

Cricket in
England.

Society in England and the sporting world generally are more than disturbed by the tactics of the Cambridge captain in the match on Saturday, the 4th July instant. In their first innings Cambridge obtained, in a rather tedious fashion, 319 runs. When the last Oxford bat came in, Oxford was not within the statutory 120 of the Cambridge score. If that point were not attained Oxford would "follow on," resuming their innings, which Mr. Mitchell desired to prevent. He, therefore, it seems, instructed Mr. Shine to add the needful number of runs to the Oxford score by bowling "no-balls" which reached the boundary. The crowd hooted, and disrespectful noises were made in the Pavilion. The tactics of the Cambridge captain were unsuccessful. Oxford won the game by four wickets in spite of his *ruse*. Public sentiment is on the whole against Cambridge and is pleased at Oxford's victory. We think the Cambridge captain was, although within his legal rights, stooping to conquer. His action was not fair sport and certainly not ideal cricket.

* * *

Time to Speak Out.

THE correspondence between Lord Salisbury and Mr. Olney is said to have been published for the purpose of testing English sentiment. The analysis furnished by cable is perhaps not sufficiently complete for an exact conclusion. But one fact is evident, and that is that the proposal comes from England to erect a permanent court of arbitration for the determination of all questions between the United States and England, except those which, in the opinion of the House of Commons on one side or Congress on the other, ought not to be submitted to arbitration. A more exact definition of questions which might be submitted to arbitration is perhaps not possible. In the Extradition Treaty a list of crimes is supplied, and persons committing these crimes may be surrendered. By an Arbitration Treaty, questions concerning damages for injuries inflicted by neglect of either party to the detriment of the other to enforce international law, could fairly be made a subject of arbitration. Nobody would be much hurt by such a reference. As usual, England would be made to pay heavily, but she could stand it, and it would be cheaper, perhaps, than to fight every time such a question arose. But it is important to bear in mind that in arbitrations so long as England is a fat goose to be plucked, she will be plucked. Questions of another kind, namely, those relating to property and civil rights have also been suggested as a proper subject for arbitration. Here, a grave difficulty arises. A few thousand square miles of territory may be transferred from one country to another. If that were all it would not be a great matter, but these few square miles may be the key to a national door, like San Juan island, or the island of Anticosti, or the island of Ireland. England has been warned in time that if an International Treaty for arbitration is made between her and the United States, the claims of Ireland will be laid before that forum. Is England prepared to submit to that demand? These difficulties show that the proposal to have this arbitration scheme afoot, is not so simple as at first sight appears. But there is a radical difficulty which goes to the foundation of the whole matter. The United States claim suzerainty over North America, possibly of South America. They seek to ignore the fact that Britain holds more of the North American continent than they do, and that she owns a very great number of the adjacent islands. They ignore more than that. They put on one side contemptuously the claim of Canadians to a free

and independent Canada. Because we have five millions of people and they fifty-five millions, they claim we exist by their sufferance. This, this is the point at issue. No arbitration will cure that sore. Many Englishmen believe that England's destiny is to leave the American continent and confine herself to Europe and the East. Many others, benevolent and peaceable, think that the interests of humanity would be served by peaceful agreement with America, even at the cost of some sacrifice. The sop to Cerberus is not specified, but with many of them it takes the shape of letting the North American Colonies go; others sincerely believe that if the United States were thus placated they would be a sincere friend and generous ally of England! Consider what that sacrifice means. Canada, Newfoundland, the West India Islands, British Guiana, the Spanish main, all surrendered to the United States. Is it conceivable that any British statesman could remain in power who brought forward in Britain such a proposal? If England does not intend to admit this claim of American suzerainty, she may as well make her stand on the Venezuela question as any other. She has undoubtedly, so far, met her match. The Americans by their resolute attitude have checked her in her dealings with Venezuela. At least, that is what outsiders believe. If England now admits arbitration because a power like the United States interferes, her Empire is doomed, and History will record her gradual decay. The miserable part of it will be that her enemies will have been those of her own household, men who had not the courage to keep what their fathers won. Far better would it be for England to perish in a fierce death grip, than, throttled by lawyers in a court, to sink into insignificance. One point is certain. If England persists in yielding to American truculence, she must not drag Canada with her. If Great Britain surrenders her position in North America, Canada must remain Canada one and indivisible. We cannot, and do not believe that there is any such fate as extinction in view for the great British Empire. When the English people see clearly all that is implied in the American claims, arbitration, except in the innocuous item of damages, will vanish for ever into thin air, and England will take and hold the territory which belongs to her. If expansion also comes, she will not refuse, in deference to the Monroe sentiment, or any other sentiment, to include still further realms under her sway. Her arms are even open to receive her former children, the New England States, when, tired of being robbed and insulted by the West and South, they seek to regain their position as British subjects.

* * *

History in the University of Toronto.

IN perusing extracts from the calendar of the University of Toronto and University College for the year 1896-97 we are amazed to see the following announcements in the Department of History:

In the lectures the more important historical movements will be discussed, and attention will be directed to the causes of social and political changes rather than to events. Special emphasis will be laid upon the history of England, the United States and Canada. Honour students in the departments of History and of English and History will be required to write the essays required [sic] by the curriculum of the Third and Fourth years. With Honour students in History in the departments of Political Science and Modern Languages this work is optional.

Why the United States and Canada? Is it politeness? We would say "Canada and the United States"—our own country first, others a long way behind. But let that pass—it may be mistaken politeness.