

England and Europe are both anxious for peace, and both are preparing for it in a peculiar way. The negotiations in progress, we are assured, have peace in view, and all parties desire that as the issue of them. But all parties are making gigantic efforts to be ready for war, and more is being done for the army than by the diplomatists. The Russian lines around Constantinople are drawing nearer to the city, while Count Schouvaloff is away on an errand of peace; the Turks are begging and working that war may cease, but—they are also massing a formidable army within their lines, and mounting great guns on all the fortifications. England holds peace meetings—has Cabinet councils to promote the same thing—gets up petitions and makes speeches in Parliament, and—mobilizes another army corps; fixes the first day of the session of Congress, and—sends for another battalion from Bengal, just to strengthen her hands in the Conference. These warlike preparations for peace are becoming a puzzle to ordinary mortals. All that can be made of it is that the two parties entertain a profound respect for each other, and each by a show of preparedness and strength will seek to intimidate the other. True, Russia is in possession of European Turkey, which will compel the Turks, if they fight at all, to fight from an Asiatic basis; but Russia is financially weak—on the verge of national bankruptcy, while England is strong in money, and every week gets stronger in men. So the advantages from delay are all on the side of England. And now the tidings are that a Congress is agreed upon; that is to say, Russia has consented that the whole treaty of San Stefano shall be discussed by the representatives of all the great European powers. The Earl of Beaconsfield is still on the side of the angels.

ENGLAND AND THE UNITED STATES.

A pleasant thing it was on the Queen's Birthday to see a small party of American volunteers, with band playing, and stars and stripes flying, marching in line with the Canadians at Montreal; and good it was to have the Governor-General speak to them such warm words of welcome and approval; and good again to have heard from their captain the honest hearty sentiments he spoke at the dinner table on behalf of himself and fellow-workingmen of the States. The whole was in striking and pleasing contrast to the attitude assumed by the *New York Herald*, which almost every day has an article breathing fierce hate towards England. It not only claims a peculiar friendship for Russia, but declares that the best interests of America will be promoted by actions inimical to England. A few days ago it was urging an amendment of the Registry laws, saying, "Mr. Woods proposed legislation to accord registry to all vessels owned wholly by citizens of the United States, without regard to where they were built, would set right a grievous evil in the present condition of our law, and would, in case of war between England and Russia, by opening the protection of a neutral flag through the simple process of a change of ownership in vessels, restore to us in great part, if not wholly, the enormous commerce lost through English depredations on our trade made under the Confederate colours." It declares that the recovery of American commerce through England's calamity would be American revenge for the harm done them in the civil war—it would satisfy in full that deep sense of unredressed wrong which inspired the famous "indirect claims" of the Geneva litigation, and asserts that if the national legislature fail to embrace this opportunity it will be "justly regarded as an adherent to the enemy's cause." This is about as indecent a way of talking as any people could adopt toward another people with whom they are not at actual war. It is utterly devoid of morality, of political fairness, of diplomatic acuteness, and possesses not even the excuse of smart writing. It is the language of an enraged and unreasonable Fenian, who cannot fight, but hopes to get something by the fighting of others. The danger that arises from such a style of writing is great. The sentiments are not put forward in letters, but in leaders. And the *New York Herald* is read by just the Fenian rowdy class that is most capable of being wrought upon by such vile bluster. If the *Herald* could see that harm might be done to England by a Fenian raid upon Canada, it would advocate that; but it knows well enough that the Fenians are a set of brainless cowards, and that Canada can take care of her own peace, as far as they are concerned. So it is advocating the adoption of a policy toward England by the nation, which for its unreasonableness and immorality, is without a parallel in the history of even a heathen nation.

But the *New York Herald* does not represent the American people, not even any respectable class of Americans. We prefer to take the volunteers who marched in Montreal on the Queen's Birthday; we believe their captain spoke truly when he said that the workingmen of America desired peace and goodwill between the two great nations of English-speaking people; and we would contrast the treasonable, disgraceful and impolitic language of the *New York Herald* with the words addressed by the Governor-General to the United States company, when he said, "I cannot allow this opportunity to pass without expressing to you, on my own behalf, on behalf of the Government, and of

Her Most Gracious Majesty, whose representative I am, the extreme satisfaction I feel in thus being able to welcome you on behalf of the people of Canada to the soil of this Dominion. A greater compliment could hardly be paid by one people to another, than the one you are good enough to confer by thus joining us to celebrate the Birthday of our Queen. I accept this demonstration on your part as an additional proof of the indestructible friendship which I hope will ever unite the people of both countries." Those are the words of a gentleman—they are the expression of an universal British sentiment, and will find an earnest response in the hearts of all Americans who are worth counting. The Fenian has put away his pistol, and taken up a pen, but he is still a fool.

RUSSIA AND ENGLAND.

The last pretext for the course the Imperial Government is pursuing has been shifted from "British Interests" to "Rights of Treaties."

England, since peace has been signed between Russia and Turkey, has herself violated Treaty rights, by sending her ships of war into the Sea of Marmora, despite the protests of Turkey, and by keeping them there, has caused the Russian forces to be held in close proximity to Constantinople as a set off to so menacing a demonstration of the power of Great Britain.

The last declaration that the fleet is there to protect British inhabitants in Constantinople is too apparent a continuation of the deception the Government have been practising on the credulity of the British public. At a time when peace was signed, it is not likely that Russia would occupy the Turkish Capital, and most of the Russian forces would, doubtless, have long since been home-ward bound, had it not been for the irritation imported into the question by the sensational policy of Lord Beaconsfield.

Bringing native Indian troops into Europe, is only on a par with the general proceedings of the Premier's life. He governs not by wise statesmanship, but by keeping the nation in continual excitement. When there is no war expectancy, we have Royal journeys to India, and new Orders or Titles created for women—from the Sovereign downwards.

It is a dangerous precedent for the English nation to sanction the bringing of troops from India to Malta, on the mere caprice of a Ministry, without the sanction of Parliament, and during a recess. India is not ruled by Parliamentary Government; troops may be raised there in any number, and it may be to England or Ireland that they will be brought on a future day.

Will the liberties of the British people be always safe, if a majority of Parliament will sanction the withdrawal of 7,000 troops (which might be augmented to 70,000, or more) from where they are supposed to be required for duty? If they are not a necessity in India, a useless expense is being incurred in the maintenance of so large a force, which it is asserted, by the action taken, can be withdrawn with safety for service elsewhere.

The persistent cavilling of the Government of Great Britain, instead of months ago entering a Congress, has had its effect adequately described by "Industry paralyzed, Capital stagnant, Taxation increased already, and a further increase imminent."

Meanwhile Tory tactics prevail, and the arguments of the opponents of war, are met by their meetings being disturbed, and violence to those attending them. If peace is maintained, it will be by the strong counter opinion which has found voice in England, and forced upon the Government pacific declarations which their acts have singularly belied.

Russia will be irritated, menaced, and bullied into unreasonable concessions. She has fought many powers combined, and her people, who to-day are free, are not less sensitive and jealous of their honor and dignity, than was the nation under Nicholas.

If war is averted, it will be, as has lately been said, "not by the policy of the Government, but in spite of it."

It is positive now that a Congress will meet at an early date, and that the whole of the Treaty of San Stefano will be submitted for discussion. Should any obstacle arise to a satisfactory settlement of the question between England and Russia in the Congress, we hope that the protocol embodied in the Treaty of Paris will then have practical application. It recommends that "States between which any serious misunderstanding may arise, should, before appealing to arms, have offices of a friendly Power."

Public opinion in England is being educated to the support of this view, which might have had an earlier consideration, but the Tory party have always been in favor of the increase of armaments.

So favorable an opportunity of raising a war feeling, and augmenting the services, could not be ignored by the early adoption of a policy which knitted the bonds of unity between Canada and the United States so strongly together, as was evinced by the sentiments and actions of our cousins across the line on the Queen's Birthday, while a few years ago our relations had become most embittered by the action of England during the American war.

Arbitration settled the "Alabama" matter; the Fisheries Award appears likely to be concurred in, and now a sentiment of friendship exists between England, Canada and the United States.

We do not see why the European Continent should be deluged with blood, and treasure wasted, when so humane and sensible a means of settling differences are embodied in a Treaty. Let Lord Beaconsfield propose this, if all other measures fail.

The "recommendation" in a Treaty may not have the force of "European law," but those who profess such high respect for Treaty rights, cannot ignore it without giving it a trial, and we therefore have hopes that a peaceful solution will be found by that course being pursued, if it should come to such an extremity.

PATRIA.

The liberty of a people consists in being governed by laws which they have made themselves, under whatever form it be of government; the liberty of a private man, in being master of his own time and actions, as far as they consist with the laws of God and of his country.—Cowley.