

to say these things, and to say them with some spirit and determination, he is at once proclaimed a jingo. If this is jingoism then THE WEEK is a jingo paper, and is proud of the fact. But it is not jingoism; it is not needless and provocative extravagance of language: it is national self-respect. And what is more it is common-sense.

"One Notable Effect."

A recent number of the London Speaker, a superior radical weekly review, contains an interesting article on "Canada and England," in which it is observed that one notable effect of President Cleveland's bombshell Message "is that it has already altered 'the manifest destiny,' so-called, of the Canadian Dominion." The Speaker says it had learned from Mr. Goldwin Smith that "the Dominion is a purely artificial creation—a string of separated provinces intended by Nature to be dependent on their great southern neighbour, but strung together by the Canadian Pacific Railway, bound by the artificial bonds of a Constitution, attracted to a common centre by the magnetism of Government appropriations in aid of provincial finance." Then, later, The Speaker confesses that it once thought that the annexation of Canada to the United States was only postponed by the reluctance of the great Republic to receive the Dominion! The Speaker is surprised to learn that it was mistaken. Its eyes have been opened, it says, by the Cleveland bombshell. The Speaker is impressed by the fact that Canadians evidently do not want annexation, that on the contrary, they are prepared to go forth to war rather than submit to such degradation. Though Canada "can fully appreciate what they would suffer in a war," she "frankly takes the risk" exclaims The Speaker with evident but wondering admiration. It hears "of no dissentient voice," the "whole Canadian public, Liberals and Conservatives alike," will "uphold the British connection." "National feeling has once more triumphed over geographical considerations; and national feeling so expressed, deserves," adds this radical journal, "a hearty response on this side of the Atlantic. . . . And we should not fail to give her our best support." "It will be a curious instance," says The Speaker, in conclusion, "of the odd turns of history if the only result of President Cleveland's Message—apart from widespread but temporary economic disaster—should be to strengthen the cause of the British Empire. But it seems after all not improbable." Whether or not this is to be the only result of the Message, it will certainly be one of the results. In fact it is already seen. The Federation of the Empire is only a question of time. And that time has been shortened by several years owing to President Cleveland's bombastic and menacing message.

Clutching at a Straw.

In the current number of The Nineteenth Century are two important articles on the Venezuela boundary question, one by Mr. Henry M. Stanley, M.P., the other by Mr. Edward Dicey, C.B. Mr. Stanley's contribution is of much significance as he is a very high authority on all matters connected with Great Britain and the United States. What he has to say is most disquieting. There is smoldering amongst Americans, affirms Mr. Stanley, an intense fire of hatred towards Englishmen which nothing but war will satisfy. It is by no means confined, he says, to Irish-Americans or to politicians or to newspapers, but it is the true American spirit that is aroused now in "deep, dead earnest." Mr. Stanley sees only one way that may possibly prevent war over the Venezuela boundary, and that is by England appointing an European Commission of her own to examine her claims and to report to her Foreign Office. Mr. Dicey mildly favours Mr. Stanley's suggestion, and says that in order to give this

Commission an international character, the Great Powers might each be requested to nominate a representative amongst their own citizens, who would take part in the deliberation. "If a Commission so constituted were to confirm our existing contention, it would be impossible for the United States to dispute our right to enforce that contention. If, on the other hand, the Commission should decline to sanction our claims, we might then abandon them without loss of honour." Neither Mr. Stanley nor Mr. Dicey seems to be much wedded to this particular solution of the controversy, but they are both appalled by the thought of war and the wholesale fratricide it means. They seize upon the idea of a Commission just as a drowning man clutches at a straw. We greatly fear that the proposed Commission will be of no more effect than the proverbial straw.

A Commission Unacceptable.

The suggestion to refer the Venezuela question to a Commission is equivalent to advising England to give away what she claims. In every instance where England has submitted such matters to arbitration, particularly with the United States, she has suffered. Look at the Alabama claims. Remember San Juan Island. The only decision in her favour was the fishery award and that was because Canadians were allowed to work up the case. The Behring Sea dispute was apparently in England's favour but the party of the other part declines to carry it out and pay over what her own executive authority says she ought to pay. Consequently, therefore, arbitration is not satisfactory to England. The feeling of the ordinary foreign arbitrator seems to be that of the ordinary juryman in a case against a rich corporation. England is, to him, a fat goose to be plucked. Why, again, should England arbitrate? She is claiming her own property. The Americans who have no interest in the dispute, who were not even appealed to by either party, constitute themselves judges, erect a tribunal, and coolly ask both parties to submit the evidence in support of their respective claims to this tribunal. It may be said: If England is so sure of her case why should she not, for the sake of peace, give way to this whim of the Americans and let them have the evidence. The answer is a very sad one. Because England is beginning to understand that this request to submit her case for decision in the Venezuela dispute is only one small branch of a very large claim. That claim now stands developed in the Davis resolution reported by committee for adoption by the United States Senate. Once admit this claim to submit the Venezuela dispute to American decision and England's power on this continent is over. The American claim of suzerainty is virtually admitted. This issue is too grave to shirk and it is idle and worse than idle, it is madness for British subjects to shut their eyes to what is so plainly brought before them.

The Davis Resolution.

Mr. Davis' resolution, as formulated, stands thus: "The United States will regard any infringement of the Monroe doctrine particularly any attempt by an European power to take or acquire any new or additional territory on the American continent, or any island adjacent thereto, or any right of sovereignty or dominion in the same, in any case or instance as to which the United States shall deem such attempt to be dangerous to its peace or safety, by or through force, purchase, cession, occupation, pledge, colonization, protectorate, or by control of the easement in any canal or any other means of transit across the American isthmus, whether on an unfounded pretension of right in cases of alleged boundary disputes or under any other unfounded pretensions as hostile to the United States. If this resolution carries it means that as to Venezuela, the Mosquito territory—Nicaragua, the dispute with Brazil—England must at once stop