

for other classes of shipment, more urgently required for the prosecution of the war.

"The protest of the Canadian distillers is based upon the claim that the embargo on spirits is being enforced primarily as a measure of protection for distilleries in the United Kingdom, rather than for the purpose of conserving tonnage. A number of Ontario distilleries have subscribed to this protest which, as already stated, has been forwarded to London. No reply has been received from the Imperial Government.

"The distillers are much concerned at having their export market in Great Britain closed, especially in view of the material diminution present and prospective, of their sales in Canada."

The embargo has been established by the British Government and they only can remove it. Is it likely that they will receive sympathetically an application which begins by suggesting that they are hypocrites, that while they are pretending to be influenced by a high policy respecting the conservation of vessels for the carriage of more necessary things, their real purpose is to protect the home distiller against competition? Men are not usually moved to favorable action by allegations of that kind. It is hardly probable that any such thought of protection to the British distilleries entered the minds of the British Ministers when they made their regulation. But if they should desire to protect their home industries, are we in Canada in a position to complain? There is a large measure of protection in our Canadian tariff, especially in the duties on spirits. Heavy duties are imposed by our laws to shut out British whisky. If Great Britain should wish to retaliate we could not very reasonably complain. Embargoes on trade between Great Britain and the Dominions are much to be regretted. It is only right that efforts should be made to prevent them. But the distillers' petition is not happily conceived for their purpose.

The Mexican Situation

UNCLE Sam's most difficult problem at present is Mexico. The German question, which a few weeks ago seemed so threatening, is settled, for the moment at least. The question between Great Britain and the United States concerning interference with mails for Europe, upon which Mr. Secretary Lansing has addressed a somewhat sharp note to the British Foreign Office, may be productive of some rather frictional correspondence, but in the end it will be disposed of without anything more serious. The broad question of "preparedness" for military possibilities, which has been agitating the public, will be adjusted by compromises between the rival views. The party political conflicts will increase as the time approaches for the holding of the elections, but no bones should be broken in this warfare. The trouble that is most threatening and most certain to produce the gravest consequences is the condition of affairs in Mexico. President Wilson will have to admit that his well-meant policy of "watchful waiting" has entirely failed to lead to peace and order among his Mexican neighbors. The United States troops were compelled by the Mexican attacks on Columbus to cross the border in their effort to punish Villa and his band of raiders. Villa has not been caught. Carranza, although recognized by the United States Government as the President, or "First Chief," of Mexico, has proved unable to re-

store order. He seems to have but little more power than any other of the many men who have claimed leadership in the Republic. The bands of raiders have made so many attacks on the Americans along the boundary line that it has been deemed necessary to concentrate almost the whole American standing army, besides the Militia of several States, on the border. Carranza, admitting that he is unable to preserve order under present conditions, asks—perhaps demands is the right word—the withdrawal of the American troops from Mexican soil, claiming that their presence tends to excite the people and make his task more difficult than it otherwise would be. General Scott, representing the American forces, and General Obregon, Carranza's War Minister, who have been in conference at a border point, do not appear to have been able to reach any satisfactory conclusion.

To get out of Mexico while Villa remains unpunished would be to abandon the whole purpose of the American Government. To stay in seems to mean that a more aggressive policy must be adopted. And that may easily mean that war must be declared against Mexico, and the American nation must undertake the conquest of the country. How the Mexicans—or those who follow Carranza—view the situation is indicated by an article in *El Pueblo*, published in Mexico City, which is regarded as an organ of the Carranza Government:

"We are confronted by the most serious, the most grave, moment of our national life. We are facing the tremendous danger of war, which we have never desired, and never desired provoked, and which surely is not desired by the United States.

"The nation ought to know the truth and ought to consider that all the sacrifices, all the anguish, which our struggles to purify our political organization and reconquer the liberties of the people have cost, should not be rendered sterile by an absurd and unjust war.

"From the beginning the struggle to implant a constitutional form of government has been met with constant difficulties from Washington, which we have met with impartiality, good faith, and a legitimate defense of the general interests of the country. In the United States, refugee Mexicans, in union with capitalists, Catholics, and American adventurers, have plotted to undo the work of the revolution.

"The stupid aggression of Villa and his bandits is not an isolated factor, but is connected with the work of these divers elements along the frontier, who daily try to overthrow the Constitutionalist Government and disturb the tranquility of the United States.

"We have yet the right to believe that President Wilson, who knew how to face the great crisis of the European War, who has proclaimed and sustained his pacific theories, who has seen through the schemes of filibusters, and who has opened his arms to the Latin-American Republics in an appeal for Continental solidarity under the Monroe Doctrine, will not retrace his steps, will not tear up the foundations of his prestige, by unchaining a war which nothing can justify, and sacrifice a people already weakened and bled by their internal struggles.

"Against such a war are the collective interests of both countries, but if, unfortunately, we are dragged into such a war, President Wilson may rest assured that never again will the United States have the

confidence of a single Latin-American nation. And as for Mexico, while one Mexican stands, the ground which he covers will be his home, his religion, his honor."

The Carranza paper's reference to the alleged plotting of Catholics in the United States against the revolutionary movement calls attention to the religious side of the trouble. The Carranza Government is anti-Catholic.

The American view of the situation is thus stated by the *Houston, Texas, Chronicle*, a journal which supported the policy of recognizing Carranza:

"Greater by far than what we have suffered are the sufferings of the Mexicans themselves, and in this connection let it be remembered that the vast majority of Mexicans never have been interested in the complicated series of revolutions, and consequently have been victimized without their consent and without reason.

"We have proceeded on the theory that Mexico was disturbed by a popular uprising by means of which a downtrodden people would presently come into its own. We have proclaimed the obviously impossible assumption that 13,000,000 peons, ignorant, shiftless, indigent, and irresponsible though they were, could establish and maintain a democratic Government.

"We have ranged ourselves on the side of savagery against civilization, on the side of brutishness against intelligence, and have called it humanity. We have permitted the Mexicans to be murdered by the thousands, to be robbed, ravished, and tortured, and have called it respect for their sovereignty.

"The result is that not only have we failed to accomplish anything of material value, but, what is far more discouraging still, we have failed to accomplish anything of moral value.

"The Mexicans, as a general average, have less respect for us to-day than they had five years ago. Not only do they trespass on our rights with less compunction, but they receive our advice with less confidence.

"The circumstances of the situation make it impossible to disassociate our own interests from those of Mexico. Try as we may, we cannot help being affected by the social and economic conditions which prevail across the border.

"Further than this, the United States of America has no moral right to permit a people, living next door, to destroy itself. To call such a course due regard for national sovereignty is to deal in hypocrisy.

"There is no such a thing as sovereignty in Mexico to-day. There no longer exists a nation. Neither of these terms can be used with reference to the Mexican situation except to bolster up specious argument.

"On the south side of the Rio Grande there is naught but anarchy and demoralization. We can not escape our share of responsibility by asserting that we contributed nothing toward the disaster. It is not enough to refrain from doing things. Nations, like individuals, must expect to play a positive part in constructive progress, or else be reckoned unworth while.

"The United States of America could have done, and still can do, much to alleviate Mexico's afflictions. If it fails, the traditions of its founders and the preachment of its idealism are in vain. This Government faces the duty, not only to itself, but to Mexico, to the world, and to the future, of going over the border and re-establishing law and order as it, and it alone, can."