

PROF. GOLDWIN SMITH AND HIS CRITICS.

SIR,—In most of the late issues of your valuable journal I have seldom failed to find Prof. Goldwin Smith either adversely criticized or subjected to a kind of abuse not to be confounded with legitimate criticism.

In these criticisms the Professor, being an advocate of Continental Union, is charged with being disloyal and a traitor.

In advocating a measure (Continental Union) that—without the shadow of a doubt—would advance the material prosperity of this country, I fail to see where Prof. Goldwin Smith is disloyal or a traitor to Canada.

In only advocating the adoption of above measure, subject to the consent of Great Britain, I am again unable to see where the Professor is disloyal or a traitor to the mother country.

There are of course two ways of looking at the question of Continental Union: viz., the sentimental view and the practical or common sense or, as some would call it, the dollars and cents view. The Sentimentalists are generally men of lofty and noble thoughts, and scorn the base groveling spirit that would bring dollars and cents into this question. True they tax British goods, but what would you have? Are there no spots on the sun? They are also ardent Imperial Federationists whether Great Britain will give them Imperial Federation or not; they are more English than the English themselves, and—in their eyes—the prosperity of Canada is only secondary to the greatness and welfare of Albion. Should the Sentimentalist be a military man, visions of military glory arise before his enraptured eyes, the prancing war horse, the waving plumes, all the “pomp and circumstance of glorious war.” He longs to wade knee deep in the blood of the man of the wooden nutmeg and the bass-wood ham.

A milder form of the Sentimentalist dreams of a “United Canada,” a millennium wherein the French Roman Catholic and the Ontario Orangeman are as brothers and where no sectional or sectarian strife will interfere with the advance of a great nation. Of a certainty our advance in population has been “very deliberate” (12 per cent last decade) but let us once be united, etc., etc.

The dollars and cents view of the question is that by joining the Union we would share in their phenomenal advance both in wealth and population, would develop our mines and other natural resources, and bring both capital and enterprise into a country sadly lacking both, the race and religion cry would be quelled—no sect having special privileges—and, in addition, most of us who have come to man's estate would live to see a deep water way from Duluth to Liverpool. These are a few of the many advantages to be secured by Continental Union. Sentimentalists writing on this subject invariably avoid any mention of the dollars and cents side of the question; they may be wise in doing so but are they honest? are they really loyal to Canada? Of course the intense loyalty of the office holders (*Vide* McNeil's resolution) is most gratifying and is only equalled by the gratification they experience in drawing their plump salaries, mileage, etc. It is rumoured that the Government intend to spend three million dollars in new fire-arms. In that case the prosperity of the country is assured, but to make assurance doubly sure I would suggest that they expend an additional five hundred dollars in stimulating the mining industry.

Gravenhurst, Feb. 24th, 1896.

J. R.

[If J. R. is such an ardent annexationist why does he remain amongst a people who will never share his views?—ED. THE WEEK.]

MANITOBA SCHOOLS AND THE MASSEY HALL MEETING.

SIR,—Every one must be glad that a meeting which might have done much to embitter the present relationships between Protestants and Catholics developed with such great good humour; and that all, except a very few ultra-serious people, so thoroughly enjoyed themselves. The ludicrous efforts of the old-time politicians to play the innocent, ingenuous, and non-partizan role, and yet to make much political capital for their respective parties, was exceedingly comical, and the audience thoroughly tickled, cheered everything and voted for everybody.

The fun commenced with the first pair of speakers and never flagged. Mr. Mulock, approved by his leader, Mr. Laurier,—“a true man (cheers); a good man; a great man”

—moved the first resolution. He advocated “conciliation rather than force as a means of adjusting this delicate question.” The Manitoba Government has suggested “an investigation of such a kind as would furnish a substantial basis of fact upon which conclusions could be formed with a reasonable degree of certainty.” “Shall we, therefore, now press upon the Dominion Government the necessity of adopting this safe middle course, or shall we allow them to light the fires, or—” (Prolonged cheers). Remembering that Mr. Laurier recently said at Merrickville: “There is not a man in this audience but who would like to see the Catholic schools restored by the Legislature of Manitoba”—and that for him the idea of an inquiry is that the public may be satisfied that Catholics have a real grievance, which ought to be remedied, Mr. Mulock's speech was directly opposed to that of the gentleman who seconded his resolution (Mr. Craig), upon whom, nevertheless, the audience, with thorough impartiality and the best of good taste, showered its commendations. Mr. Craig said that “he was not in favour of a commission. He was in favour of leaving Manitoba alone. He opposed the policy of the Government, but he was not with the Opposition.” No inquiry or conciliation for him. The resolution so happily framed that a member of the Opposition, for Opposition reasons, could move it, and a gentleman who “was not with the Opposition” could second it, “was put to the meeting and carried enthusiastically.” Of course that is just as it ought to be at “a non-partizan meeting”; but it leaves one entirely uninformed as to whether Mr. Mulock or Mr. Craig won the first bout, and that is what one wants to know.

The fun naturally got louder when Mr. McCarthy and Mr. Martin appeared for the next set-to. No inquiry, no commission, would suit Mr. McCarthy. Nothing fitted the occasion but “positive and absolute hostility to the Government which has taken this step.” (Loud and long continued applause.) Had he not said in Cardwell: “I do not think there is a corporal's guard of men in Cardwell who want further information.” And now he does not despair that he may get “even Mr. Laurier's support, in the modified form in which he opposes the Remedial Bill.” Mr. Martin, the seconder of this resolution, agreed, of course, to the “positive and absolute hostility to the Government”: “To put the Grits in power? That's the issue. . . . If not, then this is not a non-partizan meeting,” he said. But as to the inquiry, he asserted that “that is what, as I understand, the resolution calls for. . . . I am for a commission. I am for an investigation.” Whereupon, as the *Globe* report tells us, “there was some laughter”; and later, that “the resolution was then put and unanimously carried.” Whether Mr. McCarthy or Mr. Martin can be said to have won the second bout, and whether that resolution calls for a commission or not, are as uncertain as the result of the Mulock-Craig contest.

The next two aspirants were fairly matched, and hit one another some rare blows. The Hon. Mr. Wallace moved the resolution, and leaving it at once, attacked the “positive and absolute hostility to the Government” proposition. “We Conservatives,” he said, “have been invited by previous speakers to leave our political party. But what for?” The meeting may take care of itself, but as for Mr. Wallace he will remain a Conservative—that is good enough for him. Then in flat-footed opposition to Mr. Mulock, and to the resolution which had just been carried (as its seconder understood it), Mr. Wallace said: “I've made up my mind on this matter. I don't want any commission.” Mr. J. K. Kerr, in seconding Mr. Wallace's resolution, flew to the rescue of his political friends. He “wanted an inquiry,” and he appealed to the Conservatives not to refuse “to vote for that amendment which will call for delay”—that is, for a commission. The resolution, of course, “on being put was carried without dissent”; but whether Wallace or Kerr won, nobody probably will ever know.

Mr. Maclean closed the meeting and asserted that “nobody wanted the Bill . . . but the hierarchy of Quebec, backed up by a certain section of the Conservative party, and a certain section of the Liberal party in Quebec, and a Government, which,” etc.—nobody but somebody—a remark well adjusted to the paradoxical condition into which the meeting had good-humoredly drifted.

Was there ever such a meeting? Can any one tell for what it voted? Was it for Mulock, Martin, or Kerr, or for