or property as he has always enjoyed; using his own language, and possessing from the first moment that he

sets foot there the full rights of citizenship. And that without sacrificing anything, without foreswearing his allegiance to the land of his birth, as he must do in order to obtain citizen rights in any foreign country.

It is needless to dwell on the vast advantage which it is to the people of the United Kingdom to be able to make homes for themselves in so many parts of the new world, without ceasing to be Britons. There is nothing which more excites the envy and admiration of foreign nations. But is there no corresponding advantage to the younger nations of the British family in the fact that they have a home, and a footing, and a place as of right, in the old world, which no other denizens of the new world possess? Take the people of the great republic on your borders. They come to Europe as visitors by tens and hundreds of thousands, and many of them come to stay. And welcome visitors they are, especially in Great Britain. The sense of relationship is strong and growing, and we are all very glad of it. But much as he may feel at home in Great Britain, much as we may do to make him feel so, the citizen of the United States can never be at home there in the same sense in which a Canadian or Australian can. The great historic sites to which he makes his pilgrimage, the monuments of art and antiquity, the accumulated treasures of centuries of civilized existence, great as may be the attraction they possess for him, are yet not his, as they are yours and mine. And, of course, he cannot take his part in the

public life of the country without abandoning his own nationality. The Canadian can do so at any time and for just as long as he likes without any such sacrifice.

These privileges of British citizenship are without parallel in history. I cannot dwell at greater length upon all that is involved in them, either in the way of material benefit, or in their effect on character, though I feel strongly that the multiplied sympathies and the wider outlook which the citizenship of a world-state gives, have an educating influence of the highest value. And, here, if I may, without appearing to be egotistical, refer to my own case, I should just say that I am conscious how greatly my own life has been enriched by my experiences in Egypt and South Africa, arduous and even painful as they sometimes have been. I am not now thinking of the political or business aspect of these experiences, but simply of the education, which it was to me, to be brought into close touch with the life of these two countries, so extraordinarily dissimilar and yet both so interesting. That was an experience which I could never have had in the same degree as a mere foreign visitor. And I feel the same about my present sojourn in Canada. It is much too short, but I am getting more out of it, in the way of my own improvement, than I should out of a stay of equally brief duration in any foreign country.

Now turn from the individual to look at the community. Despite a general similarity of spirit and aim which distinguishes the self-governing states of the Em-

pire throughout the world from other nations, there is no doubt great diversity between them. They are developing distinct but closely related types of civilization and character, and, that being so, they have much to learn from one another, which can best be learned and perhaps can only be learned if they draw closer together instead of drifting into separation and that inevitable consequence of separation, potential antagonism. This is a big subject, much more than I can elaborate at the end of a long address. But I may just indicate what is running in my mind. My personal experience of the younger communities of the Empire is limited. But as far as it goes, it confirms what has often been asserted by careful observers. In the freer and less conventional life of these communities men are more readily judged by their essential worth than they are in the Old Country. Social distinctions are of less account. "A man's a man for a' that." In this respect the younger states are in the best sense of the word more democratic. Again, the supreme importance of education is more generally recognized. It is impressive to see the new provinces of the Canadian West, which have only existed as political entities for a few years, already equipped with such stately school buildings, already starting Universities and resolved to start them on no mean scale. Again, it is a commonplace that new departures in social organization are more readily attempted here or in Australia or New Zealand than in the United Kingdom. There is not the same excessive

caution about making experiments, or the same difficulty in breaking loose from the domination of time-honored theories and routine. For one who, like myself, is something of a radical, at any rate in the field of economics and social reform, there is much encouragement in all this, as well as much instruction.

But if there is much that the Old Country can learn from Canada, is there not also much that she can give to Canada in return? I speak from a brief experience, and I may be quite wrong, but you will wish me to say frankly what strikes me. The younger states of the Empire have taken all their fundamental institutions from the Old Country. I am not sure that they have yet reproduced all that is best in her public life. Without ignoring the excesses of party spirit in the United Kingdom, which I am the last to defend, I think that as a rule the tone of public controversy there is comparatively high. The number of men who engage in public affairs, contrary to their own interests and even inclination, from a sheer sense of duty, is considerable. The civil service, impartially recruited, entirely free from party bias, absolutely independent and yet self-effacing, is probably the best in the world.

Now turn from the political to the intellectual life of the country. I think the general level of education and intelligence is higher on this continent. But I also think that on the topmost plane of literature and learning, of course with individual exceptions, there is something in

the maturity of thought and perfection of scholarship which distinguish the Old Country and the Old World generally, which seems entitled to peculiar respect. But I will say no more on these points. On the whole, it would be better for Canadians to look out for what is best and most worthy of imitation in the Old Country, and for me to spend my time in Canada in looking out for what is best and most worthy of imitation here. That would appear to be the right division of labor in the present case.

And now, before sitting down, I want to answer two criticisms, not external but internal criticisms. I mean doubts which have arisen in my mind as to the appropriateness of what I have been saying to-day. The first is this: for the past fortnight, during which I have travelled thousands of miles and conversed earnestly with scores of able people, I have been ceaselessly in contact with, hearing all day and dreaming all night, and imbibing, so to speak, through the pores of the skin, the story of that immense development, present and future, of Western Canada, which necessarily preoccupies the minds of all its inhabitants to-day. The only thing which everybody cares for, so says my internal critic, is the one thing I have said nothing at all about. But not because I am not impressed with it, or fail to realize its importance alike to this country and to the future of the Empire. If the plains, which I have just been traversing, are going to become the principal granary of the United Kingdom,

and I don't see how they can fail to become that, this is evidently a new factor of tremendous moment. But then it would be carrying coals to Newcastle to dilate upon it here. There is not a man in this room who does not know much more about it than I do. If I am going to dwell on the great future of the Canadian West and all that it involves, let me do so, not in Winnipeg, but in London.

But now that I have silenced one internal critic, up jumps another and a more formidable one. "What," he says to me, "have we not heard enough of all these fine generalities about Empire and Imperial Union? Is it not time to come to something more definite and practical?" Now that objection appeals to me very much, for, absurd as it may seem to say so at the end of this interminable rigmarole, I am not a man of speech, but a man of action. No amount of practice will ever make speaking anything but pain and grief to me, and especially speaking in generalities. It is very much easier to discuss a particular definite proposal. But then, in the first place, this is a club for the formation of opinion and not for the discussion of programmes. And I must reluctantly admit that there is still a great deal to do, quite as much, or more, in the Old Country as here, in creating a sound attitude of mind on Imperial Unity. It is not that in a vague and after-dinner-speech sort of way there is not great enthusiasm with regard to it. But of the people who share that enthusiasm, very few take the trouble to think out what



they themselves can do to turn it to practical account. Men are waiting for a sign, for some great scheme of an Imperial constitution, which, as it seems to me, can only result from, and not precede, the practice of co-operation in the numerous matters, in which it might be practised now without new institutions. And so opportunities are missed every day, which would not be missed, if there was a more general and vivid sense of what is incumbent on those who sincerely aim at being citizens of Greater Britain.

I have tried in my imperfect way to live up to that ideal all my life, and have found it a constant source of strength and inspiration. I do not think I have been a worse Englishman because I have never been a Little Englander, but have sought to realize, beyond my duty to England, the duties and obligations of a wider patriotism. May I put it to you, quite bluntly, it is only if a similar spirit prevails in all parts of the Empire, that the great heritage of our common citizenship and our world-wide dominion can either be preserved, or so developed as to yield all the benefits which it is capable of yielding to every one of its inheritors. It is no use a few of us, even a large number of us, working away for the common cause on the other side of the Atlantic, unless others are working for it over here, working for it as Canadians, keeping it in their minds from day to day, watching for every opportunity which may further it, on their guard against every step which may imperil it. It is only



by a long pull and a strong pull and a pull altogether, that we can place our great common heritage, the British Empire, above the danger of external attack or internal disruption.

### III.

#### THE CANADIAN CLUB, TORONTO, OCTOBER 27TH.

It is perhaps rather unfortunate that the subject of my address to-night should be a political subject. Even the most ardent lovers of political discussion must, I fancy, be feeling some satiety on the day after the close of a hotly contested general election. But if my subject is political, it is at any rate not party-political. It has nothing to do with any of the questions which at present form the staple of party controversy in this country. My views may excite, indeed they are bound to excite, differences of opinion, but they will not follow the ordinary lines of party cleavage.

Only one more preliminary remark. I have not come to Canada as a lecturer or a propagandist. The object of my journey is simply to make myself better acquainted with Canada, with the conditions of its life and the opinions of its people. And from that point of view my visit has been an unmitigated success. It is difficult for me to tell you how much instruction I have derived from it. Whether it would not have been better to allow me thus to improve my mind, without at the same time compelling me to exhibit its emptiness by making speeches, is another question. Whatever may be the advantages, and

the charms, of the role of a silent observer, it is one which the vigilance and the enterprise of the Canadian Clubs have rendered impossible in my case. They are scattered all over the land, and, like the robber barons, whose castles lined the great mediaeval trade-routes, they insist on taking their toll of the passing traveller. True, I have succeeded in evading several of them. But where evasion is clearly hopeless, I do my best to pay up cheerfully, and to look as if I liked it. But I beg you to observe that this payment is not in the nature of a voluntary contribution. I am not volunteering my opinions. I am told to "stand and deliver" them. That being the case, I am bound to deliver them frankly. No other course would be compatible with self-respect or respect for you. But if, being pronounced opinions, they knock up against the pet prejudices of some, or disturb the contented inertia of others, I shall decline to be responsible for the "moral and intellectual damages" so occasioned.

And now, not to detain you too long, may I take one or two things for granted? In the first place, it may seem very conceited of me, but I will take it for granted that my audience to-night are acquainted, in a general way, with the spirit in which I approach the question of the relations of Canada with the Mother Country, and with the other parts of the British Empire. And I will take it for granted further—this is perhaps a bolder assumption, but I am prepared to make it—that, broadly speaking, this spirit is in harmony with the spirit and temper of the

great majority of those in Canada who think much or earnestly about this question. I may be quite wrong, but that is my present impression. I think there is a widespread, a preponderant, I do not say a universal, desire among the people of this country, not only to maintain the union which at present happily exists between Canada and the other self-governing states under the British Crown, but to see that union grow closer, to foster more intimate commercial and social intercourse, a better mutual understanding, and greater mutual helpfulness. Underlying that desire is the conception, not clearly grasped perhaps, but constantly becoming stronger and more definite, the conception of the Empire as an organic whole, consisting, no doubt, of nations completely independent in their local affairs, and possessing distinct individualities, but having certain great objects and ideals in common, and capable, by virtue of these, of developing a common policy and a common life.

Well, now that being a general desire, the question arises how to realize it. And here opinions diverge widely. My own view is that, if people already friendly and related, wish to become more friendly and more closely related, to develop greater intimacy and interdependence, the only way for them to achieve this is to do things together; great things, if possible, in any case things that are of some moment, and are worth doing. To do this, that, and the other important piece of business together, not to stand talking of your mutual affection and sym-

pathy—that is the method, as it seems to me. And there are many opportunities for co-operation between the members of the Imperial family, some that have been taken, many more that have been and are being missed. It is quite a mistake to suppose that nothing can be done. An enormous amount can be done even with our present instruments. And if the instruments are imperfect, it is in using them that we shall invent better ones. Some people think that no progress can be made without the creation, as a first step, of some Imperial Parliament or Council representative of all parts of the Empire. I do not agree with them. But do not misunderstand me. I am and always have been a Federalist. Personally, I am unable to conceive the effective permanent all-round co-operation of the self-governing states of the Empire without a common organ, an executive belonging to all of them, in the constitution of which they will all have a share, which will be responsible for the defence of their common interests, and armed with power to defend them effectually. And for my own part I do not think the difficulties besetting the creation of such a body are anything like as great as they appear to many people.

But, in my view, this is the natural end of a particular process of constitutional development. It is not the beginning of it. It may come more or less quickly. Or the true solution may be found in some other form of organization, which, on the basis of our present knowledge and experience, I personally am unable to conceive.

What is certain is that we can only arrive at an ideal system of co-operation by actually beginning to co-operate in the problems immediately before us.

Do not let us allow differences of opinion as to the future constitution of the Empire—I do not deprecate the discussion of such matters; in fact, I welcome it, only I don't want it entirely to absorb us—I say, do not let such differences prevent our working together to-day, wherever we can work together, for purposes which we all, or the great majority of us, consider desirable. To sum up. While we keep the ideal in view, let us pay immediate attention to the one practical thing after another that arises and that can be dealt with here and now.

Now, there is one respect in which I think most people are agreed that a great deal can be done to draw together the different parts of the Empire, and that is the development of trade relations between them. But this is a subject on which, great as its importance is, I will not dwell to-night. I shall have other opportunities of discussing it. Another great branch of the subject is co-operation for defence. In approaching that I wish to remove one common source of misunderstanding. The way in which the case is sometimes put is an appeal, or something like an appeal, on the part of the United Kingdom, to Canada, or Australia, or New Zealand, to lighten the vast burden resting on the Mother Country. Personally, I am not in accord with that manner of

approaching the question, for many reasons. I think there is something in the argument, that the United Kingdom, certainly as long as it retained Indian and other dependencies, would require at least as large an army and navy as it has to-day, even if the self-governing states were wholly separate, and the United Kingdom was under no obligation to protect them. Moreover, I think that even under present conditions, their membership of the Empire adds more to its collective strength, than liability for their protection adds to its responsibilities. But no doubt the general position would be much stronger if all the self-governing states were to adopt the course, which Australia seems disposed to adopt, of creating a national militia, and laying the foundations of a fleet. And I for one should welcome such a policy, wherever adopted, not as affording relief to the United Kingdom, but as adding to the strength and dignity of the Empire as a whole, to its influence in peace as well as to its security in case of war.

It is not a question of shifting burdens, but of developing fresh centres of strength. For this reason I have never been a great advocate of contributions from the self-governing states to the army and navy of the United Kingdom, though as evidences of a sense of the solidarity of the Empire such contributions are welcome, and valuable, pending the substitution of something better. But I am sure that the form which Imperial co-operation in this field will ultimately take, and ought to take, the form

at once most consistent with the dignity of the individual states and most conducive to their collective strength and organic union, is the development of their several defensive resources, in material and in manhood. I know that it may be argued—it has been argued—that individual strength would make for separation. But I have no sympathy whatever with that point of view. On the contrary, I believe that in proportion as the self-governing Dominions grow in power they will feel a stronger desire to share in the responsibilities and the glory of Empire.

But quite apart from any danger to the Imperial spirit in the several states, which I do not fear, there are no doubt many difficulties about the creation of separate defensive forces, and there is a danger of their developing on lines so dissimilar as to hamper conjoint action should it become necessary. This is especially true in the case of the navy. The professional and technical, not to say the strategic, arguments for a single big navy of the Empire are enormously strong, so strong that they might conceivably overcome, as they have to some extent overcome in the past, the political objection. But without wishing to be dogmatic on a subject which requires a great deal more careful study on all hands than it has yet received, I must say that, speaking as an Imperialist, I feel the political objection very strongly.

If the self-governing states were going, under our present constitutional arrangements, merely to contribute to a central navy, whether in money or, better still, in



men and ships, I do not think they would take that interest and pride in the matter which it is essential they should take. They would continue, as now, absorbed in their local affairs, and, even if they felt their obligation to the Empire as a whole, they would rest content to have discharged it by such a contribution. The contribution, under these circumstances, would probably not be large, but that is not really the weakest point in such a system. Its fatal weakness is that the participation of the self-governing states in Imperial affairs would begin and end with the contribution. The responsibility for the whole direction of Imperial affairs, for policy, would still rest with the United Kingdom alone. That might save trouble for the moment, but it would be a very poor substitute for a real Imperial partnership. I know the latter cannot be achieved all at once, but I want to proceed on lines which lead towards it, and which do not lead away from it. The true line of progress is for the younger nations to be brought face to face themselves, however gradually and however piecemeal, with the problem of the defence of the Empire, to undertake a bit of it, so to speak, for themselves, always provided that whatever they do, be it much or little, is done for the Empire as a whole, not for themselves only, and is part of a general system.

I may illustrate my idea by the analogy of a firm in which different partners, with shares perhaps of very different amounts, take charge in different centres, but

always of the interests of the firm, not merely of their individual interests. I can see in my mind an arrangement, in the first instance, possibly, a number of separate and special arrangements, by which the self-governing states would supplement, with their own forces, acting under their own control, but on a mutually agreed plan, the efforts already immense, but not even thus quite adequate, which the United Kingdom makes to cause the influence of the Empire to be felt in every portion of the world. You know what the presence of a British ship of war means in any waters. For once that they have to fire a shot, our sailors render a hundred invaluable and little-recognized services to the Empire, and to civilization, in time of peace. But they cannot be in all places where their presence is desirable. Without firing a shot a gunboat in the Southern Pacific may prevent the recrudescence of slavery, or in the North Pacific act as a salutary warning to poachers. Imperial interests would be as well served, in either case, by an Australian or a Canadian as by an English gunboat.

I hope I have said enough—time will not allow me to say more—about the spirit in which, the object with which, I desire to see the self-governing states develop for themselves that fighting strength which has once already, at a moment of great emergency, contributed so greatly to the safety of the Empire. Let me say one word as to method. It is of the highest importance, not only for strategical reasons, but as a contribution to Imperial unity, that these

forces, without being forced into one rigid mould, should yet be trained, armed, officered on similar lines, so that, in the details of military and naval organization as in policy, these separate efforts may dovetail into one another. From this point of view I think Mr. Haldane's idea of a general staff of the Empire is an idea of great value. The soldiers and sailors of different parts of the Empire will be under the control of their several governments, and those governments must arrange for the manner and degree of their co-operation. But they will all be the servants of the one Empire and of its common sovereign, and they cannot know too much of one another.

We need not wait, indeed we ought not to wait, for a war to make them better acquainted. The same object can be attained by a systematic interchange of services in time of peace. It would be of immense value for any British officer to serve for a time in a Canadian or Australian force. It would be of no less advantage to the Canadian or Australian to put in a period of service in another part of the Empire than his own. At a further stage of the development, the principle of interchange might be extended, from individuals to whole regiments and to ships.

And this idea of interchange of service can be and ought to be applied in many other directions than that of Imperial defence. It is not only the military and naval service of the Empire which would benefit by it, but the civil service as well. The civil service of the self-govern-

ing states has been largely fashioned, as their political institutions have almost wholly been, on the model of the Mother Country. No doubt that is less true of Canada than of some of the sister states. But in Canada also there is a tendency, and a very wholesome tendency, to adopt at least the main features of the system, which a long and dearly bought experience has led us to adopt in the United Kingdom. But if we are all going forward on the same lines, why do so in water-tight compartments? Why not have a common standard, at any rate in the higher grades of the civil service? The men who possessed that qualification would then be available for administrative work in any part of the Empire, and the government of any one state would have the best ability and experience of the other countries to draw upon as well as that of their own.

I do not see why administrative ability should not flow freely between one part of the Empire and another, as professional ability already does. We have a Canadian professor at Oxford and several Canadian lecturers. That is an excellent beginning in one direction. But I think it would be of at least equal importance to have Canadian attaches at several British embassies which I could name, and Canadian administrators in some of our Indian districts. Again, in any tariff-making commission that might be appointed in the United Kingdom the experience of men from any of the British countries, which already have widespread tariffs, would be invaluable.

able. And on the other hand, there are probably men in some of the departments of the civil service at home who would be useful for your purposes here in Canada. Permanent transfers might be the exception rather than the rule, but temporary transfers could with great mutual advantage become quite common. They would be of the greatest benefit to the individuals concerned, and would tend to keep up a high standard all round, and to militate against routine and stagnation.

Now these are only a few instances. I could go on for hours giving other illustrations of what I mean by doing things together. They are all in harmony with that which is the root idea of Imperialists, namely, to develop the common life of the Empire. The basis is, of course, our existing common citizenship, the fact of our all being, to use a technical term, British subjects. Yet we are still far, very far, from doing all that we could do to reap the benefits which our common citizenship offers, or even to show a proper respect for it. Citizenship of the Empire is an immense privilege. Yet how careless and haphazard is the manner in which it is at present conferred! There is no uniform system of naturalization in the different states. Each deals with the matter without regard to the others, and what is the result? Every man naturalized in the United Kingdom, where the period of residence required is long, is a British subject in every part of the Empire. But a man naturalized in Canada, Australia, South Africa or New Zealand, where the periods are

shorter but different one from another, is only a British subject in the particular country in which he is naturalized. This is the beginning of chaos. There ought to be the same conditions precedent of naturalization in every part of the Empire, and they ought not to be too easy. But once admitted to the privileges of British citizenship, a man should enjoy them to the full in every country under the common flag.

But the point I am mainly insisting on is the opportunities of individual development and mutual helpfulness which our common citizenship affords. Are we doing all we can to increase these opportunities? I believe we are doing more than formerly, but still not enough. We are only beginning to realize, and that not fully, the importance of directing the stream of immigration, and of capital, from one part of the Empire to another rather than to foreign countries. And yet every tie, commercial, social, educational or political, which causes men to pass and repass from one part of the Empire to another, is of real importance in welding us together and making us realize the meaning and value of the common citizenship. "*Multi pertransibunt et augebitur scientia.*" Yes, and not only will knowledge be increased, but patriotism—the wider patriotism of the whole Empire.

And again, people cannot all travel, but they can all read. How little do people in any part of the Empire read of the doings of their fellow-citizens in other parts?

Yet they have time to read abundance of trash of all sorts. I believe there are many who would gladly read better stuff if they had the opportunity. Is it too much to hope that now that we have cheaper rates for mailed matter, especially if we can also get cheaper telegraphic rates, there may be a vast improvement in this respect? Assuredly there is the greatest need for it. It rests largely with the enterprise of the press, and I hope they will rise to the height of their great opportunity.

And now I have done. If I have only touched, hurriedly, imperfectly, incoherently, on a few aspects of a vast subject, of which my own mind is full, I hope I have at least appeared to you to be grappling with a real problem, and not engaged in phrasemaking. People often say to me, "We wish you would give us a short address—just twenty minutes or half an hour—about the Empire. It must be quite easy for you." As a matter of fact, there is nothing that I find more difficult. I am so intensely conscious of all that the Empire stands for in the world, of all that it means in the great march of human progress, I am so anxious to give full and yet unexaggerated expression to my sense of the high privilege of British citizenship. But there is nothing so odious as cant, and this is a subject on which it is particularly easy to seem to be canting. Not that I am afraid of falling into a strain of boastfulness. The last thing which the thought of the Empire inspires in me is a desire to boast—to wave a flag, or to shout "Rule Britannia." When I think



of it, I am much more inclined to go into a corner by myself and pray. But, even thus, the road is full of pitfalls. One misplaced word, the wrong turn of a phrase, may make the sincere expression of lifelong conviction sound like mere empty verbiage and rodomontade. Moreover, I am keenly alive to the amount of positive mischief which may be done by a few careless expressions. But there are some among my audience who, having given years of service to the cause of the Empire, must often have felt the same difficulty. I can leave it to them, living as they do here amongst you, to interpret and supplement my imperfect utterance. And I know I shall have all their sympathy when I say that, if it is sometimes wearisome and distasteful to have to talk about the Empire, there is nothing so bracing, so inspiriting, as to try to live for it.





#### IV.

#### THE CANADIAN CLUB, OTTAWA, OCTOBER 31ST, 1908.

This is not the first time since coming to Canada that I have had to appeal to the indulgence of my audience, on the ground that long journeys and a vigorous course of sight-seeing are not at all compatible with the adequate preparation of addresses worthy of such gatherings as that which I see before me to-night. In the present instance I have indeed had no time for preparation, but the subject is one with which I have had so intimate and so recent an acquaintance that I may perhaps be able to say something sensible and interesting about it, though without any attempt at elaboration. The subject about which I propose to speak to you, therefore, is South Africa. But do not be alarmed at the prospect. South Africa has been, and to some extent still is, a topic which excites bitter political controversy. Let me say at the outset that I shall not refer to any question of a political or controversial nature. Putting politics entirely aside, the problems of South Africa are extremely interesting, and, in some respects, very similar to yours here in Canada. There are also, no doubt, many and great differences, to some of which I shall presently allude. But I think that a comparison of the conditions of the various younger countries of the Em-

pire is always full of interest and of instruction. And if I read aright the spirit which animates the Canadian Clubs, I think that information about other parts of the Empire is always welcomed by them, and that it all helps to that education in the wider citizenship which it is one of their chief objects to promote.

To begin with. One of the points of similarity which strikes one at once between Canada and South Africa is the problem of distance. The vastness of both countries, the great stretches of hardly-inhabited territory, which separate the principal centres of settlement, are among the main difficulties which have stood in the way of unification both here and there. Hence it comes that the question of communication, of transportation, looms so large in the history of the development of either country. South African prosperity, the connection between different parts of South Africa, which will very shortly result in a confederation such as yours, would have been absolutely impossible without the enterprise of the people who first pushed forward the great lines of transcontinental communication. The first line of rails which connected the end of Lake Superior with the Pacific Ocean is in its importance to the history of this country paralleled almost exactly by the importance to the history of South Africa of the great enterprise which pushed a little local line of 56 miles—as it was thirty or forty years ago—first some 700 miles to Kimberley, then, in another direction, some thousand or more miles to Johannesburg, and

finally beyond Kimberley something like seventeen hundred miles to the Zambesi, and which has since pushed it 500 miles beyond the Zambesi into the very heart of Africa. It is impossible to overestimate the part which a vigorous policy of railway construction has played and is playing in South Africa, not only in respect of the material development of the country, but in making its political unification possible. Indeed, the Iron Road, which is indispensable to the effective settlement of every new country of extended area is of more vital importance in South Africa than anywhere else. More important even than in Canada. For Canada, at any rate in its eastern portion, is fortunate in the possession of great lakes and a great navigable river. It is almost everywhere rich in waterways. South Africa, on the other hand, is peculiarly deficient in inland waterways. It is the railway or nothing—nothing but the mule-cart or the ox-waggon. It is impossible to overestimate the change, the transformation, which is wrought in all the conditions of South African life by the advent of the railroad. Those portions of the country which, like the far northwest of Cape Colony, are still devoid of the only effective means of communication, continue to present that character of arrested development, the sparsity of population, the backwardness, and the isolation, which till recently kept almost the whole of this country so cut off from the general progress of the world.

And now the question arises, and it is one to which everybody interested in South Africa is looking for an answer, what are the possibilities of development within the country which has been so recently knitted up? Many people have asked me during my present journey, "How does South Africa compare with Canada in respect of opportunities, of the chances which it offers to settlement and immigration?" This is, of course, a question which it is impossible to answer, but there are several aspects of it, on which it is easy to throw a certain amount of light. Speaking generally, the resources of the two countries at the present time present the greatest imaginable contrast. Canada, though she is by no means deficient in mineral wealth, is still pre-eminently an agricultural country. Her main contribution to the markets of the world and the main cause of her recent enormous development—the main cause, though not the only one—is her great and growing agricultural wealth, the extent of which is a discovery of comparatively recent time.

In the case of South Africa, the position is exactly reversed. The agricultural products of South Africa are comparatively inconsiderable; her economic strength lies in her enormous mineral wealth. Now, I do not think the extent of that mineral wealth is yet by any means fully realized. Figures appear in the newspapers constantly, but it needs a pretty close attention to these figures to grasp their full import. Taking gold alone, and taking the gold mines of the Transvaal alone, I have,

within my own experience of South Africa, seen their output grow from less than £12,000,000 sterling a year to something like £24,000,000. That has been the progress in twelve years, despite the great interruption caused by the war. And I have no doubt whatever—I remember being laughed at when I said this five or six years ago—that the production will very soon amount to £30,000,000 sterling a year, or \$150,000,000—£30,000,000 a year taken out of the ground along a narrow reef fifty miles in length.

Now, these are enormous figures. It requires some imagination to realize them. And observe that I am speaking only of the gold production of a single small district—the Witwatersrand. As yet, though, as you may imagine, hundreds of men are constantly engaged in looking for fresh outcrops, though hardly a month passes without rumours of some new discovery, as yet, no payable extension of the Rand reefs has been found; nor has anything at all like them been found in other parts of the Transvaal or of South Africa. But it will be many years yet before the gold-bearing reefs of the Rand, which are of sure and unquestionable productiveness, can be exhausted. I will not attempt to say how many. That is a question which is hotly debated, and about which there is the greatest difference of opinion among experts. My own belief is that, especially in view of the constant reduction of the cost of working, which tends to bring the poorer portions of the reefs within

the range of profitable exploitation, it may well be fifty years before the Witwatersrand is worked out. It may seem fantastic to contemplate an average production of twenty or thirty millions of gold a year for half a century, but personally I think it not only possible, but probable.

These, however, are guesses about the future. To return to the facts of the present. Next to the Witwatersrand, with twenty to thirty million sterling of gold a year, you have the diamond mines of Kimberley producing diamonds to as large an amount as the world can afford to take. The difficulty there is to keep down production in order to prevent prices falling away. In the diamond mines of the Transvaal you have an annual production of between £4,000,000 and £5,000,000, to which there seems to be no end for many years to come. And during the last few years another diamond mine, the "Premier," has been opened up near Pretoria in the Transvaal, which is probably of even greater extent (though the stones may not be of quite the same quality) than the mines at Kimberley. In addition to all this you have gold mining in Rhodesia steadily increasing, and at present amounting to between £2,000,000 and £3,000,000 a year. And it will be strange indeed if this is the end of all things as far as the mineral wealth of South Africa is concerned. In any case you have this enormous wealth assured for the next fifty or perhaps a hundred years. And as I say, it would be a strange thing, indeed, and contrary to all



human probability, if other sources of wealth of a similar kind were not discovered long before these are exhausted.

But I have always maintained that the true policy of South African development is to assume that this immense wealth, which is certain, is the end of all things there; that is, in the way of precious metals. I hold that it is wise to assume that there is nothing more to come, and to devote ourselves betimes to the development of other resources upon which the country can live when these minerals are exhausted. That is, to my mind, the sum and substance of wisdom so far as the economic future of South Africa is concerned. The revenue of the country depends practically, at present, upon its mineral production; the mineral wealth keeps the country going. But it is not enough that it should merely keep the country going. By means of this mineral wealth other resources must be built up on which the country may live when the precious metals have been dug out of the ground. This will be more and more recognized as the true policy of South African development. The question is, what other resources are there?

Let me say at once that there is nothing, and there never can be anything, at all equal, from the point of view of agricultural wealth, to your Western prairie. I have no doubt about that. There is nothing of that size and continuous quality. There are splendid patches of agricultural land, but not so enormous, not so continuous, not so sure. Still, there is a great variety of resources



at present quite untouched. For instance, the wealth of South Africa in coal is only just beginning to be tapped, and her wealth in iron, which in some parts of the country, especially in the Transvaal, is very great, is so far quite untouched.

Having regard not only to the quantity of coal and iron, but to their juxtaposition, the closeness in which these deposits lie to one another, there is, I believe, no reasonable doubt that the time must come, sooner or later, when the production of iron and of all the articles into the composition of which steel and iron enter, will play a very important part, and that it may very well be the case that the centre of South Africa will be the greatest industrial region of the southern hemisphere. It is impossible to speak positively on this subject, but it is a matter which in estimating the chances of the future cannot be left out of the account, and one which those who have the control of the affairs of the country would do well to keep constantly in view. Of course, it stands to reason that so long as a very limited European population has this vast quantity of precious metals to exploit, they will pay a lesser degree of attention to other products which may be permanently of even greater benefit to the country, but the exploitation of which gives less immediate profit. Therefore, the development of minerals, other than the precious metals, is a matter which will come gradually, and which may not attract so much attention until the working of the precious

metals shows some signs of coming to an end. And so coal and iron, especially iron, are for the present comparatively neglected.

But, if the mineral resources of South Africa, other than the precious metals, are of problematical development, something substantial can certainly be done, and something is being done, to increase the productivity of the soil. And people are beginning to discover that if in this respect South Africa can never hope to rival the most favored countries, she is nevertheless capable of far more than people once gave her credit for. The old idea of South Africa was that though the rich coast strip might yield the most valuable products of a sub-tropical climate, that strip was not very large and not very healthy, and that the healthy high veld, which constitutes the bulk of South Africa, was incapable of being more than a moderately good sheep-farming or ranching country. And a great deal of the veld can undoubtedly never be anything else than a pastoral country. Large tracts of it, mainly in Cape Colony, can only support sheep, and other large tracts have so far never supported anything but horses and cattle. But since this matter has been taken systematically in hand people have begun to discover, in the first place, that land which used to be considered only valuable as pasture will really bear rich crops, especially mealies, and again that a great deal of country which it was thought could only bear crops with irrigation can, under more scientific treatment, bear crops

of value even without this artificial assistance. These discoveries, together with the great improvement which is being effected in the quality of flocks and herds by the introduction of better breeds, and by the successful war waged on the greatest curse of South Africa, epidemic disease among animals, are opening a new prospect to the South African farmer. If only the other great scourge to which he is exposed, the plague of locusts, can be tackled with equal success, the future will be a bright one. And there is every hope of such improvement.

One of the most important features in South Africa to-day is the development of her agricultural resources by the means of science. That is of special interest to Canadians for two reasons. One is that this development is a good deal similar to what has happened in your own West, in this respect, that in the West to-day millions of acres are being cultivated with the greatest profit, which were despaired of even by good judges of agriculture ten or twenty years ago. The supposed difficulty and supposed impossibility have turned out to be a delusion. Precisely the same thing is happening, though on nothing like the same scale, in South Africa to-day, and land is being profitably used which in time past was looked upon as hopeless. And there is another point which will be of interest to you. This development, which has begun within the last few years, is largely due to the fact that, directly after the war, we started in the

two new colonies, the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony, very active agricultural departments. The Government took the matter up as it never had been taken up before. Up to that time the principle of South African government was very much the same as that which at one time dominated the minds of people in Great Britain, namely, that the development of the resources of a country was not a thing which concerned the government, but that all the government had to do was to keep order, to see fair play between man and man, perhaps to remove any barriers which might stand in the way of trade and industry, and to trust to the enterprise and energy of individuals to do the rest. As a matter of fact, that system has rarely answered. I do not think it is a perfect theory for an old country; it never answered in a new one. Now, in South Africa the first thing which the Government did after the war, and which was carried on side by side with repairing the damage of the war, was to try to start the country, in every respect, but especially in respect of agricultural development, on a higher plane than that on which the commencement of the war found it.

We looked round the world to find the men who might be competent to run a thoroughly scientific and energetic agricultural department in both the new colonies. And we found them in different parts of the world, but we found some of the best of them on this continent, and especially in Canada. And not only

did some of the men come from Canada, but I think all the men who came, in any leading and responsible position, had made a special study of the agricultural development which has been so characteristic of the United States and of Canada. For that teaching of scientific agriculture which is going, I believe, to effect the transformation of a large part of South Africa, a complete transformation of its economic condition, we looked to the experience and the lessons of scientific agriculture in this country. And I am glad to think that, despite all the differences which divide South Africans to-day, and despite the contrast which in some respects undoubtedly exists between the present regime and the regime which preceded it, the agricultural departments of the new colonies have struck root to such an extent, and the good work that they have already achieved has received such an amount of recognition, that, whatever may happen to other things, this is a piece of solid progress which nothing is going to undo.

Now, one word in conclusion on a wholly different subject. I have purposely avoided all political references, but there is one political question, not of a controversial nature, which naturally excites so much interest to-day, that I wish very briefly to refer to it. I allude to the great subject which is being considered at Durban during these very days, the federation, or, as some prefer to put it, the unification of South Africa. Call it what you will, the problem is to create one central legis-

lature and government for all South Africa, with or without subordinate provincial governments and legislatures. The result of the conference at Durban will, I have not the least doubt, be the closer union of South Africa. The exact form of that union I would rather not attempt to forecast. But there is this great difference between the problem of the union of the South African states and the problem which confronted the statesmen of Canada before Confederation, that there is nothing really separating the states of South Africa to-day except artificial boundaries. I do not mean to say that there are not deep divisions among the people of South Africa. There are deep divisions, and only time can overcome them and draw the two great European races together into one nation, and perhaps a long time may be required. But these divisions exist inside every one of the states, not absolutely in the same proportion, but in very much the same proportion. It is not a case, for instance, of bringing together a British community and a Dutch community; it is a question of uniting a number of communities in all of which these same elements exist. Therefore, so far as the question of race is concerned, great as are the difficulties which it presents, it does not present any special difficulties to union, because, whatever problems may arise from the co-existence of nations of different languages and ideas in one body politic, these problems already exist in each of the separate states, and they are not going to be



increased, but rather diminished, or, at any rate, modified, by uniting those separate states into one state. The obstacles to union are of another character, and perhaps the greatest of them is, that one of the states is so much wealthier and more prosperous, at the time being, than the rest; that there may be people within that state who do not wish to share their prosperity with the rest of South Africa; and, on the other hand, there may be people in the other states who are afraid of coming into the partnership with such an overwhelming neighbor. I do not, however, believe that this or any other difficulty will prevent the union from being accomplished. The majority of people in all the states, of people of both races, are too much alive to its necessity. And they all have a great common difficulty to face—I am speaking of the white people—in the fact that, though they are the absolute masters of the country, the ruling race, they are still only a minority, and a small minority, in the midst of a much more numerous colored population. The whites number a million and a quarter, there or thereabouts. But the colored population, mostly pure blacks, are four or five times as numerous. And that is a situation which is full of difficulty, and which constitutes no doubt the most serious of all the problems which lie before South Africa. The precise nature of the difficulty is, indeed, often misunderstood. There is no question, at least not in my opinion, of the black population ever becoming a danger to the political supremacy, to

the government of the whites. There may be occasional rebellions. I doubt whether they will be frequent or very serious. In any case I am sure the white races will be more than able to cope with them. The real danger, if I may so express myself, is not a military, but a social one. It lies in the influence which contact with a less civilized race, in fact, the mere presence of a less civilized race, may have upon the European population itself. One consequence of the fact that the colored people are the majority, the subject majority, and that they constitute what you might call the working class, is that work, manual labor such as it is no discredit for a man to perform in any European country, no discredit, but the contrary, comes to be regarded as beneath the dignity of a white man in South Africa. He will not do what he considers a black man's work. If he is obliged to do it, he feels himself degraded by it. This tends to indolence, to an unhealthy contempt for many kinds of work, which are in themselves honorable, on the part of the whites. It tends to the degradation of those of them, who are, after all, compelled to do work of that kind, and so to the creation of that socially undesirable stratum which is known, in the Southern States, for instance, by the name of "mean whites."

Time does not allow me to dwell at greater length on this difficult and complex subject. I only wanted to point out that the Native Question, which naturally exercises the minds of all men in South Africa, is a question



rather different in its character from what it is commonly supposed to be by the outside world. But, whatever its difficulties, it will no doubt be easier to deal with in a united South Africa, than under three or four different and conflicting systems in the different states. For this, as for every other reason, those who have the welfare of South Africa at heart—and we must all desire the welfare of that great and important part of our common Empire—cannot but feel an earnest wish that the present effort to bring about South African union may be crowned with success.

V.

BOARD OF TRADE, MONTREAL,  
NOVEMBER 1ST.

Speaking at Toronto the other day, I expressed the belief that the policy of tariff reform was at no distant date going to prevail in the United Kingdom. Prophecies are cheap, and that is, of course, only a personal opinion. Still it is one which I hold very strongly. And it is quite certain that, if tariff reform does come, it will come to stay. Parties may very probably still be divided with reference to the range of the tariff or the height of particular duties. But no party is likely to propose a simple return to our existing system, any more than at the present time any party in Canada advocates the complete reversal of the so-called "National Policy" originated by Sir John Macdonald.

But assuming the United Kingdom to adopt a tariff similar in its general character to that of other great industrial and commercial nations—similar to that of Germany, for instance, though no doubt with a much lower average rate of duties, especially on foodstuffs—a great change will come over the whole aspect of the Imperial problem. For it will then be possible to reciprocate the preference at present given by Canada and other dominions to the Mother Country, and the prospect of a

great development of trade within the Empire will seem much nearer than it does to-day.

Now, to my mind, what is known as "Preferential Trade" between different parts of the Empire has always appeared one of the happiest and most fertile ideas ever introduced into the sphere of national economics. To treat the Empire as an economic whole without any internal barriers is not a practical proposition. On the other hand, it is both bad business and bad politics that the different communities within the Empire should deal with one another in any respect as if they were foreign countries. The policy of preference is a working compromise. And it is a principle of wide application affecting a great deal else besides import duties. If the United Kingdom were to remain, as I for one feel convinced it will not remain, a country of unrestricted free imports, I should still adhere to the principle of preference. I should still, for instance, desire to see the stream of emigration and of capital directed from the United Kingdom to other parts of the British Empire rather than to foreign countries, though without a change in the British tariff, and consequently without the possibility of substantial mutual concessions in respect of customs duties, it would be much more difficult so to direct it.

Even at the risk of wearying you, I should like to make this point of view perfectly clear. The principle of preference, and the reasons for it, I should define as follows: in the interests of the Empire as a whole we

are bound to desire the greatest development, in economic as in other respects, of every part of it. It follows that every part, which like any of the self-governing dominions, is a distinct and independent economic unit, must be free, as indeed they all are free, to shape its fiscal policy according to its own special requirements, with a view to the fullest development of its own wealth and productive power. The same, of course, applies to the United Kingdom itself. But, subject to that, it is desirable to encourage the maximum of intercourse, including, of course, commercial intercourse, between the different states and to foster trade within the Empire to the greatest possible extent. Nothing could contribute more to that result than the general adoption of the rule, that, other things being equal, or very nearly equal, the people of any state in the Empire should obtain what they need to obtain outside their own borders, from other portions of the Empire, rather than from foreign countries; that wherever they reasonably can, they should give their custom to their own kith and kin rather than to foreigners. Mutual concessions in respect of tariffs must exercise a powerful influence in that direction; they must tend to lead trade into channels within the Empire rather than into channels outside it; not to divert it from its natural course, but to keep it in one course rather than another where both are natural. They constitute a permanent factor of immense importance, just turning the scale in innumerable cases in favor of one source of supply as

against a competing source of supply; in favor of a British as against a non-British source.

I maintain that if any group of nations, situated as the great self-governing dominions of the Empire are relatively to one another, were to adopt such a policy of mutual concessions, they would be the gainers by it. It would tend to give stability to trade, it would tend to give their several exports a position of vantage and security in certain great markets, and would mitigate the risks and uncertainties of unrestricted international competition.

So much from the economic point of view, pure and simple. But the case for reciprocal concessions between different parts of the Empire is, of course, immensely strengthened, when we consider also their political effect. By buying its wheat, as far as possible, from Canada rather than from Argentina, the United Kingdom will be helping to build up the prosperity of the Dominion. By buying china and earthenware or glassware or cutlery from the United Kingdom rather than from Germany or Belgium, Canada is helping to give employment to British instead of foreign hands. By obtaining her sugar from the West Indies instead of the Continent of Europe, Canada is making all the difference to the economic prospects of the West Indies. Needless to argue that development and employment in any part of the Empire is more important to us than an equivalent amount of development or employment in some foreign country.

Stated in broad and general terms, that is our case. I should like to illustrate it more particularly by what has happened already as a consequence of the preference given to the United Kingdom by Canada, and what would be likely to happen if that preference were reciprocated.

Now, as regards the benefit which the trade of the United Kingdom has derived from the existing Canadian preference, there really is no room for dispute. Every now and then some ill-informed free importer still ventures to belittle that benefit. But on a close examination of the trade statistics in detail it is impossible for any fair-minded man to resist the conclusion that, as a very competent observer put it to me the other day, "Preference has kept Great Britain from losing such trade with Canada as she has still got." On this point I might quote the words of Mr. Bain, formerly Deputy Commissioner of Canadian Customs, which are contained in an appendix to a most valuable report on the "Conditions and Prospects of British Trade in Canada," published as a Blue-Book in London this year. Mr. Bain says (p. 108):—

"Dealing now with the preferential tariff, I venture to assert in the strongest way that, if such preference had not been granted, British trade with Canada would be on a very small basis to-day."

Again he says:

"The preference undoubtedly accomplished the purpose for which it was intended, and it not only arrested the decline in British trade, but gave it a very healthy impetus."

I believe that these are conclusions based on evidence, and evidence so strong that no fair-minded and well-informed free importer can refuse to accept it. The present Chancellor of the Exchequer, as you know, has accepted it. While arguing that to adopt reciprocity would cost the United Kingdom too dear, he admitted in the freest and most generous terms the advantage to the United Kingdom of the Canadian preference. And the same is true of the preference given by other dominions. I think you may take it that on this point controversy is practically over, and that the benefit derived by the United Kingdom from existing preferences, if nothing occurs at this juncture to impair that benefit, is going to be one of the most powerful weapons in the hands of tariff reformers, and will contribute materially to the victory which I anticipate.

That victory would, I hold, be of immense importance, not only to the United Kingdom, but also to Canada. I am not sure that the bearing of it on your own development is fully realized. People in this country certainly seem to be in favor, and strongly in favor, of the United Kingdom granting a preference in return for the Canadian preference; but I think they are in favor of it as a matter of sentiment, as a matter of principle, and not so much from any belief in the importance of its practical effects. And I can well understand that to the farmer of the West, for instance, in the first rush of his new prosperity, to the man who finds the crop of a single



year replacing or almost replacing all that he has spent upon his land, the advantage of two or three cents a bushel against an unseen competitor in a distant market may appear a matter of very small account. He probably does not give it a thought—not at present. But things will not always be as they are at present. The West as a whole, indeed agricultural Canada as a whole, is bound to develop and grow immensely in wealth and prosperity, but individual profits will not show as large as they do now, though even now they only do so over a special and limited area. Mixed farming will gradually take the place of specialized wheat farming over a large part at least of the western prairie. And even specialized wheat farming where it may still prevail will require more capital than it did at the outset. Moreover, Canada is not the only country which is making prodigious strides in agricultural development. Her food products, whether vegetable or animal, whether the wheat and oats of the western prairie or the cheese and butter of the Province of Quebec, in so far as they are not consumed at home, will have to compete in external markets, and above all in the great British market, with similar products from many parts of the world, and especially from the Argentine. In the keenness of that competition a very small permanent advantage will have a very great effect. Two or three cents a bushel may seem a small matter. They are not a small matter when multiplied by two hundred millions.



Moreover, this is a question of development. All the new countries want capital. There is not enough spare capital in the world to go round. In the competition for what there is, which is the fiercest competition of all, an advantage will lie with the countries which appear to be more profitable as fields for investment, because, other things being equal, their products are in a position to compete on specially favorable terms in some of the most important markets. And that consideration will tell with peculiar force in Great Britain, where, if the principle of Preference were to be endorsed by the nation, a great impetus would be given to the sentimental as well as the material influences making for the investment of British capital in other parts of the Empire rather than in foreign countries.

And in this general Canadian development all classes will share. It is not merely a question for the farmer. The transportation agencies, the manufacturers, are equally concerned. Indeed, the position of the Canadian manufacturers—I do not, of course, expect them to admit this—seems a peculiarly favorable one. They have got a protected home market, which gives every promise of vast expansion. Whatever Canadians require, which Canadian manufacturers can produce at anything like equal cost with other people, Canadian manufacturers will supply.

But at the same time, as I hope and believe, under Preference British manufacturers will get the lion's share

of the rest, in so far as they can supply it. I lay great stress on that qualification. People are often perturbed by the great growth of trade between Canada and the United States. I do not think it is necessarily injurious to trade between Canada and the United Kingdom. There are a vast number of articles which Canada draws from the United States which she could not by any possibility draw from Great Britain. The trade of this country with the United States will grow, and ought to grow, but its growth need not involve any injury—quite the reverse—either to Canadian or British industries. The bulk of the importations into Canada from the United States does not hurt them at all, though I do not, of course, deny that there are some classes of goods imported into Canada from the United States which I should prefer to see imported from the United Kingdom.

I say I think the position of the Canadian manufacturers is a very strong one. But I should like, certainly with great fear and trembling and quite foreseeing that I may bring an avalanche on my unlucky head, to utter one word of warning.

There is a growing feeling in favor of Free Trade in many parts of the country. I do not think it will prevail. I do not think that, either in the interests of Canada or of the Empire, it is desirable that it should prevail. But I believe the movement would become very formidable if the bow of Protection were strung too tightly, and indeed if it were not, as time and circumstances demand, to be

somewhat relaxed. From the point of view of the manufacturers themselves it would be a mistake to be too aggressive. As long as they retain a position of substantial vantage in the home market, they have no interest, but the reverse, in diminishing the prosperity of their own customers, as excessive duties do diminish it. And as regards the position between Canadian and British manufacturers let me say just this: a good deal of harm was done at one time by the idea that the policy of preference aimed at an artificial division of industries between Canada and the United Kingdom, certain kinds of manufactures being, so to speak, appropriated to Canada, and the United Kingdom being left undisturbed in the exercise of others. I do not believe in such an artificial limitation, but I do believe that, with reasonable tariffs and mutual preference, there will be something like a natural adjustment. The policy of Preference is sometimes represented as an exchange of sacrifices. It is nothing of the kind, and the word sacrifice is quite out of place in connection with it. The idea simply is that, while Canada should make for herself everything she can make at a reasonable cost, she should buy what she cannot so make from the rest of the Empire rather than from outside it, provided that the rest of the Empire is capable, again at a reasonable cost, of supplying it. As a matter of fact, if this principle were adopted, there would in practice be something like a division of labor in supplying the Canadian market between Canadian and British manufacturers.

And no doubt friction would occasionally arise, though with good management it ought to arise very seldom. With regard to such cases, to cases for instance where it is urged that the British preference, even though it still leaves a high duty upon the British article, nevertheless tends to prejudice the Canadian producer, and to transfer work from Canadian to English or Scotch hands, all I can say is, I do not want British preference to harm Canada in any way whatsoever, but I want the matter considered from the point of view of Canada, of Canadian industry as a whole, and not merely from that of a particular trade. It is all a question of degree, of what is a reasonable amount of protection to the Canadian producer. But it is quite evident that if a particular trade or trades, which have no natural advantages in Canada, can make the Canadian consumer pay much more than their value for the products, he will have so much less to spend on the products of other Canadian industries which may be much more suitable to Canadian conditions. In such a case it is not only to the advantage of the United Kingdom, but to the advantage of Canadian industry as a whole, that the British producer should come in. And there is one thing more to be said about such causes of friction. They will be rare, but we can never expect altogether to avoid them. I think, however, that they will only be dangerous as long as the system of Preference is in its infancy, and especially as long as it is one-sided. At present if any Canadian trade is or

thinks itself unfairly affected by the preference given to British goods, there is no one in Canada interested in presenting the case on the other side, and so ensuring that it shall be fairly considered on its merits. But once let the whole body of Canadian exporters be interested in maintaining a preference for Canadian goods in the United Kingdom, once let the whole Canadian community feel the benefits of closer commercial relations with the United Kingdom, and any aggrieved trade will have to make out a real case before it will be able to obtain public sympathy.

And it must not be forgotten that Canadian manufacturers themselves will be directly as well as indirectly interested in the maintenance of a preferential duty by the United Kingdom. One of the features of tariff reform will certainly be a tax on imported manufactures. Now, Canadian manufacturers already compete to some extent in the markets of the United Kingdom—take agricultural implements, for instance—with similar manufactures from other countries, and especially from the United States. Strong and growing Canadian industries will be increasingly engaged in such competition in the British market. I think they will be among the keenest defenders of preference for British goods in the Canadian market against any unreasonable attack.

And now, in conclusion, only two further remarks. I sometimes hear complaints in Canada about the slow progress which the idea of mutual preference seems to

make in the United Kingdom, and I hear that slow progress attributed to a want of sympathy, of response, on the part of the Mother Country to the advances made to her by Canada and the other self-governing dominions, to something like a refusal to grasp their outstretched hands. That impression is natural, extremely natural, but it is nevertheless an erroneous one. To us, who know all the enormous difficulties which the new departure in economic thought had to encounter in Great Britain, progress does not seem slow, but fast. And in any case I am sure that our delay and hesitation is not due to any want of sympathy with the idea of a closer union of the Empire.

At heart the vast majority of people in the Old Country have a very strong feeling of attachment to the young countries of the Empire, a very strong desire that the bonds between all the members of the Imperial family may be maintained and strengthened. The bulk of the British people are Unionists at heart—Unionists, I mean, not in any party sense, but in the sense of desiring to keep the Empire together. No doubt there is a section of which this is not true, a section who really are Little Englanders, Cosmopolitans and Separatists. And no doubt also the operation of the party system often gives to this, as to other minorities, a much greater influence than they are entitled to either by their numbers or their character. But it is quite certain that the attitude of this section is entirely out of accord with the general national



sentiment. And if there is delay in accepting either the idea of mutual preference, or any other proposal which aims at promoting Imperial unity, it is due to doubts as to the efficacy of the particular scheme to attain its object, and not to any want of sympathy with the object itself.

And, lastly, let me say this: No man is a stronger advocate of Preference than I am, but do not let me be supposed to hold that Preference alone, even in its widest application, is going to solve the whole problem of Imperial unity. Trade relations are important, very important, and very far-reaching, but they are not everything. Neither do I know that closer trade relations, immense as their value would be in keeping us together, will necessarily lead to the growth of common political institutions or of a common policy.

The reason for putting up a big fight for Preference is that it is something making in the right direction (something in itself desirable on economic grounds, and desirable in its ulterior effects on wider grounds) which is immediately practical. It is something which can be accomplished now. The great danger of the whole Imperial movement is that it may lose itself in aspirations. And in some ways that danger is greatest with the very people who are the keenest Imperialists. They have a great and splendid ideal—I entirely sympathize with it—of an out and out federation, and they are apt to think that unless we have got that, nothing at all can be done. My own feeling is that so far from there being nothing

to be done, hardly a day passes on which something might not be done, some impulse given in a right direction, some check given to movement in a wrong one. I am all for the big ideal, but am quite equally convinced of the necessity of tackling practical problems as they in fact arise, provided we tackle them in the right spirit. Preference is a real live issue, which affects vast numbers of people and interests everybody. It is a real live question, and therefore it is worth all our efforts to bring it to a satisfactory conclusion, not only for its own sake, but for the sake of the moral, for the sake of the demonstration that we are not unpractical visionaries, but that the spirit which animates us, while it may find its full satisfaction only in some future and as yet distant achievement, is capable of accomplishing here and now results which are of great immediate value to all the communities within the Empire.





## VI.

### WOMEN'S CANADIAN CLUB, MONTREAL, NOVEMBER 2ND.

Although I do not propose to preach a sermon, I am going to begin with a text. And with characteristic modesty I am going to take that text from one of my own old speeches. I have said the same thing a dozen different times in different words, at different places, but this is how I seem to have said it at Rugby, on November 19th, 1907: "The greatest danger that I foresee is that the ideals of national strength and Imperial consolidation on the one hand and of domestic reform and social progress on the other, should become dis severed, and that people should come to regard as antagonistic, objects which are essentially related and complementary to one another."

I believe in national greatness and power, but I hope I take a fairly comprehensive view of what constitutes them. It is not only armies and navies, though these have their functions to perform; it is not merely guns and ships, though these also are necessary; it is not merely a well-filled treasury and good credit; it is not merely high policy, though according as that is wise, prudent, and far-seeing, or short-sighted, spasmodic and impulsive, the value of fleets and armies and reserve funds may be greatly heightened or diminished. I say ultimately greatness and power rest on the welfare and contentedness of the mass

of the people. And this involves so much: the physical health of men and women with all that is necessary to insure it; air, space, cleanliness, exercise, good houses, good food, and all that is generally included in domestic economy. Physical health first as the basis; then, of course, trained intelligence, the power of thought and observation, quickness of hand and eye, the development of various forms of industrial skill, and so forth.

I might go on all day recounting the multitude of things which make for the welfare and contentedness of a people, from physical health onwards, through education, to the highest planes of morality and religion, things which were never better summed up than in the old prayer-book phrase of "health, wealth and godliness." But my special point is that all this involves an immense amount of social organization. In our complex modern society there is room, no doubt all the room and the need in the world, for individual enterprise and initiative. But there is no room for a policy of laissez-faire, or "go-as-you-please and the devil take the hindmost," unless you are prepared to have such a mass of "hindmosts," such a number of failures as will drag down the whole community to a lower level. In the keen rivalry of nations, in the constant competition between them, from which none can escape (I am not thinking of war; wars might forever cease, but there would still be competition in peace), one of the things which is going to count most is waste, waste of human power through bad social and

industrial arrangements. There is a great silent force always working on the side of those nations which waste least in that respect.

One other point. I have spoken of well-being and contentedness. You cannot have contentedness, as distinguished from mere sluggish acquiescence, without a certain measure of well-being. More than that, you cannot have patriotism. Not that I mean to say for a moment that patriotism is the exclusive possession of the well-to-do. One often finds the strongest sentiments of patriotism in members of what is commonly known as the working class, and there is good reason for that, too. I think in some respects the dignity of citizenship, pride in being a member of a great nation, is a more valued possession to the man in a humble station than it is to the great and wealthy, who have so much else to enjoy and be proud of. But there is a limit to this. Patriotism, like all the ideal sides of life, can be choked, must be choked, in the squalor and degradation of the slums of our great cities, or by exceptionally hard and cruel conditions of life anywhere.



"No shade for those that sicken  
In the furnace fire of life,

No hope of more or better  
This side the hungry grave,  
Till death release the debtor,  
Eternal sleep the slave."



# MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART

(ANSI and ISO TEST CHART No. 2)



**APPLIED IMAGE Inc**

1853 East Main Street  
Rochester, New York 14609 USA  
(716) 482-0300 - Phone  
(716) 288-5889 - Fax

Where conditions exist which cause feelings such as these to take possession of great numbers of the people—and I fear such conditions do exist frequently in many of our large centres of population—you cannot expect to find patriotism. You cannot expect a casual laborer in an English town, for instance, working for fifteen or twenty shillings a week, and having a wife and family to support, and no certainty that he will get even that fifteen or twenty shillings from week to week, I say you cannot expect that man to set much store by being a citizen of a great empire, or even to care about a vote, except for what he may get out of it for himself or his class. I need not dwell further upon this. I hope I have made my point clear. It is that one of the essentials of national greatness is good social organization, and that patriotism and Imperialism (Imperialism, which is simply the highest development of patriotism in the free peoples of a world-wide state) must look inwards to the foundations of society, to prevent disease at the roots, as well as outwards, to ward off external danger and attack.

And here is where the influence of women especially comes in. I do not mean to say that I underestimate their influence in any branch of national policy. On the contrary, it may be of quite peculiar value all round, were it only in this respect—that it is less likely to be deflected from the right line in any great national and Imperial issue by party considerations than is the opinion of the average man. No doubt women, too, are often partisans,

bitter partisans, but they are not brigaded, platooned, as men are, in party divisions. They are not exposed to the same temptation, or to the same pressure as men often are, to subordinate public, national, Imperial interests, to the interests or supposed interests of a party organization. I say, Heaven forbid that we should try to circumscribe the influence of women in public life. And very fortunately, even if we wished to, we could not do it. Their influence is, in fact, all-pervading. But their actual work will necessarily lie mainly in the sphere of internal and social development. What I want them to realize is that in doing that work well they are rendering national and Imperial service as much as any soldier or sailor or diplomatist.

I have been told that one of the foremost of living Englishwomen recently addressed this club, and that all that she talked about was the provision of playgrounds and other means of recreation for the children of the poor in London and other great centres of population in the United Kingdom. I think she was perfectly right. What does one of our greatest modern writers and artists in words say about this? In simple and childlike language, no doubt, for he was only writing a "Child's Garden of Verse," but yet with deep underlying truth, he says:—

"Happy hearts and happy faces,  
Happy play in grassy places,  
This is how in ancient ages  
Children grew to kings and sages."



I do not know that there is any greater Imperial service that could be rendered than if we were to provide, as we do not provide, but as we might provide, ample space and means of healthy recreation for even the poorest children in our great cities.

Now, this is a problem, one of a group of problems, which are no doubt less urgent and which come home less to you in a vast thinly-peopled country like Canada than they do to us in the crowded, thickly-populated countries of Western Europe. But I am not sure that the peculiar difficulties of a crowded town life are not going to be reproduced on this side of the Atlantic, only with added irony, because there is so much room. I do not know how many of those present have read a book called the "Jungle." It gives a terrible picture, an exaggerated picture, no doubt, but still, I fear, not one wholly devoid of truth, of very undesirable social conditions in one of the great cities of the United States. I do not think there is anything like that in Canada. Far from it. But I do think that the people in many of the new towns which are growing so fast, especially in the Canadian West, hardly realize how rapidly slums, and the other evil features of a crowded town life, do spring up, unless careful provision is made beforehand to avert them—provision so easy to make in the first instance, if people would only be sufficiently far-sighted, so hard to make afterwards, when all the surrounding open space has been taken up and has attained a prohibitive value. Then,

when it is too late, people are sure to regret that in the first instance they did not reserve sufficient elbow room for a large population and a sufficiently ample public domain. But if men are too much absorbed in their business or in political questions of more immediate interest, but by no means of equal ultimate importance, to think of such things, surely the women might look after them.

Now please observe that this is merely a single illustration of a neglected public interest. I want women to come to the rescue, especially on the neglected sides of public life. I do not believe in a division of interests—I mean, to confine women to one class of questions and men to another. I do not believe in a division of interests of that kind, but I do believe in a division of labor. We cannot afford to dispense with the aid of women in the great work of social organization, if only because there are not men enough to go round.

I often hear of there being too many people in a particular trade or a particular profession, but I have never yet heard of a plethora of men available for the innumerable kinds of public and social work which require doing. The fields are ripe for the harvest, but where are the laborers? We cannot, I say, afford to dispense with the aid which women are willing and able to give. Some people maintain that when one talks like this one is encouraging woman to neglect their domestic duties, that one is taking them out of their proper sphere, and so

forth. No sane person would encourage women to go into public work to the neglect of their domestic duties. But there are many of them who have time to spare, who have special gifts for social work, and who are very anxious to undertake it. I say it would be madness to repress them, especially when there is so much work which goes undone. We have begun to learn this lesson, at least in the old country.

In the United Kingdom to-day the assistance of women is welcomed, and they are doing an increasingly important work in many directions. As inspectors in factories, as members of boards of guardians, and indeed as members of all bodies which are concerned with local government, and especially with regard to the management of schools, they are taking a more and more prominent position, and the community is immensely the better for it. Everything that pertains to education, to housing, to hospitals, to the life of women and children employed in mines and factories and shops, to the care of those who have fallen in the race of life, whether they have fallen for good—the numbers of whom, in a new country like this, should be comparatively small—or whether they have only fallen temporarily, and can by timely and sensible help be set on their feet again—all these are spheres of work, in which the co-operation of women is peculiarly valuable.

I might greatly extend this catalogue, but I am not here concerned to give a catalogue of women's opportuni-

ties, but rather to bring home to you the national aspect, so to speak, of them all.

I have spoken of the work done by women in the Old Country because it is what I have myself seen and know. I cannot speak with equal experience of what is being done by them in Canada. But of this I am firmly convinced, that what is known throughout the Empire as "the women's movement" can only gain, and may gain immensely, from an exchange of experiences, from the women of one part of the Empire following the efforts, and learning from the successes, or the failures of women in other parts. That is one of the chief advantages of the unity of the Empire, of what I have spoken of as our common citizenship. We have got to evolve between us all a higher type of civilization. People do, in fact, learn more easily from those of their own household. We do, in fact, learn more easily from the efforts and experiments of men and women in other parts of our own Empire than from what is done or attempted in foreign lands. Social experiments in the other dominions of the Crown produce an effect in Great Britain which is not produced as readily by similar experiments, say in the United States or in Germany. There is a special instance which occurs to me at this moment, namely, that in the attempt to deal with the evil of sweating in England, we have derived peculiar instruction from what has been attempted with a similar object in Australia. And there is a very great deal that we can learn with

regard to social organization generally from other parts of the Empire also. Nor need the Old Country be ashamed in so doing. She is in a good position to repay in other respects the debt which she owes to the younger countries. It is by mutual knowledge, by mutual help, by learning from one another, that we shall preserve in some and develop in others the vivifying and inspiring sense of being, despite many differences of origin and tradition, one people with a great common mission in the world.

## VII.

### THE CANADIAN CLUB, MONTREAL, NOVEMBER 3RD.

This is the last opportunity I shall have, at any rate for some time, of addressing a Canadian audience. That being the case, I may, perhaps, without appearing too egotistical, be permitted to say a few words about my personal experiences during this my first journey on the American Continent. I shall be sailing from Quebec the day after to-morrow, just seven weeks from the time when I landed there. In the interval I have visited every province of the Dominion except the Maritime Provinces. That is an unfortunate though inevitable omission which I hope some day to repair. But it is comparatively easy for a traveller from the Old Country to see something of the Maritime Provinces in a four or five weeks' trip. In this instance, having a greater continuous amount of time to spare than I am often likely to have, I thought it best to make sure of seeing the more distant parts of Canada, and so, after spending a few days at Quebec, I traversed the whole country to the shores of the Pacific, and have now spent as much time as remained to me in visiting the principal cities of what used to be known as Upper and Lower Canada.

Of course, I am quite aware that hard as I have worked to see all that could be seen in the time at my disposal, there is a vast deal more that I have missed.

The knowledge I have acquired of Canada is necessarily very limited and superficial. There are many places which I longed to visit, but could not visit; and there is no place which I have visited where I did not feel the need of more time. Still, with all its shortcomings, this has been a most instructive as well as a most delightful journey. It is always pleasurable and interesting to see a country for the first time. But the pleasure and the interest are greatly enhanced when, as was my case in this instance, one knows something about it from previous study. And then I have enjoyed another great advantage. Wherever I have gone I have had friends to take me by the hand and ensure my seeing not merely the outside of things, but being brought into some real contact with the life and interests of my various places of sojourn. In this respect I have been most fortunate everywhere, but nowhere more fortunate than here in Montreal.

The drawback of my journey, if it has had any drawback—I do not like to complain where I have so much more to be grateful for—is that I have been asked to make so many speeches, and that frequently I could not, without discourtesy, refuse to comply. I own that I am rather appalled to think how many words I have spoken in public, often with most inadequate preparation, during the last six weeks. People are too apt to think that because a man has spent many years in public life he is necessarily a ready speaker. But this is a great mistake. There are two kinds of public servants. There

are those whose primary business is to mould and to guide public opinion. They are necessarily always speaking, and may reasonably be expected to attain considerable fluency. But there is another class, whose business is to perform certain definite pieces of public work. Their duty is in the office rather than on the platform; as it may take them, as administrators or diplomatists, to distant parts of the earth. For men of this class the rule holds good that "if speech is silver, silence is gold." They are apt to find that their business is better done the less they talk about it in public. Now, for nine-tenths of my public career I have belonged to the latter category, and I must be forgiven if I am not an adept at much speaking.

But, since on this occasion I am perforce among the orators, what is it that I have been attempting to do? Most of my speeches have dealt—this was what was asked and expected of me—with various aspects of what, for want of a better word, is called "Imperialism." In what spirit have I approached that theme? My object has certainly not been to lecture the people of Canada or to try to convert them to any particular doctrine. It has been a much more modest one, namely, to explain my own point of view. I am not asking people to agree with it, but I do want them to understand it. And I am not sure that even now, after all that has been said and written on the subject, people do understand the point of view of what I may call an out and out Imperialist.



Let me, therefore, try once more, very briefly directly, to sum it up.

My point of view is that of a citizen of the Empire of one who, no doubt, recognizes a special duty to that portion of it in which he happens to reside—in my case, England—as, for the matter of that, he has a special duty to his own parish and his own country—but whose highest allegiance is not to England, or to the United Kingdom, but to the great whole, which embraces all the dominions of the Crown. That is his country. He does not regard himself as a foreigner in any part of it, however distant, however different from the part in which he habitually resides. He would consider it to be a great loss and a great wrong—yes, something altogether wrong and unnatural—if events occurred which compelled him to regard himself. It is part of his birthright to be a citizen, to be at home, in every quarter of the Empire. Speaking as an Englishman, if in treading on Canadian soil I had to admit that I was treading on foreign soil, I should feel that I had been deprived of an inestimable privilege. And I should feel precisely the same, if, being a Canadian, I found myself a foreigner in any part of the British Empire. For this world-wide state, this Empire, belongs just as much to every born Canadian, Australian, New Zealander, South African, as it does to any Englishman, Irishman, or Scotchman. This is, I hold, the only right view of the mutual relations of the self-governing states of the Empire, of which the United

Kingdom itself is one. They are equal sharers in a common heritage. That is true Imperialism.

I know there are difficulties about grasping this doctrine. Let us, therefore, try to see just what it means, and also what it does not mean. I want to strip this great idea of all disguising, all deforming misconceptions.

We who believe in the unity of the Empire, who desire to see it become a more perfect unity, who are in favor of every measure and every tendency which makes in that direction, are constantly being admonished of the difficulties and the danger which might arise from different parts of the Empire "interfering with one another's affairs or meddling with one another." But such admonitions indicate an entire misunderstanding of our position. The complete independence of every self-governing state of the Empire in its local affairs is a fundamental principle of Imperialism. Nobody dreams in these days of the British Parliament making laws for Canada or Australia. Such an idea is alien to all thinking men, but it is particularly repulsive to Imperialists, for they would see in it the greatest danger to the very thing which they have so much at heart—unity of action for common purposes.

But there is another misconception which seems more difficult to eradicate, and that is the idea that Imperialism means that the self-governing dominions, while, no doubt, remaining independent in their respective local affairs, should be grouped as satellites round the

United Kingdom, and should, in matters of common interest, all dance to the tune set by some Imperial piper at Westminster. Once more I say no Imperialist either expects or desires to see the dominions occupying any such subordinate position. His notion is that, just in so far as any of the self-governing dominions sees its way to sharing in the responsibilities of empire, it should also share in the direction of Imperial policy. And his ultimate ideal is a union in which the several states, each entirely independent in its separate affairs, should all co-operate for common purposes on the basis of absolute unqualified equality of status.

No doubt the idea of such perfect equality presents difficulties to many minds. They see that, however much you may talk of equality of status, the different states of the Empire are in actual fact still very unequal in strength and resources. The United Kingdom, in particular, still is, and must for many years longer continue to be far superior in these respects to any other member of the Imperial family. And therefore they fear that it would, in fact, drag the others after it, possibly into adventures and complications, in which they would have no interest and from which they greatly desire to be free. And certainly that is the last thing which as an Imperialist I either contemplate or wish. Moreover, it is the last thing which, as a matter of fact, I think at all likely to happen. In my opinion, a common policy, the active participation of the dominions in the counsels of the Empire,

would be much more likely to keep the United Kingdom out of unnecessary foreign complications than to involve the other states in such complications. An united Empire, while enormously strong for purposes of defence, would, as it seems to me be absolutely averse from, I might almost say incapable of, a policy of adventure.

But while I think that the fears to which I have just alluded are groundless, I admit that they are, under present conditions, with the present great inequality of power between the different states of the Empire, not altogether unnatural. And therefore it is that, in the interests of Imperial unity, though not only for that reason, every Imperialist must long to see the greatest possible increase in the population, the resources, the strength, the internal cohesiveness, the national self-consciousness and self-reliance, of the great dominions of the Crown other than the United Kingdom. He must desire this, both for their own sakes and as calculated to increase their ability and their willingness to enter into a permanent indissoluble union with the United Kingdom and with one another. For his belief is that, as the self-governing states grow in power, and as their relations with the outside world increase, two consequences will follow. On the one hand, they will become more conscious of the need of mutual support, of the advantage of being, not isolated states, but members of a world-wide union; and on the other hand, they will be more willing, because they feel themselves more capable, to

share in the responsibilities and the glory of Empire. It is on their strength, not on their weakness, on the growing extent and multiplicity of their interests, not on their continuing to live isolated lives in their several corners of the world, that the Imperialist relies for the impulses which will bring about closer union.

That being the case, you will well understand with what sympathy and with what hope I, as an Imperialist, contemplate the present great development, not only of the material resources, but of the national spirit of Canada. There are those who seem to fear that the growth of a Canadian spirit, of Canadian patriotism, will be a danger to the unity of the Empire. I take precisely the opposite view. The last thing I should dream of doing would be to run Imperial patriotism against Canadian. I want to rest the one upon the other.

I have heard it said a good many times of late, not by Englishmen, but by Canadians, that public life in Canada is unattractive because there are no big issues. That seems to me an extraordinary view to take. No big issues! The next half-century will determine the question whether Canada is to remain part of the British Empire. And the decision rests with Canadians. No external compulsion could well be applied, certainly none will be applied, to influence them in it. And their decision may involve the fate of the Empire as a whole. In any case, it must enormously affect its position and influence in the world. Look at the map. Take Canada

out of the chain that girdles the globe, and you not only diminish enormously the size of the King's dominions—I do not care so much about mere size—but their continuity and capacity of consolidation. The Empire might remain a great Power without Canada. Indeed, the United Kingdom alone might, and would, remain a great Power, for greatness is not merely a question of dimensions. England by herself was great in the Middle Ages, great in the time of Elizabeth, when Scotland was still a separate Kingdom and no British Empire existed. And the other portions of the Empire may become great states in isolation, if the whole splits up. But it would be ludicrous to compare any of them, whatever its future development, to the undivided whole. That whole is the greatest political entity in the world to-day; properly organized, it must be by far the greatest Power. I am not going to beat the drum or sing paeans in praise of it. But in all soberness and sincerity the British Empire, with all its defects and weaknesses, is yet an influence, second to none, nay, more than that, an influence without an equal, on the side of humanity, of civilization and of peace. The continuance of that great power for good depends largely on the action of Canada, of the Canadians of this and the next generation. With such a problem confronting them, it is impossible to commiserate with the people of this country, least of all with those of them who are still young, on the lack of big issues in their political life.

