

present able City Engineer and the energetic Health Officer. Besides, his notices are signed with the Union label, which may mean that he has secured the Labour vote. Alderman Shaw appears to appeal mainly to the fact that as he has been in the Council so long he ought to know something about the manner in which the city should be managed. Besides, he is a strong Conservative, and counts on party support. Mr. Fleming is apparently a supporter of the aqueduct scheme. Mr. Shaw is opposed to those who advocate it. While it remains in its present hands we confess our entire sympathy with Ald. Shaw in his opposition to it. We believe that to allow any projector of any such ill-digested scheme to lay hands upon the city franchises would be to inaugurate a still more complete transfer than even now exists from ratepayers to tax collectors and from them to boodlers of the little property not already confiscated. But, as we have said, people get the government they deserve, and if better men refuse to come out as candidates they must suffer accordingly.

American
Newspapers.

We are a little disappointed with The Globe's editorial criticism on our remonstrance against the too common appearance in Canada of certain low-class American papers. "Let the galled jade wince—our withers are unwrung." These papers are not rivals of THE WEEK. We intended to do a service to our *confrères* on the press. In spite of The Globe's disclaimer of any modesty in the matter we are confident that all other newspaper men will agree with us in the statement we made. Newspapers do not like to attack one another's business methods except under the greatest provocation. The Globe, if it were not irrevocably wedded to its pet lost cause—Free Trade—would also agree with us that taxation is a legitimate way to prevent the entrance of these bad papers. As to who is to frame the *Index Expurgatorius* and other details—these are questions for our legislators. But to dispute the proposition that Canada is justified in taking almost any measure to exclude treasonable as well as blackguard papers is absurd. As for the funny part of The Globe article we assure our contemporary that we are able to take a joke. But we still trust to see that paper on the same line as ourselves. It is always possible to discriminate, and the respectable well-written American papers will be always welcome here. It is only the worthless lying sheets we wish to see excluded.

"We Stand to Guard."
was inspired by the recent outburst of illwill towards Canada and England on the part of our militant neighbours over the border. We invite our musical readers to compose a score for the song. The compositions received will be submitted to a committee consisting of the musical editors of THE WEEK and a representative of one of the music publishing houses of Toronto. Messrs. Whaley, Royce & Co. have agreed to publish the song and place it on the market at their own expense. They will allow the author and composer a royalty of ten per cent. of the retail price on all copies sold after the first two hundred. The royalty will be equally divided between the author of the words and the successful competitor for the score. Competitors will sign their compositions with a *nom de plume* and address them to the Editor of THE WEEK. The name and address of the composer together with the *nom de plume* should be endorsed in a sealed envelope, which will not be opened until the selection is made. The competition will be open until February 15th, 1896.

Professor Goldwin Smith's Latest.

WE have refrained hitherto from noticing Professor Goldwin Smith in any hostile manner. In the earlier days of the existence of this journal he was its most prominent contributor, so much so, that to this day THE WEEK has been popularly supposed to be "Goldwin Smith's paper." The connection ceased long ago, but our kindly recollection of the earlier relations remained. In the next place, knowing Professor Smith's reputation, and admiring the stand he took on the Home Rule question, we trusted that he would recant his notions on the Imperial one. But we have been disappointed, and Professor Goldwin Smith's latest contribution to the Olney literature allows us no further option. By the Philadelphia Record of the 25th, as quoted in the Toronto World of the 27th, Dr. Smith is stated to have written:

"Any attempt on the part of Great Britain to
"use the American continent as a base or highway
"of war against a nation with which the United
"States should be at peace, would be apt to call
"the Monroe sentiment into active play."

This sentence, being interpreted, means: If England uses the C.P.R. to transport troops to India in case of a war with Russia, the United States being at peace with the latter power will be justified in applying the latest attempted extension of the so-called Monroe doctrine, or, in other words, in invading Canada to pull up the rails and stop the trains. There is no other meaning possible.

We desire an expression of opinion from our readers concerning this statement. Here is a gentleman living among us, calling some of us his friends, many of us his acquaintances. For years he has told us, practically, that we are a set of fools, that we do not know what is good for us. He has also warned those who were anxious to incorporate us in their territory that if they did not hurry about it they would be too late. He knows that the C.P.R. was built by Canada at enormous expense to weld the Dominion together. He knows that it is Canada's pride that this great highway can be made useful not only to this country but to England, the country he was born in, where he received his education, and to which he still claims to owe allegiance. When his countrymen are taken by the throat with a gruff "hands off," he not only excuses the aggressors but goes deliberately out of his way to point out to them something they themselves admit they never thought of. Is this act one an Englishman should commit? Is it one a British subject should be guilty of?

Dr. Smith is now an elderly gentleman. He is afflicted with the *cacoethes scribendi* but his friends should warn him, as we warn him now, that if he persists in these opinions *he must not express them here*. The citizens of Toronto will not allow it and we do not think any other place in the Dominion will permit it. He may think as contemptuously of Canadians as he likes, he may prefer to be praised by Americans for the "clear light of his understanding," but he must shed that clear light outside of Canadian territory.

We cannot understand how an Oxford man, an English gentleman, who has mixed on equal terms with the very first ability of England, should be able to forget his traditions, his antecedents, and his patriotism. No matter how much he approves of the Monroe doctrine, he should not, while living in Canada, give a public apology for it. He knows it involves the destruction of all the ideals Canadians have struggled and fought for. With grief and sorrow we pen these lines. But *coûte que coûte* Professor Goldwin