

believe it is only courtesy to acknowledge such with the ordinary mode of recognition when we meet them. It is a mark of true gentlemanhood. A lady of social position who can be all suavity and politeness, when expediency demands it, can draw herself up haughtily on other occasions and give an insolent nod, which says coarsely "Stand off! *you* have no social position." For the nonce her victim haply may peer through the flesh veil at that shrivelled soul, and wish her well. People of such ilk exercise this method of the cut usually. It is contemptible and unscientific.

The following is a very effective, and rather elegant way of administration: A gentleman walking along a thoroughfare, or quiet street—or, it may be, in the drawing-room—is encountered by a lady with eyes of recognition and delight. He looks at her in wonder: "Oh! have I seen you before? Yes? yes? *somewhere*, doubtless," say his eyes, though scarcely six months previous, during a summer out-flight, he had waxed confidential in his attentions to her. This method requires polish, and utter self-possession, with a moiety of conceit added, and is used mostly by the learned professions.

Then there is the don't-see-you method, which is very easy if the conditions are favourable. It happens in this way: A lady is walking down the street talking to a friend; a well-known acquaintance looms in the way before her; she talks vigorously, "turns her eye's tail up" slowly, and cuts the victim serenely, all in one sweep. This is the most common method of street cutting. It always reminds me somewhat of Trabb's boy in "Great Expectations," her demeanor is so loudly proclaiming "Don't see you, 'pon my soul I don't see you."

A very different and much more abominable way of doing the cut is this: The cutter, in response to a courteous recognition, stares with gorgonizing (not necessarily British) eyes which say "Sir! how dare you presume." The main attribute required here is pomposity. Over against this gorgonizing method, there is another way of performing the cut, and, to my mind, it is the only upright and self-respecting way. This is merely a cold look of unrecognition to the condescending and patronizing bow of one who really needs discipline of this sort. I have been an eye-witness to cuts of this sort and relished the sight exceedingly. Although hardly in accordance with the sermon on the Mount, ethically, this kind has a moral value. There are other ways of doing the cut, but a thought of wearying forbids referring to more.

The near-sighted person can never perform the cut with any credit to himself, for the reason that the enemy is upon him, before he knows his man. And, then, again he is forever cutting the people upon whom he delights to beam. The absent-minded man, of course, never sees friend or foe, till he stumbles over them. As a rule, these are the rare souls, the occasional wanderers in life, from whom an eye beam is a delight—from whom a word is silver treasure. These beautiful and lofty souls who "pass my gate," with feet on the solid earth and head up among the stars, know nothing of the cut, its philosophy or science—their contemplation is on higher themes.

MARY TUPPER.

Winnipeg, Dec. 25th, 1894.

* * *

Correspondence.

PRINCIPAL GRANT ON SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

The Editor of The Week:

SIR,—Dr. Grant's voluminous review of Mr. Pope's life of Sir John A. Macdonald, which appeared in your issue of Dec. 14th, should be carefully studied by all who wish to become acquainted with a good reviewing style, combined with an exceptional gift for seizing the governing facts of history. It ranks with the best reviews of the *London Times* and *Spectator*. One among the numerous points to be achieved by a reviewer should be to quote incidents which throw a light upon the character of the age. He has done this admirably by quoting the scene between Sir John and the reporter, and his humorous advice to the latter, "Young man never again attempt to report a public speaker when you are drunk." The *London Spectator* quotes another humorous fact which will give future generations a good idea of the rough and ready ways of early Colonial days, as contrasted with the more decorous usages of older civilizations. It

appears that at his first case at the bar—to the great scandal of the judge—he came to blows with the opposing counsel. While the crier of the court—as in duty bound—shouted "Order in the court" he sympathisingly whispered in his ear "Hit him, John." Such a pugilistic encounter has never been heard of in England, and probably not even in Lowland Scotland.

The reviewer has fallen into a general misapprehension when referring to the Joint High Commission of which Sir John was a member. He states: "It was known that the questions to be settled" (between England and Canada on the one side and the United States on the other), "had excited the people of the United States so keenly that if the negotiation failed war would have been the result on the very next occasion when Britain was in difficulty with other powers." He overlooks the fact that, even after 1870, General Grant stated his belief that until the South was reconciled—since happily achieved—they would avail themselves of any good opportunity to rise again.

Literary men and politicians who do not come into actual contact with the people in daily life often make mistakes as to their real opinions. I maintain that in 1870 the genuine Americans were friendly and peaceable, although very willing to gain any point by buncombe. From April, 1870, till January, 1871, I came in daily contact with Americans in New York and New England. I interviewed thousands, and, in many hundreds of cases, stated that I was from London. During the nine months the American press "breathed threatenings." Although I laid myself out for remarks, I only met with four persons (two not being native Americans) who made unpleasant observations about the Alabama affair. I consequently came to the conclusion that the newspaper war-scare was a "plant," and wrote to the Foreign Secretary with the facts. The letter was duly acknowledged. I have forwarded a full statement of the facts to the *London Times*. The statement was sent to refute the missive of Mr. Edgar, appearing in its issue of 26th December. Englishmen, unacquainted with our real life, would, on reading his letter, imagine that all Canadians are ready and willing to die in the last ditch, if a dozen patriots are refused permission to acquire on their own terms the property of others. It is ridiculous to suppose that Canadians propose to shed blood in order to enable—say—12 gentlemen thus to feather their nests. At this very time we are exerting ourselves to punish those who have feathered their nests at the expense of Toronto. I believe Mr. Edgar to be an upright and clever politician, but feel sure that intelligent Canadians will laugh at such mock-heroics. It seems to me—although not a Conservative—that while the Conservatives as a mass are wisely or unwisely in favour of protection, the majority of our leading Reformers manifest "a benevolent neutrality" for buncombe.

Dr. Grant, referring deprecatingly to the state of political morality, says: "The fact that in Canada and the United States methods essentially immoral are accepted by both parties . . . as the rule of the game." Conceding that well-known fact, we must bear in mind that during the last fifty years neither party in Canada has openly encouraged crime in order to gain recruits for an attack upon its adversary. After the event, crime has been excused—notably in 1885 on the Riel affair; but that is very different to encouraging people to commit crime, as Mr. Gladstone has repeatedly done, subsequent to the rejection of his Home Rule Bill in 1886. No Canadian leader has ever sunk so low as that religious statesman who has always been so strict in "giving tithe of cumin and aniseed." In Canada, cattle-maimers (are there any?), outragers, and homicides, have never looked to the leader of either of our political parties as a shield or champion. Therefore, so far as that is concerned, Canada is ahead of England.

The reviewer fails to appreciate a fact that greatly helped to bring about the defeat of the free-traders in 1878. All sensible people admit that the voters, as a mass, are ill-qualified to judge questions requiring good reasoning powers and far-seeing views. This, of course, applies to all countries. In 1878 trade was very bad, and numbers believed that in some manner it was the fault of the Government, and that the latter had the power to give prosperity off-hand. As an instance—just before the election of 1878—the writer was impressively informed by a suffering storekeeper, referring to the Government, "We must have a change." He did not explain what he wanted except more cash customers, but