

tration is an intellectual passion, and that it is also advocated by a certain number of windbags of the Chauncey Depew type, to whom it is useful in their careers as interviewees. But every sensible American one meets warns one against treating Mr. Chauncey Depew as a man of weight—his function is to supply "copy" to newspapers—while "the best people," whom Mr. Bryce reports as being devoted to the cause, are probably not unfriendly to Great Britain as it is, and it is probably for this reason that they are utterly effaced when the great anti-British lion of the States is roused by the enterprising politician. Would the adoption of any or even all of Mr. Olney's proposals—impossible as some of them appear to us—be accepted as an earnest of good-will, or simply as a sign of British weakness leading to further demands by the next President in difficulties, such as that we should withdraw from the West Indies or clear out of Canada? Supposing a friendly interpretation were placed by the States upon our concession, is it certain that the perpetual liability to litigation would make us better friends? We confess to being unable to answer these salient questions.

Mr. Laurier's
Proposals.

Now that the alleged interview between Mr. Laurier and a Chicago correspondent has been acknowledged as substantially correct, it can be discussed. To begin with, it is a most unusual and improper cause to take to commit the Dominion to such serious propositions as the Premier has laid down. For years most of the propositions he makes have been on record as a standing offer to the United States. Several times they have been contemptuously rejected. Even the Hon. George Brown was told, "you can get what you want if you are annexed, not otherwise." The United States politicians then laid down the ultimatum "annexation peaceably if we can, forcibly if we must." From that position they have never varied one inch. It is humiliating and even degrading to approach them again. We are getting on well enough. Let the overture come from them. Further most of the items mentioned by the Premier are studied slights to Canada or measures taken with the express intention of driving her to the wall. Canadians are only too well aware of this truth, and it is a most bitter mortification to them to see any of their statesmen, and more than all their Premier, once more exposing their country to insolent refusal. As for the surrender of a right of way through the canals it may answer with Egypt, but will never answer with Canada. We cannot believe that Sir Oliver Mowat was consulted before this interview was granted.

An Opinion
From Boston.

A friend has sent to us a copy of the Boston Evening Transcript of the 19th instant which contains the following telegram which purports to be sent to them from Quebec. We print it with its head note verbatim as it appears:

LIBERALS NOT JINGOES.

Laurier Refuses to Insult America by Subsidizing Ships Which May Be Used as Armed Cruisers Against His Next-Door Neighbour.

QUEBEC, Aug. 19 (Special)—Indications are not lacking of friction between the Government of Mr. Laurier and the Imperial Authorities over the question of the proposed fast transatlantic steamship line. Some time before the defeat of the late Tory Government Sir Charles Tupper, as its head, had about completed an arrangement with the British Government by which Great Britain would supply one-third of the subsidy necessary to the creation of the service on condition that Canada, besides supplying the other two-thirds of the subsidy, should build ships to have an average speed of at least twenty knots an hour and to be available for use by the British Government in time of emergency as armed cruisers.

Mr. Laurier and his friends are in favour of a different kind of steamship service. They have given out that they do not think it necessary to make so tremendous an outlay

for a twenty-knot service destined to compete with steamships running to and from New York in the carrying of passengers, when one of seventeen-knots average would be so very much cheaper, and would equally well accommodate the requirements of Canadian trade, particularly the shipments of grain and produce requiring cold storage. The Canadian Liberals are not favourable, either, to such displays of jingoism and insult to their nearest neighbours as to contribute from the Dominion exchequer toward the establishment of boats that would be used by England as armed cruisers in case of war.

Our friend who resides at Boston, and is an esteemed contributor, pertinently remarks that it is a singular thing if Canada in providing for the defence of an empire of which it is a part is deemed to insult the United States. A possible defence against invasion is an insult to the Yankees. Mr. Laurier and his friends are no more responsible for these telegrams than we are, but they should understand the kind of people they have to deal with, and it ought to be a warning to them to be cautious in handling questions which affect the interests of Canada and the Empire.

The Two
Elections.

The Conservatives must not cheat themselves by imputing to the Manitoba School question alone their two last defeats following so closely their general rout. The fact is that the country was tired of the selfish struggles for leadership between half-a-dozen men all of about the same standard of ability, and each thinking he was "the man for Galway." Then the *régime* of the party since Sir John Macdonald's death was productive of no result. The country was standing still. The people therefore got rid of the whole Ministry and their followers. This lesson is the true one for the Conservatives to learn. Their fall was not occasioned by the Manitoba School question in which they were in the right, but by the personal rivalries and antipathies of ambitious leaders. These rivalries are not yet settled, and concord cannot yet be expected. There is a disposition among those members of the party who opposed Sir Charles Tupper to take the ground of committing the Conservative party to oppose, under any circumstances, remedial legislation. These men are logically correct. They wrecked their party by their fanatical opposition to the Roman Catholics and now they propose to continue the same line of action against their political opponents. We think it would be unwise for the Conservatives as a party to allow these men to influence their policy. The legislation Sir Charles Tupper proposed was just and generous. It did not please the Orange and ultra-Protestant constituencies and the Roman Catholics of Lower Canada deserted him for a French-Canadian leader. But the Conservative party as a party has nothing to be ashamed of in meeting defeat through a policy of generous treatment of a minority. It remains to be seen what Mr. Laurier can effect. Until he proposes his plan, the Conservatives will be very foolish if they allow the same extreme Protestant element to commit them to any declaration that under no circumstances will Separate Schools in Manitoba be allowed. It would be worse than a crime, it would be a blunder.

Our Canadian
Catiline.

Quousque tandem, Catilina, abutere patientia nostra? Professor Smith, how much more mischief are you going to try to do Canada? Here is your latest effort from the Saturday Review. Writing for English readers you say:

"In forming your opinion on the Canadian question you in England do not consider what Canada *might do for you* if she had a vote in the councils of her own hemisphere. You will persevere in your heroic attempt permanently to sever