

Bronx Park, had secured this animal in Quebec for \$700; and that New York now possessed the only captive musk ox on the North American continent.

Can it be true that Captain Bernier for the modest sum of \$700 disposed of this great treasure? Or was it a fit of economy on the part of the much-persecuted Minister of Marine which caused this living trophy of Captain Bernier's historical voyage, on an historical vessel, with an historical equipment, to be sold for a paltry \$700? We cannot believe that Captain Bernier, patriot and explorer, would be guilty of such a national sacrifice. Indeed, we refuse to believe it without further proof. We herewith demand the appointment of a Royal Commission to determine the name of the guilty party and to have him held up to the execrations of the citizens of Quebec, Ottawa, Montreal and Winnipeg, all or any of whom would quickly have raised \$700 to prevent New York being able to boast of superior business ability.

Again, think of the cruelty of it! New York has had musk oxen before, but they do not live long in that climate. Pneumonia soon carries them off, after the first hot summer. Had the Baby from Melville Island been kept in Canada, she might, in our more invigorating climate, have grown to maturity and strength and remained for many years a national witness of a national accomplishment.



IT is kind indeed of the New York *Tribune* to say that the Monroe Doctrine protects us and to express its opinion that "Canada is as safe from attack as is the United States." Equally kind and probably more accurate is its stated belief that the Canadian navy is no more a menace to the United States than the United States navy is a menace to Canada or to Great Britain.

The only difficulty about this view of our affairs is that the enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine must come from the United States. If Japan for example were to make an attack on Canada, and Canada were to appeal to the Monroe Doctrine, who would decide whether the United States should come to our defence or not? Plainly, the United States authorities. Then, supposing the United States authorities were hostile to us and friendly to Japan, who could force the United States to help us?

Aside from this, however, there is a reason why Canada should have a navy. The other day, when two Americans were shot in Nicaragua by order of President Zelaya, two warships, the *Des Moines* and the *Vicksburg*, were despatched to Preytown to "protect American interests." If two Canadians were so treated, and as there are Canadians there the circumstance is equally possible, what would Canada do? She would cable to Great Britain and a British war ship would be sent thither. There lies the reason why Canada should have some cruisers of her own, so that she may relieve Great Britain of this police duty so far as this continent is concerned. Of course, a cash contribution to the British navy would equally serve the purpose, but most people will prefer the method of having Canadian boats for such an expedition. The Canadian vessels would be useful also if British subjects, as well as Canadians, were in danger.

#### MRS. PANKHURST IN TORONTO

MRS. PANKHURST, familiarly known as the leader of the militant suffragette party of Great Britain, visited Toronto last week and fairly captured that Tory stronghold. The Canadian Club listened to her after-luncheon talk last Saturday, and, in the evening, Massey Music Hall was packed to the doors with an audience which endorsed the movement of which she is the head. Many of those who attended the great meeting doubtless went, out of curiosity, but this feeling quickly deepened into admiration and good-will. Whatever may have been the views of those who listened, there was but one opinion as to the speaker. She is an orator with the true *voix d'or*—rich, soft and plaintively appealing—but she addresses herself to the reason and the sense of justice rather than to the emotions. She traced the agitation for woman suffrage in England from its early days, in order to show the reason for the present strenuous methods. Kindness, persuasion and petition having been tried for thirty long years, thirteen women—no unlucky number there—decided, as men have decided in the days of grievance, to make the government exceedingly uncomfortable until wrongs were righted. When women really set to work to make things uncomfortable for any man, or body of men, they usually succeed in the enterprise, and the audience fully appreciated the good-humour and wit with which the speaker of the evening presented the case. Mrs. Pankhurst admitted the revolutionary state of affairs in England, but declared

that no serious harm had been done to life and property and that the suffragettes themselves were the ones to suffer. In fact, to use the French phrase, Mrs. Pankhurst "gave us to think." When women, gently bred and nurtured, are willing to die by starvation in order that justice may be done in the matter of the suffrage, they are in earnest and deserve a respectful hearing and consideration.

Mrs. Pankhurst showed commendable discretion in refraining from discussion of Canadian conditions, alleging that she is unfamiliar with them. In this instance, as in several others, she was a model of wisdom for certain transatlantic masculine orators—Mr. Keir Hardie, for instance, who goes out to India and knows all the affairs of Hindostan in a fortnight. The cases of extreme violence were repudiated and the "acid-throwing" denied. In fact, the sensational tendencies of the modern press may be used to account for the details of many so-called atrocities.

Mrs. Pankhurst, at the club and in the auditorium, gave the impression of a sweet, womanly, brilliant personality, utterly incapable of seeking notoriety, desperately convinced of the justice of her cause, and equipped with an eloquent advocacy, such as one seldom hears in these days of unpolished speech. To doubt her ability, her earnestness and her real refinement would be stupidity.

FRITH.

#### UNE ELECTION A MONTREAL

LA physionomie, le caractère de la campagne électorale de Saint-Jacques, a été particulièrement intéressant.

Ce ne fut pas une lutte de partis, mais un duel à l'américaine entre le pouvoir et l'opposition, ou plutôt un groupement de tous les mécontents contre le gouvernement.

D'un côté le ministère arborant fièrement le drapeau libéral dont il couvrait son candidat, de l'autre les mécontents: conservateurs, anciens libéraux se qualifiant "libéraux-indépendants," et enfin nationalistes menant la troupe au combat derrière leur propre bannière.

La lutte fut chaude, le succès très disputé, les discours très animés: tout cela pour en arriver à un résultat rappelant les bulletins des soirs de bataille où le général victorieux admet que l'ennemi s'est retiré en bon ordre.

La victoire est certainement un triomphe pour le ministère; mais le gouvernement commettrait une grave erreur s'il la considérait comme une approbation absolue de sa politique. Elle est due, cette victoire, au choix d'un excellent candidat ministériel et aux fautes incompréhensibles, impardonnables des oppositionnistes.

M. Clément Robillard, le candidat libéral élu, est un de ces rares hommes publics contre lesquels la critique est désarmée. Honnête homme, ayant traversé la vie sans jamais faire de mal à son prochain, serviable, à la tête d'une modeste fortune acquise par trente ans de travail, ayant vécu toute sa vie dans le quartier qui vient de l'élire, ce candidat avait pour lui toutes les chances imaginables. Seulement, il ne parlait pas ou peu, et quand il parlait, il le faisait sans la moindre éloquence.

Son adversaire, Mtre. N. K. Laflamme, est un de nos jeunes avocats les plus célèbres. Quelques procès criminels retentissants, plusieurs causes politiques bruyante l'ont placé au premier rang du barreau, et, chose rare, son talent est à la hauteur de sa réputation. Son prestige est d'autant plus grand que nous étions au lendemain de l'enquête de la Commission Royale sur nos affaires municipales, enquête que Mtre. Laflamme avait conduite avec beaucoup de brio en sa qualité d'avocat du Comité des Citoyens. Ajoutez à cela une grande facilité de parole ne s'élevant pas jusqu'à la grande éloquence, mais servant une dialectique puissante, serrée, vigoureuse, produisant une forte impression sur la foule.

Malgré cela, on s'aperçoit—en comparant les résultats du 12 novembre à ceux du 8 juin 1908—que Mtre Laflamme, bien que son adversaire fut moins redoutable qu'un premier ministre, n'a pu augmenter le nombre des partisans ralliés par M. Bourassa l'an dernier.

C'est autant par la faute de son entourage que par la réputation inattaquable de son concurrent que la victoire lui a échappé. Mtre. Laflamme a eu le tort de laisser porter la discussion sur le terrain municipal et de l'agrémenter d'accusations en l'air, de propos injurieux, de sarcasmes à l'adresse de son adversaire moins instruit que lui, de caricatures déplacées, le tout accompagné de processions, de fanfares et de transparents dignes du plus vulgaire barnum.

Sa défaite a réjoui nombre de citoyens désireux de voir ces consultations populaires, que sont les élections, entourées du décorum, du calme et de la dignité dont son heureux adversaire ne s'est pas départi un seul moment.

SAINT-LAURENT.