

a report a neutral fifth member might be summoned. The Commission's findings on matters of fact would be binding on both countries and would serve as the basis for subsequent negotiations between all concerned. Should the negotiations fail there would be an ultimate arbitration by a tribunal to be composed, for instance, of the Chief Justices of Great Britain and the United States, with perhaps a neutral third member. The Times states that the scheme will need the most careful consideration, but recognizes with unqualified satisfaction that it is such that Great Britain could honourably accept it. It adds that the plan also offers an excellent prospect of an ultimate agreement. The chief difficulty about arbitration, as the cable message points out, relates entirely to the settled districts. If in this case international arbitration could be made to resemble municipal law, so that the fact of long settlement would count as in ordinary courts, the greater part of the British objections to arbitration would disappear. Provided there is some agreement acceptable to England touching the districts inhabited by subjects of Her Majesty this scheme for the settlement of the boundary is to be commended. It is to be hoped that this dangerous dispute will soon receive its quietus.

A Young  
Canada Party.

Mr Francis H. Turnock, editor of the Alberta Tribune and Vice-President of the Calgary Young Men's Conservative Association, has addressed an able and interesting Open Letter to Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, calling upon him as a statesman of ability, audacity, and imagination to deliver Canadian Conservatism from "the blighting domination of mediocrity," under which it is now staggering to its fall, by accepting the leadership of a "Young Canada Party" which shall have for its chief aims the permanent restoration of principle in the Conservative party and its reconstruction by a strictly evolutionary process. Mr. Turnock points out to Sir Charles Hibbert that the opportunity which now presents itself to him is that which presented itself to Disraeli in 1846. The Conservative party of Canada has forgotten, of recent years, that "the Conservatism of a new country must be constructive as well as defensive." "The evolution of its policy has ceased," affirms Mr. Turnock, "and it is relying upon its past achievements." Like the Conservatism against which Disraeli warred in 1846 Canadian Conservatism offers no redress for the present and makes no preparation for the future. "It was against such a development of Conservatism," continues Mr. Turnock, "that the Young England Party revolted. It is against such that a Young Canada Party should revolt. The Young England Party seized the opportunity of regenerating English Conservatism when, in 1846, the obstinacy of Sir Robert Peel impelled him to ruin his Party by disregarding the wishes of a majority of his followers. The schism in Canadian Conservatism which has resulted from the obstinacy of Sir Mackenzie Bowell in retaining the leadership after he has lost the confidence of his Party, invites similar action." Young Conservatives "are looking for a leader" who will insure for the party "a puissant and creditable future rather than a disgraceful and not distant decay," and "instinctively" they turn to Sir Charles Hibbert and raise their *Ecce Homo*.

No  
Laissez Faire  
Principles.

Mr. Turnock then proceeds to suggest the particular lines on which the leader of the "New Conservatism" should educate his party. Liberalism, he says, stands for "Laissez Faire." Conservatism is its negation. But the

weakness of contemporary Canadian Conservatism is its capitulation to the principles of "Laissez Faire." It has no policy in regard to the national future of Canada. It has no definite article of faith in the matter of Provincial Rights, nor does it announce anything decisive respecting our national destiny. The National Policy is not represented simply by the Protective Tariff, yet the development of the Canadian West, which was at one time recognized as a part of the National Policy, is now neglected, and the original efforts of the Government have thus been practically nullified. After remarking that the cause of Conservatism is the cause of Democracy, and that Conservatives have nothing to fear from the freest expression of popular opinion, Mr. Turnock goes on to favour Sir Charles Hibbert with his views on many matters of political and social importance. Whilst we cannot always agree with the writer of the letter we are ready to admit that much that he says is sound common sense, and no doubt reflects the views and opinions of thinking men in the great North-West. A young Canada party led by Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper would certainly be interesting.

Home  
Truths.

A distinguished American, Professor Charles Eliot Norton, contributes a notable article to the February Forum on some dark aspects of civilization in the United States. Professor Norton takes a very gloomy view of the state of things, and we feel that he is only too well justified in doing so. He finds few manifestations in his country of "the rooted instinct in men to admire what is better and more beautiful than themselves," of which instinct the late Mr. Lowell used to speak in such hopeful terms. There is little, if any, respect for authority, for experience, for culture, for intellectual attainment, but there is an abundance of rough and swaggering assertion of individual independence:

"The spirit of independence is the spirit to which the progress of civilization is mainly due; but, if not controlled by reason, it becomes the parent of anarchy, destructive of free institutions and of social order. In Europe its excess is checked in part by her great armies and navies, in which the principles of discipline, subordination, and obedience are maintained, and also by the existence of a large class of men sufficiently instructed to set a true value upon the principle of authority, rightly understood, as the balance wheel by which individual independence is regulated. In America we have been living under conditions which have admitted of no check upon this spirit of independence; and the result is seen in every class, in the enfeebled sense of the virtue of obedience and the necessity of discipline, in the unrestraint of expression, and in the readiness to question and to resist the exercise of authority. Even in the most civilized parts of the country the sentiment of the independence of the individual is often misdirected and depraved, while in the vast half-civilized and half-settled regions it becomes the very manifestation of barbarism and of a relapse toward savagery."

The children of the public schools are "notoriously self-sufficient and impertinent" and "ignorance has increased and is increasing" in spite of the much-vaunted school system. As a result "genuine courtesy and refinement" in the United States are rarer in the Republic "than almost anywhere else." And the upper classes are no better than the lower.

A Dangerous  
Community.

But this is not all. Professor Norton declares that though the condition of affairs in the East are bad enough, in the West it is still worse. The arrogance and self-assertion of the people are unchecked by any restraints imposed by neighborhood to other powers, or by tradition or inherited culture.