

revolver on board. Under ordinary conditions, even under ordinary war conditions, the British captain would have felt that he should hasten to take off the men and count on their gratitude for the saving of their lives. But in the light of such German methods as were illustrated in the Lusitania's sinking, in the light of the atrocities committed by German soldiers in Belgium and Northern France, how could Captain Martin trust these Germans? They were armed, and their number was at least three to one of his crew. He felt that if he saved them they would turn upon their rescuers, overpower them, seize the little British ship and take her and her crew away as a prize. The belief was a natural one, fully justified by the German system of warfare. The Germans begged that they be rescued. They promised they would behave. They offered the fishermen money. But what reliance could, in the light of recent events, be placed upon any assurance given by men who had been taught by their Kaiser and his ministers that no treaty or promise was sacred? What expectation of good behavior could properly be formed in dealing with men of an army whose avowed policy was to resort to any kind of "frightfulness" in their prosecution of the war? So the British captain, keeping away, went in search of a British warship or some other craft which could protect itself while saving the lives of the German airship's crew. No such armed vessel was found. The Germans had to be left to their fate. They and their wrecked airship sank in the North Sea.

Are there not German citizens somewhere in Germany who can see that it does not pay to disregard all the rules of honorable warfare, and to establish such a reputation for treachery and inhumanity that honest and chivalrous fishermen dare not extend to drowning men the assistance which the British sailor is ever ready to give to those in peril?

### Preparedness

PRESIDENT Wilson, having found that his proposals for larger military expenditure are meeting with considerable opposition in Congress, decided to make a direct appeal to the people for support of his policy. He has therefore delivered a series of addresses throughout the country. It has been reported that the opponents of the President's policy will start a campaign to reply to his addresses, and many expected the late Secretary of State, Mr. Bryan, to lead it. Mr. Bryan, however, denies this. He has engagements to make several speeches, but they will have no particular reference to the President's campaign. The fact that Mr. Wilson has taken the stump in this way is regarded in some quarters as evidence that he fears a defeat of his policy of preparedness. It is altogether probable that Mr. Wilson has willingly availed himself of the opportunity to enter upon a campaign which brings him into close touch with the people at a time when events are rapidly shaping for the Presidential election contest of next fall.

The resignation of Mr. Garrison, the Secretary for War, indicates the difficult position of the President. He has to meet the opposition of a section of the people, of both parties, but chiefly Democrats, who think the proposed large military expenditure is both useless and dangerous, while at the same time others, like Secretary Garrison, would have him go further than he does. Probably Mr. Wilson feels that, by patient negotiation with congressional leaders, he will find the happy medium, and that in the end it will prevail. In the meantime,

in "swinging round the circle," the President is very much in the public eye, and unless some improbable mishap occurs he will smooth the way to his nomination and perhaps to his election.

### Humiliating a Nation

IT is a recognized principle of international relations that where differences occur between nations not at war efforts should be made to effect a settlement on terms that will not involve the humiliation of either party. Even where it is seen, and privately admitted, that one party is clearly in the wrong, it is expected that something shall be done to enable that party to "save his face," and avoid the frank confession that might be looked for in the case of a difficulty between individuals. Germany seems ready enough to avail herself of this rule. But it is strange that German statesmen fail to understand how illogical and one-sided are the positions they assume in their international negotiations. For instance, the German Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Dr. Alfred Zimmerman, who in the form of an interview with an American press correspondent, has made an appeal to the people of the United States. Dr. Zimmerman says the German Government believed they had practically settled their difficulties with the United States, including the Lusitania case; that they had made all reasonable concessions; and that they found with surprise that America was making new demands which it was impossible for Germany to accept. "You must not," he says, "push your demands too far; you must not attempt to humiliate Germany." What the United States Government had asked was a recognition by the German Government that the sinking of a peaceful passenger steamer, without warning, and without any preparation for saving the lives of the passengers—an act which resulted in the loss of hundreds of lives—was an act at variance with the laws of humanity and the laws of nations. To a Government and people with even very moderate claims to be considered civilized, such a request could not be deemed a proposed humiliation. It should rather be regarded as a favorable opportunity for expressing regret at a deed that shocked the world. But Dr. Zimmerman's plea that the pressing of this demand meant an attempt to "humiliate" Germany is all the more remarkable when we remember certain events which immediately preceded the war.

It is now clearly seen that long before the Serrajevo murder Germany had resolved to have war, and that if the murder of the Austrian Archduke and his wife had not occurred some other excuse would have been sought. But it has pleased Germany and Austria to pretend that the war is the necessary consequence of the crime in Bosnia, and therefore it is well to recall how Germany and Austria dealt with Serbia at that time. Austria, prompted, as is now seen by Germany, held the Serbian Government responsible for the murder. The murderer was an Austrian subject, not a Serb, and the crime was committed on territory ruled by Austria. But the Austrians alleged that there was in Serbia a spirit of hostility to Austrian rule, and that this was the cause of the crime. So Serbia was called to account. A series of demands was made by Austria. Some of these were quite unreasonable. Nevertheless Serbia, for the sake of peace, assented to most of them, reserving only the extreme one, compliance with which would have given Austrian officials an authority on Serbian soil inconsistent with Serbia's sovereignty as a nation. Austria, and

Germany, standing behind Austria, were asked not to press such a demand to the point of Serbia's "humiliation." "Serbia has gone a long way to meet you; you should not push your demands too far; you should not attempt to humiliate Serbia"—so spoke, in effect, the nations which desired peace. But Austria, spurred on by Germany, did push the demands so far that self-respect obliged the little nation to refuse to submit to such humiliation. And now Dr. Zimmerman and his associates have the audacity to tell the American people, when they seek reparation for one of the blackest crimes in history, that they "should not attempt to humiliate Germany." Germany claims the right to bully and humiliate every nation with which she comes into contact. But Germany herself becomes very sensitive to the question of national humiliation, when she is asked to disavow, not the murder of two persons, as in the crime of Serrajevo, but the murder of many hundreds of peaceful travellers!

### British Columbia's Agent General

SIR Charles Hibbert Tupper, in a letter to the British Columbia press, calls attention to the extraordinary situation respecting the office of the Agent General of British Columbia in London, on which we lately commented. The Act under which the office of Agent General in London was created provides that the official shall not be removed except upon an address from the Legislature of the Province. No such address has been adopted. Unless Hon. Mr. Turner has distinctly resigned the office, he is therefore still Agent General. The British Columbia official Gazette announced the resignation of Mr. Turner, and the appointment of Sir Richard McBride, and the latter went to London to take charge of the office. The terms of Mr. Turner's letter of resignation are vital to a fair understanding of the question, and in all the discussion this letter has not been produced. Some idea of Mr. Turner's attitude, however, may be learned from an interview which he had with a correspondent in London. Mr. Turner is thus reported:

"I have resigned only on condition that certain things are carried out. To carry them out necessitates a meeting of the House. Those stipulations include the question of a pension and other conditions I cannot name. There will be no resignation unless these stipulations are carried out."

"If this report of Mr. Turner's words is correct, it is evident that there has been no resignation within the meaning of the law. "There will be no resignation," says Mr. Turner, unless certain stipulations are carried out, and these stipulations can only be carried out by future legislative action. Mr. Turner's statement that "there will be no resignation" unless certain things are done seems to be pretty conclusive evidence that there has been no resignation yet. In the absence of such resignation there has been no vacancy, and the appointment of Sir Richard McBride is clearly illegal. Intimations are given in the British Columbia press that some Orders in Council have been passed respecting future action, but Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper very properly points out that no Order in Council can override the provisions of the law. It seems clear that Sir Richard McBride, although he has gone to London to enter upon the duties of the office, has no legal standing, and that if anybody should take the trouble to question his status, he could not be recognized as Agent General for British Columbia.