

Major-General
Gascoigne.

The new commander of the Canadian militia has already established himself as a favourite in militia circles, and is regarded generally as a man of tact and sound practical sense. It was once remarked by a man of discernment that what accounted for the unpopularity of Englishmen in the Colonies was their assumption that they could teach the colonist everything from milking his cow to governing his country. General Gascoigne does not appear to be a man of this kind. On the contrary, he is most appreciative, and, what is more, is quite ready to express his appreciation. Immediately after the church parade of the Toronto Garrison on Sunday last he sent a note to Lieutenant-Colonel Buchan requesting him to express to the permanent force as well as the active militia his "extreme satisfaction at the remarkably good turn-out" he had witnessed that afternoon. "Not only," continued the General, "did the number present on parade exceed my expectations, but the general smartness and magnificent appearance of the troops, as well as their steadiness and evident knowledge of drill and training, gave me the highest gratification. I am proud to have the honour of commanding such troops." These are strong words, but no one who was fortunate enough to witness the parade can say they were not well deserved. We are proud of the Toronto Garrison, and we are glad to know that so distinguished and able a soldier as the present Commander can speak of the force in such warm terms. Words of warning and advice from a man so ready to appreciate all genuine effort are the more to be heeded and acted upon. At the Garrison dinner given to General Gascoigne on Saturday evening, he pointed out, in the course of his excellent speech in reply to the toast of his health, how necessary it was that the officers should "take themselves seriously," and that it should ever be their aim to set a good example in every way to their men. They must be prepared to make sacrifices, sacrifices greater even than those made by their forefathers, so as to make the country believe in their earnestness and steadfastness of purpose. The General struck the right note here. We hope his words will be laid to heart.

Principal Grant
and Americans.

We publish in another column an interesting article from Principal Grant, which, coming from the source it does, demands every respect and consideration. He takes strong exception to the article "Delenda est Carthago" which appeared in THE WEEK on the 25th ultimo. We fear the Principal has not understood the purpose of the article. Probably the fault was ours, but the fact is there. The tone of the article was defence, not defiance. "I admit that there is a possibility of an American political party betraying the country into a war with Britain before the sober sense of the American people had time to assert itself." These are Principal Grant's own words. In spite of Fudge he sees the danger too, and that is "one of the reasons why he is unalterably opposed to annexation." So far the Principal agrees with our article. Where he disagrees is in our statement that the struggle is inevitable. He thinks it is only probable—that is all there is between us. Our purpose in writing the article was to warn, as far as we could do so, writing so far away, the English people of their extraordinary infatuation. They think the Americans are like themselves. They are not. The war of 1812 was brought on by exactly the element in America who are promoting a warlike feeling now. The honesty of the Englishman is not at first a match for the astuteness of the American. He is more than equal to it ultimately, but too often history has shewn what terrible losses have been received because English diplomatists

trusted to the influence of good feeling where really there was bad feeling. Touching Principal Grant's reference to Cassandra may we not ask if Cassandra had been believed would it not have been better for Troy? However that may be, we would be glad if the distinguished Principal were right and our views wrong. We hope we are mistaken in them. But why are the Americans building ship after ship of war? Why are they letting contracts for gun boats on the lakes? Who is it to fight? Are these ships built for toys? God forbid that we should begin a war, but when you see your next door neighbour piling up combustibles near your fence you want to know what he is about. If his record is not particularly good you watch him pretty closely. "Delenda est Carthago" was written after due reflection, and anxious consideration of what our national duty is here. Further, whatever faults the Irish agitators may have they are not cowards, and the Invincibles, as they call themselves in the United States, have a serious and desperate purpose. They have good organization, they can get all the money they want, and they control the American voting machine.

An Ancient
Family Skeleton.

In the course of his official duty as Governor of Canada, General Haldimand, in November, 1781, wrote a letter to Lord George Germain, of unhappy memory, in which he described the then existing feeling of the French-Canadian population. He stated in his letter that he had observed in the Canadian gentry an expectation of a revolution to take place in the country. As evidence of the fact he referred to a letter which had fallen into his hands from Mons. de Lotbinière, "who after receiving the King's bounty went over to the rebels at Philadelphia." More than a century after the event the descendant of De Lotbinière, the present so much respected Sir Henry Joli de Lotbinière, has felt himself called upon to vindicate the memory of his ancestor. Dr. Kingsford, in the seventh volume of his History of Canada, in order to illustrate his narrative of the events of that date, referred to this letter of Haldimand's which he had disinterred from the Archive Office. Sir Henri de Lotbinière and Mr. Justice Wurtel, at a meeting in Montreal of the United Empire Loyalist Club, lately held, claimed that Dr. Kingsford had made "statements that are wrong," and that "reparation should be made to Sir Henri for any wrong he (Dr. K.) had inadvertently done his family by the passage in question." Dr. Kingsford, in his quality of historian, refuses to withdraw his statement. It seems to us properly so. The question is not, is the historian wrong, but was General Haldimand wrong? Assuming the letter to be genuine, it was undoubtedly of the character ascribed to it by Haldimand. Sir Henri does not believe apparently in the genuineness of the letter. That point cannot be decided now. The Governor was, at the time, quite satisfied that it was genuine, and so the case must rest. But there is this important principle lying at the base of the discussion. Should a public writer be assailed by a member of a family living for arraigning the conduct of a character who passes across the glass of history a century before—especially where he gives authority for his statement and the mention of the name is incidental to sustain an argument? There is something childish in any such contention. What is the use of collecting archives at all if they are to be made subservient to family or individual sentiments at the present day? It is a sobering thought that the events of our lives will have to stand the test of critical examination hereafter. That is the true duty of history, and it would greatly impair the value of any work intended for permanent existence if a writer were to act upon the theory that he must subordinate his writings to the feelings or wishes of his own contemporaries.