

stands alone in so doing. This is straightforward and intelligible, and Mr. McCarthy takes in substance the same position in regard to the North-West Territories and their dual language system. It is not easy to see how any lover of liberty and of local self-government, on either side of politics, can refuse to support him in these positions. With reference to Quebec the principle involved is, as we have always contended, and as Mr. McCarthy now seems to admit, quite different. The question of constitutional principles and loyalty to old compacts is involved. We observe, by the way, that Mr. McCarthy seems to have nothing to say touching the Separate School question in Manitoba and the Territory. Can it be that he does not regard this as of at least equal importance with the language question, or see that the rights of a people to local self government are infringed upon quite as much by having Separate Schools forced upon them, as by being compelled to use a second language on certain occasions and in certain public documents? We are glad to see, however, that he does propose to move in the matter of the deadlock now existing between Lieut. Governor Royal and the North-West Council, and is resolved to vindicate to the utmost of his ability the rights of the representatives of the people. He is also suspicious of an unholy compact between Premier Mercier and Hon. Mr. Chapleau, and is resolved to oppose with all his might any proposal to grant "better terms" to the Province of Quebec. On the whole the situation between Mr. McCarthy and his old leader is very seriously strained. Sir John will probably have several difficult problems to settle during the coming session, such as will put his tactical skill to some pretty severe tests.

**T**HOUGH the evidence elicited at the investigation in Montreal touching alleged abuses in the cattle-carrying trade was not so satisfactory or complete as it might have been had the evidence of some reliable men who have had experience as caretakers of cattle crossing the Ocean been accessible, the facts brought out amply prove the necessity for legislation and executive action. We cannot but think that the attitude and temper in which a few of those interested approached the enquiry was, to say the least, unfortunate. The question was not one of Mr. Plimsoll's motives and purposes, though no one who is acquainted with his noble struggles and achievements in the past, on behalf of the safety and comfort of British sailors, can doubt either the sterling worth of the man or the genuineness of his philanthropy. Still less was it a question of Great Britain's colonial policy or of Canadian loyalty. Indeed, if we may say so without disrespect to any one, there is some danger of Canadians being made ridiculous by the growing tendency to introduce the question of loyalty on all occasions. Mr. Plimsoll no doubt did well to repudiate the idea that the proposed legislation by the British Parliament had anything to do with either the question of colonial relations and obligations, or that of protection to the owners of flocks and herds in the Mother Country. It is a simple question, in the first place, though this fact seems to have strangely fallen into the back ground, of providing for the safety and comfort of the sailors and those having the care of the cattle on shipboard, and, in the second place, of humanity to the cattle themselves. No civilized Government or people can afford to tolerate any business, or any mode of carrying on business, which tends to degrade even those engaged in the most menial offices in connection with it. That the treatment of the men employed in tending the cattle on shipboard, in some of the ships, has been in some cases both cruel and degrading seems too clear to admit of reasonable doubt. Nor can it be in the interests of the trade and of those engaged in it that the cattle should be neglected, or ill-treated, whether by over-crowding, want of abundant fresh air, or in any other way, during the voyage. The picture drawn by Mr. Plimsoll, in his speech at the banquet in Toronto, of ships sent to sea with three decks covered with cattle from bow to stern, and from side to side, with forty or fifty additional crowded into the passage ways after the stalls are filled, until the sailors are unable to get from bow to stern save by climbing over the flimsy superstructures erected above those on the upper decks, is sufficient to make even a landsman shudder. The two feet and a-half allowed for each animal is suggestive to the uninitiated of horrible discomfort, though it seems to be regarded as sufficient. To permit the narrow passages for attendants and for air to be obstructed can be nothing less than downright cruelty, and can bring nothing but loss to all concerned, save the inhumanly greedy shipmaster or owner who is responsible for it. It is possible

that Mr. Plimsoll may not be free from the warmth and impetuosity of temperament which are often characteristic of the most active and useful philanthropists, but the cattle dealers of Canada owe him gratitude instead of distrust for the part he is taking in bringing abuses to the light and compelling their removal. Much credit is due, too, to those interested in the trade who, like Mr. Frankland and others, have taken a broad view of the subject and are seconding his efforts. It is gratifying to be able to believe that those abuses are far less serious, so far at least as the Canadian trade is concerned, than Mr. Plimsoll had supposed, and that all that is needed for their connection is to have the traffic put under the oversight of efficient Government Inspectors, backed by reasonable legislation of the British and Canadian Parliaments.

**T**HE Behring Sea correspondence is a complicated, and, to those who are not in a position to study all the details, a somewhat tangled mass. We commented in previous numbers upon the length of the interval which apparently separated Mr. Blaine's latest despatch from that to which it was assumed to be in reply. It seems, however, that negotiations were going on in the meantime which throw further light upon the affair. The proposal submitted by Sir Julian Pauncefote in April last, for an international control was, we now learn, rejected the following month, and it was a distinct offer to submit the question of the legality of the seizures of Canadian vessels to impartial arbitration, made by the British Minister in October last, that Mr. Blaine refused but the other day. Whether the rumoured counter proposal by Mr. Blaine for a commission to visit Alaska and report on the question of the alleged danger of extermination of the seals, such report to be followed, if then found necessary, by arbitration, has actually been submitted to Lord Salisbury, remains to be seen. The comments of some of the London papers imply, or assume, that such an offer is under consideration and is likely to be accepted, as no doubt it would readily be if at all fair or reasonable. On the other hand a cablegram of a few days since announced that the Canadian High Commissioner knew nothing officially of such an offer, though he thought it by no means unlikely that it had been made. The one re-assuring fact is that a hopeful feeling, amounting almost to an assurance that the way to a peaceful settlement is in sight, has taken the place of the state of apprehension which existed a week or two since. If the Washington correspondents, who claim to have received assurances from the highest sources, may be relied on, all those sensational stories about the proposed increase of the United States naval forces in Behring Sea, which were for a time accepted as genuine on both sides of the Atlantic, were absolutely without foundation. That no such intention now exists we may rest assured. Knowing what we do of the peculiar party politics which plays so large a part even in Washington diplomacy, we need not stay to enquire too curiously whether the reports in question were really pure fabrications made by Democratic correspondents to meet a Democratic demand, whether they were put forth as feelers to test the national sentiment, or whether, as the *Christian Union* seems to intimate, they may have foreshadowed a contemplated policy which was radically modified by a confidential communication from Lord Salisbury. The one important fact is that there seems to be no longer danger that any such insanity is contemplated. We are delighted to learn, apparently on the best authority, that Mr. Blaine is now and always has been in favour of accepting the reasonable mode of settlement, which, by some strange misconception, he has hitherto been supposed to refuse and gladly leave the task of examining historical documents, and hunting up parallel passages to his Democratic opponents, who may be relied on to attend to that part of the business during the next Presidential campaign, if not before. We congratulate ourselves on the prospect that international good sense and good feeling are likely to prevail, and this vexatious, if somewhat petty, quarrel to be settled in a manner just and honourable for all concerned.

**A**FTER the foregoing paragraph had been sent to the printer, telegrams from Washington to the morning papers announced that application had been made to the Supreme Court of the United States on behalf of the owner of one of the Canadian vessels which was seized by the U.S. revenue cutter, *Rush*, asking for a writ of prohibition, to be directed to the judge of the District Court of the United States in and for the territory of Alaska, restraining him from proceeding with the condemnation and sale

of the vessel. This seems simple and straightforward enough, even to the non-legal mind, nor is it easy to see wherein it affords ground for the sensational exaggerations, for such they evidently are, with which the correspondents garnish their tid-bit of news. We dare say it may have been from the first the intention of the injured owners, or of the Canadian and British Governments representing them, to seek redress for the injury done them in the United States' courts. Nothing seems more reasonable than that the subject of one nation who has suffered damage in person or property from the Government of another nation should, either directly or through the Government of his own country, seek redress in the first instance through the courts of the nation which is responsible for the injury. It is very likely that the action of the client may have been in this case delayed, pending the result of negotiations which it may have been hoped would effect a settlement on such a basis as would do away with the necessity of the legal proceedings. If so it would appear that matters have now reached a stage at which the British and Canadian Governments deem it wise to carry the question of seizure and confiscation before the highest Court in the Republic. Possibly the recent refusal of the offer of arbitration made in October last, as noted above, may have hastened the present action. But it seems very unlikely that this appeal to the Court in strictly legal form can be properly regarded as "throwing a bombshell into the camp of the American administration," still less that it can have been done with a view to bringing directly before the Court, together with the question of the legality of the seizure, "all the controversies relating to it which are now pending between the United States and Great Britain." It is not easy to see how this petition, even if granted, can enable the Court to pronounce upon anything but the question of United States jurisdiction over the waters in question. It is true that a decision on this question favourable to the petitioner and adverse to the U.S. Government would probably involve all other points at issue and, if accepted by that Government, render further negotiations or arbitration unnecessary. But it could hardly be true, on the other hand, that a decision adverse to the petitioner and to the claims of the British Government would estop the latter from further proceedings. The decision of the Court, as between the two nations, would evidently be *ex parte*, and an appeal would still lie to some higher international tribunal, if such could be found or constituted. However these are but lay speculations and may be proved worthless by the event. The situation is certainly an interesting one. The application shows strong faith on the part of the British and Canadian Governments in the justice of their cause, and may also be interpreted as implying a high compliment to the impartiality of the judges of the Supreme Court of the United States. Further proceedings will be watched with great interest on both sides of the line.

**A** RECENT number of the *New York Commercial Advertiser* contains a lengthy article, contributed by a Toronto correspondent, on the subject of British Federation. Though the article contains little or nothing that is absolutely new to those who have followed the course of the discussion in Canada or the Mother Country, it unfolds very clearly for the consideration of the readers of the *Advertiser* the conditions of the problem, and ably presents the best arguments of the advocates of Imperial Federation. The significant feature in the case is the fact of the publication of such a paper, in a prominent position, in an influential New York paper. It can scarcely be doubted that to many an American reader the unfolding of a scheme so magnificent in its proportions, and so closely related to its possibilities, whatever they may be, to the commercial welfare of the great Republic, will be little less than a revelation. There are few things in regard to which the people of any nation are more liable to erroneous impressions than in their assumptions with regard to the actual knowledge of themselves and their country possessed by their neighbours. American travellers in England never tire of repeating conversations or detailing incidents to show the monumental ignorance of the average untravelled Englishman in regard to the greatness and glory of the United States. An Englishman needs to be but a short time in the Republic to be astounded with the discovery of an equally glaring want of information there in respect to his own country. The Canadian who sets foot for the first time in New York or Philadelphia, and who has a fixed conviction, formed by newspaper reading, that one of the chief topics of conversation in intelligent circles in the United States is the future of his own country and the desirability of having its "manifest destiny" accomplished