

tor had lost £70,000 and another £40,000. But we don't see that a financial panic is going to be manufactured out of these club incidents, startling and unusual as they are, and discreditable as some of them are likely to prove.

A commissioner has been appointed by the Canadian Government to act in conjunction with another whom the United States is to appoint, to define and delimit the international boundary in Passamaquoddy Bay. It is doubtful whether any precise authority for this appointment can be found either in the Treaty of Ghent or the Ashburton-Webster Treaty. The latter deals with specific portions of the international line, but does not touch this point; the Ashburton Treaty provides for settling the question of the ownership of certain islands in this bay; but if not here, authority will no doubt be found somewhere. The incident which made the delimitation necessary arose out of the water, not the islands; the Canadian Government contending that American fishermen had poached on its preserves. The American commissioner's appointment would require the sanction of the Senate. There can scarcely be any serious ground of difference in this delimitation. The island of Grand Manan, in this bay, once claimed by both countries, is now acknowledged to be part of New Brunswick; if the ownership of any others be disputed, the Ashburton Treaty provided a mode of settlement by commissioners; but could that settlement once made be reversed? The proposed joint commission is also to delimit the boundary between Canada and Alaska, a feat which the Americans two years ago represented as impossible. Whatever difficulties there may be arise from the nature of the physical geography.

Russia has of late been busy making seizures of British and American sealers in that part of Behring Sea over which she pretends to have a right of jurisdiction. About half a dozen of the former, most, if not all, of them Canadian, and two American, have been captured. Americans, as represented by the Government, are not likely to protest. It suits them very well to see Russia backing up, in this indirect way, the American claim to extraordinary jurisdiction in the other part of the sea. But with Great Britain it is different. She has no arrangement with Russia, such as she has made with the United States for a specific purpose, and she does not and never did recognize Russia's right of jurisdiction, from the time of the issue of the *akase* embodying the claim of 1822 to the present time. The British press is practically unanimous in calling on the Government to insist that Russia shall put a stop to the practice. Some journals contend that an apology is due from Russia, and that she should be required to indemnify the vessel owners.

A seizure has been made of an American schooner, the "Hattie Maud," of Portland, for infraction of the Treaty of 1818, in shipping sailors in a Canadian port without a license. Though the offence is a year

old, and the vessel has since changed owners, the remedy against her remains intact. The owner, Mr. Whitten, is anxious to settle with the Canadian authorities and to keep the case out of court. There are some reasons why this might be the preferable mode of dealing with the case.

Mr. Van Horne is reported, by cable, to have become convinced that the question of Canadian Atlantic mail service must be dealt with on a business basis. The fair inference from what is said is that the most available British port must be selected and that the idea of calling at a French port must be dropped.

The destruction by fire of the "Corinthian" once more raises the question of the efficiency of steamboat inspection as now practiced. A doubt whether the pumps were in proper order has been raised. Whatever importance may attach to the resolution of this doubt, it is still more important that inspection should in future fully embrace this item, and that the pumps should frequently be examined, if not by the inspector, by somebody.

CAN THE PRESENT DECIDE FOR THE FUTURE?

Apropos of the enforced retirement of Mr. Elgin Myers from the County Attorneyship of Dufferin, Mr. Longley, having made the brave resolution to come to the rescue of a fallen brother, expresses the opinion that "there is no official in the Dominion of Canada, from the Prime Minister down, whose oath of office precludes him from standing on any platform in Canada and advocating annexation." Let us take the case of Attorney-General Longley himself and see how this doctrine would work out in practice, in a possible event which he recognizes. Mr. Longley in effect avows that he is prepared to dispose of his country in the best market. In deciding the question of its disposal to the United States, or elsewhere or otherwise, Mr. Longley says in so many words: "If the interests of Canada are identical with the interests of Great Britain, well; if they come in contact, in any form, I shall take my stand on the side of Canada." Of course he must be allowed to be the judge of what constitutes the interest of Canada. We submit that there is a nobler rule, and one that is morally binding, for the guidance of communities in emergencies. There are such things as right and wrong, and there is such a thing as duty. The obligation to do right and to perform one's duty must take precedence of any claim of self-interest. Suppose, for instance, that war broke out between Great Britain and the United States, what would Mr. Longley do, in pursuance of the principle he lays down? The question would arise in his mind, not on which side lay the right and the wrong of the quarrel, but from which side the bread of Canada would get most butter. That was the rule on which Dugald Dalgety acted, and it is curious that Mr. Longley, Attorney-General of Nova Scotia,

should be willing to take that redoubtable warrior for an example. Let Mr. Longley beware that he gives no occasion for people to conclude that he ranks himself among the ignoble herd who are at all times willing to sell their country, and who would thank God or Beelzebub with equal indifference for finding them a purchaser.

In making his choice between the country that was going to war for his protection in a quarrel of Canada's own raising, a supposable case, Mr. Longley might soliloquise in this fashion: "True I have taken an oath to bear faithful allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Victoria, but oaths and piecrusts were made to be broken. My oath is in one scale, self or Canadian interest, as I view it, in the other; my decision is made: I accept the perjury for the sake of the solid pudding and other good things it will bring. The clashing of interests has come, and have I not said before, when no war was visible on the horizon, with a solemnity equal to any that my oath can bear, if it come 'in any form,' I should disregard everything but the interests of Canada, as they appear to me, and as I have a right to define them. I also said, with equal certainty, that there is nothing in the oath of an Attorney-General of Nova Scotia to prevent his advocating annexation. The action for which that advocacy was, and could only have been a preparation, has come, and I am logically bound to take part in it. Discussion produces conviction, conviction predetermines the choice of action. True I cannot lay down at will an oath which officious people tell me was taken in view of just such an emergency as this; but I can muster enough of bravery to disregard it and walk over to the enemy, after the example of the illustrious Wilcocks, in this crisis of the fate of that crown which, while taking my advice, was wise enough or weak enough to count on my allegiance."

Few will be able to accept the doctrine that Mr. Longley, while Attorney-General of Nova Scotia, has a right, as he claims, to go on a platform and advocate annexation. Surely the oath he has taken, to bear true allegiance to Queen Victoria, should, out of mere decency, prevent him from doing so, while he continues in the position of adviser of the Crown. If he wants to advocate annexation, let him throw up his office, that he may not seem to play a double part, and then let him try to discover which of the constituencies of Nova Scotia would be willing to elect him on that platform to the House of Commons. But Mr. Longley wishes us to accept as a fact the averment that he does not now and never did advocate annexation. In the light of this declaration, we must confess that we know no other instance in which any writer, amateur or other, has been so much maligned by a perverse generation of readers insisting on searching above the lines, below the lines, between the lines, and through the lines, everywhere, and, as they wickedly concluded, not in vain, for the means of condemnation. After all, let us, if not out of respect for these cross-grained judges who do not deserve consideration, but in decency and honor let us abstain from stooping to palter with our oaths.

Mr. Longley lets it be known that he is in