

lation is addicted to the practice, is certainly poor justification for encouraging or forcing the trade in China, where, according to the *Pioneer's* own "lowest estimate," the consumption is proportionately fifteen times greater, and the victims may be assumed, therefore, to number one in thirty-three of the whole population. (This must surely be an excessive estimate, but it is a fair arithmetical deduction from the *Pioneer's* statement that while in India the consumption is but thirty-two chests to the million of population, it is at least 475 chests to the million in China.) Equally futile is the argument drawn from comparing the India Government's derivation of a revenue from the control of the opium trade with that of the British Government from control of the liquor traffic. In the first place, the abstainers, now becoming formidable, will protest that two wrongs can never make a right. In the second place, if any reliance can be placed upon the evidence—we will not say of the missionaries and other philanthropists, at whom the *Pioneer* unmercifully sneers—but, of such men as Sir George Staunton, Sir Thomas Wade, Mr. Bruce and other distinguished British officials and diplomats, the opium habit is so much more destructive to every higher attribute of humanity than the most excessive use of intoxicating drink, that all comparisons must fail. But the most noteworthy point in the *Pioneer's* ardent defence is its contention that "there is not now and never has been since Lord Elgin's treaty of Tientsin in 1858 any sort of coercion or even pressure exercised by the British Government on the Chinese in the matter of opium"; that when, subsequently, the customs tariff was settled by a Convention, "the Chinese members of that Convention acted of their own free will"; that "similar forbearance was exercised at the time of the Chefoo Convention in 1876, Sir R. Alcock and Sir J. Wade both being as scrupulous as had been Lord Elgin, not to force the opium traffic on the Chinese Government against its will"; and that the additional article of the Chefoo Convention, ratified in 1886, provided that after the expiry of four years the Chinese Government should be at liberty, by giving a year's notice, to make what changes it pleases. "There is, accordingly," says the *Pioneer*, "no shadow of a pretence that the opium trade with China is now maintained for any other reason than because the Chinese and their rulers desire it." These statements afford a striking instance of the way in which words may be strictly accurate and yet seriously palter with the truth. Can the *Pioneer* forget that the first article of the Treaty of Tientsin abrogated the Supplementary Treaty of 1843, by which Britain bound herself to discourage opium smuggling, or doubt that the most important result of the Second Chinese war, in the eyes of the British Government, was the legalization of the opium traffic, under the tariff supplement to the Treaty of Tientsin? That Treaty, with its all-important supplement, is still in force. The main question, that of legalizing the importation of opium, was not raised at the Chefoo Convention, but only the minor one of the kind and extent of internal taxation. The Chinese view of the meaning of the "Additional Article" may be inferred from the dying words of the Marquis Tseng, the very man who drew it up, "*We are not free.*" The Chinese may be in error, not understanding the advance of British sentiment during the last thirty years, but there can be little doubt that the question asked a few years since by the Viceroy Li Hung Chang, "Would not the demand for a prohibition treaty with Great Britain bring on a third opium war?" represented the prevailing opinion in Chinese Government circles, whether the declaration of Sir Rutherford Alcock, one of the framers of the Chefoo Convention, that "if they (the Chinese) were to say, 'we decline to admit opium,' . . . they must be prepared to fight for it," correctly represents the present feeling in British Government circles or not.

THE capture of Valparaiso by the Congressional forces has, in all probability, ended the civil war which has been going on in Chili for the last six or seven months. It is so difficult to get accurate and reliable information in regard to events in the South American Republics that one never feels very sure that he understands the real merits of such an affair as this. There can be little doubt, however, that the struggle was the outcome of President Balmaceda's overweening and unpatriotic ambition. It is apparently true that in claiming the right to nominate his successor he was within the letter of the Constitution. But that extraordinary constitutional provision is evidently of such a nature as to admit and almost invite flagrant abuse. Such abuse seems to have been attempted by

Balmaceda, in the nomination of one who would have been but a mere puppet in his hands, and through whom he could have carried out his traitorous designs. On being thwarted by Congress he seems to have resorted unhesitatingly to arbitrary and unscrupulous measures to carry out his designs, and all through the struggle to have played the part of an unprincipled and cruel tyrant, relying on his control of the army for success. The fact that the victory of the insurgents was the signal for the destruction of his palace by the mob, and an attempt to seize or do violence to his person, appears to show that he had no hold on the confidence or affection of his fellow-citizens, but had retained his ascendancy over them by tyrannical means. It is possible, however, that the city may have been divided in sentiment, in which case the defeat of his forces would give the opposing faction an opportunity to wreak their vengeance. Still, if one-fourth of the reports that reached the outside world from time to time concerning Balmaceda's violent and cruel conduct, not only his fellow-countryman but the world may be congratulated upon his overthrow. So far, reports indicate that the victorious generals have held their troops well in hand and are showing praiseworthy moderation. However, the presence of war-vessels representing the various powers may have had much to do with this. We may, at least, hope that the Congressional leaders will justify their brave and determined and now victorious course, by reestablishing the Government on a strictly constitutional basis at the earliest opportunity, and that the country may now enter upon a career of permanent peace and progress.

A PAPER FOR THE TIMES.

IN dealing with such an important question as political morality, the writer recognizes shortcomings that hardly justifies the expression of opinions on his part, but when the public conscience is so thoroughly aroused as it is in Canada to-day the opportunity should not be lost to enquire whither are we drifting? for Canadians who know no soil but their own, who love their country because it is their own, may fairly ponder over their probable future if political corruption continues to be recognized as part of their political system. The exposures which the census year of 1891 has brought to light shows that if we want to make ourselves respected or that if we want to respect ourselves we must put down with a strong hand the system of raising money out of the resources which the Governments have it in their power to grant or withhold in order to keep themselves in power.

In this art there is a disposition to yield the palm to the Province of Quebec, but this is not just; although the revelations before the Senate Committee have astounded everyone at the magnitude of the sums abstracted from the public treasury and the disposal of them, they only differ in their degree of boldness, and not in the principle adopted. We are not educating our public men to be statesmen, but to be politicians, and the ultimate effect of that policy is but too apparent, because it is to our public men that we have to look for the guardianship of the integrity and welfare of the country.

Since the New Year dawned three distinct public acts on the part of Canadian Governments have been the subject of enquiry. In Ottawa the Tarte committee has exposed to view a system of converting the public treasury into a fund to be used for corrupt purposes. In Quebec the Senate Committee has exposed the most unblushing appropriation of public moneys the ultimate disposal of which was for private advantage. In Manitoba the Provincial Government attempted to legalize a fund which was interpreted by a leading public journal to be a fund created for corrupt purposes, a charge which the courts of the Province of Manitoba on two separate occasions held to be justifiable. In the Province of Ontario, which has attained an enviable reputation for the successful management of its affairs, it is currently reported that the brewers and license holders are systematically levied upon for the purpose of extracting an election fund for favours granted, which, if true, marks a downward step in the political life of the chief Province of the Dominion.

All this is not a system by which patriotic individuals are induced to assist their friends in the incidental expenses attendant on public life, but an organized system of exchanging public favours for pecuniary support, which has the effect of placing a floating vote, that is amenable to the corrupt influence of money, in a position to sway the destinies of the country at the dictation of a Government, and if the system becomes an acknowledged system, it will cease to be a question of, what is public opinion? but what amount will it take to sway the balance that gives effect to public opinion? Having educated our people up to that standpoint, the country may in the future fall an easy prey to the exigencies of a Government who hold lightly the value of the constitution which the people have inherited as a birthright.

We may take the history of unhappy Poland as a warning and example of the sacrifice of national dignity and national independence through corrupt influences—an empire which numbering many millions of a population that stretched from the Baltic to the Black Sea, once pow-

erful, independent and glowing with patriotism, fell through the corrupting influences of its rulers, became dismembered, and since its fall it has been an easy prey to foreign nations, who have cut and carved it at their will.

It is from the lessons of history that we must learn to guide ourselves if we would preserve our own country in its dignity and independence. We must not overlook the fact that we have as a neighbour a powerful and wealthy nation embodying two political forces which affect us; they are at present latent, but might at any time spring into life as active forces, one is the Monroe doctrine of the manifest destiny of this continent, and the other is the commercial absorption of this continent under the extreme protective views that at present prevail. To either of these forces we might be compelled to succumb if we train ourselves to recognize that money is a potent factor in an electoral campaign. It is desirable to realize that the welfare of Canada, that the welfare of this continent, can be best promoted by maintaining ourselves free from the entangling influences of our neighbours, who have already a large country to control and govern; and this can only be done by erecting such safeguards over ourselves as will tend to preserve the franchise of the people pure, and as the Honourable Mr. Blake says: "Whatever we do, do with our eyes open," and let us not run the risk of being caught in a foreign trap. It is only necessary for Canadians to realize that there is danger in the political methods of the day, both morally and politically, to put on the brakes and abandon what had come to be recognized by many as a manly system of defending their political principles.

To wash our dirty linen in public is one of the penalties we have to pay as a nation when we abandon the path of rectitude, but it has to be so cleansed if we would purify ourselves, although a leading merchant remarked that, if such revelations as have come to light were common, we might fear for the debasing effect on our young men and upon their business connections, and when one newspaper as was lately the case openly advised its friends to take money from their opponents, but not to vote in accordance with the terms of the bribe, we may well pause and contemplate the downward path of political life. If left to their own will untrammelled by sinister forces, Canadians may be trusted to govern their country well, and it is safer to trust to their patriotism than to any organization which the purse strings are supposed to perfect. "All gone in boodle," was an expression extracted before the Senate Committee of enquiry; with men's wages unpaid and banks striving to get their own, and should ever the nation's dishonour cause its demise, "all gone in boodle" will be the epitaph.

C. A. BOULTON.

August 24, 1891.

ADVENTURE IN CANADA—1760-1761.

CANADA, from the time of the landing of Jacques Cartier down to the conquest by the British in 1759-1760, has been written up by French authors in a manner and with an emphasis which does honour to the French nation. The incidents of travel and adventure during that most interesting period have, by the forethought and care of Jesuit missionaries and explorers, been preserved to us in pages of burning eloquence by these most worthy pioneers in the cause of science and religion. When we look back and think of the difficulties with which they had to contend, we stand appalled at the courage, wisdom, self-sacrifice and perseverance of those men, as it were, opening up a new world. The almost impenetrable forests of Canada, the home of the Indians, the bear, the wolf, and other beasts of prey, to men less determined and less persevering, would have presented insuperable obstacles to progress and civilization. The early explorers cared for none of these things; they left behind them a noble example to be followed by those who were destined to succeed them in similar enterprises, but under another flag.

No sooner had the Union Jack superseded the Tricolour than Britons, inspired with a love for adventure and keen for the activities of commerce, appear on the scene, armed for a conflict with the resistances of nature and the oppositions of civilized and semi-civilized man.

When in August, 1760, the French fort of "De Levi," a few miles below Oswegatchie, surrendered to the British, General Amherst continued his voyage down the St. Lawrence to attack Montreal. Not only was there lost in the voyage down the rapids below Lake Francis, called the Rapids-des-Gédres, several boats loaded with provisions and military stores, together with upwards of a hundred men, but a British trader suffered the loss of three boats loaded with merchandise, and saved his own life only by gaining the bottom of one of his boats, which lay among the rock shelves and from which he was extricated by one of the General's aides-de-camp.

Nothing daunted, this Briton, immediately after surrender of Montreal, proceeded to Albany, procured a quantity of goods, intending to carry them to Montreal and dispose of them in the new market opened up to British adventure. His immediate design was, however, frustrated by the early setting in of winter; he was only able to reach Fort-de-Levi, now given the name of Fort William Augustus by the English, when he found it necessary to dispose of his stock, finding ready purchasers in the officers and soldiers of the garrison. The goods being got rid of, the adventurer was still determined to get to Montreal if it were possible to do so. It was in the month of January, and, as he tells us himself, "the journey was to be performed through a country inhabited only by