

PRINCIPAL GRANT

THE VERY REV. GEORGE MONRO GRANT, D. D., C. M. G., a distinguished Canadian educator and author, and principal and vice-chancellor of Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, was born at Stellarton, Nova Scotia, Dec. 22, 1835. Educated at Pictou Academy, and at the West River Seminary of the Presbyterian Church, he received a bursary in 1853, that entitled him to a course at the University of Glasgow. His career there was distinguished by exceptional brilliancy. Ordained to the ministry in 1860, he returned to his native Province, and in the following year was appointed a missionary in County Pictou. Not long afterwards he was sent to Georgetown, Prince Edward Island. In May, 1863, he accepted a call to the pastorate of St. Matthew's Church, Halifax, where he remained for fourteen years. In 1872, he accompanied the present Sir Sandford Fleming in his journey overland to British Columbia, as the result of which he published in 1873, "Ocean to Ocean." In 1877, he became principal of Queen's College, Kingston, receiving in the same year the degree of D. D. from his Alma Mater. In 1888, he proceeded on a journey round the world, lecturing in Australia and elsewhere. In 1889, he was elected moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada; in the same year he was elected president of the Imperial Federation League, Kingston. He was elected president of the Royal Society of Canada in 1891, and in 1894, president of the St. Andrew's Society, Kingston, to which office he was reelected in 1895-96. He received the honorary degree of LL. D., from Dalhousie University, Halifax, 1892. His published works include, besides, "Ocean to Ocean," "Advantages of Imperial Federation" (1899); "Our National Objects and Aims" (1890); and "The Religions of the World in Relation to Christianity" (1894). He has also edited "Picturesque Canada" (1882), and has written considerably for English, American, and Canadian magazines. He has done much for education as head of Queen's University, Kingston, Canada. Principal Grant is an impressive and eloquent speaker, an entertaining writer, and, socially, a man of delightful gifts.

OUR NATIONAL OBJECTS AND AIMS

ALLOW me, Mr. President, to thank you for conceiving and carrying out the plan of a series of addresses on Canadian subjects to the members of the National Club and their friends. I consented with pleasure to give this introductory lecture, if a friendly talk on a subject of common interest may bear so formal a title. It seems to me that those of us who have any leisure time should have suffi-

(462)

cient seriousness to give it to the discussion and consideration of problems suggested by the history, the position, or the outlook of our country.

Different estimates are made of what our immediate future is likely to be, and no wonder, for our political position is perhaps unique in history. As a matter of fact we are something more than a colony and something less than a nation. A colony is a dependency, and we are practically independent. A nation has full self-government, not only as regards local questions, but as regards all foreign relations, including peace, war, and treaty-making. We have not ventured to undertake those supreme responsibilities, either alone or as a partner, and therefore we are not a nation.

Our actual position is veiled by the kindly courtesy of the mother country. It is the custom to associate a Canadian representative with the British ambassador when negotiations affecting our interests are carried on with other states. This year, too, Lord Salisbury, after submitting since 1886—in our interest as well as in the common interest—to aggressions that would not have been allowed to any other power on earth for a week, at last was constrained to inform Secretary Blaine that the country that continued to capture Canadian ships on the high seas must be prepared to take the consequences. So far nothing more could be desired, but we cannot forget that Lord Salisbury—nominally responsible to the Queen—is really responsible to the British House of Commons, and that neither in that House nor in the Queen's Privy Council have we any constitutional representation.

Few will maintain that the position is satisfactory either to Canada or to Britain. In these circumstances men cannot avoid speculating concerning our future, nor is it any wonder that diverse views are entertained concerning what

that future is likely to be. Every day speculation is going on. Every one else takes a hand in it, and why should we keep silent?

Only a month or two ago the most distinguished student of history in Canada told an audience that political union with the great republic to the south of us was our manifest destiny. . . .

Canada is never likely to have more than a tenth of the population of the United States; but five millions, growing gradually to ten within the lifetime of some of us, are as many as one can get his arms around and enough certainly to make a nation; as many as England had in the great days of Elizabeth; far more than Athens had in the century after Marathon, when she bore the statesmen, poets, philosophers, historians, mathematicians, men of science, artists, and teachers, at whose feet the students of the world have sat for more than two thousand years; far more than Judea had in the golden age of that prophetic literature which is still so largely our guide and our inspiration to righteousness; far more than Rome had when her sun was at the zenith; for the glory of Rome was not when she held the East and West in fee, and Christian emperors like Constantine and Theodosius the Great ruled the world, but when, defeated at Trebia, Thrasymene, and Cannæ, her fields wasted, her veteran legions annihilated, her young men slain or prisoners, scarce freemen enough left in Rome to form one legion more, she still wavered not an inch, but closed her gates, forbade mothers and wives to ransom their captive sons and husbands, and refused to discuss terms of peace while Hannibal remained in Italy.

Oh, for something of that proud consciousness of national dignity and of that stern public virtue which is the strength

of states! Why should we not have it in Canada to-day? We come of good stock. It is not more millions either in men or money that we need most, but more of the old spirit in the men we have; not a long list of principles, but a clear insight into those that are fundamental.

To give to each Province a free hand within its own sphere, to be tolerant of diversities, to deal equal justice to all, to treat minorities considerately, and to have faith in our country, this surely is a creed that can be taught at every fireside and in every school as well as on the hustings. These principles, tenaciously adhered to, will be sufficient. These duties, honestly discharged, will shed light on our course from day to day. We are asked simply to be true to ourselves and faithful to every brotherly covenant. With that spirit in our people, the national position of Canada is full of hope for the future and impregnable against every attack.

Secondly. Next to our need of a better understanding of one another is the need of a right attitude to other countries, especially to our neighbors. In speaking of this, the subject of our national aims comes up. Every great nation has contributed something to the cause of humanity. That is its divine mission and the reason for its existence. To that ideal it must on no account be false.

What does Canada intend to give to the world? What faith do we carry in our hearts? Depend upon it the future of individuals and of nations is determined by their own hearts and their actual positions in the world. Our position is peculiar. Since the Peace of Paris in 1763, when Canada, with the consent of all parties, became British, she has remained British.

We believe that this was good for the inhabitants. Other-

wise they would have remained under the bondage of the old régime, and when it broke up they would have been sold as Louisiana was. Bonaparte cared nothing for the West. Good for vanquished and victors in the civil war that followed in the thirteen colonies of the south! Cities of refuge were provided in the forests of Ontario, on the banks of the St. John, and the shores of the Atlantic for those true Loyalists who otherwise would have been deported to the West Indies or have been made to fare even worse. The experiment of free government was thenceforward to be tried on this continent under different constitutional forms, and that, too, was gain.

Good for the United States! Their chief foes have always been of their own household. Their best thinkers lament that tendency to national brag and bluster, with consequent narrowing of public life and deterioration of character, which success engendered. It is no pleasant thing for me to say an unkind word concerning our neighbors. They are our own flesh and blood. They are an example to us in a hundred ways. They have among them men and women who are the salt of the earth. In no country is it more necessary to distinguish between the froth of the surface and the pure liquor beneath, between the outcries that we hear first and the sober judgment and Christian sentiment that find expression later on, between the selfishness of the politician and the calm wisdom and great heart of the saving remnant. Their wise men know that it was a good thing for them that their flag was kept on one side of the watershed of the continent.

The schism that took place when the thirteen colonies broke away from the empire has been a grievous bar to their own development on the best side, and to the progress of

humanity. No greater boon can be conferred on the race than the healing of that schism. That is the work that Canada is appointed by its position and history to do, if only it has a great enough heart for the work. How to do it will tax our wisdom as well as our faith. One thing is clear. We can do nothing if we barter our honor for some hope of immediate gain. The man who does not respect himself will never be respected by others. Much more is that true of a nation. The man may have death-bed repentance and a future life, but there is no life for the nation in the hereafter.

What is the right attitude for us? To guard the independence we have gained in the course of successive civil struggles, and to guard our national as carefully as we would our individual honor. Language is sometimes used that looks in the direction of surrendering our fiscal independence to a foreign power, and at the same time of discriminating against our own empire and the rest of the world. The first means national extinction, and the second is as unreasonable and impossible as it would be for Britain to discriminate against us. The fewer restrictions on trade the better. Free trade would be good for us and better for our neighbors, and next to free trade are fair treaties of reciprocity.

But let us not use ambiguous language. Let us not call that unrestricted trade which means free trade with one foreign nation and prohibited trade with our own commonwealth and everyone else. That would ensure for us the contempt of the one foreign nation and the righteous indignation of all others with whom we are now trading.

I need say no more on this, for I believe that the independence and honor of Canada are safe with Canadian statesmen of both parties. If, however, any of them should waver, the

people will not. Outside of the two planks named, tariff changes are questions of expediency and must be discussed by experts. I, for one, do not profess to be able to see any eternal principle at stake between seventeen and a half per cent and twenty per cent duty. Nor do I understand how the abolition of the old reciprocity treaty, the rejection of the agreements negotiated by Mr. Brown and Mr. Chamberlain, or the passing of the McKinley Bill, can be considered wise. In every case the action was injurious to the people of the United States. The last-named bill will hurt us, and hurt themselves more; but should it hurt us twice as much as some hope and others fear, we shall not lose our temper. For good or ill the press represents us to a great extent when Parliament is not in session, and I trust that it will not misrepresent us now. Let us wait hopefully for the time when our neighbors will be awakened to see that selfishness is blindness. Let us remember that we ourselves have not been wholly blameless in the past, and let us hope that we shall shake hands yet across the line, and, letting bygones by bygones, unite in furthering the good old cause of righteousness and peace over the world. There have been two wars between Britain and the United States. In the first the mother, and in the second the daughter, was most to blame. The honors are thus easy between them, and sensible people have made up their minds that there shall be no third exhibition of what has been rightly called the sum of human folly and villainy.

How can there be if the principle of arbitration is accepted? Great Britain and Canada are prepared to submit every dispute with the United States to impartial arbitration. The public cannot refuse the offer that the Queen has made in the hearing of the world, though every week's delay in ac-

cepting the offer exhibits the opposite of a neighborly spirit. Every day Canada is giving new hostages for peace.

There is a steady migration going on from northern to southern lands, in Europe, Asia, and America. We see this even within the boundaries of the same country; in Russia, in Germany, in the United States. The movement does not mean that the northern countries are being depopulated. They are increasing in population. They remain, too, the homes of obedience to law, of purity, health, and manly vigor. I expect that before long we shall have lost all our negro population and have gained instead Icelanders, Scandinavians, Jews, and Germans. Already there are a million of Canadians, mostly white, in the United States. They go because of the greater variety of industries, or because of the mildness of the climate, or because centres of population attract, or because there is no extradition treaty, or for other good reasons. They go to better their conditions, but they are at the same time missionaries of peace and good will.

Why should all our young men stay at home? Their parents did not, or we should not be here. The young men of Britain go everywhere, opening up fresh fields, making new homes in every quarter of the globe, whence are diffused the virtues of the highest civilization the earth has yet known, and yet the old country increases steadily in wealth, population, and intelligence, while she retains also the moral leadership of the race. We need not be alarmed because some of our young men go to the United States, while others follow the flag to Africa and India, to explore the Aruwhimi, like Stairs, or rule in Uganda, like Huntley MacKay. We have lands enough and to spare. Those who stay at home will build up the country, and those who go abroad will save us from parochialism. Does anyone fancy that there would be

no movement of population to the south if we made a change in our commercial policy or political allegiance? If so, we need not argue with him.

I have spoken of the high aim that Canadians should carry in their hearts and always keep before their eyes when they think of the future. A great people will have a worthy aim, and such an aim will prove an ennobling inspiration. "It is best not to obey the passions of men; they are but for a season; it is our duty to regard the future," said Champlain, the man who built Quebec, and who may be regarded as the first great Canadian. We are to build up a North American Dominion, permeated with the principles of righteousness, worthy to be the living link, the permanent bond of union, between Britain and the United States. That ideal may be far in the distance. So is the Pole Star. Yet sailors steered by it for centuries.

But, you say, we must think of the present more than of the future. You ask me whether I have nothing to say with regard to our present duty. Here we are face to face with serious problems affecting our daily life and pressing us in their most acute form through the recent legislation of our neighbors. What should be our attitude with regard to these? For here, too, as well as in home affairs, an immediate policy should be outlined, as immediate action is necessary. This question I might pass by, on the ground that events are wiser than men, and that the best answer to it will gradually be evolved out of the conflict of parties. But I shall endeavor to give my contribution toward an answer. Take it for what it is worth, remembering that I now speak with that submission which is called for when matters of expediency rather than matters of principle are concerned. Let us first understand as clearly as possible the state of the case.

As regards the United States, its action has been long considered and fully discussed, and there is little likelihood of its being changed in a hurry. Those who tell us that the McKinley Bill is the darkest hour that precedes the dawn, and that the dawn is already breaking, deceive themselves. I hope they shall not deceive us. In due time the light will break, but the man who waits for it will have to be almost as patient as the rustic who waits till the river has ceased running that he may cross dryshod.

We have to think of present duty as well as keep in mind what we may be called on to do ten or twenty years hence. For fifty years free traders in England have been declaring that the dawn was just about to break in the United States, yet what is the present position of affairs? The Republican party, comprising a large majority of the sober, thoughtful, and patriotic men of the northern, western and northwestern States, is solidly protectionist. The Democratic party, comprising almost the whole of the rest of the people, does not dare to unfurl the flag of free trade. In the last election it spent its time trying to prove that it was more truly protectionist than the other party.

There is no present hope, then, of any radical change in the fiscal policy of our neighbors. They believe that their present policy gives them the advantages of both free trade and protection.

It appeals too strongly to national selfishness and national vanity, as well as to their fervent patriotism and anti-Britain spirit, to be cast hastily aside. No politician is likely to disregard the great forces that I have enumerated. They tell one another proudly of the happy lot of the American workman compared with the "pauper labor" of Europe. They listen with unaffected delight to the groans which their flat-