

of them, of whom four—Lohmann, Richardson, Abel, and Hayward—are Surrey players, and of whom the fifth, Gunn, hails from Notts, having been selected by the Surrey County Committee, who were in charge of the arrangements, to play in the final match of the season between England and Australia, asked, in a joint-note, for a fee of £20 each for so playing. In the two previous inter-Imperial matches of the year, which were played on the grounds of the Marylebone and the Lancashire Cricket Clubs respectively, a fee of £10 with expenses, had been paid to and accepted by the professional players engaged. The Surrey Committee, after receiving the application for enhanced pay, appear to have repeated, in the case of their own four players at any rate, their invitation to play in the great match, but to have specified the lower scale of pay. The four men refused to play on those terms, whereupon the Committee filled up all the men's places, and issued on Saturday morning last a fresh list of the England eleven against the Australians. Their "firm attitude" was rewarded by a large measure of success, for on Saturday evening all their own four recalcitrant players, except Lohmann, who has since apologized, "placed themselves unreservedly in the hands of the Surrey Committee," whereupon that august body, its honour saved, restored the penitents to their places.

In other words, this was a little "strike," and the strikers were beaten. The difference in climate accounts for cricket not being so universal in this part of Canada as in England, but in all games professionalism is an element not to be ignored. It has its rights and they must be fully recognized. But here we think the Committee was right. The professionals thought they had the game in their own hands and could make their own terms. Next time it will be their innings, because their demand was reasonable enough, and they will make it again at a reasonable time and in a fairer way.

\* \* \*

### Is England Afraid?

THE inhabitants of the United States of America are at present indulging in a very loud, self-appreciative chuckle. They consider that they have got the better of England in the Arbitration discussion between Lord Salisbury and Mr. Olney, or, as they put it, "between Olney and Salisbury." We must say we think they are justified. Lord Salisbury, according to the latest despatches, has consented to submit the claim between England and Venezuela to arbitration on Mr. Olney's terms. British subjects are to be compensated for the mistake they have made in improving property under a "mistake in title" and England gracefully withdraws. That the award will be against England is a foregone conclusion. The English Liberals will, we presume, wrap themselves up in their virtue and join in the chorus of satisfaction which England's rivals will raise. What is the reason why England thus so constantly gives way to the United States? Is she afraid? If not, why does she give way? The answer depends on several considerations. England is an enormous creditor of the United States. If a British fleet bombarded New York to-morrow it would be pounding British capital. The American railways were built and are run by English capital. Any loss to them means loss to English bondholders. The trade between England and the States is \$750,000,000 a year. Any interruption of this trade would mean a very serious loss to English merchants. Thus England has a material interest in peace—a very material interest. Next, England's aspirations lie in Asia and Africa, not in America. Canada is useful as an alternative quick route to reach India, and that is about all. It takes very little to rouse an Englishman to defend India, or to send a fleet to the China seas, but it takes a good deal to make him think about his American possessions. Sentimentally

also, England objects to war with the United States. So many millions of British subjects have colonized the States that England looks upon America as her creation. The ordinary Englishman talks of his "kin beyond sea" and his "American cousin" as if the relationship was really one, like that which exists between himself and his own blood relations. Then the Americans who visit England, as a rule, are impressed by what they see there. In spite of themselves they are touched by the associations of the localities they visit. The *genius loci* awes them. The consequence is that their tone is not as aggressive as it is in their own country, and those of them who are more civilized often settle in England as being more suited to their taste. From these specimens Englishmen judge the remainder.

Then the national characteristic of Englishmen is, that they are "slow to anger." It takes a great deal to rouse them, but once roused they are like their own bull-dogs—they never let go. Fortunately for peace, they do not see one thousandth or one ten-thousandth part of the insults daily hurled at them by the American press. They know as a sort of general thing that to "twist the lion's tail" has become a recognized part of the stock-in-trade of an American politician. At that they good-naturedly laugh on the "it amuses she and does not hurt me" principle. Then there is in the average English heart an innate horror of war. It is not cowardice. It is founded on a desire to give every man his due, and to do as a man would be done by. But an impatient, excitable race are apt to mistake this sentiment for cowardice. The French have sometimes made that mistake when England was concerned. For all these reasons we would say England was not *afraid*. Why, then, should it be thought she is afraid? In the first place, there is the memory of the Revolution. The English were thrashed then, and have been shy of the Americans ever since. Next, the English people have accepted the American "bounce" about the war of 1812 as gospel truth. They know all about their defeats at New Orleans and Plattsburgh. They are ashamed they burned Washington (*vide* Green's History of the English People), and they never heard of Lundy's Lane or Queenston Heights. So they themselves almost believe that in the two wars they have had with the United States they have had the worst of it. Then they know they are vulnerable in Canada. A certain school of English army officers—forgetting, or being ignorant, of the lessons of history—say "Canada cannot be defended." Lord Wolseley does not say so, but many officers do. Thus, for these reasons, England may be said to be afraid. But would all the considerations we have mentioned, and we have stated them as dispassionately as possible, be sufficient if it came to the alternative, "Surrender your American possessions or war!" to lead to surrender? The answer to this question affects Canada very vitally. So far, the answer of England has always been—No Surrender. If a certain school of politicians in England had had their way, the surrender would have been made long ago. The demand was made last December in almost those words by Cleveland's message. It will not be long before we hear it again. We think that on the whole we are justified in saying that when the Americans allege that England is afraid of them, they are partially right and partially wrong. England is afraid of war, because she knows what it means, and when she goes into it she does so because she cannot help it, and fights then to win. But if the Americans think that England is afraid of them, that is another matter; and for the sake of peace we hope they will not presume on the notion. The consequences would be deplorable all round, and things had better remain as they are.