

## Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

Canadiana.org has attempted to obtain the best copy available for scanning. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of scanning are checked below.

Canadiana.org a numérisé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de numérisation sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- Coloured covers /  
Couverture de couleur
- Covers damaged /  
Couverture endommagée
- Covers restored and/or laminated /  
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- Cover title missing /  
Le titre de couverture manque
- Coloured maps /  
Cartes géographiques en couleur
- Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black) /  
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- Coloured plates and/or illustrations /  
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- Bound with other material /  
Relié avec d'autres documents
- Only edition available /  
Seule édition disponible
- Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion  
along interior margin / La reliure serrée peut  
causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la  
marge intérieure.
  
- Additional comments /  
Commentaires supplémentaires:                      Continuous pagination.

- Coloured pages / Pages de couleur
- Pages damaged / Pages endommagées
- Pages restored and/or laminated /  
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/  
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- Pages detached / Pages détachées
- Showthrough / Transparence
- Quality of print varies /  
Qualité inégale de l'impression
  
- Includes supplementary materials /  
Comprend du matériel supplémentaire
  
- Blank leaves added during restorations may  
appear within the text. Whenever possible, these  
have been omitted from scanning / Il se peut que  
certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une  
restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais,  
lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas  
été numérisées.

NATIONAL LIBRARY  
CANADA  
BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE

A MONTHLY  
REVIEW

**THE BYSTANDER**

OF  
CURRENT EVENTS,  
CANADIAN AND GENERAL

*CONTENTS.*

	PAGE.		PAGE.
The Liberal Leadership .. ..	337	The Silver Bill .. ..	353
The Mercier Banquet .. ..	339	The Behring Sea Controversy ..	354
The Two Premiers .. ..	341	English Politics .. ..	356
Parties in Ontario .. ..	342	Mr. Parnell's Change of Front ..	358
The Third Seat for Toronto ..	343	The Catastrophe of Mr. Caine ..	359
Events in Journalism .. ..	343	Lord Wolseley Against War ..	360
The Franciscans .. ..	345	European Affairs .. ..	362
Miracles in Quebec .. ..	346	Relations of Church and State ..	363
Priests in Politics .. ..	346	Reform in the Family .. ..	365
Political Awakening in Manitoba ..	347	College Training .. ..	366
Australian Confederation .. ..	348	Anglophobia .. ..	367
The Toronto Carnival .. ..	349	Morse's Life of Franklin .. ..	373
Public Parks .. ..	350	CANADIAN LITERATURE:—	
Business in Congress .. ..	351	"Read's Simcoe." .. ..	375
The Federal Election Bill .. ..	352	"Layman's Handbook." .. ..	376

Toronto:

HUNTER, ROSE & COMPANY, 25 WELLINGTON ST.,  
PUBLISHERS.

WHOLESALE AGENTS

JOS. M. SORLEY,

TELEPHONE 1398

Real Estate Broker,

39 ADELAIDE ST. EAST.

INVITES the attention of the public to call and examine his List of Properties, of which the following are specially recommended as being extra good investments :

Mimico. 600 feet on the Janes Survey, \$8.00 per foot.

North Toronto, 1,126 feet on Glenwood Ave., \$7.50 per foot.

“ “ 96 feet on Yonge Street, \$22.00 per foot.

Brockton Addition, 240 feet Mackenzie Ave., \$25.00 per foot.

“ “ 232 feet on Cooper Ave., \$24.00 per foot.

“ “ block of 1,034 feet on Royce, Albert, Longfellow and Lappin Ave's., \$20.00 per foot.

Rosedale. 150 feet on Gordon Ave., \$45.00 per foot.

Toronto Annex, lots on all streets from \$37.50 to \$100 per foot

**Loans Negotiated.**

**Investments Made.**

**Rents Collected.**

JOS. M. SORLEY,

TELEPHONE 1398.

39 ADELAIDE ST. EAST.

Come and See † †

† † the Latest Novelty

ONLY TO BE SEEN AT

**Bruce's Photo. Art Studio,**

132 King Street West

(OPP. ROSSIN HOUSE.)

*Beautiful Permanent Pictures.*

*Portraits or Views on Silk or Linen,*

NOW ALL THE FASHION.

GET YOUR HANDKERCHIEFS DECORATED.

GUARANTEED TO STAND WASHING.

# THE BYSTANDER.

---

AUGUST, 1890.

---

**M**R. BLAKE'S deliverance about the Liberal Leadership, as critics have not failed to notice, is ambiguous. If it means refusal, it is the voice of nature. Nothing ever was more certainly proved by experience than that Mr. Blake's gifts are those of a forensic advocate, not those of a political leader. Even when he is speaking in the House of Commons he is always at the Bar, and his speeches, very able in their way, but prolix and over-loaded with details, fail to make a broad impression on the minds of his audience or of the people. His breakdown was decisive, nor is there the slightest reason for believing that it would not recur. What has he done since to retrieve his position? He has compromised himself in the eyes of the people by appearing as the advocate of the C. P. R. against the nation, a step which professional etiquette might technically justify but could not make either seemly or wise. He gratuitously estranged by a repellent scornfulness, which is a different thing from coldness of manner or reserve, the Equal Rights section of the Liberal party when sound policy, to say nothing of principle, bade him treat their scruples, which he could not possibly regard as otherwise than natural, with respectful sympathy and try, while he differed from them on a particular point, to keep them still his friends. He even crossed the floor of the House to throw himself ostentatiously into the arms of the enemy. These are the things which make it difficult for Mr. Blake to win the hearts of his followers, not the lack of magnetism about which so much

nonsense is talked. His political purity is unquestioned ; so are his private virtues ; but it is idle to deny the forfeiture of respect entailed by his conduct in the Riel affair and by the transparently fictitious pleas which he stooped to put forward on that occasion. It is not unlikely that in this case also he was led astray partly by his habit of speaking from a brief, the responsibility for the statements in which rests not on the advocate but on the client. What is his policy ? Nobody knows, though from time to time he appears to cast back a wistful yet irresolute glance upon the programme of the Aurora Speech. The great issue at the next election will be financial and commercial. But financial and commercial questions are precisely those to which least attention has been paid by Mr. Blake. About the National Policy he wavered long, seemed at last to have embraced Revenue Tariff, and then in his Malvern Speech on the very eve of battle, half-hauled down his colours, with the inevitable result of disheartening his own ranks, while he drew not a single deserter from those of the enemy. His personal leaning, so far as can be discerned, is to a junction with Sir John Thompson, while the action of his chief confidant indicates a continued craving for the fatal alliance with the Nationalists and Ultramontanes of Quebec. When a man of great promise has failed there is a natural desire to give him a second trial ; but the sympathy which is bestowed on the unfortunate general must be extended to the unfortunate army. It is difficult to believe that under such a leader the Liberals can hope to turn total defeat into victory.

The ambiguity of that part of Mr. Blake's letter which relates to himself necessarily extends to the part which relates to Mr. Laurier. Mr. Blake may mean that he wishes Mr. Laurier to be definitively accepted and heartily supported as the leader, or he may mean only that the time for taking out the warming-pan has not yet come. If he means the first he has great difficulties to surmount. He can hardly disguise from himself the fact that though, owing mainly to the advantages attending a long possession of power combined with the personal weak-

ness of the Opposition, Mr. Mowat has won the Ontario elections, there is a strong ground-swell of repugnance to Ultramontaniam and priestly domination. To reconcile British and Protestant Liberals to French and Catholic leadership, the leader must at least bring a substantial accession of force. But Mr. Laurier brings with him no such accession. If he leads French Liberalism, it is as a man leads a wild horse by clinging desperately to its tail. At the Mercier Banquet he faintly breathed Moderation, while Nationalism thundered applause at the salutation of the Tricolor. Sir Richard Cartwright, who is now practically the head of Ontario Liberalism, may not be an ideal leader, but at all events he is a strong and resolute man, he thoroughly knows his own mind, he is a political not a forensic speaker, and he is perfectly master of the question upon which battle at the coming election will be joined. Mr. Laurier's character is such as to make it comparatively easy for Sir Richard to maintain with him a relation which might be awkward if he were not so unselfish or his temper were not so good. Unless a heaven-born leader should appear, the Liberals had better remain as they are. If, however, they have made up their minds, as at present appears, to an alliance with Rielism and a flirtation with Socialism, their choice of a leader is not of so much importance.

—At the triumphal banquet given by the Club National, Mr. Mercier pointed to the Tricolor and said, "This flag, gentlemen, you know. It is the National flag. The Government which you have you know. It is the National Government. The party which I have before me I know. This flag, this government, and this party are to-night honoured by the National Club. It is a national triumph which we celebrate to-night, and not national merely in name but national in tendencies, aspirations and sentiments." After this who can question the aims of the party which the late election has shown to be dominant in Quebec? Who can doubt that be-

tween the British and Protestant sections of the Dominion there is being formed a French nationality, under the moral sovereignty not of the Queen but of the Pope? Who can fail to see that a New France stands in the way of our efforts to bring about the national unity of the Dominion? Nor is New France the creation of Mr. Mercier or dependent for its existence on his continuance in power. It is the natural outcome of influences which have been allowed and even encouraged by our party leaders to operate till they have got beyond control. When there is a solid mass of people of one race inhabiting a compact territory with a language, religion, character, laws, tendencies, aspirations and sentiments of its own, there is *de facto* a nation. That Canada has power to absorb or assimilate this nation is what nobody can imagine. The time was when the growth of French nationality and of the Ultramontane theocracy connected with it might have been prevented, but that time has long since passed away.

The Liberal Premiers of the other Provinces, excepting the Province of Manitoba, were invited to the banquet, but with one accord they made excuse. Mr. Mowat sent a letter which was intended we presume to be taken as an expression of sympathy, but in fact was a long-drawn sigh. Could there be a stronger proof of the severance of Quebec parties and politics from those of the rest of the Dominion? There still remains in Quebec a British and Protestant outpost which as its numbers dwindle will find itself more and more compelled to look to its main body for protection: apart from this, and from such adhesion to the Ottawa Government as the sheer payment of subsidies can command, how much of political connection is left? There is not, it seems, to be a single representative of the British element in the Cabinet. So much for the British conquest of Quebec! All the more ought we to guard against French and Ultramontane encroachment the integrity of the British Province.

Mr. Mercier with his Nationalists has wrung from the fears and rivalries of the two British parties the renunciation of the

political veto, that is of all national control over Provincial legislation. But he does not mean to stop there; he calls for further concessions to French nationality which he will probably be able to extort, as he has the renunciation of the political veto. Not that that he means to leave us alone. He means to direct his serried phalanx of votes upon Ottawa and compel us to shoulder the Quebec debt. In this also he may reasonably hope for success so far as the politicians are concerned: in fact the Dutch auction has already opened; but he will have to reckon with the Equal Right movement and will find that though it may not be able to carry elections against the Machines it will make the Machines feel its power.

—At the Cameron Banquet Mr. Mowat referred to Sir John Macdonald's Kingston Speech and made a strenuous effort to repel the calamitous embrace of the Tory chief. He tried to represent Sir John's words as a mere personal amenity which he returned in kind. It will not do. Sir John not only said that Mr. Mowat was a very nice person, but congratulated him on the renewal of public confidence in him, in other words, on his victory in the elections. It is understood that Sir John has expressed himself plainly elsewhere, and his deeds have corresponded with his words, for, passively at all events, he "knifed" Mr. Meredith. Sir Hector Langevin's organ claimed Mr. Mowat's victory as a triumph for the Macdonald Government, and a triumph for the Macdonald Government it unquestionably was. We hold then to our diagnosis. Mr. Mowat is the Sir John Macdonald of Ontario. The two Premiers receive in turn the well-earned support of the Roman Catholic vote. Mr. Mowat, like Sir John Macdonald, regards the Americans as "a hostile nation," and is no great friend to Reciprocity. Questions of jurisdiction on boundaries, such as there have been between the two men, are not questions of policy. On questions of policy the two are radically at one, while the



same pillar upholds the power of both. We take some credit to ourselves for having seen this fact before it was proclaimed by authority at Kingston.

—Mr. Meredith has a perfectly good part to play if he has the force and spirit to play it. He may very soon redeem the defeat which he owed to his lack of presentable men and to his fatal connection with Ottawa. He has only to make up his mind to be the head of a Provincial party, British in opposition to French encroachment, Protestant in opposition to hierarchical domination, and rationally Conservative in opposition to the Socialism which the other party appears to be adopting as a plank in its platform. He will then be in the true position of a Conservative leader in Ontario, and will soon find that he has a strong body of opinion on his side. With the tariff question he need not directly concern himself. It belongs to the Dominion, not to the Province. The last election, in which Ottawa deserted him and openly rejoiced over his defeat, relieves him from all inconvenient obligations in that quarter. It has rid him also of Sir John Macdonald's chief agent. Unless the public should suddenly develop a taste for literary bilge-water, he is likely soon to be rid of Sir John Macdonald's organ. His great want still is men and this want is not likely to be supplied while the party remains a broken-down donkey engine of Dominion Toryism, without object or principle of its own, and used only to keep Ontario in financial thralldom to Quebec. But when once there is life and hope in a cause or a party men appear. The only question is whether Mr. Meredith has the force and spirit. But if he has not, why does he remain where he is? A man could not have a more unsatisfactory part to play than he has had for the last eight years. To go on playing it would be not only unsatisfactory but ignominious.

—It is to be hoped that the Ontario Opposition will move, were it only by way of protest, for the restoration of the electoral rights of Toronto. A more shameless gerrymander never was perpetrated than that by which the Party in power appropriated one of the seats for this city. The city is practically reduced to a single elective member, the vote of one of the two elective members being killed by that of the Act of Parliament nominee. Toronto is well entitled to more than three members, and there is no reason why she should not have her full number, especially as her wealth and intelligence are more than proportionate to her population. It is said that some of the members for other ridings are residents of Toronto; suppose they are, what political advantage does that give her? The entire House of Commons is resident in the British metropolis for more than half the year; yet this is not urged as a reason against giving London her fair share of representation. At all events let Toronto's three members be hers. The three-cornered system has been tried and condemned in England. It lingers now, we believe, nowhere except at Capetown, and there in a decrepit and discredited state. Its consequence, besides the falsification of the popular verdict, is that the minority member is nailed to his seat, unable either to resign or take office, lest the seat should be lost to his party. Thus a man distinguished enough to be eligible to office can never take a minority seat. But the object was not to improve the representation by giving the minority a voice: it was only to give a dominant party by Act of Parliament a seat which was not theirs by election.

—The transit of Mr. Edward Farrer from one journal to another has made a sensation which is the highest and most sincere of all compliments to the power of his pen. If we refer to it, however, it is for the purpose of pointing a moral. The awkward part of the business, as hostile critics do not fail to point out, is that not long ago Mr. Farrer as a writer in the

journal which he is now leaving was being personally attacked by the journal to which his pen is transferred. Let journalists, if they have the slightest regard for the interests or character of the Press, learn to respect the privilege of impersonality, and while they combat the articles to let the writers alone. The responsibility for the line taken by a journal rests not on the writer but on the editor ; if it did not, anonymous journalism would be at an end. A writer when attacked by name cannot defend himself, or even deny the authorship of an article if it is not his, without breach of duty to his management : nothing therefore can be more unfair or cowardly than the practice of personal attack. Its obvious tendency is to degrade the Press by driving from its service every man who has a character to be assailed and who shrinks from smirching it in blackguard brawls. It was indeed for this very purpose that recourse was had to the practice by the Press tyrant to whom its extension in Canadian journalism is largely due. It may be, as some contend, that anonymous journalism is a bad system and that signed articles would be better. That is a tenable view. But if anonymous journalism is to continue, the law of impersonality must be upheld.

Why cannot journalism like other intellectual callings be a regular profession and have its code of honour, with the means of enforcing the law against delinquents ? Why is it that one journal should so often be seen dealing foul blows at another, and that the people should have to look on while their reputed instructors and guides roll together in the mud and gouge each other like Texan rowdies ? Why is it that the whole Press should be disgraced by infamous "enterprise" without the possibility of calling its black sheep to account and purging itself of their vileness ? Partly perhaps the cause is to be found in the nomad habits of "Bohemians," which make it difficult to bring them into any association or under any controlling influence, and baffled even Mr. Ross Robertson's patriotic effort to establish a Journalists' Club in Toronto. Whatever be the cause the effect is very bad.

—The triumph of the Jesuits has brought to Quebec, whence it will operate on the Dominion, another corps of the Papal militia. The Franciscans, it is now announced, have landed and are displaying to an edified people the hard boards on which they sleep, the sackcloth which forms their bedding, and all the paraphernalia of their asceticism. After all, they have nothing to compare with the pillar of Simeon Stylites or with the hooks in the flesh of an Indian Fakir. So in the thirteenth century they landed in England, staining the ground with their bleeding feet, and living on alms from door to door. Very soon they became wealthy and corrupt. Every tendency which has largely prevailed among mankind is pretty sure at one time to have had good in it. Asceticism is no exception to the rule. It was a sort of convulsive effort of man to set himself free from the tyranny of his sensual appetites, which, in an uncivilized age and in the absence of any support from medical science, he could hardly have done by cool unassisted reason. The asceticism of the missionary was also, no doubt, very useful in impressing the imaginations of barbarians who were themselves the slaves of fleshly lusts. These good effects were never unalloyed, since the idea that self-torture or self-maceration was holiness must always have given a false and degrading idea of God. Moreover extremes produce reaction and the riot of the carnival was the natural concomitant of the Lenten fast. Medical science, which like all truth is the voice of God, is now our guide in the performance of our physical duty, which is to keep our bodies in the best possible order for all the purposes of life. To this end abstinence may often be useful; asceticism never can be. The day of asceticism, as well as that of thaumaturgy, is past. The net result of this new irruption of friars probably will be a further draining by ecclesiastical suction of the wealth of Quebec ending in increased need of subsidies from the Dominion. What the Jesuit palmerworm leaves the Franciscan locust will devour, and Ontario and Protestant Montreal in the end will pay for all.

—The triumph and reinforcement of the army of clerical reaction is naturally accompanied by a fresh development of thaumaturgy. Miracles are again announced at Ste. Anne de Beaupré, and we are told that twelve hundred pilgrims have resorted at once to her shrine. If Ste. Anne de Beaupré wishes really to demonstrate her miraculous power and convince the unbelieving, why does she not replace a lost limb, cure somebody of cancer, or restore sight to the blind? Why does she confine herself to cases of nervous ailment or hysteria in the magical treatment of which she has successful rivals in the most notorious charlatans? Why, we may also ask, does she perform her miracles in a corner, and in the corner of all the world where they are least needed, among the devout peasantry of Quebec? Why does she not perform them in some centre of sceptical intelligence, such as Toronto, Chicago, or New York? Of course all of the poor peasants who are drawn to her shrine leave some of their scant earnings behind them. Is it possible to believe that the hierophants of Ste. Anne de Beaupré, any more than those of St. Januarius, of the House of Loretto, or of the Holy Coat of Treves, are themselves the perfectly honest victims of the gainful delusion which they maintain?

—We did not say “the name of priest is perfidy.” What we said was “*in politics* the name of priest is perfidy.” Nor did we speak of Roman Catholic priests only, but of all priests, Roman, Greek, Anglican or Coptic, and of all clergymen of whatever denomination who leave the field of religious duty to engage in that of political intrigue. If anyone doubts the justice of the remark so far as the Roman Catholic Church is concerned let him review the history of the dealings of Popes and their satellites in former days with the monarchies of the time, those of the Catholic clergy with the political parties of modern Europe, and those of the hierarchical wielders of the Catholic vote with the political parties of the United States,

this country and Australia. Is not the Catholic vote in this Province given for the Liberals in Provincial elections and then immediately transferred to the Conservatives in elections for the Dominion? When priests are trying, for an end of their own, which has no relation to the interests of the commonwealth, to play off one party against another and reign by the division, how can they be otherwise than perfidious? Is not perfidy, in that case, the very basis of their strategy? Some ecclesiastical organ it seems has been calling for the infliction of civil penalties on those who like us dare to criticize the action of a political priesthood. To the restoration of the Inquisition we have no doubt we should come in due time if the propagandists of the Encyclical could have their way, but at present we have got no further than the restoration of the Jesuit Estates.

—The Prime Minister of Manitoba alone of all the Liberal Prime Ministers was honoured with an exclusion from the list of invitations to the Mercier banquet. Let him take this not only as an acknowledgment that he is loyal to British civilization and to the organic principles of society in the New World, but as a warning that he and his Province have little to do with the imbroglios of old Canadian parties, or with the struggles of their leaders for power. His principal task is to promote the development of his Province and to relieve her of those remaining shackles which prevent her from moving forwards on her destined course of prosperity. From railway monopoly she has been set free, after a struggle which revealed at once the temper of her railway despot and the indifference of Ottawa to anything concerning her except her votes. But railways are of comparatively little use unless goods can be freely carried over them. So long as the tariff continues in existence, the monopoly of the C. P. R. will practically be to a great extent maintained. Commercial liberty is the object to which the efforts of Manitoban and North-Western statesmen

ought henceforth to be steadily directed. Without access to the Continental market Manitoba may subsist but cannot flourish or hope to compete with her rivals Minnesota and Dakota, which are within the commercial pale. It is impossible not to regard with suspicion the subsidy now held out by the Ottawa Government to the Hudson's Bay Railroad. There are two sinister objects which such a subsidy may be intended to serve. It may be intended, like so many similar grants, to purchase votes and it may be intended to turn the eyes of the people away from the south, where their natural market both for buying and selling lies, to the north and the distant market of England. The English market this year is likely to be exceptionally good, if it is true that the English crops have failed, and that those of Russia are below the average. But taking a series of years it is a declining as well as a distant market and will decline the faster as Indian wheat land is brought under the plough. The Continental market, on the other hand, will be always improving as the population grows and as the wheat land is taken up and exhausted. Nothing could blind any one to this fact but political fancies which are not bread. Manitoba seems now to be awakened to the necessities of the situation and bent on discarding the representatives who have betrayed her, and sending to Ottawa a trustworthy delegation. When the time comes she will have to brace her sinews for the struggle, for every engine will be plied both by the Government and by the C. P. R. But without brave and strenuous effort nothing worth having is to be won.

— It seems that through some "traitorous" channel a doubt has found its way to the Australians whether the success of Canadian Confederation is so assured that they have only to tread in our footsteps. The Nationalist victory in Quebec and the Mercier Banquet, with the Tricolor unfurled, if any report of them reaches the Antipodes, are not likely to remove the hesitation. Let the Australians come here and judge for

themselves. Let them form their own opinion as to the completeness of the unity which has been established between Ontario and Quebec, between the Provinces on the Atlantic and those on the Pacific. Let them inspect the Dominion Statute Book and see what the Federal Parliament does for its money. Let them examine not only the paper Constitution but the actual polity, and study the working as well as the structure of the Machine. The real government in their hemisphere as in ours is Party. Let them, with the example of Canada before their eyes to aid their forecast, try to figure to themselves what their Federal Parties will be, and what will be the relations between the Federal Parties and those of the several colonies. Let them consider how the influence of the Federal Parties over the several colonies will be kept up. Let them measure, still with our example in view, the amount not only of expenditure but of corruption, demagogism and faction which the creation of a Federal Government as a prize of perpetual contention between Federal Parties, will entail. Already, as we have more than once pointed out, they are practically federated for all the ordinary purposes of such unions, as a group of colonies under the same Crown. If Independence was the aim of the Australians, federation would be necessary for the purposes of external security and extension as well as for that of internal peace. But otherwise they had better count the full cost before they take the leap. Once more, we say, let them come here and judge for themselves. Let them judge for themselves, after inquiring not only among the officials at Ottawa, or among enthusiasts of Imperialism into whose hands visitors are apt to fall, but among people of different shades of opinion and in different parts of the country. To be the guiding light of Australia would be a great honour to us, but to be her will-o'-the-wisp would not.

—To make a whole population supremely happy for three days is an arduous undertaking. The Toronto Carnival was



almost doomed to failure by its length apart from the slips into which inexperience was sure to fall, such as Chinese lamps multitudinous but unlighted, bands without stands to perform on, and fireworks too distant for effect. Nobody but the hotel-keepers, the street railway, the vendors of ice cream and the hackmen cries encore. We doubt whether even the hotel-keepers of the higher class received any equivalent for their Carnival assessment. It is impossible to think that our people got an amount of pleasure at all commensurate with the expense, the trouble and a disturbance of industry which extends beyond the days of the Festival. Nor has our city risen at all in the eyes of strangers who were tempted to visit it by the grandiloquence of the programme. The notion that dissipation is "good for trade," is like the delusion of the king of France, who fancied that kings gave alms by spending money on their pleasures. What the people have spent in pleasure they cannot have to spend in dry-goods, and probably little money is laid out by carnival visitors at the stores. Let us have popular recreation by all means; there is no apparent reason against making it a regular department of municipal government. But let us go rationally to work. Some active or scheming spirit starts a fancy, and whips up for it a little factitious popularity. Then no one dares to say a word against it and we all roll headlong into a fiasco. Heaven forbid that this new gate should be opened for municipal ambition!

—A little excitement, with Chinese lamps and fireworks, is good sometimes to break the monotony of labour. But the best of all recreation is that which is taken quietly and in a regular way. Parks are the safety-valves of city life. Yet we allow the Parks of Toronto piece by piece to be destroyed. Walpole uttered almost a literal truth when he said that the cost of closing Hyde Park would be three crowns. In this country we have politics in plenty, but not so much of

public spirit, otherwise a stand would have been made against putting the Parliament Buildings where they are. And now another large slice, which is at present the play-ground of our boys, is going, and if you say a word for its preservation an organ which professes to speak for the working classes meets you with taunts and sneers. Nobody proposed that the University should give the land to the city, but Mr. Dwight and others thought that there might be a chance of obtaining such terms as would enable the city, possibly with some help from voluntary effort, to secure the lease. That the Trustees of the University are legal owners of the land and have full disposing power over it is indisputable. But property in a Park which was attached by a public grant to a public institution and has long been enjoyed by the people, can hardly be said to be exactly on the same footing as ordinary property. The Colleges of Oxford and Cambridge have a legal power of selling or closing Parks and walks attached to them which they could not exercise without incurring public odium. The question is, at all events, one seriously affecting the welfare of the people of Toronto, and it is strange that a popular organ should meet an effort to solve it in this interest with taunts and sneers.

—Whether in excluding the Executive from the Legislature the framers of the American Constitution were actuated by purism, by deference to the theory of Montesquieu, or by deliberate statesmanship, is doubtful. The result, however, has been to leave the House of Representatives without leadership and to expose it to the danger of anarchy. The only available leader is the Speaker who, as the Chairman, ought properly to be judicial and impartial. Speaker Carlisle acted on the theory of judicial impartiality, and the result was that the House became a struggling mob, each member of which striving for his own measure thwarted all the rest, and no business could be done. Speaker Reed, a strong Partisan, a violent Pro-

tectionist, and a man of masterful and unscrupulous temper, has acted on the opposite theory, and has restored the legislative efficiency of the House with a vengeance. The work of seven months includes the passage of the bill for a new Tariff, the Customs Administration Bill, Bills for an extension of the use of Silver in the standard currency and for the Federal control of National Elections, a new general Pension Bill, a Bill for the admission of two new States to the Union, and the adoption of new and revolutionary Rules of Procedure. These were all contested measures, and the same may be said of the numerous resolutions passed for the unseating of Democratic members in favour of Republican contestants, the Chicago World's Fair Bill, and of many items in the General Appropriation Bills, as those pertaining to the increase of the Navy and the improvement of the great waterways. An important Bill has also passed to give effect to the recommendations of the International Maritime Conference which sat at Washington last winter. Among other Bills of the first-class sure to pass are those for the restraint of mercantile combines and monopolies and for permitting the State to regulate or forbid the sale of intoxicants brought from one State into another. It is true, the principal measures are as bad as possible, but they have passed, and Speaker Reed may flatter himself that he has renovated the power of legislation. He has renovated in equal measure the power of appropriation. To lavish five hundred millions of dollars in a single session is a proof of vigour and one which, unless the American people are out of their senses, will tell on the chances of the party in power at the approaching Congressional elections.

—The Bill for the exercise of Federal control over National elections, which forms one of the list, is intended to force political power into the hands of the negroes at the South for the benefit of the Republican party. Hitherto the negro, though legally invested with the suffrage, has not been

allowed by the whites to vote. He has been practically in a state of political suppression, while the South has been kept solid for the Democratic party. The expectation that there would be a division of parties among the whites, and that in time the negro would be called in to the aid of one of the parties, and would thus acquire liberty of voting, has so far been belied. The whites have remained a unit for the ascendancy of their race. If Federal force is now to be used to give the negro the free exercise of the ballot, and enable him to overturn white ascendancy in the interest of a party in the North, a very serious crisis may ensue. The problem of the races is at best one of desperate difficulty, since political equality without social equality is hardly possible, while social equality is impossible without intermarriage. Probably wisdom would acquiesce in the provisional exclusion of the negro from political power which he neither greatly values nor knows how to exercise, and would rest content with securing to him his industrial freedom and his personal rights. But faction in its frenzy looks at nothing except the means of passing its rival in the neck-and-neck race for power. When the National Election Bill is carried into execution, a storm can hardly fail to arise.

—The new Silver Coinage Act passed by the United States Congress is beneath contempt as a measure of finance. As a concession to the greed of the owners of silver mines and the ignorance, prevalent in the Western and Southern States, that takes a deluge of bad money for a flood of new wealth and clamours for a debased currency as a means of prosperity, the Act possesses the merit of putting off the evil day of a change from the gold to the silver standard of values, and thus affords opportunity for the intelligence of the country to rescue the Union from financial disaster, the shadow of which has been over it ever since the original Silver Coinage Act of 1878. On the other hand, the silver interest has gained by

the Act an advanced position from which to continue its attacks upon the financial system. It is impossible to forecast how long that system can maintain itself under the steady flow of so fluctuating a medium as silver into the national currency. A crash brought on by this juggling with the currency would bring people to their senses and firmly re-establish the gold standard, but the price paid for experience would be high. If the drain upon the Federal revenues continues at its present rate, the Treasury will be forced to resort to its accumulation of depreciated silver dollars, in which case the illusory character of the promises of the Act for maintaining the parity of the two metals will appear. The working of the party system was signally illustrated in connection with this Bill. The Senate, dividing upon sectional and not upon party lines, passed a radical measure that would have made the maintenance of the gold standard impossible. The House of Representatives, also without a party division, passed a conservative measure under which the maintenance of the gold standard would have been certain and comparatively easy. The differences between the two measures were reconciled by a conference committee, upon which both parties were properly represented. This committee brought in a unanimous report in favour of a compromise measure. Against this report Democratic members in both Houses voted almost solidly. Their obvious object in so doing was that in the coming general election they might tell the electorate in the Eastern States that the Republicans have betrayed the gold standard, and in the West and South that the Republicans have been disloyal to silver, and have sold out to Wall Street. Such is the relation of party motives to the public good.

The Behring Sea controversy has moved in a circle and come back to the point from which it started nearly four years ago. By discovery, exploration, settlement, occupation and general consent, extending over more than a century and a half of time,

the right of Russia and of her grantee, the United States, to monopolize the fur seal fishery is asserted to be absolute. There is just enough of colour in such a claim to persuade the Americans to cling to it, and more than enough of doubt as to its soundness to justify England and Canada in insisting that it shall be at least submitted to some impartial tribunal. Whatever negotiations are now to go forward between the two governments, will in all probability point to arbitration. Even in this restricted field there is room for misunderstanding. The British Government requires an arbitration embracing the entire question, while the government of the United States wishes to start with the assumption that down to the time of its purchase of Russia's rights in North America, the government of the Czar did in fact exercise effectively and without question, the precise jurisdiction over the Behring Sea fisheries now claimed for the United States. Neither the Behring Sea question nor the Fisheries question with the United States however is so dangerous as the fishery question with France, because what France hugs is not the claim by the quarrel.

Much that had been incomprehensible in the conduct of the Washington authorities, since negotiations were resumed between Mr. Blaine and Sir Julian Pauncefote, has been cleared up. We now know that the long negotiation for a close season in the seal fishery, which was the occasion for the appearance of representatives of Russia and Canada in the conferences held at Mr. Blaine's house, was entered upon at the direct suggestion of the American negotiator and was broken off by Mr. Blaine because he could not carry his advance point of a continuous close season from the middle of April to the middle of October in each year. As an alternative, Sir Julian Pauncefote offered two close seasons, one while the female seals were moving in and another while they were moving out of Behring Sea, subject to such modifications as a mixed commission of experts should determine. This offer seems an entirely reasonable one, and the refusal to accept it throws doubt on Mr. Blaine's sincerity in inviting discussion of

a close season, based upon common interests and without reference to the particular claims advanced by the United States. It is not yet clear why the American government in addition to its needless withdrawal from a line of negotiation proposed by itself, should have come to the utterly indefensible resolution to resume its assertion of a claim to the exclusive right of fishery in Behring Sea. The solution is probably to be found not in a new view of the question of international law, but in the weakness of Canada's position on this continent as an outlying dependency of a country which has but a faint interest in her quarrels, and, being itself pressed by dangers of all kinds in its own hemisphere, is unable to act with vigour and effect in her behalf.

—We almost lose patience in reading the nonsense that is sent over here for the delectation of Fenian or socialistic palates about convulsions in the British Ministry and the approach of a Dissolution. Everybody who has private correspondents in England must know that all this is trash. There may be differences of opinion in the Cabinet about particular measures or points of strategy, but English statesmen know how to be true to each other, to the common cause, and to the country, of whose perilous situation the ministers must of all men be the most sensible. There is, no doubt, among the regular Tories of the Lowther type a jealousy of Mr. Goschen; but Mr. Goschen has the steady support of the Liberal Unionists whom he represents in the Cabinet and on whose votes the existence of the Government depends. To suppose that with a majority of more than seventy the ministers will in deference to the clamour of their opponents dissolve Parliament and run the risk of a general election is to suppose they are in their dotage. The snap division taken the other evening when the supporters of the Government were absent at Ascot, though hailed with a yell of triumph, could have no significance whatever; at least it could be significant only as a revelation of the un-

happy truth that the man who has none but public interest in politics grows weary of the work, while the professional demagogue is never tired. The minority too, it must be remembered, on this and on all occasions, is made up of the most heterogeneous elements: Mr. Gladstone, Sir Wm. Harcourt, Mr. Labouchere, Mr. Bradlaugh, Dr. Tanner, Mr. William Healy, and Mr. Cunningham Graham, can have no object in common except the overthrow of the Government, and were they victorious to-morrow, the veriest cat's chorus would ensue. It seems clear that the introduction of the Licenses Bill was a mistake. It was a mistake, in our humble judgment, to bring on controverted legislation which could possibly be put off while the House of Commons is in such a condition that legislation of any kind is hardly possible. The first object should be by measures as strong and broad as the necessity of the case may require to drag all legislation out of the quagmire of Obstruction and restore the efficiency, independence and dignity of the House of Commons.

The state of things in England, however, whether in Parliament or out of it, is ominous in the highest degree. In Parliament, Constitutional government, seems to have come to an end. It is possible, as we have said before, only if the minority will allow the majority to govern. But the present minority, rather than let the majority govern, is prepared to bring on Parliamentary anarchy and to wreck the Constitution. As an English writer says, the Session of 1890 is without a parallel for wanton waste of Parliamentary energy and for the successful application of the novel arts of unscrupulous Opposition. "How to prevent the Government from governing; how to hinder the Legislature from legislating; how to sap the health, exhaust the vitality and undermine the lives of individual Ministers; how to damage Parliamentary institutions by constantly recurring scenes, insults and outrages;—these have now become the main features in the strategy of Her Majesty's Opposition for carrying on what used to be manly, honourable and patriotic Party warfare." The writer is also fully justi-



fied in saying that there is no difference between the conduct of Mr. Gladstone or Sir William Harcourt and that of the Irish members. There is none, at least except in regard to brutality of manner, which the Irish members, taken some of them from the same social stratum as Tammany, exhibit to an extent very faintly represented by the reports, and at once astounding and revolting to an eye-witness of the scenes. Not the least deadly of the effects of Obstruction is the "sapping of the health of individual ministers" whose lives are thus worn out in struggling against the ruffianism, inarticulate as well as articulate, of members imposed on Irish electors by the fiat of Mr. Parnell. Meantime, Mr. Gladstone has been acting, to borrow Tyndall's phrase, as 'a universal blast-furnace of sedition.' Not only has he succeeded in rekindling in Scotland and Wales, as well as in Ireland, old Provincial jealousies which threaten the integrity of the nation, but by his incitements to popular defiance of law and order in Ireland, and by appeals to the masses against the classes, he has evoked a spirit of resistance to authority, and is scattering the seeds of revolution. Animated and morally countenanced by him, agitators, political, social and industrial, are at work in all directions. These incendiaries have already filled the industrial world with disturbance; they are now apparently proceeding to undermine the fidelity of the police and of the army. The mutinous movement in the Guards is regarded as their work. When it comes to this, Faction is not far from over-stepping the line which separates political conflict from civil war.

—In the meantime, a gleam of light, though probably a fugitive and deceptive gleam, appears in an unexpected quarter of the sky. Mr. Parnell has been seized with an apparent fit of moderation, has spoken courteously to Mr. Balfour, and signified his disposition to compromise on the question of the Irish Land Bill. This man has always been an enigma, impenetrable even to his followers, whom he treats as his social

inferiors and excludes from his inmost councils. In estimating his professions we must not lose sight of his avowal before the Commission of Inquiry, that he had told the House of Commons a deliberate falsehood for a strategical purpose. His present moderation, however, is regarded as sincere by his Irish brigade as well as by their allies the Radicals, and it has produced a wild outburst of wrath, with cries for the deposition of the recreant chief. By Mr. Morley and other philosophers of the Home Rule school it was always contended that, Parnell possessing the confidence of his countrymen, it was folly not to negotiate with the man who had power to agree to a settlement. The answer was that what Irish agitators wanted was not a settlement but agitation, and that as soon as a leader showed himself disposed to agree to a settlement he would fall. The childishness of fancying that terms can be made with a set of men who subsist by disaffection is manifest to all but the most philosophic eyes. Of Mr. Parnell's moderation the probable cause is the failure of funds which are running low because the American Fenians care little for amendments of land tenure, much less for constitutional improvements, and are disposed to subscribe only to rebellion. Another theory is that Mr. Parnell's nerve is shaken by the O'Shea case. Mr. Parnell, it will be remembered, by his fiat forced the complainant in the O'Shea case as a representative on the electors of Galway. A pleasant foretaste this of the vast increase of liberty and dignity which would accrue to Irish constituencies from Home Rule!

—Mr. Caine has signally displayed the moral weakness and the lurking vanity of the fanatic. He was a strong Unionist, so strong as to give rather special umbrage to the Home Rulers. But he quarrels with the Government because it will not consent, at his tyrannical dictation, to rob people who with the direct sanction of the State have invested their money in public houses. Not content with speaking and voting against

the License Bill, he resigns his seat and appeals to the moral universe. The moral universe, by way of response to his appeal, refuses him re-election by a very large majority. Hereupon his pique transports him beyond all bounds, and reckless of what he has himself proclaimed to be the vital interests of the country, he flings down his Unionism at the feet of Mr. Gladstone, who treats him with deserved contempt. Lord Salisbury and his colleagues are men of unblemished character, and no man in his senses can imagine that they are less desirous of promoting temperance than Mr. Caine. But they know that it is the highest duty of a Government to uphold justice and that the first victims of injustice are sure to be the discredited and the weak. The publican or the Irish landlord may be the first to be robbed, but he will not be the last. From what we learn, it would seem that we are not likely to hear much more of Prohibitionist legislation in England at present. Nobody will venture again to propose compensation, while the resistance to confiscation is still too strong to be lightly faced. As to the loss of such a man as Mr. Caine to the Unionist cause, it is the loss of dry rot to a ship.

—Lord Wolseley's words deprecating any thought of war between England and the United States might be entitled 'Hints from a soldier who has smelt powder to soldiers who have not smelt powder.' They come in season. Nobody believes in a frightful diplomatic crisis or in the imminence of a naval collision in Behring's Sea. The triangular negotiation is at present dragging its slow length through a voluminous correspondence, carried on with tedious formalities of transmission and retransmission among the three governments. But the party which is in power in the United States is in a rather dangerous mood. It suspects that unless some abnormal force, such as a violent Granger movement, should upset politics altogether, it will be beaten in the Fall Elections, and that its loss of the House of Representatives will be followed by its loss of the

Executive power in the next Presidential contest. Its McKinley tariff and its Federal Election Bill are measures of despair. It is therefore tempted to violent courses in diplomacy both for the purpose of diverting public attention from the tariff question and for that of baling out surplus revenue in war expenditure. Lord Wolseley knows Canada and knows what American invasion would be. Our Jingoës have been brandishing an opinion given by an English officer to the effect that the invader would again be repulsed as he was in 1812. There must be a gap in the officer's historic consciousness of seventy-eight years. Since 1812 all has been changed. The country has ceased to be a natural fortress of forest which the bushranger could defend against regular troops. It has been laid perfectly open for military operations. On our frontier have grown up great cities which would be at the mercy of the invader. Railways would enable the enemy to concentrate his overwhelming resources, and steam would make him master of the Lakes, every point on the northern shores of which he would threaten with superior force. We have no army, nor could we create one in anything like the time allowed by the swift march of modern war. It takes, we believe, about six months to make a good infantry soldier, a year to make a cavalry soldier, and a still longer time to make a good artilleryman. A weak point of all volunteer forces is their lack of non-commissioned officers, who are the muscle and sinews of a regiment. These the British volunteers might perhaps draw at need from the Line, but Canada will have no such source of supply. Those who brag about a levy *en masse* must be half-conscious that they are talking nonsense. When Palmerston was told that in case of invasion the people would rise as one man, he replied 'Yes, and they would be knocked down again as one man.' Does anybody seriously think that supposing enough enthusiasm to exist there would be any use in calling out an immense mob, which has never had arms in its hands, to oppose a drilled force of any kind? We have no equipments of war, no staff, no general who has ever handled a large

body of men under fire. The army of the Americans is small, it is true, and soldiers do not speak highly of their militia. But they have all the equipments of war, and their immense resources would enable them to buy men. They must have among them a number of immigrants drilled under the military systems of Europe. If England were to bombard their seaboard cities, they could retaliate on Toronto and Montreal. Another vital difference between the situation in 1812 and the present is that now we have in the midst of us a French nation, while the French are no longer kept true to us by antagonism to the Puritans of New England, but, on the contrary, are bound to New England by the presence there of three or four hundred thousand of their kinsmen. That Canadians would again do what men could in defence of their country and their rights is our proud hope and belief; but that is no reason why we should allow any Bombastes Furioso, from mere love of hectoring, to bring down an avalanche of calamity on our homes.

—All speculation about peace or war in Europe, interesting as they are to us (since if England fights Canada must bleed), will be futile so long as the issues of peace and war are locked in the breasts of autocrats and diplomatists, or dependent on accidents, such as a quarrel in Central Africa, in Bulgaria, in Afghanistan, or on the coast of Newfoundland. Bismarck has recorded the fact that at the time of the war between France and Austria, that bosom friend of England Louis Napoleon, after publicly embracing the British Queen, was trying to get up a maritime alliance with the continental powers for the purpose of crushing British power in the Mediterranean. Louis Napoleon's design of attacking Austria was masked by the most solemn disclaimers of any warlike intentions, and the French ambassador Pelissier, in an interview with the British Foreign Minister, took it on his personal honour that no military preparations were going on in France, though a few

weeks afterwards France invaded Italy with an army of a hundred and fifty thousand men. If we want to divine what is coming we must watch events. To read cabled rumours is waste of time ; so it is to read reports of interviews. Diplomats know how to be perfectly frank with an interviewer and yet tell him nothing. The inner councils of Russia, of which we see little, and the conflict of motives in the breast of the Czar, of which we see nothing, are still the main factor in the situation.

—A work just published by Dr. Child, of Oxford University, has an interest for those who are trying to get rid in this country of the last vestiges of the connection between Church and State. Plainer words, it might seem, were never spoken than “My kingdom is not of this world.” But they were so interpreted through a series of ages as to mean “My kingdom is not of this world until my servants can get temporal power into their hands;” and the fruits of the interpretation have been those dark or sometimes crimsoned pages of history which record the relations between Church and State. Dr. Child has given us a careful study of those relations during the period comprised in his work. He shows plainly enough that the Church of England having been under Papal supremacy during the Middle Ages fell after the rupture between Henry VIII. and the Papacy not less completely under the supremacy of the King, and was moulded and remoulded not by Convocation or any ecclesiastical authority, but by those who wielded the royal power ; by Henry VIII. and his minister Cromwell, by the Council of Edward VI., by Mary, by Elizabeth and her statesmen : he might have gone on to say by James I. and by Charles I., for Laud acted less as a spiritual head of the Church with the concurrence of Convocation, which in truth he treated with little consideration, than as the ecclesiastical minister of the king. The Tractarian theory of Anglican history, and of the authority by

which the doctrine and ritual was settled, is thus shown to be untenable; in fact it may be doubted whether it was ever sincerely held by its authors themselves, though they adopted it as a shield for their operations. So far as can be seen, the great body of the Clergy remained through all the revolutions and all the counter-revolutions of half-a-century reactionary at heart, in accordance with the natural tendencies of a priesthood, and were strangers to the changes which the Crown and its ministers ordained. The people, at least those in the more intelligent parts of the country, went with the king in casting off the Papal supremacy, suppressing the Monasteries, and humbling the clergy. Henry VIII. would not have dared to do what he did without the support of a large part of the nation. We think that Dr. Child underrates the force of the anti-papal and anti-monastic feeling in England before the Reformation, though he may be right in saying that the anti-papal legislation, such as the Statute of Provisors, was practically of less effect than is supposed. But what nursing-fathers and nursing-mothers for a Church were the Tudor kings and queens! What hands to have fashioned the beliefs and worship of a Christian people! There have been murderers on a larger scale than Henry VIII., but none ever murdered affection as he did when he sent Anne Boleyn to the block and married on the next day the woman to make way for whom she was butchered. The murder of More was also an unspeakably foul breach of personal friendship as well as of public justice. Dr. Child seems to think that conscience may have had something to do with the divorce of Katharine of Arragon. Has he read the king's letters to Anne Boleyn, written while the question of divorce was pending? There is, we suspect proof in the Act of Succession passed after the death of Anne Boleyn, that Henry had seduced her sister Mary, and that this was made a ground for his divorce from Anne. Cromwell not only committed judicial murders, but coolly set down in his note-book memoranda for their commission. The Council of

Edward VI. was a gang of scoundrels steeped in public plunder, conspiracy and blood. Elizabeth, besides the scandals of her court, unquestionably instigated Sir Amyas Poulett to murder Mary Queen of Scots. There is too much reason to believe that the death of Amy Robsart was no surprise to her, while it is certain that she continued her equivocal intimacy with Leicester when, to use Burleigh's words, he was "infamed by the death of his wife." Dr. Child seems to think that those were the morals of the age. If they were it must have been an age of devils. But they were not the morals of More or Pole, of Cranmer, Latimer or Hooper, of Cartwright, Travers or Browne. They were not the morals of Burleigh or other Elizabethan statesmen of the better class. Who can wonder that such men as More and Pole, having been Liberals or Reformers at first, recoiled when they saw the unity which was naturally dear to them broken, and spiritual supremacy usurped by Henry VIII. To Pole, by the way, Dr. Child, apparently following Froude, is hardly just. Pole was no bigot or fanatic, nor was he a persecutor. He was, with Sadolet and Contarini, a member of the Oratory of Divine Love, held the cardinal Protestant doctrine of Justification by Faith, and sought reconciliation on liberal terms with the Reformers. By his slackness in the Marian persecution, he incurred the suspicion of the persecuting party at Rome, and was recalled from England in disgrace. In styling him the last and best of the Roman Catholic Archbishops of Canterbury, Macaulay perhaps overshot the mark; but he erred less widely than those who run into the other extreme. Great sympathy is due to all those moderate men who sought to reform the Church without the destruction of the Unity of Christendom. The religious wars which followed were a fearful vindication of their course.

—Mona Caird having in the *Westminster* preached the emancipation of the family, that is, its dissolution and a reign,



let us say, of unconfined affection, Mr. D. F. Hannigan now comes forward in the same review to advocate the removal of all distinction between legitimate and illegitimate children. The French Revolutionists did what he proposes, with the result which might have been expected. It is very hard, says Mr. Hannigan, like many philanthropists before him, that the child should suffer for the sins of its parents. It is still harder that the community should suffer for the sins of the child's parents as it might if the State ceased to draw any distinction between the offspring of lawful marriage and that of lawless lust. Mr. Hannigan says that marriage is not always a union of souls. Perhaps not; but it is at least as often a union of souls as concubinage or adultery, and it has some claim to careful treatment as being the keystone of civilized society and the safeguard of pure affection, the highest source of human happiness. Without it we should be as the beasts of the field. When Mona Caird, or those who are in sympathy with her, play with this question they will do well to remember that marriage is a restraint placed by the stronger sex upon its own passions and that by the removal of the restraint the weaker sex would be far the greater sufferer. The male sex is not all made up of sentimentalists like those who gather round the tea-tables of Woman's Rights: it is full of much wilder and rougher stuff which when "emancipated" would use its liberty with a vengeance. Certain however it is that the family as well as property and authority of every kind is being assailed by the revolutionary battering-ram and is even beginning to tremble beneath its strokes. In the times that are coming people will have to be rooted in their convictions if they want to retain any part of the present order of things.

—Mr. Andrew Carnegie proclaims that a college education is fatal to business success. His challenge is answered by a number of champions of high training, and by none with more vigour and effect than by Mr. Erastus Wiman. Of Mr. Eras-

tus Wiman we suppose many Canadians have been led by persistent misrepresentation to think as a sordid schemer incapable of sympathy with anything refined and high ; yet no one ever pleaded the cause of culture better than he has done in this discussion. Mr. Andrew Carnegie is the horn-blower of "Democracy Triumphant," who thinks that the American Republic must be forty times greater than ancient Rome because the Mississippi is forty times larger than the Tiber. A high civilization we should have if he were to be the arbiter of human development ! What does he mean by business ? Almost all the great statesmen of England, and notably the great financiers from Montagu downwards, have been men of college training. The victory of Germany over France in the late war was justly described as the triumph of the Universities. Even in commercial business, when you get beyond mere routine, men of trained mind must have the advantage, as Mr. Wiman shows, over an office-boy. That a good many of the youths who now come to college had better stay away, we have already said. But the reason is that they do not avail themselves of the training. Those who do, if the training is sound, cannot fail to be better for it in any walk of life in which mind is required. Where no mind is required, or only a thievish mind, such as makes Corners and Lobbies, Mr. Andrew Carnegie's assertion may be true.

—In the *North American Review* the other day there was a Symposium on American Hatred of England. Those who maintained the existence of the feeling might have found confirmation of their view, so far as a certain section of the literary world in the United States is concerned, in Mr. Cabot Lodge's recent "Life of Washington," which contains some jets of Anglophobia singularly bitter and pre-eminently discreditable to a writer of history who binds himself in ascending the judgment-seat to leave all prejudice below. When Washington, because he is outranked by the regulars, with-

draws from the service, Mr. Lodge tells us that "the disappointment was of immense value to the American people at a later day, and there is something very instructive in the early revolt against the stupid arrogance which England has always thought it right to display towards this country. She has paid dearly for indulging it, but it has seldom cost her more than when it drove Washington from her service and left in his mind a sense of indignity and injustice." Here and throughout the volume whatever is done amiss by the English Government, or even by an individual Englishman, is ascribed to "England," and given as a specimen of the character of the British nation. The biographer, we may remark in passing, lets the cat out of the bag with regard to the motives of Washington for joining the rebellion. Undoubtedly the order as to the relative rank of regulars and provincials was wrong; and yet in this very volume is abundance of proof that it was not out of unison with Colonial feeling. In the Revolutionary War, the Americans, as Mr. Lodge himself remarks, were always apt to give European officers rank above their own. Lee, for example, we are told was much overrated, because he was an English officer among a Colonial people. Presently we come upon this paragraph: "He (Washington) also made warm friends with the English officers and was treated with consideration by his commander. The universal practice of all Englishmen was to behave contemptuously to the colonists, but there was something about Washington which made this impossible. They all treated him with the utmost courtesy, vaguely conscious that beneath the pleasant, quiet manner there was a strength of character and ability such as is rarely found; and that this was a man whom it was unsafe to offend." Discourteous behaviour to colonists was the universal practice of Englishmen: in the instance before us they behaved with perfect courtesy; that, being Englishmen, they should have done right from right motives is impossible; therefore the only way of explaining their conduct is to assume that they were actuated by fear!

In unison with the last passage is one that comes a few pages further on, "Washington had grasped instinctively the general truth that Englishmen are prone to mistake civility for servility and become offensive, whereas if they are treated with indifference, rebuke, or even rudeness, they are apt to be respectful and polite." This, we presume, is the hypothesis on which Mr. Cabot Lodge treats Englishmen when he goes among them, and then he wonders if in some unguarded moment they betray a doubt whether he is perfectly charming. And this critic of character is himself a man of British name and blood, whose not very remote ancestor was an Englishman.

We commend to the notice of our readers the spirit and taste of the following passage, as well as its fitness for insertion in a work styling itself a history: "Rude contempt for other people, is a warming and satisfying feeling, no doubt, and the English have had unquestionably great satisfaction from its free indulgence. No one should grudge it to them, least of all Americans. It is a comfort for which they have paid, so far as this country is concerned, by the loss of their North American Colonies, and by a few other settlements with the United States at other and later times. But although Washington and his army failed to impress England, events had happened in the north, during this same summer, which were so sharp-pointed that they not only impressed the English people keenly and unpleasantly, but they actually penetrated the dull comprehension of George III. and his Cabinet. 'Why,' asked an English lady of an American naval officer, in the year of grace, 1887—'why is your ship named the Saratoga?' 'Because,' was the reply, 'at Saratoga an English general and an English army of more than five thousand men surrendered to an American army, and laid down their arms.' Although apparently neglected now in the general scheme of British education, Saratoga was a memorable event in the summer of 1777, and the part taken by Washington in bringing about this great result has never, it would seem, been pro-

perly set forth." How high-bred must have been the American naval officer who thus trampled on the feelings of an English lady, guilty of nothing but unaffected ignorance of an event which after all is more present to the minds of those who daily inflate themselves with Saratoga and Yorktown than to those of mankind at large! How generous, we may add, must be the historian who can record the act with applause! It was a pity that the English lady did not know the whole of the history as well as the part which the gallant American revealed to her, or which she might learn from Mr. Cabot Lodge. She would then have been able to remind the American of the circumstances under which, and the number of forces to which, Burgoyne was forced to surrender. She might also have reminded him of the violation, on a manifestly hollow pretext, of the Saratoga Convention, and have told him that it was as flagrant a breach of faith as any recorded in military history. "Jay," said Gouverneur Morris, as he and Jay sat smoking together thirty years afterwards, "what a set of d—d scoundrels we had in that second Congress!" "Yes," said Jay, "that we had," and he knocked the ashes from his pipe. That is the seamy side which swagger provokes us to turn outwards. It will not escape notice that Mr. Cabot Lodge, in the passage just quoted, admits by implication that the American Republic has allowed hatred of England to make her disregard justice in her "settlements" with Canada. The better class of his countrymen will thank him little for his eulogies.

Again, after recounting the lawless execution of the American Captain Huddy by a party of Loyalists commanded by Captain Lippincott, in retaliation for the execution of the Loyalist Philip White, this dignified and dispassionate historian proceeds, "The deed was one of wanton barbarity, for which it would be difficult to find a parallel in the annals of modern warfare. The authors of this brutal murder, to our shame be it said, were of American birth, but they were fighting for the Crown and wore the British uniform. England,

which for generations has deafened the world with pæans of praise for her own love of fair-play and for generous humanity, stepped in here and threw the mantle of her protection over these cowardly hangmen. It has not been uncommon for wild North American savages to deliver up criminals to the vengeance of the law, but English ministers and officers condoned the murder of Huddy, and sheltered his murderers." "England"—always "England," in order that the whole people may be enveloped in the odium, though Mr. Lodge must be well aware that the English people had nothing to do with the matter, and that if the mantle of protection was thrown over murder by anybody it must have been by the commanders on the spot. But we have only to turn the page in order to see that even as regards the commanders on the spot the statement is a calumny. "Sir Guy Carleton," says Mr. Lodge himself, "who really was deeply indignant at the outrage, wrote, expressing his abhorrence, disavowed Lippincott, and promised a further inquiry." More than this, Mr. Lodge must have had Sparks before him, and Sparks says, "In the public offices of London I was favoured with all the communications of Sir Henry Clinton and Sir Guy Carleton to the Ministry on this affair of Captain Huddy, and justice requires me to say that those commanders expressed the strongest indignation and abhorrence at his execution and used every possible effort to ascertain the offenders and bring them to punishment." The court-martial before which Lippincott was sent acquitted him of murder only on the ground that he had acted not from malice but in the belief that the Board of Directors of Associated Loyalists under whom he served had authority to give the order. A full account of the affair will be found in Sabine, an American and a descendant of Whigs, but a man of generous feelings and regardful of the truth. He justly condemns the execution of Huddy but does not say "England" protects cowardly murder. Outrages without number were committed on both sides, by Whigs as well as Tories, the responsibility for which rests on the perpetrators and on the fury of civil war.

Of course we have the old complaint, of the want of cordiality on the part of "England" towards the United States in the years following the Revolutionary War. Suppose there was a want of cordiality, did the Americans do nothing to provoke it? What has Mr. Lodge to say about the treatment of the Loyalists? What has he to say about the violent manifestations of hatred of England borne by every packet across the Atlantic? What has he to say to the popular reception of Genet and the arming by that Jacobin scoundrel of piratical cruisers against British commerce in American ports? When the British envoy complained justly, as Mr. Lodge cannot help admitting, of the injuries done his country under the American flag and with American sympathy and encouragement, what according to Mr. Lodge himself was the attitude of the American people? They were fêting and caressing Genet, cheering and applauding him wherever he went, welcoming him with ovations and receptions. "At Philadelphia he was received," we quote Mr. Lodge himself, "by a great concourse of citizens called together by the guns of the very privateer which had violated neutrality." These things England was to take as tokens of American goodwill and proofs of American perfection, which called for the utmost cordiality and for all sorts of compliments in response. Towards Washington who behaved with decency England did show cordiality in return, and the flags of the British fleet under Lord Bridport were half-masted at his death. This Hildreth mentions. Mr. Lodge admits Hildreth's trustworthiness: why did he suppress the fact?

A better spirit is rapidly prevailing over that of Elijah Pogram in American historians, and writers not a few worthy of their high calling have appeared, Mr. Parkman heading the list. But the improvement has not yet reached all American historians or biographers, and it certainly has not reached Mr. Cabot Lodge. A few Englishmen, we are sorry to say, still write in the same ignoble strain, but no author of mark is of the number,

—The “Franklin,” which follows “Washington” in the series of “American Statesmen,” is in a much better key. Its writer, Mr. John T. Morse, jr., is not far from the view which, as we believe, will prevail in the end, that the quarrel between the Mother Country and the Colonies was the consequence of a false situation, rather than of tyranny on the part of the Mother Country; that its immediate cause was far from being one which could justify a civil war; that there were faults upon both sides; that if the King was obstinate, there was also at Boston a party resolved from the beginning against reconciliation; and that the quarrel was in itself and in its consequences a deplorable affair. An American writer must be thoroughly open-minded and judicial who can say that Grenville, “in protesting that he was acting from a real regard and tenderness towards the Americans, spoke in perfect good faith, that his views both of the law and the reasons for the law, were intelligent and honest, that he had carefully gathered information and sought advice, and that he had a profound belief alike in the righteousness and the wisdom of the measure.”

Franklin's love of the Mother Country, which was intense is a conclusive proof that her government, though faulty, was not tyrannical; while the esteem in which he was held, and the respect with which he was treated in the highest English circles, shows that, though Colonial dependence necessarily involves inferiority and is a bad system on that account, the insolent contempt of the people of the Imperial Country for Colonists has been greatly overstated by American writers. Franklin was the man who could best have acted as mediator. He had begun in fact, to play that part, when there came the fatal incident of the stolen letters, followed by the disastrous scene before the Privy Council. Wedderburn is truly called by Mr. Morse one of the meanest of England's lawyers. He was one of the low Scotch adventurers, too common in those days, and twice his vileness brought great calamities on the country; once by estranging Franklin, and a second time by inducing the King to veto Catholic Emancipation. It must be



owned, on the other hand, that Franklin's conduct with regard to the letters could not well be defended in the court of honour, though it might be palliated by the patriotic motive; and it was specially offensive to the English gentlemen who though loose in their morals, and often politically corrupt, had still a keen sense of honour. However, it is more than doubtful whether even Franklin's mediation would have been effectual. Samuel Adams and his party, we take it, were resolved from the beginning on Independence. It is unlikely that any concessions would have ultimately availed.

Franklin's own idea of the connection between the Colony and the Mother Country was that it should be one not of dependence but of perfect equality. "An equal dispensation of protection, rights, privileges and advantages is what every part is entitled to and ought to enjoy, it being a matter of no moment to the State whether a subject grows rich and flourishing on the Thames or on the Ohio, in Edinburgh or Dublin." This, Mr. Morse calls a broad and liberal doctrine, and he is sorry that it could be accepted by no Englishman then living. It was however accepted by Adam Smith, who proposed that the Colonies should have a representation, and of course he meant a fair representation, in the Imperial Parliament. The objections to that plan were set forth by Burke, and on no other could there be real equality. If the Imperial Parliament was to be sovereign, it followed that the Colonies must be dependent. On the other hand, were the Colonies to contribute their proportion to Imperial armaments, and to shoulder their share of the debt which had been contracted for joint aggrandizement or defence? If they were not, and if the whole burden was to be thrown on the Mother Country, it could scarcely be said that the Mother Country enjoyed an equality of advantage and protection, 'Colonial self-government has a fair sound, but what does it mean, when carried fully into effect, except that the Imperial Country is to resign all its power and retain the whole of the responsibility? Into this arrangement we have now slid, but had it been definitely proposed a

hundred years ago it could scarcely have found acceptance with any British statesman. The relation of the Colonists to their Mother Country founded on the feudal notion of inde-feasible personal allegiance was from the outset radically false, and was pretty sure to end in some catastrophe, such as that which produced a schism in our race, and for a century has made the two sections of it strangers, if not enemies, to each other. A quarrel which was the work of evil destiny, all right-minded men will study to bury and forget.

—Mr. D. B. Read's "Life and Times of Governor Simcoe" (Toronto: Geo. Virtue) opportunely appears at a time when, after the fashion of youthful communities in the New World, our people are beginning to look forward to the first centennial anniversary of the founding of Upper Canada. Unluckily for the biographer, there is not much material to make a book, at least as regards Simcoe's administration of affairs in the Province. The author has therefore had recourse to the Governor's military career during the Revolutionary War, while in command of the "Queen's Rangers," that notable, irregular corps, part infantry, part light horse, which did the King good service in the war with the insurgent colonists, and, later on, furnished material for the loyalist settlement of Upper Canada. To those already familiar with Simcoe's narrative of his campaigns, in 1778-81, this portion of the work will lack the interest of a fresh story, though probably few possess the "Journal." What there is to relate regarding the beginnings of civil government in Upper Canada, Mr. Read has related. Even the section dealing with this subject, however, has had to be eked out with a review of the incidents connected with the passing in the Imperial Parliament of the Constitutional Act of 1791, which set apart Upper Canada from the old French Province. Beyond this, the chief local interest centres in the brief chapters dealing with the "First Parliament of Upper Canada" and the "Establishing of the

Capital at York." As a sequel to these, we have, at the close of the book, a chapter reciting the incidents connected with the "Governor's Last Days in Canada." The intervening portion of the work gives an account of tours in the Western Peninsula (to the Thames, a rival for the honours of the capital, and to Detroit), of the opening of communication inland from Lake Ontario, and of a visit to the Mohawks, to whose chief, Joseph Brant, the Governor paid the homage due to a brave and staunch ally of Britain. Mr. Read's work is a modest, painstaking narrative; all that was to be told it tells with soberness and truth.

—The "Protestant Episcopal Layman's Handbook" (Toronto: Hart & Co.) contains many smooth stones out of the brook which will be handy for any slinger whose mark is the High Church Goliath. The section on Bishops will be pleasant reading for the proud wearers of the mitre. On the whole, however, the list of Episcopal scandals is not long, and the worst belong to the times of general corruption, the Restoration and the middle of the last century. Perhaps the most startling of them is that of Blackburn, Walpole's "jolly old Archbishop of York," who "won more hearts than souls," and who was believed in his youth to have been associated with pirates. The Church of England narrowly escaped Sterne. The Duke of York, it is true, held the Bishopric of Osnaburgh, but this was a secularized See, while his Grace was certainly a highly secularized Bishop.

*Will be Published August 1st. Price, \$1.00.*

THE  
DARK CONTINENT  
AND ITS SECRETS:

A THRILLING RECORD OF

H. M. STANLEY'S  
EXPLORATION AND DISCOVERY

IN

**Equatorial Africa;**

INCLUDING THE NARRATIVE OF "HOW I FOUND LIVINGSTONE," AND THE  
GREAT AFRICAN EXPLORER'S RECENT

**Successful Search for Emin Pasha.**

TOGETHER WITH CHAPTERS ON THE CONGO FREE STATE, ON THE MAHDI'S  
REBELLION IN THE SOUDAN, ON THE SLAVE TRADE, AND  
ON MISSIONARY AND TRADE ENTERPRISE  
IN AFRICA, ETC., ETC.

COMPILED AND EDITED BY

**G. MERCER ADAM.**

---

WITH ILLUSTRATIONS.

---

**Toronto:**

ROSE PUBLISHING COMPANY.

1890.

# The North British Canadian Investment Company

(LIMITED)

---

CAPITAL SUBSCRIBED, £500,000 STG.

---

HEAD OFFICE:

54 *West Nile Street, Glasgow, Scotland.*

---

Chairman of the Advisory Board in Canada:

W. B. McMURRICH, Esq., Q.C.

---

## Money to Loan

At Lowest Current Rates and on the most favorable terms of  
repayment, on Improved Farm, Town and City Properties.

**Mortgages and Debentures Purchased.**

---

Apply to

**J. L. SCARTH,**

General Manager,

1 York Chambers

9 Toronto Street,

TORONTO