

A MONTHLY
REVIEW



THE BYSTANDER

OF
CURRENT EVENTS,
CANADIAN AND GENERAL.

NEW SERIES.

OCTOBER, 1889,
TO
SEPTEMBER, 1890.

Toronto:
HUNTER, ROSE & COMPANY.
1890.

F5000. B99 n.5 c.v.12

Entered according to Act of Parliament of Canada, in the year one thousand eight hundred and ninety (for the Proprietor), by GRAEME MERCER ADAM, in the office of the Minister of Agriculture.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
CANADIAN AFFAIRS .		Confederation, Australian and	
Affray Among the Dailies..	145	Canadian.....	348
Anti-British Feeling Among Canadians.....	87	Conflict in the North-West.	13
Attitude of Our Government on the Tariff.....	379	Constitutional Law.....	7
Australian and Canadian Con- federation	348	Copyright Legislation.....	68
Bank Reports and the Com- mercial Outlook.....	315	Corruption, Sir Richard Cart- wright on	85
Banks and the Government, The.....	187	Cost of the Parliament Build- ings	276
Benwell Murder, The... 227,	247	Depreciation in Farm Pro- perty.....	384
Book-Publishing, Question- able Methods of.....	2, 299	Detective Service, The.....	228
Canada, Sir Charles Dilke on	213, 268	Dilke, Sir C., on Canada..	213
Quarterly Review on..	284	Dissolutions, Parliamentary..	82
Canadian Art... 132, 270, 300,	335	Prerogative of.	289
and Australian Con- federation	348	Premature	380
Literature.. 71, 104,	136	Dual Language Debate, The	181
Nationality.....	77	in the North- West	140
Parties	18	Education Report, The.....	267
Railways.....	311	Effects of the Equal Rights Agitation.....	8
Cartwright, Sir R., on Cor- ruption.....	85	Equal Rights Movement... 1,	41
Chances of Escape from Party Government	276	on the Platform	275
Charlton, Mr., and the Ex- odus.....	185	In Society.....	163
Commercial Union.....	146	Events in Journalism.....	343
and Gen. Wilson ..	219	Exodus, The.....	
Situation, The....	382	and Mr. Charlton..	185
		Federations, Australian and Canadian....	348
		Possible and Im- possible.....	220
		Fisheries Question, The	284
		Flags on Public Schools, The	217
		Formation of Third Parties .	138

	PAGE		PAGE
Forest Destruction	316	Meredith, Mr., and Education	143
Franciscans, The.	345	Middleton, General, the Case	
Gentlemen Emigrants	228	of.	288, 318
Gresswell's Canada.	335	Parting Address.	388
Harvey Murder Case, The.	88	Military Anniversaries.	319
High Schools, The Ontario.	387	Mining, Report of in Ontario	282
Imperial Federation in The		Miracles in Quebec.	346
Senate.	178	Modern Language Associa-	
Independence and the Young		tion, The.	164
Liberals	177	Mormonism in the North-	
Jesuits Estates' Act, The.	5	West.	86
Journalism, Events in.	343	Mortgage Debt in Ontario.	385
Kingsford's Canadian History	170	Municipal Taxation in On-	
Large Farms in the North-		tario.	239
West.	56	New Native Industry, A.	212
Last Session, The.	278	North-West, Dual Language	140
Libel Suits	387	The Settling of.	224
Liberal Leadership, The.	141, 337	Representation.	225
Lincoln Election, The	286	and Manitoba.	111
Localism in Elections	245	Mormonism in.	86
Lorne, Lord, as a Novelist.	169	and the Tariff,	
Loyalty Resolution, The.	172	The.	34
Manitoba and the North-		Ontario, Contest in.	107
West.	3, 111	Elections.	305
and our Tariff.	211	Mining, Report of.	282
and Ottawa	322	Parties in.	191, 244, 342
Peopling of	285	Taxation in.	239
Political Awakening	347	Opening of the Session.	137
Politics in.	191	Parliament Buildings, Cost of	276
Railway Monopoly	87	Parliamentary Dissolutions.	82
School Bill.	226	Party Government, Chances	
Masson's North-West Fur		of Escape from.	276
Traders.	171	Parties in Ontario.	191, 244, 342
Mercier Banquet, The.	339	Peopling of Manitoba.	285
Mr., Recent Speeches	73	Politics in Manitoba.	191
Meredith, Mr., Position of.	142	Political Awakening in Mani-	
and the Contest		toba.	347
in Ontario.	107	Political Situation, The.	105
		Poole's Anglo-Israel.	134

	PAGE		PAGE
Possible and Impossible Fed- eration.....	220	Temperance Question, The..	48
Prerogative of Dissolution ..	289	Third Seat for Toronto, The.	343
Press, The, and the Benwell Murder.....	247	Third Parties, Formation of.	138
Priests in Politics.....	346	Titles of Honour.....	143
Professor of Philosophy, The New.....	165	Toronto Carnival, The.	349
Protectionism.....	279	—— Anglican Jubilee....	114
Prospects of Reciprocity.....	80	—— Growth of.....	113
Provincial Elections, The...	273	—— Magnates and the Esplanade	246
Public Parks	350	—— Third Seat for.....	343
Public School Expenditure..	317	—— University.....	206, 240
Quarterly Review, The, on Canada.....	284	Two Premiers, The.	341
Quebec Elections, The.....	308	Two Races, The.....	11
—— Miracles in.....	346	University, Burning of The..	206
Questions before the Country	1	—— Admission to....	206
Railway Monopoly in Mani- toba.....	87	—— Confederation..	39
Reciprocity.....	53, 80	—— Professorships...	40
Religious Toleration.....	44	—— Quarterly Review	254
Rideau Hall.....	221	Use of the Veto, The.....	83
Roman Catholicism v. Jesuit- ism.....	110	West Lambton Election, The	84
Rome and Education	15	Whither are We Tending?..	179
Royal Society of Canada, Meeting of	290	Wilson, General, and Com- mercial Union.....	219
Rykert Case, The	223	Women and the Medicoes, The.....	221
—— Letters, The.....	187	Young Liberals, The, and Independence.....	177
Salaries and Nepotism.....	386		
Senate, The, as a Political Reality.....	185	AMERICAN AFFAIRS :	
Separate Schools.....	17, 243	A Paradise for Workmen....	296
Settling The North-West...	224	An American on the French Revolution.....	61
Stanstead Election, The	109	American Elections.....	89
Sunday Street Cars.....	37	—— Nationalization...	308
Surrendering to the Papacy..	381	Anglophobia.....	367
Tariffs, The.....	241, 377	Behring Sea Controversy....	354
		Blaine's, Mr., Pan-American Congress	291
		—— Letter.....	310

	PAGE		PAGE
Brazilian Revolution, The...	123	War of Races in the South.	147
Business in Congress.....	351	Washington's Life, by Cabot	
City Government	250	Lodge	367
College Training.....	366	Wealth Accumulation.....	249
Conduct of the Americans...	24	Woman Suffrage in Wyoming	251
Cronin Verdict, The.....	123	ENGLISH AFFAIRS :	
Davis, Death of Jefferson...	119	Bye-Elections in England.	58
Degradation of Politics, The.	264	Catastrophe of Mr. Caine.	359
Divorce Question, The... ..	153	Cession of Heligoland, The..	324
Enfranchisement of Women.	116	Choosing a Leader.....	127
Fall of the Monarchy in		Churchill, Lord, the End of..	231
Brazil.....	90	Coleridge, Lord, and Journal-	
Federal Election Bill	352	ism	392
George's, Mr. Henry, Theory	158	English Politics. 21, 124, 252,	
Household Service.....	168	293, 356	
International Copyright....	299	Fox and Derby.....	326
Labour Disturbances.....	248	Gladstone and Pitt	23
McKinley Tariff, The.....	309	Imperial Federation. 58, 128, 294	
Millionaires.....	237	Industrial War in England... 198	
Morse's Life of Franklin....	373	Ireland and the Land Ques-	
Nationalization of Land.. 94,	236	tion.....	94, 151
"Our Infant Woollens"....	314	Ireland, Famine in.....	392
President's Message and Reci-		Labouchere and Salisbury... 230	
procity, The.....	118	Labour Disturbances.....	129
Prospects of Deadlock in the		London Docks Strikes	59
United States.....	293	Manning, Cardinal, and The	
Protectionism.....	33, 155	Strikes	153
Reciprocity.....	31	Mutinies in England.....	390
Silver Bill, The.... 292, 312,	353	Opening of the British Par-	
Tariff, The.....	209	liament.....	195
Three Americas, The.....	55	Parnell's, Mr., Change of	
Two Markets, The.....	33	Front.....	358
		Commission, Re-	
		port of.....	192

	PAGE		PAGE
Passion for Scandal, The..99,	131	THOUGHT AND OPINION :	
Perils of England.....	27	Admission to Universities....	206
Political Situation in Eng-		Agnosticism and its Practical	
land	91, 323	Bearings	259
Rosebery, Lord, on Imperial		Anglicanism and Rome.....	203
Federation.....	128	Anglo-Israel.....	134
St. Pancras Election, The... 229		Atheism and Public Morality	328
Salisbury, Lord, on Imperial		Browning, The Poet, and His	
Federation.....	58	Obscurity.....	261
Scandals in England, The.99,	131	Corson, Prof., on Shakespeare	404
Situation in England,The.91,	323	Cremation	238
<i>Times</i> , The, and its Enemies.	194	Criminal Class, The.....	396
Wolseley, Lord, Against War	360	Dante's Theology.....	330
EUROPEAN AND EASTERN AFFAIRS :		Dollinger, Dr., The Death of.	205
Australian Federation.....	295	Jesuit Morality.....	239
Bismarck, The Fall of.....	232	“Lux Mundi”	256
Crisis in France, The	236	Memoir of a Journalist....	266
Europe, The State of	148	Methodism and Priestcraft..	332
——— Monarchy in.....	149	Movements in the Churches .	102
European Affairs	362	Newman, Cardinal, Death of	400
——— War Cloud, The... 128		Papacy, The.....	204
First of May, The.....	296	Persecution, History of.....	100
France, The Crisis in	236	Presbyterian Revision.....	331
French Elections, The.....	61	Reform in the Family.....	365
——— Revolution, an Ameri-		Relations of Church and State	363
——— can on the.....	61	Religious Movements.....	201
German Emperor, The.....	297	Renan's Manifesto	63, 165
——— Socialism and the		Ruskin, John.....	402
——— Claims of Labour.	233	Shakespeare, Prof. Corson on	404
Monarchy in Europe,The149,	199	Social Absenteeism	97
Russian Atrocities, The..235,	298	Socialism, Spread of.....	394
What France Wants.....	298	Talleyrand's Memoirs.....	328
		Weissmann on Life and Death	166

	PAGE		PAGE
CANADIAN LITERATURE AND ART :		Lorne, Lord, as a Novelist ..	169
Art in Canada.....	270, 300, 335	Machar's "Stories of New France"	268
Blackstock's, Mrs., "Land of the Viking".....	72	Masson's North-West Fur Traders	171
Copyright Legislation.....	68	Ontario Mining Report.....	282
Dawson's Handbook of Geol- ogy.....	104	Poole's "Anglo-Israel".....	134
Dixon's "Border Clans"....	104	Pope's "Jacques Cartier" ...	269
Education Report for Ontario	267	Read's "Lives of the Judges" 136 — "Life of Governor Simcoe"	375
Gresswell's Canada.....	335	Royal Society of Canada, Meeting of.....	290
Kingsford's History of Can- ada.....	170	University Quarterly Review	254
"Layman's Handbook, A" ..	376	—————	
Literary Journalism in Can- ada.....	407	Bystander, A Protest by....	272
		————— Explanation by ..	302

THE BYSTANDER.

OCTOBER, 1889.

THE situation in the Press is just now singular. Our great Toronto dailies are struggling desperately with each other for existence on an area which is insufficient to support them on the scale of expenditure required in the present day for news, especially for telegraphic news. In these circumstances, there is little chance of a hearing for any cause which does not bring circulation and advertisements, still less for any cause which repels them. Till this conflict is over and the great organs of opinion are set free, the community may have some use even for a very small journal which has nothing, either in the way of commercial exigency or party connection, to restrain it from holding its own course, or bringing any question before the public.

—By the events of the last half year, three questions of the highest importance seem to have been presented in the clearest, most practical, and most urgent manner to our people. The first is, whether the political veto on Provincial legislation is a real power of control, or a nullity. The second is, whether religious equality is, or is not, a fundamental principle of our Commonwealth. The third is, whether there is any hope left of fusing British and French Canada into a united nation.

By a strange freak of destiny, Wolfe's victory seems not only to have been annulled, but to have brought about the

signal triumph of the vanquished. Left to itself, the feeble colony of the Bourbons would have been lopped by the Revolution from the parent tree, and in all probability would have perished. Conquered by England, it has been fostered into a French nation, which now has not only won back Quebec, but threatens to encroach indefinitely on the territory of the British race. The responsibility for this result rests partly on the weakness of the British Government, of which the last manifestation is the attitude of the present Governor-General; partly on Samuel Adams and the other Boston Revolutionists who, in their eagerness to declare Independence, seeing that Quebec had been wrested from France, would not wait till it had been made British; partly on our own factions which, bidding against each other for French and Catholic support, have played into the hands of our antagonists and consummated the process the other day by voting in unison for the Jesuits' Estates Act, and afterwards together relieving their uneasy consciences by singing "God Save the Queen."

The Jesuits' Estates Act was a blow, and a bold one, struck against the Conquest Settlement, and at the same time in favour of the sovereignty of the Pope, for the recognition of which the Nationalist leader is appropriately rewarded with a Papal order of merit. After their victory at Ottawa over British supremacy and Protestant right, the French held a triumphal festival on the day of their national saint, St. Jean Baptiste, and unveiled a monument in honour of the heroes of their French and Papal nationality, Jacques Cartier and the Jesuit Brébeuf. On that occasion, it was exultingly proclaimed that French Canadians would never cease to be French and Catholic; that, as the double monument bore witness, after a century of separation from their mother country, French as well as Catholic they were, French as well as Catholic they would remain. The Red and Blue of French Canadian parties were thenceforth, it was announced, to be merged in the tricolor. Pontifical Zouaves carried in religious procession a flag which had been borne in

battle against the British. The homage of the French Canadian nation was cabled to the Pope, and the Pope recognized the French Canadian nation by responding to the salute. Jesuit and Ultramontane journals joined the choir with editorials frankly avowing that the French nation stood apart from the British, that it had separate aims and a different ideal; in effect, that partnership between it and the British element there was none. Disheartening events these surely for Imperial Federationists! Disheartening events these surely for all who have cherished the hope that a mass of British Protestantism and a mass of French Catholicism, or rather of French Ultramontanism, can be fused into a Canadian nation. Lord Lorne was anxious, among other gifts, to provide us with a national hymn. Is the hymn to be in a dual language with opposite aspirations in alternate stanzas? In September, 1887, to do honour to the French frigate *Minerve*, the French flag was hoisted and the British flag was lowered on the Citadel at Quebec. We were bidden to believe that this was an accident. If it was, it was one of the most pregnant and ominous accidents in history.

We might have been prepared for this turn of events ever since aggressive Ultramontanism ousted quiet Gallicanism from the Church of Quebec; certainly ever since the Jesuit got the helm into his hands. Some years ago Abbé Gingras put forth a pamphlet in which, after glorifying the Dark Ages, justifying the Inquisition, asserting the right of the Church to over-rule the Civil power, and of the Clergy to interfere in elections, he described the necessary policy of French statesmen towards the Dominion as one of conciliation, more or less elastic, with a covert aim,—that is to say, the creation of a French and Papal nationality—in their minds. The history of Canada used in French Canadian schools breathes not French patriotism only, but antagonism to the British. It belittles their victories, exults in those of the French over them, presents them in an odious light, and accuses them of wishing to oppress French Canada as they oppressed Ireland

ascribing the deliverance to the priests. Of the existence of British Canada it scarcely takes notice. The seed thus sown in the heart of the young French Canadian has sprung up and borne its natural fruit.

We do not blame the French, much less do we desire to say a harsh or disrespectful word of a kindly and courteous race. What they have done an English colony would have done in their place. It was perfectly natural that as they found their numbers and strength increase, they should desire to cast off the ascendancy of the stranger and reverse the conquest. It was perfectly natural that they should take advantage of the weakness of the British Government and of its timorous tendency to court their good-will at the expense of those of whose allegiance it felt more sure. It was perfectly natural that, the political Sovereign being alien, they should accept the native priesthood as their leaders, the Pope as the supreme object of their allegiance, and that their nationality should thus provisionally assume, as it has, a theocratic form. But the fact and the situation have to be faced. Is Quebec to be in the Confederation but not of it, a nation apart, with designs and aspirations of her own, but at the same time ruling us by her compact vote, determining our policy and drawing, as she has drawn, upon our Treasury? Is she to bring up a million or more of our citizens and the electors of our Parliament, not only in the mental condition which priestly rule requires, but in paramount allegiance to the Church of the Jesuit and to a foreign power? Is she to carry on to the end a process of shouldering out the British and Protestant element, and to do what she likes with the remnant in the meantime? Sir Richard Cartwright lays it down that we have no more right to interfere with the action of Quebec than England has to interfere with the action of Canada. Do Canadians take part in electing the British Parliament? Does their delegation coerce the Government, and enforce the payment of tribute at Westminster, by staying out of the House till the last bell for a division has rung? By the help

of what remains of the old Bleu party an equivocal situation may be prolonged; but the time cannot be far off when we shall have to choose between a reassertion of the national control over Provincial legislation and a dissolution of partnership with Quebec.

Lord Durham feared that the day might come when the English of Lower Canada, to remain English, would have to cease to be British. He strove to avert that day by the Union of the Provinces which he thought would bring the French under the political ascendancy of the British. The measure might possibly have succeeded in the hands of a Royal Governor with full powers: in those of party politicians, bidding against each other for the French and Catholic vote, it was sure to fail. Moreover, changes adverse to Lord Durham's object have taken place. The legendary Frenchman who was to fire the last gun for British dominion belongs to the times when the dominant priesthood regarded with fear and aversion Revolutionary France as well as Puritan New England. New France is now reunited in heart to her mother country. Forces opposed to the ascendancy of the priesthood and to the national unity of which it is at present the organizing force and the bond may be at work; the French emigration into New England, if it becomes American and at the same time retains its connection with those who stay behind, may prove a conduit of disturbing ideas; the exactions of the Church may become intolerable to the peasantry; the educated classes may feel the effects of contact with the literary Liberalism of old France; but at present it appears that the combined national and sacerdotal movement of which Jacques Cartier and Brébeuf are the symbols is in the ascendant, and that its leader has the ball at his foot.

—The law points of the Jesuits' Estates Case must be left to lawyers, and the country is somewhat weary of that part of the discussion. We will not combat again the figment of a

cloud on the public title to the Jesuit property, as if there could be any cloud on the title of property which had passed to the Crown both by treaty and by escheat, and had been duly made over by it to the Province. The Minister of Justice admits that in the Preamble to the Act there were things "which might have been in better taste," in other words, that there was matter offensive to the feelings of the nation. For the excision of that matter, at all events, if the feelings of the nation had been thought entitled to any respect, the Act would have been remanded to the Quebec Legislature. Perhaps, however, wrong is done by this admission to the framers of the Act, who could scarcely have devised a more delicate way of asserting the two things which it was their object to assert, the abrogation of the Conquest Settlement and the supremacy of the Pope. The people have felt that, apart from all narrow technicalities, they have a broad right, if we are a nation, to resist the infusion at the public expense of poison into the national veins. They know what Jesuitism is, what it has done, what are its principles and aims, how the nations of Europe, even those which were most liberal and tolerant, have found themselves compelled to deal with it, and they are resolved that, at least, the State shall not implant and foster it here. They are resolved also that under no pretext will they be brought to recognize the supremacy of the Roman Catholic Church over the State or the ascendancy of a foreign power. They understand the majority at Ottawa, and see in it only a reason for trying to rescue the country from the domination of the Catholic vote.

The Governor-General says that there is no evidence before him to show that the Jesuits in the Dominion and in this nineteenth century are less loyal and law-abiding citizens than others. He has before him the Encyclical, which the Jesuit brings in his hand and which asserts the supremacy of the Church over the State and the right of the Church to use force for the imposition of her creed, thus directly contravening the organic principles of a Commonwealth founded on State supre-

macy and freedom of conscience. He has before him the claims of the clergy under Jesuit influence to interfere, against the law, in elections. He has before him the institutes of the Order, by which the Jesuit surrenders his judgment and his conscience into the hands of Superiors resident at Rome, whose commands supersede his duty to his country. He has before him the clauses of the Catholic Emancipation Act passed by his own Legislature, when "this nineteenth century" was twenty-nine years old, and the repeal of which no one would venture to propose, treating the Jesuits as dangerous to the State. He has before him the doings of the Jesuit since the beginning of the nineteenth century in Spain, Italy, Switzerland, France and Germany, and the action which the Governments of those countries have found themselves compelled to take in order to deliver themselves from his machinations. He must know well that what the Order of Loyola was in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries it is now; that its laws, its aims, and its means are unchanged; that it is the same in all dominions and countries as well as in all centuries; that its members are citizens of nothing but a world-wide conspiracy against liberty, light and human progress; and that if they accept the citizenship of a Protestant Commonwealth it is for the purpose of its subversion. Guy Fawkes had to be law-abiding till the time came for firing the train, and the Jesuit no doubt was law-abiding in Switzerland till the time came for kindling the flames of civil war. The very property which is given to the Jesuit he cannot hold. It is held, as Solicitor-General Weäderburn states in that opinion with which we should like to see the Minister of Justice deal, by an authority at Rome and may be used, and is very likely to be used, for the purposes of intrigue against the British power in China, Madagascar, or any part of the globe.

On the point of Constitutional Law the nation was surely entitled to the judgment after full and fair hearing of its own Supreme Court. Of this it had been deprived by devices of the kind which we are learning to regard as statesmanship,

and in giving effect to which the chair of the House of Commons was made to play a very sinister part. The case, it was pretended, could not be submitted to a legal tribunal when it had been before Parliament, as though it were the province of Parliament to decide a question of law. At last, instead of the judgment of our own Supreme Court, there is palmed upon us the opinion of the British Law Officers, who have no judicial authority in the matter, and who are politicians and members of the same party with Sir John Macdonald. An opinion is worthless without the case on which it is given; yet the case is withheld; and we are not even told by whom the opinion was sought. Is this the proper way to treat the nation? To speak of such an opinion as satisfactory or conclusive on any point is mockery; but after all the only point which it touches is the bare legal power of the Legislature of Quebec. It can in no way affect the main question, which is whether the political veto ought not to have been applied. The question raised by Mr. Macdougall as to the application of the consolidated fund to a religious purpose, is also apparently left untouched.

—One bright side, at all events, this controversy has. It has evoked a greater breadth of public sentiment on a question of principle, and outside the party lines, than anything since the Pacific Railway Scandal. For a time the Machines have been thrown out of gear, much to the dismay of the Machinists, and the moral interval would be a gain even if the agitation to which we owe it were far less reasonable and righteous than it is. The politicians flatter themselves that the storm will presently blow over, that this abnormal and scandalous outbreak of public morality will subside, and that we shall get comfortably back to the regular game of Political Euchre, of which the Right Bower is the Catholic vote. Their hope may be fulfilled. Party organizations are wonderfully strong, strong as usual in inverse proportion to their reason-

ableness, and the Shibboleths have extraordinary power. Otherwise, how should an inhabitant of Port Arthur be found giving a party vote for a tariff which keeps his minerals locked up in the bowels of the earth, and prevents his village from becoming a mining city? Yet it may be doubted whether things will again be exactly as they have been. They certainly will not if the Equal Rights Association continues in existence and maintains anything like its present strength. We do not despair of seeing some of the Machine veterans replaced at the next election by fresh men, such as a struggle of principle brings to the front. A better start than this great question affords, a political aspirant can scarcely desire.

An episode in the movement of special interest is the conflict in the Orange body, between the nobler element and that which is less noble. The Orange banner has so long been trailed behind the Catholic vote, in the service of political party, and by leaders whose aims are much more practical than those of the Deliverer, that instantaneous regeneration is not to be expected. But it is evident that at least the liegemen of place and patronage have no small difficulty in keeping the upper hand. If Orangeism cannot get its head out of the lap of Delilah and again do its first work, it ought, if it has any respect for the shades of the illustrious dead, to cease to take in vain the name of a hero. It is impossible that there could be two human beings with characters and aims more entirely opposed to each other than the Grand Master of a place-hunting organization and William of Orange.

The political veto of the Central Government on Provincial Legislation was justly designated by Sir Alexander Galt in his pamphlet on "Church and State," as the one sure guarantee for Protestant and civil rights and liberties in Quebec, without which the representative guarantee would some day "dissolve into thin air." The abandonment of that veto, and with reference to one of the very class of cases to which it was specially intended to be applied, by the Central Government, is plain notice to the Protestants of Quebec

that they are to be left without protection, and has apparently broken their slumber at last. Their apathy, which allowed the incorporation of the Jesuits to pass without protest, has hitherto been the weak point in the case. They have perhaps had the excuse of hopelessness, and also that of heavy pressure, since prominent opposition to the Church is visited on her part with penalties, to which philosophers who arraign Equal Rights men for intolerance would do well to turn their attention. A British farmer in the Eastern Townships may not unnaturally deem it better to decamp than to live in perpetual conflict with adverse influences, municipal and fiscal as well as social. The chiefs of commerce in Montreal, who would be the natural leaders of the British and Protestants, probably wish to make their fortunes undisturbed; their fortunes made, nothing ties them to Quebec. Montreal may find, however, indeed she has already begun to find, as would Belfast if Home Rule were conceded, that with a Catholic Legislature not only Protestant liberties but the Protestant strong-box is in peril.

—Fanaticism is the epithet brandished against the opponents of Jesuit incorporation and endowment by politicians who can themselves hardly debate the most trivial question of party politics without displaying fanaticism of the narrowest and most virulent kind. Some have even talked of persecution, though there has not been a whisper of desire to impose upon Roman Catholics or Jesuits a penalty or disability of any sort, or to prevent them from propagating their opinions, or, for that matter, their casuistry with the same freedom as is allowed to any other Church or sect. The battle is for civil right and for equality, and for these alone. The Church of Rome is not merely a body of spiritual opinion, organized opposition to which might be apt to contract the character of persecution or fanaticism; it is, and avows itself in the Encyclical to be, a temporal power using the sword, whenever it can

get the sword into its hand, to maintain and extend a sway which has brought it enormous wealth and power, and when it cannot get the sword into its hand, using for the same purpose intrigue and the votes of masses under its ecclesiastical command. Jesuitism is not merely a body of extreme spiritual opinion : it is a great social and political conspiracy, though in aid of ecclesiastical aggrandizement, which by its machinations has filled Christendom with blood and havoc, and has made for itself a record of evil more terrible than that of any worldly power of iniquity. It may be doubted whether Garibaldi, Mazzini, and the other European patriots in their mortal struggle with Jesuitism and the powers under its influence, ever thought of the theological peculiarities of the Jesuit, or even of his casuistical tamperings with morality. They saw in him only the arch-enemy of freedom, and the murderer of its friends. "A company of teachers and preachers," the Minister of Justice calls the Society of Loyola. He might almost as well apply the term to the troopers of the Catholic League, or the crews of the Armada. Were all the Liberal statesmen of Europe who combated and expelled Jesuitism, fanatics and slaves of religious hatred ?

Nor does the movement involve hatred of race any more than it involves hatred of religion. We, as a race, are trustees of a civilization of which the organic principle is liberty, political and religious. That civilization is being attacked by another race under the influence, unhappy, as we think, of the immemorial and inveterate enemies of the principle, which at the same time threatens to extend its borders at the expense of ours. We must defend our trust, and this may be done without any feeling against the race, and with a very lively conviction that the greatest boon which we could bestow on our French fellow-subjects would be deliverance from the dominion of obscurantism and the reactionary influence of the Medieval Church.

That the agitation is not, as the political managers of one party say, a plot against Sir John Macdonald, or as those of

the other party say a plot against Mr. Mowat, is disproved, if such absurdity need disproof, by the fact that ecclesiastical aggression of the same kind is provoking a similar reaction on the other side of the line. Mr. John Jay, the eminent publicist, and Bishop Coxe, of Western New York, are there saying precisely what the leaders of the Equal Rights movement are saying here. With legions recruited by masses of ignorance and superstition from her European domain, and armed with the American franchise, Rome is moving against American civilization. The Catholic *Telegraph* of Cincinnati says: "We hold the balance of power in the national elections, and, if united, control many State and municipal elections also." The first point of attack there as here is the school, and the attack is met there as here by what may be called an Equal Rights agitation for the abolition of all public grants for sectarian purposes, whether veiled under the name of "teaching and preaching," or under that of charity.

The issue of the conflict between Rome and modern society, which the Encyclical so boldly challenges, cannot, from our point of view, be regarded as doubtful. Nothing seems more certain than that the Papacy is dead at the root, though after so many centuries of ascendancy and when it has so completely entwined itself with all the fibres not only of religious but of political, moral and even æsthetic life in European Christendom, the process of dissolution must be slow. A spasmodic energy has been lent to it of late by the violent determination of power to its ecclesiastical head, which has produced the ascendancy of Ultramontaniam and the Jesuit, but is merely the proof of its loss of influence over the national governments. Its faith lingers only like the snow-wreaths of spring in the dark hollows of the hills, such as Calabria, Tyrol, Ireland and Quebec. Its only propagator, saving the Jesuit, is the Irish dispersion which itself in the second, or, at latest, the third generation, falls away. Nevertheless, its forces on this continent are formidable; its organization is immensely strong; it is favoured to a fatal extent by the

emulous servility of the factions, and before it succumbs it may give our civilization a very bad quarter of an hour.

—Not nationality only, but extension of their nationality, is the aim of the French, some of whom see glorious visions of a French and Papal Empire in North America. On Eastern Ontario they are encroaching apace, introducing their language into the public schools, and with it their ecclesiastical system. Party has opened the door for them and will probably continue to hold it open, while our commercial system by expatriating the British farmer makes room for the Frenchman, whose standard of living is much lower. The French begin to demand representation in the Ontario Cabinet, and their claim apparently will soon be backed by numbers which the politicians will be unable to resist. It is difficult to foresee the end of this process.

The scene of the conflict now shifts to the North-West. Thither also, as we have good reason to know, the aspirations of the French Nationalist extend. Riel's first rebellion, unlike his second, was practically a success. With the aid of Sir George Cartier it gave the French the recognition of their nationality, the dual language, and Separate Schools. Upon this basis and operating from St. Boniface as their stronghold, they have been trying to wrest from the British the future of the North-West. The energies of one able and active priest are devoted to the promotion of French immigration, which is organized with the aid of Church funds. But in Manitoba the stars in their courses fight against the enterprise as manifestly as they fight for it in Quebec. The number of the French Catholics is small, and they are being swamped by the inflow of the English-speaking race, whose tongue the other fractions of nationalities, such as the Mennonites and Icelanders, gradually adopt. It happens moreover that for the present the chief instrument of their aggrandizement has fallen from their hands. The British have been united by the struggle for railway

emancipation against the Ottawa government and the C. P. R. Sir John Macdonald, by the course which he has taken, has annihilated his party, and the Opposition in the Local Legislature is literally reduced to a corporal's guard. The French have thus ceased to hold the balance of power, there being no balance of power to hold, and can no longer play the game of hovering between the parties and compelling both to obey their will. To complete their misfortunes, it appears that at the critical moment they have encountered a strong man. Against the dual language a blow has already been struck, and war has been declared against the Separate Schools. But to abolish the Separate Schools the Manitoban Act must be amended: the only other course at least is the awkward one of stopping the grant to the schools; and the question is thus likely to come before the Dominion Parliament, and to test the zeal of the Liberals for local liberties and their power of adhering to principle in defiance of the Catholic vote. Will those who have voted that the Roman Catholic and Jesuit Legislature of Quebec shall be allowed to tax Protestants in aid of a conspiracy for the subversion of their own religion, turn round and vote that the people of Manitoba shall not be allowed to adopt Equal Right as the principle of their system of public instruction?

For Separate Schools there was perhaps a plea when Roman Catholic disabilities, having been but recently removed, and the religion being still in some measure under social proscription, there might be reason to apprehend want of respect for the faith of a Catholic pupil. There can be no plea now when all such danger is past, and thousands of Roman Catholic children are being brought up in public schools without any complaint on the part of their parents. It is not from the parents indeed that these complaints come; it is from the priests. The priest desires that the child shall be brought up as a liegeman of the Church. The State contends that he shall be brought up as a citizen of the Commonwealth, though without prejudice to his faith or his Church-membership; and upon this issue is joined, alike in the United States

and here, indeed wherever Rome is struggling to create her empire within the empire and above the empire of the State. Since the removal of any special danger to the faith or self-respect of Catholics, there can be no tenable plea for the concession of privilege to any particular Church. If Roman Catholics are entitled to Separate Schools, Episcopalians, Presbyterians and Methodists are entitled to them also. The only assignable ground for the special claim is that Roman Catholics alone have a religious conscience to be respected, and the rest are mere heretics. This, a free-spoken ecclesiastic, like the Bishop of Kingston, sometimes gives us pretty plainly to understand. But it is a plea which the State cannot for a moment entertain.

What the real tendencies of the Church of Rome are, with regard to popular education, we learn from its condition in the countries where she has had things entirely her own way, such as Spain, Calabria, Sicily, Brittany, the Roman Catholic Provinces of Austria, and the Spanish Colonies in South America before their emancipation. The Jesuit himself, though a professed educator, did little or nothing for the education of the people. He confined himself almost entirely to the children of the rich and powerful, or to those destined for the priesthood; and in dealing with these his real object was not to enlighten, but to cure, by intellectual vaccination, the pestilential desire for light. It is only where she is threatened by Protestant rivalry that the Church of Rome becomes so anxious about schools. A Canadian politician who subsists upon French votes, writing to the London *Times* the other day, did not want the effrontery to assert that more liberal provision was made for popular education in French than in British Canada. Massachusetts, it appears, reports that among the French immigrants, who are pretty sure not to be the least active-minded and intelligent of their race, there are 13,319 illiterates to 3,913 who can read and write. Arthur Buies, in *La Lanterne*, cites a correspondent who has held high office and has lived in a rural district in the French Pro-

vince for forty years. This correspondent deposes that among men between twenty and thirty you will not find one in twenty who can read, or one in fifty who can write. "They will tell you," he says, "that they went to school from seven to fourteen, but that they have forgotten all they learned. This all, what was it? We may judge from the fact that the teachers are for the most part young girls taken from the convents, because they are too poor to pay their pupil's fee, and with a salary of from ten to twenty louis a year." This description is confirmed by the testimony of all who have lived among the *habitans*. Even the mayor of a town, trustworthy informants tell us, is not always able to write. But perhaps as signal a proof of the general ignorance as any is the performance of miracles, which goes on with unabated success and with immense profit, material as well as moral, to the Church at Ste. Anne de Beaupré. Why are no miracles performed in Ontario and New England? It was rash in a Protestant divine to undertake to prove in theological tournament that the Church of Rome teaches that the end justifies the means. Even Iago does not chalk his principles on the walls of Cyprus. But as some at least of the higher ecclesiastics are educated men and exempt from vulgar illusions, it would not be difficult to show that in countenancing the miracles of Ste. Anne de Beaupré, Knock, and Lourdes, as well as the miraculous liquefaction of the blood of St. Januarius, and the exhibition of the House of Loretto, or the stairs of Pilate, to multitudes of dupes who pour money into the coffers of the Church, they must at least be acting on the principle that means the most equivocal are justified by an end which to them seems to be good. It would be presumptuous in us to undertake to save the French of Quebec against their will; but from our point of view, at all events, we must repeat we are not displaying hatred of them by relaxing the grasp of a Church which not only devours their substance and grows inordinately rich, while they are very poor, but keeps them in the darkness which priestly rule and thaumaturgy everywhere require.

—When Separate Schools are abolished we shall have to face the difficult question whether the Bible is to be used in schools. So far as the mass of the community is concerned, morality is still based upon religion, and to read the Bible, or at least the New Testament provided that no sectarian dogma is introduced, is merely to teach children the received ethics. Where the people are unanimous in desiring that the Bible should be read, there can surely be no reasonable objection to the practice. But when anybody objects, it would seem that our principle requires us to respect the objection. It may come and is likely to come, as we have said, from the priest rather than from the parent. A parent is not very likely of himself to object to the reading of a plain ethical portion of the Gospel or a simple parable, because the Douay Version is not used. But it avails little to scrutinize the motive of the objector if he is only exercising his right. We must fall back for religious instruction on the Sunday School. Let our system be founded in righteousness, though it be in some measure to our own hindrance.

Is it just to compel those who choose on religious grounds to pay for Separate Schools for their children, also to pay school tax for the Public Schools? The case of these people is not harder than that of the rich who do not use the Public Schools, or that of the childless who have no use for schools at all. It is not harder than that of the man with one child, who is made to pay for the schooling of the children of his neighbour with six. The whole system is based on the political necessities of a democracy which, without it, would be governed by total ignorance. We do not ourselves profess to rejoice above measure in an arrangement which legally supersedes the duties and responsibilities of the parent in regard to education by the action of the state. Nor do we fail to mark the difference between the original common school of New England which, the community being so small and its members so well acquainted with each other, must have been essentially parental, though on a joint-stock plan, and

the present State machine. But the political necessity is paramount, and as all equally share the political benefit, it is consistent, at any rate with rough justice, that all should equally pay. The political benefit, however, ought to be secured, and it can be secured only by an educational qualification for the franchise. This might be enforced either by the presentation of a certificate of attendance at an authorized school—and private schools might be authorized for this purpose—or by requiring the applicant to prove to the Register his ability to read and write. Every man has by nature a right to justice and fair treatment at the hands of the community and its government. But the notion that every man has by nature a right to political power, whether there is any chance or none of his using it for the benefit of the community and himself, whether he knows anything or knows nothing about the questions on which he is to vote, must be relegated to that limbo near the moon to which reason has now sent the Jeffersonian generalities of the preamble to the Declaration of Independence. Mechanics are generally supposed to be the revolutionary class; yet we never happened to fall in with an intelligent mechanic who refused to admit that political power is a trust, and that to be allowed to exercise it a man ought to be capable at least of informing himself about the questions which are to be decided by his vote.

—Speculation as to the prospects of Canadian parties is little in THE BYSTANDER'S line. We are of the number of those who look forward to the day when the reign of party will cease, when governments instead of being partisan will be national, and when this perpetual civil war of intrigue, calumny and corruption, which some people take for an ordinance of Heaven, will acquit Heaven by coming to an end. The party system is almost everywhere in a state of pronounced disintegration; parties are almost everywhere split-

ting into sections, none of which are capable of supporting a government. In the British House of Commons there are now at least five sections, and government is carried on only by a precarious coalition of two of them. In France, amidst the chaotic strife, no administration can live, and the people in despair turned their eyes to a circus-rider who promised to redeem them from anarchy. Such at least we take to be the solution of the Boulanger enigma. If the Canadian Government seems to be an exception, and to be comparatively stable, its stability has been secured by means which have entailed, to a deplorable extent, the political corruption of a people naturally as well fitted for free institutions and as worthy of them as any people in the world. It is vain to attempt prediction till there has been time to measure the staying power of the Equal Rights movement, and to see how it will affect the party organizations. Each of the two is threatened with a revolt, the Conservatives with that of the Orangemen, the Liberal with that of Liberals who are determined to keep the Liberal faith undefiled, and not to be dragged into alliance with priestly domination and reaction. The Liberal leaders are probably by this time aware that by supporting the Jesuit Act in the manner they did, they played into the hands of their enemy. Supposing that they felt themselves bound by the extreme theory of Provincial Right, into which they had been drawn by their antagonism to the party in possession of the central power, and hampered by the fatal connection with Rielism, into which shallow intrigue had seduced them, they ought surely in giving an equivocal vote to have taken care to found it on the special reason and to keep their general principles free from stain. They ought surely to have made it clear that they had no fellowship with Jesuitism or ecclesiastical aggression, that they were true to religious equality, and that they regarded with respect and sympathy feelings and fears identical with those which had been displayed, in a more extreme form, by all the Liberal statesmen of Europe. It was their duty also, we venture to

think, even in their character of professed Home Rulers, to insist firmly on the right of the nation to have a question of constitutional law tried by its own Supreme Court. Instead of this, they flung themselves into the arms of the Government, lauded the speech of the Minister of Justice, which was nothing but a sophistical representation of the whole transaction, its history and the motives of those engaged in it; and allowed a body of their friends, considerable both in numbers and in weight of character, to feel that they were treated as fools and fanatics. One of them afterwards went further and displayed his superior philosophy in a highly offensive speech. Preternaturally shrewd as they are within a certain range, politicians often strangely fail to take the measure of public feeling. To Reciprocity, we presume, the Liberals mean to adhere. Their leader embraced it late and with apparent hesitation, but he embraced it, and has since been faithful to it. If this is not their platform they have no platform at all, and the next general election will once more see them fall before a Machine management superior to their own, and provided with a great fund of corruption to which they have no clear and popular policy to oppose. Disaster will teach them that they can have no moral or sound alliance with anything in Quebec, except the party, whether Protestant or Rouge, which aims at bringing the Church under control, repressing her political aggression, putting an end to her reactionary influence on popular education, arresting her absorption of wealth, and setting the people free from her imposts.

Any day may of course see the scene changed by the retirement of the aged leader of the Tory party, and the dissolution of a fabric built not on principle, but on a personality, which, as everybody says, must ensue. Sir Charles Tupper has judiciously retired to a distance from any cabals which may be going on about the succession. If a vacancy occurred he would be called, and there can be little doubt that he would listen to the voice of duty. He will find it difficult, however, to gather the wires into his hands. He may even

find, if these agitations go on, that the revival of public morality has seriously impaired the Machine.

—From the other side of the water the great news is that our Mother Country has apparently escaped dismemberment. Disunion is at a discount; Radicals keep it in the background at the elections; and the fountain of its money supplies is ceasing to flow. Everyone who had studied Ireland knew that the political question was little, and the agrarian question almost all, so that if the agrarian agitation could be allayed the political agitation would subside. The Irish peasant would care no more for a Parliament than for a metaphysical treatise or a theodolite if he had not been told that it would give him the land. O'Connell's Repeal movement ended in nothing but the payment of Repeal rent to O'Connell, that of Smith O'Brien ended in the cabbage garden. It will have been remarked that the political agitators while they preached agrarian plunder have been by no means anxious to promote land law reform. For the present the Union is safe, and we may rejoice, apart from any narrow or selfish pride of Empire, as Englishmen, in the preservation of the centre and the heart of our race; as men, in the preservation of what all the best minds of Europe acknowledge to be a great power of good. There is not a true Liberal in Europe who does not think that humanity would suffer by the victory of savagery and superstition over British civilization, who wishes to see Ireland made over to a Papal Parliament, or imagines that the cause of Pontifical Zouaves is the cause of freedom. The escape was narrow. Even a few days before the division on that motion of Mr. Gladstone, by which, it is idle to doubt, had it been carried, Ireland would have been severed from her sister island, the Unionist leaders expected to be beaten by sixteen. Yet Mr. Bright spoke the truth when he said that there were not more than twenty men in the House outside the Irish party who were sincerely in favour of the motion. All the

rest voted for the dismemberment of their country under the pressure of the party screw applied by Mr. Gladstone, through Mr. Schnadhorst. Such are the dangers with which, even in such a country as England, where most of the public men are too rich to care for patronage or pelf, party threatens not only the good government but the very life of the nation. For, we repeat, no man of sense can doubt that a separate Parliament given to Ireland in the present mood of the people would mean complete separation, and not only complete separation, but the conversion of Ireland into a hostile power, intriguing with all the enemies of Great Britain, and threatening her with war from Irish ports.

Mr. Gladstone has lost control over the Radicals, who have set up an organization and a whip of their own. As he recedes from the scene let it be said that the charge against him is not that of inconsistency, to which it is generally a good answer to say that a man who never changes his mind can have no mind to change. That with which he is charged and will forever stand charged in history is having turned round on a vital question, and brought his country into the extremity of peril for the sake of the Parliamentary majority which was necessary to carry him back to power. For nearly fifty years he had been in public life; during a great part of that time he had been in office; he had been constantly called upon to study, often to deal with, the Irish question. Does anybody believe that all this light about the iniquity of the Union, the infamy of the means by which it was obtained, the villany of Mr. Pitt, whom he had before lauded for that very act, the blessings to Ireland of an independence, which he had before declared would be the renewal of internecine war between religious factions, and the iniquity of coercion, which he had been carrying on in its most stringent form, dawned upon his mind at the moment when he found, after the general election, that he would not have a majority without the Parnellite vote? Does anybody believe that at that precise moment boycotting ceased in his eyes to "have murder for its sanction,"

“the steps of the League” to be “dogged by crime,” and Mr. Parnell to be “wading through rapine to dismemberment?” In his despair at the loss of power, and his rage against his country for rejecting him, he plunged into a course of what, in a man instructed as he is and trusted by the State as he has been, can only be designated as political crime. He stirred up Provincial hatred and hostility to the Union not in Ireland only but in Scotland and Wales. He laboured with malignant energy to set the masses against the classes, pointed out the learned and scientific professions to popular hatred, and put forth a false version of political history to show that intelligence had always been the enemy of justice. He has traduced the country before the whole world, exposed her to the hatred and scorn of foreign nations, and defiled with rabid calumnies the memories of her foremost statesmen. He has stimulated sedition, countenanced resistance to the law, and held the Government up to execration for repressing outrage by measures far less severe than he was himself but yesterday employing for the same purpose. All this he has done on the pretext that the Government would not pass a measure of Home Rule, while he steadfastly refused, avowedly on strategical grounds, to say what was the measure which he wanted Government to pass. Having been the devout champion of Church Establishment, not on ordinary grounds of policy, but on the high ground of divine obligation, he now holds out Disestablishment as a bribe to the dissenters for supporting his Irish Policy. What was the coarse corruption of Rigby and Sandwich to this? There is hardly such a moral fall in history. The only excuse is the blind self-worship bred by constant adulation, and that excuse Mr. Gladstone must share with characters in history to associate him with whom in his better and happier hour would have been profane.

Mr. Gladstone's last charges against Pitt, it seems, are that of provoking rebellion in Ireland to pave the way for Union, and that of holding out to the Irish Catholics Emancipation as a lure, while he well knew that George III. would refuse to

grant it. Both charges are baseless. Pitt had faults, but he was thoroughly honourable, and incapable of even contemplating for a moment the tortuous and infamous courses which seem to suggest themselves to the mind of Mr. Gladstone. He would have been mad if, in 1798, he had wilfully added to all the perils by which he was encompassed, that of an Irish rebellion, accompanied, as it was sure to be, by a French invasion. What Irish factions may have done to each other is a different question. Pitt neither belonged to nor sympathized with any Irish faction. For the second charge, there is not a particle of evidence, nor has it the shadow of probability. George III., though very narrow-minded, was not so great a bigot as is assumed. He always expressed his dislike of the uncharitable dogmatism of the Athanasian Creed by refusing to stand up when it was read; he spoke with respect and sympathy of the Methodists, and what is more, there is reason to believe that on the Catholic question he had been touched by the noble reasonings of Burke. But at the fatal moment, the Chancellor and two Archbishops crept to the King's ear and persuaded him that by consenting to Pitt's measure he would break his Coronation oath, thus forfeiting his title and that of his family to the Crown. This neither Pitt nor anyone else, except the plotters, could have foreseen. The mischief was mainly done by the Chancellor's betrayal to the King of a confidential letter written by Pitt. Perhaps Mr. Gladstone would say that Pitt wrote the letter, foreseeing that his confidence would be betrayed. Pitt gave the most decisive evidence of his good faith by laying down power at once and, as it then appeared, forever. If only that commanding figure could rise for a moment opposite to his accuser in the House of Commons, self-righteousness might stand rebuked before patriotism and honour.

—Nothing can have been more ignoble or more disheartening to the friends of popular government than the con-

duct throughout this Irish business of the public men and the Press in the United States. Their hypocrisy is manifest. If they are animated by this burning hatred of coercion, why do they not show it when Russia coerces Poland, when Germany coerces Posen and Alsace-Lorraine, when Italy coerces Sicily, when Austria proclaims a state of siege in some province which is restless under her rule? Why is their philanthropy confined to Ireland, and their righteous indignation concentrated on Great Britain? When the Irish in New York rose against the draft, which they had as good right to resist as they have to resist payment of their debts, Americans massacred them without mercy and without remorse, nor have they been sparing of the halter for Molly Maguires. Congress and the State Legislatures have committed what they must all have known to be flagrant breaches of international right and courtesy, by passing resolutions of sympathy with disaffection in another and a friendly nation; not only the Fisheries Treaty but the Extradition Treaty has been rejected without a pretence of honourable reason; the laws of diplomatic courtesy have been broken by the rude and abrupt dismissal of a British Ambassador; an acting President of the United States has accepted a nomination in terms pledging him to impertinent interference in the affairs of a foreign country; a President elect has signed an address justifying outrage in Ireland; a Senator, and one of the highest moral pretensions, has palliated the Phoenix Park murders; honour has been refused to the memory of John Bright, the foremost champion of the Republic in its darkest hour; even the laws of good manners have been violated by those to whom they were not unknown, while day by day the Press has fed the maw of malignity with envenomed falsehood. All this under the tyrannic lash of the Irish vote. Was it worth while to rebel against George III. if the end was to be such a bondage of the national soul as this? An Eastern slave bows his head, not his conscience, and he is at least sincere in reverence of his Sultan. Mr. Gladstone is always appealing to what he

calls tributes of American sympathy. The tributes extorted by the Irish vote are as Irish as if they were penned at Cork. However, the revolt has begun. The murder of Cronin has lifted the veil which hid the features of the Clanna-Gael. American citizens moreover of British or Canadian origin have at last seen the duty and the wisdom of being naturalized, and are being naturalized in numbers which will soon begin to counterbalance the Irish. They are not going to form another anti-national, unpatriotic, plotting and plundering clan in American politics; but they will make it an unsafe trade for the political sycophant to trample on the feelings of his British or Canadian fellow-citizens.

But can Canada cast the first stone at American politicians? Did not Canadian Legislatures, Federal and Provincial, pass resolutions of sympathy with the cause of disunion in Great Britain just as unwarrantable as the American resolutions, and under precisely the same influence? Did not the Tory leader begin the game? What was the form of the resolutions signifies little; they were moral aid lent to the deadly enemies of the Mother Country in the attempt to dismember her, and tributes to the Irish vote. They went into the fund of rebellion with the manifestoes and the money of the Clanna-Gael. A stand was made at last, but it was not made by the holders of titles, or by people who had been at Court, and scanty was the aid or encouragement that it received in high social quarters. Those who, from hope of gaining or fear of losing a vote, helped to strike or refused to aid the Mother Country in her peril, may talk as superciliously as they please of the loyalty of those who did their best for her in that hour of peril. Their censures will be lightly borne.

In one way Canada has aided the Unionists. She has furnished them with a warning example. The Jesuits' Estates Act and the fiscal legislation of Quebec teach England what the uncontrolled rule of a Roman Catholic majority would be in Ireland; the total collapse of the political veto shows what will be the value of a similar veto as a restraint on the Sep-

aratist action of an Irish Parliament ; while our whole position is a lesson on the difficulties of that Federal system which Home Rulers so lightly propose as the simplest of all possible solutions. Quebec, though alien, was not so hostile to her British partners in Confederation as Ireland would be ; yet to keep her in harmony with the rest of the Dominion and stave off disruption is at least no easy task.

From peril of dismemberment the Mother Country has, for the present at least, escaped. Not only is Home Rule virtually withdrawn, but the Radical party is in disarray and is looking about in vain for a leader, Mr. Bradlaugh, its strongest man, being socially disqualified, and the choice, apart from him, lying between an opportunist who smiles at principle, a literary Jacobin, and a jester. The Government is still strong, notwithstanding some of the losses which are the usual fate of governments at bye-elections. Yet clouds rest upon the future. At the last general election the country was saved by a combined and desperate effort of all who did not wish to see her dismembered, the energy of men and classes usually timid or apathetic being evoked by a great and definite peril. But the next general election will be a time of trial. The fate of the country will be largely in the hands of three masses of voters to whose action no one can look forward without the greatest misgiving—farm labourers, excellent in their calling, but as ignorant as children of all public questions, who vote simply for their bread and cheese, and are open to the wildest illusions as to the direction in which their bread and cheese are to be found ; factory hands, many of whom are denationalized, and think much less of the country than of the labour market, while not a few of them are the prey of socialistic chimeras ; and Irish peasants who, though little interested in political questions themselves, will probably continue blindly to vote for political leaders hostile to Great Britain. By that time, too, the professional politician, whom the advent of democracy has brought with it, will have had time to work, and the professional always gets the better of the amateur. It

would not be surprising if the Local Government Act, by warming local demagogism and wirepulling into life, should shake the ascendancy of the Conservatives in the metropolis which has hitherto been their stronghold.

—On the cause of Commercial Union, or of freedom of trade with our own continent, whatever people may choose to call it, a shadow has been cast by a notable defection. The reason tendered is the rejection of the scheme by the Americans which is supposed to have been signified at a fish dinner by the mouth of Senator Hoar. Senator Hoar's utterance has since been drowned by the evidence taken before his own Committee at Boston which, in unison with the deliverances of the Chamber of Commerce of New York, and all other commercial bodies which have been approached, shows that commerce in the United States is desirous of the extension of trade relations with this country. The last formal expression of American opinion on the question was a resolution which passed both Houses of Congress, with only one dissentient voice in the Senate, in favour of Commercial Union. What the policy of the new Administration upon the question will be we cannot yet tell: very likely the new Administration itself does not yet know. We can only say that there seems to be nothing in Commercial Union which disagrees, but on the contrary everything which accords, with the interest of the Republican party in its present situation. The Protectionists, who are in the ascendant in that party, must see that in spite of the victory which they so narrowly gained, and gained by such desperate expedients, at the last election, their position is anything but secure; they must understand that the increase of the mechanics' vote in favour of Free Trade shows that the mechanics are beginning to doubt whether Protection means high wages; and they must know that unless the nation has fallen into its dotage they will not be allowed to go on baling out surplus revenue in army pensions at a rate exceeding the cost of the great

standing armies of Europe. Had Mr. Cleveland gone to the country on the general principle which he at first propounded that no government has a right to take from the people more than the public service demands, instead of challenging, as he did by the Mills Bill, the hostility of a number of special interests which were sure to fight him with the fury and the unscrupulousness of despair, it is not unlikely that he might have won. In these circumstances a policy which would at once reduce surplus revenue and extend American trade ought to be welcomed by the Republicans as a signal gift of fortune to their party. But we must wait patiently till Congress meets. The Americans, whom our alarmists suppose to be always coveting our territory and forming sinister designs against us, have in fact slept on the Canadian question for many years. Since the fall of Slavery and the termination of the slaveholder's effort to increase his political power by extension at the South, the Free States have had no motive for seeking a counter-extension at the North; and that the Americans do not desire extension of territory for its own sake, their rejection of St. Domingo, which laid itself at their feet, and their refusal to avail themselves of the opportunities which they have had of annexing Mexico, are sufficient proof. Fully to awaken them takes some time, and is a slower process in the case of the Middle and Southern States than in the case of those on the Northern border. Nor would anybody deny that there are on the side of the Americans, as well as on our side, narrow and selfish interests opposed to the general good, and evil spirits who, either in the interest of monopoly or for the gratification of their personal propensities, are always trying to sow hatred between two sections of the English-speaking race, which, whatever destiny may have in store as to their political relations, must have the closest relations of all other kinds with each other, and depend largely for their common wellbeing on their mutual good-will. It is not the least unhappy part of Protectionism that the monopolist is tempted to cultivate hatred of the nations whose goods he desires to ex-

clude. Political ambition, also, and diplomatic broils may thwart, as they often have thwarted, measures essential to the material welfare of the people. All this, and any other untoward accidents that may occur, must be borne and will be borne patiently and hopefully by those who have no pressing necessity for votes, if they are convinced that admission to our natural market by the removal of the tariff wall would enable us to enjoy the measure of prosperity which nature has intended for us, secure to our industry its just earnings, and bring increase of wealth, comfort and the domestic happiness which attends them into Canadian homes.

As to the state of opinion on this side of the Line it is idle to throw out assertions which cannot at present be brought to a decisive test. All that we can say is that Commercial Unionists believe that in spite of political impediments and false appeals to sentiment, the desire for free admission to the markets of our own Continent is steadily making way among all who are interested in the great natural industries of the country. Those who go among the farmers of Ontario report that the literature which, since politics have unhappily become mixed with the commercial question, has been preferred as a missionary agency to public meetings, is largely read and is doing its work. The North-West, saving Government officials, is a unit upon this question and would be blind indeed if it were not; for the folly of the struggle against Nature is most glaring where nothing but an artificial line separates those whom she has bidden and whom Government forbids to trade. Nothing has prevented the people of Manitoba from moving, but the necessity of giving their undivided attention to the removal of Railway monopoly, from which they are now happily set free. The commercial opposition is almost entirely confined to those manufacturing firms, which believing, rightly or wrongly, that they cannot manufacture as well and as cheaply as the Americans, deem Protection necessary to their existence. The Red Parlour, in short, is the Opposition; and though the Red Parlour is strong in union, in the sinews

of political war, in its control over the Government, to whose election fund it contributes, and in its control over the organs of public opinion which look to it for advertisements, it is not the country, nor can it forever prevent the real interest of the country from being understood. In the Dominion Parliament Reciprocity has been adopted as the platform, and indeed is the sole platform, of a party which, though it represents much less than a moiety of the seats, represents nearly a moiety of the population. Even the Government, bound up as it is with the interest of the Red Parlour, shows signs of misgiving with regard to a commercial policy, which its chiefs manifestly embraced not from economical conviction, but as an expedient of party tactics. The utterances of Sir Charles Tupper at all events must have been somewhat disquieting to Separatists. Apparently the Government feels the pressure of the lumbermen who, unlike the farmers, those patient sheep of all shearers, are an organized interest and able to bring their weight to bear. Regardless of the ignominy of becoming "hewers of wood for the Yankees," it seems anxious to get lumber on the free list, which, however, it will hardly do without some reciprocal concession, such as the free admission of American articles made wholly or principally of wood. Protectionists therefore, who cry that "the fad is dead," need all the comfort which the daily repetition of that cry can give. If personal vituperation and slander of Mr. Erastus Wiman and his associates in the movement, through Protectionist organs, affords any further relief, that satisfaction will not be grudged. The protected manufacturers have reason enough for being angry, though, if they could see things aright, their anger would be turned not against the advocates of a sounder system, but against the political leader who, for purposes of his own, has led them to invest their capital on a basis which is not sound.

It is needless to renew the discussion when there are no fresh arguments. A comparison between the English and the American market can be made, and the allegation on which Separatists constantly take their stand of the superior-

ity in value of the English market can be brought to the test only when the American market is made like the English, free. What at present appears is, that notwithstanding the tariff, our trade with the Americans does not fall in amount far below our trade with the British, while it must be more profitable, as the freights are less; that whenever an opening has been made in the tariff wall by the reduction of duties, trade has rushed through; and that the American market increases in extent much more rapidly than the English. But whatever the advantages of the English market would be, they would not be lost when those of the American were gained. We should have two markets instead of one; in case of war between England and other maritime powers, which may any day break out, we should still have a market instead of having none.

That two neighbouring nations cannot enter into an agreement to trade with each other without detriment to the political independence or the honour of either of them, is an absurdity too preposterous to be nakedly put forward, though it is constantly insinuated under cover of patriotic declamation. It seems to be imagined that Canada is counselled to some act of submission, whereas she is counselled to nothing but the fair consideration of proposals, which, if she finds them inconsistent either with her interest or with her honour, she can at once reject; while if she accepts them, she may reserve to herself, as she did in the case of the old Reciprocity Treaty, full liberty of future withdrawal. After the conclusion of the commercial agreement, as well as before it, the political destinies of Canada would be absolutely in her own hands, and what can any nation which feels its foundations firm and is true to itself desire more? If there is any tendency to political union among us, which the adversaries of Commercial Union strenuously deny, it arises from that action of unifying forces upon two sections of an identical population, geographically interlaced and rapidly fusing, which neither tariff nor vituperation can any more arrest than they can

arrest the course of the sun. Trade does not tend to annexation more than railways, the international extension of which is being actively promoted by men who rave against Commercial Union. The C. P. R. was to be a grand instrument of separation from the United States as well as of union among the Provinces of Canada; it was to be a purely national enterprise, no American was to have any part in it, and its complete severance from the American system was to be secured by monopoly clauses, no matter at what sacrifice of the prosperity of our own North-West. Yet there was an American firm in the Syndicate, capital was sought in New York, an American was the Vice-President, a typical American is now President and Manager. The line is carried through the State of Maine, and is connecting us with the American system at the Sault. Here surely is annexationist conspiracy of the most dangerous kind. Separatism itself, by producing commercial atrophy, has helped to annex to the United States a number of Canadians, equalling the aggregate population of all our Provinces except Ontario and Quebec; and are the men so much less precious than the land? If the removal of obstacles to commerce is good in itself, its results will be good; and among good results all but extravagant jingoes will reckon an increase of friendship between the nations. Easier relations, with regard to the fisheries and other angry questions, could not fail to be produced. It is the policy of Separatism to confuse the commercial discussion by dragging in the political question; the friends of Commercial Union, if they are wise, will decline the lure and leave the future to take care of itself.

Of the interest and honour of England in this matter, England is herself the guardian, since no commercial treaty between us and the United States could be made without her consent. She needs not the officious tutelage of men who, after piling protective duties on her goods, are thrown into paroxysms of outraged loyalty at the thought of discriminating against her when they think that their own interests are

threatened. Even on this side of the water care will be shown for her, should negotiations commence, by people whose loyalty is not less sincere and warm though it may be less vociferous than that of the Protectionists. We cannot act upon two opposite principles at once. If the fiscal unity of the Empire exists, let it be respected; if it has ceased to exist, each member must do the best it can for itself in its own circumstances, which in our case are those of a community forming part of a continent under a protective system. England is already treated by us commercially as a foreign nation, since we lay protective duties on her goods, while she on her part refuses, and will always refuse, to give the colonies any fiscal preference. Nobody proposes to discriminate against her in the invidious sense suggested; all that is proposed is such a tariff arrangement with the United States as will prevent mutual smuggling; so that those who have pointed the iron duty directly against Great Britain have little ground for a display of filial indignation. It has been shown that we already discriminate, though not against particular British articles, against the aggregate of British trade. It has also been shown that in her general interests, which are those of an investor as well as an importer, England would not be a loser but a gainer by the change. Not a cent of revenue would be taken from the British Crown, nor can the interests of a few exporting houses be allowed to outweigh those of the great body of the British and Canadian people.

—A harvest better than was at one time expected in quantity, and first-rate in quality, has revived the confidence of Manitoba and the North-West. The dark hour of despondency which preceded the abolition of railway monopoly, and during which even ex-members of a Conservative Government were departing for the States, while the Province was on the brink of secession, is past, and has been succeeded by a general feeling of hope for the future. Hope there must be, and

almost boundless hope, for the future of such a tract of land so fruitful. Yet, no Manitoban professes to believe that the rate of progress has come up to reasonable expectation. There is the land, but where are the people? There are probably not yet nearly two hundred thousand whites in the whole of that vast region. Dakota and Minnesota, particularly Dakota, with a soil no better and a climate not so good, fill up much more rapidly, and what is still more significant, they fill Dakota especially, with Canadians. Of this there are probably several causes, apart from the accidents of weather and inexperience of prairie farming. The railway policy of the Government was unpropitious to settlement; whatever may be the value of the Canadian Pacific Railway as a political and military road, its effect on colonization has been bad. It has sent the settlers down a line of a thousand miles, increasing their freights, carrying them away from their centres of distribution, and depriving them of the advantages, social as well as economical, of close settlement, which are particularly needed in such a climate; it is even now carrying settlers on to British Columbia, whence, there being no farm land for them, they pass into Washington Territory or Montana, and are helping rapidly to people Seattle, Tacoma, and Spokane Falls. Then there was railway monopoly, which rode Manitoba like a nightmare, being prolonged by chicane when the Dominion had given a guarantee for thirteen millions as the price of its surrender. Madder freak surely despot never played in the drunkenness of power than the attempt to compel the whole of that region to confine itself to one commercial outlet, and, this fourteen hundred miles away at Montreal. Injudicious and vexatious arrangements with regard to the laying out and allotment of lands, especially the one mile limit, are held to have done no small mischief. The rebellion caused by the neglect of the Ottawa Government to pay timely attention to the claims of the half-breeds and to soothe their simple and not unnatural fears, had also the effect for a time of repelling immigration. But the North-West still groans under a tariff

imposed for the benefit of the Eastern supporters of the Ottawa Government, and to her an unmitigated and undisguised curse. A duty of twenty-five per cent. on farm implements not having proved sufficient to prevent the settler from buying them where they were best and cheapest, another ten per cent. was imposed. This is borne, though people rise in arms and rend an Empire in their indignation at a trifling duty on tea imposed, not in the interest of private gain or political party, but in that of public defence. The tariff and the rebellion, however, are only the two gravest and most conspicuous among the evil consequences of subjection to a distant and party government. Subjection it may be truly called, for the representation of Manitoba and the North-West at Ottawa, owing to the difficulty in a new settlement of finding proper men to send to Parliament, and the malign influences of the Capital, has failed to give her any real voice in the national councils, and on the most important occasions has proved true to the interests of the Ottawa Government, and false to those of its constituents. But above all, the region suffers by exclusion from the commercial pale of its continent, and from the general flow, not only of trade but of capital, of commercial enterprise, and of population which those within the pale enjoy. With the exception of a little flour sent to British Columbia, it sells nothing to any Canadian Province, and it is shut out of its natural market; nor is it much consoled by hearing that the Ottawa Government is endeavouring to open markets for it in Australia and Brazil. The artificial immigration of Skye Crofters, Icelanders, and others which it receives from Europe, though not to be despised, is of far less value than the natural immigration of Canadians and Americans who are born to the manner of its farming; and this it will not get in sufficient measure till the fatal barrier is removed. To the piling up of a vast debt, in spite of our immunity from military and diplomatic expenditure, the exodus of not a little of the very flower of our population, and the complete establishment

in the midst of us of a French and Papal nation, may be added, as a fruit of our policy during the last twenty years, the retarded prosperity of the North-West.

Winnipeg still feels one at least of the consequences of the Boom, inasmuch as she stands almost in a wilderness, the effect largely of the inordinate prices at which land was held in her early days and which drove settlement further West. But a reasonable measure of prosperity is assured to her in the end. She is the centre of the railway system; she is the centre of distribution; she is the centre of government, law, education and pleasure. She will grow, in time, as Toronto has grown. The universal passion for city life will tell in her favour. People who have made any money will come to her to spend it, and then they will come to live. Farming, which flourishes round Portage La Prairie, only fifty miles off, will presently extend to her fields. She has not yet gained much in extent, but she has gained in solidity, and the better buildings are an earnest of permanence and a sign of hope.

—By the proposal to introduce Sunday street cars in Toronto a question has been raised, which, though limited in its immediate scope, touches a vital interest of humanity. Few or none now cleave to the observance of the Jewish Sabbath. It not only belongs to the Jewish Dispensation, but was based on a literal acceptance of the Mosaic Cosmogony, which, unless religion is to be brought into direct collision with science must now be laid aside. Nor did it originally form any part of Christianity. Dr. Hesse, whose Bampton Lectures are the most complete treatise on the subject, after quoting the passage of St. Paul in which Sabbath days are coupled with new moons and other times and things, the observance of which, as obligatory, is condemned by the Apostle, pronounces that no testimony can be more decisive than this to the fact that the Sabbath was of obligation no longer. The observance of the

first day of the week as the Lord's Day was evidently a perfectly free Christian ordinance, though of the Jewish Christians some might cling to the Jewish practice, and be tolerated by their fellow-christians in so doing. Christianity seems to have undergone two or three successive superfetations. The first was that of Alexandrine and Byzantine theosophy, which loaded it with a great body of metaphysical dogma. The second was that of medieval priestcraft, which loaded it not only with a multitude of superstitious beliefs and practices, but with the usurped despotism of the Pope. The third and fourth were those of Reformation dogmatism on the one hand, and of the Tridentine reaction against the Reformation on the other. Justification by Faith as a dogma was evidently produced by antagonism to Indulgences, and to the whole medieval system of salvation by ecclesiastical observances, sacraments, penances and payments, of which Tetzels' money-chest was the extreme and most offensive manifestation, while Predestination almost necessarily flowed as a logical deduction from Justification by Grace. Antagonism was crystallized in dogma which was stereotyped in Protestant creeds. In the same way the Protestant revival of the Sabbath seems to have had its source in an extreme Biblicism, bred of the struggle against ecclesiastical authority, and the Roman Calendar as the work of that authority and an embodiment of saint-worship at the same time. But apart from all theological dogma, Jewish, Roman or Protestant, stands the great human necessity of the day of rest; of spiritual rest for those who are religious, of physical and mental rest even for those who are not. This necessity grows stronger as the stress and strain of life increase, while the tendency to encroach upon the day for the purposes, both of business and pleasure, grows stronger at the same time. Experience has proved that less than one day's rest in seven does not suffice; and without a stated interval of repose and calm, modern society, amidst the whirl of competition, speculation and excitement, would be almost in danger of going mad.

Nor can there be any doubt that the religious feeling about the day has hitherto been its strong safeguard, and kept at bay the aggression both of covetousness and dissipation. Denunciation of those who defend the observance of Sunday on religious grounds as fanatics or hypocrites is therefore out of place. Some arguments, which to say the least are hollow, have been used on the Liberal side. It is not for the purpose of attending distant places of worship that Sunday street cars are desired. Nor is there much force in the invidious remark that as the rich use their carriages the poor man ought to be allowed his street car. There are many rich who strictly abstain from using their carriages and make a point of giving all about them, as far as possible, the benefit of the day of rest. The really valid argument is, that without street cars the people who live in the middle of the city will be denied access to fresh air and healthy pleasure, and being mewed up in the streets will be consigned either to torpid dulness or to pleasures which are not so healthy. The change is evidently coming, and we can only hope that the Car Company will so arrange that none of those in their employment shall go without his day of rest. The case in favour of the change is strengthened by the encroachment which, in the sequel, will too probably be carried much further, on the Queen's Park; a cruel sacrifice of the health, not only physical but moral, of a great city, whose boys have no other playground, to a cheese-paring finance, which ought to have met with a strenuous resistance. But democracy does not seem to breed Hampdens, or if it does they are too much occupied by their commercial business, alike in New York and Toronto, to attend to a public wrong.

—Mr. Gooderham's bequest has probably settled the question as to the removal of Victoria College: at all events a Methodist College will be founded in the University of To-

ronto. Long ago THE BYSTANDER advocated Confederation on the grounds which he has never seen assailed, that the resources of this Province are not more than enough to maintain one university on a proper scale, and that starveling universities must lower the standard and may do social mischief by luring into intellectual callings a number of youths largely in excess of the demand. We therefore rejoice in a partial success, while we are sorry that it is only partial, and see that some difficulties may arise from the federation of a single college and one which is likely to be highly denominational in its character. Local interest and denominational feeling have, like the sons of Zeruah, proved too strong. There has also been at work a dislike, which is more rational, of political control, and in this respect it was perhaps unlucky that the Government was not represented on this occasion by a university man. It is easy to enter into the feelings of those Methodists who on religious grounds cling to the seclusion of Cobourg. Wesley, very likely, and Whitfield, almost certainly, would have done the same. But no seclusion short of that which is maintained in a Roman Catholic seminary will suffice. Impose what tests you will, and let your teaching be as rigidly orthodox as it may, with free access to bookstores and unrestricted intercourse, you will find that your separate University is a fortress with gates well guarded but without walls.

--In questions respecting appointments to Professorships, there should, we venture to think, be as little as possible of outside interference. It is wise on the most public grounds, as well as natural, to look first to your own *alumni*, because the appointments then act as prizes for home industry and effort. But the paramount consideration plainly is the interest of the student, which calls for the selection of the best teacher wherever he can be found. Patriotic preference of an inferior man will be punished by the intellectual leanness of the next academical generation.

THE BYSTANDER.

NOVEMBER, 1889.

MR. LAURIER came to see whether Ontario Liberalism would accept a leader opposed to Equal Rights. The answer seems to have been decisive, and the more so as Mr. Laurier is and deserves to be personally most acceptable. Unless the Liberal Party soon puts intrigue under hatches and calls principle to the helm, it will be in danger of going on the rocks. If the result of the Rielite intrigue will not cure Liberals of listening to bad advice what will? Let them remember that the same men who drew her into that intrigue and who are now trying to set them against Equal Right also threw cold water at first on Reciprocity, so that under this guidance they would have been left absolutely without a policy at all except that of mere huckstering for votes. It is pretty evident, from the success of the Equal Rights' meetings recently at Toronto and Montreal, that the feeling is not dying out, that it is settling down into conviction, and that the parties will have to reckon with it at the polls. The lineaments even of a new party begin to show themselves, if leaders could be found. In both parties there is a strong revolt, let them affect to talk lightly of it as they may. The Conservative Machine perhaps stands the strain better than its rival, because it is the more strongly organized, and its managers have the patronage and the appropriations in their hands. The Richelieu election seems to show that even in his own Province the Liberal leader is weak and that the priest party give to Sir John Macdonald, as Mr. Chapleau says they ought, the chief credit

for the passing of the Jesuits' Estates Act and regard him as their true friend. Yet the Conservative managers are evidently afraid to bring on an election for East Toronto, and the country has become sufficiently familiarized with party practices to allow the office of Collector of Customs to be kept vacant on that account.

Each of the political parties has tied a millstone around its neck by embracing a theory of Provincial Right incompatible with the integrity of the nation. The Liberals did it because the Central Power was in the hands of their opponents; and now the Conservatives have done it to cover their surrender to the Quebec vote in the matter of the Jesuits' Estates Act. Both have fallen into the trap of making principles to suit situations. From the language used it might be supposed that Provincial Right was something far more sacred than National Right, or any other kind of right; that it had existed, so to speak, before the political worlds, and had a transcendental claim to reverence. What is it but the portion of power assigned to the Province by the Act of Confederation? Why is the national right of controlling Provincial action in the common interest less sacred than the Provincial right of action? Sir John Thompson avers that the authority of a Provincial Legislature is as absolute within its sphere as that of the Imperial Parliament by whose act the Provincial Legislature was created and which can change or abolish it to-morrow. But the sphere of a Provincial Legislature is bounded not only by the definition of its subjects, but by the national veto. That the national veto was intended to be a reality has been proved out of the mouths of those who are now holding the opposite doctrine, and no answer to this evidence or to that furnished by Sir Alexander Galt's pamphlet has been attempted. Sir John Macdonald says that popular government means the liberty of the people to rule or misrule themselves as they please. But Constitutions are framed, we submit, for the purpose of saving us from misruling ourselves, and all parts of them have an equal claim to observance. So

Sir John Macdonald must have thought when he vetoed a local railway Act passed by the Legislature of Manitoba. If the Dominion retains its power of controlling Provincial action for the common good, Canada may be a nation; if it does not, she can be nothing but a league. And who wants a league with a French and Papal Quebec; a league too on such a footing that while Quebec pursues objects of her own, she is to dominate over our politics and extort money from our treasury by her solid and alien vote?

If the veto is a nullity the question arises whether any Province ought to be left without a Second Chamber or some equivalent security against rash legislation? With all due respect for our local legislators, we can hardly deem them men of such calibre that in their case we can afford to dispense with the checks and safeguards deemed indispensable in the case of the most august assemblies in the world. One of them the other day was seen selling pools for races. By this gentleman's vote a great question relating to the distribution of political power, the tenure of property, education, or the relations between the sexes, might have been settled after a single hearing and without power of revision. The legislature of Ontario once broke a will, and it was not contended, we believe, that it had exceeded its legal power. The States of the American Union have all of them two houses, and the veto of the Governor is a real safeguard. We, with all our mock-monarchical buckram and costly shams, are left without any safeguard at all.

It is very true that the national veto is not in satisfactory hands. Under the cloak of the Governor-Generalship it is exercised by the leader of the party in office. But this is an inevitable incident of that party system, from which it is to be hoped that the Commonwealth will some day be delivered. Under the party system all power is not in national but in partisan hands. It has been said that the Liberal leaders think of proposing to transfer the veto to the Home Government; if they did propose such a surrender of independence, they would complete their ruin.

The Machinists still try to persuade us, and perhaps succeed in persuading themselves, that the Equal Rights agitation is merely an outburst of bigotry and intolerance on the part of the Protestant clergy, and the cry is taken up by some to whom all religious movements are repugnant, and Protestant movements most of all, because Protestantism is the form of religion with which they come most into conflict and perhaps that which they think they have most reason to fear. Of those who thronged the Equal Rights' meetings at Toronto, at Montreal, and in all parts of the country, how many were clergymen, or in any way connected with the clergy? Ministers of the Gospel will probably bear with equanimity the reproach of being "simple and earnest souls," cast upon them by the Machiavels of the Machine. Not a syllable has been uttered, not a thought has been conceived, against the most complete and unqualified toleration of all opinions, including those of the Ultramontane and the Jesuit. The protest is solely against the bestowal of State aid and encouragement on any particular religious body, and notably on the Jesuits. The advocates of Disestablishment in England might as well be accused of intolerance as the advocates of Equal Right. "France," says Mr. Laurier, "expels the Jesuit; England tolerates him. Will you follow the French or the English method?" We are not sure that we should not have to follow the French method if the Jesuit were by his intrigues to bring upon us, as he has brought upon France, an avalanche of ruin. The English method, however, as set forth in the Act of 1829, which a British Prime Minister declared the other day to be no dead letter, is to treat the Jesuit as a person dangerous to the State and to permit his presence in the country only under very jealous restrictions. Would Mr. Laurier and his Ultramontane friends like Canada to adopt the British Act of 1829?

—Toleration preached in the name of the Jesuit! In the hapless Netherlands, after half a century of religious carnage, who

was it that revived the dying fires of persecution? "And now," says Motley, "the hour had come when the Jesuits thought that they might step openly with their works into the daylight again. Of late years they had shrouded themselves in comparative mystery, but from their seminaries and colleges had gone forth a plentiful company of assassins against Elizabeth and Henry, Nassau, Barneveldt, and others who whether avowedly or involuntarily were prominent in the party of human progress. Some important murders had already been accomplished, and the prospect was fair that still others might follow if the Jesuits persevered. Meantime these ecclesiastics thought that a wholesome example might be set to humbler heretics by the spectacle of a public execution." The historian then gives the story of Anna van den Hove, a poor servant girl who while her two mistresses had gone back to Roman Catholicism remained steadfast in the Reformed faith, and whom the Jesuits denounced to the civil authority, demanding her execution under a statute then deemed obsolete. The girl refused to apostatize. "So Anna van den Hove was led, one fine midsummer morning, to the hayfield outside of Brussels, between two Jesuits, followed by a number of a peculiar kind of monks called love-brothers. These holy men goaded her as they went, telling her that she was the devil's carrion and calling on her to repent at the last moment and thus save her life and escape eternal damnation beside. But the poor girl had no ear for them, and cried out that like Stephen she saw the heaven opening and the angels stooping down to conduct her far away from the power of the evil one. When they came to the hayfield they found the pit already dug and the maid-servant was ordered to descend into it. The executioner then covered her with earth up to the waist and a last summons was made to her to renounce her errors. She refused and then the earth was piled upon her and the hangman jumped upon the grave till it was flattened and firm." Has the Jesuit changed and become a convert to toleration, as Sir John Thompson and Sir John Macdonald would have us believe? It was no longer ago

than in 1867, that Pius IX., in whose name the Jesuit reigned at Rome, conferred the honour of saintship upon Peter Arbués, the bloody Spanish Inquisitor, because he had met his death by an avenging hand in his path of religious murder. Ask the Jesuit himself, whether he has changed. You will not get a straightforward answer: but you will get one which will probably satisfy your mind. Apart from any consequences to ourselves, what right have Canadians, as men or as Protestant Christians, to furnish the Jesuit with funds and a legal status for his machinations against humanity and Protestant Christendom? Sir John Macdonald's levity shows that like other politicians of his stamp, however astute, he is liable to loss of touch with common sentiment. He evidently finds it impossible to believe that people seriously and inflexibly object to being made partakers in a dark and deadly conspiracy against liberty, light and the progress of mankind.

For two centuries the Church of Rome in alliance with reactionary despotism struggled to extirpate Protestantism with fire and sword, by open war and midnight massacre, by the rack and stake of the Inquisition, the arts of the Jesuit and the dagger of his pupil the assassin; and in the attempt she made a hell of Christendom, decimated whole communities, and half-wrecked civilization. Nor has she now renounced her methods; on the contrary she has proclaimed them anew in the Encyclical, consecrated them afresh by the canonization of an Inquisitor, and stands ready to apply them again to-morrow if she had the power. In no case has she willingly conceded the smallest measure of liberty to those whom she styles heretics, and in countries such as Spain where she retains her influence Protestantism can hardly be said to enjoy full toleration at this hour. Protestant communities which had narrowly escaped destruction at her hands bound the arms of her liegemen, who were also her political emissaries, with the manacle of political disability sometimes too tightly and sometimes too long. But those manacles began to be loosened as soon as the fires of the Inquisition had ceased to burn, and they were

struck off long before toleration had been granted to Protestants in any country still under the sway of Rome. The Church of Rome is now invited in free countries like ours to a system of perfect justice and perfect liberty, under which all men and all churches shall be free to preach and propagate their opinions, while none shall receive aid from the State or from any source but reason and truth. With this she will not be content if by the votes of subservient masses she can gain more ; but a party has arisen in Canada which is resolved that with justice and liberty she, like all the other Churches, shall be content and that ecclesiastical encroachment, which threatens at once conscience and civilization, shall have an end. What the consequence to political parties may be is a consideration for the parties themselves.

—The conduct of the Protestant Committee of Education in Quebec in receiving a portion of the Jesuit fund has perhaps been harshly judged, or at all events somewhat misconstrued. Their course, if it is not precisely that which Latimer, Luther, or Knox would have taken, is intelligible and implies no personal approbation on their part of the Jesuit Act. That Act is law, and their position, as we understand it, is that the money has come to them as trustees and that they are legally bound to accept and administer it. They have at all events insisted firmly on the recognition of the trust in favour of superior education. If there has been anything amiss in the personal bearing of any of them we must recollect first, that they are appointed by the Government, and secondly, that they are liable to ecclesiastical resentment, which some of them might dread for the institutions with which they are connected more than for themselves.

Some people are much shocked at the idea that political lawyers in giving an opinion on a Constitutional question can possibly be biassed by party feeling or by the exigencies of party. Holy simplicity ! Have these people forgotten that

on the appeal in O'Connell's case to the House of Lords, the two Conservative law lords voted one way and the three Whigs the other, while the judges whose opinion had been taken were on the side of the minority? At all events, let us have the case on which the opinion was given, and without which, as everybody knows, the opinion is worthless. But why opinions or cases at all? Why is anything left to suspicion or surmise? Why was not the country allowed to have the Constitutional question openly and fairly argued before its own Supreme Court? Why was every manœuvre and subterfuge employed to close the gate of public justice against the nation?

—Since the last appearance of the *THE BYSTANDER*, the verdict of experience has been pronounced upon the Scott Act, and assuredly no verdict ever was more decisive. It has told in England where the question had just come to a head, and in the United States, as well as here. In England it may even prove to have given Prohibition a death-blow. It is remarkable that the battle was fought and the decision of the people upon the issue was obtained by effort entirely outside the party lines. The politicians, as soon as the Temperance vote showed strength, fell on their knees before it, and political journals paid a homage which, as has since appeared, was hollow, to what they took to be the prevailing power. The first stand was made by the Liberal Temperance Union, a non-political organization. The position taken by leading clergymen and preachers also produced its effect. By the members of the Liquor Trade, as they were morally disqualified by their interest in their own cause, no effectual resistance could be offered, and the Scott Act was taking in county after county, like the tide running in over a flat, when the Liberal Temperance Union appeared in the field. A word from men who were known to have none but a public interest in the matter set the people thinking for themselves and experience soon did the rest. Everywhere it was found that the effects of the

Act were defiance or evasion of the law, contrabandism and perjury, together with an increase instead of a decrease of drunkenness, clandestine drinking, always leading to more excess, deterioration of the liquor, demoralization of the trade, and the substitution of whiskey, as the liquor most easily smuggled, for milder beverages such as lager and cider. An unlicensed and unregulated took the place of a licensed and regulated trade; and it was a notable and instructive part of the experience of the contest that the tavern-keepers of the worst class were not strenuous opponents, in fact were often secretly friends, of the Act: they knew that the practical result, so far as men who had no scruple in evading the law were concerned, would be simply escape from the license fee. Recent inquiry assures us that the fruits of Prohibition in the North-West, where it is nominally enforced by the Mounted Police, are no better than they were in the East; that, as regards the quality of the liquor they are worse; and that instead of an extinction of the taste, an artificial excitement of it is the general result. The repeal vote was essentially popular, the politicians fearing to take any part.

Let all due honour be rendered to those who took part in what they believed to be a moral crusade against a great social evil. It was not their fault if the movement drew into it some whose object was to carry the bag, and who kicked away the Temperance ladder as soon as they had clambered to their mark. Had not the first crusade of all its crafty and self-seeking Bohemond as well as its pure and devoted Godfrey? Nor is it possible that enthusiasm, however genuine and well warranted, should not have fanaticism as its shadow. That shadow fell darkly on some clauses of the Scott Act by which, for an object assumed to be better than justice, the safeguards of justice were set aside, hearsay evidence was admitted against the accused, appeal from the arbitrary jurisdiction of Prohibitionist magistrates was denied, and, worse than all, husband and wife were compelled in defiance of the laws of affection and in breach of their marriage vow to give evidence

against each other. Nor was the proposal to treat tavern-keepers as criminals, when their trade had been specially licensed by the State, and to deprive them without compensation of their property and livelihood, consistent with equity any more than the language held by fiery declaimers about these men was consistent either with reason or with charity. It is necessary to record that the rising against the Scott Act has been in part a rising against tyranny—tyranny which was not more endurable because in this, as in many like cases, the intention was unquestionably good.

What then do the Temperance party, to give them in courtesy a name to which we cannot allow that they have an exclusive right, now propose to do? Are they still bent on striving at once to eradicate by legislation in this community a taste which prevails over the whole world, and which the earliest mythologies prove to be primeval if it is not congenital to man? Before they make up their mind to this and before they renew their resolution of excluding from the Legislatures, and from the public service, all who will not do their will, let them once more fairly consider whether there is a case for arbitrary legislation at all. Is not Temperance making way at least as fast as any other good habit is making way under the spontaneous influences, religious, educational, social and scientific, of an advancing and spreading civilization? Is not public opinion growing daily more strict upon the subject and daily enhancing the penalties, social and commercial, which wait upon excess? Are not the masses of our people in Canada temperate, and has there not, for the last two generations, been a marked progress among us in that direction? Even in our cities is the amount of intemperance scandalous, and is it not chiefly foreign? Let legislation be founded on fact, not on the fictions of declaimers, who tell us in the fine frenzy of the platform that nearly half the adult male deaths in Canada are from drink, and that if all the confirmed drunkards were drawn up in line they could put a girdle round the earth. There are besides the Voluntary Associations, free so

long as they are really voluntary from any objection on the score of tyranny, which have undoubtedly done good, and which it must be remembered would cease to exist if Prohibition were enacted, and, should the experiment fail, could not easily be revived.

If, however, the Temperance men resolve to strike for Prohibition, we would conjure them in the name of public morality, as well as in that of their own cause, to show the courage of their convictions and do thoroughly that which they have made up their minds to do. Let us not have another régime of unlicensed drinking, perjury, and contempt of the law. The object of the Prohibitionists can be effected by nothing short of the total suppression not only of the sale of liquor but of its manufacture and importation. The use or possession of liquor as well as the sale must be made a crime, since buying is as essential a part of the forbidden trade as selling. To enforce the law against the resistance which we have already experienced, a great extension of the police force, especially in the rural districts, will be required. Nay it is doubtful whether, to make the system thoroughly effectual, it will not be found necessary to issue a perpetual writ of *ne exeat* against all the inhabitants of the Dominion; for if they are allowed to go into countries not under Prohibition they will be very apt to relapse and to bring back the infection with them. A local addition to the Decalogue must always be an arduous undertaking. Even if liquor could be completely banished by law, perhaps the next Parliament might be occupied in passing supplementary laws against the use of opium or the hypodermic injection of morphine. Compress human nature forcibly in one part and you are pretty sure to produce a swelling in another.

Nobody denies the special evils and danger of the liquor trade or objects either to stringent regulation or to any reasonable action of the Government in the matter. We may cherish liberty as the sole foster-mother of sterling morality, and regard democratic tyranny as not less dangerous than the dynastic

type without pedantic addiction to *laissez faire*. Liberal Temperance has its positive as well as its negative side. It not only does not deprecate, it calls for such regulations in regard to the license fee or anything else as shall put the trade in the hands of responsible men and hold them thoroughly to account, though the fact is that nobody has really more interest in the repression of drunkenness and riot than a decent tavernkeeper himself. It advocates all measures which will promote the use of the milder beverages instead of whiskey, which, especially in the form of dram-drinking, is the real evil. If medical science, unbought and uncoerced, pronounces any beverage to be poison, Liberal Temperance is ready to prohibit its sale. But merely to harass the retail trade and make it disreputable, without suppressing it, is a policy not less foolish than pusillanimous. Nor is there any use in arbitrary reduction of the number of places of supply when you cannot reduce the demand. A recent measure of that kind in Toronto had for its result the most drunken Christmas that had been known for many years. The crowding into the taverns which were left led to an increase of treating and of riot. So easy is it for the sumptuary or moral legislator in mending one hole to make two.

We think only of the harm done by excess in drinking when not less harm is done, as Sir Hy. Thompson has told us, by excess in eating or by eating unwholesome food. It is likely that the craving for drink itself is not seldom produced by bad cookery, such as is too common in the farm-house and the country inn. If lunacy is on the increase, as it is said to be among farmers' wives, as farmers' wives do not often drink, the cause, supposing it to be in diet at all, must be sought rather in the frying-pan than in the cup. Indigestion seeks relief in patent medicines, which again aggravate the evil. A movement for the reform of our cookery is understood to be on foot, and it may help the cause of Temperance as well as that of Eupepsia.

—With regard to Reciprocity there is nothing new. The question is in abeyance till Parliament and Congress meet. Columns are still filled with the complaint of indignant patriots that we belittle the country by proposing to extend its market, while the people who raise the cry are themselves confessing the need by trying, though so far without success, to open new markets in Australia, Jamaica, and all parts of the world. Did not the origination of the N. P. “belittle” the state of things which existed before? The alarm bell of Annexation also continues to ring. Yet the alarmists declare that no Annexationism exists except in the secret counsels of a few bad characters who if they ventured to show themselves would be crushed by public indignation. What then is there to fear? Nobody pretends to believe that the Americans think of annexing us by force. Apparently we are at liberty to discuss the Commercial question when it comes before us on its own merits, without troubling ourselves about that which the political future may have in store. When the scheme is presented we shall see among other things how it affects the interest of the mother country. Supposing the mother country acquiesces, will the Commercial loyalists be ready to accept the scheme?

The interim may be profitably employed by Protectionists in clearly settling and preparing distinctly to state the principles of their own policy, which we have never yet been able to apprehend. What makes an industry “national,” and entitles it to protection? Subscribing to the Government election fund? What is the proper area of protection? Would Ontario profit commercially by being protected against the other Provinces? Do the Protectionists propose to tax the people for the purpose of Protection, even though the taxes may not be wanted for revenue? It would seem so from what they are doing in the United States. We should be glad also to be furnished with an instance of an industry which having been protected during its “infancy” has on reaching maturity been able to dispense with protection, or has not clamoured for

more. Protectionism, like slavery in the United States, having first craved liberty of existence as a transient necessity, turns round, as soon as it grows strong, proclaims itself a permanent blessing, and takes the community by the throat. How does a settler in the North-West profit by being taxed thirty-five per cent. on his farm implements and forced to resort to the markets of Eastern Canada? That is a concrete form of the problem which may vary the theoretic treatment. Nor are the direct evils of the system alone to be considered. It fills us with the spirit of monopoly which generates combines on one side and unionist attempts to close the labour market on the other, while in politics it is the very mother of corruption. Free Trade, says Sir John Thompson, is unpatriotic. Was there any want of patriotism in Pitt, Peel, Palmerston or Cavour?

We had the pleasure the other day of hearing one of the first Protectionist orators in the United States. An excellent speaker in point of language and delivery he was. His theme was the miserable state of the working-class in Free Trade countries. He said that to be fair he would take his instances from England, which was the best wage-paying country in Europe. If England is the best wage-paying country in Europe, as she is the only Free Trade country in Europe, the orator had at once given away his case. He drew harrowing pictures of the distress which he had witnessed in Germany, forgetting that Germany is a highly protected country. In his comparative estimate of destitution he left out of sight the fact that while in America population is about 17 to the square mile, in England and Wales it is about 447. He did not compare the state of England before Free Trade, when famine stalked through the cities, when people were selling their wedding rings, boiling grass, and digging up carrion, with the burst of prosperity which followed the repeal of the Corn Laws. In one part of his speech he vaunted the high price of goods under Protection to show that the workman must be receiving high wages, in another he undertook to

prove that goods were cheaper under Protection than under Free Trade. He said nothing about the farmer who has all this time been exposed to free competition not only with the pauper labour of Europe but with the Hindoo. Of course he threw in a little sentiment, with which even fiscal brigandage cannot dispense. He talked about the diversification of national character and he did not tell us what had become, under a system fatal to trade, of those mariners of America, about whose enterprises, as a feature of national character, De Tocqueville grows so eloquent. But these arguments convince—with a contribution to the election fund.

—Independence found the Spanish Colonies in Central and South America totally devoid of political training and utterly unripe for self-government. The natural consequence was a period of convulsions and revolutions, of political brigandage under the name of pronunciamientos, of usurpation alternating with anarchy. Canning's boast that the New World had been called into existence to redress the balance of the Old World seemed destined to rank among the mockeries of history. It is the fault of the prison house if the limbs of the prisoner when he first comes forth from it are weak and his eyes are unable to bear the light. Most of these States have now struggled through the days of tribulation to something like stability of government and ordered freedom, while the leading shoots of the tree, such as Chili and the Argentine Confederation, are apparently entering on a very prosperous career. Even in Mexico pronunciamientos appear to have ceased, elections take place in a constitutional way, brigandage has decreased, and commerce is comparatively safe. Brazil, under her Portuguese dynasty, has always enjoyed stability, though her progress has not been so great as might have been hoped. The cloudy part of the prospect is that, whether it be to the climate or to habits of which the climate is the cause, the superior race, Spanish or Portuguese, seems to be dwindling, while the native

Indian race, which multiplies, shows little aptitude for civilization. Life and property, however, being now secure, emigration may flow in and recruit the growing element. This great group of States, at any rate, has now fairly put in an appearance on the political scene, and "the three Americas" have an interest in each other. It would have been ungracious, perhaps impolitic, to allow the delegates of our distant partners on this Continent to set foot on our soil without receiving any token of friendly recognition; and it is a pity that the authorized representatives of Canada did not feel themselves called upon to do something on the occasion.

—Under Sir John Lister-Kaye the experiment of large farms in the North-west is again being tried on the grandest scale. It might be thought that if ever farming on the large scale was to succeed it would be on the Prairie where there is nothing to limit extension, where machinery has the freest play, and where, from the nature of the climate, aggregation of farm buildings and dwellings appears to have special advantages both economical and social. Yet experience hitherto has been adverse. It seems that nothing will make farming pay but the hard work, hard living, and hard bargaining of the man who both toils and owns the land. Sir John Lister-Kaye's enterprise however will be watched with interest, the more so as economical changes never fail to bring social and political changes in their train.

—The question of peace or war in Europe is one which concerns us more nearly than we seem to suppose, because if the war were maritime and England were in it, there would be in the first place an interruption to our trade, and in the second place a call on us to contribute to our own defence and that of the Empire. Lord Salisbury tells us that there will be peace, for the rather strange reason that the armaments are large.

The largeness of the armaments may make the masters of the legions pause, perhaps even shudder ; but it fills the world with the spirit of war. There is about as much chance of learning the truth from a Foreign Minister about anything wrong in the diplomatic sphere as there is of learning the truth from a railway guard about anything wrong on the line. Sir Charles Dilke comes away from an interview with Bismarck satisfied that there will be peace ; but we are as thoroughly satisfied that if Bismarck meditated or apprehended war he would not tell Sir Charles Dilke. Each of the last four great wars was heralded by an assurance that the peace of Europe was not likely to be disturbed. The Emperor of the French put forth the most comforting disclaimers of any warlike intentions a few weeks before he rushed upon Italy with a hundred and fifty thousand men. Nations, or even Kings, seldom deliberately go to war : they come to a diplomatic deadlock and then draw their swords. All that can be said is that gunpowder is lying about in heaps—on the Russo-German frontier, in the Danubian Principalities, in Crete, Armenia, Afghanistan—and sparks are flying in all directions. French vanity burns to avenge its defeat on somebody, and the hope that the peasantry when invested with power would vote down the conscription has so far totally failed. The Czar must have ever present to his mind the idea of shunting domestic Nihilism into foreign war, and military ambition is always whispering in his ear. The same prophets who foretold the war between Prussia and Austria, and afterwards the war between Germany and France, foretold also with equal confidence war between Germany and Russia. If Germany were attacked by France and Russia, England could hardly stand aloof, for her turn would certainly come next. Then the Colonies would be called upon to show that distant and unarmed dependencies are a source of strength to a nation.

—In England bye elections usually go against the Government. No Government can help making malcontents, and a British minister has not like a Canadian Minister the means of capturing constituencies by appropriations. By the reduction of interest on Consols, which must have brought a number of families below the line of comfortable living, malcontents many a one, we may be sure, have been made, while the rest of the community have been made ingrates. Nobody votes for a Government on account of benefits received. At bye elections local and personal influences too have free play, and in Buckinghamshire the name of Verney is very strong. But so far as the question of the Union is concerned the results of these elections, which are taken to denote the progress of Home Rule, in fact denote that Home Rule had been almost withdrawn from the field. That issue has of late been kept in the background by the Gladstonians who contest the elections on ordinary Liberal issues such as Disestablishment, reform of the House of Lords, reform of the land law, extension of the suffrage, and free education. Liberals who are Unionists, consequently, the rank and file of them at least, give a Liberal vote, whereas, if the issue of the Union were revived, they would give a Unionist vote as they did before. On this point perfect confidence prevails in the Liberal camp; of that all who are interested in the matter may feel assured. The serious part of the late elections is the evidence which they have afforded of the spread of Socialism as to which what Mr. Balfour says is right.

—Lord Salisbury's letter on Imperial Federation, now that we have its full text, amounts to a positive declaration that the Imperial Government will not move. If the Imperial Government will not move, nobody else can; for who is to call the Colonies together? The movement has of late been made a stalking-horse for Protection. For its genuine adherents we have nothing but respect and sympathy to express. Only

let them read history and see whether it affords any example of an Imperial Federation resembling in the least degree what they propose. They will find that the Roman Empire was all in a ring fence and had the world to itself, while the Spanish Empire, though not in a ring fence, was an empire in the true sense of the term, the dependencies being despotically ruled by Spain. Let them consider, too, the tendency of the race, whether it is to centralization or independence. What is the moral of the quarrel of the Mother Country and the American Colonies? Have the Australian Colonies succeeded in Federating? Have those in South Africa? Is our own Confederation an assured success? Is there not considerable risk, in tightening the political bond, of loosening or even breaking the bond of the heart? The difficulties of dealing with the Indian Empire, of determining the relations between the British and the Federal Crown and Parliament, of apportioning the representation among communities ranging in size from Great Britain to St. Helena, are already before them. Sentiment by all means, but it is vain to bid our bosoms swell with enthusiasm for an object which nobody can define and which nobody will take a step to promote.

—Politics in England for the time were almost put out of mind by the Great Strike. Socialism evidently tried to use the strike for its own purpose, and it has done the same in the case of the sympathetic strikes which have followed; but apparently without much effect, beyond that of pouring a little poison into the wound. In a strike itself, on however large a scale, there is nothing socialistic. It is simply a mode of bargaining, or to use a more expressive word, of haggling, between the employed and the employer. In all cases the loss for the time is far greater to the earners than to the payers of the wages. Whether the strike will be successful in the long run must depend upon the amount of profit which the employers have been receiving; if it is inordinate, a part of it may be

transferred to the wage-earner, if it is not inordinate the ultimate result will be the withdrawal of capital and the depression or departure of the trade. It does not appear that the dividends of the Dock Companies were large. A year or two hence the net result will appear. Strikers have always to bear in mind the fact that the man whom they regard as the employer and against whom they strike is in reality the paymaster. Their real employer is the public which cannot be made to give more than it chooses or can afford for any labour or for any products of labour, so that the effect of striking beyond a certain point can only be the ruin of the trade. They have also to bear in mind that as purchasers of the products of labour they are themselves employers, and that in buying as cheap as they can, which they invariably do, they are keeping down the wages of the labourers who produce those goods just as much as their master, or rather the community through their master, is keeping down theirs.

Protectionists point to the Dock Strike as an awful warning against Free Trade. Men whose business is unloading vessels would be better off, it seems, if importation were reduced and there were fewer vessels to unload. Are there not fully as many strikes and other labour disturbances in the United States, in Germany, and in other protected countries, as in England? Has the arch-Protectionist, Mr. Carnegie, no trouble with his men? The Docks Strike was caused by a vast accumulation of the very lowest kind of labour round the Docks, employment in which, being dependent on the amount of shipping in port, is uncertain. At the same time, be it remembered, there are millions living in London in the receipt of good wages and in comfort, while there is a comparatively small margin of distress. London and perhaps England is overpeopled, and, let people storm against Malthus as they will, when there are too many hands and too many mouths there will be too little work and bread.

—The land of the adage, that it is only the unexpected which happens, is France. The day before yesterday Boulanger was a man on horseback; yesterday he was a god; to-day, without any assignable reason, he is a political outcast, afraid to go home lest he should undergo the sentence of a felon. The account of this last revolution we believe to be the success of the Paris Exhibition, which has soothed the vanity of the French and reconciled them to the Republican Government. The Republicans have now a majority sufficient to sustain as stable an administration as the party system will permit if they can manage to control faction and personal vanity, the second of which is in France and perhaps everywhere as great an enemy to good government as the first. It is probable that the fright which Boulangism has given them will sober them for a time, after which the Parliamentary chaos will come again. The result of the elections is in favour of peace, for a Boulanger government would have been nothing if not military.

—Most opportune, when the world is being called upon by France to celebrate an immense and devastating eruption of sanguinary violence and monkeyism as the grandest and most beneficent event in history, is the publication of the "Diary of Gouverneur Morris," a shrewd and clear-sighted American, who was in Paris during the Revolution and had the best possible opportunity of observing men as well as events. Morris clearly reveals the main cause of the catastrophe, the vileness of the men and the depravity of society. Paris, it must always be remembered, not France, determined the character and the course of the Revolution. "Paris," says Gouverneur Morris, "is perhaps as wicked a spot as exists: incest, murder, bestiality, fraud, rapine, oppression, baseness, cruelty; and yet this is the city which has stepped forward in the sacred cause of liberty." Not only stepped forward in the sacred cause of liberty, but stepped forward to regenerate the world. The

levity was as great as the immorality. The whirl of dissipation of every kind was going on, as the Diary shows, without abatement, beneath the deepening shadow of the coming storm, and while a cannibal mob was butchering men and women in the streets and carrying about their heads on pikes. In judging the conduct of those who took arms against Jacobinism we are apt to make too little allowance for their natural indignation at atrocities which disgraced humanity. Inexperience and flightiness were dangerous, no doubt, especially when combined with extravagant self-confidence and vanity, but even if they had produced a political Bedlam they would not have turned it into a slaughter-house. This was done by cruelty the twin-brother of lust, which has marked every revolution in Parisian history from the civil war between the Burgundians and Armagnacs down to the Commune. Good husbands and fathers, such as Hampden and Cromwell were, would not have butchered each other like the Terrorist disciples of a sentimentalist who wallowed in moral filth and sent his own children to the Foundling Hospital. The men generally had not even intellectual height: we can see plainly through Morris's eyes that Lafayette, with whom he was very intimate, was far from great, while Mirabeau's moral meanness detracted greatly from his power. The interest which these men and their revolution excite is the morbid interest which attaches to grandiose crime. Unhappily the conflagration set the world on fire. Nothing in history is more to be deplored than the course of events by which the great movement of enlightenment and reform which had been quietly advancing in Europe and gaining gradual possession of opinion and of governments was suddenly brought to a violent head in a metropolis of profligates with a populace of savages. To this, we owe, besides an untold amount of carnage and material destruction, the specific political disease of Jacobinism and the violent and volcanic character which political and social questions generally have assumed. The old monarchy and aristocracy of France fell by their own corruption, and their fall

was a good riddance; but ruin is not creation. France herself, after a series of revolutions and counter-revolutions is almost as far from good and stable government as ever; and she is hardly less centralized than she was under Louis XIV. Peasant ownership, whatever it may be worth, prevailed largely before the Revolution, though with some oppressive incidents, which might have been removed without wrecking the world. How far the working-class is satisfied with the result the days of June and the Commune show. To pretend, as President Carnot does, that modern science was born of the French Revolution is preposterous. Did not the Jacobins murder Lavoisier and proclaim that the Republic had no need of chemists? Celebrate the French Revolution! We might as well be asked to celebrate the Earthquake at Lisbon or the Black Death.

—What are all the disturbances of the political world to that which is going on in the world of thought? In fact the disturbances of the political and social world are largely the consequences and signs of the deeper revolution in the fundamental beliefs of men. Never has man been brought as he is now face to face with the great problem of existence. Greece and Rome had thinkers, but they were few, and compared with the serious inquirers of our time almost like children engaged in intellectual play. Nearly the same may be said of the freethinkers of the Voltairean era, whose sceptical writings were rather the excitements of a novelty-loving circle of intellectual pleasure-seekers than powerful engines of universal change; for the philosophers had less to do with the Revolution than is commonly supposed. The advance of those twin-dethroners of faith, science and historical criticism, has opened a new scene. So momentous, so overwhelming, are the problems now set before us in regard to our origin, the nature and intentions of the Power in whose hand we are, the laws of our being and our destiny, that it is almost wonderful that

those to whose minds they have been brought home can have thought for anything else. Even in its merely social bearing, the theological question is all-important; for no one can doubt that the social fabric has hitherto been largely built on a religious foundation which appears now to be giving way.

The most significant event which has lately taken place in the theological and philosophic sphere, perhaps, is Renan's manifesto in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, entitled "Examen de Conscience Philosophique." Renan is not of all inquirers the one to whose words we should attach most weight. In him, as in Matthew Arnold, the literary artist predominates over the seeker after truth. His "Jesus" is the creation of an erudite fancy without a critical basis. He is also beset by a notion that truth can be kept in the exclusive possession of the intellectual few, while salutary illusion is preserved for the benefit of the many. It seems as though he had not entirely thrown off the Seminarist and was still haunted by the *populus vult decipi et decipiatur*, though he would give the maxim a beneficent turn. Still he is sincere and earnest as well as erudite; what he says has weight and will certainly tell. After a solemn genuflexion before the altar of Truth, Renan proceeds to avow his belief that in this world of ours there is no evidence of any will or intelligence other than those of man. This world of ours, the solar system, and even the sidereal system may, he admits, be a mere grain of a universe beyond the ken of its inhabitants and totally different in character from itself, like an atom of granite in a quarry or of coal in a mine. The infinite universe beyond may have an order of which we can form no conception. It may have a God and that God may some day be revealed. But so far as the universe which we see is concerned Renan declares the hypothesis of a God to be entirely baseless. There is absolutely no proof of it, he says, and therefore there is no need of disproof. This profession of scepticism is qualified by some mysticism touching the sublime character of love and duty and the glimpses afforded by them of the infinite, which though instinct with Renan's

unfailing gracefulness is poetry, not philosophy, and would probably find short shrift at the hands of the unpoetic apostles of Evolution. Without superstition, Renan says, we should have an insufferable Positivism; insufferable perhaps to him but not to Mr. Herbert Spencer or Herr Haeckel. Renan himself may feel that the conception of acting in the presence of a Supreme Being is a necessary aid to a virtuous life, and that, consequently, to assume the existence of God is the best and most reasonable course. But many people, at all events, will tell him that supposing the facts of religion to be gone they do not care to replace them with figments. If there is no evidence of a God or of a Future State of retribution in the universe which we know, the surmise that there may be a God in a universe which we do not know and that he may have justice in store for us all, will exercise little influence on ordinary minds. The unrevealed Master of a universe beyond our ken may be beneficent or he may be the reverse; his nature may be indicated by the good in this molecule of ours, or it may be indicated by the evil; we cannot possibly divine anything about the utterly unknown. The work-a-day world is uncultivated and unimaginative; mystical breathings from a hypothetical empyrean do not reach its ear. If no evidence of the existence of a God can be produced it will live and act as if there were no God.

Renan, however, while he denies that there is any evidence of volition or intention in the order of our universe, incidentally admits that there is visible a *nisus* or effort, and he palliates the secondary shortcomings of Nature in terms which imply a supreme design: indeed if we substitute the word Deity for Nature his language might be taken as implying the manifest existence of a God. It was some time ago observed, by way of meeting the difficulty created by the co-existence of imperfection with Benevolence and Omnipotence, that the Creator's mode of action, so far as our world is concerned, appears to be not fiat, but something analogous to human effort—a gradual process pointing through temporary vicissitude

and miscarriage to ultimate perfection. Why this mode should be preferred, we cannot tell; we only know with regard to our own nature that excellence produced by effort is the highest thing we can conceive. Mr. Herbert Spencer says that this view is ascetic; but dubbing a view ascetic does not make it false unless it can be shown that immediate enjoyment, not moral training or the formation of character, is the object of the Power which made and rules the world. In admitting *nisus* or effort, with a tendency towards good, as he plainly does, Renan really admits volition and intelligence, without which effort cannot be. Evolution there may be without volition or intelligence, if only a starting-point can be found; effort there plainly cannot be. If in our universe there is evidence of effort, and of effort manifestly tending towards good, the Theistic hypothesis is proved. Besides, how came the idea of volition and intelligence to exist? Renan says they reside only in human nature. Still human nature is a part of the world; if the pride of species does not mislead us, it is of our world the crowning part. It must be therefore included, and not only included but regarded as the chief among the indications of the character and objects of the Power whose creatures we are. The generation of will and intelligence by matter or force devoid of either seems of all hypotheses the most untenable.

In trying, as he does, to prop the belief in God and Immortality up again after throwing it down, Renan is led by his conservative instincts, and they lead him right. The most terrible consequence of Atheism is that it leaves us fatherless and guideless in an immeasurable vortex of blind force. It "rounds" individual life with "a sleep" indeed and reduces affection to the momentary attraction towards each other of two atoms which will never meet again. But supposing it could take hold of the general mind, its social effects, notwithstanding the control of long habits and existing organizations, could hardly fail to be tremendous. The various treatises on Ethics are so many attempts to find a sanction for morality

irrespective of the authority of God, and all in this respect are failures; the sanction in each case itself requires a sanction. If it is shown that morality is the interest of the community, the question still remains why each of us should prefer the interest of the community to his own. Cain did the one essential thing—he survived: that is his answer to his critics. Evolution, as its bolder professors tell us frankly, is not moral. Survival is the title to existence and apparently it is as good a title in the case of the human tiger as in that of the human lamb; the means by which the human tiger survives are their own warrant and no more apparently is to be said on that score against a successful brigand or conqueror than against the benefactors of mankind. Mr. Cotter Morison, the most thorough-going and outspoken of Agnostics, proposes to meet the difficulty simply by killing the bad men, or to speak more correctly, the men who make themselves a nuisance, since bad is a moral term. But then supposing you could pick out the bad men, it is possible that instead of your killing them they may kill you. There is an end of human brotherhood, even in the Jacobin sense of the term. Without a common father, it has been truly and finely said, there can be no brotherhood. That all men are physically of kin to each other Science holds to be doubtful; but assuming that they are, why, on the Atheistic hypothesis, are we bound or concerned to spare our kin if by putting them out of the way we can secure our own survival, or a gratification of our own desires, which by producing in us comfort and hilarity tends, as the physical philosophers tell us, to the prolongation of our lives? No one who reads journals of a revolutionary type can doubt that the failure of the belief in a Providence, which rules here, and in compensation for sufferers hereafter, has had a great deal to do with social disturbances and industrial war. Men cease to acquiesce in an unequal distribution of lots which they no longer regard as a divine ordinance but as human injustice, and they feel that if there is no life hereafter they must grasp enjoyment in this life or never. The Parisian Communist, the Spanish In-

transigents, the Nihilists, and the Socialists of the more violent section, all of them are Atheists; some of them make Atheism a plank in their platform; and Christian Socialism as an attempt to reconcile Socialism with religion has met with very poor success.

That this world of ours is a molecule to infinity and that its denizens can know nothing of the infinite, is a truth forcibly put by Renan; and it ought to moderate the pretensions of physical science, which, though it is the necessary and beneficent guide of our material life here, cannot possibly show us things as they are, since it must present everything in time and space from which no inference can be drawn as to eternity and infinity. Besides, physical science is nothing but the systematized evidence of our bodily senses. And our bodily senses are what? Even about the world in which we live they may tell only a little more in comparison with the perceptions of a higher intelligence than the senses of a mole.

—By the Copyright legislation of last session at Ottawa, and the renewed opposition of English publishers to Canadian enactments on the subject, fresh interest has been awakened in a vexed question. The difficulty in dealing with the matter has hitherto arisen from this fact, that the English book-trade have continually made Copyright legislation in the Colonies a publisher's, rather than an author's, question. To add to the complications, the music-publishers have, it seems, joined the book-publishers, and their combined interests have of late strengthened the case against the Canadian book-trade and the aim of the latter to legislate at once in their own interests and in those of the author. It could hardly be helped, perhaps, that the question, as it affects British interests, should become a publishers' one, and that for two reasons. First, because the publisher, in the case of young authors and those who have not made a reputation, generally assumes the greater part of the risk involved in publication, and thereby controls, if he

does not wholly acquire, copyright. Secondly, because the authors (and particularly the novelists) have not been able as yet to break down the artificial library system, which by maintaining the high-priced three volume issues and editions not for popular use but for the privileged classes, plays into the hands of the publishers, and makes the author a mere cipher in regard to the trade arrangements for bringing out and handling his book. Helpless in regard to his home market, the author is not any better informed about, or more in a position to conduct negotiations with, the foreign market. Hence the difficulty in getting him to see not only the reasonableness, but the gain to his pocket, in meeting the views of the Canadian publisher, whom he somehow treats as an accomplice of the American literary pirate, nefariously robbing him of his due, rather than as a fellow-subject who would gladly protect the interest of the British author if the British author would put him in a position to do so. What the Canadian publisher seeks reasonably and justly to do, the author, if he will dismiss prejudice from his mind, and recognize the exceptional circumstances of the Canadian position, will find embodied in the Ottawa Copyright Act of last session, as well as in the Act of 1872, which, at the instance of the English book-trade, was vetoed by the Imperial Government. The principle on which both of these Acts were based may be briefly stated. Their first aim was to protect the native market from the inroads of unauthorized American reprints, which by a British Order in Council in 1847 were on certain conditions privileged to enter Canada. Their second and chief aim was to secure the British author's interest by legalizing native reprints, paying a royalty to the copyright owner on the edition authorized to be printed, while their manufacture in the country would give employment to the various industries connected with publishing. In this effort of Canadian legislation to solve a knotty problem, it is not of course claimed that the highest regard is paid either to vested interests or even to abstract right. The compulsory clauses of the Acts take perhaps too much liberty

with the author's or copyright owner's property for that to be maintained. But this was demanded by the peculiarities of the situation, and involves no detriment to the English author. It was, in truth, the only way of relieving Canada from being dependent for its intellectual sustenance on the costly and almost prohibitory issues of the English market on the one hand, or, in the absence of an International Copyright, on the often worthless issues of the piratical presses of the United States on the other. What the Acts sought to secure was some provision for the author, which at present is practically lost to him, and to substitute a desirable and operative law for an undesirable and defective one, which the author's ignorance or indifference has too long allowed to remain on the Statute Book. In other words, by their common-sense proposals, the author would receive a royalty, secured to him by the Government, on all editions of his work sold in Canada, as well as on such editions as might also be disposed of in the United States, as against the precarious and, at the best, inconsiderable sums collected at the Customs ports on stray copies of pirated American editions which a listless scrutiny detected entering the country. The proposals have this also to recommend them, that while the Canadian reprint would give employment to the native industries, the author would receive as royalty a sum *en bloc* on the edition authorized to be printed, with the practical benefits of acquiring on this continent a market which he does not now possess, and which, while being supplementary to the English one, would not interfere with it. Nor by either of the Acts are the interests of the English publisher, whether he is the owner of the Copyright or not, invaded or in any way disregarded. The Act of last session provides that at the expiry of a month after publication of the work in England, if the Copyright owner has not previously arranged for an edition, a license may issue from the Government to the Canadian publisher who applies for permission to reprint, and gives a bond for the amount of the author's royalty. But the English publisher may forestall that reprint, not only within

the month of grace, but prior to the issue of the book in England he may negotiate with his own agent in Canada and place on the market an edition which, if he likes, he can print from his English plates forwarded here for the purpose. Thus are even the British publisher's interests protected, though to secure them he must of course comply with the law, or allow the native publisher to step in and by Government license secure the market against the foreign reprint. In this surely there is no injustice; nor is either author or publisher at any serious detriment. The Act neither contemplates nor connives at any sharp practice or questionable advantage; it merely recognizes the exceptional circumstances of the Canadian market and seeks to legislate accordingly. Like reciprocity with the United States, it takes note of the economical situation, and endeavours, not from the manufacturers' point of view merely, but from that, in conjunction with the interests of the people, to meet as best it may the difficulty. English publishers and authors must recollect that Canada is on the American continent; and to treat it as an outlying possession of England, without reference to its connection with the United States, is to perpetuate the evil which Canadian Copyright legislation has again attempted to remove. To interfere with this legislation would not extend the British book market. It would extend that of the American reprinter, who alone would reap the benefit, while Canadian publishing industries would stagnate.

—We cannot attempt in so narrow a space to make up our long arrears of Canadian Literature. It must suffice us to mark the growth of Canadian poetry, which soon makes collections obsolete, and to pay particular homage to Mr. Wilfred Campbell as a poetic interpreter of nature, especially of lake scenery, to Mr. Archibald Lampman as a philosophic or subjective poet, to the sap which runs through the productions of Mr. Hcreward Cockin and with a little more finish will en-

sure a long life to such poems as "Gentleman Dick o' the Greys." In another line Dr. Withrow's "Our Own Country" speaks to the eye by its pictures, as well as to the mind by its letterpress, of the glories, natural, historical and architectural of our country. Nor are materials for the panegyric wanting. The sunsets and autumnal tints under our institutions are magnificent.

We may claim as Canadian, though published at New York, Mrs. Blackstock's bright and nicely illustrated booklet on "The Land of the Viking and the Empire of the Tsar." Among the illustrations is a portrait of the Czar, and we scan it with interest, as that of the man who holds the trigger of European war in his hands, to see whether from the character indicated by his features he is likely to pull it. We incline to think that he is.

NOTE.—We learn that it was not as we had previously been informed, on the Citadel, which is under military control, but on the Parliament Buildings at Quebec, that the French flag was hoisted above the British in honour of the French frigate *Minerve*. The statement, on page 3 of our last number, is therefore to this extent corrected,

THE BYSTANDER.

DECEMBER, 1889.

IN describing the character and object of the Jesuits' Estates Act at Baltimore the other day, Mr. Mercier was bold and explicit. Amid loud cheers he spoke of it as "having repaired the despoilment of the Jesuits by the same George III. who had despoiled the American Revolutionary Fathers of their rights and liberties." It was intended as a reversal of the Conquest Settlement. It did deny the right of the crown and treated the exercise of that right as robbery. Where now are the soft subterfuges of the Minister of Justice? Are not those words of Mr. Mercier in themselves enough, if this is a British Colony, to warrant the protest against the Act?

At Quebec Mr. Mercier proclaimed that red and blue were to be blended in the Tricolor. From Quebec he telegraphed to the Pope the homage of the French Canadian nation. At Baltimore he changes his note and says that the tendency of his compatriots is not to nationality but to annexation. Plainly his opinions take their colour from his audience. Perhaps he also feels that he had hoisted the Tricolor a little too high. But if nationality is not the object, what is meant by the designation *Parti National*? The steadfast aim of Mr. Mercier's compatriots for the last quarter of a century has been to elbow the British and Protestant elements out of Quebec and make it a French and Papal community, which to all practical intents and purposes will be a separate nation. By some of the leaders this aim is openly avowed; those who

do not avow it still work for its attainment, and it is rapidly being attained. Such is the solid fact, avowed or unavowed, with which we have to deal. When Mr. Mercier himself threatens the minority in Quebec with reprisals, does he not imply that the minority are intruders and that Quebec is a French and Papal, not a British, Province ?

—Political circles are still debating what effect the Equal Rights' movement will have on the Machines. It is a serious matter for those whom it concerns. Equal Rights men have simply done a plain duty to their country and humanity by opposing the endowment with public funds of a dark and murderous conspiracy, not against Protestantism only, but against civil rights and human freedom. If they have been baffled by the exigencies of political party bidding for the Irish Catholic vote and countenanced in its surrender of national right to the Papal encroachment by the representative of the Sovereign who sits on the throne of Elizabeth and William III., that is no fault of theirs ; nor was it their business to inquire what the effect on Machine politics would be. We are quite prepared to see the Machines for the present reassert their power in the elections. It is surprising, and to the lover of freedom somewhat afflicting, to see to what an extent our people have been brought into thralldom to mere party names and Shibboleths. Conscience and substantial interest alike seem to give way at the crack of the party whip, and votes are cast for men who in private are admitted to be unworthy because they are the party nominees and because, if a scoundrel were thrown out, the Tory or the Grit, as the case may be, might come in. The phenomenon is not confined to Canada. Have we not just seen the farmers of the United States voting against that which clearly was, and which many of them knew to be, their own interest in the tariff question simply because they were "Republicans," though the name since the abolition of slavery has meant

nothing except the maintenance of a war tariff. We have the consolation of knowing on the best evidence that the intensity of partyism varies in inverse proportion to education, and your most fanatical Tory or Grit is a man who can barely read the campaign literature of his party; so that there is hope in the progress of intelligence. But such fetters are not to be struck off in a moment, especially when the wearers belong to a party which has a large bribery fund in its hands. Still the waters have been stirred; public feeling has been manifested on a question of principle in a manner which has impressed the politicians; and should the subject again come before Parliament we shall be surprised if the same servility or anything like the same levity is displayed.

Naturally, and it must be added, deservedly, the Liberal party suffers most. In allying itself with Jesuitism and Ecclesiasticism it has been guilty of a more flagrant breach of principle than the party which professes to be that of Reaction. It is also out; to get in it requires a motive power; whereas its rival, being in, has in its favour both the *vis inertiae* and the force by no means inert of patronage, and appropriations. Looking out for a principle to justify the existence of an organization is a curious reversal of natural order, but it is one with which the history of Party has made us familiar. One thing seems clear; the Liberals have no chance of bidding successfully against Sir John Macdonald or his lieutenants, Messrs. Langevin and Chapleau, for the support of the priest party in Quebec: the priest party knows whom it can thoroughly trust and to whom its gratitude for the passing of the Jesuits' Estates Act is really due. The only sound, or even possible, alliance for the Liberals in Quebec is with Liberals, that is to say, with the friends of Equal Right and Disestablishment. Of these, there may not at present be many, but their number will grow. Even sheep so patient as the *habitans* grow tired at last of being fleeced. We commend the consideration especially to young Liberals who have a political future.

In the progress of the controversy, the Jesuits' Estates Act has become almost a secondary matter and questions have been opened which the Machines have no more power to close than a steam engine has to alter the day of the week. The conflict between ecclesiastical aggression and civil right is just as irrepressible as was the conflict between slavery and freedom, though happily it is not likely to assume such tremendous proportions, or to be settled at such fearful cost. It extends, as daily events show us, over the States as well as over Canada, albeit there is not in the States a counterpart of the solid block of Ecclesiasticism and Papalism presented by Quebec. It extends to every part of the world in which the Church of the Middle Ages is still struggling for dominion. In an Australian review the other day there was an able and thoughtful essay on the institutions of the Colonies, the writer of which, after suggesting some improvements, wound up with the pensive remark that all improvements would be in vain so long as the Irish Catholic vote continued for objects of its own to hover between the parties, playing off one against the other and making honest and stable government impossible. The Catholic vote in Ontario is cast in the local election for Mr. Mowat's Government as the payment for patronage and Separate Schools. In the Dominion election which immediately follows it is transferred to the other party also for goods sold and delivered, the goods being the organic principles, the interests and honour of this Commonwealth. By way of turning the eye of the public from the mark and at the same time scaring the clerical leaders of the movement it has been said that the movement ought to be directed not against the encroachments of the Roman Catholic Church alone, but against those of the clergy generally. All bodies of men who possess influence are apt to take too much upon them, and when the clergy of any denomination do this, repression will become a duty. But the clergy of churches other than the Church of Rome do not pretend to temporal power; on the contrary, they with one voice abjure

it. The Church of Rome has always pretended and does still pretend to temporal power, or rather to temporal supremacy; her very last manifesto solemnly reasserts the claim and lays a curse on all who dispute it. In former times she sought to make it good by means of the swords of Catholic Kings; now she seeks to make it good by means of the votes of Catholic electors. Before she had to be encountered in the field and at the stake; she has now to be encountered at the polls.

In any resistance to the union of the temporal with the ecclesiastical power the place of honour is justly claimed by the Baptist Church, which held its conference in Toronto the other day. This, above all other Churches kept, in its true sense, the words of a Founder who said that His Kingdom was not of this world, while almost all other Churches have at one time or other more or less treated the words as if they meant that the Church of Christ was to renounce the sword where she was weak, but to use it where she was strong. To bring the pressure of a powerful Church vote to bear on a government for the aggrandizement of the Church, let it be remembered, is not less a breach of the great principle than the legal acceptance of State support. When we consider of what wars, massacres and murders political Churches, above all the great political Church of Rome, have been the cause, and how enormous also has been the scandal of their greed and corruption, that Christianity should still be received as a message of good-will, mercy and purity seems no small proof of its divine character.

—Another question has been raised which so far as Canada is concerned is perhaps more pressing still, though it cannot be of graver import. Quebec having now openly unfurled the standard of a French and Papal nationality, and the bearers of that flag having apparently the leaders of her people and the mass of her people itself with them, what are our future relations with her to be? THE BYSTANDER has the heartiest

sympathy with those who strive to make Canada a nation, and perhaps it may trace its own pedigree to the Canada First movement in which that aspiration was embodied. But there is no use in attempting manifest impossibilities, and no impossibility apparently can be more manifest than that of fusing or even harmonizing a French and Papal with a British and Protestant community. Mere political lines or uniformity of colouring on the map will not make a nation: if they would, Austro-Italy might have been a nation, and so might Holland and Belgium. To make a nation there must be a common life, common sentiments, common aims, and common hopes. Of these, in the case of Quebec and Ontario, there are none. Quebec tells us in the plainest terms that she is pursuing an ideal different from ours, that the connection is merely provisional, that she looks forward to being a nation of herself, and even in the end to supplanting us, and not only cancelling Wolfe's victory but realizing the visions of Louis XIV. If this were a sudden access of sentimental excitement it might pass away as it came; but it has been a steady growth, and moreover it is perfectly natural; a British colony conquered by France and feeling the conquerer's grasp relaxed by his fears would have done exactly the same thing. The extrusion of British population has at the same time been continually going on. Foreseeing the catastrophe, Lord Durham tried to avert it by union. Union failed and thereon followed a partial divorce under the deceptive name of Confederation. French nationality has all the time been gathering strength; at last it has found a leader and declared itself. What chance is there of subduing or absorbing it, and, if it can neither be subdued or absorbed, what chance is there of forming out of two masses, antagonistic in all respects, a united Canadian nation? Switzerland is cited as an example of the successful union of different races and religions. But in Switzerland the races and religions are intermingled; they do not confront each other, like opposing cliffs, as they do here. Moreover the territory of Switzerland is compact, with boundaries most clearly

traced by nature, and her union, which was formed under the strongest pressure of necessity, has endured through centuries, and has been consecrated by historic struggles. After all, Switzerland, when the Jesuit crept into her, had her civil war of religions.

Ontario by herself might be a nation. There is nothing at least in the nature of things, however much there may be in actual circumstances, to prevent her. She has sufficient unity of race, her territory is compact, and a strong British population would easily deal with any attempt which the wielders of her Irish Catholic vote might make to divide or dominate her in the interest of the Papacy. Her population is as large as that of Denmark; and if her resources could only be developed by free trade with her continent, it might in time equal that of Switzerland, Belgium or Holland. Quebec would hold the lower course of the St. Lawrence, but she would never venture to close it. Besides, now that we have direct railway access to the coast through Maine, a waterway which is closed for nearly half the year is likely to lose some of its importance. Even the Mississippi is less important than it was; and to retain it would hardly now be a sufficient motive for a four years' war.

The actual crisis may be deferred. The government of Sir John Macdonald may contrive to carry the Dominion elections in Quebec. To allow it to do this suits the policy of the Nationalist and Ecclesiastical party, which is thus enabled to prevent any interference of the Federal Parliament with its aims, and to draw on the Dominion treasury for its rather urgent financial needs at the same time. But though the Conservatives are allowed to carry Richelieu, the Nationalists, under their own flag, carry Joliette, and they purge the Club National of influences alien to their cause. Those who can see anything good and noble in itself, or tending to what is good and noble, in the management of Quebec and her retention within the pale of Confederation by means of patronage and government appropriations may have some years of satisfac-

tion and hope still before them. Something in the march of events here will be determined by the relations between the two mother countries. Mr. Hamerton, who has studied the French people most thoroughly and most sympathetically, says in his "French and English" that peace and courtesy may be maintained between the two nations, but that they never can be friends. It is too evident that Sedan has not effaced Waterloo.

—The signal success of Mr. Wiman's meeting at Toronto set two questions at rest. It proved that in the very centre of Separatism and Protectionism the desire for freedom of trade with our continent is strong, and it proved that in Canada public discussion is not to be put down by personal slander. To pretend that the meeting was not with Mr. Wiman is shameful: whether it was with the particular scheme could not be decided, as the scheme was not submitted to the vote; but it clearly was with the general object and with the injured man. Mr. Wiman called attention to the important fact that immense masses of English capital are being invested in the United States, so that England is acquiring an interest in the internal commerce of this continent which bears a large proportion to her interest in importation, while this vast redundancy of wealth is a pretty conclusive answer to the assertion that she has been impoverished by free trade. Very timely, too, was the warning to us in Toronto that our prosperity must ultimately depend on the condition of the farmer, and that we have consequently the deepest interest in any policy which will increase his earnings by giving him a better market. Our city is at present draining the country towns, most of which are consequently going backward: this is the source of her present growth; but it is a cornucopia which must presently cease to flow: we shall then have to look almost entirely to the farm, and the farm, let it be remembered, has been declining in value. Mr. Blue rates the depreciation since 1883 at twenty-two mil-

lions and a half. The farmer of Ontario moreover will be exposed in ever-increasing measure to competition with the harvests of the North-West, all forced in this direction by the tariff wall which bars their egress to the South. Belleville cries out that her prosperity is departing. Then let her support a policy which will bring it back again, instead of taking some petty bribe from the government and voting under the party-whip.

Is it not possible to advocate Commercial Union or a Zollverein without betraying the political independence of Canada? Hear what the Hon. Isaac Buchanan, Conservative patriot and Protectionist to boot, said at the conclusion of a review of the commercial situation in 1859: "The natural policy of Canada is seen clearly therefore to be the establishment of an American Zollverein, such as exists among the German States. Under this, the United States and Canada would neither of them levy any customs taxes on their interior frontiers, but only at the seaports from Labrador to Mexico—the same duties being levied and each country getting its share in the proportion of its population. Let it be therefore resolved that for our commercial system the principle should be adopted by Canada of an American Zollverein, or, in other words, free trade with America, but not with Europe. And this will be a fair compromise between the views of the two classes of friends of the Canadian farmer, one of which holds that our farmer is to be most benefited by general free trade and direct taxation, and the other by keeping our money in the country through the restriction of importations and indirect taxation." It is noteworthy that in commending his policy to the Americans Mr. Buchanan uses the very phrase which when used by Mr. Wiman has been distorted into treason. He says that a Zollverein "would give the Americans all the commercial advantages of annexation."

Mr. Buchanan was not always in the right; certainly he was not on the question of currency. But he clearly saw the great fact that the fiscal unity of the empire had been abandoned

and that Canada must thenceforth be at liberty to do the best she could for herself with reference to her own commercial circumstances, which are those of a community sharing this continent with the United States.

—The air has been full of rumours of a dissolution of the Legislature of Ontario. There could be no justification for such a step. No constitutional crisis to warrant an appeal to the people had arisen. There could be no assignable reason except a desire on the part of the holders of power to nip in the bud the Equal Rights' movement; in other words, to prevent public opinion from being fairly matured and finding expression at the polls. It is time to protest against the usurpation by the heads of party governments of a power of dissolving Parliament whenever it suits their convenience, and for the purpose of snapping a verdict. Such a practice, besides the turmoil and expense of frequent elections, would be subversive of the independence of Parliament, the members of which would hold their seats, not for the term for which the people in the exercise of its legal power has elected them, but during the pleasure of the Prime Minister. When to this usurped power of dissolution are added those of gerrymandering and of passing such party measures as the Franchise Act, together with a great command of patronage and government appropriations, there is no saying to what extent an unscrupulous Minister might entrench himself in power. Dissolution is the prerogative of the Crown, to be exercised for the purpose of providing the Sovereign with advisers who have the confidence of the people. In England we do not believe that the Sovereign would consent to a purely tactical dissolution. It is true that in 1874, when Mr. Gladstone was allowed to dissolve, there was no constitutional crisis; but Mr. Gladstone had been beaten the year before on the Catholic University question, had then resigned, and had consented to resume office only on the understanding that there was to be an early appeal to the

country. A heavy responsibility rests on the late Governor-General who abandoned to Sir John Macdonald the last prerogative of the Crown. The fact is that a Governor-General thinks of little beyond having a smooth passage through his term, and making a good fund of social popularity, which the English take for administrative success and accept as a certificate for higher employment. Yet the Governor-Generalship, with its seven Lieutenant-Governorships, must, since Confederation, have cost us in the aggregate something like six millions. This would be a heavy price to pay for figure-heads however beautifully gilded. We may fairly expect that the Governor General shall, at all events, act as the guardian of the British North America Act and see that the people enjoy the rights and securities which it gives them. To be just to Lord Lansdowne, let us say that he reduced the expenses of his office as much as possible, paying for his own trips over the country, whereas Lord Dufferin's trips to the West alone cost the Dominion twenty-eight thousand dollars.

—The *St. Thomas Journal* asks pertinently enough why the national veto on local legislation should be essential to the preservation of nationality in the case of Canada when it is not necessary in the case of the United States. Our answer is that in the first place there are in the United States checks of other kinds upon State action which we lack. The Governor's veto, unlike the veto of our Lieutenant-Governors, is a reality and is often used. There is sure access to the Supreme Court, whereas we see what a shifty government can do here. There is a power of amending the Constitution, which has been used for example to put an end to Slavery with its disruptive tendencies, whereas our Constitution is locked up in the keeping of an Imperial Legislature to which it is hopeless to appeal. Besides in the last resort the national government of the United States possesses and has used on the largest scale the power of coercion, whereas the Dominion has no such power, and Quebec

knows well that the Imperial Government will never venture to interpose with force. But more than all, the American Commonwealth, now that slavery has been eliminated, is homogeneous and moves of itself with sufficient uniformity on a national line, the same political parties with identical aims and issues pervading its whole frame. The Dominion, on the contrary, has in the midst of it a subaltern nationality, French and Papal, with distinct aims of its own, and unless the action of this subaltern nationality is controlled by a central authority, so as to keep it in tolerable unison with that of the Federal nationality, the federation, will become a mere league. A league with a French and Papal nation, the *St. Thomas Journal*, we believe, does not desire.

—The West Lambton Election was the old story—the two Machines bidding a gainst each other for the Catholic vote and victory in the Dutch auction remaining, as was natural, with the Mowat machine, which beyond doubt has the strongest claims to ecclesiastical gratitude. The outcome to the Province, as usual, is ecclesiastical domination. No Equal Rights candidate was in the field, the Association having expressly declined to take part on this occasion; but an Anti-Machine candidate, who combined Equal Rights with Prohibition and Third Party, polled a vote respectable in itself, and which, if it were added to the Conservative vote, would turn the scale. The Opposition perhaps in time will learn its lesson. Its leader by hauling down his flag before the last general election did not gain a single Catholic vote. The priest knows who is his true friend in Ontario. If the Opposition is to be led as it is now, it may as well disband at once; indeed it had better; for all it does now is to mask the responsibility of the Government. Sir John Macdonald said that Mowat must go. But did he mean it any more than he meant that he was dying to catch Riel? The Catholic vote is given to Mr. Mowat in the Province and then to Sir John in the Dominion. This arrangement proba-

bly suits Sir John well, and it would be at once disturbed if life were put, by the only conceivable means, into the Ontario Opposition. The men who occupy the place of leaders of the party did not even show themselves in the Riding. Independence of Ottawa seems to be the first condition of an effective Opposition in Ontario. Another condition, however, is the appearance of some stronger men than Mr. Meredith has at his side.

—In Sir Richard Cartwright's fierce indictment of the Government there was much that is only too familiar. No one can doubt that we are governed to a deplorable extent, by corruption, or that the consequence is the demoralization of a community well fitted by nature, if ever a community was, for the working of representative institutions. Indeed Sir Richard's instances were not taken from the worst class of all. When, on the eve of a general election, a Prime Minister assembles the representatives of a particular commercial interest in the parlour of a hotel, takes from them subscriptions for his election fund, and virtually pledges to them in return the commercial policy of the country, corruption assumes its most dangerous and noxious form. The most novel and startling count in Sir Richard Cartwright's indictment was that relating to the corruption of the Press. It would be difficult to substantiate the charge by proving the motives with which advertisements and printing patronage are given: but when a government such as ours spends two or three hundred thousand dollars a year on the journals we may be sure that a sinister influence is exercised, and that poison, to use Sir Richard's apt metaphor, is cast into the well of public truth. The excuse, as has been said before, is the difficulty of holding together provinces geographically scattered, differing in race and without unity of commercial interest. This may amount almost to a plea of necessity. But the system is not the less immoral or the less injurious to the political character of the people.

—In scattering benedictions over the North-West the Governor-General has bestowed a share on the Mormon settlement. We are assured by Mr. Mackenzie Bowell that none of the settlers are living in polygamy. The sect, however, is nothing if not polygamic; a detachment of it is rather a sinister accession to our civilization; and Mr. Bowell is hardly to be congratulated on having to appear at once as the champion of Jesuitism in the East and of Mormonism in the West. Shreds of outlandish nationalities and equivocal sects—Icelanders, Skye Crofters, Mennonites, and Mormons—are hardly the stuff out of which a strong, sound, and patriotic community is made. Of the motley collection the Icelanders are probably the best. The Mennonites are materially the most prosperous, but their prosperity is very material: they generally decline the duties of citizenship, and when they do vote are said to be weak. To transport the herdsmen and fishermen of Skye from the mild air of the Hebrides and set them to farming in the North-West was not an unquestionable act of benevolence, though it may be hoped that their children will do well. What the North-West wants is the Canadian immigration which is now peopling Dakota, Minnesota, Montana, and Washington Territory. But this it will not get, nor will it enjoy, in any respect, its destined measure of prosperity until it has thrown down the tariff wall and brought itself within the commercial pale of its Continent. Manitoba wishes for rest after her struggle against railway monopoly. This is natural; but in time, having gained freedom of construction she will have to strike for freedom of trade over the road. The country will not fill up while it is commercially kept out in the cold. The writer of a Tory account of Canada and Canadian sentiment in the *Quarterly Review*, the other day, had sufficient confidence in the faith of his readers to tell them that there was a cordon of towns and villages from Port Arthur to Vancouver. In the whole of the region, two thousand miles long and of infinite breadth, there are not, we will venture to say, more than two hundred thousand whites, say one-fifth of a man

to the square mile of the habitable area ; and this twenty years after the assumption of the territory by the Dominion.

—The country gave a guarantee for thirteen millions to indemnify the C. P. R. for the surrender of a monopoly to which, as far as Manitoba was concerned, the Company never had a right. Having got the guarantee the Company, with the manifest connivance of the Government, maintained the monopoly by blocking the construction of the rival railway. It is now doing the same thing again, and as before with the connivance of the Government, the object probably being to secure the exclusive handling of this year's harvest. So at least Manitobans are complaining. But, as Sir Richard Cartwright says, if any one calls attention to the wrong in Parliament, he will be voted down, perhaps without debate, by a majority at the command of the Government. Not only so, but Manitoba herself, as likely as not, at the next election, lured by some paltry and perhaps illusory bribe, will send up representatives to uphold the wrong. "Considerable indignation," says the *Winnipeg Sun*, is felt over the matter. Then let the people, instead of merely "feeling" indignation, show it.

—A curious letter signed "Maple Leaf" appeared the other day in the *Toronto Telegram*. It was written in support of a proposal to treat the English subjects of Her Majesty as aliens and impose on them a year of naturalization as a condition of eligibility to municipal office. From this it went on to inveigh with extreme bitterness against English immigration. Other writers have followed in the same strain. We believe the letter to have been a symptom of a feeling, which though unavowed, is growing. There is a singular contrast in this respect between American and Canadian sentiment. To Americans England is an object of traditional hatred ; yet the Eng-

lishman is received by them without the slightest prejudice on the ground of nationality and made heartily welcome to everything to which he is eligible by law. Canadians, while they profess and no doubt feel great love of England, are disposed in an increasing degree to look upon the English immigrant as an interloper. The appointment of an Englishman to any office or place, even in a bank, excites jealousy, and it appears to be easier for Americans than for Englishmen to make their way here in public life. The true explanation no doubt is, not that Canadians are unkind, but that in the last generation immigrants from the Imperial country enjoyed a preference approaching to a monopoly, of which the memory lingers in the minds of the natives who are now determined to have Canada to themselves. With this perhaps is combined a suspicion that natives of an Imperial country imagine themselves superior to colonists, so that the jealousy may be looked upon as one of the moral incidents of Colonial dependence. It is only in Old Canada that the English immigrant has this adverse feeling to encounter : in the North-West there can be no nativism, because there are no natives.

—The Harvey case raises once more the solemn question as to the conditions of capital punishment. For our part we incline to the stern opinion that, if a man takes human life knowingly and under no hallucination or misconception, his life ought to be taken. No one would propose to hang a lunatic who did not know what he was doing or a man who imagined he was defending himself against a robber and assassin. But the plea of criminal propensity, we think, ought not to be heard. It is to compel men to restrain their criminal propensities that the law is made. If criminal propensity were to be a ground of acquittal a man by indulging his evil passions till they became his masters might qualify himself for cutting our throats with impunity. It is very likely that the criminal propensity of "Jack the Ripper" has become uncontrollable.

Medical experts ought not to be heard unless they can attest positive hallucination. When they say that a propensity is uncontrollable they only mean, at least they can only prove, that it has not been controlled. If a man has really been miscreated the responsibility for the necessity to which society is driven of protecting itself against the influence of his example by putting him out of the way must rest with the Creator. Motives are a ground not for acquittal but for pardon or commutation. Nobody would propose to let the law take its course in the case of a modern *Virginus*. What we ought to do with an *Othello* it might be difficult to say ; but we know what an *Othello* does with himself. When a man has committed a wilful homicide without a palliating motive, surely it is better for him as well as for society that he should leave the world. What is life worth in a criminal lunatic asylum or a solitary cell?

—American politicians believe in a mysterious law by which the Republicans are doomed to lose at the off-elections. It is possible that the party may contain more than its share of those quiet citizens who go to the poll only on great occasions. Whatever may be the cause, there can be no doubt in the present instance about the effect. The Republicans have lost and lost heavily. Nor can we doubt that Mr. Cleveland is right in saying that the leaven of Free Trade works. In the farmer's mind all leaven works slowly and this combined with the strategical error committed as we think in the introduction of the Mills Bill accounts for the failure of the farmers to support their own cause at the last election. But even the farmers must begin to see the flagrant folly and iniquity of a system which takes from the people a hundred millions a year and squanders them in pensions to protect the inordinate gains of master manufacturers. The Republican Government has had to put a limit to the use of that waste-pipe. It will probably next try to get rid of surplus by large appropriations for washing the blackamoor white. But the end must come. Protectionism has

hitherto been supported by the mechanics in the belief that it raises wages ; but the increased vote cast by artisans in favour of Free Trade at the last Presidential Election shows that this fallacy is losing hold. To withdraw all at once the foundation, however erroneous, on which the industrial edifice has been built, would plainly be dangerous, and many who in principle are Free Traders will desire to move cautiously on that account. The same thing may be said with regard to our Protectionist policy in Canada. But tariff reform is coming and it will help us to Continental Free Trade. The Republican party itself, we repeat, can have no better policy than that which would reduce revenue while it extended trade.

—So quiet and commercial a transaction as the termination of monarchy in Brazil can hardly be called a revolution. It seems to have been brought about mainly by mistrust of the clerical tendencies of the heiress and her consort. Not unlikely Pedro himself foresaw a catastrophe. There is no great change, since the monarchy was constitutional, and the monarch, we are told, at New York rode to his hotel in a hack robed in a common duster. Yet the news sounds like the passing bell of Old World institutions in the New World. We are now fairly face to face with Democracy, and while the foolish and thoughtless will exult as if humanity had finally entered into a political Paradise the wise and thoughtful will bend themselves more earnestly than ever to the arduous task of making democracy a government not of popular will but of the reason and conscience of the community. The will of the people no more constitutes a right than the will of a despot; nor, if this is a moral world, is it a better and surer foundation for a polity. Feeble attempts to engraft aristocracy on Canada by means of titles or the influence of the little court at Ottawa will share the fate of the attempt to engraft monarchy on Brazil. We must frankly accept the dispensation and for real and lasting safeguards look to democracy itself organized on the principal not of anybody's will but of duty.

—Our diagnosis of the situation in England received speedy confirmation. Mr. Gladstone was to have declared his Irish policy at Southport, but he did not. Why? Because the Brighton election, which he hoped to win, was at hand and he knew that he would spoil his chance by raising the issue of the Union. Home Rule for the present is laid aside. No plan is before the country. Mr. Gladstone's original scheme is so dead that his doubting followers are beginning to take advantage of its decease as a door of escape from their quandary, declaring that to it and to it alone their adhesion was given, and that their Home Rule affections are buried in its grave. The dilemma is fatal: the Irish members must either be excluded from the Parliament at Westminster or not. If they are, Home Rule, in the present mood of the Irish at all events, means separation. If they are not, how determine the special subjects on which they are to be allowed to vote? To draw a line between Imperial and British questions would be found impracticable. The policy of every government or governing assembly is an organic whole, the parts of which have constant reference to each other. If in a debate on a question of peace or war something was said about British finance, could the Speaker bid the Irish members withdraw? A proposal to federalize one member of the United Kingdom while the rest is left on the national footing is like a proposal to federalize one of a man's arms or legs. If Federation is your aim, restore the Heptarchy. Retrace the boundaries of the old Saxon Kingdoms, make London again, as it probably was in Saxon times, a State of itself, revive the division of Northumbria into Bernicia and Deira, that of Wales into its Principalities, that of Scotland into Lowlands and Highlands, that of Ireland into the four Provinces. Then you will have a group of States nearly equal among themselves or at least free from any obnoxious superiority, and thus suitable for Federation, whereas a Federation of England, Scotland, Ireland and Wales would be a perpetual domination of England over the smaller countries and a perpetual cabal of the smaller countries against England.

The only objections to such a plan are, first, that it is not so easy to draw off the life of a nation into a number of separate receptacles as it is to draw off liquor from a cask into bottles ; and secondly, that Great Britain, a power, with all her faults, of justice and of progress, would be erased from the map of the diplomatic world. Home Rule, however, for the present at least, is dead. A Radical victory at the next general election is possible and it might bring Home Rule as part of a revolutionary programme in its train, but a victory of Home Rulers on the direct issue there will not be. By the part which Canada, through her legislatures, has been made to play in countenancing and stimulating the attempt to dismember the Mother Country, the politicians may have gained Irish Catholic votes, the country has taken nothing but dishonour. Let it not be forgotten that it was the Tory leader who began the game. Sir John Macdonald is very indignant with those who say that his conduct with regard to the Jesuits' Estates Act was influenced by fear of the French vote. What influenced his conduct with regard to the Costigan Resolutions ?

—The Salisbury Government is preparing to make a grand effort to settle the Irish land question. No one who knows Ireland doubts that this is the root of the trouble. The political agitation springs out of it and would die if the land question were settled, everywhere at least except in the hot heads of Dublin and Cork. To do away with dual ownership is no doubt the object of the scheme. But is it certain that the abolition of landlordism will do away with dual ownership ? Will not the result be for the landlord to substitute the mortgagee ? The Canadian and American farmer is incomparably more thrifty than the peasant, miscalled a farmer, of Celtic Ireland is likely for generations to be. Yet Canadian and American farms are heavily mortgaged. Such a change would be a doubtful gain, since the landlord, unless he is very bad, does some sort of duty and in hard times is merciful : the mortgagee knows no

duty and no mercy. It will not be surprising if out of the grave of the agitation for the plunder of landlords should rise an agitation for the plunder of mortgagees, since the Irishman has now been taught by demagogues the poisonous lesson that plunder is easier than thrift and agitation much pleasanter than industry. Moreover, behind the difficulty of land tenure lies that of overpopulation. The one indeed partly gives rise to the other, since it was by the desperate bidding of peasants against each other for the holdings that the rents were inordinately raised. Ireland, let agrarian demagogues say what they will, has a climate unsuited to cereals, and can maintain a large population only on the potato. But the Celtic Irish, encouraged by their Church, multiply recklessly like the people of Quebec who, in spite of their comparative thrift, would be liable to famine, if they had not a ready outflow into the States. Nothing will work a thorough cure in Ireland but copious depletion, followed by the uprooting of the potato; and this, it is to be feared, could be effected only by a strong government acting without interruption from demagogism for twenty or thirty years.

In the political line one grievance and one only through the whole course of this agitation has been named. It is hard upon Ireland to have to go to Westminster for her private bill legislation. There would surely be no danger in letting a Parliamentary Committee sit at Dublin during the recess for private bills. It would have to report to Westminster, and if it grew restive the ready remedy would be to let it drop. It might, at the same time, cure, as it were by vaccination, the desire for a separate Parliament. This would be a more wholesome concession, at all events, than a lay Maynooth, under the name of a Catholic University, which, besides being a seminary of obscurantism, such as no free and progressive government can consistently found, would to a certainty become a hot-bed of sedition.

Mr. William Pilkington, introducing himself as an Anglo-Irish farmer and land-agent of long experience, in his "Help for

Ireland," tells us something about "land-burning" which seems to show that all the woes of Ireland do not come from the Union. Land-burning was the process of burning the surface of the soil, which, by precipitating the phosphate, produces a great yield, especially of potatoes, for two or three years, after which the land is ruined. Burned land was taken, Mr. Pilkington says, largely by young couples who waited only to get a plot of potatoes ripe before they went to the priest. In the land-burning times Mr. Pilkington has known the banns for thirty-seven couples published in one day and more than a hundred marriages solemnized in the same parish in one week. According to certain theorists the result ought to have been great opulence, since the more producers there are the greater (except in very small islands) will be the product. You may "relegate political economy to Saturn," but it has a trick of coming back. That all the people whom such young couples bring into the world can be found not only in bread but in education, leisure and happiness, as optimistic philanthropy now seems to assume, is glad tidings if it is true, and any change of economical organization by which it would be brought about ought to be heartily welcomed by us all.

—There is a point at which, in mid-revolutionary career, even Mr. Gladstone calls a halt. The nationalization of land, he says, without compensation would be sheer robbery, with it would be sheer folly. Mr. John Morley, Jacobinical though he is, echoes the judgment. To take from a man the land which he has bought with the full sanction of the community, signified through its laws, and perhaps bought of the nation itself,—if this is not robbery, what is? Under what form or name the robbery is to be committed, and whether the instrument is to be the bludgeon, the bayonet, or the taxing power, matters nothing. There can be no doubt that the writer of "Progress and Poverty" means confiscation and rejoices in it, though the victims, by his own showing, are guilty

of nothing but ignorance of his discovery. Land, he and his disciples say, is the gift of God, and therefore cannot be rightfully appropriated by man. The wool in Mr. Henry George's coat, the leather in Mr. Henry George's boots, the metal in Mr. Henry George's types, are equally the gift of God. Besides, if land is the gift of God, and therefore incapable of appropriation, it ought to be humanized, not nationalized. A nation has no more right to appropriate it than a man.

When all the land has been seized into the hands of a set of politicians, idealized as "the State," what is to follow? Is it to be let out again to the present holders, or is there to be a redistribution? Who is to have the good land, who the bad? Mr. George says that every child born into the world has a title to a share in the land. Is there then to be redistribution every time a child is born or grows up? Or, as the land belongs to us all, are we all to squat upon it at our pleasure? Supposing the land is to be let out, are the holdings to be secure or not? If they are, we have private property in land again; if they are not, labour will not be put into the land, and the result of public robbery will be, as it has always been, cessation of industry and dearth of bread.

It is happily not true that poverty has increased with progress. The area of comfortable living has immensely increased, both in itself and relatively to the amount of want and suffering. The amount of want and suffering has of course positively increased with the growth of population and the increased scale of fluctuations in trade. Destitution arises from a vast variety of causes, physical and moral, quite independent of anything in the tenure of land, and is found in full measure in commercial communities, like Holland, where the land is a secondary matter, and Venice, where there is no land at all. If the landlords have swallowed up all the wealth of the community, where did the Rothschilds, Vanderbilt, and Jay Gould get their riches? The supposed discovery on which the whole theory is based is itself a mare's nest. It is not true that the labourer gives his labour to the capitalist in advance of pay:

he begins to draw his pay, as soon as his wages are secured to him, in credit and can go at once to the store.

These robbers who have wrongly appropriated the land in every community of the world, who are they? What has history to tell us about them? They are no more historical than the priests who everywhere invented religion. In Russia, Hindostan and Afghanistan there linger vestiges of tribal ownership, which has spontaneously and independently been discarded by the nations generally in favour of the system of private ownership, experience having taught that private ownership produced the best tillage and the most food. The true test of a system of land tenure, though land reformers hardly ever notice it, is production. That system is the best which gives the community most bread.

Mr. George and his disciples propose to confiscate the land: another set of men proposes to confiscate the property of all the stockholders in railroads. Public plunder is in the air and the thought excites envy and malignity as well as greed. Property, like all the other parts of our state, like the whole universe, so far as it comes within our ken, is full of defects and attendant evils: the faculties by which it is acquired are not more justly distributed than health, strength or life; but it is the only known motive-power of production: when its security is destroyed, as it was by the robberies of the French Revolution, as it would be by the adoption of Mr. George's scheme of confiscation, production ceases and famine ensues. To defend it against confiscation therefore is to defend the life of the community. The best defences of property, as well as the only sure source of happiness to its holders, are to be found in the performance of social duty, and in steadfast effort to improve the common lot. But one has only to read certain Socialistic or "Labour" journals to know that there are some who are not to be satisfied or reconciled in this way, who, for the gratification of their envy and hatred no less than of their greed are bent on confiscation, and with whom in the end there may be battle, as indeed there has already been in more

than one European country, and on a smaller scale upon this Continent. It seems hardly to occur to the philosophers of this school that the multitude of innocent people whom, as a first step towards the extirpation of poverty, they propose to reduce to beggary, will resist, and that the "ransom" which communistic brigandage demands of property-holders may be paid in the only metal which ever satisfied a highwayman. But of "ransoms" let us hear no more. For lawful property no ransom is due. Let those who hold it be ready to defend it against the philanthropic robber as their right, while they use it as a trust in the eye of God.

Do away with all the difficulties derived from feudal law or professional pedantry which have hitherto beset the purchase of land. Introduce everywhere the Torrens System which, owing largely to the exertions of Mr. Herbert Mason, has been making way in this country. Let acquisition be perfectly free to all members of the community. Multiply, as much as sound economy permits, the number of possessors. This is the true and the only sane nationalization of land.

In his lecture at Toronto the other night, Mr. Henry George occupied himself less in the advocacy of his own panacea than in the confutation of Protectionism. Here he has an easy game. For of all the commercial schemes, though not the most immoral the most absurd, is that which proposes to make communities rich by taxation.

—The passage of the Atlantic in less than six days by the *City of Paris* draws the Continents very close together. Now let an antidote to sea-sickness be discovered and there will be almost a fusion of the wealthier classes in America and Europe. Every extension of man's power and facilities is sure to prove good in the end, but at first great facility of locomotion is not without its drawbacks. It begets restlessness and tempts the wealthy to leave their posts of social duty. The rich men of this Continent especially are tempted to go where their wealth

can be better enjoyed, as it can in the more brilliant society and the more perfect services of Europe. Yet unless the rich will stay at their posts and do their duty, there will be social trouble and that soon. A visit to the Old World is to the intellectual class almost a part of education, but the rich man is not educated or in any way improved by lounging away his time in the pleasure cities and watering-places of Europe. The temptation is great, especially when men of wealth and refinement are deprived of their natural objects of interest and ambition by exclusion from public life. Yet it must be overcome if Society on this Continent is to remain sound. Of the social and agrarian trouble in the United Kingdom, especially in Ireland, the cause in no small measure is the absenteeism of landlords which has taken away the keystone from the arch of the manorial system. Politics happily are not the only social work of man: other work less ambitious and exciting, yet not less fruitful and better perhaps for the heart, may be found. The life of a wandering sybarite, without a fixed home or home duties, chasing from one pleasure-haunt to another the shadow of happiness which he can find in none, is pitiable and grows more pitiable as it draws near its end. Nothing can be less enviable than the American colony in Paris. Pleasure itself, supposing it the chief aim of life, is not complete without a spice of duty. But, we repeat, serious danger impends over pleasure, wealth and all, unless social duty is done.

Amidst the signs and rumblings of social war special interest attaches to the history of the industrial insurrection under Wat Tyler. By Professor Thorold Rogers the rising has been ascribed to the attempt of the lords to keep down wages which had risen in consequence of the reduction of population by the Black Death. Professor Ashley in the *Political Science Monthly* seems inclined to ascribe the outbreak more to the levelling doctrines, anticipative of the Socialism of the present day, with which the preaching of John Ball and his compeers had filled the air and which incited the villeins to withhold feudal dues and services from the lords, whose

attempt to enforce their claims brought on the storm. Our own impression is that the catastrophe was due to a complication of causes, social and economical, among which we should certainly include the preaching of the Wycliffite Levellers and probably the improvement in the condition of the serfs which led them to aspire to a still greater change of their state, as Socialism takes hold of the highly paid mechanics of the present day. But something, we suspect, was also due to the non-residence of the lords who, like the French nobility of a later day, had exchanged the country for the Court and instead of performing their duties on their estates and keeping up their social influence had been thronging the gay Chaucerian Court of Edward III., banqueting at the Round Table in his newly built castle palace, glittering in the tilt-yards of a galvanized chivalry, and following the king and his adventurous son to glory and plunder on foreign fields. It has been noted that the districts of France to which the Revolutionary movement did not extend were those in which the landowners had continued resident.

—If the Americans believe that Abraham Lincoln was “the greatest man since Christ,” let them save his ashes from profanation. His ashes are profaned when prurient curiosity is fed, as it has been by a recent biographer, with the miserable details of his domestic unhappiness and the quarrels between him and his wife, caused by his opening the door in his shirt-sleeves or cutting the butter with his own knife. The lust of scandal is becoming a madness. Scandal about aristocracy above all is luscious. It was a sad disappointment when a jury acquitted the Earl of Galloway of a disgusting offence, though a conviction would have brought misery not only on him but on a family too high-placed to escape the pointed finger of malignity. This passion for aristocratic scandal is nothing but flunkeyism turned upside down. The same people would grovel at the feet of a lord. People of the same

class are trying to get Sir Charles Dilke back into Parliament. Closely connected with this tendency is the growing disregard of privacy and social confidence. A man in good society has no scruple in making a telling magazine article out of conversations which he has heard at private dinner parties. Dr. Lushington, Lady Byron's counsel, amidst all the foul controversy on that subject, kept his professional secret and carried it with him to the grave. Had he been born in these times he would have sent at once for a reporter.

—Nobody wishes unnecessarily to revive the hateful memories of religious persecution, but when the apologists of the Jesuit, to throw a mantle over his character and acts, tell us that Protestants and Roman Catholics have "alike" reason to blush for the deeds that have been perpetrated by their adherents, we must beg leave to demur to the perversion of historical justice for a political purpose. For centuries Christendom had been dominated by a power which treated heterodoxy as crime and practised every form of persecution, renouncing thereby, as clearly as deeds could renounce it, the inheritance of Him whose Kingdom was not of this world. The evil belief thus ingrained did not at once depart when the Papacy was overthrown, nor did Protestantism at first know of what spirit it was. But what are all the sins of Protestantism in this way put together compared with the extermination of the Albigenses, the autos-da-fe and torture-houses of the Spanish Inquisition, the persecution in the Netherlands, where Alva alone could say that he had put to death eighteen thousand persons, the persecution in France under Francis I., the massacre of St. Bartholomew, which the Pope celebrated by a solemn thanksgiving and by commemorative pictures, medals and orations, the extermination of Protestantism by the sword in the Dominions of the House of Austria and the Dragonnades in France, to say nothing of the civil wars kindled by the Popes for the destruction of

heresy or the dethronement of heretical Princes? Such atrocities as were perpetrated by Protestants on Catholics in the Low Countries were not measures of religious persecution but acts of vengeance excited to frenzy by the far greater atrocities of Alva and his fellow persecutors. Protestantism, if unhappily it did in some cases punish public profession, never scrutinized conscience with the rack. Cromwell prohibited the Mass, but he disclaimed all inquisition into conscience. The darkness of course lingered longest in the countries least advanced in civilization. Scotland in 1697, when a young man was hanged for blasphemy, was still in a very barbarous condition, and the temper of the people had been rendered cruel by the persecution of the Covenanters under James II. It is pretended that this took place after persecution in Roman Catholic countries had ceased. It was nearly contemporary with the extermination of the Huguenots. The autos-da-fe in Spain and Portugal went on far into the next century, and one took place in Mexico so late as 1815. In France the religious murder of Calas took place in 1762, and that of La Barre in 1766, while in 1731 the Prince Bishop of Salzburg expelled the whole of the Protestant population, 30,000 in number, from his territories. But this is not the whole, nor even the most important part, of the case. The most important part of the case is that Protestantism with one voice now disclaims the principle of persecution and bewails every act of persecution that was ever committed in its name; while Rome in her last manifesto distinctly reaffirms the principle of persecution by anathematizing all who deny that she has the right to use the temporal power for the enforcement of her creed, and so late as 1867 canonized the cruel inquisitor Peter Arbues. To bring the fact nearer home, Father Gingras, of Quebec, in a pamphlet which has often been quoted, has an unqualified defence of the Inquisition. "The excessive cruelty of the Inquisition! pure calumny, gentlemen, never was a criminal tribunal more humane." Ask a Jesuit whether he renounces persecution and condemns the

members of his Order who took part with the persecuting Popes and Inquisitors as we condemn Calvin for the execution of Servetus. That many Roman Catholic laymen are now in their personal belief perfectly tolerant we know, but what we have to deal with on the present occasion is not Catholicism, the religious faith of the Middle Ages, as to which we only say that it belongs to the past, but the conspiracy set on foot in aid of the Roman Catholic reaction by Ignatius Loyola.

That the Papacy was the friend of freedom in the Middle Ages is another historical fallacy which is also being revived on this occasion. That the despotism of the Popes limited the despotism of Kings as one encroaching force limits another by mere collision is true; but in no other sense is it true that the Papacy was the friend of freedom. Till King John had submitted, the Pope was willing to take advantage of the disaffection of the Barons, but when John had submitted and become the vassal of the Roman See the Pope annulled the Great Charter and prohibited its observance under pain of excommunication. Fanciful historians have represented the opposition of Becket backed by the Papacy against Henry II. as a struggle for the liberty of serfs to enter the priesthood, which had been restricted by an article in the Constitution of Clarendon, and have given the Church credit for upholding the rights of the people against feudal tyranny. Unluckily the Constitutions of Clarendon were brought before the Pope at the Council of Sens, and His Holiness having divided the articles into those which were intolerable and those which might be tolerated, placed in the latter class the article restricting the ordination of serfs. There is no use in trying to make out that the slavery of the soul is the freedom of the man.

—In the ecclesiastical world, as it is imaged by recent conventions in the United States, the chief movement discerned is a revolt in the Protestant Churches generally against

dogmatic formularies, which, as we have had occasion before to remark, are in great measure the antagonisms of the sixteenth century crystallized into tests, Justification by Faith in its extreme form being the expression of antagonism to Indulgences, while Predestination is the logical though not the moral corollary of Justification by Faith. It is not surprising that the religious conscience, awakened and enlightened by inquiry, should struggle against its bonds. Nor is it surprising that peculiar uneasiness should be excited by the dogma of Predestination. No ingenuity can reconcile a belief in the article of the Westminster Confession on that subject with a belief in the justice of God. The sophistries of Necessarianism which Jonathan Edwards has with such calamitous skill pressed into the service of his terrible creed may perplex the understanding but cannot possibly confound the moral sense. The iron chain of causation on which his theory depends cannot really be regarded as having its initial link in man, or even in the first Father of the race; it must be traced up to the Creator, who is responsible for all effects of the First Cause. It is true that without Free Will goodness and badness, simply as noxious or beneficent qualities, may exist in man as well as in animals, plants or minerals; but sin cannot exist without Free Will, nor without sin can punishment, much less everlasting punishment, for sin be just. The process of revising formularies in an age of criticism and general disintegration is arduous; those who are summoned to undertake it cannot help feeling that they are asked to open a flood-gate which may let in an overwhelming flood; and the relaxation of tests naturally suggests itself as an easier and safer policy than the reconstruction or expurgation of doctrine. The Church of Rome looking on at all this perplexity and distress of conscience will exult in the august simplicity of a system which stands in need of no tests, but only requires blind faith and absolute obedience. The answer to her taunts is that what she has to deplore is not perplexity or distress of conscience within her communion, but the revolt and practical secession of entire

nations. In France, that "eldest daughter of the Church," the mass of the male population cares no more for the Papal religion than for that of Jupiter, and in Italy the statue of Giordano Bruno is erected amidst general acclamations at the very door of the Pope.

—Sir William Dawson is one of the first practical geologists of the day and a work by him is above our criticism. His "Handbook of Geology" deals with the great geological periods as well as with the general principles of the science. The work is of special interest to Canadians, inasmuch as fully one half of it deals with the geology of the Dominion. This section treats of the geological structure of (1) the Acadian region; (2) Old Canada; (3) the prairie plateau of Manitoba and the North-West; (4) the mountain ranges of British Columbia, with a glance at the physical features and glacial deposits of Newfoundland and the Arctic basin. Were the tariff wall only removed and liberty given to us of developing our vast mineral resources, the value of Sir William Dawson's book as an economic manual would be greatly increased.

Mr. Homer Dixon's "Border Clans" deals with a subject about which little has been written, though it filled the imagination of Walter Scott, who loved to wander in the Border dales and to trace the vestiges of the wild marauding life in the local character which he has embodied in Dandie Dinmont. The book has a genealogical as well as an historical interest, for the bearers of many well-known names—Johnston, Scott, Kerr, Dickson, Rutherford, Irving, Elliot, Armstrong, Foster, Henderson—appear in Mr. Dixon's list. Some of the names had special epithets attached to them, but it is to be hoped that the quality is not hereditary in the case of "the angry Kerrs." The last chapter has only a family interest.

THE BYSTANDER.

JANUARY, 1890.

A MIDST the tangled confusion into which the Jesuits' Estates affair has thrown the parties and their relations, the broad lineaments of the situation are clear enough. To avert the separate growth of a French nationality, with its certain consequences, Lord Durham conceived the design of fusing the British and French Provinces by means of a legislative union into a nation, in which he no doubt hoped that the British element would prove the stronger and prevail. Full effect, however, was not given to this policy, since the representation was not fused but was left on a quasi-federal basis, each Province, irrespective of its population, sending an equal and separate delegation to the United Parliament; a concession which though under the circumstances it may have been inevitable was pregnant with danger to the scheme. What might have happened if real power had remained in the strong and impartial hands of a Royal Governor we cannot possibly say; but in the hands of party politicians fain to seek the French and clerical alliance the fate of the scheme was settled from the beginning. Government under that ill-starred wedlock became impracticable and a divorce inevitably followed. The next attempt was a nation with a federal structure, the Constitution being modelled on that of the United States, though with a false front of monarchy, which, so far as the practical operations of our institutions is concerned, is mere lumber and waste of money. To make up a federa-

tion, the other British colonies were taken in, though, as their distance and the absence of commercial connection prevented their effectual incorporation, their nominal inclusion has but little modified the question between Ontario and Quebec. The keystone of the new edifice was the national control over Provincial action embodied in the Veto, that "vast power," that "palladium," to cite once more the words of Sir Alexander Galt, which could alone control the divergent and separatist tendencies of the French colony. But this power upon the very first signal occasion for its exercise the two political parties have combined to surrender at the bidding of Quebec, who is thus declared at liberty to pursue her anti-national tendencies without control. So, virtually, ends the experiment of a nation with a federal structure. The existing arrangement may be mechanically prolonged by Machine management and by the payment of bribes to Quebec out of the Federal chest, in other words, out of the purse of Ontario. The Equal Rights movement has evidently had the effect of scaring all those in Quebec who are not Nationalists and making them do their best to put on the drag; and the consummation may thus be further postponed. But the keystone is out of the political arch; the hope of welding the British and French elements into one body with one soul is, to all appearance, at an end. Mr. Longley, it seems, derides the possibility of a separate French nation. What he derides as a possibility is almost a fact. Difference of race, of language, of religion, with a distinct political character and ideal, and a territorial boundary line almost constitute a nation. The fundamental institutions of Quebec even are different from ours, since while we are a democracy she is under priestly rule. The connection in such circumstances becomes little more than a league. A war in Europe, if the mother countries of British and French Canada were opposed to each other, would tear away the last rag of disguise. The credit is claimed for Sir John Macdonald of having been the chief author of Confederation; but he must

also bear the responsibility of having, in founding his Government on French support, raised the French power to its present height. However, the surrender has been complete on both sides.

If the Ottawa Government is not the organ of national supremacy and control, what is it? What does it do to justify its enormous expense, the mountain of public debt which it is piling up, and the vast development of corruption of which unhappily it is the cause? External security and internal peace with freedom of intercourse, which it is the regular function of a federal government to give, were given us already by the Empire of which all these colonies are members, and under which they were in fact federated to all intents and purposes before Canadian federation. Suppose Ontario kept her best public men in her own legislature, instead of sending them to Ottawa, why should she not be competent to make her own laws, criminal as well as civil, appoint her own judges, regulate the marriage law for herself, raise and officer her own militia, issue her own currency? To settle the tariff nothing would be needed but a zollverein, while such matters as navigation, postal rates and railway gauges might be settled by convention. This is the question which Ontario will presently begin to ask herself if Quebec is not to be a partner in the effort to found a united nation, but a load to be carried; still more if Quebec is to reign over us and make us tributary to her by force of an alien vote. As to Manitoba and the North-West, liberation from their thralldom to Ottawa and its confederates would be to them the opening of a more prosperous era.

In any case Ontario has interests of her own which she cannot afford to sacrifice. The Roman Catholic and Archiepiscopal organ at Kingston is quoted by Mr. Meredith as saying, "Holding, as we do, the balance of power between the two great factions we have but to be independent and we can dictate the terms upon which one or the other shall receive our support." This is explicit, and it is in this way, we may hope,

that Ontario has made up her mind not to be governed. We demur to the rule of an ecclesiastical Tammany even when it is allied to a "Liberal" Party. A square issue was tendered by Mr. Mowat, and still more by the organs of his party, which did not, any more than did Mr. David Mills, measure their language in speaking of the friends of Equal Right. It has been pretty squarely taken by Mr. Meredith, who now for the first time has a chance of at least making a good fight in the impending battle. Mr. Mowat occupies in the Province a position something like that of Sir John Macdonald in the Dominion : he has long been in possession of power, has filled the Province with his appointees, has redistributed the representation at his pleasure, and has all the means of influence in his hands. The Catholic vote he is allowed to use, turn about with Sir John, by an arrangement very convenient to both of them, though rather perplexing to their respective organists. A Ministry thus entrenched and wielding the patronage is not to be overturned by any minor charges of misgovernment, such as tampering with licenses or jobbery about registrarships. It can be overturned only by the leverage of a great question appealing strongly to the interest or sentiment of the people. Let Ottawa now leave Mr. Meredith's hands free and there will be a prospect at least of an effective Opposition, without which, everybody will admit, party government is of all forms of government the worst. Mr. Meredith, we are glad to see, firmly marked the distinction between repression of ecclesiastical encroachment and doing any sort of wrong or showing any antipathy to Roman Catholics. To deprive our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens of equal right, in any respect or in any degree, is what has neither been proposed nor desired by any human being.

The complete separation of the spiritual from the temporal and the perfect equality of all religions before the law are organic principles of civilization in the New World, which have been approved by experience as well as by conscience in their application both to Church and State. They condemn Separate

Schools, the collection of tithe in Quebec, and all ecclesiastical domination in politics. They will make their way as certainly as the light of morning. Even the French peasant will in time be enlightened by the transmission of ideas to him from his compatriots who have settled in the United States and will grow tired, as all the Catholic nations in Europe have grown tired, of being eaten up by ecclesiastical imposts and exactions. Old politicians may think that they can shuffle off the issue for their time. But young politicians will find that, to say nothing of principle, they have made a grand mistake in lending themselves to that which is sure in the end to prove the losing side. Rational and manly allegiance to party is compatible with a firm refusal to be put in a wrong position on the leading question of the future.

—In estimating the electoral results of Equal Rights or any other independent movement we must bear in mind the tremendous power of the Machines. Wonderful would be the political thralldom to which they have reduced the people if we did not know that free institutions will not make free natures, and small is the number of those who are by nature free. Most of us crave for a sheepfold and a shibboleth. The people will vote not only against a principle, such as Equal Rights, but what is stranger still, against their material and well-known interests rather than brave the ban of Party. Virtually the Machines coalesce against anything which is independent and spoils the game, as principle is always apt to do. They have evidently coalesced on the present occasion. Every one who gives an independent vote therefore indicates the convictions of a score. In Stanstead, Mr. Colby, at all events, had to come down from his pinnacle of disdain and to condescend to fight for his seat. He took the line that if a Provincial Act is *intra vires* it cannot, however bad, be constitutionally vetoed, having himself the other day voted for vetoing a Manitoba Act chartering a local railway, the legality of which was undoubted and had

been expressly admitted by his chief. He grants that the Equal Rights movement is one of principle, but says that it is not one of worldly wisdom ; but then his notions of worldly wisdom appear to include a use of the Speaker's chair for a partisan purpose, which is worldly with a vengeance if not so manifestly wise. In Stanstead a protest was all that could be hoped, and a manly protest breaks the spell of Machine servitude.

—A strong article in *Le Canada* against the Jesuits shows that the restless and intriguing Order is only a degree less hateful to the quiet people in its own Church than it is to the special objects of its hostile machinations. To understand this case, we must always bear in mind the difference between the Latin Church of the dark ages with its natural superstitions and the Ultramontane reaction set on foot when the day had dawned to prevent the spread of light. It is of the reaction that the brotherhood of Loyola is the embodiment and organ. The contrast was seen when Jesuit emissaries were plotting against the throne and life of Elizabeth, while Howard, an old Catholic, commanded the fleet against the Armada. It is seen when we compare the poetry of genuine piety and romance, embodied in the medieval cathedral, with the meretricious ornaments of the Jesuit Church and its air loaded with sensuous clouds of incense. It is seen when we compare the crafty casuistry and florid oratory of the Jesuit with the religious literature of the Middle Ages. The old Latin Church was practically consistent with nationality and patriotism. Ultramontanism is an anti-national conspiracy. Nobody doubts the perfect sincerity of Anselm, of St. Louis, or even of Becket, though in Becket we see strongly developed that ecclesiastical ambition which was at work, together with less sinister influences, in building up the edifice of medieval superstition ; but charity itself can hardly believe that men who inherit our common nature can pass their lives in plotting, intriguing and casuistically tampering with moral-

ity, without feeling at all events an occasional suspicion that they are not serving truth. The triumph of anti-national Ultramontaniam over the national Catholicism followed naturally when the national governments threw off their vassalage to the Pope, and the Vatican thus became the sole centre of reaction. Yet the ancient faith was still lingering among the old Catholic families of England, at the time of the "Papal Aggression," when the Duke of Norfolk from offended patriotism became a Protestant. It lingered till yesterday in French Canada, which had been isolated from the general movement by British conquest and subsequently by the French Revolution. In the Sulpician Seminary of Montreal, the old Catholicism had a fortress which it cost the Jesuit engineer the utmost efforts of his craft to reduce. That fortress however has now fallen.

—Whether Mr. Martin's bold plan of uniting Manitoba with the adjacent territory can be carried into effect we must leave it to the inhabitants to decide. But he cannot do better than combine the people of the whole of the North-West for the maintenance of their common and distinct interests. Those interests have been sacrificed to the objects of a party government at Ottawa, which wants to make everything politically subservient to itself, and of a group of Montreal capitalists, which wants to make everything commercially tributary to Montreal. The people have themselves been accomplices in their own undoing by allowing themselves to be seduced by petty government bribes into sending untrustworthy representatives to Ottawa, though the difficulty of finding men at once of character and of leisure in a new settlement may be pleaded as an excuse for the mistake. The result has been what everyone who chooses to speak the truth must pronounce, considering the vast capacities of the country, comparative failure. The country has not only been kept back but discredited, and instead of the elements of a vigor-

ous, high-spirited and thriving community has been receiving heterogeneous scraps of population till at last it is in danger of being turned into a second Utah; the Ottawa Government, probably caring not much how the region is peopled so long as it is not by "a gang" which will assert its political independence. With fair-play that fruitful expanse can hardly fail to prosper, the rigour of its winter notwithstanding; but it has not yet had anything like fair-play. About its first chance of fair-play is that which is given it by the patriotic attitude of the Greenway Government.

The C. P. R., that great national enterprise to which because it was national, exclusively and superlatively national, the Dominion has given over a hundred millions in subsidies of different kinds, and in which no Yankee was even to hold stock, has now not only become thoroughly identified with the American railway system, but, as the *Toronto Mail* has proved, discriminates against Canadian trade. This surely is a fact from which commercial separatists, if they are not blind, will draw a moral. The operation of the national road with regard to immigration is much the same as it is with regard to trade. It is all the time carrying immigrants down the line away from Manitoba and our settlements to Washington, Oregon and Montana. In an emigrant train going west there were found 7 passengers for Vancouver, 3 for Victoria, 21 for Tacoma, and 37 for Seattle. The *Canada Gazette*, by the way, will find on referring again to the BYSTANDER of former years that it was of the Intercolonial, not the C. P. R., that we spoke when we said that it would probably be ruined by the short cut through Maine. It is the C. P. R. itself that makes the short cut. In subsidizing the short cut the Dominion Parliament has in fact declared that the BYSTANDER's prophecy with regard to the ultimate abandonment of the Intercolonial has proved true. He predicted that commercially the section north of Lake Superior would be a failure, and to that prediction he adheres. Nothing at least can falsify it, as he thinks and as is thought by

much better authorities than he is, except an extraordinary development of mining in the region, which again is impossible without a market.

—The gourd-like growth of Toronto is due, we apprehend, not so much to manufactures as to the passion for city life which all over the world is leading the people to throng into the great cities and has swelled London into a huge tumour on the social frame. In the production of this tendency popular education, by creating a distaste for manual labour, has probably played a part, but a greater part has been played by the railways, of which Toronto has recently become a centre, and which bring in the people first to make purchases or see sights and ultimately to settle. If those who have money come in those who have not money must follow to get employment, while a good many moths are lured by the brightness of the candle. Speaking generally, the tendency has its evils. The people cannot afford to be so well housed in the city as they are in a village; they breathe less pure air, their children grow up in surroundings less healthy for body and mind, and though they have more of crowd and excitement they have really less of social life; for while in the village they all know each other, in the city they do not know their next-door neighbour.

The alarm has been raised that manufactures are beginning to fly from city taxes. This seems as yet to be only in a single case. Yet city taxes must be a heavy deduction from profits made here. In Toronto we all pay for our own roads, sidewalks, drains and water. We shovel our own snow and care for our own boulevards. The relief of the poor is left to private charity and there is not even a city officer for its superintendence. A city government could hardly do less for the inhabitants. What then, people ask, becomes of the great sums raised in taxes? Peculation, nobody we believe, suspects. Jobbery can hardly be altogether avoided when a corps of contractors is brought into contact with a body elected as the Council is

But the chief leakage, we take it, arises from the waste which is inseparable from an unskilled administration, and one which being elected every year is too short-lived to exercise foresight and act on system. The heaviest charge, apart from the interest on the debt, is the school tax, on which we suspect, in spite of all our sentiment, it will some day be found necessary to put a curb. The only justification for making one man pay for the education of another man's children, which he is no more by nature bound to do than he is to feed and clothe them, is that in a democracy ignorance is a political danger. It seems however from what Mrs. Ashley says and from what the Minister of Education said some time ago that the dangerous class, or a large portion of it, is allowed to escape attendance at the schools. If the truancy law is not enforced the school tax becomes simply a heavy impost levied by one section of the community for its own behoof and without warrant on the others. In order to make the system consistent either with social justice or with the soundness of city finance, the teaching must be kept strictly elementary, and the truancy law must be enforced. To enforce the truancy law in a community such as ours is difficult, no doubt, but to shrink from enforcing it is to condemn the system.

—At the very successful Jubilee of the Anglican Diocese of Toronto the key-note of the speeches generally was comprehensiveness. Comprehensiveness, which is dear to cultivated and liberal minds, combined with hierarchical and historical dignity, has been a strong point in the Church of England. But how far can it be carried? The tendency of Ritualism, it is hardly possible to doubt, is to the restoration of the Mass, the very phraseology of which, and all the ritual, saving the bells and incense, have been introduced. Now a man who does not like Ritualism will, if he is liberal and sensible, put up with a great deal of it, because he feels that Ritual in itself is not doctrine, and that what is unedifying to him may be edifying to others. But the Mass is either a miracle or an im-

posture ; and how can a man assist at what he believes to be a false miracle ? To a certain extent the difficulty arising from the vital difference between High Church and Low Church settles itself for the present by a division of congregations, but this also must have its limit.

The subject of preaching came up. People know, of course, yet they do not make practical allowance for the fact that preaching is a gift, and that you can no more expect your pastor to preach like the Bishop of Huron, the Bishop of Algoma, or the Bishop of Nova Scotia than you can expect him to write like Mr. Farrer or to paint like Mr. O'Brien. The wonder is not that ordinary sermons are no better but that they are as good as they are ; for we take it there are few literary men who if they were called upon for two essays a week on the same class of subjects would not soon throw down their pens in despair. A clergyman, instead of having leisure for composition, has his time filled with visiting, and, in addition to this, by the ever-increasing throng of religious side-shows of every kind. Our people must remember, too, that pulpit oratory, like other rare articles, must be paid for, and that Canadian stipends are not as high as those of New York. When preaching the Word meant nothing but imparting saving truth to people who were ignorant of it, no oratorical power was required. But now congregations demand pulpit oratory, and grow restless if the preaching is dull or unvaried, whence arise no little trouble and scandal. A corps of itinerant preachers naturally suggests itself ; but to this, besides the expense, which would be considerable, is opposed the deep division of opinion, to which reference has already been made. It would almost be necessary to have two sets, one for High Church the other for Low Church congregations. A few there are, perhaps, who care a great deal more for the service than for the preaching, and who will be satisfied if their pastor cultivates the brevity which is the one kind of excellence within the reach of the humblest composer. But the vast majority crave for fine preaching, and how their craving is to be satisfied it is

hard to say, unless they will let their pastor read published sermons, a plan to which we see no objection, and which would give us all a corps of select preachers indeed.

Among the names to be commemorated first and foremost, of course, was that of Bishop Strachan, a martial eulogy on whom drew from the Bishop of Western New York the good-humoured reply that he should go home and tell his fellow-countrymen that the man who had really driven them off the hillside at Queenston Heights was Bishop Strachan. 'The robust and strenuous representative of the Apostles on one occasion allowed himself to be driven off his own position when he had much better have held it. His Church had lost her exclusive possession of Toronto University; still she had possession, she had prestige, she had the support of the most influential, the best educated, the most academical class. Secession is of all policies the weakest. The best is to stick to the ship. Bishop Strachan ought to have stuck to the ship instead of giving it up to his opponents and getting off into a boat, of which, lavish what able effort, what munificence, what affection you will upon it, a ship can never be made. An Anglican College in the free University, at all events, would have given him all the security that he could reasonably desire without the impotence and the mental evils of seclusion.

—One day comes Mr. George and proposes to regenerate society by turning over all our real estate to the politicians; the next comes Miss Susan B. Anthony and proposes to regenerate society by turning over the government to the ladies. Miss Anthony says that the want of the ballot entails not only political but moral and social degradation. The answer seems to be that in the country from which she comes the women, though they have not the ballot, instead of being morally and socially degraded, are in the enjoyment of privileges some of which are rather oppressive to the men. Miss Anthony assumes that women are an unenfranchised class.

They are not a class but a sex, with the interest of which those of the other sex are by their conjugal and family ties completely bound up, so that in legislating for their wives, daughters and sisters the men are legislating for themselves. The reason why the men have made and must make the law is that they alone can enforce it: laws made by women could have no force behind them and would therefore fail. The liberties of which restitution is claimed, as though the men had robbed the women of them, have really been wrought out by the men, and the number of men who have perished in extorting them from despots bears a considerable proportion to the number of those by whom they have as yet been enjoyed. Miss Anthony mentions no legislative grievance which male legislators are unable to redress, or of which they have refused redress to their wives, daughters and sisters. She complains generally that women are half-paid. They are not half-paid in their own callings, such as those of the singer or the *modiste*; and if they make less money in other callings it is generally because they have less muscle and less brain power than the man, or because they are not so devoted to the vocations, few of them absolutely renouncing marriage. Those who agitate for female suffrage seldom say much about the interests of the family which has hitherto been a unit before the State, and the harmony of which could hardly fail to be imperilled by the introduction of political division; for whatever fine pictures may be drawn few can really believe that conjugal love would not be affected by the appearance of man and wife on opposite sides in a bitter party conflict. Of want of facility of divorce American women can now hardly complain, nor can they say with Mill that a woman is worse off than a slave since she cannot change her master. Miss Anthony seems to admit that the movement is not general among her sex, and the fact seems to be that it is largely kept on foot by the craving of a few ladies for the excitement of public life. In England, the other day, one hundred and four women of the highest distinction, seeing that the real interests of the whole

sex were in danger of being sacrificed to the fancy of a few, appealed to "the common-sense and educated thought of the men and women of England against the proposed extension of the Parliamentary suffrage to women." The movement has now been going on in the United States for forty years during which time almost all the States have dealt either in the way of construction or revision with their civil codes, and not one of them has given the political franchise to women. In the Territory of Wyoming the experiment has been made, the object being probably to attract women where they were scarce, and in face of the results of that experiment four new States the other day in drafting their Constitutions deliberately confined the political franchise to males. In Washington the question was put to the people and the result was a great majority against the innovation. The Americans have a great safeguard in the submission of constitutional amendments to the people, who cannot be wheedled or frightened like individual legislators. Here the ladies have only to wheedle or frighten a party leader in order to bring about a sexual revolution.

—That President Harrison should not have mentioned Commercial Union in his message is no proof that Commercial Union is dead. It was not likely that a new President the first time he opened his mouth to a Congress hardly settled in its place would propose Commercial Union, especially as a committee on relations with Canada was still sitting. When Congress gets fairly upon the tariff question, and not till then, we shall know the policy of the Republican party and the President. So say our own informants. Revenue must be reduced, and in view of that necessity no policy apparently ought to be more welcome to the Republican party than one which reduces revenue and extends trade at the same time without touching the principle of Protection. That there is in the Republican party a section disposed to unfriendly

courses towards Great Britain, and towards Canada as her dependency, cannot be denied, and it is very likely that Mr. Hoar is a member of it: he has at least given strong indications of anti-British feeling. But we know not why his word should be invested with so much authority or why it should be assumed that his section would prevail. Meantime there can be little doubt that Free Trade is gaining ground. People begin to say that Mr. Cleveland stands a fair chance of re-election. If we are satisfied that we are right in desiring for Canada the markets of her own continent, we must be patient and hopeful, not despair of the cause because by some turn in the battle of political parties its progress is checked for a time or because opponents shout that it is dead.

Truly does the *Sherbrooke Gazette* say that the chief sufferer by protection is the farmer. If a decline of twenty-two and a-half millions in the value of farm property in Ontario since 1883 does not condemn the system, so far as the owners of that kind of property are concerned, we should like to know what would. The same cry comes from all parts of the rural districts and from the towns which depend on them for their trade. The wages of agricultural labourers have also fallen. The farmers of Ontario, at any rate, and all whom their depression affects, are rife for a change of system. They would heartily respond if the Opposition would move a resolution declaring that the fiscal policy of the Government, so far as they were concerned, had failed. Not less hearty would be the response from Manitoba and the North-West. The Opposition will throw away its chances if it does not, either by way of amendment to the Address, which is the best and most effective course, or in some form during the course of the session, move vigorously in this direction.

—Jefferson Davis was not a great man but his death closes an era. He was called a monument of American clemency. It is true the Americans showed infinitely more humanity

and wisdom after their second civil war than they did after their first, when they hanged or despoiled and drove into exile by Acts of Attainder Loyalists guilty of nothing but defending a cause which they had a perfect right to defend, the Revolutionists themselves being witnesses; for even Samuel Adams and the Boston agitators disclaimed, though insincerely, any intention of severing the connection with the mother country. But it would have been murder to hang Jefferson Davis or any other Confederate as a rebel. Champions of an evil cause the men who fought for slavery were. Rebels, in any rational sense of that term, they were not. Secession was not rebellion. Two groups of States, radically differing from each other in social structure and therefore in political tendencies and requirements, had been held together in an uneasy union, which Northern morality denounced as a compact with hell. At last, naturally and inevitably, they fell asunder. The Southern group became *de facto* a nation. It had a regular government, with executive, legislative and judiciary, perfectly recognized and obeyed throughout the whole of a large and well-defined territory. It commanded not only the allegiance, but the devotion of its free citizens, who poured out their blood for it like water through a long war of independence. Even among the slaves there was no revolt and hardly a symptom of disaffection, though as the war went on many of them were swept into the Federal lines. If affirmations of the principle that people have a right to change their government were needed they might have been found by cartloads in the speeches of Northern orators and the writings of Northern publicists. The North, being far the larger and more powerful nation, proceeded to conquer and re-annex the smaller and weaker nation. In doing this it did only what the strong have always been doing from the days of Sennacherib downwards; but conquest for the purpose of self-aggrandizement, however familiar, can claim no sympathy. The only ground which the North had for claiming sympathy and complaining of its absence, was that the South was a slave power,

founded for the propagation of an accursed institution and that in taking arms against it the Federals were executing the ban of humanity. But that ground the North through its legislature positively disclaimed, offering the South if it would return to the Union not only the retention of slavery but further guarantees. John Corwin's Resolution in favour of a Constitutional Amendment, declaring the institution of slavery inviolable and unalterable, had received the requisite two-thirds majority of both Houses of Congress when parley was ended by the opening of the cannon on Fort Sumter. After this with what face could the people of the United States upbraid England with not regarding the war as a crusade against slavery? The great mass of the English people, discerning the practical issue, notwithstanding the ignominious disclaimer, and being true to the noble traditions of their own nation, did after all sympathize with the North; and Great Britain steadfastly rejected the proposal of joint intervention which was pressed on her by the French Emperor though acceptance would not only have brought her the cotton, for want of which her countless looms were standing still and her myriads of artisans were on the brink of famine, but would have given her a perpetual claim to the gratitude and support of a powerful community on this side of the Atlantic. It may be doubted whether any nation ever paid a higher tribute to morality than did England in withstanding that temptation. The more candid of the American historians now admit that one motive of their countrymen for making war on Great Britain in 1812 was the hope of sharing with Napoleon the victory which they believed that tyrant was sure to gain over European independence. The Americans had nursed a slave-owning aristocracy, and with that aristocracy European aristocracy sympathized in the struggle. What else in reason could be expected? Could the Americans demand of a foreign nation a unanimity of feeling in favour of the war which was as far as possible from existing among themselves? Among the friends of the slave-owner in the North were the great mass of the Irish, in deference to whose

passions honour was the other day denied to the ashes of John Bright, the grand European champion of the North in the struggle. An Englishman need not fear that when his country stands before the tribunal of history sentence in this cause will go against her. As to the violations of British neutrality by the South, in the case of the *Alabama* and her consorts, what were they in comparison with the violations of American neutrality which had been permitted to the French at the opening of the war between France and England? Americans of the better class are ready to hear reason on these points, but in the Press and among the masses the Anglophobic version still prevails, and a common audience receives with incredulous surprise the assurance that the *Alabama* was not armed in a British port with the cognizance of the British Government and manned out of the British naval reserve. A democracy, when its self-love and self-will have been flattered by generations of demagogues, is as incapable of doing justice to those who have affronted its majesty as the most besotted of despots.

—Nothing in the commercial world is more striking than the immense flow of British capital into the United States. It shows in the first place that England has not been ruined by Free Trade, and in the second place that the English do not regard the United States as “a hostile nation” or give the colonies a commercial preference over it. Whatever may be said as to trade, investment does not closely follow the flag. Possibly the investors may also be feeling, in some degree, decreased confidence in the stability of British as compared with American institutions. The *New York Times* states that a hundred millions of British capital are about to be invested in a single enterprise. From another source we learn that since July of last year eighteen American brewery companies have been bought out in the London market. Canadian experience shows that the British investor is apt to be at once singularly

rash and singularly timid, and both in the wrong place: he will refuse the soundest stock and rush into the most speculative enterprise. Let him remember that American sharp-practice, though it has been much exaggerated, is not altogether fabulous, that the United States are a foreign though not a hostile country, and that Anglophobia does sometimes affect the strictness both of commercial dealing and of legal justice.

—The escape of the Cronin murderers from the halter, which, if they were guilty at all, was manifestly their due, is a partial failure of justice. The Americans, however, have seen what the Clan-na-Gael is like, and what it is they have been flattering and fostering all these years. No man deserves to stand in the dock of public opinion better than he who, when President Elect, to pander to Irish passion, signed an address excusing Irish outrage, or the highly moral Senator from New England, who, with the same noble object, palliated the Phoenix Park murderers.

—The Brazilian Revolution was more of a revolution than at first appeared. As to the cause we were not misled. The Emancipation of the Slaves may have disgusted the great landowners and deprived the Crown of their support at the critical moment: but it was not the emancipation of the slaves that caused the revolution. The main cause of the revolution, as the advices indicate, and as the London *Times* thinks, was one of which we heard long ago. It was fear of the reactionary tendencies of the heiress to the Crown who was in the hands of the Jesuits. The first thing this lady does on setting foot in Europe is to make a pilgrimage to Lourdes, and the friends of the dynasty, aware of her weakness, propose to pass her over in their choice of a pretender and adopt the Emperor's grandson, a boy of fourteen. Jesuitism has

scored another James II. This is Sir John Thompson's harmless "company of Christian teachers and preachers." If a civil war breaks out, the public money of a Canadian Province may be used to shed Brazilian blood in the interest of Ultramontane reaction. Amidst all our speculations about the political bearings of the Jesuit case we think too little of the plain question of duty. What right has Canada to aid a deadly conspiracy against liberty, progress, and truth ?

We are told that we need not trouble ourselves about the Jesuit ; he always fails. So he does. He failed in Germany after destroying by the Thirty Years' War more than half the population. He failed in France after kindling the War of the League and nearly handing over the country to Philip II. He failed in France again after extirpating the Protestants and sowing the seeds of the Revolution. He failed in the Netherlands after the religious murder of multitudes and half-a-century of bloodshed. He failed in England after nearly wrecking the liberties of the people by the hand of James II. and bringing on civil war in Scotland and Ireland. He failed in Spain after helping Ferdinand VII. to overturn the Constitution and inaugurate a reign of terror. He failed in Switzerland after arraying the Catholic cantons against the Protestant in the field of civil war. He failed once more in France after drawing her into a ruinous war with Germany. In Brazil he fails after leading a dynasty to ruin and filling the country with strife, which may possibly result in serious bloodshed.

—It seems as if the junction of the Liberal Unionists with the Conservatives in England; long delayed by Lord Hartington and his friends, in the vain hope that when Home Rule was out of the way they might again lead a Liberal party of the old stamp, is at last about to take place. Home Rule is out of the way, at least for the present ; but in its place appears socialistic revolution, to save the country from which and from dismemberment at the same time all the anti-revolutionary

forces must be combined. Hoodwinked to a strange extent by the survival of monarchical and aristocratic forms which had lost all their force and ceased to afford any real safeguards, British statesmen have gone on extending the franchise without providing any checks or strengthening the upper works of the Constitution till they have slipped, without being aware of it, into the most unbridled democracy. Universal suffrage is more perilous in England than it is in France, where the masses are small landowners and Conservative in their way, while in England they are mere wage-earners with a very large proportion of factory hands, the least stable and the most dangerous of all political elements. Power having, it may be said, finally departed from the House of Lords, the only practical safeguards left are the seven years' term for Parliament and non-payment of members. The first preserves to the Legislature a certain degree of independence; the second keeps the representation generally in the hands of men of property. But both these are marked for abolition in the Radical programme drawn up the other day at Manchester under the auspices of Mr. Gladstone, and, should the Radicals win the next election, will certainly fall, together with any remnants of restriction or qualification which limit the sway of universal suffrage. The country will then be launched on the current of revolution, made still more impetuous, if this strife between employer and employed goes on, by the prevalence of industrial war; and where it will bring up, who can say? Feeble leaders, like Lord Rosebery and Mr. Morley, will be utterly incapable of controlling the more violent section of their party even if they were conscientious enough to risk their popularity by the attempt. The disturbance would probably extend to the dependencies. It would hardly be possible that the Indian Empire should survive a reign of revolutionary demagogism in the Imperial country. Its rulers have already begun, we believe, to feel an increase of their perils from that quarter.

That which is worshipped as the British Constitution in reality never was much more than a balance of power between

the Crown, the aristocracy, and the Commons. The balance has oscillated from time to time, inclining under the Tudors to the Crown, under the early Hanoverians to the aristocracy, who then nominated a large portion of the popular House, and of late to the Commons. Power has now completely and finally centred in the House of Commons, which has thus become the government of the country, the executive being a committee of its dominant party. But the House of Commons never was intended to be a government: it was intended only to be the representation of the people for the purpose of granting taxes and conferring with the Crown in which the Government was supposed to reside. Nor is it in any way fitted for its new function. It is a mob elected by a larger mob, which is fast reducing members of Parliament to mere agents by the Caucus. Anyone by attending a few evenings in the gallery may satisfy himself that all power of deliberation and almost the power of preserving order is lost. Unless something can be done, and done speedily, to make the House of Commons fit for the functions of government, there will cease to be a government or any real authority in the country. Lord Salisbury, unhappily, with all his ability, is not the man to grapple with organic problems. He has never given his mind to them. His dominant idea is the preservation of the hereditary House of Lords, to the irretrievable decadence of which he is blind. His only other idea, so far as appears, is female suffrage, by which he imagines that he can cool the revolutionary cauldron. If female suffrage did cool the revolutionary cauldron it would be only for a moment, and at the expense, too probably, of interests more precious if possible than those of the State itself.

The danger of dismemberment for the time is over. Mr. Gladstone refuses to disclose his plan of Home Rule. He has no plan to disclose. The dilemma in which he is placed between the exclusion and retention of the Irish members is fatal. He is also in a dilemma with regard to the order of precedence between Irish and Scottish Home Rule, the Home Rulers of each country demanding that their measure shall be carried

first, because when the Irish depart from Westminster the Scotch, when the Scotch depart the Irish, will be left in a hopeless minority. Precedence is also claimed for Welsh disestablishment by the friends of that measure whose vote is indispensable. Mr. Gladstone, pressed by the different sections of his followers, takes refuge in ambiguous utterance, which begins to lose its effect.

—The Radicals are choosing a leader to succeed Mr. Gladstone. They are embarrassed, but not by their riches. Their choice lies between Sir William Harcourt, Mr. Morley and Lord Rosebery, the weakness of Lord Spencer being now apparently confessed. But Lord Rosebery is in the Upper House; the real leader of the Radical party must be in the Commons. The natural heir is Sir William Harcourt, but of him one of the journals which is booming Mr. Morley, under cover of putting forward Lord Rosebery, says, that it “trusts England will never sink so low as to be governed by him.” We can understand the remark, though we doubt whether the cynicism of the coarse opportunist is really more ignoble than the demagogism of the philosophic man of letters who after taking the highest ground as a preacher of morality and of government by intelligence stoops to play the low game of faction, to become the organ of party falsehood, to flatter mob passions, and to delude the ignorant masses with promises which he must know cannot be fulfilled. If the revolution which Mr. Morley invokes really began he and all the other literary and philosophic Jacobins would be crushed like egg shells. About the strongest of the Radicals and the least unfit to govern, strange as it may seem, in reality is Mr. Bradlaugh, who is disqualified by his social heterodoxy. Lord Rosebery is a showy man of talent, whose ambition exceeds his ability, without settled opinions or much force of character. Launched on the revolutionary current, he would drift or sink. Meantime Sir Andrew Clark says that for aught he can

see Mr. Gladstone may live to two hundred. If he does, and continues to advance in his revolutionary line at his present rate he will come to a great pass at last.

The choice of a leader is a serious matter, for the masses to whom the franchise has now been extended, ignorant of all questions and careless of all principles, have nothing to follow but a name. Gladstonian is the proper title of the party; a member of Parliament is elected to vote with Mr. Gladstone, which he must do on all occasions, at the peril of his political life. If he gives a conscientious vote he immediately receives a notice of dismissal from the Caucus. Thus government by the people has, for the time at least, resulted in autocracy.

—The Imperial Federation movement has ended in the proposal by Lord Rosebery of an annual Conference. Not only is a Conference not a Federation, but the proposal seems to imply that the idea of federation is laid aside. However, if the Conference is not to be a mere palaver, it must be invested with some sort of authority, and to be invested with any sort of authority it must be chosen in a regular way, with the consent of the several Colonies, and with an accredited representative from the Mother Country. Of mere oratory and fraternization we have surely had enough.

—Canada may well keep her eyes anxiously fixed on the European war-cloud for two reasons: because a maritime war would suspend her trade with Europe and because a war between Great Britain and France would set the British and French Provinces of the Dominion by the ears. But to attempt to register the daily shiftings of the cloud and the changes in its hue is vain. Lord Salisbury tells us there will be peace; and this is sufficient assurance that there are no immediate signs of war. Lord Salisbury's skill in diplomacy

is beyond question ; but if the remark were not presumptuous, we should say that he was too great a diplomatist: he believes too much in diplomacy as an occult science and overrates its power of controlling violent passions and brute forces. How can he or any man tell what gust of emotion may to-morrow sweep over France, what thoughts may be harboured in the breast of the Czar, or what complications may any day be brought on by some outbreak in Eastern Europe, in Crete, or in Afghanistan ? Assurances of peace may be trusted when armaments are reduced: while they are augmented we must infer that those who augment them look for war. The finances of France appear to be in a bad state. Supposing a crisis comes, will it lead the French to curtail their military expenditure, or will it lead them at once to hurl themselves desperately on Germany ? Who can tell ? In such a case passion would reign and diplomatic science would have little power.

—The contagion of the Dock Strike has spread and British industry seems to be falling into disorganization at the moment when reviving commerce had made the outlook bright. What will be the ultimate consequence, we all know ; it will be the withdrawal of trade from the disturbed centres ; perhaps its departure from England to the continent ; for the men have not yet succeeded in persuading their foreign competitors to forbear taking advantage of their mistakes. The community, let us say again, is the real employer and will give no more for goods or labour than it can afford, so that if the producers or labourers insist on a price higher than the community can afford the trade must cease. There is no help for it, however ; combination is lawful, though it seems hard that those who turn a single wheel in a great machine of industry should be able by striking to make the whole machine stand still, and that a great city should be plunged in darkness whenever the men in the gas works have a quarrel with their employers. Nor are there any means of preventing men from

preferring the calling of a social incendiary to other ways of making their bread. All that the community can do is to protect the rights of non-union men. This it is not only concerned in interest but in duty bound to do. It is not right that any man should be able to say to another unless you will join my combination and submit to the rules which it chooses to make, you shall not work for your bread. There has evidently been a good deal not only of intimidation but of violence in connection with the London strikes. To let club law prevail would be a relapse into barbarism as well as monopoly. This apparently the country begins to feel and two strikes have been resisted and beaten, as it seems, with the general assent of the community.

There can be no shadow of doubt that the material condition of the labouring class in England and other great commercial countries has immensely improved during the last half century, and this without the exercise on their part of the self-denial in regard to marriage which has been exercised by other classes. It is equally certain that the feelings and conduct of the wealthier class towards the labouring class have improved fully as much. Benevolence is multiplying its efforts on all sides, and at this very moment Mr. Guinness is giving a million of dollars for homes for the poor in London and a quarter of a million in Dublin. Yet there never was a time when the feeling of the labouring class, at least of a large portion of it, towards the wealthier class was worse than it is at present or when the industrial air was more full of conspiracy and strife. Raised to a higher level, the mechanics see greater luxuries apparently within their reach. Half educated, they are in that twilight of the mind in which chimeras and charlatanry have power. They have generally ceased to look to a future life for compensation if they get less than their share here, or to believe in the constitution of society as the ordinance of God. There has arisen a set of labour agitators and writers of labour journals who make it their trade to instil venom into the heart of the artisan and to possess him with

the belief that he alone is the "toiler," while all other men are "spoilers" who ought to be made to disgorge, and may deem themselves lucky if they are allowed to escape with their lives. When this industrial embitterment is everywhere going on simultaneously with a political revolution, by which political power is being transferred into the hands of the masses and independent authority is ceasing to exist, who can feel sure that we have not stormy times before us? Fortunately the chiefs of industry and commerce, on whom in this case the brunt of the conflict falls, are not like political demagogues: they are men raised to their leadership by genuine qualities, and they have hitherto met their difficulties and perils with sagacity as well as firmness. As to the possessors of wealth generally, let them instead of roving in search of pleasure stay at their social posts and do their duty. If they do not, trouble will come on them as it has come on every class in history which has been false to its mission. If they do, even supposing they fail to allay the ill-feeling among the working class and to conjure the impending storm, they will get something better than wealth can give and something which the loss of wealth cannot take away. It is a bad part of dependence that wealthy colonists are apt hardly to look upon the colony as their home or their post of duty. They spend half their time in England and look on that as their social spheres.

—If anything can be more revolting than the details of the vice which haunts great and luxurious cities it surely is the appetite which causes those details to be telegraphed all over the world and eagerly devoured. Worse still is the use of them for a political purpose, to which the Radicals in England seem to be joyfully looking forward. To carry on political warfare with ordure is congenial enough to a Parnellite agitator or a member of the Clan-na-Gael; but this filthy savagery has not hitherto polluted British public life. Unfortunately public opinion seems to be debauched enough to license anything so long

as excitement is provided. A Radical journalist is praised by his brethren of the Press for his skill in so collocating two paragraphs as, without risking a direct charge, to convey a deadly imputation against the character of the son of the Prince of Wales. The victim of this cowardly brutality is a stripling whom a manly savage would spare, and who, as he cannot bring a libel suit, is absolutely defenceless. There are crimes which law cannot reach and which public sentiment seems no longer to chastise. Those who have been shocked by foul reports may, we believe, rest assured that the young members of the Royal Family are so closely watched over that their resort to haunts of infamy, even were they so inclined, would be impossible. The Prince of Wales when he was at the university was the subject of slanderous reports which could not possibly have been true, since sight was never lost of him by those who had him under their care.

—Our warmest sympathies are due to those who try to make Toronto a centre of art. But we must not forget the difficulties against which we have to contend. You may count on your fingers, perhaps on the fingers of one hand, the centres of art in the world. They can exist only where there are fine collections to furnish a standard as well as good schools of technical skill, together with great wealth and high culture. It is doubtful whether there is yet one on this continent, though sheer force of money may presently create one at New York. In our case the area is wholly insufficient. We talk of Canada, but the real area is only Ontario and the British quarter of Montreal. We are completely cut off from the Maritime Provinces and from the scanty population of the North-West. For the same reason all efforts to establish a literary periodical have hitherto failed. It is difficult even for a first-class newspaper to maintain itself and meet the high requirements of the present day on so limited a constituency. Yet the local newspaper has not to compete with the products of the world: the local artist has, for the few who buy works

of art are always going to Europe and they buy by preference there. First-rate artists will not stay at any but a great centre. The President of the Canadian Academy himself is drawn away to London: there was nothing of his in the Exhibition at the Canadian Institute. It is even false kindness to encourage a good painter or sculptor to set up his studio where there will be few to appreciate and fewer still to buy. Toronto is not, as some homilies which have been read us on this subject seem to imply, behind other commercial cities of the same size in love of beauty. The marked improvement of her house architecture and the increasing display of objects of taste in her stores acquit her of the charge. But really good painting or sculpture is a tremendously expensive article: it is beyond the means of any but our richest men; and there can be no use in constraining people to buy anything which is not really good. A great deal not only of vulgar embellishment but of genuine beauty in the shape of decoration may be had for the cost of even a tolerable picture or statue. Besides very few even of those who have passed their lives in refined society are sufficiently good judges of art to buy it with confidence, whereas any man may feel sure of getting from a good furniture or decoration store something which is worth his money, and which even if it does not do the highest credit to his taste will not make him a laughing-stock to connoisseurs. The Canadian millionaire when he goes to Europe can buy under good advice as well as with an infinitely greater choice. In portrait painting the local man has an advantage, but even for portraits those who are willing to give a high price will go to Europe, while those who are not will take the photograph touched by the artist's hand. Nobody can pretend that the last Exhibition at the Canadian Institute was successful: it seemed to owe its escape from failure in drawing the public to the bastard attraction of a lottery. Music enjoys a happy exemption from the necessities which chain to certain centres her sister arts, and her progress in Toronto is enough to prove that we are not barbarians.

The counsel will be thought unworthy, we know, by the votaries of high art, but we cannot help thinking that an improvement of the art department of the Industrial Exhibition might be useful as a humble instrument both for the cultivation of popular taste and for the sale, at all events, of such works as please the many. What is exhibited there will be seen by the whole Province, not by Toronto alone, and though the majority will come only to stare some may come to admire and a few to buy. We commend to Mr. Withrow and the other managers the provision of a separate building suitable for the quiet enjoyment of art and a special committee to supervise the admissions. If obtainable, a Loan Collection should always be got together to add to the attractions of native artists and furnish a standard of excellence. Meantime our thanks are due to the organizers of the Exhibition at the Toronto Art Gallery for bringing before our artists and our people such pictures as Dawant's "Embarkment of Emigrants," and Hoeber's "The Daily Bread," and we may add, with special pride in the achievements of an old Toronto artist, G. R. Bridgman's "Boy Overboard."

—Industry is always respectable and no one can deny the praise of industry to Dr. Poole's portly volume on "Anglo-Israel." Every particle of evidence or of anything that looks like evidence in favour of the whimsical hypothesis that the Saxon race is the Lost Tribes of Israel has been collected with the most diligent research by Dr. Poole, whose ethnology in its vigorous sweep draws no distinction between Celt and Teuton, while his philology is subtle enough to deduce "Saxon" from "Isaac." It is impossible to speak of "Anglo-Israel" with disrespect, since it is the creed of the most popular preacher in Toronto, and in England has arrived at the political dignity of being a "vote," and of putting test questions to Parliamentary candidates. It seems to be, in effect, Jingoism with a Biblical sanction. As descendants of the Chosen Race the

Anglo-Saxons inherit the earth. But the doctrine that the Deity bound Himself to advance the interests of a particular race at the expense of the rest if it would pray and sacrifice to Him is a tribal belief and belongs to the theological past. That the Father-of-All has made all nations of one blood to dwell together is the Gospel view, in accordance with which the Apostles went forth to convert the world. Dr. Poole would not like to make religious theory the procuress to unscrupulous ambition. Mazzini had faults and made great mistakes, but he shines among vulgar Chauvinists and Jingoës like a star in virtue of his teaching, amidst all his fervent patriotism, that each nation should regard itself as an organ of humanity. Dr. Poole quotes Dr. Abbadie, of Amsterdam, as saying in 1723, that unless the Ten Tribes have flown into the air or have plunged into the centre of the earth they must be sought for in the North and West and in the British Isles. With deference to the learned shade of Dr. Abbadie, we cannot help thinking that the amalgamation of the Ten Tribes into the other Semites by whom they were surrounded in the land of their captivity is as easy a way out of the difficulty which presented itself to his mind as the transformation of a set of dark, long-nosed and crafty Orientals, into a people of fair-haired, blue-eyed and frank-faced rovers on the Northern Sea.

There is a preface by Dr. Withrow in which is renewed the old indictment against Christendom for the religious persecution of the Jews. We believe that we should have no difficulty in proving to the Doctor that the charge is greatly overstated and Christendom, which has plenty of other grounds for self-reproach, may be comparatively at ease on this. The main cause of the risings of the people against the Jews in the Middle Ages was not difference of religion, though that no doubt embittered the quarrel, but the exactions practised on the people by the Jew. The chief case of a distinctly religious persecution was in Spain, and even there it is difficult to distinguish the religious conflict from that struggle of races, Occidental and Oriental, for the possession of the Pen-

insula, in which the Jew was on the Oriental side. It is the same in modern times; the so-called religious movements against the Jews in Russia, Germany, Austria and the Danubian Principalities are not religious, but are the risings of the people against insufferable usury practised on them by an alien, intruding, and exclusive race. We promise to give Dr. Withrow proof of this whenever he will do us the honour to call for it. Perhaps he will in the meantime consider whether if Christians have been too often intolerant, Jews who will not eat, drink or intermarry with their fellow-citizens are models of toleration.

—British Canada has at all events reason to be proud of her judges and grateful to those who have appointed them for having in the exercise of their momentous trust usually kept the fell demands of party at least within decent limits. Amidst the general decadence of authority and reverence consequent on political strife the people have never ceased to look up with respect and confidence to the Bench; and when a tyrant of the Press, who had trampled with impunity on the characters and feelings of all other people, ventured to assail a judge he was at once made sensible of his error and slunk away in silence. Mr. Read's *Lives of the Judges of Upper Canada* comprises more than thirty sketches of the occupants of the Provincial Bench, the series commencing with Chief Justice Osgoode, who was appointed on the passing of the Constitutional Act in 1791 and ending very worthily with Sir M. C. Cameron, who died in 1887. The work is rendered interesting by personal reminiscence, is enlivened by anecdote, and, as not a few of these men played important parts in public life, is welcome to the historical and general as well as to the professional reader.

THE BYSTANDER.

FEBRUARY, 1890.

THE Government proposes, it seems, that little shall be done at Ottawa this session. The Government proposes, but the Opposition may dispose. The leaders of the Opposition will be greatly wanting, both to their interest and their duty if in the present situation they fail to call the attention of the country to the working of a system under which farm property in this Province has fallen in value to the extent of twenty-two and a-half millions in six years, the farmer is depressed, country towns dependent on trade with him are declining, vast mineral resources lie undeveloped, our shipping disappears from the lakes, the debt has increased to two hundred and sixty millions, the burden of taxation has been aggravated in proportion, the cost of living has risen to thirty-five per cent. more than it is in an old and overcrowded country, smuggling has spread along the Border to the injury of lawful trade, the very flower of our population is leaving us, and the promises of Government have been miserably belied with regard to the North-West, in the whole of which, after all these years, instead of the myriads promised, there are not above a hundred and fifty thousand white inhabitants, including Icelanders, Menmonites and Mormons, while a great population, largely composed of Canadian emigrants, is filling the farms and towns on the other side of the Line; the counter-vailing benefits received by the country being a number of baronetcies and knighthoods and the creation of a few great fortunes which the possessors are apt to carry away to

the brilliant society of England. If the industry, energy and thrift of the Canadian people have struggled gallantly against the effects of this policy and kept the country up to a level of which we may still be proud, this does not render the policy less injurious. When Lord Stanley, in the speech put into his mouth, dilated on the great development of all our resources, and notably of our mineral resources, since the days of his predecessors, it must surely have been with some consciousness of the nature of the ceremony which he was performing. If in the land of Mumbo Jumbo it were the custom that at the opening of a tribal assembly one man should deliver as his own a speech which another man had written we should moralize pleasantly on the grotesque habits of uncivilized nations.

“ We have knocked Truth and Righteousness into a cocked hat ” was the exulting cry of a Machinist Liberal after the West Lambton election. Knocking Truth and Righteousness into a cocked hat is perhaps the best definition that could have been given of the function of a Machine. The leaders probably judge somewhat differently, and know that the secession of nearly eight hundred electors from the party lines where the Machine candidate was very strong and the independent candidate very weak, is a warning that the cocked hat into which Truth and Righteousness are to be finally knocked has not yet been found. It is pretty manifest also that the Government is afraid to open East Toronto and is keeping the Collectorship of the Toronto Customs vacant on that account. The leaders themselves however have shown, in this Jesuit affair, that the peculiar shrewdness generated by their calling as politicians is sometimes accompanied by a loss of touch with common sentiment which betrays them into tactical errors. The indignation caused by the endowment with public money of the most hateful and deadly of anti-social conspiracies, natural as it seems, evidently took them by surprise.

Since the West Lambton election the leadership of a Third Party seems to have been formally accepted by the Rev. Dr.

Sutherland. Dr. Sutherland by his character as well as by his ability as a preacher and speaker, is well-entitled to lead a moral movement, and he is perfectly in his right even on the principles of the party system. That system must have a remedy for cases in which both the regular parties fail to do their duty. In the present case not only have they failed to do their duty but they have actually coalesced, as Dr. Sutherland and his friends would say, against "truth and righteousness." Coalesce they assuredly did in the Stanstead election, and throughout this conflict they have in great measure dropped their hostility to each other while they combined to assail independence. Mr. David Mills could not abuse Tories more roundly than he abused Liberals who were so unreasonably faithful to principle as to refuse to court Ultramontaniam for a political end. But the creation of a new party is an expensive as well as a troublesome process. It involves the erection of a new Machine. Nor can you be at all sure that your new party will not presently bear to Truth and Righteousness about the same relation as the old parties. Six or seven times in some countries of Europe the impure liquid of faction has been run off from old party receptacles into new; and it remains as impure in the last receptacle as it was in the first.

Not the formation of Third Parties, but the emancipation of public life from party altogether and a return to national government, will be the ultimate aim at all events of the true reformer, while he may see that the party system is established at present, that he cannot hope at once to disestablish it, and that so long as it prevails public men and actions must be judged by its rules. The system is everywhere in a pronounced state of decadence. Sectionalism has thoroughly set in, and all attempts to restore discipline have proved hopeless, so that hardly anywhere can a party be found large enough to form a stable basis for a Government. In France no Government has been able to live six months, and Germany would be in the same plight did not the iron hand of Bismarck uphold a rule practically irrespective of party. In England, the mother of the

system, no party has now a majority, and the Government leans on a prop supplied by a section of its nominal opponents. In Australia administrations flit over the scene like shadows. In Canada we have had comparative stability, but it has been the fruit of corruption, carried on through subsidies and Government appropriations, for which the condition of Quebec and the indifference of the remoter Provinces to Dominion politics have afforded a propitious field. The next demise of the leadership will probably be the end even of the sinister stability which exists here.

—Mr. McCarthy having put his hand to the plough does not look backwards. The debate on his motion for the abolition of the dual language in the North-West can hardly fail to make the dry bones of party rattle. Let us hope that at all events counsel will not be darkened by false analogies. True analogy there is none. The medley of language as well as of races and religions in the case of Switzerland is aboriginal and immemorial, while the very fact of its being a medley, not an antagonism, makes it comparatively harmless. In the case of Austria the use of more than one political language is rendered necessary by the union of different nations under one Imperial Crown. Neither of these cases, nor as we believe any other case that can be mentioned, bears a real resemblance to the attempt to inflict duality on a community in its cradle by means of legislative intrigue, and for the purposes of ecclesiastical propagandism. In Germany and in the United States there is a mixture of races and languages; yet neither nation recognizes for political purposes any language but one. This is a British Colony. The Treaty of Cession secured to the French the enjoyment of their language and religion in Quebec: the rest is ours.

—It is difficult to see how Mr. Laurier after formally endorsing a Nationalist and Ultramontane candidate in Quebec

can continue to lead the Liberals of Ontario. Unnatural and hypocritical alliances always end in disaster. People are surprised that Mr. Joly, a French Protestant, should come out in defence of the Jesuit grant: but Mr. Joly's instincts, though he has not of late taken part in politics, are still those of the regular politician. His plea that the Jesuit Estate was an escheat to which the Jesuits had a moral claim, and that the Act was the settlement of that claim, is palpably untenable and has already been renounced by Mr. Mercier who describes the Act as having "repaired the despoilment of the Jesuits by the same George III. who had despoiled the American Revolutionary Fathers of their rights and liberties." There was in fact nothing to escheat. The Order having been under the ban of British law and unprotected by the Treaty of Cession, the estates were forfeit even before the suppression of the Order, and were at the disposal of the Crown, as is clearly implied by that opinion of Solicitor-General Wedderburn, of which Sir John Thompson and all who argue on his side so carefully steer clear. But supposing the estates to have escheated by the suppression of the Order, can Mr. Joly contend that the revival of the Order by the Pope gave it any claim, legal or moral, to estates held before the suppression? Supposing the Pope were to revive the Order of the Templars, would he confer a moral claim to the property now held by the two Inns of Court? Would any Roman Catholic Government listen for a moment to a demand like that which Mr. Joly calls upon a Protestant Government to admit? But we repeat Mr. Mercier's own avowal has settled the question and proved that the Act was intended as a blow against the Conquest Settlement and at all by whom that settlement is upheld.

—Mr. Meredith's encounter with the ecclesiastical dragon of Kingston is likely rather to confirm him in the attitude which he had begun to assume. Neither in this controversy nor on the platform has he said a syllable implying the slightest ill-

feeling towards Roman Catholics or the slightest tendency to deprive them or their Church of any liberties or privileges enjoyed by their Protestant fellow subjects. In this he is at one with the avowed friends of Equal Rights. At the same time he is being manifestly borne forward by the swelling current of opinion from the position of manager of a donkey engine to that of a defender of British and Protestant Right in the British and Protestant Province, and a guardian of our political independence against the domination of the "solid vote" thrown now into one scale now into the other at the ecclesiastical word of command. Unless some hand from behind pulls him back or his own resolution fails him before the Provincial elections, we shall at least have a more interesting contest than we had on the last occasion.

—Mr. Meredith's proposal to take education out of politics is well received and will help to fill his sails at the election unless the Government alters its course so as to take the wind out of them. The abolition of the Council of Public Instruction a twelvemonth after its reorganisation was not a deliberate measure or dictated by experience: it was caused by a personal crisis in the Board, the wrath of the Chief Superintendent having been kindled by the revision of his text-books, the inquiry instituted into his Depositories, the free exercise by the Council of its power of election to the headships of Training Colleges, and generally by the curb which the activity of the reorganized Council put upon his autocracy. Had the Government been firm enough to enforce upon its Chief Superintendent an observance of the rules of public life, or had there been a strong man in the Chair of the Council, all might have gone well. At the pass to which things had been allowed to come the change was inevitable, nor were there wanting other arguments in its favour, such as the convenience of having in the Legislature a Minister responsible for the expenditure. It seems to be felt, however, that the result

of the experiment is unsatisfactory and that it would be well to return to the old system or something like it. A Council is of course unfit for ordinary administration, which must be placed in the hands of some regular officer. But for such matters as the selection of text-books and the regulation of the curriculum it is useful. The Council was certainly free from any influence, political or commercial. Nor did it show any such tendency to ecclesiasticism as the Council of Instruction in Manitoba is said to betray. It is good for the educational profession to have at its head a body of its most eminent representatives. As Minister of Education we must take whomsoever, in the somewhat fortuitous distribution of offices among the leaders of a political party, it may please fate to give us, and if the man happens to be unfamiliar with the special subject and obliged to rely on others the result is an irresponsible Vizier or a Camarilla. With the withdrawal of education from politics Mr. Meredith, it may be surmised, will combine a cautious and conservative policy with regard to education generally. It is time that we should take care what we are about if we do not mean to educate country life and farm industry out of existence.

—That baronetcies should be revived in Canada and more knighthoods bestowed by a Tory government of England was most natural, since a Tory government embodies the hope of propagating aristocratic sentiment on this side of the water and saving a part of the New World from democracy. Vain is that hope and far from beneficial, as we think, to Canadian society are the means employed for its realization. To titles bestowed by the community on the holders of public trusts there can be no sort of objection: these are real titles of honour: democracy need not renounce everything that is impressive or graceful; some day perhaps it will evolve its own æsthetics. But these baronetcies and knighthoods are not annexed to public trusts, nor are they bestowed by the community. They

are too often the prize of servility or of undignified solicitation, and we could even point to a case where a title was used, at the instance of a Party leader, to cancel the just sentence of the nation against his associate in corruption. Their effect is in a measure to estrange the public man from his own country and attach him to the skirts of the aristocracy from which the title comes. Amidst all the criticism of Mr. Edward Blake let it not be forgotten that he did Canada the honour to refuse distinction which was not to be conferred by the nation which he served. To say that the sacrifice was great would almost be a satire on humanity. Nevertheless it was not small. A fountain of honour by all means let us have, but let it be here. One creation is satisfactory, inasmuch as it recognizes the fact that the Grand Trunk, with comparatively little aid from the country, has perhaps done more for it and better earned the title of "national" than a rival, which having received over a hundred millions on the ground of its exclusively national character is now not only a private commercial enterprise but partly an American road, fighting Canadian private enterprises virtually with public funds and discriminating in its rates against Canadian traffic.

Of Q. C's. we have had simultaneous showers from two opposite quarters, and soon they will be coming up "even into our kneading-troughs." Mr. Mowat's batch is at all events the more creditable. Of the appointments in the other batch some are condemned by Conservatives who care for the honour of their profession. Not long ago the indignation of all honest Conservatives was still more aroused by an appointment to a judgeship, and the influence in that case was not merely political but sectarian. Yet we flatter ourselves that we emulate England where, saving the necessary recognition of the claims of Law Officers of the Crown, judgeships are now given irrespective of party, and the silk gown is bestowed with the strictest regard to professional standing. The blame rests not so much with Sir John Macdonald himself as with those who by their adulation have filled him with the belief that he

is absolute master of the country, and licensed at his sovereign will and pleasure to purchase political support with a seat on the Bench of Justice and fling the honours of the Bar to a man of blemished character or to one who has hardly ever been in Court. The practice arraigned by Mr. Laurier of keeping open appointments indefinitely for party purposes, in which Sir John Macdonald so freely indulges, is another exhibition of the same insolent autocracy. Rumour speaks of an appointment to the Senate which would throw all other excesses in the use of patronage into the shade; but a contemporary has placed the record of the aspirant's career distinctly before the Governor-General, and it is to be hoped that his Excellency will not want the firmness to guard the honour of the country and his own.

—We have been treated to a concert of unusual power and sweetness by the Toronto dailies, one of which is alleged to have been detected in treasonably furnishing the politicians at Washington with the "secret information" that there is an exodus from Canada and that we have some annexationists among us. If the accusers will only look back to their own columns they will see that hardly a day has passed for two or three years without their charging the opposite party, which includes half the people of the country, with annexationist aims, and thus conveying to the Americans and the world at large in an exaggerated form the very "secret information" which they upbraid their rival with imparting. It is not likely that people of sense will draw from the noise of this affray any inference but the true one, that our great Toronto dailies have not all of them room to live. We should as soon think of allowing the chorus on the shingles to affect our view of a great question. Mr. Mulock therefore may be calm unless he is very anxious to display his superior attachment to the Throne. Old journalists see with pain that the correspondent of one journal can be found to act as spy upon the cor-

respondent of another journal. But the laws of literary war and the common interest of the profession have long since been given to the winds. One thing, at all events, this affray has clearly proved : Commercial Union is not Annexation.

—The renewal of Mr. Hitt's and of Mr. Butterworth's motion shows that Commercial Union is not dead at Washington. The course of the session will probably show that it or its equivalent is still alive at Ottawa. That there is in the Republican Party at Washington a section inclined to a less friendly policy towards Canada as a British dependency has never been denied. To that section Mr. Hoar apparently belongs. There were reasons at one time for fearing that Mr. Blaine, a far more important personage, belonged to it also. Mr. Blaine is from Maine where Protectionism is not less narrow and bitter than it is here. In Pennsylvania, among the manufacturers there is another set of the same extreme stripe, the members of which used to drink wisdom from the lips of Mr. Henry Carey, who frankly avowed that the great object of his hatred was a trader. Among its organists evidently is Mr. Gibson, of whose deliverances *The Mail* makes the same use against the cause which it once most ably upheld as it makes of those of Mr. Hoar. But a section of the Republican party is not the party, much less is it Congress; and Congress as a whole has more or less to be reckoned with on commercial questions in regard to which local interests often run athwart the regular party lines. On all questions the grand object of politicians at Washington, as well as at Ottawa, is to get some coign of vantage for the next election: to this Government is everywhere reduced under the party system; and we must expect that in such a jungle of intrigue the march of any great question will be difficult and slow. Opinion, if it advances, will in the end control the action of the politicians, but the advance of opinion among great masses takes time. Those who have joined a movement expecting a quick return

in the shape of votes will fall away. Those who have joined it in the public interest must learn to be patient as well as hopeful, and hopeful as well as patient. The Commercial Union literature has all the time been circulating, and the desire for a change of policy among the farmers has grown so much that, in spite of the party lines, it can hardly fail to have its effect on the next general election. The American money, which Mr. Chapleau does not scruple to charge the opponents of his monopolist Government with receiving for political purposes, will therefore not be needed. This calumny has been heard before, and on that occasion the President of the Commercial Union Club met it, so far as his organization was concerned, by stating that a contribution to their fund had been offered by the head of an American firm on behalf of his Canadian Branch and had been declined on the ground that the Association, acting solely in the interest of Canada, could not receive aid from any but a strictly Canadian source.

—The Barnwell tragedy in South Carolina shows that the terrible problem of race in the Southern States is no nearer its solution. The political question between the races has been settled so far by not allowing the negroes to vote or not counting their votes when given. In this they have acquiesced and probably they have lost little by it, since had they voted they would have infallibly been the prey of the lowest class of demagogues. There is no use in refusing to recognize differences of political aptitude or pretending after what we have seen in Hayti that the negro is ready for self-government. But the blacks have also been the victims of constant outrage and of atrocious lynching. The savage barbarism which is the fruit of slave-holding will probably linger for generations in the Southern character. It seems clear that in the case of six out of the eight negroes who with every circumstance of cruelty and insult were lynched at Barnwell, there was not even any evidence of guilt, much less a judicial verdict. Most

of them, it is reported, were in custody merely as witnesses of an alleged crime. Two races cannot live together on these terms, nor can any civilized government permit several millions of its citizens, whatever their colour, to be deprived not only of their political but of their personal rights and shot or hanged like dogs. It seems evident that public opinion in South Carolina supports the lynchers and sets justice at defiance: in this case there is nothing for it but military occupation. The fact is the negro is no more allowed a trial than he is allowed a vote. On the merest suspicion of any offence against the whites he is incontinently lynched. Unless superior power intervenes there will presently be an outbreak of the hatred of race on a larger scale, and instead of trickling in outrage blood will stream in massacre. If, on the other hand, there should be a great exodus of negroes, of which there now appear some symptoms, who will raise the cotton? The whites cannot do it.

—In Europe there is still peace: there are still assurances of peace; but war is in the air. That which causes the half-drawn sword to linger in the sheath probably is not so much regard for peace as the expensiveness of mobilization, which becomes the more formidable the more the finances have been exhausted by preparation. The "hasty spark" struck by the outrageous conduct of a Portuguese filibuster in Central Africa which in calmer times would "straight have grown cold again," is in these times enough to put the nations in a flame of excitement. France, from whose inveterate enmity England and the dependencies of England have most to fear is preparing to lash herself into a fit of Anglophobia by a grand revival of the worship of Joan of Arc, conveniently forgetting, as she always does, that Joan was as much the victim of French faction as of British invasion, and that one of her two judges was a French Bishop. It seems certain that Russia is assiduously strengthening her military base and per-

fecting her means of transporting troops in Central Asia. The conclusion to which calm observers, such as Mr. Curzon, free alike from Russo-phobism and Russo-philism are led is that Russia has no serious intention of conquering India, but that she does intend by pressing England in that quarter to open the road to Constantinople. Of the brilliant achievements of Lord Beaconsfield, nothing now remains except Cyprus, a forlorn island in a dead angle of the Mediterranean, and the mortal hatred of Russia, once England's firmest ally. Two Russian engineers the other day took a trip over the C.P.R. to gather hints for the construction of the railway in Siberia, a compliment which suggests, by the way, that Canada is Siberian. Perhaps they noted as they went what at certain points in the mountain section a little dynamite would do. In Central Africa a new scene of jealous rivalry among the European powers has been opened and a fresh field has been sown with the dragon's teeth.

—The fall of monarchy in Brazil has produced more serious effects than it was possible at first to foresee. A blow has evidently been given to the stability of monarchy in Portugal and even in Spain. There can be no doubt as to the declining strength of the institution. If in England the Crown seems to sit more securely on the head of royalty than elsewhere, this is because the wearer has long been divested of any political power. But the violent opposition aroused among the people by the proposal to grant money to any member of the Royal family shows that even in England hereditary monarchy is almost dead at the root. The only hold which it retains is social, and this is fast being impaired by the unwillingness of the present wearer of the Crown to perform its social duties. Her refusal to revisit Ireland, where she was admirably received, persisted in notwithstanding the entreaties of all her best advisers, is likely to prove disastrous to her family as well as to the country.

That the Russian prison system generally is about as much below other prison systems as Russian civilization generally is below the civilization of other countries, seems to us to be the upshot of the most trustworthy evidence on the subject. But there seems to be no longer any doubt about the massacre in Siberia. Why do not American legislatures pass resolutions of censure on the oppressor and of sympathy with the oppressed? This is surely an atrocity fully as great as the imprisonment of Wm. O'Brien, or the execution of the Phoenix Park murderers. But on Russia, though her iron heel was on Poland and whatever atrocities she might commit, the American politicians have always smiled. Through some peculiarity in their moral structure it is only Irish woe that wrings their hearts, only British misdeeds that excite their righteous indignation.

—The British Cabinet is in labour with another Irish land measure, and it no doubt believes that this time the problem will be solved. It is to be hoped that a settlement of some kind will presently be attained or there will be no such thing as security of property or faith in contracts left in the island. The agrarian root of the Irish difficulty is deeper than the political, but deeper again than the agrarian root is over population, which no changes of the law can directly affect. On a land unfitted by its climate for cereals the people multiply and are encouraged by their church to multiply without limit; they can subsist only on the potato, and when that barbarous and treacherous food fails, comes and must come famine. This is the hard fundamental fact which no legislation, much less any rhetoric, can annul. No remedy apparently can be thorough short of thirty years of strong government, with systematic emigration and extirpation of the potato. But such a remedy could be applied only by a Cromwell riding into power on the wings of victory in civil war. Not that civil war is absolutely out of the question if things in England go on as they have been going for the last ten years.

To show on what sort of facts the people of the United States form their opinions about the Irish question, the New York *Tribune*, which may be said to be at the head of American journalism, tells its readers that Ireland is by nature a great manufacturing country, that her rich fields of coal are practically boundless, but England up to fifty years ago imposed extraordinary restrictions on her trade. Fear of the revival of Irish manufactures "is the reason why Manchester, Bradford, Birmingham, and all other manufacturing centres in England so bitterly oppose Home Rule." A writer who undertakes to enlighten his readers on this subject might be supposed to know that the Union which swept away the restrictions on Irish trade was passed not fifty but ninety years ago. The bounds of the "boundless" expanse of coal fields are well ascertained, and Ireland imports two millions of tons of coal annually for her domestic consumption. On the other hand, nearly two millions of her people find employment in Great Britain, chiefly in the manufacturing cities, while England affords to the natural produce of Ireland by far the best market for such produce in the world. If the writer in the *Tribune* had cared enough for truth even to look into the 'Parliamentary Companion' or 'Whitaker's Almanac' he would have found that Bradford sends to Parliament two Home Rule members out of three, and Manchester three out of six. Birmingham sends Unionists from motives purely political, not because her manufacturers of small arms are likely to suffer from Irish competition, much less from disunion. Leeds sends three Home Rulers out of five. Newcastle, Wolverhampton, Rochdale, Derby, are Home Rule. Bradlaugh and Labouchere sit for a manufacturing city. The manufacturing centres generally are Radical and Home Rule. The policy which the *Tribune* recommends and supposes, with good reason, that Mr. Parnell means to adopt, is to return to the commercial night which prevailed before the Union and set up a corps of monopolists to prey by taxation on the general industry of Ireland. Suppose England were to follow suit and close her market

against Irish produce and industry, what does the *Tribune* think would become of Ireland?

For this return to Protectionism Mr. Gladstone, the arch-Freetrader, is to pave the way. Does Mr. Gladstone ever look back on his former self? "Amongst the scenes that are now unhappily being enacted in Ireland by certain persons we may lose sight of the great and unquestionable progress of that country. It has achieved material progress in a degree most remarkable for a country with little variety of pursuit. I do not believe there is a labouring population in all Europe—although the condition of the Irish labourer leaves much to desire—which in the course of the last twenty years has made a progress equal to that of the labouring population in Ireland. Let me look at the farming class, which, as you know, may be said almost to constitute the body of the nation, understood as the term is understood in Ireland—let me look at the indication of their surplus wealth. Forty years ago the deposits in the Irish banks, which are the indication of the amount of their free savings, were about five millions. Some fifteen years later than that, I think they had risen to some eleven or twelve millions. There are now of deposits in the Irish banks, which represent almost wholly the honest earnings and savings of Irish farmers, a sum of nearly thirty millions of money. Of course, I don't mean to say that the whole of these are agricultural savings, but an enormous proportion is of agricultural savings, and, at any rate, you cannot mistake the meaning and the force of the comparison between the thirty millions in round numbers of the present day and the five millions which were in the Irish banks forty years ago. If I am to speak of moral progress in Ireland, I say that it has been remarkable, and it is associated with legal progress in regard to every class of legal offences but one. There is still one painful and grievous exception—the exception of the agrarian offences." Would any one believe that these were words used only nine years ago by the man, then in power, who, now that he has lost power and is seeking to regain it by help of the Irish vote, pro-

nounces the Union an utter failure and declares that there is no hope for Ireland except in its repeal? Will posterity have the slightest doubt as to the cause of the change?

—A notable feature of the late strikes was the prominent part played by Cardinal Manning. That ambitious and scheming hierarch (for such he notoriously is) intimated some time ago pretty plainly that, the day of kings and their favourites being over, and the people having succeeded to power, the Church must cultivate her influence with the people. While despotism reigned Rome was everywhere the confederate of the despot; when despotism was revived, as it was by Ferdinand of Spain after 1815, and by Louis Napoleon in France, she welcomed and seconded its revival. To despotism is her natural affinity; but an alliance with temporal power, be it that of despot or of demagogue, is a necessity of which she is conscious, and her consciousness of which is fatal to the sincerity of her belief in her own claims as the Church of the truth. She has now lost her temporal kingdom in Italy and is becoming, even in Europe, to a great extent disestablished, so that her revenues as well as her moral support must henceforth be drawn largely from the people. It will not be surprising, in spite of her condemnation of Father McGlynn, if she should execute a change of front and try to recover her power by placing herself at the head of a social revolution. Significant utterances have been heard of late from some of her priesthood and even from her head. In that revolution, did she invoke it, she would assuredly perish, for her hierarchy has neither command enough of the popular mind nor statesmanship enough to control such a movement; but in the meantime she might add not a little to the perplexities and dangers of the situation.

—The *North American Review* has a symposium—a word which, by the way, has travelled as strange a road as “Pontiff,” “Marshal,” or “Constable”—on what may emphatically be

called the burning topic of Divorce. The debaters are Cardinal Gibbons, the Anglican Bishop of New York, and the Agnostic Colonel Ingersoll. The Cardinal looks down from the serene height of Catholic morality on the immoral aberrations of an unbelieving world. We would ask him to turn his eyes to the history of marriage and of the relations between the sexes generally in France, Spain, Italy, Austria, Morocco, and other countries where his Church has had her way. We would also remind him that if his Church exalts marriage by making it a sacrament she degrades it by pronouncing celibacy the holier state. Further, we would observe, that in the period preceding the Reformation the practice of granting dissolutions of marriage, on the pretended grounds of consanguinity and pre-contract, had virtually introduced among the wealthy a license of divorce comparable to that of Illinois or Indiana. The Agnostic, of course, is for freedom both of divorce and of re-marriage. "Would you force a woman to live with a man whom she has ceased to love?" Yes, we would, if she has freely become his wife, freely interchanged with him the marriage vows, above all if she has borne him children. Out of regard for her own real happiness and for her character, we would forbid her to pass as soon as passion was sated from the arms of one man into those of another. If the continuance of romantic love were to be the condition of fidelity how many marriages would outlive the honeymoon? Marriages which can be so lightly dissolved are of course as lightly contracted, and thus the evil is multiplied at both ends. Mr. Phelps, in *The Forum*, says that if the right of re-marriage were taken away nine-tenths, perhaps ninety-nine hundredths, of the divorce cases which now crowd the calendars of the Courts and pollute the newspapers would disappear. In other words, the real cause, in the vast majority of cases, is not the intolerable irksomeness of the existing union so much as a desire to contract another. The law is in the wildest confusion, each State having a different law from the rest. In some States the laxity of the law and the laxity of the tribunals together amount

almost to free love. When a woman can get a divorce because her husband keeps her awake by talking, because he does not take her for rides, or because he has enlisted in the Navy, and a man can get a divorce on grounds not less frivolous and grotesque, it would be better to allow people to separate and marry again as they choose without prostituting the Courts of Law. Mr. Gladstone has addressed to the Americans a homily which perhaps might have had more effect if the preacher had not been socially countenancing the matrimonial liberalism of some of his political friends at home. He says very truly that the soundness of the State depends on that of the family which is the unit of the State. He might have added that while his family may rebuild the State, the State can never rebuild the family. The alarm bell however has been rung most effectively by the Rev. Dr. Dike, who has made this momentous subject his own: American morality is now on its guard and the tide in that quarter appears to be on the turn. In Canada, on the other hand, the matrimonial morality of Chicago is struggling to effect a lodgement and apparently with a fair chance of success.

—In another symposium Mr. Gladstone upholds Free Trade and Mr. Blaine Protection. Mr. Gladstone need only point to the fruits of British Free Trade which surround Mr. Blaine, into whose country streams for investment the vast overflow of wealth which half a century of Free Trade has produced in an island not larger than a single State of the Union. What practical proof can there be of anything if the commercial wealth of England is not a proof of the wisdom of her commercial policy? Mr. Gladstone points to the immorality of Protectionism as a system under which a favoured class swells its gains by taxing the rest of the community. We might press this argument further and show that Protectionism is the policy of corruption. For what but corruption determines which class shall be favoured? What class is favoured in

Canada but that which subscribes to the election fund of the Government? Mr. Gladstone might also have shown that Protectionism is the system of inhumanity. What is more inhuman than to cut off nation from nation and put a bar upon the interchange which, attended as it must be by friendly intercourse and union of interests, would go far, if it were allowed free play, to make one heart as well as one harvest for the world? There are also the evils, moral as well as financial, of smuggling, which are evidently on the increase under our own Protective tariff.

Mr. Blaine must have felt his own weakness when he was reduced to charging Mr. Gladstone with himself contravening Free Trade principles by paying for the transmission of Ocean mails. He pleads that the circumstances of the United States are not the same as those of the country for which Mr. Gladstone prescribes. In this there is some truth, but it is not truth which will avail his cause. The reason why the United States have not suffered as England would have suffered and as Canada is suffering from Protectionism is that the United States are not, like England or Canada, a country but a continent, producing almost everything in itself. Yet Protectionism has wiped out of existence the mercantile marine of the United States and with it that nautical element of the national character which is the subject of a striking passage in De Tocqueville.

Protectionists point triumphantly to the general halt in the progress of Free Trade and the relapse of some nations into Protectionism. Universal suffrage may have widened the basis of government, but for the time at least it has put the world into the hands of lower intelligence than that of Turgot, Pitt, Huskisson, Peel and Cavour. The consequence has been a return in commercial policy of the blind cupidity of the Middle Ages. It appears from what Mr. David A. Wells says that not only international but inter-parochial Protectionism is raising its head again. The laundries of Paris demand protection against those of the country. There is, we believe,

a law on the Statute book of one of the American States restraining the manufacture of pure vinegar in the interest of people who could only make it impure. Having killed trade by Protectionism, the Solons of the system undertake to revive it by bounties, paid at the public cost, and this policy which it might have been supposed could emanate only from an asylum for economical idiots, stalks again more than a hundred years after Adam Smith. Monopoly besets us anew in the form of combines, trusts and tyrannical Trade-unionism, as well as in that of Protective tariffs. Yet the footprints are not all turned backwards. New South Wales has been steadily true to Free Trade and has proved its wisdom by outstripping in the race of prosperity her neighbour and rival Victoria, though Victoria with her gold mines had a much better start. In 1866, when they set out, New South Wales with Free Trade, Victoria with Protection, Victoria was 200,000 ahead in population, a million sterling ahead in revenue, eight millions ahead in trade, a hundred and fifty thousand acres ahead in cultivated land: she was far ahead in manufactures and was the equal of New South Wales in shipping. In 1888, New South Wales was one million ahead in revenue, seven millions ahead in exports, and only one million behind in imports. She was even slightly ahead in manufacturing industries. The general parity of conditions and the identity of the population in these contrasted colonies of Australia make the experiment of Free Trade in New South Wales very conclusive. The proposal of the Zollverein among the nations of Central Europe is also a movement in favour of Free Trade, which would thereby be introduced over a large area. In the same way, Napoleon's continental system, which is sometimes cited by Protectionists as an example in favour of their theory, was from the vast extent of his empire practically a large measure of Free Trade.

Where is the proof, we would ask by the way, that Sir John Macdonald is by conviction a Protectionist? He has taken up Protectionism for a political purpose, but where is his profession of Protectionist doctrine or his reasoning in support of

it to be found? Just before the election of 1878 he positively disclaimed Protectionism and declared that he was only for readjustment. His saying, "Reciprocity of Trade or Reciprocity of Tariffs," clearly implies that the first is the preferable alternative, and that Reciprocity of Tariffs is only the instrument for enforcing Reciprocity of Trade. We ask once more what is the proof that he is a Protectionist by conviction?

—The Anti-Poverty Society charges us with misrepresenting Mr. Henry George who it says "proposes no disturbance of land titles, no dispossession, no redistribution or leasing by the State, but simply an appropriation by the community of that value which it caused by the community, and thus securing free from taxation that which the individual produces." The seventh chapter of *Progress and Poverty* opens with these words: "The truth is, and from this truth there can be no escape, that there is and can be no just title to an exclusive possession of the soil, and that private property in land is a bold, base, enormous wrong like that of chattel slavery." Can it possibly be said that this imports no disturbance of titles to land or dispossession of private owners? Does not it plainly import that every farmer in Ontario is a wrongful possessor of what he deems his freehold and has no better title to it than he would have to a slave? In that case who is the owner but the State, and how can it grant anything but leases on sufferance at the utmost? If it gave the fee or even a lease for years it would be renewing the enormous wrong. The whole chapter which follows is a practical amplification of the opening sentence: "The anti-slavery movement in the United States commenced with talk of compensating owners, but when four million of slaves were emancipated the owners got no compensation, nor did they clamour for any, and by the time the people of any such country as England or the United States are sufficiently aroused to the injustice and disadvantages of individual ownership of land to induce them to attempt its nationali-

zation, they will be sufficiently aroused to nationalize it in a much more direct and easy way than by purchase : they will not trouble themselves about compensating the proprietors of land." This is pretty plain, is it not ? Further, the operation proposed is represented under the figure of a lawsuit, 'The People vs. the Land Owners,' in which the land is taken from its wrongful possessor 'the land owner,' and adjudged to its rightful owner 'the People,' and we are reminded that no compensation is given to the losing party in a lawsuit. The comparison is preposterous, since the losing party in the supposed lawsuit never had a legal title, whereas the land owner unquestionably has, and the measure proposed by Mr. George is not a judicial proceeding before an impartial tribunal, but a high-handed spoliation of one class by another. "The value caused by the community" is apparently the same thing as "unearned increment," and the appropriation of unearned increment is scouted by Mr. George as a ridiculously inadequate measure of justice. Mr. George is a writer of whom, without breach of loyalty to free thought, one may speak with plainness. He talks with levity, nay with exultation, of despoiling a multitude of persons whom he himself allows to have purchased in good faith, as well they might, considering that the property was guaranteed by the law of the community of which they and Mr. George himself were members, and that the practice of holding such property has been sanctioned by the custom of the whole civilized world for thousands of years. Does not plain justice say that if a description of property, the possession of which the whole community has through its laws solemnly and immemorially ratified, the reform ought to be made at the expense of the whole community ? The fact, we are afraid, is that with a good many of Mr. George's admirers what took was not so much the philosophy as the confiscation.

There is a nationalization of land without robbery which the Law Amendment Society has got introduced into the North-West and is now struggling to get introduced into Ontario. It is the Torrens System of land titles and conveyance, which in-

stead of exacting, each time a lot changes hands, fees for historical researches into the title, and thus in the case of small lots imposing a heavy fine on the transaction, enables every member of the nation to buy an acre of land by a process as simple as that by which he buys a yard of cloth. Experience has abundantly proved both the feasibility and the benefits of the system. The benefits are not economical only, but social, and the system commends itself to every statesman as the best antidote to the growing lust of socialistic confiscation. But there is prejudice, professional and general, to be overcome, and the Law Amendment Society needs such backing as public opinion can give it in pressing a reform at once truly popular and truly Conservative on the Government and legislature of this Province. The improvement is so manifest that a Bill embodying it drawn by a Conservative Chancellor almost passed the British House of Lords. At the last stage, when opposition is generally understood to be withdrawn, a set of those noble lords of the pigeon-shooting order who seldom show themselves in the House except for some selfish purpose, came down and threw out the Bill as anti-feudal. Such is the knowledge which the House of Lords has of its own position and such are the chances of its averting destruction by self-reform!

—The glories of the Toronto Club Ball have furnished Labour journalism with a text for a sermon on the inequalities of wealth which we have to thank some correspondent for sending to us. “The big building on York Street was filled with fashionable beauties and the chief rulers in the synagogue of caste. Women, the soft effulgence and rare beauty of whose pearls was only equalled by the snowy background of the bared bosoms on which they were displayed; women, whose eyes flashed with the light of perfect health and enjoyment; men high in the world of commerce—railway magnates and telegraph magnates, real estate dealers and street railway owners

—all indeed to whom Dame Rumour has given the reputation of great wealth and mighty influence were there. The revelers danced to the music of an imported band; the refreshments were of the most superb description; the rooms were magnificently decorated, the hired flunkies were gorgeous in new suits of the Club uniform, and all went merry as a marriage bell. The aristocracy of Toronto surpassed itself; it forgot for a time that this is a democratic country; it forgot for a time the great world lying in the lower grades of 'society'; it forgot for a time heaven and God and everything else, and, in an ecstasy of delight it fell down and worshipped itself—a great composite golden calf." The journalist pronounces the doom of wealth in the form of an apologue. Justice holds her court, and before it are brought one of the ladies with the pearls on their bosoms and a woman of the people, "bowed down and ragged and with a look of hopeless weariness on her face." The lady of the pearls is asked whether she has the title of labour to her wealth: it is at once assumed that she has not, and her jewels are forthwith taken from her and given to the woman of the people. Why is it to be assumed that she has not the title of labour to her wealth, if her husband has made it by hard work in an honourable profession or a useful branch of commerce, and if she herself has conscientiously done the duties of a wife, a mother and the head of a household, before putting on her pearls for the evening? Half the men at that ball had risen by labour, though of a superior kind, from the ranks to which jealousy longs to reduce them. The inequalities are indeed great and the contrasts painful, though to speak of the wife of a mechanic with good wages, setting out with her husband and children for her Saturday excursion as "bowed down and ragged and with a look of hopeless weariness on her face," would happily be absurd. But the responsibility rests on Justice herself if she represents the Maker of the Universe. He it was, not the lady with pearls or her compeers, who ordained that instead of a planet full of mechanics with high pay and short hours there should be this vast and varied scene, the inequalities and

contrasts of which, if you take into view all races, all times and all stages of civilization, are infinite, and throw those between the classes of any one community completely into the shade. The same Power has decreed that level as you will, and whatever violence you may use in the process, as soon as the havoc is over, the inequalities and contrasts shall again emerge. Bray society in the mortar of revolution: you will not annul the different powers of earning and saving inherent in its individual members any more than by breaking up a mass of matter you will annul the chemical properties inherent in the particles of which it is composed. Perhaps by the time this trial takes place, the great mystery will have been cleared up. Supreme Justice will have vindicated herself and all who stand at her bar will know why it was that she distributed her pearls so unequally. Not her pearls only, for if we could see into the bosoms on which they rest we shall find inequalities of happiness deeper and more mysterious than inequalities of pearls. When one class tells another that the "handwriting is on its wall," this is merely a mystical way of expressing envy and hatred, neither of which has so far done much to improve the lot of man. The handwriting is not on the wall of any set of people who in this most imperfect world are trying to do their duty in their station. It is on the wall of everyone who is not trying to do his duty, on that of the mechanic who, by scamping the plumbing poisons a household, as well as on that of the frivolous woman of fashion who squanders what she has not earned in selfish luxury and vulgar show. That pauperism waits on wealth and that to remove it you have only to abolish the wealthy class is a notion much cherished in certain quarters, but belied by facts. Nowhere is there more destitution than in barbarous or decayed communities where there is no wealthy class. Suppose the roof of the Toronto Club House had fallen upon the whole "synagogue of caste," would the mechanics of Toronto have been better off the next morning? Amusements every class must have of a kind suited to its tastes and means, and a ball costs no more in proportion

than a great Labour Procession or a day at the Industrial Exhibition. Not that we desire to break the force of any rational warning against selfish luxury, extravagance or vulgar ostentation. There is too much of them all among us, and we shall have to look to our ways, if not from higher motives, from fear of the mine which the bitter feelings excited by the reckless and vulgar display of wealth are charging beneath our feet.

—In the papers before New Year's Day appeared with equal honours the following brace of announcements:



GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
TORONTO.

HIS HONOR THE LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR WILL HOLD A RECEPTION AT GOVERNMENT HOUSE ON WEDNESDAY, 1ST OF JANUARY, BETWEEN THE HOURS OF 4 AND 5 O'CLOCK.

FREDK. C. LAW,
COMMANDER R. N.,
OFFICIAL SECRETARY.

ST. MICHAEL'S PALACE.

HIS GRACE THE ARCHBISHOP OF TORONTO WILL BE AT HOME ON
WEDNESDAY, THE 1ST OF JAN.,
BETWEEN THE HOURS OF 3 AND HALF-PAST 5 O'CLOCK, AT ST. MICHAEL'S PALACE,
TO THOSE DESIROUS OF CALLING.

J. F. McBRIDE,
SECRETARY.

In the report of the receptions, that of the Archbishop, whose office and position are unknown to the Commonwealth, was placed between that of the Lieutenant-Governor and that of the Mayor and on the same footing with theirs. It is surely time to put a gentle check on social as well as political encroachment, and upon the by no means harmless servility which is engendered. Not long ago a Protestant, who was at the time Speaker of the Senate, was seen to go on his knee before a Cardinal at a reception. No doubt he knelt, and knelt not in body only, but in soul, before the Catholic vote. The representative of the Roman Catholic Church in this

Province is entitled to the same measure of social respect as the representatives of the Anglican, Presbyterian, Methodist, or Baptist Church, and to no larger measure. But he apparently wishes to arrogate to himself a much larger measure; and people are so prone to worship title, even when it is assumed without warrant, and pageantry however hollow, that a *caveat* may be in season. Let a man call himself His Grace, or the Grand Patriarch, or the Most Worshipful Grand Arch, or Illustrious Brother, or anything else that he and his sect or society please within their own pale. But let not unauthorized rank be foisted on the Commonwealth, especially when it ministers and is intended to minister to political aggrandizement.

—The Modern Language Association had a very successful meeting to which interest was added by the presence of the two new occupants of our chairs of literature, Professors Alexander and Cappon, who promise to give fresh life to that study. A paper on Comparative Philology read by Mr. Chamberlain made us feel that since men who are now fifty went to school a new science has grown up and is bearing fruit not only for the historian but for the philosopher, the theologian, and all whose study is Man. With regard to the critical and scientific study of literature it was rather aptly remarked that the country in which English was studied least was that in which English literature had been produced. We are in some danger of making rules for seeing the glory of the sunset and smelling the sweetness of the rose. Alexandrian criticism came when Athenian production had departed. But there is a middle path which our professors will no doubt keep. As to style, we should almost despair of cultivating it by rule or system. To imitate the style of a great writer would be like imitating Jupiter's nod. All that most of us can do in the way of style, or ought to aim at doing, beyond grammatical correctness, is to know exactly what we mean to say, to say it, and have done with it. The best school of pure and graceful English is the

society of those who speak it, as the golden road to perfect mastery of Italian is to be born a Tuscan.

—Our new Professor of Moral Philosophy has given his inaugural and has proved, we believe we may say, to competent judges that he is master of his subject. He promises to connect philosophy with life. If he keeps his promise he will do what has been hardly done by any modern philosopher except the despised Paley. The others have devoted themselves to the quest of some sanction for morality other than the Will of the Author of our being and superior to experience which, as the debate still continues, they can scarcely be supposed to have found. Paley, who had no turn for metaphysical speculation, assumes at once that the sanction of morality is the Divine Will and proceeds to give practical rules of life. There is something of the same practical character in the lectures which Frederick Maurice gave as Professor of Moral Philosophy at Cambridge. Discovery in the region where the physical passes into the moral has completely changed the field and it is vain to suppose that a new professor can tread exactly in the footsteps of Professor Young.

—MR. FRANCIS E. ABBOT, who in the Boston *Unitarian Review* does us the honour to notice our criticism of Renan's Agnostic Manifesto, thinks that we have unconsciously thrown ourselves into the arms of Agnosticism by admitting that we can know nothing of infinity or eternity. We must frankly confess that if a knowledge of infinity or eternity were essential to religion and morality we should, so far as we can see, be reduced to Agnosticism. But the one thing needed, as it appears to us, to save us from Agnosticism, religious and moral, is a well-founded conviction that we are under the government of a Being whose character and objects are indicated by our moral nature, who will deal with us as we keep the moral law,

and who, through all the perplexities of this temporary scene, will in the end bring out moral good. Mr. Abbot quotes with sorrowful amazement our admission that nothing can be inferred from time as to eternity. "What," he asks, "is eternity but unlimited time? And how can either the presence or absence of limits in time change in any degree the nature of time itself?" Try, we would say in reply, to think of time without limit. Your mind will simply sink down under the effort. Eternity, as it appears to us, is the negative of all the characteristics and conditions of time. The "confluence of two eternities," each eternity limited by the point of time at which we start, of which Carlyle talks, is unthinkable. It is this notion that eternity is an extension of time which gives force to an Agnostic objection to the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. No white robes, no palm branches, no harps, can make the idea of time without limit other than one of insupportable weariness. We do not doubt of course that physical science tells us physical truth, but as it can only present things in space and time we do not see how it can give us a knowledge of infinity and eternity; nor do we see how, being merely the systematized report of our senses, it can give us the knowledge of anything supersensual. But we do not confine "Science" to physical science. Science is merely the Latin for knowledge, and if the indications of our moral nature are trustworthy they are just as much science as anything observed through the crucible or the telescope. It is rather important to bear this in mind, that physical science may not be invested with a false glamour at the expense of knowledge derived from other sources.

—The comparative longevity of animals is a subject which seems not to have received from science so much attention as it deserved, considering that an inquiry into it appears more likely than anything else to throw light on the nature of Life and Death. Darwin seems never to have taken it in

hand, though the phenomena which it comprises are apparently among the most curious and pregnant of Evolution. Dr. August Weismann, of Freiburg, takes it in hand in a series of essays, a translation of which has been published by the University of Oxford. We cannot attempt in our narrow space to summarize the scientific results. But they are somewhat melancholy for Man. For him, the crown, as he thinks, of creation, Nature seems to feel no special care. To man is allotted at most one century, to an elephant are allotted two. The longevity of birds is wonderful: ravens, parrots, eider ducks, eagles, vultures and wild geese reach a century. A falcon is said to have lived 162 years, and swans are said to have lived 300. It appears, according to Dr. Weismann, that Nature's ground of discrimination is purely physical and that she measures out life not by the dignity of the being or his capacities of development, but by the necessities of reproduction. A bird which lays only one egg in a year and is liable to having that one egg destroyed by a number of accidents, would not be able to keep up the race if it did not live long enough to lay a great many annual eggs; though why the bird lays only one egg remains to be explained, and the explanation seems to involve another Evolutionary process requiring almost unlimited time. We gather, too, the unconsolatory impression that if there is any care it is not for the individual, who is so dear to each of us, but only for the race. The removal of generations by death seems in like manner to be determined by the consideration that "the unending life of the Metazoan body would be a useless luxury," and that as the individuals would become damaged in course of time would be not only valueless but harmful to the species. Death is not universal: the lowest organisms do not die but propagate by fission. However, where biology with its centenarian geese and undying amœba ends, moral philosophy begins. It cannot be contended that the moral and intellectual development of man has no object but reproduction or physical perfection. What physical purpose is served by poetry? By what physical process

can poetry have been evolved? Was reproduction Nature's aim in giving birth to Shakespeare?

—Mr. Bellamy, of "Looking Backward" fame, proclaims on the other side of the Line the death of domestic service and tells us we shall all have to take to co-operative house-keeping. He seems hardly to know how deep and far-reaching a change in our whole life the renunciation of separate homes would imply. The cause of the disturbance he, like us, takes to be "the democratic spirit of the age which has rendered and is rendering the relation of personal servitude unpopular. "Domestic Service," he says, "implies a sacrifice of personal dignity in the relation of the employee to the employer which at the present day is required of no other class of workers and would be endured by none." The consequence is a perpetual effort on the part of the servant girl to assert her dignity by mutiny. Masters and Mistresses, says Mr. Bellamy, exact of their servants a submissiveness and even obsequiousness of manner not required in any other relation. This is not true of the best masters and mistresses, who are as careful of the feelings of their domestics as they are of those of their guests. Why are subordination and respectfulness of manner more intolerable in a household than in a regiment or a ship? If household service were degrading a girl in service would be a degraded being. But is she so? If she is in a good family is she not rather raised by intercourse with a more highly educated class? Would not a sensible man just as soon take her as a factory girl for his wife? We are misinformed if the discipline of factories is not full as strict and full as rough as that of most households. The factory girl goes where she likes in the evening, but the real value of the privilege depends upon where she likes to go. In rural France a maidservant wears the dress of her order with as little sense of degradation as a soldier wears his uniform. On this democratic continent we are trying to live up to a Jeffersonian

ideal, according to which the worst of evils is subordination, though the sage himself so far stooped from the ideal to the practical as to hold slaves to the end of his life; like his Master Rousseau, who, having preached the most sublime doctrines of parental duty dropped his own infants into the basket at the Foundling Hospital. The trouble is, however, not confined to the New World. Carlyle believed himself to have ascertained that of the distressed needlewoman in London a good many were, in his phrase, "mutinous servant girls come to the net upshot of their anarchies." However, Mr. Bellamy has laid his finger on the sore point. Be very careful of the feelings and studious not to wound self-respect. This is good for both parties. Remember, too, that the restlessness of servants is caused in part at least by the restlessness of employers. The old English households to which we wistfully look back were the households of people who instead of crossing the ocean every year in search of pleasure and turning their domestics adrift staid at home and did their duty.

—Lord Lorne's muse has brought forth, under the title of "Love and Peril," the Canadian love story with which she was announced to be in labour. The story, we cannot help thinking, is a schoolboy production and not above schoolboy level in sense or taste. Allusions to the "bird cages" of the ladies of Toronto and to their dressing their hair over old sponges are not high-class wit. The political moral to which the story leads up through an account of the North-West rebellion is that Canada ought to have a standing army as well as a Governor-General's body-guard, a Royal Society, a Royal Academy, and the other paraphernalia with which Lord Lorne's genius endowed her. With all deference for the opinion of an ex-Governor-General we cannot think that the necessity for a standing army is proved by an insurrection which, whatever Lord Lorne may say, could put only five hundred men at most, and those very imperfectly armed, into the field. That

of which the North-West rebellion proved the necessity was a government with eyes and thoughts for something besides the working of the party machine. Nothing seems more certain than that with timely attention to the claims of the Half-breeds and timely lenitives applied to their simple fears, the rebellion might have been prevented and nine millions, besides many lives, saved to the country.

—Of Mr. Kingsford's "History of Canada" it may be said that it is an addition rather to the archives than to the literature of the country. It takes not so much the form of a narrative as that of a thorough and erudite investigation of a series of chapters in our early history. The last chapter dealt with in the last of the three volumes which have at present appeared is the Expulsion of the Acadians. The false and calumnious version of this affair has been made popular by the barley-sugar composition which is styled the poetry of Longfellow. Perhaps the moralists will some day give us, for the benefit of history, their opinion as to the proper limits of lying in verse. The episode, as Mr. Kingsford admits, is painful, but as he clearly proves is not disgraceful to Great Britain. The Acadians were not Arcadians, but very much the reverse, and they were under the influence of incendiary priests. In defiance of treaties they obstinately refused to come into British allegiance, or to abstain from hostile action against Great Britain. As Mr. Kingsford well puts it, they were a party in a besieged fortress conspiring and co-operating with the enemy against the garrison. There was nothing for it but to remove them, and this was done in as humane a way as possible, the only inhumanity shown being on the part of their own kinsmen at Quebec, who received such of them as having escaped deportation made for that Province with the coldest indifference and allowed them to starve. We owe to Sir Adams Archibald the first strenuous confutation of the false belief that England had committed in Acadia a second Massacre of

Glencoe ; but Mr. Kingsford's confirmation is the fruit of independent research. What would the Germans do with a people of a district in Alsace-Lorraine who now persisted in remaining in arms against Germany ?

—Few chapters in the unwritten history of Canada are more full of romance than those relating to the Fur Trade and the rivalries of the two great Companies. In M. Masson's *Les Bourgeois de la Compagnie du Nord-Ouest* (Toronto : Williamson & Co.) we have an account of one of the companies known as the "Nor'-Westers," whose headquarters were at Montreal. We learn a good deal, however, about the great English company of the "Hudson Bays," the area of its operations, and some of its hardy factors, who distinguished themselves by their explorations in the region long known, to geographers at least, under the name of Prince Rupert's Land. Amid the vicissitudes of nations this chartered company held the territory for two hundred years, until it passed to the British Crown and subsequently to the Canadian Dominion. Till the end of that period colonization knocked at the door in vain. For a hundred years the Hudson Bay Company did little to open up the country, contenting itself with establishing a few trading-posts on James Bay, to which the Indians of the Athabasca and Saskatchewan region resorted for trade. Meanwhile the great plains of the North-West had been explored by way of the Ottawa and Lake Superior, first by the adventurous French, and, after the conquest, by the equally adventurous Scotch of Montreal and Quebec. The result of this probing of the continent by the waterways of the St. Lawrence system was the speedy diversion of the peltry trade from the routes it had been wont to follow, and the awakening of the Hudson Bay Company to the active rivalry of the traders of Montreal. In 1784, the latter organized themselves into a trading corporation, known as the North-West Company, the history of which has now been given us by M. Masson. The

story told in his pages comprises the dramatic incidents in the career of the company, from its organization in 1784 to its amalgamation with the Hudson Bays in 1821. It is a story of almost continuous strife, peril and bloodshed. The ill-starred relations of Lord Selkirk and his Red River Colony with the Hudson Bays, and the long and bitter contest between the settlers and the wintering partners and employees of the North-West Company, are the chief incidents of the story. In narrating them, the author shows a manifest animus against the Hudson Bay Company and the philanthropic nobleman who sought to found a colony on the Red River. So partisan is M. Masson in dealing with this portion of his work, that the reader will have to seek elsewhere for the materials of a soberer judgment. The chapters dealing with exploration in the region we take to be more trustworthy, and they are certainly very entertaining. Pleasant also is the account given us of the magnates of the Montreal Company, and of the lordly hospitality in which they indulged at the annual gatherings of the partners at Fort William. Very welcome, to the wintering partners at least, must have been those times of cheer, for desolate indeed was the life of the early fur-traders in posts remote not only from civilization but from contact with their kind. Interesting matter will be found in the latter half of the book, which deals with Alexander Mackenzie's expeditions to the Arctic and the Pacific oceans, with Simon Fraser's voyage from the Rocky Mountains to the coast, with an exploratory tour with Captain (afterwards Sir John) Franklin, and with various trading ventures among the Missouri Indians. The author has derived the materials for these interesting narratives from the hitherto unpublished journals of servants of the fur companies. The work, as a whole, is a valuable addition to the literature of the North-West.

THE BYSTANDER.

MARCH, 1890.

THE breast of the American politician is probably united to that of the Canadian politician by a sympathetic chord which enables him to divine that the Canadian politician is sure to be always ready with a loyalty manifesto as he is himself always ready with a manifesto in favour of downtrodden Ireland or the Grand Army, and that the significance of the act in both cases is the same. It is not likely therefore that the effect of Mr. Mulock's Resolution on the minds of American politicians will be serious, or that either Mr. Hill or Mr. Butterworth will deem it necessary to alter his course in Congress in regard to Commercial Union. But on the mind of the American people the effect of an anti-continental Resolution passed with apparent unanimity by the Canadian Parliament can hardly fail to be bad, and it would be idle to deny that in this way the action of Mr. Mulock and his party may have done serious damage to the cause of improved trade relations. The consequences to their own position cannot be doubtful. This is the second occasion on which they have taken counsel with their enemies against their friends. The spirit miscalled loyalty to which they have appealed is that of hostility to closer relations of any kind with this continent, commercial as well as political, and it has answered their call with a vengeance. No wonder the Tory press is jubilant. No wonder Sir John Macdonald was ready to lend his helping hand in the concoction of the Resolution and to prune it of anything which might have made the gorge of some honest Liberal

rise and provoke him to move an Amendment. The game has been thrown by an act of shallow cunning or of panic into the hands of the Tory leader. He may now reject any overtures of Reciprocity with perfect impunity, and, having with genial courtesy assisted the Opposition to sharpen the razor with which it has cut its own throat, listen with calm complacency to its terrible criticism of his cab fares.

If the alarm on which the Resolution founded itself was genuine, it has had no parallel since Cowper's sheep determined to save themselves from the sound of the huntsman's horn by leaping into the pit. No creature in male attire surely can be such an old woman as to be really scared by "the plot." The plot, everyone with half an eye must have seen, was the device of a journal in financial extremities to ruin a rival whom it had no chance of beating in fair fight. The very fashion in which the revelation was presented, with flaring typography and sensation headings, was enough to warn the beholder of its real character. Mr. Hoar, as we have had occasion already to say, is a personage whose importance has been greatly over-rated. But whatever may be the extent of his influence his object is not Annexation; it is merely the defeat of Commercial Union. He wants to protect the products of his constituents in New England against Canadian products, and he uses Annexation only as a lure to draw away support from Reciprocity. That he should have entered into a conspiracy with the Editor of the *Mail* for the forcible annexation of Canada and read the notes of his intercourse with his fellow-conspirator before a committee of the American Senate, only insane partisans can believe. There was at all events nothing to justify serious alarm and warrant the Opposition in flinging itself, as it has done, into the arms of the Government and wrecking its own cause.

The mover may very likely have had reasons of his own. More than once, though he is now so ecstatically loyal, he has voted sympathy with the "veiled rebellion," the object of which was to "break the last link which bound Ireland to Great

Britain," and deprive Her Majesty of her Irish crown. He has recently supported the Jesuit Act, by which the "robberies of George III. were repaired," and which introduced the Pope's name into legislation, to the manifest disparagement of the Crown. By the first of these strategical measures he conciliated the Irish, by the second the French and Catholic vote, but neither can have been pleasing to the loyal portion of his constituency, least of all to the Orangemen who are numerous in one section of North York. His loyalty Resolution trims the balance. The leader of the Opposition must wish to place his loyalty if possible beyond reproach, and to bury the recollection of his Rielism at a time when he is called upon to undertake the delicate task of defending against Equal Right the interests of the French and the Catholic priesthood. The same motive would have its influence with all the French and all the Catholics in the House. To enable Mr. Laurier to keep the Ultramontane vote, which after all he cannot keep, is really the paramount object of Opposition policy. Mr. Laurier calls himself a Liberal of the Liberals, and so in some other planet he may be, but here he is a Liberal supporting ecclesiastical ascendancy as well as French encroachment. His qualities as a speaker and as a gentleman are beyond dispute; but his leadership is very costly. Had the object been to find a feather bed on which the reputation of his ill-starred predecessor might fall softly a better choice could not have been made.

Though it can hardly have been the set purpose of Mr. Mulock and his friends, they may not have been disinclined to deal a blow at a critical juncture against the *Mail*, which for obvious reasons is equally odious to both Machines. To no one has the conduct of the *Mail* on the subject of Commercial Union been more obnoxious than to ourselves; in fact it was by the *Mail's* somersault on that question that THE BY-STANDER was called again into existence. But while the *Mail* must bear the consequence of its own levities as best it may, and defend itself as best it may against the competition of

other journals, whether self-sustaining or subsidized by the Government, the community cannot afford to see it crushed in the interest of the Machines. Alone it is independent of the Roman Catholic power; alone it is free from the electoral exigencies which constrain party organs to countenance Provincial raids on the Dominion treasury; alone it can be trusted to speak when party organs are kept silent by their fear of votes. From fear of advertisers it may not be free, but from fear of votes it is; and this is a great thing. If the *Mail* chooses to kill itself by folly or infidelity to principle nobody will mourn it, but we must not let it be killed. Above all we must not let it be killed by methods which would turn the Press into a scene of unbridled ruffianism and mutual butchery. Has nobody any remnant of regard for the honour and interest of the profession? We heartily congratulate the gentleman of the *Empire* who was discharged by the magistrate for want of evidence. Had he been proved to have acted as a spy on his fellow-journalist for the purpose of ruining a rival journal he would have borne an unsightly mark for the rest of his days. Even apart from the point of professional honour, a man had better let anything which is not very wicked or very dangerous pass than poison social confidence and stain his own character by playing the spy.

The spectacle of Liberals in the New World hypocritically grovelling before political fetiches, of which the Old World has almost grown ashamed, could hardly fail to produce a generous reaction in less politic breasts. The Young Liberals of Toronto and the National Club of Montreal, of course, have been compared to the three tailors of Tooley Street, but the record of the three tailors of Tooley Street as originators of great movements is by this time such that nobody need be ashamed of the comparison. The worst part of the survival of the old Grit Machine is that it is training up a generation of young Liberals in compromise, subterfuge and prevarication. No young man who has imbibed Liberal principles can sincerely believe that they sanction defence of religious privilege

or connivance at ecclesiastical domination ; and to begin public life by sacrificing principle to the exigencies of a Machine is to prepare for yourself a maturity of weakness and perhaps of shame.

The Young Liberals who met the Mulock Resolution with a counterblast appear to have in view Independence. That aspiration deserves our warmest sympathy, but those who cherish it must look at facts. Is there any hope of fusing British and French Canada into a nation ? Is there any hope of keeping permanently united, and at the same time separate from their continent, a string of territories, geographically divided from each other, commercially unconnected, and devoid of any natural boundary, either physical or ethnographical, such as now constitutes the Dominion ? When Mr. Blake set out to lead us to Independence, the French nationality of Quebec was not so strongly developed as it is now, nor had the fatal want of territorial compactness been brought so distinctly into view, the colonization of the North-West having then scarcely begun. Yet Mr. Blake's heart failed him and his flag was hauled down. Without a partnership of the heart, without identity of character, without community of aspiration, without anything at once to unite and to distinguish, is there any object in creating a separate community or any chance of its holding together when it has been created ? Ontario, as we have said before, might be a nation ; her population, saving the French encroachment in the East, is homogeneous and might well be raised to five millions ; her territory is sufficiently compact and its boundaries are tolerably well defined. Nor could there be any reason for fearing American aggression. But on the grander project nature seems to have set her ban. If, however, the Young Liberals and the National Club are bent on the experiment, their right course apparently is in the first instance to move for leave to Canada to elect her own Governor-General.

—Major Boulton is to be congratulated not only on having enhanced the picturesqueness of the Senate by his appearance in full uniform, but on having displayed a gallantry worthy of that uniform by presenting Imperial Federation for the first time in the form of a practical proposal. Hitherto it has floated before us as a nebulous entity, to which its devotees refused to give a definite shape; much less would they take a practical step of any kind, even when, as under Lord Beaconsfield, power was completely in their hands. But Major Boulton proposes to move in earnest. His plan is that Canada shall have representatives in both Houses of the British Parliament, with the privilege of voting on Canadian questions, and these alone. He is aware, no doubt, that this project is not new and that objections to it are already on record. Such a representation, it has been urged, while it would commit Canada to all Imperial entanglements and burdens would in reality be almost worthless. The representatives domiciled in England and brought under the political and social influence of the Imperial country would soon be more English than Canadian. Nor would it be possible to separate Canadian questions from the rest. The policy of every governing body must be an organic whole, the parts of which all more or less affect each other. A question about the boundary of British dominion in Africa or about the frontier of Afghanistan is not in itself Canadian; but it is Canadian if Canada would be drawn with Great Britain into the war. It is needless to enter into difficulties of detail, such as the awkwardness of the situation in which Canadian members of the Imperial Parliament would be placed if during their term the balance of parties should change here. Towards self-government, not towards centralization, the whole course of events has long been tending: that way points the genius of the race; and Major Boulton strives in vain to put back the shadow on the dial of history.

—Commercial Union was an attempt to give Canada the benefit of Continental Free Trade without political change. In the conduct of the movement by those who set it on foot this aim has been steadfastly kept in view, and all questions as to political relations with the United States have been scrupulously avoided, as well as all entanglements with Canadian parties. From the moment when party feeling was awakened, the Commercial Union meetings which had previously been numerous and successful were suspended, and the Club has confined itself to the circulation of its tracts which party could not touch. The political designs and intrigues which have been sedulously imputed to Commercial Unionists by the champions and organs of monopoly were slanderous figments and nothing else. Of that all who care for truth and justice may rest assured. Indeed, it is now plainly seen that Commercial Union, instead of being Annexation in disguise, is regarded by American Annexationists, who may be allowed to understand their own game, as destructive of the main inducement to political union, and is vehemently opposed by them on that account. It would certainly have tended to make the Canadian people content with existing institutions. That two neighbouring nations could not trade with each other without a sacrifice, on either part, of political independence is an assertion absurd in itself and confuted by the experience of commercial treaties, including the Reciprocity Treaty with the United States, to which our producers look back with wistful eyes. It is on a par, in point of sense, with the pretence that we should be selling our country because we sold our products, or that we should become hewers of wood and drawers of water for the Yankees by exporting our natural products and receiving their money or their goods in return. If the Mulock Resolution proves fatal to Commercial Union, or to Continental Free Trade, by whatever name it may be called, the end is sure. It is sure, and probably it is not very far off; for taxation has been carried to its limit, and there are no other means of replenishing the bribery fund by perpetual

drafts on which the fight against nature has been maintained, and the discontent engendered by commercial atrophy, especially in the Maritime Provinces, has been kept down. So assured appears the course of events that there would be as little use as there is pleasure in touching an angry question were it not that the earnings of the people are being squandered on such Separatist enterprises as the C. P. R., which, after receiving enormous subsidies as the pledge and bulwark of our distinct nationality, has become an American road and a potent addition to the commercial cords which bind us to the United States. The destiny which bears us onwards towards union with the rest of our race upon this Continent is no occult or mysterious power. It consists of attractive forces, geographical, ethnological and economical, the action of which is visible to all and is constantly increasing in intensity. The very struggle to defeat nature seconds her operation, by driving Canadians, through the impoverishment which it creates, out of Canada and thus promoting the fusion of the Canadian with the American people. There is moreover the growing desire to escape from French domination, which, if our politicians are hopelessly enthralled to the French vote, can be done only by a junction with the main body of our race. In the words endorsed by Lord Durham, Canadians begin to feel that "in order to remain English they may have to cease to be British." Nationality is a noble aspiration and it was well that destiny should be challenged on that subject, as she was by Canada First. It was well perhaps also that the alternative of Imperial Federation should be discussed and that we should see whether any intelligible and feasible plan of that kind could be framed. But to share with the rest of our race the work of founding an ampler and happier humanity on this broad Continent is no ignoble lot; it is a lot higher, surely, than perpetual dedication to a distant rule or to the cold ashes of an extinct feud. Certain it is, at all events, that willingness to entertain the idea of Political Union, if not positive desire for the change, has been spreading of late, even in the most unexpected

quarters, all official or Parliamentary displays of "loyalty" notwithstanding. Nothing but a bold organ and a resolute leader seems wanting to give the vague tendency the form of a pronounced movement and turn the whispered heresy into an avowed creed.

—Mr. Blake wades deeper and carries a section of his party further with him into his intrigue with Rielism, Ultramontanism and French Nationalism. An intrigue we are warranted in calling it, since the protest of his own judgment and conscience against his present course is on record in his London speech. It is waste of words to reason against arguments which, we know well, are not those of conviction, but those of the tactician constrained to devise some decent justification of the course which brings him votes. Nobody much cared to answer Mr. Blake's special pleas for the immunity of Riel, because nobody supposed Mr. Blake himself capable of believing either that a man who had just been conducting with no small skill a very difficult enterprise was insane in such a sense as to be irresponsible for his actions, or that the pretence of a political motive would justify any brigand in filling the community with blood and havoc. It would be equally superfluous on this occasion to answer the argument that by keeping up the annoyance and expense of a double political language we should attract settlement to the North-West. With the parallels alleged by Mr. Blake or his followers we have already dealt, and so, we presume, in their own minds have the speakers by whom they are brought forward. What analogy is there between the lingering existence of Erse in Ireland, of the tongue of the Cymry in Wales, of Gaelic in the Highlands of Scotland, of Breton in Brittany, or of Basque in Northern Spain, and the legislative intrusion, antecedent to settlement, of French as a political language into the North-West for the purposes of ecclesiastical propagandism? What light do the political necessities of a motley Empire like Austria, or of a

motley Confederation like Switzerland, throw on the present question? Where, as in the case of Austria, two or more nations are united under an Imperial Crown, the recognition of more than one political language is inevitable. In the case of Switzerland, as has already been said, the combination is immemorial, nor does the division of tongues correspond with the division of races or religions, since there are German-speaking and French-speaking Cantons of both creeds. Not that diversity of language is by any means helpful to national unity even in Switzerland, while in Austria it is an important factor in a division which keeps the Empire always on the verge of disruption. Cases of heterogeneous populations annexed by conquest, as Poland has been annexed by Russia, and Posen by Prussia, are evidently still less applicable as analogies to the present case, while as precedents nothing could be less auspicious. Mr. Mulock seems to have persuaded himself that unity of language is actually essential to the greatness of a nation. He must take a gloomy view of the prospects of Great Britain, since Gaelic is almost extinct in Scotland, Erse is rapidly becoming extinct in Ireland, and the language of the Cymry in Wales, though more tenacious, has since the introduction of railways been manifestly doomed. Mr. Blake and Mr. Mulock want the French vote, and at that shrine they sacrifice the plain interest of the North-West and their own moral allegiance as British citizens; that is the vital fact enfolded in all this oratorical buckram. They are at liberty to talk any nonsense which will serve the occasion, even such nonsense as the polyglot theory of national greatness, but they are not at liberty, nor is Mr. David Mills at liberty, falsely to impute odious sentiments and iniquitous aims to their opponents. They know perfectly well that Dr. Caven, Mr. McCarthy, and the other leaders of the Equal Rights movement, are as free from fanaticism and from persecuting tendencies as they are themselves. They know perfectly well that it has not been proposed or desired in any quarter to curtail the religious freedom of Roman Catholics, to subject them

to disabilities of any kind, to deprive them of any privilege enjoyed by other citizens, or to disparage their Church or creed. They know perfectly well that they would themselves, if the French and Catholic vote were out of the way, be foremost in protesting against Separate Schools, against tithe and fabrique imposts, against legislative propagation of a dual language for priestly purposes, against ecclesiastical domination in civil affairs. Equal Right, they are all aware, means Equal Right, and not the shadow of anything more. Government by the "solid Catholic vote" wielded by the priesthood, to which, as well as to legal privilege, Equal Right seeks to put an end, is not equality; it is the ascendancy of a sect maintained by disregard of civil duty. The tidings of the burning of the College buildings at Toronto reaching Ottawa in the middle of the debate, furnished Mr. Blake with an embellishment for his speech in the shape of an apostrophe to the university of toleration. Why is it a university of toleration? Because Anglican privilege, which once reigned there, has been abolished, and Equal Right has taken its place. Mr. Blake does not even want the hardihood to pretend that the Ultramontane and Nationalist movement in Quebec was caused by the counter-movement of resistance, which, by its excesses, it at length evoked. He will next tell us that the Equal Rights Association imported the Jesuits.

If there are any to whom, after Mr. Blake's alliance with the Rielites and his acceptance of service with the C.P.R., the catastrophe of his leadership is still an enigma, they may solve the mystery by studying his demeanour towards friends who happen to differ from him. Much has been said about want of magnetism as the cause of his failure; but some of the most trusted, the most successful, and even the most beloved of leaders, have been anything but magnetic. Pitt was not magnetic, nor was Grey or Peel, and Chatham was unapproachable. The real cause lies deeper. Mr. Charlton, it may be presumed, knew that the Hull police was under the Provincial, not the Dominion, Government. But everybody knows that if

the assailants of Miss Wright had not had the French vote looming behind them, the Dominion Government would have called on the Provincial authorities to stop a disgraceful riot at the door of the National Legislature. At all events, the head of the Government had said what there was to be said in defence of his own position, and the ex-Leader of the Opposition was not called upon to put himself forward for the purpose of striking a blow at an old friend. These ultra-Provincial Rights men are so earnest in the path to which they have been suddenly converted that we are reminded once more of the actor who blacked himself all over to play Othello. But their consistency is hardly on a par with their earnestness. They are too scrupulous to interpose when a woman is being stoned at their door, because it would be an interference with Provincial Police; yet they have no scruple in bringing the influence of Dominion patronage and Dominion influences of all kinds to bear upon Provincial elections. Sir John Macdonald, if we are not misinformed, is doing it with all his might at this moment.

The coalition of the Machines against Equal Rights is now complete, and they are emulously bidding against each other for the French and Catholic vote. But let the Opposition bid as it may, the gainer will be Sir John Macdonald, in whom the French and Catholics recognize their genuine friend, and who in allying himself with reactionary ecclesiasticism is at all events not outraging the principles of the Tory party. The Opposition leaders have already by their supercilious manner towards their dissident supporters, as well as by their equivocal acts, disorganized their party to an extent which may prove fatal at the next election. The first fruit of their demeanour and their policy is the Haldimand election. Mr. McCarthy, in the meantime, shows a gallant front to foes who assail him on every side. It is something, amidst all the fishing for votes and the political pusillanimity which that habit engenders, to see a man standing on his own feet and not afraid to stand alone.

—Mr. Charlton's proposal to inquire into the causes of the Exodus was of course voted down by the majority at the back of the Prime Minister. What signifies it that the flower of our population is leaving us, so long as Sir John Macdonald remains in power? The Prime Minister, however, gave one piece of information which threw a side-light on the subject. He admitted that the Oxford and New Glasgow Railway in Nova Scotia cost the country \$1,543,000, and that the distance saved by it was seven miles. Sir Charles Tupper had said that the saving would be forty-five miles, a very moderate embellishment on his part. The line was surveyed, it seems, to pass through Cumberland, then represented by Sir Charles himself, and Pictou, represented by his son. The million and a half are added to the general burdens of the people; and perhaps some scores of Canadian farmers pay by banishment from their homes the price of buying Nova Scotia for the Government, and securing the seats of Sir Charles Tupper and his son. Mr. Charlton reckons the number of Canadians in the United States to-day as 1,470,466, besides half a million of emigrants who have come into Canada and moved to the United States. Let it be borne in mind that these people are taken, for the most part, from the most active and enterprising portion of our population, and also that they leave us usually in youth or early manhood, when Canada has borne the cost of their bringing up. To compare to this exodus from the country the shifting of population between different parts of the United States is absurd. The United States do not lose their farmers or their citizens.

—We are told that the Senate shows a disposition to emerge from limbo and assert itself as a political reality. This might be very well if the Senate were a different body from what it is. On no part of the Constitution does the reproach weigh more heavily of having never received the sanction of the people; for it is scarcely conceivable that the people would

have willingly put their own necks under the yoke of a nominative Senate. If the vision of a genuine Senate, of an Upper House representing the worth, intelligence and influence of the country, in the principal lines and professions, or in connection with the great interests, floated before the mind of the political architect, not only has it never been realized, but no attempt to realize it has been made. The Senate is packed with the personal followers of the politician who has held power for the last twenty-five years. Three-fourths of them are the nominees and the political retainers of this one man, as to whose rule of appointment we have authentic information. "My Dear Pope,—I want you before we take any steps about John Young's appointment to see about the selection of our candidate for West Montreal. From all I can learn, William Workman would run the best. He will very likely object; but, if he is the best man, you can easily hint to him that if he runs for West Montreal and carries it, we will consider that he has a claim to an early seat in the Senate. This is the great object of his ambition." For the writer of the well-known letter, of which this is an extract, the usual plea may be urged and partly admitted, that he has had to fight nature, and that nature can be fought only with bribes. But that which in some measure excuses the man does not save the character of the system or improve its fruits. "Sacrifices for the Conservative party"—in other words, contributions to the party election fund, are spoken of openly and without misgiving, as titles to a seat for life in the Legislature. We lift up our eyes and hands in holy horror at the profligacy of the times when seats in Parliament for English boroughs were bought in market overt. The old method of corruption may have been more gross, but was it more demoralizing than the new?

—The *Globe* by a stern but most wholesome act of justice has saved the Senate and the country with it from at least one disgrace. Apart from the shameful disclosures which Mr. Rykert's letters contain of traffic in interest or pre-

tended interest with the Government, their very tone and the character self-portrayed in them are enough to show that the writer is fit to be made a baronet. Mr. Tupper, of Winnipeg, who is introduced as a helpmate by Mr. Rykert on the occasion, some time ago, it may be remembered, had a public quarrel with his partner who insisted that the sums received by Mr. Tupper for promoting the interests of clients at Ottawa should be brought into account with the firm. What that quarrel revealed Mr. Rykert's letters corroborate. Mr. Tupper's firm has flourished beneath the dew of Government patronage like a willow planted by the water-course, while disappointment and despondency have reigned around. And Mr. Tupper is heir to a baronetcy. So much for hereditary honours!

The remarkable thing is that in spite of a previous disclosure hardly less damaging than the present and of his general reputation Mr. Rykert is able to boast that he has retained the confidence or at least the suffrages of a constituency for twenty-five years. The respectable Conservatives of Lincoln County know what he is and confess that they know what he is, yet time after time they allow themselves against their sense of honour to be driven to the poll in his favour by the lash of party. In a debate in the American Senate the other day one Senator protested that he had nothing to say in favour of non-partisan legislation. He believed, he said, "in the most partisan legislation, Republicans for Republicans, Democrats for Democrats." To this a Senator on the other side responded "Aye and Amen: I believe in partisanship. I wish every citizen in the State were a bitter partisan of some kind or other." It is pleasant to see men frankly embrace the consequences of their theories. Nor can there be any doubt that the theory is most useful to politicians whose aim in public life is a share of the Government timber limits. But is this our political ideal?

—Our commercial morality, notwithstanding the inevitable percentage of roguery, is sound; our political morality is

almost a jest. It would seem unwise therefore to transfer the regulation of the machinery of credit, which is the very life of our commerce, from commercial to political hands. Yet this is what they advocate who propose to take the power of issuing the bank bills from the Banks and give it to the Government.

Two things these reformers say they want—a national currency and a safe currency. They already have both in as large a measure as circumstances will permit. The bills of our leading banks circulate all over the Dominion at par. If hitherto the bills of the remoter Provinces have not passed at par in Toronto, this is one of the many things incident to the looseness of the Federation and the dislocation of its territory; and the Banks propose to obviate it by special arrangement. That the currency is safe is proved by the fact that the bills are taken everywhere and by everyone without the slightest hesitation or misgiving. Well they may be. For a few days the bills of the Central Bank were at a slight discount, after which they were taken up in full. The notes of the Maritime Bank were paid only after a long interval. But at last they were paid, and they would have been paid sooner had not Government laid its hands on the deposits in the name of the prerogative of the Crown. No other loss or shadow of loss has fallen on the holders of British Canadian Bank bills since the inauguration of our present system, while the Government paper of the United States has been at fifty per cent. discount, and that of more than one European monarchy has been heavily depreciated, to say nothing of South American Republics or Hayti. The bills are the first charge on the assets; we have the security of the double liability; and to make that security doubly sure the Banks are now ready to form a mutual guarantee fund for the protection of bill holders against any possible loss.

The fact is, however, that neither of the pretended motives is the real motive. The real motive is a desire to appropriate the gains of the Banks, or at least to make them engines for

artificially raising the value of Government securities and thus in effect levying forced loans upon the people. The idea that Government is entitled to the gains of the Banking trade or to meddle with the Banking trade more than with other trades, arises from what may almost be called a verbal fallacy. It is the duty of a Government to stamp the coin in order to assure us of its weight and fineness, and this duty Governments, after a long course of fraudulent debasement, have at last been drilled into doing with integrity. Coin is called money; bank-bills, because they circulate like coin, are called money; and the idea prevails that all money is the province of the Government. But bank-bills are not money: they are instruments of credit, like promissory notes, bills of exchange, or drafts. As often as they change hands gold passes, just as it does in the case of a cheque at the bank of issue from the credit of the giver to that of the taker. Their issue and circulation, like that of other instruments of credit, ought to expand and contract with the necessities of commerce and will do so as long as the function of issuing them is left with the banks, which are the organs of commerce and the indicators of its requirements. When an honest Government undertakes to meddle with the circulation of bank-bills the result appears in the history of Peel's Bank Charter which has had to be suspended as often as the crisis for which it was provided has arisen. When a dishonest Government undertakes to meddle, the result is such as that which led Tom Paine after an experience of inconvertible paper to demand, in right earnest, that death should be the penalty of any proposal to return to the system. There are governments which are half honest; and these try to use the banks as engines for putting a forced value on Government securities, levying thereby, in effect, as has already been said, a forced loan upon the nation. Bank-bills must usually be taken like coin without examination. It is therefore right that to guard the public against fraud banks should be subject to inspection and should be required to hold a reserve. This is the sole ground of Government interference

with the banking trade, which is just as much a department of commerce as any other trade ; nor ought the funds of trade to be unduly locked up under colour of enforcing a reserve. That nationality and security are not the only aims of the Government at Ottawa is shown by its proposal to lay hands upon the deposits when they have been for a certain period in the hands of the Banks. Government has no right whatever to these funds and might as well put its hands into a till.

The cupidity of Governments is probably excited by the American system which puts a forced value on Government bonds by making them the basis of bank circulation. But the American system is now approaching a catastrophe. When the public debt is paid and the Government bonds are withdrawn a new basis will have to be found. The Canadian system shows its superiority by extending its operations largely beyond the Line.

In any raid upon the Bank circulation, Government would have the sympathy of industrial destructives who are jealous of the gains of the Banks and of those of all other commercial corporations, as though it were possible for trade to be carried on without profit or for industry to prosper without trade. It will also have the sympathy of socialistic speculators who are glad to see any power grasped by Government because they think that the power of Government will some day pass into their own hands and be wielded by them for their own objects, as that of issuing paper currency would with a vengeance. But those who know that the Banks are the vital organs of commerce will look with jealousy on any tendency to draw them into the political vortex, and place them, possibly, at the mercy of spendthrift and rapacious governments. The governments themselves, if they understood their own interests, would see that by deranging or crippling commerce and thus preventing the growth of wealth, they would be drying up the sources of their own revenues in the long run. Wisdom and probity, things inseparable from each other, let us hope will pre-

vail and prevail without delay, for commerce cannot afford uncertainty and suspense.

—While confusion reigns at Ottawa, in Ontario parties appear to be defining themselves afresh on a Provincial basis. It is plain that Mr. Mowat will take the field as the opponent of Equal Right and will receive the solid Catholic vote, by which we mean not the votes of all Catholics, for some Catholics are at heart Liberal and opposed to clerical domination, but all the votes that are at the command of the clergy. He will also receive the solid French vote from the East and West sections of the Province. Archbishop Cleary has sounded the trumpet call to which the armies of the faithful will respond. Thus Mr. Mowat's antagonist, even if he were not led by inclination, would be almost borne by the tide of war into a position in which he will appear as the champion of religious equality and of British and Protestant right. The practical question is whether Mr. Meredith will be able sufficiently to disentangle himself from his fatal connection with Ottawa to play his part freely and with effect. What is certain is that he has no other part to play, and that if he allows the managers of an Ottawa party to damp the spirit of his councils and force upon him Machine nominations, as they are now doing, he might as well leave the field. Ottawa cares little for him: it does not want him to win: it wants him to keep things quiet for it here and prevent Ontario resisting "Better Terms" when they are demanded by Quebec and the smaller Provinces. He can hardly fail to see this or to know that he has reached the point at which a choice must be made.

—In the meantime Manitoba will not be "checked." She rejects by an overwhelming vote the blessings of dualism tendered her by Mr. Blake, and her decision will draw with it that of the Territories. In that quarter, at all events, a vigorous initiative shows itself, and it is possible that even a

leader will appear. In Dominion politics Manitoba is a cipher, or worse; remote from Ottawa, and without men of sufficient standing and sufficient leisure to send thither, she tamely allows her representation to be jobbed by the Ottawa Government, and members to be nominated by its influence, who betray the general interest and her own. But her Provincial Legislature, filled with the best men she has, is independent and patriotic. She is to be congratulated on the failure of an attempt just made to suppress public opinion in Winnipeg by buying *The Sun*, the only independent journal, and reducing the Press to a single organ in the hands of a combination, the physiognomy of which is not very distinct, but appears to blend the features of the C.P.R. and the Hudson's Bay Railway with those of the Ottawa Government and the Ultramontane party. The attempt to reduce the Press of a free community to a literary satrapy was not very likely to succeed. At all events, it has not succeeded. The *Winnipeg Tribune* steps, as an independent and patriotic journal, amidst much cheering, into the place left by the sinister absorption of *The Sun*. We note with pleasure Mr. Greenway's contradiction of the reports as to dissensions between Attorney-General Martin and himself. Mr. Greenway's Government may have its faults; but it is the most patriotic, the most economical, the strongest and best Government that Manitoba has yet had; and those who care more for the material interest of the Province than for faction, cabal, or any desperate railway enterprise, will make a great mistake if they do not give Mr. Greenway and his colleagues a fair trial.

—The gradual severance of Canada from the Motherland is in nothing more marked than in the growing indifference of Canadians to British politics. Formerly the news from "home" was awaited with eagerness, was devoured with absorbing interest and furnished the text for endless comment.

Now the opening of the British Parliament, big with the fate of the Mother Country as the day is, hardly inspires a single editorial.

The Parnell Commission was, as we have steadfastly maintained, a mistake from the beginning. If *The Times* had libelled Parnell, Parnell and his crew had ten times more savagely libelled every member of Parliament and every Minister of the Crown who had been concerned with the repression of crime in Ireland. Both sides ought to have been left to the ordinary tribunals, which were disparaged as well as ousted by the obtrusion of this extraordinary inquest. It was little likely that the convictions or feelings of infuriated faction would be swayed by any judicial verdict, even though it had been delivered by Minos, Æacus and Rhadamanthus instead of Judges Hannen, Day and Smith. We may safely say that had the Pigott Letters proved to be genuine instead of forgeries the language of Mr. Gladstone and his followers about Mr. Parnell would have been little changed by the discovery. It was inevitable that the Government should be regarded, however unjustly, as the prosecutor of its political enemy, and should thus be involved in the chances of a failure, especially when it was ill-advised enough to allow the Attorney-General to appear. The inquiry moreover, when entrusted to legal hands, to be conducted under legal conditions, became in its own nature almost desperate, since the evidence required was legal, whereas the proof of connection between the head of a party and their followers must generally be not legal but moral, however certain the connection may be. The future historian, sweeping aside questions as to the authenticity of a particular letter or as to the formal proof of complicity between those who were acting together for the same end, will point to the broad and decisive facts. During the whole of this reign of crime and outrage in Ireland, Mr. Parnell and his colleagues have been completely masters of the three Provinces over which it prevailed; they have nominated the members for every constituency; they have had in their hands every

organ of opinion; whatever they have seriously enjoined the people to do has been done. Had they chosen really to put forth their force, they might at any time have bid crime and outrage cease. But it was to the reign of terror produced by crime and outrage that their own power owed its existence. Therefore not only did they not bid crime and outrage cease, they virtually bade them go on by palliating them, by inflaming the passions which were sure to give birth to them, by traducing and denouncing every agent of government and minister of law who in the execution of his duty was concerned in putting them down. Will anyone hereafter believe that the proprietors of the *United Ireland*, a list which is understood to include Mr. Justin McCarthy among other Mr. Parnellites, were not morally more guilty of the acts to which that journal has incited its readers than the ignorant and hungry peasants by whose hands the acts were done?

That Mr. Parnell should come off personally triumphant after the proof that the Pigott Letters were forged was a foregone conclusion. On the other hand, legal proof has been furnished of the connection between the Parnellite organizations and the murder clubs of the United States. This will not prevent Mr. Gladstone and the Home Rulers from accepting in the next election the aid of the Parnellite organizations, with funds drawn from the American murder clubs, for the dismemberment of the United Kingdom.

—Perhaps the most serious part of the matter is the discredit cast upon an authority so closely identified with the Unionist cause as the *London Times*. That *The Times* knew the Pigott Letters to be forgeries, and even was concerned in the fabrication, is a calumny too gross for anyone but MR. William O'Brien to utter or for any sane being to believe. *The Times* erred and erred terribly in accepting anything tendered it by one of the class of disreputable adventurers

which is always called into sinister activity by Irish disturbance. But its integrity, the purity of its motives, the patriotism which has led it to risk its great name and pour forth its wealth like water for the preservation of the Union can never be called in question. Its power is attested by the fury with which it is attacked by the political leaders of the Radical Party. Such a war waged by a great combination of public men and Parliamentary factions against a journal has, we believe, no parallel in political history. Some of the present assailants are "Dugald Dalgettys" now in the Irish service, who once were proud to see their names in *The Times*. Every advantage that Parliamentary privilege can afford is taken without scruple against an unprivileged journal, the property of private individuals, and the assailants plainly show that their object is not to purge the character of Parliament or do justice to an injured reputation but to ruin a dreaded and hated power. If the country finally escapes from the mortal peril into which, by an alliance of domestic faction with the foreign enemies of England, it has been brought, great will be the debt of gratitude that it will owe, and in a happier hour will pay, to the proprietors and managers of *The Times*.

—The struggle between parties in England is morally a civil war. No passions which an actual civil war could excite would be more virulent or more unpatriotic; nor could the sword and petronel of Cavalier or Roundhead be weapons of a hatred more deadly than that which expresses itself in slanderous declamation or among savages, like some of the low Parnellite journalists, in libels still more vile. In truth it is doubtful whether the country could be effectually delivered from its present peril by any leader who was not prepared to face the risk of civil war. Scarcely without such daring could the measures be passed which even at this eleventh hour might redress the balance of the Constitution and place British progress beyond the reach of Radical and Socialistic revolution.

But Lord Salisbury is a grandee of whom nothing heroic is to be expected, especially when he is depressed by ill health, nor has he given political problems thought enough to be prepared with an organic solution. He tries to keep the nation on his side by the ordinary appeals to its confidence in the way of skilful diplomacy and sound finance, forgetting perhaps, or not distinctly seeing, that he has to deal with masses who know not what diplomacy means and care little even about finance. His policy is one of concession by which he hopes to head off revolution and especially to save the hereditary House of Lords, the paramount object of his love and care. Like some other Conservative statesmen, he seems to think that he can cure Socialism by vaccination, and talks of improving the dwelling houses of the poor out of the public taxes, an operation which must be very limited, unless enormous expense is to be incurred, and like all alms-giving on a large scale and of a promiscuous kind may eventually do as much harm as good. Aristocracy and almsgiving are in fact Lord Salisbury's domestic policy. He is a man of great ability; he has able men at his side; and perhaps he may succeed.

The story goes that Mr. Balfour in reply to the taunt that he was not likely to succeed in solving the Irish problem when Cromwell had failed, replied that he intended, like Cromwell, to be rigorous in his repression, but unlike Cromwell to be an improver at the same time. If he did say this he knows little about Cromwell, who was the one genuine improver that ever appeared on that unhappy field, and of whose improvements what is soundest and best in Ireland remains the monument. One scheme in which he is himself to appear as the Cromwell of beneficence is foreshadowed as an extension to Ireland of the British Local Government Act. If experience is to be heard it will proclaim that a greater curse could hardly be inflicted on that country than a measure, styled of self-government, which would cover it with local Tammanies. Home Rule for a time at least the three Celtic Provinces do really want, but it is the Home Rule of a Government, such as that of the Pro-

lector, so far as he had real power, was, strong, enlightened and just. Demagogism is the bane of the island, and what can a Local Government Act do but increase it, especially in the present mood of the Irish, which ought to be taken into account in granting new powers as much as the abstract merits of the arrangement itself? To "raise more hogs and less hell," as the outspoken Texan says, is what the peasantry of Ireland need. Under every sort of régime, under their native chiefs, their native kings, their native priesthood, under Tudor autocracy and Stuart Parliaments, under the Catholic Parliament of Tyrconnell, under Grattan's Parliament, under the Parliament of the United Kingdom, and not at home only but in the United States and in the Colonies, the Irish, led by successive swarms of agitators and fed with political firewater, have been "raising hell" for about two thousand years. A firm, upright and kindly rule, under which they would be allowed to "raise hogs" is the thing that, if left to themselves, they probably would welcome. Unhappily it is the thing which faction is least likely to allow them to have.

The Partick (Lanark) election augurs well for the Unionists, whose vote has increased, while their majority has not been reduced more than it was sure to be after the loss of so strong a standard-bearer as the late Unionist member, Craig Sellar. But we cannot tell from these bye-elections what will happen when at a general election the floodgates of party are opened and local or personal influences are drowned in the flood. Unless at the very brink of the descent a strong arm should interpose or a preserving angel descend from heaven, no human being can say what, three years hence, will become of England. If we did not know what faction has done from the days of the Siege of Jerusalem to our own, it would seem incredible that, with Socialistic revolution at the gates, a section of the Tory party should think of nothing but its own narrow interests or prejudices, and be doing its utmost to prevent the junction with the Liberal Unionists, without which an anti-revolutionary majority cannot be secured.

—The political danger in England is greatly enhanced by industrial disturbance which fills all breasts with an anxiety too well founded. It is true that the Strikes are largely the work of professional agitators, such as Mr. Burns, whose trade is industrial war. These men actually constrained a body of artisans to reject an arrangement, the reasonableness and liberality of which they could not deny, because it would prevent them from calling the men out on strike. But the material must be combustible or the match would be applied in vain. The relation between the employers of labour and the labourers is becoming full of danger in all countries, but especially in England, where the industrial disturbance among the artisans is closely connected with their fresh possession of the suffrage and the movement of political revolution. Political reformers in England have failed to observe that universal suffrage is far more perilous in a land of factory operatives and hired labourers than in one of peasant freeholders. The industrial antagonism is sharpened and embittered by social separation which has been enhanced since the mill-owners have altogether ceased to live near their mills and among their men. Nor does any remedy yet appear. The plans for turning the artisan from a mere wage-earner into a partner do not make much way: those cannot share the profit who would not consent to share the loss, nor can the helm of commercial enterprise be confided to the democracy of the Mill. In Mr. Donisthorpe's "Individualism a System of Politics," a book full of ingenious speculation and criticism in a lively form, it is proposed to solve the difficulty by "capitalizing" labour according to a scale which the writer suggests. But capital is a tangible reality; labour is not a tangible reality; the only tangible reality is the labourer; and how can the labourer be capitalized? Meantime, labour journals are daily instilling venom into the heart of the "toiler" and leading him to regard all employers and all above him in wealth as his "spoilers" and his foes.

All these strikes make the case worse not only by the waste which they occasion but by stimulating invention to supply the

place of men who mutiny by machinery which does not. The late Mr. Cotter Morison, in "The Service of Man," has an apocalyptic vision of the coming time when the productive powers of machinery will be such as to throw myriads of artisans out of work. It does seem as if we must be drawing towards some crisis of that kind, at least if the artisan class continues to multiply without restraint. History is like the German Pass, where at every step the path seems barred by impassable rock, but still opens out again as the wayfarer advances. Some exit from this dilemma, hope whispers, will be found. But the relation between the employer and the wage-earner is at present the great peril of civilization. Panacea, it is to be feared, there is none: palliatives there may be. Something, at all events, may be done to bridge the social chasm and mitigate the bitterness of class-feeling.

—Dom Pedro of Brazil had shut himself up in the cell of science almost as completely as Duke Prospero, and had preserved so little of Imperial state that when he was visiting Quebec he owed to a gentleman of this city a rescue from an extortionate cab-driver. The deposition of such an Emperor without apparent violence and with a handsome indemnity did not appear likely to shake the world. Yet through some singular coincidence it bids fair to make an epoch. The throne of the House of Braganza in Portugal itself evidently totters. In Spain Royalty is a sickly babe in a cradle rocked by a female Regent. The fall of the Brazilian offset of the Portuguese dynasty has given an impulse to the republican movement in both countries, while the narrow escape of the Spanish infant from death impresses upon the people the irrationality and the instability of a system which entwines public order and the national welfare with the frail thread of an individual life. Just at this juncture come the buccaneering exploits of Serpa Pinto in Africa, the quarrel with England, the childish frenzy of Portuguese passion and the crection of the adventurer

into a national hero, while the efforts of the government to avert a preposterous war bring it into sharp collision with republican patriotism. When Serpa Pinto returns it is not unlikely that he may head a revolution in Portugal and that the convulsion may extend to Spain. It is possible even that the union of the Peninsula, which seems to be decreed by nature, but which miscarried in the maladroit hands of Spanish despotism, may now be brought about under the form of an Iberian Republic on a federal footing. Federation would well suit Spain where, beside the passionate love of union, religious and dynastic, there has always been a strong Provincial life in each of the old Kingdoms or Principalities of which the monarchy was composed.

The event has at all events set people speculating on the future of Monarchy even in England. English Monarchy, having entirely ceased to reign, or even freely to appoint its own waiting-women, was strong in its weakness so long as it continued to perform its social duties. Those duties, however, for the last quarter of a century it has, whether from distaste or parsimony, neglected to perform; and in the case of Ireland, where the hearts of the people yearn for personal chieftaincy, with most disastrous consequences to the nation. Radicalism, by the mouth of Mr. John Morley, protests that while it is determined to "mend or end" the House of Lords it does not aim at the abolition of the Monarchy. But when the House of Lords and the Established Church were gone and had carried with them to the grave the hereditary principle and religious reverence for the past, the life of a dynasty, stripped of all power and left amidst alien surroundings, would not be long. The people already, in spite of the abundance of the national wealth, grudge the Crown the allowances necessary to maintain its state and preserve the sacred exclusiveness of the Royal Family. Each Royal grant is the signal for an outburst of popular discontent, accompanied with ominous demonstrations of irreverence. Royalty is constrained to intermarry with wealthy subjects and perhaps will presently

be brought down to the American heiress. Then will come social entanglements, jealousies, and perhaps scandals, which will finally break the spell. A crisis may even be near at hand. The Prince of Wales is very popular. But it has long been whispered that the chances were against his surviving his mother, and it is perfectly evident that he could not bequeath his popularity or influence of any kind to his youthful son. The barque of "Cuffs and Collars" would not long ride in safety the stormy waters of Radical and Socialistic Revolution. Like the Papacy the British Monarchy retains prestige in proportion to the distance from its centre. People here have no notion of the irreverence with which it is treated by the popular press and by the masses in England.

—Presbyterianism in the United States seems inclined to venture on Revision, and even to think of reducing dogmatic formularies to a simple creed, such as might be accepted by all Christians. This surely would be an alarming undertaking. Touch the tissue of dogmatic theology and the whole web will be unravelled. First will go the Protestant Scholasticism of which Justification by Faith and Predestination, the controversial reaction against Indulgences crystallized into a creed, are the leading dogmas. Then will go the Scholasticism of the Middle Ages which did not fail to transmit some of its influence to its Protestant successor. Then Roman legalism. Then Byzantine and Alexandrine theosophy. At last the reviser would come to the body of dogma framed by construing literally and turning into articles of faith the Mosaic and Rabbinical figures and metaphors of St. Paul. Perhaps it would be necessary to eliminate even the influence of poets such as Dante, whose pictures of the eternal torture-house present Deity as an Italian tyrant, and Milton, with whose poetry a good deal of dogma steals into the mind. When the process was completed there would hardly be left anything but "Thou hast the words of Eternal Life." The words of Christ as the rule of life and

his character as the pattern still unite all his disciples as they united all who heard him on the hill-sides of Galilee. It would be difficult to find or devise any ecclesiastical creed or article of a creed which would find universal acceptance. Would it not then be wise to be satisfied with practical communion and, without formal abrogation or revision, lay the formularies aside, or at least cease to impose them on conscience, and allow them to stand for whatever as doctrine or history they are worth? The Westminster Confession contains passages which breathe the spirit of the militant Covenanter, and which as descriptions of the God of Justice and Mercy cannot be read without a shudder. Yet it is a noble and solemn monument of the religious reason, reverently and at the same time boldly addressing itself to the great problems of human existence and of the relation between God and man. It has helped greatly to form a high, albeit somewhat stern religious character, and in this respect its usefulness has not ceased.

In England it seems that secessions to Rome have become more numerous again, chiefly, as might be expected, among the clergy. Among the laity the seceders are mostly of the wealthier and more aristocratic class, where speculative disquietude, historic and fancy and æsthetic influence have their place; between the mind of the peasant or artisan and the religion of the Middle Ages the link is broken forever. Personal influence or alms may make converts to the ancient faith among the poor, but few will be made by the reasonings of Bellarmine and Bossuet or by the talisman of Gothic art. That more of the High Church clergy of England have not already gone over is to be ascribed in some measure to the influence of benefices, by which we mean not pay alone but parish interests, and still more perhaps to marriage. Thirty years ago Dr. Pusey avowed in his *Eirenicon* that the only two insurmountable obstacles to union with Rome in his mind were the excessive exaltation of the Pope and the excessive adoration of the Virgin; questions, both of them, merely of

degree. Those who witnessed the Tractarian movement, at all events, can have no difficulty in understanding the attraction of a sacerdotal Church for the clerical mind, of an "august and fascinating superstition," as Macaulay calls Roman Catholicism, for the emotional mind, or of infallibility for the mind which is a prey to religious doubt and has not satisfied itself that there can be no real safety outside allegiance to the God of Truth, nor any real danger within it.

We seem to have made some clergyman angry by saying that the Mass must either be a miracle or an imposture. Yet surely this is the fact, and if it is a fact it is a serious consideration for anyone who is inclined to dally with the question. Against serious belief in the miracle we have not a word to say. The distinction between the most solemn celebration of the Communion and the Mass seems plain. Wherever there is adoration of the elements, by genuflection before them, by elevation of them, or in any other way, apparently the rite celebrated is not the Communion but the Mass.

Archdeacon Farrar's proposal to restore monasticism in the Anglican Church seems to have fallen to the ground. He perhaps intended it as a counter-charm to the charm of Roman Catholicism which he saw working again around him with renewed power. There is no reason why we should not use anything good however it may have been abused. A brotherhood may be a good thing, still more may be a sisterhood, provided always that there is no vow, no asceticism, no superstition. For women who do not marry and have no strong domestic or social ties, a sisterhood with a share in some useful work can hardly fail to be better than a lonely and aimless life. But monasticism of the Roman Catholic type has surely been condemned by decisive experience. It has just been attempted by a laborious and we must say fairly judicial writer to whitewash English monasticism and reverse the verdict of the Commissioners of Henry VIII. To show that the Commissioners were the agents of a rapacious government and that their verdict was very far from

judicial, is easy, but their general finding is confirmed by the state of the monasteries in Italy and other countries. It is certain, at all events, that the wings of superhuman aspiration having long become weary, the monasteries had sunk into idleness and torpor, if not into worse vice. The people over the greater part of the country saw their dissolution certainly without sorrow and probably with joy. In Italy the other day a great dissolution or reduction of monasteries took place. Not a finger was raised in resistance, not a sigh was breathed. The monks, so far as we could learn, were glad to throw off the cowl and return to home and social life. In Spain when the great monastery of Poblet was dissolved the monks had literally to run for their lives from the vengeance of the peasantry. The Order of Loyola is still full of life; but the life is intrigue, not asceticism or contemplation. It is possible to conceive a state of things in which brotherhoods might regain a beneficent force and contend with social evils and distractions, as the monks of early days contended with barbarism and the wilderness. But surely we have done with the cowl.

—Those who wish us to believe that the Papacy in the nineteenth century has changed its nature, and that we need feel no fear of its encroachment on the civil power, should get the Pope to hold his tongue. This, so far as his own disposition is concerned, the wearer of the purple crown would not be sorry to do. The late Pope was a Papal guardsman turned into a supplement to the Deity, and he behaved as such a personage might be expected to behave. But Leo XIII. is by nature, and showed himself at the beginning of his reign, a cool-headed, moderate and statesmanlike Italian, willing to live on quiet terms with the civil power. He made the philosophic Newman a Cardinal and seemed to prefer the medievalist Aquinas as a text-book to the Jesuit Suarez. But he is in the hands of the Sons of Loyola, who constrain him to ratify the Encyclical. "If the laws of the State," he says,

“are in open contradiction to the Divine Law, if they command anything prejudicial to the Church or hostile to the duties imposed by religion, or violate in the person of the Supreme Pontiff the authority of Jesus Christ, then indeed it is a duty to resist them and a crime to obey them, a crime fraught with injury to the State itself, for every offence against religion recoils on the State. To love the two fatherlands, the earthly and the heavenly, but in such a manner that the love of the heavenly prevails over that of the other, and that human laws are not preferred to the law of God, such is the essential duty of Christians, from which spring, as from their source, all other duties.” When the theological froth is blown away, the meaning is that the ecclesiastical power is above the civil power, and that when the commands of the two conflict the ecclesiastical power must be obeyed. Hildebrand and Innocent III. could want nothing more; neither of them professed insatiable ambition; they only upheld as divine the principle by which insatiable ambition was warranted. Is it intolerance to demur to such pretensions? Are not they who call it intolerance using the pretence of superior intolerance as a cloak for the betrayal of one of the great organic principles of modern civilization?

—If after the Reformation any Teutons remained Roman Catholics it was through accident or pressure; accident such as the isolation of the Mountain Cantons of Switzerland, or pressure such as that of the House of Austria on its German dominions, or that of France on the Palatinate. Dollinger belonged to the land and race of Luther. But, like Erasmus, though in a far more earnest spirit, he sought to reform the vast structure of medieval superstition without fundamental change. The attempt was hopeless and the Old Catholic movement is buried in the great scholar’s grave. But we must not think that the life of a man who has tried a path for us is wasted because the experiment fails. It is only by try-

ing all things that our fallibility learns to what we are to hold fast as good. Dollinger with his piety, his learning, his self-devotion, his great personal ascendancy has made it evident that the Church of Rome cannot be reformed. Reason and morality in his person have tried to make terms with Ultramontanism and Jesuitism and have tried in vain.

—The beauty of University College as a pile, set off by its site, was unquestionable; and its temporary destruction is a public sorrow. But the style was false. The heaviness of Norman architecture belonged to a period before the architect had gained confidence in his materials and can be redeemed only by the majesty of prodigious massiveness, as it is in Durham Cathedral. The style was not unsuitable for a Church which required only a “dim religious light,” the eyes of all the worshippers being fixed on the lamp hung over the Host, and it was perfectly suitable for a Norman keep which required no light at all. But it was not well-suited for domestic purposes or for the lecture-rooms and halls of a University. The decorative carvings, in like manner, belonged to the infancy of art, of which they were a factitious reproduction: an artist of the thirteenth or fourteenth centuries would have looked upon them with disdain. The general structure was ill-adapted to a climate with a heavy snow-fall, and the internal arrangements were inconvenient. In this last respect it may be hoped that the reconstruction will be an improvement. The Phoenix will rise in due course more glorious from its ashes and it will learn henceforth to provide proper hydrants and insure to the requisite amount. In laying down the principles of public action in the matter it ought not to be forgotten that all the chartered universities stand, as they maintain, in the same relation to the State.

—If the plan of granting to pupils on leaving the High Schools certificates of fitness for admission to the University

is to be adopted, we hope it will not be thought cruel to insist that the test shall be severe. A University education is a very good thing for such as can really turn it to account. Of these there are two classes; men who intend to devote their lives to science or learning, and men who though they may not intend to devote their lives to science or learning are capable of making good use of the fruits of high intellectual training in other walks of life. Both of these classes are limited and the second perhaps is fully as limited as the first. To send an ordinary boy to college is not only to incur great expense on his account but to expose his character and especially his habits of industry to no small peril. It must rest with himself whether he will work or not, and if he has no special taste or aptitude for the work he is pretty sure to be idle. Put him into an office or a store and he must work, while he will probably pick up from his newspaper, from such books as he may be disposed to read, and from general conversation, as much knowledge as he would get by cramming at the last moment for a college examination. The scanty and undigested modicum of classics, mathematics or science, which is forgotten as soon as the examination is over, leaves scarcely any beneficial trace. Business is in itself a mental training in its way. We need not disparage the value of college friendships or college games; but friendship is not confined to college, nor are college friendships always the best; while games may be played anywhere and ought not to be what the athletic mania tends to make them, the first object of a young man's life. For a boy of ordinary capacities and tastes the best thing is regular work in an office or some steady business, with board under the roof of his parents or in some regular and moral home.

Danger looms in this quarter. The number of youths who are tempted by the easy matriculation and graduation which a number of second-rate and third-rate universities hold out is too large and is increasing daily. There is everywhere a rush into the intellectual callings. At the same time education, which once was rare and bore a high price has become so com-

mon as to lose a great part of its commercial value. The wages of educated labour are falling and those of manual labour are rising in proportion. In Germany they are crying out that all the liberal professions are overstocked and that the professional man is fain to look for a wife with a little money to enable him to eke out a livelihood. The cry is echoed in England. It will soon be echoed here. If we do not take care we shall have a number of men unfitted by university education for common work and for whom there will be no work of the higher kind, while their ambition will have been awakened and their sensibilities will have been made keen by culture. Such a class may become not only unhappy but dangerous. It is from such a class that Nihilism in Russia draws a large portion of its recruits. The idea that after a university education youths will go back to the store or to the plough and dignify lowly callings with high culture may embellish the address of University Chancellors, but has no warrant in reality. Even those who have been at Agricultural Colleges are apt not to return to the farm. In New England farm-life is at a discount. Farms are being deserted by scores. The old Puritan community seems to be in danger of going out of existence, and this is ascribed largely to the restlessness and discontent with manual labour engendered by education. Listen not to these Siren Voices. Unless you feel sure that your boy is really able and really willing to make good use of a University, keep him at home and set him at once to the regular work which is the only security for his industry and therefore for his character.

THE BYSTANDER.

APRIL, 1890.

BETWEEN Ironclad Protection and Tariff Reform a battle has for some time been raging behind the doors of Committee Rooms and Caucus Rooms at Washington. As we were going to press the *Mail* published a Report of the Sub-Committee of Ways and Means which, if it is adopted, will prove that Ironclad Protection is winning the day with a vengeance. Wheat, barley, hay, hops, potatoes, horses, cattle, hides, dairy produce, and everything that the Canadian farmer exports and by the exportation of which he keeps his head above water, are threatened with increased duties. That on barley is trebled. Even eggs do not escape. It is not likely, however, that the proposal is pointed politically against Canada, with the object of coercing her into Annexation, as Canadian alarmists at once assume. People here have Annexation on the brain and fancy that the eyes of the Americans are always fixed on them with predatory intentions, when, in point of fact, the eyes of the Americans are very seldom turned this way. The struggle at the next Presidential election will be for the farmer's vote. The Republicans, who are also the Protectionists, held it last time by the tie of party allegiance which the farmer is very slow to break, as he is very slow to change in any way. But they know that the farmer was voting for his party against his interest and that even he cannot be trusted to do this for ever. They seek therefore to bind him by his interest as well as his loyalty to their system. Hitherto he has been paying the cost of the system as a consumer without receiving Pro-

tection himself and has been exposed without defence to the competition not only of the "pauper labour" of Europe but of the more than pauper labour of Hindostan. At the last election the Republicans promised that they would give him Protection and they are now keeping their word. This, not a design against Canadian independence, is probably the explanation of the move; though it is true and has often been pointed out in answer to the charges brought by monopolists here against Commercial Unionists, that the extreme Annexationists in the United States are always opposed to Commercial Union.

Not the less would such a policy as the Report embodies be fraught with ruin to Canada, especially in the midst of an agricultural depression which among the farmers in the eastern parts of this Province amounts to positive distress. It is indeed difficult to see how we should be able to face the future. Justice will now perhaps be done by those who are capable of doing justice at all to the effort which the promoters of Commercial Union have sincerely made to secure to our people and especially to our farmers the benefit of Reciprocity without prejudice to the political question. That Commercial Union was an insidious attempt to bring about Annexation in disguise was a sheer calumny and now receives final confutation. Unhappily the confutation comes, if such a resolution as that of the Sub-Committee passes, in a form most disastrous to the country. If the Report is adopted, will our Protectionists rejoice, as in consistency they are bound to do, over the triumph of their beneficent principle in the policy of a great country?

Simultaneously, however, with the Report of the Sub-Committee of Ways and Means comes the unanimous adoption by the Committee on Foreign Affairs of Mr. Hitt's Resolution in favour of "such commercial arrangements as would result in the complete removal of all duties upon trade between Canada and the United States." That phrase is substituted for "Commercial Union" to which, though it was selected in contradistinction to political union, a sinister meaning of a political kind has by the enemies of improved trade relations been assidu-

ously attached. As the members of the Cabinet in the United States do not sit in Congress and impress their general policy on legislation, it is difficult to say what is the exact relation borne by the reports of the Sub-Committee on Ways and Means and the report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to each other. But both committees are controlled by the Republican party, and the report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs may be taken at all events as a proof that the attitude of the party towards Canada is not hostile and that the door of commercial negotiation is still open. If Mr. Hitt's Resolution passes the House and afterwards the Senate, of which there appears to be every probability, there will be an overture which those who are responsible for the welfare of Canada will have to accept or refuse. All the attempts to open markets for us in the moon have failed, and the Government will be called to say whether it is resolved or not that our natural market shall remain closed.

The Resolution of Mr. Voorhees has been at once pounced on by our Protectionists as a proof that the farmer in the United States is no better off than he is here and that consequently nothing would be gained by Commercial Union. But evidently it is a mere move of the party game and its representations must be discounted accordingly. To set off the measure of protection promised by the Republicans to the farmer, Mr. Voorhees on the part of the Democrats holds out the lure of some special measure of relief, hinting apparently at legislation on the subject of mortgages or a grant for their reduction. Of course, to give colour to his resolution, he overpaints the necessities of the case. Nobody who goes into the United States can imagine that distress reigns there. The very difficulty with which all these revenue reformers have to deal is a redundancy of revenue resulting from a plethora of wealth.

—The debate on the two commercial policies is opened by a resolution passed unanimously by the Manitoba Legislature

calling on the Dominion Government to negotiate with the American Government for Unrestricted Reciprocity. Saving Government or C. P. R. officials, there will not be a dissentient voice in Manitoba. Few things in the cruel history of monopoly are more cruel than the suffering of that country under our present commercial policy. Thirty-five per cent. on the settler's farm implements! And on what is the money to be spent? On the building in one of the Maritime Provinces of a needless railway for the purpose of securing the constituencies to the supporters of the Government.

—We hail the birth of another "native industry." A commercial gentleman has waited, it is announced, on the Minister of Finance to say that he proposes to start a canned soup factory, but he wants a duty of twenty per cent. on canned soup and a protective duty on imported tomatoes. This is Protectionism, like the tomatoes, raw and without the philosophic dressing. The gentleman knows that he cannot make canned soup so good and cheap as that which we are now using, so he proposes that a law shall pass forbidding the public to use any soup but his. Let him go to the Red Parlour and subscribe to the election fund. He will then get what he wants and his industry will become a "native industry," a position which the industry of the farmer who does not subscribe to the election fund has never attained. A sigh of pity may be wafted to the citizens whose stomachs are thus to be devoted to the support of 'a national policy.' Employment will be given to a number of people, including, perhaps, the druggists. That these people will be drawn from other and better employment is not considered. The orators of Protectionism might draw a fine picture of the prosperity which would thus spring out of nothing beneath the wave of the legislative wand.

One Ministerial journal so far "belittles the country" as to admit that trade is not in a very sound state, that the indica-

tions of an increased revenue are hollow, and that agriculture is suffering from depression. The remedy which it proposes is simple, a further increase of the Customs duties. The physicians in the good old times, whatever your malady might be, bled you. If you grew weaker under the loss of blood they bled you again; and so on till they had cured you of all maladies forever. Is it not rather surprising that at this time of day there should still be people who think that taxation is a source of national wealth, and that if a country when highly taxed does not grow rich you have only to tax it more highly still?

—Sir Charles Dilke has followed up his “Greater Britain” with “Problems of Greater Britain” in which he deals with Canada. He has not been here for some time. That his impressions are not fresh, appears from some little slips, such as the statement that in the House of Commons the seats are not divided down the middle, as in the English House, but are “placed in circular form after the pattern of Congress,” and a remark on our architecture made evidently before the improvement of house architecture in Toronto. He has got himself posted in events up to date; but it is easier to get posted in events than in their real character and bearing. Nor is it difficult to divine the general source of Sir Charles Dilke’s information. His account of Canadian institutions is such as would be furnished by an Ottawa Pundit, and his general account of us is such as the Canadian High Commissioner might give at a Conservative dinner party. All is prosperity. Confederation is a complete success, the C. P. R. has thoroughly welded us into a nation, Sir John Macdonald reigns in all hearts through the general enthusiasm in favour of the National Policy, there are hardly any annexationists, and “scandals of corruption are almost unknown.” The last compliment comes in aptly with the Rykert case and with the inklings given in connection with it of the methods by which parliamentary majorities are really gained.

“The growth in wealth,” says Sir Charles Dilke, “of the Dominion, by every test that can be applied, has been rapid since Confederation but more rapid since the adoption of the Protectionist policy than it was before that moment.” What are Sir Charles Dilke’s tests? The flower of our people have been leaving us and are still leaving us by thousands. The value of farm property in Ontario has sunk twenty-three millions in seven years, and the North-West remains unpeopled; while the success of the protected manufactures themselves may be measured by the avowal of the late Senator Macdonald at a meeting of the Board of Trade, that the capital invested in his branch of trade would not be worth more than 33 per cent. of its face value if exposed to free competition. Meantime the public debt has been growing apace. There has been of late a rush into Canada, as well as into the United States and other countries, of British capital seeking investment, which gives us a fillip, but is an addition to our debt. Sir Charles Dilke takes the growth of Toronto for an indication of general prosperity. But the true account of the matter is given in another part of his own book, where he describes the set of Australian population to the cities. Our towns and even our smaller cities are almost without exception stationary or in decay. The exodus, while it is a disastrous drain, is a safety-valve for the escape of discontent, without which more would be heard even in England about the real effects of Canadian Protection.

In the midst of his Imperialism Sir Charles lets fall some notable admissions. Not in his chapter on Canada but in his chapter on the West Indies, he says: “If there were no Custom Houses between Canada and the United States, the bulk of the Dominion trade—indeed, comparatively speaking, almost the whole of it—would be done by the Canadians with their continental neighbours.” He also says that “although the official position of the British Empire and the United States may be so distinct as to be sometimes antagonistic the peoples themselves are—not only in race and language, but in laws

and religion and in many matters of feeling—essentially one.” Sir Charles uses the orthodox map in which Canada appears as a vast solid block equal in area to the United States. If he will look at a map in which the cultivable and habitable parts of the Dominion are marked off from the ice and will combine the fact which it presents to him with the two facts first mentioned, and with what he cannot help knowing of the antagonism of races and religions between British Canada and Quebec, he will have the main elements of the problem all before him, and it might be instructive to hear his conclusion.

A large part of the work is dedicated to the question of Defence; and the impression made upon the reader is that the British Empire is, by reason of its vast extension and especially of the unprotected state of the Colonial dependencies, about the most vulnerable of all the Powers. Again and again Sir Charles calls on Canada to put herself in such a state of defence as to be able to maintain her independence against the United States. To do this no small part of our male population ought to be in arms, while our debt and taxes would be doubled. Our people know too well that against European attack they can at once defend themselves by withdrawing from the European connection and that from American attack they can at once defend themselves by Union. Sir Charles Dilke confesses that in Australia the sending of the Soudan Contingent was followed by a strong reaction and that the Defence Bill has since brought unpopularity on its authors. He has persuaded himself that the French of Quebec are now “the most loyal of all subjects.” They are not likely to revolt, but they are French; and if Sir Charles fancies that they would fight against France he never was more mistaken in his life. He lets us see plainly that in a war with France or any great power, the enemy’s ports in these days of steam could not be blockaded and that England would have to gather her navy round her own shores, leaving her distant dependencies and even her Mediterranean fortresses to their fate. He may rest assured that this would be the end of connection. He lays

it down that a small nation such as Canada could not form a union with a great nation such as the United States on equal terms, as though Scotland had not formed a union on equal terms with England: yet he calls upon the small nation to make itself the equal of the great nation as a military power.

Sir Charles Dilke is of course opposed as an Imperialist to Commercial Union, the advocates of which he says are illogical in not declaring for Free Trade, as though the choice were open to them. But in another part of his book, by an application of his Foreign Office knowledge, he incidentally and perhaps involuntarily does the cause a good service. "No doubt," he says in the chapter on the Cape, "Commercial Unions rest upon a different footing from other arrangements with regard to trade. There are Customs Unions of territories under different sovereigns in a number of cases, for example, between France and Monaco, between British India and Portuguese India, between the Austrian Empire and the Italian Kingdom respectively, and little States contained within them, as well as the arrangements in Germany under one general sovereignty. Foreign Powers do not object in the case of India to the free admission of Portuguese Indian products into British India, and it has now become usual to admit without question Customs Unions established on the basis of a common Customs frontier as regards foreign nations, and the suppression of the Customs frontier as regards the States forming the Union." Commercial Union then is perfectly practicable, there are several cases of it, and the most favoured nation clause does not stand in the way. If Monaco can have a Customs Union with France and Portuguese India with British India without loss of political independence surely Canada might have a Customs Union with the United States without risk of political absorption. Sir Charles also admits that England would consent, though reluctantly, to a Commercial Union of Canada with the United States as she did to the imposition by colonies of protective duties on British goods.

There is one problem, and the most pressing of all, with

which Sir Charles Dilke nowhere deals. The commercial unity of the Empire, having been completely broken up, the Mother Country having resigned every vestige of political power, and nothing really remaining but mutual liabilities perilous to both parties, what is the use of the present political connection? This we say is a problem with which Sir Charles neglects to deal. He incidentally glances at certain advantages, such as the resort of wealthy Colonists to the Mother Country, and the political service which the Colonies render the Mother Country by trying for her experiments in democracy. But the first, if it is a gain to the Mother Country, is a loss socially and politically as well as financially to the Colonies and as to the second, the Mother Country, a land of factory hands, farm labourers, and Irish peasantry, had better take care how she follows the political lead of colonial democracies in which intelligence is general and property is widely diffused.

It is impossible to read one of these "Greater Britains" or promiscuous surveys of the British Empire without noting the fallacy which they all involve. The Hindoos are not "Britons," nor are the negroes of the West Indies, or the French of Canada. On the other hand, a self-governing and virtually independent Colony is most improperly designated as a part of an Empire, an Empire being a centralized dominion. An ancient European Kingdom, cast in a monarchical and aristocratical world; a number of young democracies in America, in the Pacific, or in South Africa; a vast Empire peopled with Asiatics totally ignorant and incapable of self-government; a group of tropical islands inhabited by negroes;—who can believe that all these have a common interest and a common destiny, or that you can secure their ultimate cohesion by casting over them the drag-net of a fallacious name?

—It can hardly be supposed that the Ontario Government will allow the Public Schools to be used for the purpose of indoctrinating the children with anti-Continental sentiment

That was the real object of the deputation which waited on the Minister of Education to propose that the national flag should be hoisted over the schoolhouses on a number of anniversaries. The anniversaries which these patriots love best are not those of memorable epochs in the history of our civilization such as we should wish the children of the community to cherish in their memories: they are those of battles between us and people of our race who are our partners on this Continent and in its hopes. The effect would be to tear open wounds almost healed by the hand of time, and to strip off the grass with which kind nature is clothing the grave of an extinct feud. It is not in the hearts of children, at all events, that the seeds of international hatred ought to be sown. If you want to make converts to a dangerous policy address yourselves to men. Some of the cavaliers who head this and other anti-American demonstrations are, as readers of Sabine's *Loyalists of the American Revolution* know, the representatives of a family feud with the Americans. At the time of the Civil War their feelings led them into figuring as ardent partisans of the Slave Power. We have to share this continent with the Americans, and good relations with them must always be of vital consequence to the great body of our people. Besides, who are Americans and who are Canadians? Are the two millions of Canadians or children of Canadians on the other side of the line, including perhaps near relatives of the trumpeters of enmity themselves, to be classed with the hated foes over whom we triumphed at Detroit or Queens-ton Heights? Not only are we bound up in interest with the people of the United States, but if we are to be an independent nation we must be content, at least whenever the force of England is diverted by war, to owe our independence to their justice and forbearance, since their power is enormously greater than ours and hatred, however passionate, is no bulwark. Would it not then be more dignified on our part to refrain from demonstrations of ill-feeling? In proposing to transfer the honour of discovery from Columbus to Cabot,

the patriots have at once come into collision with the French, who claim priority for Cartier. If they do not wish to make themselves and us a laughingstock, they had better let Columbus alone. The heroic memories of those who defended Canada in the two wars are enshrined in history, and are only sullied when they are invoked by those who had no part in their exploits, to kindle passions which if they were now alive very likely they would not share.

—On the other side of the line, General James Wilson, Mr. Wiman's antagonist in the discussion of Commercial Union at Wilmington, shows a spirit not less heroic than that of our flaming patriots. Like all the extreme Annexationists in the United States, he is opposed to Commercial Union. He wants to annex Canada by hostile pressure if not by force. He even lays what he thinks the moral ground for a future invasion. He asserts that the right of Great Britain to Canada is solely that of conquest, and he contends that the Colonists who did a good share of the fighting have never had their just share of what was won. This he thinks "fixes a taint upon the character of England's title which might become fatal if we should find our permanent and paramount interest impelling us towards the acquisition of her American dependencies." That the Colonists bore a share of the war is true, but they were requited by the security of their own settlements from French aggression. In the actual conquest of Quebec their effort was represented by about three hundred American Rangers who were apparently in British pay. But suppose they had done not only a share of the fighting but the whole of it; if two solemn treaties, that of 1784 and that of 1815, besides a number of minor treaties in which the right of Great Britain to Canada is recognized by the United States, cannot quiet a title what can? The gallant general had better look into his own title to Delaware, which was a Swedish settlement conquered by the Dutch of New Amsterdam, who in

their turn were conquered by a British fleet. He expresses regret that the Americans did not invade and conquer Canada with the army and fleet which they had at the close of the civil war. To say nothing of the chance of a third miscarriage, which a coalition of France, then embarked on her Mexican enterprise, with England might have rendered possible, the commonest morality would have forbidden such an outrage on the independence of Canada, who had committed no act of hostility and had done her utmost, under trying circumstances to observe her neutral obligations. We do the American people the justice to believe that they would not have consented to such an abuse of their power. Nor would the unwisdom of the step have been less manifest than its unrighteousness. A despotism may annex, a democracy must incorporate: by incorporating a conquered Canada the American democracy would have been introducing disaffection into its own vitals and preparing for itself a new rebellion at the North. But of this our people may feel assured: their destiny is in their own hands. The Americans generally desire nothing but a free union, such as may be discussed, as that of Scotland with England was discussed, without dishonour or breach of allegiance on either side.

—We said that it is not impossible that the outcome of the present fermentation in the Spanish Peninsula may be an Iberian Republic in a federal form, including Portugal. We are asked, if Spain and Portugal can be united in a Federal Republic how it should be impracticable for British and French Canada to remain united on the same footing. The answer is the map, which shows that the unity of the Peninsula and its separation from the rest of Europe have been as clearly decreed by nature as any political arrangement can be; not less clearly than the unity of our own Continent. Portugal is a Province of Spain detached by historical accident. The Portuguese race though more mixed than the Spanish is of the same stock: the

Portuguese language though it approaches in some points nearer to the French is radically identical with the Spanish and was once used in Castile. The religion of both nations is the same and has cast their characters to a great extent in the same mould. Both have undergone pretty much the same political training. There is no sharp antagonism between them of any kind, nor if they were now to unite would there be any estranging memory of conquest such as a glance at the school histories of Quebec will show that there is in New France. False analogies are sometimes instructive by throwing essential differences into relief. After all, we have never said that a federal union of British and French Canada is impracticable, provided that the political veto, as a controlling power over divergent tendencies, is retained.

—Some discoveries in relation to Rideau Hall have called attention to the waste of nearly a million there since Confederation. One member ventured to raise the real question, 'What is the use of an office which having been constitutionally stripped of every vestige of power can have no active functions?' On the Governor-Generalship and the Lieutenant-Governships we have spent since Confederation about six millions, and what benefit have we derived from all this pseudo-monarchical gimcrackery? The dinners and balls of Government House can be shared only by residents at Ottawa, and it is doubtful whether to these they do much good. Lord Dufferin's reign of splendour caused government clerks to sell their pianos. Politically, the mockery of monarchy does nothing but blind us to the sinister action of the Prime Minister and lead us to put up with abuses which otherwise we should not bear, such as electioneering dissolutions of Parliament and the use of nominations to the Senate as part of a bribery fund. Why is it that hollow figments while they are scouted in every other walk of life should in politics be thought salutary and essential? What do we gain by praying every Sunday in church

that God will enable the Governor-General and the Lieutenant-Governors to use well the delegated power which we do not allow them to use at all? Is even the wholesome respect for real authority cultivated by a misdirection of reverence to mere pasteboard? The people will soon be ready for these questions.

We are so far from being actuated by any revolutionary spirit in this matter that we have ourselves contended for the retention of such shreds of authority as were still left the Governor-General. Especially we have contended for his retention of the prerogative of dissolution as our only security against a system of tenure during the pleasure of the Prime Minister which would be subversive of the rights of the electorate as well as of the independence of Parliament, and if combined with the unscrupulous use of a large patronage and of government appropriations might prolong indefinitely the ascendancy of a bad Minister. We thought we might appeal for confirmation of our plea to the constitutional practice of the Mother Country. But Sir Charles Dilke tells us that now the continuance of a British Parliament after its third or fourth year depends entirely on the pleasure of the Prime Minister. He will not find this doctrine, we believe, in any constitutional writer, and we are very sure that if a statesman of the last generation had been asked where was the prerogative of dissolution, he would have answered that it was in the Queen. Such certainly was the belief of Sir Edmund Head. A female reign has perhaps been favourable to encroachment. But supposing the British doctrine to be what Sir Charles says it is, we have another instance of the folly of keeping us in the leading-strings of a community the character and circumstances of which are different from ours. In England the exercise of the prerogative by a party leader would be restrained by traditions hardly less effective than laws, and preserved by a standing, and to a large extent, hereditary body of statesmen. In communities like ours, if the Governor-General had no restraining voice the power would be arbitrary and would be liable to the grossest abuse. Sir Charles's limit of three or four

years, resting on nothing stronger than tradition, would be set aside as soon as a minister was strongly tempted by a favourable outlook, or fear of an impending change of weather, to go at once to the country. In fact, the same limit would not be applicable to the case of the Canadian as to that of the British Parliament, the term of our Parliament being shorter by two years. In the United States there is hardly such a thing as a traditional restraint. Everybody in office uses his authority to the full legal extent. The safeguards are the legal limit and the fixed term. No other safeguards are to be trusted here.

—In admitting the authenticity of the letters, Mr. Rykert pleaded guilty; nor, though he had a full opportunity of stating his case, had he anything to say in extenuation. He did nothing but abuse the police, a performance for which he has every qualification. The relegation of his case to the Committee of Privileges is therefore a judicial form. Mr. Rykert however, is the least part of the matter. Much more serious is the state of public morality revealed by his triumphant re-election in Lincoln, when the constituency had full evidence of his character before them, and by the conduct of the Prime Minister in twice attempting to make him Deputy Speaker and designating him for the Senate. Sir Richard Cartwright said that the Rykert case was only one which had come to light out of many. Mr. Rykert alludes in the letters to the sons of two ministers as useful agents for the purpose which he had in view. Both of them have sent in denials in the present case. But in *The Globe* of May 5th, 1886, will be found the exhibits of a law-suit brought on by a quarrel in the Winnipeg firm of which one of the two is the active member. These relate to the promotion of transactions in timber limits, coal mines or land claims, and seem to prove that a traffic in personal influence at Ottawa was going on. That the services were not professional but personal appears from the refusal of those by whom they were rendered

to bring them into account with the firm. In each transaction the promoters received a share exceeding a professional fee—two ninths, one sixth, or even a half. The *Globe* would appear not to have gone far beyond the mark in saying that everybody who wanted land or coal or lumber, whether in the North-West or in Manitoba or in the once disputed territory, hired the son of a minister to make the application and gave him a share of the plunder. We note, too, that at the same time there was a burst of indignation from the Winnipeg Junior Bar against “foreign influence” which had been exerted to deprive the oldest and most respected of the local firms of business in favour of the connections of the Government. “Highway robbery under a professional disguise” it was called by an eminent authority who took part. It cannot be said, at all events, that Sir Richard Cartwright’s statement is reckless.

After all, your man walks away with his \$70,000, while some underpaid and overtempted bank clerk goes to gaol. Why should there not be a distinct law, with adequate penalties, against political corruption? The crime is perfectly capable of legal definition and of legal proof, while, as Mr. Weldon says, it is of all crimes the highest. No ordinary fraud at least bears comparison with that with which Mr. Rykert stands charged. The proper tribunal is not a Committee of Privileges, but a criminal court of justice. Why cannot Mr. Weldon, who spoke nobly on this occasion, take the matter in hand? Every honourable journalist would rejoice if the law could be extended to corrupt dealings with the public press.

—A Senator from Alberta says that something must be done to people the North-West and he proposes assisted emigration. Assisted emigration if it brings people at all will not bring people of the right sort. Nor will touting and spouting in England, which is another proposed nostrum, be of any use: even Hodge by this time knows better than

to be taken in by touters or spouters. What the North-West wants is not so much that something should be done as that something should be undone. Throw down the barrier, let the floating population of this Continent, which the other day made such a rush into Oklohama, enter freely and the North-West will be peopled. Do away at the same time with the thirty-five per cent. on farm implements and let the North-West settler have a free market to buy and sell in. Bring the territory, in a word, within the commercial pale of its own Continent; prosperity and population will then come hand in hand. Otherwise they will not come, apply what emigration-pumps you will. But, as Mr. Martin says, the first object with Ottawa is not the peopling or the commercial development of the North-West: the first object is its vote; and this can be more easily secured while the country is in a poor way and its constituencies are open to petty inducements than it would be if the country were full and rich. If the first object of Ottawa had been the commercial development of the North-West railway monopoly would not have been so persistently maintained nor would the North-Western farmer be now paying the implement tax.

—Mr. Davin, it seems, has been arraigned by some of his constituents for his vote on the Dual Language question. The *Regina Leader* defends him thus: "It is easy for people who have no responsibility to talk. Mr Davin has to get certain things done for his constituency. There are public buildings to be got, changes in the law, certain things for individuals in every part of Western Assiniboia. These are practical material advantages. How can he get such things done if he loses influence with the Government?" There is the secret of the misrepresentation of the North-West and of the abandonment of its great interests at Ottawa. The Government keeps the representation in its hands by means of "public buildings" and by doing "certain things" for individuals. Recent

disclosures have shown, as Sir Richard Cartwright has pointed out, that it has not overlooked the Press. The North-West and Manitoba as a portion of it would be much better off if they were not represented at Ottawa at all. But if they are to be represented and if their great interests are to be dealt with there, they must manage to have an independent representation. It is difficult, no doubt, because in a new settlement there are few good men who can spare time. Manitoba is lucky in having Mr. Watson. But if necessary the electors must for a time suspend their excessive localism and choose representatives above Government influence and temptation of any kind wherever such men can be found. Let them remember that their present delegation failed to uphold their interest on the railway monopoly question vital as that was to the very existence of the settlement. The Local Legislature is good, because its electors feel a direct interest in the questions, and because the best local men can find time to attend it. After all, the men who figure and are elected as locals are sometimes mere casuals without any stake in the country or connection with its great interests. A non-resident, if he was strong and independent, would be just as likely to get all that was right done for local interests or individuals as a weak and servile resident.

—It is rumoured that the Manitoba Separate School Bill will be vetoed by the Lieutenant-Governor at the instance of the Dominion Government. There can be no foundation for the report. Sir John Macdonald is estopped by his own action and declaration from making any such use of the Lieutenant-Governor, and from holding any intercourse with him for a party purpose. The only ground which Sir John could assign for the dismissal of Lieutenant-Governor Letellier was that he had acted as a party man and that it was necessary absolutely to debar Lieutenant-Governors from assuming a party character for the future.

--The preliminary examination in the Benwell case has been conducted with a publicity which would be appropriate not to a trial but to a plebiscite. The whole community has been sharing the chase. We agree with Mr. Meredith, that the Government would do well to look to its detective service. Not only does a detective, instead of hunting silently, let himself be interviewed, but he allows it to be seen that he has staked his professional reputation on the conviction of his man. When this is the case liabilities arise. In Ireland, a good many years ago, a murder was committed and the wadding of the murderer's gun having been picked up was found to be a leaf of a school-book. Suspicion fell upon a man in the neighbourhood who kept such books. A large reward was offered and a detective was sent down. The detective got admission to the house and found there, as he said, the book with the fatal leaf torn out. The house was then entered by the police and the book was brought to Dublin. But the law officers before proceeding took the precaution of sending the book for inspection to the publisher, who reported that it was the right book but not the right edition. The detective, to make evidence, had taken the book to the house and left it there after tearing out the leaf. It is not unlikely that if the quarry escapes in the present instance, he will owe his escape to the too manifest eagerness of the hunter.

To discuss the case of a man held for trial would be unfair. Let us substitute for the name of the accused in the Benwell case any other name, that for example of the English William Palmer. William Palmer was a medical man of sporting habits who when he wanted money for the turf was in the habit of obtaining it by means of policies of life insurance followed by scientific administration of antimony and strychnine. He went on for a long time pleasantly enough, being greatly looked up to in his neighbourhood, and was detected only through an accident which obliged him to precipitate his operations. We are led to ask ourselves the reason why, assuming the truth of the Agnostic theory and of Evolution, the trade of

murder should not be plied as Palmer plied it? If Evolution is true there is nothing in the origin of man to make human life sacred. If Agnosticism is true there is no All-seeing Eye, there is no hereafter, and conscience has no authority beyond that of accumulated tribal experience. Why then should it be immeasurably worse to kill a man and live upon his spoils than to kill a sheep and live upon the mutton? If we say that murder is against the common interest of mankind, the difficulty is only put off a stage. We have still to show why the man should sacrifice his individual interest to the interest of mankind at large. If we say that the murderer will be doing violence to his own sensibilities and preparing for himself the hell of remorse, many murderers and many men of the character of Napoleon will be able to say that they are happily free from sensibilities and that they can enjoy their dinner as well after a murder or a wholesale butchery as they could before it. It comes apparently to this, that murder being a practice most injurious to the community, the community if it catches the murderer will hang him. But very often, probably, the community does not catch the murderer; it was by the merest accident and apparently after several failures that it caught him in the Palmer case; he always hopes at any rate that he will escape. You see hanging on the brink of a precipice when nobody is by a man whose life alone stands between you and a great inheritance. You push him over, succeed to the inheritance, and live in ease and opulence for the rest of your days, making perhaps a liberal and popular use of your wealth. Provided you are free from superstition, including groundless reverence for accumulated tribal experience, why should you not be happy as well as rich? We propose this question to the philosophical debating clubs, not in a spirit of captious orthodoxy, but because it is the question before us and points to the deepest question of all.

—The hapless victim of the murderer was one of a class to which as much sympathy is due as to classes on which more

of it is bestowed, the sons of the English gentry, compelled by the overcrowding of the professions to seek bread not only in a strange land but in menial or manual employment. There are men in this country tending cattle who have taken an Oxford or Cambridge degree, and have been brought up not only in comfort but refinement. When these youths come out here to farm they often do not know to what they are really coming. They picture to themselves the life of the English farmer riding round to superintend his labourers and in the hunting season often following the hounds. A chill comes over them when they find they have to work with their own hands. This is the chief lesson which the gentleman-emigrant has to learn. At least if there is anything else, he can learn it best by taking a course at the Agricultural College at Guelph, which appears now to be in excellent order. The system of farm-pupils [never, we suspect, gave the pupil his money's worth, and it was always liable to abuse. A company was formed some time ago to supply a trustworthy agency for the purchase of farms by emigrants; but it sank beneath the expense of advertising and circulating information. Could not the operations of the Emigration Office be extended to this field?

—Though the majority against the Government candidates in the St. Pancras election was not large and there was no great change in the relative members, the defeat is about the most damaging which Lord Salisbury has encountered. The candidates were well matched and the fight in every respect was fair. The Metropolis was the great Conservative stronghold and at the last election gave immense majorities for the Union. But before the Local Government Act London demagogism was comparatively unorganized and the constituencies were largely governed by the Press which was in the hands of men usually above the ward politician. The Local Government Act has supplied demagogism with a machine, as

its authors were warned that it would. Apart from the well-known tendency of bye-elections to go against the Government, the general account of these losses is that since the question of Home Rule has for the time passed out of sight, the rank and file of the Liberal Unionists have been straggling back into the Liberal camp. When, after the joint victory of the Conservatives and Liberal Unionists in the last general election, the question of coalition was under discussion the leaders of the Liberal Unionists were warned that it would prove impracticable to induce a section of the Liberal party to remain permanently separate from the rest for the purpose of acting as a crutch to a Conservative government. They were told that in elections Liberal-Unionism would be crushed beneath the upper and nether millstones; that the rank and file would desert; and that even members of Parliament would become tired of a position, which, besides putting their seats in jeopardy, involved a renunciation on their part of office and of power, though their chiefs might be taken into council by the Government. But Lord Hartington was weary and fastidious. while some of those about him were perhaps still dreaming of a reconciliation with Mr. Gladstone and a return under him to office. On the other hand there are, as we have said, Tories narrow and selfish enough to wish at any risk to the country to keep office to themselves. All these politicians will soon have to make up their minds, for the barque is drawing near the rapids.

—It might have been supposed that when police disclosures took place of the hideous vices which have always haunted and, till human nature is treated more scientifically than it is now, will always haunt the purlieus of great and luxurious cities, the instinct not only of a gentleman but of a civilized being, would lead him to leave the filth to the policeman and not sully his own lips or soul with it. That even Mr. Labouchere should have been able to make political capital of such ordure

in the House of Commons without being crushed by the general disgust, shows what a change the character of the House has undergone. It is almost surprising that on the point of order, when Mr. Labouchere accused Lord Salisbury of lying, the House should have mustered courage to deal with this man whose command of a "social" paper is the real source of his impunity. Suppose Lord Salisbury was not a member of the House, was that a reason why the House of Commons should allow its own debates to be disgraced by breaches of social decency, and its privileges to be abused by offering under their cover a gross insult to an absent man whose high position, while it exposed him to the attack, disabled him from personally resenting it. If Lord Salisbury was not in the House his son was; and had his son allowed his anger at a gross insult offered his father to hurry him into some violent and irregular exhibition of resentment, the House, had it neglected its own social duty, might have had reason to be shocked but would have had no reason to complain.

—The bubble of "Randy's" reputation seems to have burst at last. Unscrupulous the man not only is but professes to be. In that respect, at all events, the mantle of his "Elijah" has fallen upon him. But he never had any real gift save that of talking smart rowdyism, which pleased the music halls from the lips of a lord. At least if he had any other gift it was that of intrigue. That he should have ever become a power was one of the most sinister features of the situation. Lord Salisbury showed the weakness, of which there is an element in his character, by allowing Lord Randolph's cabal against Sir Stafford Northcote to succeed and rewarding it with the leadership of the House of Commons. He did worse. He allowed Lord Randolph to entangle him in an alliance with the Parnellites for the overthrow of the Liberal Government and to abandon the Crimes Act as the price of their support. This disgraceful and fatal move was the beginning of the mis-

chief. It threw Gladstone into the arms of Parnell. Very different would now be the situation, and very different Lord Salisbury's own position, if he had said in answer to such tempters that though the opponent of Mr. Gladstone and desirous of ousting him from power he was before all things a British nobleman, and that he would never embarrass the Queen's Government while it was defending the integrity of the nation against foreign enemies and domestic treason. Had the grace been given him to take that course he would now be in real power. But Party is not the school of patriotism or of honour.

—What dirge is loud and pathetic enough for the fall of Bismarck? It is an ominous comment on personal government that a youth fresh in power and intoxicated with it, as unsteady as he is ambitious, lurching from Chauvinism to mock Socialism, should be able at his imperial will and pleasure to cashier the creator and preserver of German unity, the man whose mighty genius has wrought what few men have ever wrought for a nation. We almost look in vain among the giants of history for one who has achieved such things and borne such a weight of responsibility. Bismarck's faults were but the shadows of his great qualities, while the union in him of Militarism with Liberalism was as rare as it was indispensable to the work that was to be done. He was the man for whom Destiny waited, as she often, when all else is ready, has to wait for the man. The other day his work and that of Von Moltke were in danger from the intrigues of the Empress; now he is cast from power by the vanity of her son. Were the crisis of Germany's fate over, the Man of Iron might be spared, perhaps even his retirement might be seasonable as opening the way for an era not of iron; but with France and Russia in their present attitude the crisis of Germany's fate is not over, nor is the crisis in Europe's fate, which is bound up with the fate of Germany. It will now be seen whether

Phaeton can guide the chariot of the sun any better for having a crown upon his head. Bismarck's age makes it very doubtful whether if necessity should once more call for the man and not the shadow, he can ever take the reins again. But Herbert Bismarck, though he has hitherto appeared in an equivocal light, is said by good judges to inherit more of his father's qualities than is supposed, and to be capable of becoming, at need, the pillar of the State.

—The German Emperor's attempt to outbid Socialism has met the usual and the deserved fate of such manœuvres. His International Conference is not likely to come to much. It has proved hitherto impossible to get the working-men of different nations to agree to the same restrictions; and if the workman of one nation handicaps himself those of the other nations will take advantage of him. The English workman under the guidance of Mr. Burns is in a fair way to drive trade from England.

Socialism is a very vague term and is being much misapplied. Genuine Socialism means nothing less than the total subversion of a civilization founded on industrial liberty, private contract and private property. This has not yet anywhere made great way or got political power into its hands. On this Continent it has scarcely gained a footing even in opinion. In France, or rather at Paris in 1848, it for a moment in the person of Louis Blanc mounted to power and founded the national workshops which at once and ignominiously failed. But the name "Socialistic" is applied to mere extensions of the action of the Government, the limit of whose regulative functions must always be a question of experience, and may vary greatly in different circumstances, in different stages of civilization and in different nations. There are people who call the factory laws socialistic and exult in them as a triumph over political economy, as though any sane economist had ever denied that law must protect those who cannot pro-

tect themselves. All law restrains liberty of private action, and might, at this rate, be called Socialistic. Factory laws are so far from being opposed to political economy that they fulfil its purposes by preserving the efficiency of labour which would be marred by overworking the child or the mother. State construction and ownership of railways and telegraphs, again, whether desirable or not, are no more a breach of the laws of political economy than State construction and ownership of highways and ships of war. As to German Socialism it appears to be in the main a local revolt against the military system, the burden of taxation, and the grinding usury of the Jew. The same people when they come over here are, with the exception of a few maniacs such as Herr Most, quiet and ordinary citizens. Reduction of armaments is what Germany above all countries needs; but it is hardly possible while Russia on one side and France on the other continue to grind their swords. To imagine that the Pope could be accepted as arbiter of disarmament is preposterous. He would disarm the Protestant nations.

—The world is sometimes led by verbal fallacies into practical errors. We have mentioned as an instance of this the word “money,” the equivocal use of which has led Governments to fancy that because it was their province to guarantee and regulate the coin it was also their province and their right to regulate the circulation of bank-bills and appropriate the profit. “Labour” is another fallacious word, which is betraying us into practical aberrations. We talk of labour, the dignity of labour and the claims of labour, applying the terms solely to those who labour with their hands, in fact almost exclusively to the mechanics. All alike labour—the farmer, the storekeeper, the clerk, the millowner, the schoolmaster, the lawyer, the minister and the physician, as well as the mechanic—though nobody proposes for anybody but the mechanic an eight hours law. The farmer at times works fifteen

hours and the lawyer as much. Labour is simply the means by which all but the few who have inherited property live: there is no dignity about it except that which belongs to work well done; nor can any man or set of men claim special privileges or honour in its name. On this subject there is a good deal of nonsense to be cleared away. People are repeating the complaint of John Stuart Mill that hardly any of the working-class labour for themselves, meaning that they do not themselves use or consume what they make. Who does? The pastry-cook does not eat his own pies, nor the druggist swallow his own pills. All who work work for wages in one form or another, not for the specific article which they produce. Let us not make sham grievances when there are real grievances enough in the world.

—The strong point of the Russian character is not veracity and Stepniak is a Russian. We receive therefore with allowance all narratives of atrocities which come from that quarter. But whatever may have happened no man who has not taken leave of good sense and morality will give his sympathy to Nihilism. Nihilism, like the Clan-na-Gael, is a murder club; and no murder club ever has helped or ever will help the progress of humanity. Nihilism is believed to be made up chiefly of five elements, not one of which is likely to lead the world or any community in the path of wisdom: wild students, the women whom they inspire, dismissed or discontented servants of the Government, intriguing Jews, and destitute sons of the clergy. The clergy in Russia are all married, are all poor, and their sons, too much educated to stoop to manual labour, are often, in the close hierarchy of Russian professions and callings, unable to find a place. The creed of the Nihilists is destruction, not political only but social, domestic and moral. They do not represent the Russian people, which if the question were to-morrow put to the vote would decide by an overwhelming majority in favour of the autocracy of the Czar. Their only

constituency is Chaos. The effect of their murderous agitation has been to discredit moderate reforms which were before making way, and to silence moderate reformers who are afraid of being tainted by the association. Alexander II. not only emancipated the serfs but outstripped both the aptitudes and the wishes of his people in grants of local self-government. His reward was assassination. His heir was not likely to follow in his footsteps. Nor is it surprising that the constant fear of assassination, notoriously the most maddening of all fears, should goad the Czar to acts of cruelty, the responsibility for which falls mainly on the Nihilists themselves.

—Another French Ministry, the twenty-fifth since France became a Republic, has ended its ephemeral existence. They are born and die like flies in summer. From France to Australia every thing shows that Party is in a hopeless state of disintegration and can no longer form a basis for a government. Sectionalism gains ground daily and discipline can no more be maintained. This will be seen here as soon as the bribery fund fails and the lynch-pin of personal ascendancy drops out. France grows weary of instability, and the finances, drained by the effort to prepare for revenge, are in the worst condition. The success of the Exhibition largely helped to give Republicanism its victory at the last election. Even Boulangeism though defeated is not extinct. The fall of the Republic would be felt beyond France; for the "electric chain" now binds all the European nations very closely together. English politics would be affected, probably not less than they were by the fall of Charles X., though in the opposite way.

—Of Nationalization of Land we believe we may take a long farewell. In more than one of the Australasian colonies it gained a sufficient hold upon the minds of some of the politicians to bring it within the field of practical politics, and in

New Zealand a transient attempt was made to retain the fee simple of the land in the hands of the State granting only leases to the settlers. But it was soon found that freehold ownership was the life of husbandry, and as mechanics and the people generally became owners of their holdings they went over to the side of property. Long leases could not be granted without violating Mr. George's canon that all private ownership is wrong. The Torrens System wherever it has prevailed, by facilitating the acquisition of land, has been the death of confiscation. On this as well as on the economical ground we are glad to see that an advance toward the better application of the system in this Province has been made by the Premier of Ontario, though he still drives his chariot somewhat heavily.

A stimulus has been given by Mr. George's book among the revolutionary masses of Great Britain to hatred of great landowners and to the general craving for confiscation. On this continent, the realm of freehold farmers, the movement never made the slightest way. Instead of "Nationalization of Land" is now inscribed upon the banner of the party "The Single Tax," a totally different proposal and indeed one contradictory of the original device, since in taxing a man on anything you imply that it is his own. The single tax is not new, but when proposed before it was with reference to countries in which almost all of the wealth was in land. What reason or justice would there be in taxing a farmer and letting a Rothschild or a Jay Gould go free? The consequence of throwing the whole burden of taxation on land would almost certainly be the discouragement of farming and the scarcity, or at all events the dearness, of bread.

—We have never said that great inequalities of property were not an evil. What we say is that the desire of property is the only known motive power of production and that you must take it with its evils. It is however difficult to see how, without certain gradations of wealth and a class lifted above

manual labour, civilization and progress could exist. On the whole it is wonderful how little mischief millionaires have as yet done. A distinction must be drawn between fortunes which like that of Mr. Brassey are made by taking a small percentage on a number of beneficent enterprises, and fortunes made like that of the Rothschilds by manipulating the circulating medium, or, like the vast Astor hoard, to which notice was called the other day, out of toll paid by industry to a race of land-owning drones. If the newspapers told the truth, an Astor lady once went to a Presidential reception with so many diamonds on her that a detective was required to guard them. Schemes for enabling the thriftless to rob the thrifty, which are now so rife, would do harm not only to the thrifty but in the end to the thriftless themselves, who after wasting the substance of the thrifty would be more thriftless than ever. But there is no reason why legislators should not do what they can to discourage immoderate accumulation. The British Parliament passed the Thelusson Act with that object. There could be no objection to a graduated succession duty.

—The Church of the Past, though in its despair it may dally with revolution, still shows itself on practical occasions the Church of the Past. The Archbishop of Paris denounces cremation as unspiritual and anti-Christian. With all due respect for His Grace we prefer the opinion of the late Bishop of Manchester, Dr. Fraser, who was spiritual enough though not superstitious or fantastic, and who told his diocese that it mattered not in a Christian point of view how we disposed of the dead body. The unspiritual view of the matter surely is that which ties the spirit to the cast-off clay by treating the clay as though it were still dignified by the presence of the spirit. In spite of all denunciation, and of the most deeply rooted of all prejudices, cremation gains ground. The next generation may witness the adoption of a cleaner and safer mode of disposing of the dead than the protraction of decay by coffin

burial, and at the same time see an end of those hideous processions through the streets, and of the struggle of posthumous vanities for pre-eminence in the monumental monstrosities of our graveyards. The Egyptian was a thorough-going materialist and he embalmed the body: we are half materialists and prolong the process of corruption. If we could feel at all for our remains our feeling would surely lead us to desire that they should not slowly putrefy in a box, but that they should mingle again as speedily as possible with the universal frame.

—The debate about Jesuit morality goes on, but with little fruit. There is really nothing to be added to what Pascal has said, and no Protestant can speak with half so much force as the great Roman Catholic writer. That the Jesuits constructed an elastic casuistry for the consciences of the rich and powerful whom they desired to draw to their confessionals and subject to their influence is as certain as any fact in history. But they were sure not to profess immorality or fail to leave themselves loopholes of escape. If you want to fix them with the doctrine that 'the end justifies the means' look at the annals of their conduct, at the part they played in regard to the Catholic League, the Thirty Years' War, the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, the extermination of the Huguenots, the conspiracy of James II. against English liberty, the assassination of heretic princes, the Sonderbund and the Franco-German War, remembering that every act of a Jesuit is the act of the Order and must be in accordance with its Institutes and sanctioned by its head.

—We so far go with the advocates of a Single Tax as to hold that real estate is the best basis of municipal taxation. The apportionment may not be strictly just, but it is roughly so, and the values are capable of ascertainment. Alderman Halam has put forth a strong plea for the abolition of exemp-

tions, and if they were not defended by the political influence of a powerful sect exemptions would before this have been abolished. One thing is certain, a municipal government has no right to tax any property but that to which it renders service, and the tax ought to be as far as possible in proportion to the service rendered. It has no right to anything which is beyond its jurisdiction and which receives from it no benefit. From the national government all property, whether real or personal, and wherever invested, receives benefit, inasmuch as the laws protect it. Even money invested in a foreign country is to a certain extent protected by the diplomatic action of the national government and by its co-operation with other national governments in the maintenance of international law. But property held or money invested outside a municipality receives from the municipal government no benefit whatever. The income tax with which Ontario is specially cursed is even as a national tax at once the most odious and the least productive; and the Americans after trial have rejected it on that account; but as a municipal tax it is flagrantly unjust.

—The University fire by clearing the ground gave an opportunity of putting the finishing stroke to confederation of which we wish the Government had availed itself. The best course, we venture to submit, would have been to abolish University College, to turn the staff definitively into the staff of the University, and reconstruct the buildings as a set of University lecture rooms and offices, leaving the students to board in the Confederated Colleges or in private houses. A student's residence in College is a questionable institution except under such control and influence as a religious College is supposed to afford. In the English Colleges which were taken as the model, the Fellows live, or till the recent relaxation of the rule of celibacy did live, within the College, so that the juniors were always under the eye of the seniors. The presence within the building of a single officer has not the same effect.

THE BYSTANDER.

MAY, 1890.

THE Government has now thrown over Reciprocity in natural products and committed itself to Protection all round. Between this move on our side and the McKinley Resolution on the other side we have before us a tariff war. The motive however is the same on both sides and on both sides is not commercial but political. The Republicans at Washington and the Tories here are alike bidding for the farmer's vote at the next election. Each party stands self-condemned for not having thought of extending to the farmer the blessings of protection before it found itself in pressing need of his vote; but we will venture to say that neither feels remorse. Thus it is that the questions vital to the welfare of the people fare in the whirligig of the party game. Who asks or cares whether all those additions to flour duties and fruit duties will or will not make food and little luxuries dearer to the people. We will venture to say that when the leaders of what is called the Conservative party embraced Protection as the means of recovering power they had undergone no change of mind on the commercial question or even given it any fresh consideration: they had merely counted the votes which Protection would bring. In fact they masked, and not only masked but disclaimed, their intention till they were sure that Protection was the winning card. If six good commercial men from the United States could be empowered to meet six from Canada and settle the question on the purely commercial ground, that jury would soon place the

trade relations of the two countries on the best basis, while all the hobgoblins which politicians conjure up to scare the people from the pursuit of their real good would disappear.

There was no mistaking the fact that the return of the Republicans to power boded ill not only for tariff reform but for the improvement of trade relations with Canada. The Republicans are on the whole not only the Protectionist but the Jingo party; indeed Protectionism and Jingoism usually go together, because it is the interest of the Jingo to keep up national feeling against the foreigner whose goods he wishes to exclude. Hopes were entertained of Mr. Blaine, who it was thought might read the stars and have an eye to the future. Mr. Blaine is a man of sense. But his part as a Republican leader is cast, and even if he were ready for a change himself he could not carry his party round with him. A protected manufacturer cares for the party only because it opposes tariff reform. Sir Robert Peel's personal ascendancy, towering as it was, failed to carry his party with him in his change of policy on the Corn Laws. It might have seemed indeed that Commercial Union, which would reduce revenue and at the same time extend trade without prejudice to the principle of Protection, was the very policy to suit the Republicans situated as they were; but probably the blind Protectionists recoiled from the removal of restriction of any kind. Nor should it be forgotten that Mr. Hitt continues to press a resolution in favour of closer trade relations with good hope of its acceptance by the House of Representatives. We shall presently see whether the farmers will swallow the bait. Meantime we may note with hope an incipient split, which is not unlikely to widen, in the Protectionist party itself. A Protectionist policy when there is any diversity among local interests and all have to be alike protected becomes a very tangled web, as our Government in its dealings with the flour duty has just had reason to acknowledge. The tariff has hitherto been regulated in the interest of the Protectionists of the Eastern States; but Western interests have now found championship in the Ways and

Means Committee and alarm begins to fill New England. The very enlargement of the protected area and the number of manufacturing centres which are brought within it would in time loosen the hold of the system. What does it signify to a New England monopolist whether the competition is an English manufacturer or one of Georgia or Illinois? The end is sure, but it is rather sad to think of the path of endurance, especially for our farmers and all who depend on them, by which it is to be reached.

The effect of the division on Sir Richard Cartwright's resolution has at all events been to clear the air and to define the aims and relations of Canadian parties. The Liberals are henceforth the Continental their opponents the Anti-Continental party. The Liberal party is that which accepts the apparent decree of nature, believes the lot of Canada to be cast on her own Continent, and seeks to open to her people the markets of her Continent and all the other advantages of the New World. The Tory party, on the other hand, is that which seeks to cut off Canada from the Continent of which nature has made her a part, to dedicate her to the political sentiment of an aristocratic power on the other side of the Atlantic, and to shape her policy, commercial and general, in that interest, renouncing for her the benefits of the Continental market, of Continental capital and enterprise, and of the inflow of Continental population. This forms an issue not less clear than it is momentous, and upon it apparently decisive battle is to be joined.

— The Separate School system and Roman Catholic privilege generally are historically traceable to a compact made with the Bourbon, then King of France, "the eldest daughter of the Church," in favour of the religion of the subjects whom he was ceding to the Protestant conqueror. The Bourbon is numbered with the past and his place knows him no more. He was succeeded by an atheist Republic which overturned the Church, butchered or banished the clergy, and at the same time

tore up all treaties, declaring in the case of the Scheldt that none of them could be allowed to stand against natural right. Since that, revolution and counter-revolution have followed in France till every vestige of the Old Régime has been effaced. The atheist Republic is now again installed though in a milder form and is waging legislative war against the clergy and their creed. If France were at this day to make a treaty with us about anything ecclesiastical it would be in the very opposite sense to the Bourbon treaty. Yet we in the New World are still to be bound and our civilization is to be trammelled for ever by the compact made with the Bourbon. No doubt when the Separate Schools of Ontario were instituted there was, independently of diplomatic archæology, something like a reasonable ground for their institution. The Roman Catholic Church in Protestant countries was still under a social cloud, the consequence of its attempts to extirpate Protestantism with the sword, nor had Protestant privilege entirely ceased to exist. But now every pretence of that kind is at an end. Roman Catholicism is under no disability whatever, political or social. The religion of a Roman Catholic child in the Public School is perfectly safe; and the Separate School is kept up simply as an instrument of ecclesiastical domination. Its character and design are stamped by the refusal of the Ballot. It is incredible that any one who has really embraced Liberal principles should defend such an institution except for the purposes of political party. Apostasy cries "Peace!" There is not going to be war when ecclesiastical privilege is abolished here any more than there was war when Church Rates were abolished in England or when the State Church was abolished in Ireland. But if by peace is meant tame acquiescence it is not to be looked for while unjust privilege exists. The game may last Mr. Mowat's time, but the younger men who play it with him and for him may live to pay the forfeit.

— Mr. Meredith seems, since the debate on the Separate Schools, to have pretty well taken up his position. The ques-

tion is whether he will be able to set himself free enough from the shackles of Ottawa. Sir John Macdonald and Mr. Mowat use the Catholic vote by turns and each on pretty much the same terms. This arrangement, Sir John Macdonald, caring probably little for Ontario and seeing that Mr. Mowat differs on no essential question from himself, is evidently unwilling to disturb. His personal organ has been pouring hot shot, or rather hot mud, into the section of Liberals, to a junction with whom on the Equal Rights question Mr. Meredith must look for help to win the battle; and in the conventions his influence is apparently being used in favour of Machine candidates who are opposed to Mr. Meredith's new departure. Mr. Meredith's position is very difficult; his bearing is still not free from embarrassment; his opponent has the advantage of long possession of power; and abundant experience shows that the party shibboleth usually prevails over any principle whatever. Still there will be a fight for a principle if Mr. Meredith stands firm.

—The approach of the elections brings before our minds the effect likely to be produced on the calibre of our legislatures by the set of population to the cities, combined with the growth of localism in elections. Localism is one of the many proofs that since the great extensions of the franchise political power has descended to lower and narrower minds. It is completely dominant in the States, so that the most illustrious man if he happens to live in a congressional district where the other party has a majority is absolutely excluded from public life. It is fast becoming dominant here, though the party leaders, connection with whom may bring patronage to the locality, still in a few cases find seats in constituencies where they do not reside. Even in England it is fast gaining ground. The days are gone by when any great English constituency was glad to elect a distinguished man whether he were resident or not, and the House of Commons was thus

pretty sure to embrace the political eminence of the country, as the most famous Parliaments have most memorably done. With the movement of population intelligence is now drawing towards cities and when settled there it will be politically ostracized, since no one resident in a city will have a chance of election for any rural constituency. Rural life will at the same time become duller, less intellectual, and less likely to give birth to men qualified for legislation. This must tell upon the calibre of the representation. But there is no use in preaching. Grapes do not grow on thorns, nor are large and magnanimous views of the public interest to be found in parochial minds. We may be told that the representation of Toronto has hardly been such as to demonstrate the superiority of city intelligence; but with that intelligence of any kind has not had much to do.

—Contempt was poured by C. P. R. organists on the Esplanade meetings because the Toronto magnates were not there. The Toronto magnates unfortunately never are there. Some of them excused themselves on the ground that they were not for the Viaduct. The meetings were not called for the Viaduct, but to consider the problem generally, and to secure to our people, in one way or another, safe and free access to the water. If the magnates had attended they might have given any counsel they thought fit and probably their advice would have prevailed, for the people are willing enough to be led. Free and safe access to the water is, especially in the case of all whose callings keep them in the city during the sultry months, indispensable to health and enjoyment and consequently to morality. A lakeside city cut off from the lake would be a sorry sight. No one can say that the franchise is not in jeopardy who sees the way in which railways here deal with the public safety and remembers the grasping and overbearing character of one of the two corporations with which we have to deal. Nor can it be pretended that the

City Council might well be left to itself, when, through its neglect and want of foresight things on the water-front have been brought to the present pass, and when we have just had to submit to the imposition upon us by the University of a tax of six thousand dollars a year in consequence of the failure of the Council, after repeated notice, to perform the conditions of the Park lease. Of the absence of the magnates from the counsels of their fellow-citizens at such a crisis of city interests, indifference or indolence must be the cause. Indolence is perhaps excusable in people who live in villas and do not like to turn out after dinner, though villa life, which cuts off the rich so entirely from the people among whom they lived in the early days of cities, is an unfortunate part of our present social arrangement. But indifference is a great mistake. The soundness of society, it cannot be too often repeated, depends on the willingness of its leaders to do their duty. If from fastidiousness or love of ease they shut themselves up in their mansions or, as many of them are doing at this moment, leave their post altogether for the pleasure cities of Europe and hand over the people to lower guidance, society will soon be in a bad way. The enemy will find them out presently in their drawing-rooms if they do not choose to meet him on the platform.

—We learn from Mr. Murray, the government detective, and gladly make it known, that injustice has been done him by the newspaper reporters who have put into his mouth things which he never said, especially the ominous words “that he staked his professional reputation on the conviction of Burchell.” This is too bad. We had supposed that even reporting “enterprise” would respect public justice and human life. Whatever may be the evidence against a man, he is entitled to a fair trial; and a fair trial he cannot have if the Press acts as part of it has been acting in this case. Where is an unprejudiced jury to be found? Does the fact that a man

was wild in his college days create any presumption that he will become a swindler and commit a cold-blooded murder? None whatever. But a prejudice is created though a presumption is not.

—Labour disturbances go on all over the world and from the same general causes, not the least of which is the indignant activity of professional incendiaries who subsist by industrial war. The mechanics seem to be persuaded that by a sufficient extension of the Union system, and by bringing pressure enough to bear upon society they can take their lot as a class out of the general condition of humanity, and provide that it shall not be subject to any of the accidents of trade, to the results of overpopulation, to occasional overwork, or to any of the ills to which others whose callings are just as much "labour" as the calling of the bricklayer or the carpenter are heirs. The immediate object is to impose on the whole industrial world an eight hours' law. Such a law, taking no notice of the differences between men, climates, seasons or kinds of work, seems neither rational nor just. But there is no difficulty in enforcing it any more than there is in enforcing a law against working on Sunday or against keeping stores open after a certain hour. That which there is difficulty in enforcing is a law compelling the community to give the mechanic ten hours' wages for eight hours' work. We say "the community," and it is ever to be borne in mind that the community which buys the product is the real employer, the trade master being only the provider of capital, the organizer of industry, and the paymaster. If the community finds the work too dear it will cease to employ the workman, just as it would cease to buy any goods of which the price was beyond its means or desires. By pressure beyond a certain point for increase of pay, or for what comes generally to the same thing reduction of hours, the masters may be ruined and the trades may be broken up. Some trades are now in danger of that

fate. But the community cannot be intimidated, picketed or rattened, and to it the Unionist screw would be applied in vain. This is a simple truth, but it is one which is not likely to make its way to the understanding of the artisan before something serious has occurred. It is alleged, and is not unlikely, that in certain industries the shorter time, as it does not exhaust the workman, is better for all parties. But in these cases, supposing that they could be defined, legislation would hardly be needful and it would be most unreasonable to base on them a universal law. That a body of workingmen may greatly raise their condition by steadiness, frugality and temperance, combined with prudence in the matter of marriage and in the multiplication of the members of their class, is very certain. Legislation of a reasonable kind also can do and has done something. It can protect the artisan from fraud or culpable carelessness on the part of his employer, improve the healthiness of his dwelling, guard his wife and children against overwork, give him public grounds for recreation, and provide him with Saving Banks to help his providence. There is nothing in this more socialistic than in legislation against nuisances; there is nothing so socialistic as the Sunday observance law. But to tell the artisan that he can spend all his wages without regard for the future, multiply as he pleases, and force the community, by putting on the Unionist screw, to give him a good day's wage for a bad day's work, is to tell him a most pernicious falsehood.

—New York is aghast at the hugeness of the Astor wealth, which already exceeds the revenues of kings, with a prospect of indefinite increase hereafter, as the value of the property is sure to grow; and it is evidently the religion of the family to hoard. All this is kept by will in the hands of the single representative of family wealth. Nobody denies the evil or the scandal of such an accumulation in the hands of people who have done nothing to earn their wealth but

have slept while the pile grew. Perhaps it is lucky that the aims of the family have been pecuniary, not ambitious: had they chosen to turn their wealth into power they might have been princes of evil. The desire of property, as we have said before, is the only known motive-power of production, and we must take it as it is with all its drawbacks, of which these piles in the possession of drones are the most conspicuous, till we find another. But there seems to be nothing in public morality to forbid the legislative restriction of accumulation. The Thelusson Act in England was passed for that purpose, as we have previously said, though the Thelusson accumulation which caused the alarm was even nominally less by two-fifths than that of the Astors, and really, thanks to the beneficent rapacity of lawyers, was a mere trifle in comparison. At all events, everything that the lawgiver can do ought to be done to promote distribution. The Vanderbilts apparently do not study accumulation like the Astors: besides, they have given us the New York Central.

—After all the spasmodic efforts of Reform, Tammany has again fastened its yoke upon New York and elected a Tammany mayor. The New York *Evening Post* has published biographical sketches of the leaders. In this roll of honour there are professional politicians, 28; convicted murderer 1; tried for murder and acquitted 1; indicted for felonious assault 1; indicted for bribery 1; professional gamblers 4; former gambling or "dive" keepers 5; liquor dealers 4; former liquor dealers 5; former pugilists 3; former "toughs" 4; members of the Tweed gang 6; office-holders 17; former office-holders 8; former car conductors 3; former plasterer 1; former navy-yard calker 1; former carpenter 1; lawyer 1; nominal lawyers 2; favoured city contractors 2. The one lawyer is the only man in the list who can be said to be now actually following any reputable calling outside politics. The usual appeal is made to good citizens to rise in their might and take an active part in city

affairs. If they do, it will be only for a moment and a relapse will follow. Good citizens have other things to do, Tammany politicians have nothing else to do, and of course they win. The case of city government by popular election is apparently hopeless, and yet there is little chance of ever getting the people to consent to a radical change. It is interesting to see how identical are the methods by which the kingdom of corruption defends itself on both sides of the line. Everyone who objects to Tammany rule, to the spoils' system, to the unreformed ballot system, or any other established institution, is at once accused of "pessimism" and "decrying the country," like those among us who object to the policy of which the natural fruits are the Pacific Railway Scandal and Mr. Rykert. When it is said that Sinbad would be better without the Old Man of the Sea on his back, which is decried, Sinbad or the Old Man of the Sea?

—The admission of Wyoming as a State, with Woman Franchise as an article of its Constitution, was carried in the House of Representatives by the narrow majority of 138 to 132. As an expression of opinion on the Woman Franchise question the vote goes for nothing. Wyoming is Republican and therefore all the Republicans but two voted for admission, while all the Democrats voted against it. To the Republicans, against whom the scale is manifestly inclining, the gain of the Senatorships and a seat in the House of the Representatives was vital. Of the two men who broke away from their party, and of them alone probably, can it be said with certainty that they voted according to their convictions on the issue before them. Such, once more, is Party. No questions can touch the interests of humanity more closely than those which concern the relations between the sexes. Yet one of these, and not the least important of them, is settled by a division on almost strict party lines with a wretched party object in view.

Wyoming as a Territory had Woman Suffrage, so that its present Act is nothing more than the continuation of the back-

wood's law, passed probably to attract women to a district in which they were scarce. The event itself therefore could not be of much moment. But it is pretty sure to prove the thin end of the wedge. As soon as politicians see that a new postulant for the ballot is gaining ground all power of resistance fails them, they fall on their faces and think only how they may propitiate the coming vote. Never was there a truer or a more pregnant word than that of the American who said that there would be no peace or quiet till a black woman had been elected President of the United States. When by successive agitations that point has been reached the slow and painful reascent towards reason and nature will begin. Perhaps by that time the world will also have had experience enough to make up its mind whether faction is the everlasting ordinance of nature and the only possible form of free government. In Kansas, where they have municipal suffrage for women, the men are already in revolt. Against the female candidate for a municipal office they have set up in mockery a coal-black negress and elected her.

There is a bevy of ladies over the way who have evidently set before themselves a very high and spiritual ideal. They propose to throw all the work and all the endurance on the men, to escape as far as possible the burdens of the family, to share the sovereign power with all the prizes and excitements of public life, to retain at the same time all the present privileges of their sex, and to have a good time. This they think, and indeed have been taught to think, due to their angelic nature and they call it Equality. They have made very fair progress towards realization; whether they will be altogether and permanently successful in this unangelic world, or whether the inferior sex will recalcitrate, the next generation will see. These questions are not settled in a lifetime.

—In England the bye-elections give varying results, but generally against the Government. The Government won

Ayr; it has lost Carnarvon, where the Welsh Church question no doubt has force; it did not lose Windsor, though the Home Rule cable said it did. Appearances are at present favourable to the passage of its great measure, the Irish Land Bill. Lord Derby's judgment on such matters is usually a sound one, and he is certainly right in saying that the denunciations of the Parnellites are the highest praise of the Bill, inasmuch as they show that in the opinion of those agitators the Bill is likely, by satisfying agrarian demands, to allay political agitation. Political incendiarism in Ireland has never had any life except that which it derived from agrarian discontent. O'Connell's Repeal movement, though ostensibly carried on for years, can hardly be said ever to have assumed a serious form; it was little more than a standing pretext for collecting O'Connell's rent. Smith O'Brien's rebellion came at once to an end in a cabbage garden. Of all the murders, one only, that in the Phoenix Park, has been political; the rest have been agrarian. The political agitators were very far from being zealous supporters of Mr. Gladstone's Land Bills, because they knew that the success of those measures would be the death of their trade. Mr. Gladstone appears to be somewhat wavering in his opposition to the present Bill; at least his utterances do not satisfy the Parnellites; and though in his present mood he is pretty sure to find some warrant not only for opposition, but for obstruction, his hesitation can hardly fail to tell upon that moderate section of his followers which in its heart wants to see an end of the Irish question. That an agrarian settlement would for the present damp and perhaps extinguish the political conflagration is pretty certain; not so certain is it that the settlement itself would last. The land and climate of Ontario are far better suited for grain at least than those of Ireland, while between the energy, intelligence and frugality of the two sets of farmers there can be no comparison; yet the farms of Ontario, as we see, are heavily mortgaged. There is too much reason to fear that the creation of a peasant proprietary in Ireland, though it is assumed to be the grand panacea, would

result only in the substitution of the mortgagee for the landlord; and the mortgagee never reduces rent, never resides, never lends the farmers help or guidance, does no act of bounty or kindness in the parish. If the landlords both in Ireland and England would only reside and do their duty! But duty is seldom done when there is nothing to enforce it. There lies the weak point of the manorial system, which otherwise is not without its recommendations, economical or social. The peasant proprietor in France has the dignity of freehold, but his life, besides being extremely precarious, is coarse, dull and often debased; it is in fact what Zola paints it.

As to Home Rule, it has nearly ceased for the present to be a living issue. Lord Rosebery, who looks to the future, has almost thrown up the sponge for Disunion; and Mr. Gladstone, who cleaves to it with senile tenacity, offends and disconcerts his party by so doing.

—We welcome the appearance of the “University Quarterly Review.” Canada has tried several times to give herself a national review or magazine, but she has failed, though the “Canadian Monthly” did well for a time. It is not that we lack the brains or the literary taste, but there are too few of us together; practically speaking, there is no literary constituency beyond Ontario and the British part of Montréal, Quebec being a complete non-conductor between us and the Maritime Provinces. Besides, that national sentiment on which Dr. Bourinot dilates in this review was found, when a national periodical was to be sustained, not only wanting but acting in the wrong way; it was too clear that the work of Colonial pens was disrated by a Colonial public. This truth, which is one of experience, must be told at the risk of incurring the universal charge of decrying the country and advertising Dakota. A University Quarterly, however, has a basis of its own and may well sustain itself if the object of its founders is not commercial. The first number is gracefully and attract-

ively opened by a poem from the pen of Mr. Charles G. D. Roberts. The big heart of Ottawa patriotism swells in Dr. Bourinot's paper on National Sentiment. Our feelings, if at all overwrought by that stirring appeal, will be relieved by Mr. Edgar's lighter remarks on Titles of Honour in Canada, from which we learn, by the way, that the nomination to baronetcies and knighthoods has passed like everything else into the hands of the Canadian Prime Minister, so that the "fountain of honour" is merely one of the taps in the party bar. Mr. Hodgins is learned on Municipal Corporations. Professor Alexander, being endowed with the power of seeing through the "excess of light" which darkens Browning, gives us what our faith accepts as the authentic story of "Sordello." Professor Baldwin is profound on Psychology, showing by the way that he has by no means neglected the physical side of his subject. Professor Ashley discusses, with his usual ability, the Canadian Sugar Combine. His point of view apparently is that of a Semi-Protectionist. He is disposed to take the Sugar Combine to his bosom in a qualified and philosophic way as something antagonistic to unlimited competition. A "Corner" would no doubt regard a suspension of judgment on its character as a compliment, and so probably will the Sugar Combine. But we rather expect that in the end the truth will force itself on Professor Ashley's mind that Combines, instead of being philosophic or socialistic improvements on the cruel and selfish system of competition are, like Corners, engines of cunning and rapacity devised for the purpose of sweeping the profits of many into the pockets of a few. It does not seem to us that formed in the way in which they are, and crushing other traders by such devices as they do, they bear any real resemblance to natural aggregations of trade, such as Stewart's great store, which may be deemed happy substitutes for a multiplicity of starveling retailers. In Canada the sugar refiners and the great distillers, two classes favoured by Government, have been making large fortunes amidst the general impoverishment. The only salt which keeps

the carcass of monopoly from utterly rotting, when you look into it, is the fear that if extortion were carried beyond bounds the sufferance of the public would be exhausted and rivals might be called into existence; in other words, it is potential competition. However, the question is large and complex. But we cannot help respectfully demurring to the statements that "free trade gave England forty years ago a huge, miserable and discontented working population" and that "to-day it gives London the sweating system." Before the repeal of the Corn Laws famine was stalking through English cities, the people were boiling grass for food, they were digging up carrion, and wedding-rings were being pawned by the hundred in one town: it was humanity as much as the interest of commerce that launched Bright on his crusade against the Bread Tax. There can surely be no doubt that the result of Free Trade has been not only a marvellous growth of national wealth, but a vast extension of the number of workmen receiving good wages and living in comfort, though the inseparable shadow of this is a growth, positive not relative, of the margin of destitution. The sweating system in London, like the low wages of Dock Labour, is caused not by the cheapness of bread, but by the great influx of the labouring population into the metropolis, not only from Great Britain and Ireland but from the Continent, the foreign immigration including no less than thirty thousand Polish and Russian Jews. If Free Trade England has "been brought by the discontent of the working population to the verge of social revolution," Protectionist countries such as France and Spain have been brought beyond the verge, and Protectionist Germany is now on the verge. Nor are the ultra-Protectionist United States free either from actual disturbance or from the fear of worse. Mere incendiarism, we suspect, has not a little to answer for in all the cases.

—The last theological sensation is "*Lux Mundi*," which though to us not very instructive is in its way a notable book.

The High Church and Ritualistic party has of late been gaining a complete supremacy in the Church of England. In the Low Church or Evangelical party scarcely a spark of life is left, and its adversaries, fearing it no more, can afford to acknowledge the great services which it rendered in its day to religion, to social reform and to humanity. Broad Churchism never was a party: it never had any unity of doctrine, any organization, or any definite purpose; nor can it be said in any sense to have had a leader. Stanley, who was called its leader, was rather a picturesque writer on ecclesiastical history than a religious philosopher. He never reached definite conclusions of any kind. The singular theory of Church and State which he had learned at the feet of Dr. Arnold was an anachronism and almost a platitude, being drawn from the example of ancient republics in which religion was identified with nationality because each nation had its tribal god. Such an idea never made and never could make any way. In Jowett, the Broad Church had a religious philosopher; in Hatch it had a great ecclesiologist; but Jowett has withdrawn from the theological field, and death has just removed Hatch, not before he had presented with immense force of critical erudition the case against Apostolic Succession. Of late the High Church and Ritualistic party has enjoyed an ascendancy due to the imposing unity of its creed, to the assurance which it holds out to the doubting and perplexed, to the activity of its clergy in the great cities, and above all to the attractiveness of its services. This last magnet has often drawn the more, the less there was left of the faith which listens with interest to the preaching of the word and finds satisfaction in simple prayer. But of late those who looked closely at the Ritualistic party saw that there was a rift in the lute. To be at once Ritualistic and Rationalistic would be impossible; but there was a section of the party which, as Ritualism cannot pen its ministers up in seminaries or incarcerate them in cloisters, had imbibed the ideas of a scientific age and desired to bring its creed into line with Evolution and Criticism

while it kept its Church system and its Ritual. Keble College, though destined to be the rampart of High Church orthodoxy, seems to have become a special seat of the more liberal tendency. "Lux Mundi" is the manifesto of this section and it appears to have produced the same sort of shock which was produced by "Essays and Reviews," though in a much milder way; indeed to give the theological world, seasoned as it now is, a strong shock would take a heretic indeed. To tell precisely what these writers mean in most of their essays is beyond our power. But this much is clear that they intend to reconcile their faith with the most advanced discoveries of science. They have convinced themselves, or think that they have convinced themselves, that Darwinism exactly harmonizes with the highest orthodoxy and that it is not only possible but necessary to be at once a Darwinian and a High Churchman. That this is found a delicate operation the lofty mysticism of the language seems to show. The utterance of the writer who deals with the Inspiration of Scripture is somewhat more distinct. He makes concessions to Criticism of which it is not easy to fix the limit. Inspiration, as he explains it, seems hardly to mean more than moral insight or endowment. It is no guarantee for accuracy in matters of historical fact. Some parts of the Old Testament, such as the Cosmogony of Genesis and the Mosaic Law in Deuteronomy are with a little circumlocution allowed to be mythical: others such as Job, Jonah, and the Song of Solomon are plainly allowed to be dramatic. There is also a passage less definite but more general in its sweep, to the effect that in order to be open to the evidence of Biblical fact we require an antecedent state of conception and expectation. Canon Liddon might more reasonably be scandalized at this than at a denial of the historical character of the Book of Jonah. Here, however, we only note that among the other strange offspring of this period of religious doubt and dissolution, Scientific and Critical Ritualism is born into the theological world.

The Anglican Churches on this Continent share the dignity

and have not entirely ceased to cherish the pretensions of the Established Church of England; and the future of the mother must always be watched with interest by the daughters. The writers of "Lux Mundi" see that a change of some kind must come in the relations between Church and State in England. They propose the Scotch arrangement; but in Scotland when that arrangement was made the Church was very nearly identical with the nation, which the Anglican Church is very far from being even in England, while in Wales it is little more than the Church of the gentry. The Tudors did their best to make the Church identical with the nation but they failed. Too hideous a chasm now yawns between the theory and the fact. Anglo-Saxon compromise will cover most incongruities, but not such an incongruity as a Christian Church with a supreme legislature in which sit Mr. John Morley and Mr. Bradlaugh, to say nothing of all the Roman Catholics and Dissenters. A change there must be, and those who have the interests of the Church in their keeping will do well to consider how it can be made with least loss to her and with the smallest shock to the spiritual life of the nation. Tithe they will have to resign: there is no use in trying to maintain that it is the private property of the Church or anything but an impost enforced by the State in the days when State and Church were one. But if they lose no time they may probably keep all the edifices, the estates and glebes, the rectories and the private endowments, the amount of which is very large, obtaining at the same time self-government. They will hardly be able to make so good a bargain after a Radical victory.

—Whether unbelief in Christianity in the form of agnosticism is on the increase is a question which is variously answered by optimists, pessimists, and those who are neither the one nor the other. It is certain that men are more outspoken in these days than they were in former times. If, however, we

are to place any reliance on outward symptoms, we should say that, in this country at least, there is as much faith in the Christian religion as has ever been found in any country. It is a curious fact that men who are speculatively agnostic, are very frequently practical Christians. Hume used to say, although philosophically he had and could have no belief at all, yet practically he acted very much on the beliefs of his day; and Professor Huxley, who is the modern representative of Hume and the author of the very term 'Agnostic,' is probably a very good Christian. The curious fact in connection with Hume and his opponents is, that now it is held that Kant did not answer Hume; but at the very utmost only put the philosophical world on the way to find an answer. Kant and Hamilton and Mansel, with their doctrine of the relativity of knowledge, are now regarded as the fathers of Agnosticism; and Mr. Herbert Spencer does not hesitate to say that he is quite contented to draw his own conclusions from their premises. But Mr. Spencer himself can hardly be regarded as consistent. He tells us that there is a secret power which he terms Force, which is unknown and unknowable; and yet he at the same time declares that this power is "manifested." But how can a thing at the same time be manifested and unknown? We may quite agree with Kant and his disciples and with Mr. Spencer that it is not completely manifested, or even that the Absolute cannot be completely manifested to the relative, or the Infinite to the finite; but in as far as it is manifested, it is known, and the knowledge of it is true knowledge. This is the common sense of the matter, and we believe it is equally philosophical truth. In this case, then, we are not ignorant of the Eternal and Infinite Force. We know it as eternal and infinite Mind; and it is revealed as Wisdom, Love, and Power.

However calmly we may contemplate the speculative aspect of Agnosticism, its practical bearings are much more serious. It is not every one who can be, like Hume, a philosophical sceptic and a practical believer. With many

men, and ultimately with most men, theory will control practice. And what basis is there for moral accountability or for the belief in immortality, if we are no longer to believe in a personal God? It is here that Kant brings in his Practical Reason to do the work which, he contended, the Pure Speculative Reason was incapable of accomplishing. We have no speculative knowledge or perception of God, he says. The ontological proof, the cosmological proof, and the teleological proof alike break down. They are all unsuccessful attempts to transcend the bounds of experience. But that which is impossible to the Speculative Reason is achieved by the Practical Reason. The Categorical Imperative of the Moral Law is a certain fact which cannot be denied, and which must be accounted for and reckoned with. Its demands can be fulfilled only on the supposition of a Supreme Being, the author of Reason and of Nature alike. When Mr. Spencer and others follow the one branch of Kant's argument, but ignore the other, they may be able to satisfy themselves of the legitimacy of their methods; but at least they are cutting off from mankind the great impulses by which the civilization of the race has been carried onward, the moral sentiment and the hope of immortality. If there is no God and no hereafter, then right and wrong are mere euphemisms for pleasant and unpleasant; and the so-called Morality of the future can only be what is called Egoistic Hedonism. Will this watchword stimulate and ennoble men as they have been stimulated by the words, Duty, Devotion, Love of Country, Love of Humanity? We cannot answer this question doubtfully. Pure selfishness as a controlling force, and mere quantity of pleasure as an end, will not help man onward and upward. Our comfort is that the moral sense is indestructible; and that even the Hedonist has to disguise his Pleasure-doctrine to make it presentable.

—The publication of Mr. Browning's last volume of poems has raised again the discussion of his special poetical merits

and demerits, and more particularly the question of the alleged obscurity of his style. Mr. Browning was very angry at its being supposed that he was purposely obscure. "I can have little doubt," he tells the *Browning Society*, "that my writing has been in the main too hard for many I should have been pleased to communicate with; but I never designedly tried to puzzle people, as some of my critics have supposed." This is quite likely; but it is not enough. It is the business of a literary man to be intelligible, and to require of his reader no more intellectual effort than is properly needed for the comprehension of the matter in hand. Dr. Corson of Cornell University, in his "Introduction to the Study of Browning," virtually maintains that Browning makes no illegitimate demands upon his readers. "A truly original writer, like Browning," he says, "original, I mean, in his spiritual attitudes, is more or less difficult to the uninitiated, for the reason that he demands of his reader new standpoints, new habits of thought and feeling." Now, if this were all that Mr. Browning demanded, we would readily concede it, or at least refrain from blaming his requirement. But such a concession would by no means meet the case. Mr. Browning is obscure when he is stating the simplest fact, or formulating the most familiar principle. The reader often discovers, after a somewhat lengthy struggle with some dark saying, that after all it amounts to very little, and might have been perfectly well expressed in very simple words. Take, for example, the two lines which Mr. Hutton, editor of the London *Spectator*, declares to have no meaning for him. They form a parenthesis:

("To be by him themselves made act,
Not watch Sordello acting each of them.")

Now we did not need the help of Dr. Corson to interpret these lines; and we agree with him that Mr. Hutton might have persevered with them until he saw the meaning. It is, that those people of whom the poet is speaking should themselves be made by Sordello to act, and not each of them merely watch

Sordello acting. But surely this is not a strikingly original idea, but a very common experience, and might have been written down in plain, straightforward English. Is it not the business of the poet to sing or to speak melodiously and harmoniously? If he cannot do this, had he not better, as Carlyle somewhere suggests, put down his thoughts in prose? In that case there would be no such need as Mr. Browning seems to find for the harsh transposition and abnormal arrangement of words.

Talking of Mr. Browning's obscurity, we heard of a fairly good illustration of the same in connection with the recent volume of poems. A gentleman not absolutely unfamiliar with literature, ancient and modern, English and foreign, after perusing some of the smaller poems with varying degrees of approval and disapproval, admiration, indignation, and amusement, betook himself to the reading of the longer pieces with the clear consciousness of the difficult work before him, and therefore entering upon it, as he thought, after the necessary training. Concentrating his intellectual energies upon the task, he accomplished the first page and a-half with apparently complete success. Not a line was dark. But success throws us off our guard; and he went on with diminished vigilance, thinking that all must be well. After another page and a-half he awoke with a start to find himself drifting over a sea of words which had lost all connection and meaning. Now, it is very well for Mr. Browning to inform such readers that he "never pretended to offer such literature as should be a substitute for a cigar or a game at dominoes to an idle man." But on the other hand, has a poet the right to make the reading of his verses a task as difficult as the differential calculus, or the most difficult train of thought in Hegel's Logic? We take leave to doubt it. At any rate, he has not this right universally; and when he exercises it, he must give us something as the result of our labour which shall be an equivalent for it, and not merely put us to a great deal of trouble in coming to a conclusion which we might have reached by an easier and a shorter route.

—When a writer in *The Forum* speaks of the “degradation of our politics” he assumes the existence of a state of things which no one thinks of denying, and which is now commonly regarded with indifference. If this is so, it is an indifference which will ultimately cost a country more than can easily be computed. Prof. Barnard, the author of the article in question, traces quite dispassionately the downward road which has been followed in the political life of the United States. Washington, he says, was a federalist ; but he was first of all a patriot, and only in the second place a federalist ; and therefore after his appointment to the presidency, his earliest executive act was to appoint to the leading position in his cabinet his most conspicuous political opponent, since known as the father of American Democracy, Thomas Jefferson ; and for thirty years there was no large departure from the rule of appointing to office of the most able men. But at last there came a man who chose to make himself the head of a party and not of the country, or rather, who identified the country with the party which supported him. From that time to the present, Mr. Barnard declares that “the character of the civil service of the country has been steadily falling lower and lower.” The public treasure, he says, is regarded by those into whose hands it has fallen as the merchandise of a rich caravan is regarded by the Bedouins of the desert, as legitimate booty to be seized and divided among the members of the successful band. The result was the conversion of the government into a practical despotism ; and the employment of middle-men through whom patronage might be dispensed completed the Machine. This system, he says, has become the established system of American politics ; “no matter what party is in power, it is always practised.” But it has wrought a consequence not contemplated by the originators ; for the middle-men now regard the privilege which they once received as a favour to be a right which cannot be questioned, so that the Executive has “lost the power to name its own subordinates, and the government of the Constitution has practically ceased to exist.” Mr. Barnard gives an interesting

account of the process by which the party organization is carried on, and points out the actual corruption which is the result. He remarks that it is only by occasional glimpses that we get sight of this moral rottenness and adds that it is unnecessary for any inhabitant of New York to go beyond the City debt of one hundred millions of dollars, contracted in the brief space of five years. It is the same in the Legislature. "Honourable members, though miserably compensated by the State, in many cases grow rapidly rich." The "Bill which has money in it is speedily put through." What is the remedy? That honest men should not stand aloof from politics, but do their duty.

Whilst Mr. Barnard is speaking in New York on the degradation of politics, Mr. Hamilton Aïdé is, in London, holding forth on the "deterioration in English Society," and this is his text: "When the intellectual and social history of the present day in England comes to be written, it will be found to have sunk visibly below the watermark of any previous age in one respect. We are, unquestionably, a more vulgar people than we were. Our aims, our conduct, in the great scheme of intercourse with each other have deteriorated—I grieve to write it—as they have not done in any continental people." Whilst we are disposed to accept the positive statement as to deterioration of manners, we are not quite so sure of the truth of the comparison instituted. A man sees so clearly the state of things, especially if it is getting worse, among the people who are constantly round him. When he passes into new circumstances he is conscious of a feeling of relief and hardly has time to take account of all that must be set down on the other side. Recent visitors to Paris do not find that the manners of the people have improved. It is possible that men were more corrupt under the Empire; but they were certainly more polite. M. Renan declares that people are now too rude and so wanting in consideration for each other that he is afraid to go into a street car. While he is making way for others, and bowing to them, and taking off his hat, in

the engaging manner once so common and so charming in Paris, they are pushing against him, or thrusting him aside without ceremony. And we are not sure that matters would be much improved by a journey from Paris to Berlin. It is said that they still continue, or did under Bismarck, to make low bows, but that there is not much behind them. The Prussian "sweetness and light" are hardly preferable to the English. Mr. Hamilton Aïdé does well to admonish us of our vulgarity; but he will not escape from it by crossing the channel, or even the ocean. If any one thinks so, let him study the last paragraph of the article: "Verily, Society would do well to 'study simplicity' more than it does. Pretension and self-assertion are destructive of true dignity, and the most degrading of all religions is the worship of the Golden Calf."

—It is fortunate for publishers, fortunate also for writers, that the reading—but perhaps unthinking—public has an unappeasable appetite for new books. Neither is it an appetite altogether to be decried. A brisk demand insures an abundant supply, and it would be strange if in the multitude of counsellors we did not find a little wisdom. The pity is that too generally the appetite is a craving, crude and inordinate. Among new books there is one which will spoil no palate—Mr. W. Robertson Nicoll's "James Macdonell, Journalist." This is decidedly what Charles Lamb would have called a healthy book, and to-day this is no empty compliment. It deals with the life and life-work of a good man, and it deals with them without once passing into the region of domestic privacy and reserve—and this also is to-day a compliment which should be none. And yet the book is modern enough in every sense of the word. Mr. Nicoll thinks it "the first book of its kind," and as a narrative of the life of a modern journalist it is so. What will perhaps be chiefly noticed by the ordinary reader is the pace at which his life was lived. "Five or six leaders a week, . . . articles for the *Levant Herald*

and the *Leeds Mercury*, frequent contributions to the *Spectator*, and occasional articles in the *Saturday Review*, *Macmillan*, and *Fraser*,"—such was his work when on the staff of the *Daily Telegraph*. And its quality was equal to its quantity. Indeed, it is to the conscientiousness and thoroughness with which his work was done that his employers delighted to bear witness. It would be interesting to conjecture how James Macdonell would have fared on the staff of a New World newspaper. "It is said," writes Mr. Charles Dudley Warner in last month's *Forum*, "that the American newspaper has become insultingly inquisitive, vulgar in tone, recklessly sensational, indecent," and he is at pains to point out that he does not contradict the statement. On such papers the "young lion of the *Daily Telegraph*" would have had but little scope. His scholarship would have been valueless, his care in expression thrown away, his laborious perseverance in mastering details of argument so much time wasted, and his freedom from personal jealousies and party feuds a sheer obstacle to success. Must we conclude that there are no writers of the stamp of James Macdonell on the press that Mr. Warner depicts?—A safer conclusion is that there is no room in such a press for such writers: it is joined to idols and they let it alone. It is too much to hope that this biography will lead such writers to cease to let it alone till it forsake its way and remedy some of its shortcomings, but it is something to have had painted for us a picture of a journalism of a stancher and healthier type.

—The Education Report for the Province during the last year shows that the results of the school tax are hardly answerable to its magnitude. In spite of nominal compulsion twenty-five per cent. of the children are not in school at all, while of those on the register the attendance is barely half the roll. The average attendance is higher in the cities than in the coun-

try. In rural districts it is 48, in towns 59, and in cities 62 per cent., Hamilton showing the highest average, Belleville the lowest. There is no reason or justice in making one man pay for the education of another man's children any more than for their food or clothing, except on the ground of political security afforded to us all by the education of the masses. If that very class whose ignorance constitutes the political danger is allowed to escape, the system is utterly unreasonable and unjust. It seems that two-thirds of our teachers hold third-class certificates. Nearly two-thirds are women, and if we may judge by the behaviour of our boys, women, however good they may be as teachers, are not the best disciplinarians. Changes are frequent: in one county there were forty changes among eighty-eight teachers in a year. The result is great fluctuation. The requirement of a hundred days' attendance is almost everywhere disregarded and sometimes from this cause a school is closed during half the year.

—Whatever the cause, literary activity in Canada, so far at least as this is manifested in the issues of the native press, is at present at a low ebb. But one work has reached us since the publication of our last number. It is a collection of "Stories of New France," by Miss Machar (*Fidelis*) and Mr. T. G. Marquis, of Kingston, dealing with incidents of adventure and heroism in the early history of Canada. Those who seek to heap incense on the altar of national pride will not be gratified by observing that the work is published in Boston, though from the author's preface it seems to be chiefly designed for Canadian readers. The fact emphasizes what we have repeatedly said, that there is no adequate or even safe market for literature in the Dominion. The stories will be familiar to those who are acquainted with Mr. Parkman's series of picturesque narratives of "France in the New World." They are no doubt, however, of such interest as to warrant the para-

phrase here made of them and their collection, in an inexpensive form, for popular use. The work at least has this advantage, that it enables the student to pick up his reading of Canadian history without having to wade through uninteresting and interminable details, though, on the other hand, in many of the stories he may have a surfeit of horrors and more than he cares for of rapine and bloodshed. The chronological order is preserved in the stories, which cover the period of French Dominion in Canada, or, to be more precise, from the period of Cartier's discovery of the St. Lawrence to that of the fall of Quebec. The subjects chiefly dealt with are French discovery, colonization, and missionary enterprise, with the tragic story of the incessant wars with the Iroquois. Among the prominent personages introduced are Cartier, De Roberval, De La Roche, Champlain, Frontenac, Maisonneuve, La Salle and the two heroes, Montcalm and Wolfe, whose deaths on the Plains of Abraham brought the long struggle for empire to a close. The theatre of strife is now the rugged Acadian peninsula, and, anon, the narrow strip, wrested from nature and savagery, of the ill-starred French colony on the St. Lawrence. The stories are told with spirit and, on the whole, with a close adherence to facts. Apart from the native histories, there is a place for the book, and our young people, especially, will find it instructive as well as entertaining reading.

—Mr. Joseph Pope's interesting monograph on Jacques Cartier (Ottawa: A. S. Woodburn) has since come to hand to supplement Miss Machar's contribution to native letters. The little work indicates minute and painstaking research, especially in those portions of the book which the ordinary reader will deem less historical than antiquarian. Antiquarian, rather than historical, are discussions as to the actual sites of Stadacona and Hochelaga, and the questions where and by whom Mass was first celebrated in Canada, and whether

Cartier had priests with him on his early voyages. To follow much of the book with interest a knowledge of topography is needed, and the reader might have been aided in this had the author or his publisher incorporated with the text a map or two, marking the track of Cartier's explorations in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, and indicating the supposed sites of his various landings. Had Mr. Pope or Mr. Ganong, to whom our author acknowledges his obligations for hints about the St. Malo mariner's cruising in the Gulf, supplied us with a few charts, the reader would have followed the narrative with more intelligence. But it is ungracious to find fault, particularly when Mr. Pope has expended so much labour on what he has given us, and told the story so well of what can now be known of Canada's first discoverer. Mr. Pope pays the tribute of a co-religionist to Cartier's devoutness as a Catholic, but in doing this we hardly think him justified in speaking of Parkman's "unworthy sneers against the faith and worship of the Ancient Church." In the introductory chapter and in the narrative of the later voyages, the author has shown the fruits of his industry and research. Of Cartier's relations with Roberval he has perhaps told us all that can now accurately be ascertained. The little book as a whole is an honest bit of work and deserves, by Canadians especially, to be widely read.

—We are glad to see that Canadian art is capable of giving us a new pleasure, and that in a department less hackneyed than that of the landscape painter. Mr. G. A. Reid's recent picture, "A Story," which has just been sent for exhibition to the Paris *Salon*, shows us that among our native artists we have one who can draw on his imagination for a subject and at the same time treat it with ability and fidelity to nature. The handling of figure subjects, no doubt because of their difficulty, is rare on the part of Canadian artists. Of the men who can do really good work in this department, we have per-

haps not more than two—Mr. Reid and Mr. Harris. The success of both of these artists is a feather in the cap of Canadian art. Mr. Reid's new picture, like that with which he so successfully dealt last year, is a homely theme—akin somewhat to Wilkie's rustic subjects—and having the charm of appealing not only to the imagination but to the simple pleasures associated with boyhood's days and home life. The picture tells readily its own tale—a group of boys in a hayloft surrounding the figure of one of their number who is telling them a story. Like all Mr. Reid's work, it is strong and realistic. The posing is easy and natural, the drawing accurate, the colour good, and the lights and shades well managed. The faces of the boys bear the marks of his skilled and unhesitating brush. That of the narrator is full of character, earnestness, grit, as if he had done a heroic deed or grappled with some grim power of evil. In the faces of his comrades is depicted the horror, or the eeriesome feeling, excited by the story. Here the artist most shows his power, and the result is a picture that impresses as well as interests us. We are glad to learn that the painting is to return to Toronto, Mr. E. B. Osler being so fortunate as to become its purchaser.

Of artists who can do good portrait-work we have happily no lack in Canada. There may not be anything daringly or strikingly original in the execution; but if the work is sober and lacking in the higher artistic qualities, it is usually faithful and pleasing. On the easel of two Toronto artists there may have been seen in the past month two excellent examples of this branch of work—Mr. Cutts' portrait of the late Mr. W. A. Foster, Q. C., and Mr. Forbes' portrait of the Attorney-General of Ontario. Both are good likenesses. Mr. Cutts had the disadvantage of having to work from a photograph and without having personally known his subject. Mr. Forbes, though he has been differently situated, had a confessedly difficult subject to treat. Each has succeeded well, and the result in both cases is not only a likeness but a faithful representation.

THE BYSTANDER is on a smaller scale than other journals, but it is on the same footing and claims the same rights and courtesies for itself and all connected with it. It has a responsible editor ready to correct any errors that may be pointed out, and to do justice to all complaints. Messrs. Macdonald and Tupper, of Winnipeg, feeling themselves aggrieved by an editorial paragraph in our last number, chose, instead of remonstrating with the Editor, to send a personal and insulting letter to Mr. Goldwin Smith, to whose name the title of "Editor of THE BYSTANDER" was tagged, though the bulk of the letter could have no reference to anyone in that capacity. That gentleman might have been warranted in disregarding a missive which opened with a broad insinuation that he had come to Canada with a stain on his character and in need of an "asylum." He, however, forwarded it at once to the Editor of THE BYSTANDER, who was prepared to do without delay whatever the justice of the case might require, when Messrs. Macdonald and Tupper took the law into their own hands by publication in their party journal. The paragraph in our last number simply called to remembrance what had long ago been placed on record in *The Globe* which, so far as we know, never found it necessary to withdraw or modify any of its statements or remarks. We shall, however, finding the statements of *The Globe* now challenged, cause independent inquiry to be made at Winnipeg, and should the result of those inquiries give us reason for believing that we have been in any respect misled, full justice shall be done. It is needless, we hope, to protest that we could have had no motive in referring to the matter other than the desire to strengthen the hands of those who in Parliament are seeking to reform a state of things which, so far at least as Manitoba and the North-West are concerned, stands much in need of reformation.

THE BYSTANDER.

JUNE, 1890.

IN the struggle for Provincial office, which is going on with its usual vivacity, the general opinion seems to be that the "ins" will stay in and that the "outs" will stay out. The "ins" have had eighteen years wherein to entrench themselves behind the ramparts of patronage and influence, nor have they failed to make the best use of their opportunities. Moreover, in the eyes of the people, who naturally look first to their material interests, the "ins" have greatly the advantage in administrative reputation. Mr. Meredith is allowed by everyone to be a man of at least equal ability to any member of the Government; he is allowed by everyone except party journalists or preëminent Christians to be a high-minded and honourable gentleman. That the Province should be prevented from availing itself of his administrative ability and integrity because he belongs to the minority in questions which have nothing to do with administration, is a strong example of the irrationality of the party system. That he is lacking in malignant energy as leader of a faction is not the worst of faults in our eyes. But he stands alone: his party can supply him with no lieutenants who are at all equal to himself or have any hold on the confidence of the people. Mr. Meredith, moreover, though he has made a gallant effort to shake off Ottawa, has not completely succeeded, and till he does shake off Ottawa he cannot possibly have a fair chance in Ontario. Victory in Ontario may be a sentimental object, but it is not of vital importance to Sir John Macdonald, so long as he can

keep in his hands the government of the Dominion, which he does by help of the Catholic vote. It is impossible that he should consent to any vigorous action against the pretensions of the Roman Catholic hierarchy on the part of his lieutenants here. His influence in the nominations, so far as can be discerned, has been practically exerted against the platform on which Mr. Meredith takes his stand.

But there are people to whom the question is not one of "ins" and "outs" or of Big-endians and Little-endians. There are people whose object it is, so far as they can amidst the complications of the party fray, to uphold one of the great organic principles of our New World civilization, that entire separation of the Church from the State on which the purity of the Church as well as the integrity of the State depends, and at the same time to rescue the government from ecclesiastical domination and the British Province from French encroachment. What are these people to do? The answer is that they must do in each constituency what they can. In whatever constituency they may happen to be they must, as circumstances permit, make their force felt, assert the claims of their principle to recognition on the part of the candidates, and discountenance those who are hostile to it or are likely to betray it. A few such exhibitions of strength as that made by the Equal Rights party in the Ottawa election would render it impossible for Mr. Mowat or any one in his place to pay the Roman Catholic hierarchy for the future the price of its political support. In estimating the result, whatever it may be, the fatal strength of party must be borne in mind. It elects Mr. Rykert. It is too certain to prevail with multitudes who at the same time are in favour of Equal Right and would undoubtedly vote for it if that issue were submitted to them by itself. In these circumstances any vote cast for the principle must be multiplied many times to denote its true significance and will be so multiplied, we may be sure, in the minds of observant politicians. Apostasies from the cause of principle under the lash of the party-whip there have been and will be: one

there has been most notable and most deplorable. But by these, the cause being known, no man ought to be shaken in his conviction or discouraged. Let waverers keep their eyes fixed upon those leading advocates of Equal Right whom they know to be free from the yoke of party and sinister influences of every kind. So long as these stand firm, there can be no excuse for leaving their side, apostatize who may. A strange Liberal he must be who is willing to be an accomplice in the barter of civil and religious equality for the patronage of a reactionary priesthood. The most miserable thing is to see young men on the threshold of their career learning to sacrifice their consciences to party tactics, and thus entering public life through the gate of chicanery and falsehood. Vainly they flatter themselves that when they have gained power by dishonest means they will use it like honest men.

The adherents of Equal Rights ought by this time to be pretty well steeled against the hypocritical charge of intolerance. Intolerant because, in a community of which religious equality is the law and the soul, they object to maintaining out of public taxes a set of schools which are manifestly and almost avowedly the engines of ecclesiastical domination! Intolerant because they refuse to put public education into the hands of Archbishop Cleary! Not a wish has been conceived, not a syllable has been uttered, by any leader or organ of the Equal Rights movement against the religious liberties or rights of Roman Catholics. Nor is any more respect due to the cant about peace than to the cant about toleration. Every measure of justice must be a disturbance of the peace of injustice; but in the long run justice is the only road to peace. Reform must come in the end, and the disturbance will not be less when the evil has grown greater. To say that if we did away with Separate Schools by constitutional means, and no others have ever been proposed, we should be false to our God is the very delirium of the platform. Why is this, of all communities, for ever to "lie in cold obstruction," to be debarred from legal

self-improvement and shackled to the end of time by a compact made with the Bourbon past?

Special interest will attach to the contest in Toronto, where owing to the ingenuous attempt of the Grits in the last gerrymander to give themselves by Act of Parliament one of the seats for the city, utter uncertainty and perplexity reign. We are not without hope that a respectable vote, at all events, will be cast against the Machines. In Mr. E. Douglas Armour not only have the friends of Equal Rights a thoroughly good representative of their principle, but all independent citizens have a candidate by supporting whom they may enter a telling protest against Machine domination and all that it brings in its train.

—The cost of the Parliament buildings, of which the Opposition makes a strong point, will very likely be three times the estimate. This is the universal story, told by the unfinished piles of Albany and Philadelphia, with their ever-growing builders' bills, as well as by their humbler counterpart in the Queen's Park. Democracy, whatever else it may be, in its present phase is not economical. Wastefulness never overthrows a democratic Government, and it is not likely that the expenditure on the Parliament buildings will prove fatal to Mr. Mowat. What might righteously prove fatal to him, so far as Toronto votes are concerned, is the paltry policy of the budget-maker, who, to boast of a petty saving, destroys a park which is essential to the enjoyment, the health and the morality of the people of Toronto. Why had Toronto no Hampden when this was done? Unhappily, for some reason which perhaps Dr. Bourinot and other profound students of our institutions can explain, our political soil is more fruitful of oratory and some other good things than it is of Hampdens.

—In this as in other general elections questions of administration and questions of principle, matters of the most various

kinds such as those of Separate Schools, text-books, expenditure on Parliament Buildings, and liquor licences, are thrown in a confused heap before the people, and in each constituency are further complicated with local and personal influences, so that it is seldom possible to obtain a distinct verdict on any issue. This is a very weak point in our parliamentary institutions. Long ago we called attention to the Swiss system of the *Referendum*, under which legislative questions, especially those relating to changes of the Constitution are submitted separately and directly to the popular vote, so that a clear verdict is obtained. The system seems to work well in Switzerland, and though, in appearance ultra-democratic, to be in its practical tendency conservative. Individual legislators can be corrupted, or, as they are apt to be in the case of Woman's Suffrage, cajoled, but the people at large cannot. Something of the kind is already practised in the United States where amendments in State Constitutions are submitted to the popular vote. It is in effect a transfer of the veto from the monarch who has lost the power of exercising it to the sovereign people in whom the supreme power now resides. Such a body as the Legislature of Ontario, with its single chamber, ought not to be permitted to alter the Constitution at its pleasure without popular assent.

Another Swiss institution to which we formerly called attention is the Standing Council of State elected by the Legislative Assembly for the term of its own existence, irrespective of any changes in the legislative balance of the Assembly. This separates the Executive from the Legislative, gives the country a stable executive independent of the fluctuations of party, and enables it to make use of administrative ability without regard to irrelevant differences of legislative opinion. It seems in fact that the members of the minority are not infrequently elected to the Council on the ground of their executive capacity. If the system prevailed here Mr. Mowat and Mr. Meredith might both give us the benefit of their administrative capacities whatever their opinion might be upon Equal

Rights or Prohibition. There is an approach to it in the American Cabinet outside Congress; but the Swiss arrangement under which the members of the Council have seats in the Assembly but are independent of legislative party is the better plan. In the marked consideration now paid to the *Referendum* and the Standing Council of State, a gleam of hope for our emancipation from the accursed system of party government with all its corruption, its evil passions, and its civil wars of intrigue and calumny, begins to dawn.

—The Session which has just closed has been marked, as the last was, in the case of the Jesuits, by occasional flirtations between the parties or their leaders which have curiously alternated with the normal prosecution of the party war. Mr. Mulock's Resolution united all the members except two in a loyal and fraternal embrace. Mr. Mulock himself has since been falling on the neck of Sir John Macdonald while Mr. Blake grasps the hand successively of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice. The meaning of this is that all of them are alarmed by the growth of an independent sentiment, especially on the range of questions embraced in the Equal Rights movement, which threatens to spoil the whole game. We might see with pleasure the suspension of animosity between political rivals if only it were love not hatred of a common enemy that inspired it. For the rest, we have had the usual spectacle of a mechanical majority. The Opposition not only has no real leader, but, to increase its tribulation, it has an ex-leader on its flank. Turks and bees are wise in their treatment of supernumerary claimants to the throne. Sir Richard Cartwright, however, has shown his usual force as well as his usual combativeness, and his speeches by their breadth and simplicity of treatment as well as by the weight of their facts and arguments impress the popular mind and prepare it for the great issue between Restriction and a free Continental market, which, if events hold their present course, is destined before

long to be submitted to its vote. The Session closed with the customary grants of railway subsidies, pushed through as usual when it was too late for consideration, though the Government must have known its own intentions at a much earlier day. What was by no means customary was the patriotic protest entered by a Conservative Senator against an expenditure which has reached scandalous proportions and which he truly describes as a "gigantic system of bribery." Senator McCallum demands an earlier submission of the grants in order that the Senate, which he describes as a body independent of local interests and claims, may be enabled to do its duty to the country by deliberate inquiry and discussion. Such undoubtedly is the Senate's duty, but Mr McCallum forgets that three-fourths of the members are the nominees of a single man. His protest was of course voted down, and the "bribes," as every one knew them to be, passed.

—When there is a surplus it is the plain duty of the Government to reduce the burdens of the people. Instead of this the Government of Sir John Macdonald piles on new taxes, not in the commercial interest of the community at large, which there is hardly a pretence of considering, but for the purpose of buying certain political interests, and thus securing its own tenure of power. At the same time a similar measure is passed with the same motive by the party in power in the United States, which is itself under the control of the Protectionist Lobby. Thus not only the burdens of both communities are increased, but the Chinese wall between them is for the sinister objects of intriguing politicians raised higher than ever, and the people on both sides are more than ever debarred from the free interchange of their products and from reaping the natural fruits of their industry. For a time things have come to a worse pass than ever. But we are not without hope that the darkness of monopoly which seems so thick may be the darkness which precedes the dawn. Decidedly in the

United States there is a growing movement, especially among the artisans, in favour of free trade, and there is a corresponding state of alarm and of nervous uncertainty in the camp of Protection. The Presidential election was not won; it was bought: the manufacturers put up the money to purchase New York, Indiana, and Connecticut; some of them avow it with cynical frankness. They are now desperately striving by the McKinley Bill to make the farmer, upon whose dull eyes the light is slowly dawning, believe that he has an interest in Protection. Like those who practice to deceive, those who practice to plunder the community under the guise of Protection have a tangled web to weave. In that vast and diversified area of production rivalries are springing up among the protected interests themselves; what is or what is fancied to be Protection to one is ruin to another; and the monopolists in Congress are at their wits' end to devise a tariff which shall suit all. The duty on hides was put on and taken off again half a dozen times, not because legislators had changed their minds about fiscal policy, but because New England and the West were pulling against each other. The position of New England as a centre of protected manufactures and a focus of Protectionist opinion is being greatly affected by the rise of competing manufactures in different parts of the Union; it is not unlikely even that the large contingent of force which she sends to the Protectionist camp will presently be withdrawn. When "native" industries thus fall out, honest industry has a chance of coming by its own. We should not be surprised to see the whole edifice of folly and iniquity, with its lobbies, Red Parlours, and the whole apparatus of fraud and corruption, fall to the ground. It is in fact merely the fear of a sudden crash that prevents a great number of Americans from declaring at once for Free Trade. It would be curious to trace the growth of the system from the time when Protection was sought for infant industries just to enable them to grow, with an assurance that when grown they would resign it, to the present time when having grown to giant bulk they demand Protection in

increased measure, and to grasp it corrupt whole States and Provinces, and swell the American Pension List to eighty-seven millions a year.

Mr. Gladstone confesses and bewails the backsliding of the world from Free Trade towards Protection. Partly it is a real backsliding of opinion, the consequence, as we have said before, largely of an extension of the suffrage which has thrown the Government of the world for the time into less intelligent hands, and brought back upon us the ignorant cupidity and the commercial fallacies of the days before Adam Smith. But in large measure it is not a movement of opinion at all: it is the work of sheer corruption practiced by great monopolist interests upon venal constituencies and the governments which are dependent on their vote. The monopolists in the United States would not put up their money if they felt sure that opinion was on their side.

Meantime it will be observed that Mr. Hitt continues to offer his Resolution, which now stands in this form, in which it will probably be brought before the next Congress :

Resolved: "That whenever it shall be duly certified to the President of the United States that the Government of the Dominion of Canada has declared a desire to establish Commercial Union with the United States, having a uniform revenue system, like internal taxes to be collected, and like import duties to be imposed on articles brought into either country from other nations, with no duties upon trade between the United States and Canada, he shall appoint three commissioners to meet those who may be likewise designated to represent the Government of Canada, to prepare a plan for the assimilation of the import duties and internal revenue taxes of the two countries, and an equitable division of receipts in a Commercial Union; the said commissioners shall report to the President, who shall lay the report before Congress."

While we have no wish to inspire Commercial Unionists with false hopes, we beg them to understand that a futile resolution would not be pressed by a man of the standing and sagacity of Mr. Hitt; that there is every reason to believe that the commercial world is in favour of the measure, and no ground

whatever for despair. The Mulock Resolution has done little or no harm. The sympathetic insight of American politicians has taught them that Canadian politicians have loyalty, as they have themselves sympathy with Ireland, always on tap, and that the frothy liquid is brewed of much the same ingredients in both cases. Changes of this kind are not brought about in a day, especially where commercial interests are crossed by political tactics. The advocates of nature's rights have nature's mill grinding slowly, but grinding small, upon their side. We have to lament the departure of Mr. Butterworth from public life. But at all events he ends nobly with a protest, not less masterly than it is eloquent, against the excesses of Protectionism and in favour of a liberal policy toward Canada. His words have left their mark.

—The Ontario Mining Report is full of instruction, no small share of our gratitude for which, as well as for much economical instruction of other kinds respecting our Province, is due to the secretary of the Commission, Mr. Blue. Evidence was taken at 37 places, from Ottawa to Rat Portage, and 164 witnesses representing all the mining interests were examined. The report also comprehends full information on mining laws and on metallurgy, with maps and plans. Let all read it who maintain that Ontario does not want a better market, or that the quarter in which she must look for it is not on her own Continent. The area richest in minerals is that lying between Sudbury district, in the neighbourhood of Lake Nipissing, west to Port Arthur, at the head of Lake Superior, and on to the Lake of the Woods. Within this region are gold, silver, copper, nickel, iron, galena, plumbago, and zinc ores, mica and apatite, besides large deposits of granite, marble and freestone. Many of the central and eastern counties are also rich in most of the metals named, and also in phosphates and other mineral fertilizers. In the Western peninsula are salt, petroleum, gypsum, materials for building, including large deposits of

clays for terra cotta and pressed brick. In fine, as the Report testifies, the Province contains almost all of the economic minerals, in workable quantities, except coal. Yet, as the Commission states, "the tolls upon trade and the want of facilities for cheap transportation are a hindrance so serious to the employment of capital that a number of the most promising of known mineral properties are either lying idle or are being worked in the face of great odds." Another drawback is the state of the mining laws, which put obstacles in the way. American prospectors and explorers seem to suffer, to the great loss of the Province, for more than one-half of the capital now invested in the mines of Ontario is said to be American, "in spite of the repellent conditions imposed by trade policies upon both sides of the line." The restrictions imposed by these trade policies fatally repress mining enterprises in the country, and the commissioners call attention to them in the hope that they may be removed. The Report cites the fact that by long odds the United States, in spite of the tariff imposts, is our principal customer for the products of the mine. Says the report: "The value of the mineral exports of Ontario alone to the United States for the twenty fiscal years 1869 to 1888 was \$14,329,330 and to all the rest of the world it was \$3,342,894. These figures present in a striking light the natural commercial affinity which exists between the two great Anglo-Saxon divisions of the Continent, and open a field of speculative inquiry as to what might have been the volume of the business if trade restrictions had not clogged its movement." To clinch what it has to say on this point the Report adds that "everywhere among men interested in mining operations, with the exception of those engaged in producing and refining petroleum, the Commissioners have met with expressions of an earnest desire to see the American markets opened to the admission of Canadian minerals free of duty upon terms equally fair to both countries." Such is the voice of nature regarding our commercial relations. How long will it be stifled by the politicians in the interest of their ambition?

—The Governor-General promises a speedy settlement of the Behring's Sea question: he does not promise a speedy settlement of the Fisheries question. Now we shall again hear reproaches launched at the mother country for not settling these questions with ironclads. The mother country is in daily peril both of a Russian and a French war: she is besides weakened internally by Irish sedition, which Canadian Legislatures have done their best to foster by hypocritical resolutions of sympathy with disunion, passed for the purpose of capturing the Irish vote. She will do all that her diplomacy, now thoroughly well represented at Washington, as well as at Westminster, can do; but it is idle to expect of her anything more. We contribute nothing to her armaments, nor do we allow her any privileges of trade. Sir Charles Dilke is in the right; if Canada wants to be a power and to have her rights enforced by arms she must set up an army and a navy of her own. The Fisheries question with France is more angry and dangerous than that with the United States. France seems to cherish it as a pretext for quarrel: there is no saying to what it may lead; and we should take it on our hands if we incorporated Newfoundland.

—British ignorance of Canada is inveterate. It appears even in the standard geography books, in which we are told that the St. Lawrence between Lake Ontario and Montreal is called "the Iroquois," and that its navigation is impeded "by waterfalls in its course and by its mouth being frozen up for three months in the year." When the ignorance is coupled, as indeed it usually is, with the complaisant assumption of superior knowledge, it is sometimes very amusing. A writer in the *London Quarterly Review* undertakes with supreme confidence to enlighten his readers about everything in Canada, and particularly about the state of opinion. From him we learn that "when the host is elevated in the Metropolitan basilica (at Quebec) it is to the thunder of artillery of the Colonial

forces," and that the Canadian Pacific "runs from start to finish over British ground." This last mistake, which we see continually repeated in British journals, is the more wonderful because the British own most of the stock of the road and have imbibed the notion that they have a deep interest in it as an Imperial and military line. It seems however hopeless to drive into their minds the fact that the road runs through Maine and that they can make no military use of it whatever, but would have to go round by the old Intercolonial. It is rather remarkable, by the way, that a writer in an English Tory Review would be found suggesting, in effect, to the Americans that it is their true policy to leave Canada in the hands of England, because to England the possession is a source of weakness and pledges her never to assume a bold and independent attitude towards the power at whose mercy it lies.

—Manitoba cannot help being aware of the fact that what she wants is population. But what sort of population she wants and how it is to be got, are points on which her mind does not seem to be so clear. The sort of population which she wants, we venture to submit, is the floating population of this continent, used to the climate, used to or capable of generally adapting itself to the farming, and also used to or capable of quickly adapting itself to the institutions. She wants the material for building up a strong and healthy community as well as the hands to till her soil. To get population of this kind no emigration grant or emigration agents are needed. Take away the Chinese wall and it will come of its own accord. Of emigration grants a large portion goes to the agencies, and the rest is apt to be spent in bringing over people by no means of the best kind. It might be invidious to point to the confirmations of this in Manitoba. Take away, we repeat, the Chinese wall and throw Manitoba open to the Continent. Then people as well as capital and enterprise will come in. Then Manitoba will flourish as she ought; while the wall stands she never can.

Manitoba seems to be taking up again the scheme of the Hudson's Bay Railway. She understands her own interest and her own business better than we do. The most authentic information which we can get is that the passage can hardly ever be said to be entirely free from ice. In that case there seems to be little prospect of success. Of the line of seven hundred miles, over which the road is to be carried, very little can be remunerative, so that the port must be all in all. Since the abolition of C. P. R. monopoly and the opening of railway connection with the South, the special reason for a desperate effort to find an outlet at the North has ceased to exist. However, we repeat, Manitoba knows her own business best.

—The re-election of Mr. Rykert with the brand of Parliamentary infamy fresh upon him, and the letters, worthy of Jonathan Wild, in which he depicts his own character still under the public eye, may be a blessing to us though it comes in the ugliest disguise. It may, and if anything can it will, spur us to reform. This infamy, astounding as it is, is the natural fruit of the system of Government by debauching the people with their own money, which has now been carried on for many years, and which has profoundly corrupted the political character of a community originally as worthy as any community could be of free institutions. The county of Lincoln richly deserves to be disfranchised, and in a sound state of public sentiment disfranchised it would assuredly be. No constituency can have a right to pollute the council of the nation. But to how many other counties would justice have to mete the same measure? The politics of the Maritime Provinces, as Dominion elections show, are mere corruption, fed by government works and grants. That corruption reigns in Quebec we did not need the McGreevy scandal to tell us. Corruption tampers with the representation of Manitoba and turns it into an instrument for defeating the claims of the Province. The character of Mr. Rykert is not a sudden revelation. It

was well known to the head of his party when he twice tried to get him made Deputy Speaker and when he was on the point of making him a Senator. Mr. Rykert's plea to his constituents was that though he was infamous others were infamous also; and his plea unhappily was true. We now know our own condition, and if we have any sense of public morality or regard for national honour left in us, now it will be shown. Soon the demoralization will be past cure.

We have had a lesson on the blessings of government by faction as well as on those of government by corruption. Bad as the conduct of the party which re-elected Mr. Rykert has been, the conduct of its rival has been little better. Had the local leaders of the Liberals possessed a particle of patriotism, they would have refrained for this turn from nominating a candidate and allowed the Conservatives, to whom the seat belonged, the chance of purging their own honour and that of the country. But when did faction care for the honour of the country or for anything but its own selfish ends? Government by party, we are told, is the best and not only the best but the only possible system, though its logical outcome is the re-election of Mr. Charles Rykert; while the most upright and the ablest of men, if he were not the slave of a party and cared only for the good of the whole people, would not poll twenty votes in any constituency in Canada. Other reflections crowd on our minds. Is this, the sceptic will ask, the outcome of our monarchical forms and our orders of knighthood, which are supposed to do so much for the elevation of our political character above that of our democratic neighbours? Is this the outcome of all the churches and all the apparatus of religion with which we suppose Lincoln is as well provided as other counties? What could Yankees or heathens do worse?

Not only is Mr. Rykert re-elected, but he goes off with seventy-four thousand dollars obtained out of the public property by "discreditable, corrupt and scandalous means." Once more we say, let us have a law, with adequate penalties against political corruption, or let us open the prison doors of

malefactors who were far less sorely tempted than the member for Lincoln, and have betrayed far less sacred trusts. The sophistry of the advocate argues that Mr. Rykert's delinquency was private and therefore beyond the cognizance of Parliament. It is nothing of the kind. How can the dealings of a member of Parliament with the public departments respecting public property be otherwise than public? But supposing it were, is private roguery no disqualification for a public trust?

—To name the case of General Middleton in the same breath with that of Mr. Rykert would be preposterous. Nobody, we apprehend, doubts the General's honour or imagines that he would wilfully do anything unbecoming a soldier and a gentleman. His unselfishness he showed by risking his military reputation to spare the blood of our citizens, for no one apparently doubts that had he been reckless of blood he might at once have carried Batoche. In the heat and confusion of war he assented to what was certainly a wrong suggestion as to the disposal of property believed to belong to a rebel and practically derelict, so that it would have been almost certainly looted in any case. He never received the furs or inquired after them. If he had received them, it is reasonable as well as charitable to believe that he would have been well advised and have disposed of them rightly. Of any other furs which have been in his possession he seems to be able and willing to give a satisfactory account. After the lapse of five years he may well have forgotten, as he says he had, an order which had never taken effect. The horse which he took for the public service he handed over at the end of the campaign to be sold at auction for the Government. We may safely say that this was a scrupulosity exceeding any that he had seen exhibited at the storm of Lucknow. Perhaps the wild scenes through which he went in the great Mutiny may have somewhat impaired his ideas of strict legality in a war with rebels. As soon as he knew that his

character was impugned he himself insisted on investigation. The desire of having a Canadian instead of an Englishman to command our forces had been manifested with extreme intensity in certain quarters, and it has been allowed, we fear, by those who cherish it to influence their judgment on the merits of General Middleton's case. The two questions at least have been blended together by the General's enemies in the press. Of the excessive bitterness with which the conqueror of Riel has been assailed in the House of Commons by the defenders of Riel the motive is only too apparent. Is there to be no end to the dishonour to which that alliance brings the Liberals and their leaders? The man who allowed himself to be seduced into it in the hope of recovering power by the aid of the Rielite vote, and this in face of the recent, public and solemn protest of his own conscience, ought to know that in ruthlessly immolating the character of an old soldier to the vindictive passions of his political associates, he brings another stain and a dark one on his own. If a British soldier of rank is to be tried for his honour it ought to be before some other tribunal than an assembly of politicians bent on their own game.

—Sir Michael Hicks-Beach lays down as an axiom that the dissolution of Parliament is not to be justified on constitutional principles unless Ministers have been defeated in the House of Commons, or unless the House becomes impotent to carry through its business, or unless it is paralysed by the approach of its statutory demise. The London *Times*, which is good authority at all events for political practice, endorses Sir Michael's view. This is what we have ourselves constantly maintained and continue to maintain, Sir Charles Dilke's dictum notwithstanding. Sir Charles's rule that a Parliament after four years continues to sit merely during the pleasure of the Prime Minister is to be found, we submit, in no constitutional writer, nor anywhere but in his own brain. It will at all events not fit Canada, where the term is not the same that

it is in England. Nor is Sir Charles Dilke sensible of the difference between the Old Country where the use of indefinite powers is limited in practice by traditional understandings and a colony in which no traditions or understandings exist and whatever power is conceded will be used without limit for party purposes. If Parliament had an axe hanging over its neck which the Prime Minister might at his pleasure let fall, its independence, which the caucus and corruption have already reduced to a minimum, would be gone, and there is no saying to what extent an unscrupulous Minister, by always dissolving when the chances happened to be in his favour, might establish himself in a morally usurped power. If any authority whatever is left to the Governor-General and he is not a mere *cochon à l'engrais* at \$120,000 a year he is bound, by refusing to dissolve without constitutional cause, to defend the independence of the legislature and the right of the people against the unscrupulous ambition and cupidity of the masters of the party machines.

—As the Royal Society of Canada is holding its ninth annual session, there has been time to show whether it earns its public grant. What is the harvest? In the literary field, we fear, next to none. A society for the promotion of literature is an anomaly. An Academy of Painters produces something tangible and by clubbing makes a show. A scientific association, like the Royal Society founded by Charles II., has also its *raison d'être*; it helps joint investigation, promotes the communication of ideas, and produces tangible results. But there can be no *raison d'être* for a society for the promotion of literature, the essence of which is taste, which no royal or gubernatorial patronage can bestow. The utmost that can be said even for the French Academy is that it may possibly serve to keep out of literature that provinciality against which Matthew Arnold inveighed, a function which cannot possibly be performed by the body that meets at Ottawa. Anyone

who consults the volumes of Transactions already published will, we think, agree with us. In the region of science the Royal Society of Canada has achieved a measure of success. The results of the researches of such men as the Dawsons, Selwyns, Sterry-Hunts, Murrays, Matthews, Whiteaves, and others in the geology, mineralogy and palæontology of Canada, have been discussed and made public. Sir Daniel Wilson's investigations also, on the Huron-Iroquois, on the Pre-Aryan American man, and other anthropological subjects (all within the domain of science) could hardly have found a fitter medium for dissemination. The same may be said, in some degree, for the quasi-scientific contributions of Mr. John Reade. But as for Section I, that devoted to "French literature, history, and allied subjects," the tables of contents make one smile. The "allied subjects" embrace fugitive recollections of a visit to the Colonial Exposition, some scenes from an unpublished comedy, a poem in five hundred and odd lines on "La Cloche," and so forth. We say this without any disparagement of the native literature of French Canada, of which, on the contrary, we heartily recognize the charms. The Canadian Society suffers in a comparison with its American counterpart for the Advancement of Science. It is a close corporation, it is not migratory, it offers no fund for the prosecution of individual research. Even its plaudits can have little effect, since their echoes do not pass beyond its portals. Literature is a plant which to thrive must be self-sown. Forced culture will produce only a sickly hybrid. Canada is ambitious of having a native literature; let her wait, and if she has the gift it will come. She will one day awake and find herself famous in the world of letters. It is not to be forgotten that the country is paying for the Royal Society \$5,000 a year, a sum for which a good deal in the way of useful research and encouragement might be done.

—Mr. Blaine's grand Pan-American Congress has failed. Commercially it has come absolutely to nothing, while the

philosophic provisions for international arbitration which have been nominally embraced are little likely to restrain the passions of imperfectly civilized communities, headed by Presidential dictators who sometimes are not far removed from brigands. It does not seem by any means clear, in spite of all the dinners and ovations, that even an increase of good-feeling has resulted from this dead-lift effort to inaugurate an eternal friendship. Mr. Blaine's eyes have been turned in the wrong direction. It is not among the communities of the South, Indian with a sprinkling of Latins on the top, that the Anglo-Saxon of the United States will find congenial partners, but among his own kinsmen at the North; and thither it is that self-government, imperilled in the United States by the foreign influence, must look for true reinforcement. Law and respect for law are the great heritage of the Anglo-Saxon race, and of the races which have come under its influence, and the character of which has been recast in its mould. They are in a less degree characteristic of the Latin races, and not characteristic at all of the other races of South America. The Viceroy of India reigns in all a conqueror's power and state over the two hundred and fifty millions of Hindostan. Yet he cannot without due process of law take a grain of rice from the lowliest Hindoo. The Roman was a famous law-giver, and in his way and degree a great propagator of legality; but he never equalled the Anglo-Saxon. To extend the reign of law is the great mission of our race, and it is for this purpose that politically we ought to unite, not for that of domineering in common over the world.

—The commerce of the United States and consequently that of Canada is threatened with disturbance by the influence of the Silver Ring. If that gang succeeds in imposing its policy on Congress, a result of the same kind will follow which would follow in the case of a large issue of debased coin, or of inconvertible paper currency. The good money, that is to

say the gold, will fly, as it always does, before the bad, and general derangement will ensue. It is probable that though political economy is not as a rule the strong point of American politicians, most of them have the sense to see this and that in yielding to the pressure of the silver gang they will be sinning against light. Their weakness once more points the moral that with party government any compact and thoroughly selfish interest, by taking advantage of the balance of parties, may control legislation and gain its nefarious ends. Where is the optimist who will maintain that the world can be forever governed in this way?

—The chances of immediate legislation at Washington in any direction may be lessened however by the recurrence of a deadlock. The Republican majority has admitted Wyoming and Idaho as States, without a sufficient population, for the sake of the two Senatorships which each, being Republican, will give the party, while by a fraudulent decision, in which men who carry their heads morally so high as Senators Hoar and Evarts did not scruple to take part, they have stolen the two Senatorships of Montana. They have thus in all probability secured a majority in the Senate for some years to come. But it is generally conceded that the Fall Elections will go in favour of the Democrats, who will thus capture the House. The Senate will then be in the hands of one party, the House in that of the other; and to get any measure through both will be almost impossible. Here is the infirmity of the double-chamber system combined with party government. If a Democratic President is elected next time, the Executive will once more be opposed to the Senate and a diplomatic as well as a legislative paralysis may again ensue.

—The British Parliament seems to be labouring almost hopelessly with obstruction. The truth will be forced upon

the minds of British statesmen in time that no nation, much less an empire, can be governed by a mob. To call the House of Commons a deliberative assembly is farcical: what goes on there is not deliberation but a Parliamentary civil war. The government at the moment of our writing is at bay on the question of giving compensation to publicans whose licenses are withdrawn. The "Temperance" party are not satisfied unless they can ruin men whose trade, by the very fact of their holding a license, is shown not to be criminal but sanctioned by the State. Compensation was given to the slave-owners; why should it be withheld from the publicans? If we were to define fanaticism, we should say that it was the enthusiasm which tramples on justice. Mr. Gladstone has gone round on this question as he has on most others, his object being the Temperance vote. He is said by those who sit opposite him every night to show signs of physical failing. The Gladstonians will have no leader when he is gone, and without a leader the "masses" are nothing.

—Over the spirit of the Imperial Federationists' dream, at least as it is dreamed by Lord Rosebery, the one British politician of any mark who has countenanced the movement, a singular change appears to have come. Lord Rosebery proclaims that in the Confederation, which is to give the law of peace and war to the world, are to be included not only Great Britain with her Colonies and dependencies, but the United States. He cannot possibly mean that the political union between Great Britain and the United States is to be renewed and that we are thus, in face of experience, to run the risk of another American Revolution. He must intend a moral reunion of the whole English-speaking race. In other words, he ceases to be an Imperial Federationist at all and becomes, so far as the English-speaking race on this continent is concerned, if not an Annexationist, at least a partaker of sympathies which Imperial Federationists denounce as disloyal. Any Canadian

Jingo who was present must have been stricken to the heart. He must have longed to be on horseback, sword in hand.

—Australian Federation has apparently come to the birth. We shall presently see whether there is strength to bring forth. It is curious that the Australians seem to be, like Sir Charles Dilke and other English observers, or rather non-observers, of Canada in a fool's paradise about the success of Canadian Confederation and to imagine that they have only to follow where Canada has led the way. Has it never occurred to them to send an independent inquirer to this country and enjoin him to extend his political interrogations beyond Ottawa or the Governor-General's residence at Quebec? They do not even seem aware that the establishment of a Federal Government will entail, as it has entailed here, an enormous development not only of expenditure but of faction, demagogism and corruption. Two difficulties they will have peculiar to themselves, that of agreeing on a capital and that of reconciling fiscal systems, Victoria being wedded to Protection while New South Wales is equally wedded to Free Trade. We shall be rather surprised if after all the scheme takes effect. The belief prevails, not only that Federation is the political panacea, but that it is perfectly easy of accomplishment, though history says that it has been hitherto brought about only under strong pressure from without, such as that of the Spanish power on the insurgent Netherlands or that of England on the American colonies, and even then with the greatest difficulty. As soon as the subject of union is practically approached all the centrifugal forces are at once called into action, and if Australia succeeds in controlling them she will deserve to be called the mother of statesmen.

—The Ides of May passed without any event fatal or even menacing to European society and civilization. That the forces of order were organized, while those of disorder

were unorganized is true, but it will always be true so long as the army and the police are sound. There seems to have been no great manifestation of socialism in the proper sense of the word. There was an epidemic of strikes with all their disastrous consequences to trade; but strikers do not aim at the subversion of the existing order of society; they aim only at higher wages and shorter hours. However, it would be idle to deny that the antagonism between employer and employed, which these conflicts sharpen and intensify, is fraught with danger as well as with bitterness. Bismarck in an interview with a correspondent of the *New York Herald*, the report of which bears the stamp of genuineness, is made to say with cynical bluntness that this industrial war between the two classes is natural, and must go on forever; but history hardly bears him out: in the medieval guilds there was fellowship, not antagonism, between master and man. An international combination of workmen against the rest of society, such as this First of May demonstration seemed to threaten, is not much to be feared. Its magnitude would break it down. The French or German "toiler," dearly as he loves the British toiler, does not yet love him well enough not to take his gains from him if he can.

—The picture of Australian Democracy given by Sir Charles Dilke has taken the fancy of those who look for a great increase of wealth and happiness, from an extension of the functions of the State. Socialists we will not call them, because any extension of the powers of the State to matters cognate to those already within its sphere, whether wise or unwise, is not Socialism. Mr. Wiman has been led to put forth a lively little brochure, entitled "A Paradise for Workmen," in which he comprehends with the Australian experiment the social policy of the German Emperor. If Sir Charles Dilke's account of Australia is half as optimistic and as open to criticism as his account of Canada, we had better wait to hear from Australia

before we announce a Paradise. For our own part we no more worship individual liberty than we worship State interference. We are willing to have our lives guided aright by any system or power that can do it. We are ready to give ourselves into the hands of the State, that is of the government, provided we can be assured that the government is perfectly wise and good. But so long as the government consists of ordinary men, not to say of leaders of faction and demagogues, we shall prefer to confine its duties to those matters with which it alone can deal. The reason, as it seems to us, why society at present does not come to ruin is that power is largely in the hands, not of the politicians, but of chiefs of commerce and industry, of wielders of social influence and moulders of opinion. To construct a perfect government is the first task of the Socialist, though it is one to which he never turns his attention. He rails at all existing governments and proposes to put unlimited power into their hands. After all, erect what government you will and put what you will into its hands, we doubt whether the workman will make any great advance towards Paradise otherwise than by steady industry, integrity, frugality and temperance,—modes of improving his condition which no labour journalists preach.

—Europe continues to watch with anxious eyes the eccentric movements of the German Emperor. That the Emperor's nature is not noble appears too plainly from his failure publicly to acknowledge at parting, by a single word of gratitude, the immense services of the great man who has placed the Imperial crown upon his head, and by whose heroic daring Germany has been made a nation. He seems to think that Bismarcks are secondary accidents and the wearer of the crown is all in all. Had his majesty's grandfather thought the same his majesty would be king of Prussia. He proclaims peace and increases his army. Very likely he does desire peace, but the mighty hand which could impose peace on Europe is gone.

The prevailing theory seems to be that the dismissal of Bismarck was caused by friction between him and the Emperor. We cannot help fearing, however, that there is also something in the theory that royalty and family feeling have contrived to revenge themselves for the overthrow of petty monarchies, especially that of Hanover. To those whose trade it is to be kings the greatest of all offences are those which affect the trade.

—Mr. Hurlbert, an American ex-journalist of mark, after carefully studying France, comes to the conclusion that the French people want a Monarchy instead of a Republic. The French people want neither Monarchy nor Republic: the prestige of both has long been worn out, and as to the traditions or monuments of the monarchical past they are no more to the French peasant than Stonehenge is to Hodge, or Luxor to the Fellaheen. What the French people want is strong, stable, and trustworthy government; and the question is how to found such a government on the shifting sand of a Chamber made up of a dozen factions always caballing against each other, always conspiring against the administration, and filled with restlessness by personal vanity, as well as by party passion. For a moment there is an apparent increase of strength and stability; but how long will it last?

—Mr. Gladstone's comparison of the killing of a single rioter at Mitchellstown to the Siberian atrocities is worthy of Mr. Gladstone though it will be echoed by American Anglophobists who exulted over the slaughter of more than a thousand Irish in the Draft riots. But surely there can be no use in irritating the Czar when we cannot control him. Our protests are all taken as expressions of sympathy with Nihilism, the professed object of which is not to reform Russian Government, but to destroy the community, the moral law,

religion, marriage and the family, while its instrument is murder. Nothing is so cruel as fear : no fear is so maddening as the fear of assassination ; and the more the Czar is threatened by the dynamite of Nihilism the more savage his measures of repression will be. He may be goaded into war. We believe that as to the Russian prison system the sober truth is, as a trustworthy inquirer told us some time ago, that it is barbarous in proportion to other things in Russia, compared with more advanced nations, but not more.

—We are not surprised at the rejection of the Copyright Bill by Congress. The wonder is that anyone should think it worth his while to roll up the Congressional hill this stone of Sisyphus, which always rolls down again. Strike for free trade in books, and when you have got it produce your literary wares as you produce other wares, in such a shape and at such a price as will suit and command the market, instead of clinging to conventional forms and asking a guinea for that which is not worth half-a-crown. That is the true policy. Meantime, Canada, ill-starred, is left between the upper millstone of British Copyright and the lower millstone of American piracy. If our Bill is vetoed it will be hard upon us and not less hard upon the English author.

—In a recent issue of *The Week*, Prof. J. Clarke Murray, of McGill University, enters a timely protest against the pestilent fashion of book-hawking, which not only degrades literature and is unfair to the legitimate book-trade, but is a means of gulling and often of swindling the public. For one good book put in circulation through its agency, perhaps fifty indifferent if not bad ones, are palmed off. In the case even of the good book, the buyer is often made to pay twice its fair price. Some day, surely, the system will be upset, and we shall see England throwing over the artificial and privileged library system,

and this continent rejecting book-publishing by subscription. In this matter we would do well, as Matthew Arnold did, to look to France. The intrusion of the book-canvasser has become well-nigh intolerable: this, our publishers may as well acknowledge.

—The Exhibition of the Ontario Society of Artists is about the best we have had and promises well for the future. The work of a few artists will usually stand out from that of the rest, but on the present occasion the average merit is high. Nor is there what we have previously noted, a marked contrast in the success attained by the workers in water-colours and oils. This year the more difficult department is equally well represented. At its head, in figure subjects, stands Mr. G. A. Reid, with "Mortgaging the Homestead" and "The Other Side of the Question." In the latter there is perhaps too high a colour, but both are clever and show increasing power and facility. "A Study"—a profile face in shadow, with a well managed light effect falling on the neck, from the same brush, deserves praise. Mr. Forster's "The Rival Ladies' Schools" is a very amusing, clever and skilful handling of a very amusing subject, while it surmounts great technical difficulties. Miss Tully's portrait of a young girl (No. 215) shows fine treatment. The high merit of Mr. Pinhey's "Christian Martyr" suffers by being hung above the line. From the same artist we have a native historical subject (No. 156) which is vigorously treated. The figures of the Indians shooting their arrows at the passing canoes are examples of intensity of action. Mr. Forbes shows well in the likeness of "The Late Mr. Bendelari," and Miss McConnell in a strong figure (No. 229) seated in an arm-chair. Mr. W. A. Sherwood has a fine subject, cleverly treated, in the Rev. Dr. Scadding. Mr. Cutts is also well represented in the portrait No. 239. In landscapes, perhaps the best in the gallery is Mr. Bell-Smith's "Dulse Gatherers in the Bay of Fundy." The fog effect is capitally rendered,

and the foreground is a very careful bit of work. Mr. Homer Watson has this year no large canvases, but the small landscapes he sends are characteristically good. In oils, among the other subjects that deserve mention, are Mrs. G. A. Reid's Flowers, Mr. Forbes' Peaches, and two studies of dogs—"A Scotch Terrier," and "A Pug"—by Mr. Sherwood.

In water-colours the chief honours belong to Mr. M. Matthews and Mr. Bell-Smith, though throughout this department there is much positive excellence. Mr. O'Brien is not strongly represented this season. Appeals to the public for support will avail little if the head of the Canadian Academy appears comparatively to slight the exhibition. What Mr. O'Brien sends, however, is good, particularly his "Clovelly," a sea-coast piece in Devon. Another Old World scene he sends us is "A Norman Stairway," which is excellent in its line of art. An old and ever-welcome exhibitor is Mr. J. A. Fraser, who shows some charming sketches which may well serve as models for our younger artists. It is pleasant to see that Mr. Fraser, though settled at a distance, is loyal in his attachment to Canadian art. The chief field of Messrs. Matthews and Bell-Smith's successes is that of the Rockies. Specially good are Mr. Bell-Smith's examples (Nos. 47, 59 and 67) of rolling clouds and tree tops on the mountains. No. 112, by the same artist, representing a canyon on the Illecillewaet, is bold and effective. Mr. Matthews is a strong exhibitor, also, in his mountain sketches. Very admirable are No. 7, "In Fraser Canyon," No. 11, "The Hermit Range of the Selkirks," and No. 122, "Head of the Illecillewaet." No. 36, "The River's Birth," we deem a masterpiece. In this last the artist has succeeded in giving us a splendid vista. Mr. Matthews' whole work is of a high order. Cool and rich is Mr. Revell's "On the Humber" (No. 56). A Cumberland scene, from the same brush, is an effective and painstaking bit of work. No. 101, a harbour scene, by Mr. Knowles, is commendable. Exceedingly good also is all of Mr. Bruenech's work, particularly No. 46, "North Cape in a Storm," and No. 262, "Elizabeth Island, Jersey." Mr. Gagen

has some excellent qualities as a studier of character. His Nassau sketches are both picturesque and pleasing. In Sculpture, Mr. Dunbar, Mr. Frith, and Mr. McCarthy, as usual, make a good showing. On the whole, as we have said, the exhibition is a success.

Professor Ashley, in his paper on the "Canadian Sugar Combine," noticed in our last issue, said: "So it is with competition. It gave England forty years ago cheap cloth and cheap cotton. It gave it also a huge, miserable and discontented working population that brought it to the verge of a social revolution." This we took to refer to Free Trade, which was introduced rather more than forty years ago, and which gave England cheap cloth and cheap cotton. In the same paragraph, Prof. Ashley had twice treated free trade and free competition apparently as convertible terms. It seems, however, from a letter received from him, that in this passage he did not mean free trade, but free competition generally; that he distinguishes the one from the other; and that he means to speak of "Competition," and not of "Free Trade." We must beg leave therefore to correct what we said. We should, however, be prepared to deny that anything in the way of commercial or industrial legislation, done forty years ago, had produced a "miserable and discontented population." There has been, we submit, from that time not only a vast growth of national wealth, but a growth almost equally vast of the area of comfortable living. The inverted commas in our paragraph were misplaced: they ought to have been after not before "free trade."

If there has been delay on our part in dealing with the case of Messrs. Macdonald and Tupper the blame rests partly on those gentlemen. They chose, or perhaps one of them chose, instead of addressing a remonstrance to the editor of this journal who might at once have attended to it, to send

a grossly insulting and libellous letter to a writer who happened not to be in the country and publish it in their party organ. After the publication of that letter we might perhaps have been warranted in leaving the matter where it stood. Special notice was hardly due to a volley of personal abuse, discharged moreover against the wrong object. The statements of the *Globe*, to which we referred, were perfectly explicit and circumstantial, and were supported by documentary evidence produced in a public law suit. Nor were the facts on which our remarks were based denied at the time of the occurrence, either by the party organ, which could do little more than cry *tu quoque*, or by the Prime Minister, when the charge of "trading on and speculating in their influence with the administration" was brought against the firm in Parliament by Mr. Malcolm Cameron. The Prime Minister touched only two or three transactions, leaving the general case untouched. However, we have caused inquiry to be made at Winnipeg, as we said we would. Some of the sources of information which were open to the *Globe* at the time are now closed against us. Still we have what we consider abundant evidence, documentary and of other kinds, before us. We never said or meant to imply that any department of Government had been corrupted or approached with improper language. It is not alleged that even Mr. Rykert ever bribed an official, or introduced himself formally as a member of Parliament demanding of Government the price of his support. Nor did we in simply recording the denials of Messrs. Macdonald and Tupper in the Rykert case mean to imply any doubt of their veracity, but, on the contrary, to accept their disclaimer without question. But subject to these remarks we are prepared to maintain that the statement of the case in the *Globe* was substantially true and that in partly reproducing it we did no wrong. We say this without the slightest misgiving. "I think," says a former member of the firm in reply to a legal interrogatory, "the (timber) limits were gotten from the position Macdonald and Tupper (held) apart from their being lawyers."

What position did they or could they hold apart from this connection with the Ministers? What else could have led to the employment of these two young men, out of all the lawyers in Winnipeg, in a long series of transactions of this kind? What but their personal connection with 'Government' could have led to their success, above all their local compeers, and their extraordinary gains? "It has been very generally understood here," says a most trustworthy informant, "that about the only means of getting anything done in the Interior Department at Ottawa, out of the regular routine course, was to obtain the services of some Conservative lawyer or agent, and from their intimate relations with the two principal members of the Government the firm of Macdonald & Tupper have almost monopolized this business." By what miracle is it that this not very eminent firm has flourished while disappointment and even despondency have reigned around? Of the marvellous list of agencies, to which they have pointed as the source of their apparently inordinate gains, did all come to them in the ordinary way? The Winnipeg Bar seems to have thought not. What made them Land Solicitors to the C. P. R.? When they, without professional claims to the honour, are made Q. C.'s and the Attorney-General of the Province is passed over, this is surely notice to suitors of the channel through which favourable access to Ottawa is most likely to be found. With regard to the general opinion at Winnipeg, both at the time and now, on this subject there can be no doubt. Even the Manitoban journalist who now supports Messrs. Macdonald & Tupper and seconds their calumnious attack on a writer in this journal, formerly himself denounced their practices, amidst roaring applause, in language which it would be almost libellous to repeat. We are of opinion that in an ideal state of official practice and public sentiment the sons of Ministers would not be habitually engaged in promoting claims of any kind in the departments of Government. If this sounds like suspiciousness, perhaps at the present juncture it will be thought that suspiciousness is not, of all faults, injurious to the Commonwealth.

THE BYSTANDER.

JULY, 1890.

THE Ontario Election went as we said it would go and, we believe, for the reasons which we gave. Mr. Meredith had not at his side a single man possessed as an administrator of public confidence. His right and left bower had been tried in the last session and had failed. He took up Equal Rights too late and as the people thought too obviously with a view to the election. At the same time he incurred in full measure the hostility of the Roman Catholic clergy and gave his opponents the full benefit of their influence. He had no other cry, the Mowat Government not having laid itself open to any special charge. Ottawa knifed him, yet he had to move under the restraint and to carry the odium of the connection as well as to drag the weight of its local organ. The position which he undertook to storm had been fortified by the assiduous exercise of patronage, including the sinister licensing power, by gerrymandering, and all the other influences which a party in office commands, for eighteen years. If we add that he is himself rather too open-minded and too amiable for party leadership, we shall be saying what from our point of view is not disparagement but praise.

Mr. Meredith has now to choose his course. He can hardly doubt that there is an end of the old donkey-engine which he was set to work in Ontario in the interest of a party at Ottawa, and indirectly in the interest of Quebec, by whose support the party at Ottawa is kept in power. His task has in fact been to hold Ontario down while Quebec plucked her, and this can

be done no more. The tie between Dominion and Provincial party has been finally broken. An Opposition here to have a chance of success must be a Provincial Opposition. In that character it may work its way to victory. Nothing can be weaker than the moral position of Mr. Mowat, a professing Liberal and an old opponent of Separate Schools, purchasing the support of a reactionary priesthood by a flagrant sacrifice of Liberal principle. Old stagers may be content to remain in such a ship, but the younger men will be repelled. Hope will come to the Opposition and bring strength with it. The men whom it so much needs will be called out, and they will not, as soon as they show ability, be drafted off to Ottawa. To govern us while he keeps himself in power by the Roman Catholic vote is what the Grit leader undertakes. There are surely men enough in Ontario resolved not to be so governed to make a decent following for his opponent.

It is pleasant when you have said what seemed paradoxical to be proved right. Many of our readers must have thought that we were guilty of paradox in saying that Mr. Mowat was the Sir John Macdonald of Ontario, that the real affinity was between the positions of those two men, and that Sir John never very heartily desired that "Mowat should go," but was well content with an arrangement under which he and Mr. Mowat used the Catholic vote by turns, while all was kept quiet in the British and Protestant Province. But our diagnosis has proved true. Not only did Ottawa knife Mr. Meredith. *Le Monde*, Sir Hector Langevin's recognised organ, openly hailed the success of Mr. Mowat as a victory for Sir John Macdonald's Government. And now Sir John himself, with Archbishop Cleary at his side, exults over the renewal by the people of Ontario of their confidence in Mr. Mowat. What says Ontario Toryism; what say the managers of its organ, who for months past have been furiously abusing Mr. Mowat and holding him up as totally unworthy of public confidence? What, we may also ask, say the Liberals who have voted for Mr. Mowat and Archbishop Cleary? Are not those Liberals,

who followed Liberal principle and not Party, abundantly justified in their course?

Mr. Mowat of course received the entire Roman Catholic vote. Not only did he receive the vote, but prayers were offered up for his success, as prayers would be offered up tomorrow for his discomfiture if he ceased to serve the interest and do the bidding of the Church. He may yet live to find as others have found who have played the same game that in politics the name of priest is perfidy. His party indeed need only live two years to become sensible of the fact. For at the Dominion election the sheep will all be driven into the other pen and the Grits, in requital for their surrender, will poll not a single Roman Catholic vote.

A portion of the Orange body did nobly for its own principles and for the cause of William of Orange. The "new party" persisted in going to the poll without the faintest chance of success, or even of polling a respectable vote, and did just enough to ensure the victory of the Machines, a result which its eminent and eloquent leader can hardly have desired.

How fared Equal Right? Far better than any movement of principle outside the Machines has ever fared before it. Its meetings up to the last were crowded and enthusiastic. It manifestly turned several elections. In Toronto its chief candidate did nobly on the platform and polled 4,500 votes, among which if the names could be known, would certainly be found no mean portion of what is best, most intelligent, and most independent in Toronto. This was done with hardly any organization and without an election fund. The strength of the Machines is tremendous; it was felt in the very core of the Equal Rights Association. The issue was confused and overlaid at the polls by other issues, general and local, as well as by blind allegiance to party. Had it been distinctly submitted to the people, there can be no doubt what the verdict would have been. There can be no doubt if the issue of Equal Right ever is submitted to the people what the verdict will be. But the men who have come forward as the champions of the prin-

ciple must persevere. They have taken the public conscience into their hands, and if they fail the people, the deadness to principle will be greater than ever, and our latter end will be worse than our first.

—Mr. Mercier triumphs in Quebec. He even, in the teeth of all prophecies, carries Montreal. So the Nationalist Tricolor still floats over that Province, the Pope reigns over it, and the revival of New France is more than ever its aspiration for the future. The appeals of the victorious party both to Nationalism and to Ultramontanism appear to have been as open and direct as they were successful. Good-night to French Conservatism, and at the same time to British influence, in the French Province! The only drawback to Mr. Mercier's triumph is that his treasury is empty. This gives rise to a rumour that he will "sell out" to Sir John Macdonald for a large subsidy. There is certainly no stern morality on either side to forbid the deal. If this did happen after the surrender of all Liberal principles by the Grits for the sake of the Mercier alliance it would be in its way one of the pleasantest little incidents in our political history. But it is more likely that Mr. Mercier will again have recourse to the strong-box of the British and heretic financiers of Montreal. A subsidy, however, may be extorted from the Dominion Government and to provide the means for it perhaps another ten per cent. will be laid on the farm implements of the settlers in the North-West. Meantime we would invite the attention of Imperial Federationists and all people who are inclined that way once more to New France and ask them how they propose to work it into their projected system. Mr. Mowat, we observe, has not congratulated Mr. Mercier.

—The judgment which was given by the Supreme Court of the United States the other day in the case of Nagle, the

United States officer who had shot Terry to save the life of Judge Field, and which affirmed the right of the Federal Government to protect its judges on circuit, had a significance beyond the special case or class of cases. It denoted an extension of the Federal and National power. The two Democratic members of the Court, the Chief Justice and Judge Lamar, asserted the principle of the State Right Party by a dissentient judgment accordingly. But nationalization will not stop here. The social and commercial fusion consequent on the extension of railways and of commercial enterprises and corporations has been silently removing the landmarks of State Right. To a corporation trading in half-a-dozen States it is most inconvenient to be under as many different commercial codes. The frightful diversity of divorce laws is also producing effects which are fast becoming intolerable. Unification both of commercial law and of the marriage law is in the air.

—The indications now are that the so-called McKinley Tariff Bill at Washington will become law without material change. The Republican leaders have felt the public pulse most anxiously and carefully, and believe that the Bill will give them votes and money enough to carry the autumn election for members of the House of Representatives, which is their almost openly avowed purpose in settling the details of the Bill. If they have grievously or even fatally injured some important interests, they have imparted at least a temporary stimulus to others, and as they have not scrupled to give the preference to interests from which they expect the most in a partisan sense, it is probable that the proximate results of the measure will tell politically in their favour. That the ultimate and not very distant effect of the Bill will be to hasten the movement towards freer trade can hardly be questioned. The McKinley tariff will further reduce the declining export trade of the United States, and, as the inevitable tendency of the protective system is to accumulate the

wealth of a country in the hands of a favoured minority, there must shortly be a hapless and discontented majority ready to strike so soon as the cause of distress is seen with the clearness of practical conviction. The McKinley Bill is the product of an era distinguished, beyond all precedent, for the corruption of the machinery of popular government by bribery on a scale of hugeness comports with the largeness of American ideas in general. It has a parallel, in this respect, in our Protective system. Nothing much better than the McKinley Bill could be devised as a means of practically testing the comparative merits of Free Trade and Protection over so wide an area as that of the United States. In that respect it is an important contribution to economic science. It will in the upshot, we have little doubt, prove to be also an important contribution to the progress of commercial and industrial liberty. There are parts of it which as Canadians we must deplore, and which will probably inflict upon us temporary loss and distress, yet in the end we may be glad to see it passed in its unmitigated deformity. Combined with the equally suicidal policy of our own Government, it may produce a revolt which will overturn the whole edifice of iniquity. Let it be noted that in England Mr. Gladstone, while he has changed on almost every other question, remains firm in his adherence to Free Trade and scouts the idea that Protectionism under the name of Fair Trade or of any other *alias* has a chance of success in Great Britain. Our Imperial Federationists therefore may lay aside any ideas of a Tariff Union or of discrimination in favour of the Colonies, not that our protected manufacturers desire anything of that kind, for to their loyal minds the exclusion of British goods is the first object of commercial legislation.

—So far we had written when there suddenly came Mr. Blaine's letter transmitted by the President to Congress and recommending that authority be given to the President to de-

clare the ports of the United States free to all the products of any nation of the American hemisphere upon which no export duties are imposed. This has fallen like a thunderbolt upon the McKinley Bill and its supporters. We had not been without reason to believe that something of the kind was brewing in that quarter, but we could not understand how the party would have pushed the McKinley Bill in Congress as it did, if it knew that its own leaders in the Administration were hostile to its policy. Generally the unity of party at Washington is strict enough, if not to prevent internal dissensions, to preclude their open exhibition. Mr. Blaine is a man of larger mind than most of his party, and as Secretary of State he stands on an eminence from which he commands a wider view than those who are struggling in the Congressional crowd. He no doubt scans the future and sees that in spite of the verdict apparently given by the nation at the last Presidential election, the tide of opinion is really turning, as this journal has maintained, against the follies and iniquities of the present system. The American nation would be in its dotage if it were not so. Mr. Blaine has championed the Protection policy both on the stump and very recently in literary debate with Mr. Gladstone. But he would probably say that his proposal being confined to the nations of the American hemisphere, and leaving the tariff-wall against European goods untouched, he is guilty of no treason to his principle. His proposal is in terms confined to the South American "nations" which sent delegates to his Pan-American convention. But Canada also is in the American hemisphere. For us, too, if Mr. Blaine's policy triumphs at Washington, the proposal of Continental Free Trade will change the scene.

—The sword of the Inter-State Commerce Act still hangs suspended over the two Canadian Railways and nobody seems to know whether it will fall. In the balanced state of parties in the United States almost every sectional interest has a veto on

the national policy. The veto of a sectional interest saved us from the national policy of retaliation. A similar veto which is certainly being interposed, may save the C.P.R. and the Grand Trunk. Yet it is scarcely probable that the Americans if they have any national feeling will allow the two foreign roads to retain a privilege against their own and against lines subsidized by their Government, especially when one of the foreign roads is being perpetually paraded by its injudicious friends as a great military work and the grand engine of a policy antagonistic to the United States. In Commercial Union lies the only sound and permanent solution of this as well as the Fisheries' question, the Behring Sea question, and all other commercial questions between us and our neighbours.

—The true object of the so-called Silver Bill at Washington is expressed in its title: "An Act directing the purchase of silver bullion and the issue of Treasury notes thereon." Firstly, and chiefly, the design of the Bill is to create an artificial price and demand for silver by compelling the Government of the United States to purchase vast quantities of it in excess of the normal wants of the Mint. The members of Congress most active in pushing this compulsion to extremity are, some of them, largely interested in silver mines, and are thus using their official positions for purposes of the most sordid character. They are supported by otherwise innocent colleagues, who believe that a debasement of the currency would benefit their respective localities, west and south, by inducing an inflation of enterprise and of values of land and products, and so increasing the capacity of their constituents to pay their debts. Men who live, or wish to live, by speculation, instead of by labour, are also for the Bill, hoping to find in the effects of a redundant currency, produced by issuing circulating notes upon the bullion to be purchased under compulsion of the Act, many opportunities for turning the "nimble sixpence" at the sole charge of somebody else.

Boundless as the capacity for economical delusion is, it seems incredible that many people can deliberately and sincerely convince themselves that there can be two standards of value, any more than there can be two standards of height, weight or quality, or that the Silver Bill means anything but an inflation of the currency by a vast coinage of bad money. The Bill is but one more manifestation of the struggle constantly going on between unscrupulousness and avarice on the one side, and thrift and industry on the other. Luckily the political necessities of President Harrison and his nearest partisans are likely to restrain him and them from permitting the Bill to go as far in the direction of mischief as otherwise it might. Capable management of the Treasury may still put off for a while the evil day when gold shall no longer be the standard of value for the American Union.

Canadian financiers, foreseeing the Silver Bill, have made their American contracts expressly in gold. But will the stipulation be respected? May not the Supreme Court, which, in the ill-omened case of the Legal Tender Act, held that paper when issued by the Government, though depreciated, must be taken at par, also hold that silver when issued by the Government must be taken as gold in the like manner? The disturbance of the faith of contracts cannot be more flagrant in the second case than it was in the first. The Supreme Court, when political considerations do not interfere, is a most respectable tribunal, but political considerations do sometimes interfere. We stoutly maintain, however, that in no case has Congress any legal power to break contracts, and that the Supreme Court in holding that Congress has that power gives an unrighteous judgment. Congress has no powers but those which are expressly given it by the Constitution, and the Constitution gives it no power of breaking contracts, while it expressly withholds that power from the State Legislature. If the excellent correspondent of the New York *Tribune* or anyone else has any answer to this argument we should like to see it.

—“Our Infant Woollens” is a tract, put forth we believe by one of the highest authorities in New England, showing in a striking instance how infant industries keep their promise that as soon as protection has given them a foothold they will dispense with it and stand alone. From the first protective tariff, that of 1789 and 1791, vaunted as the foundation stone of American prosperity, to the McKinley Bill, the protective duties on Woollens have advanced through successive stages from $7\frac{1}{2}$ to 100 per cent. The people are now not only being robbed by the monopolists of the 100 per cent. duty on their clothes, but their earnings are being taken from them and squandered in pensions at the rate of a hundred millions a year to prevent the reduction of the tariff. Meantime the treasurer of the Arlington Woollen Mills reports to his stockholders: “I have been your treasurer for a consecutive period of twenty years. During this period the average earnings have been 20 8-10 per cent. upon the capital. . . . The earnings last year were nearly three and a half times those of the year previous, and there is every indication that the current year will be the most profitable one in the Company’s history.” The artisan votes for protection because he is told that it keeps up wages. Have wages in the Arlington Mills been kept up to the level of the profits? The development on the largest scale of fertile lands, rich minerals and water-powers with a vast immigration, as the writer truly says, have stimulated production and have really created the prosperity which Protection falsely arrogates as its own work. Canada has now been consigned by Sir John Macdonald for his political purposes to “infants” of the same kind, and we shall have a similar succession of demands for further applications of the pap-boat, enforced as they are in the United States by the lavish use of corruption. Unfortunately, Canada if she has, like the United States fertile lands, rich minerals and water-power to make up for the drain of taxation, is by the same policy excluded from her natural market, whereas the United States are a vast market to themselves. However, we say once more

the night of Protectionism is now far spent. Mr. Butterworth's speech on the McKinley Bill which called forth a great burst of sympathy from the country is not unlikely to prove the first streak of dawn.

—The reports of our Banks and other financial institutions are on the whole favourable. The Bank of Montreal admits that it has had a pinch, but this appears to be largely owing to the withdrawal of Government deposits. It seems almost misanthropic to breath a misgiving as to the perfect trustworthiness of their indications. Yet we cannot help asking ourselves what is the basis of our commercial prosperity and the security for its continuance. Ontario is a farming country and its staples are wheat and barley. Our wheat market in England, if it is not closed, is greatly diminished and likely to be still further diminished by the influx of wheat from India and other quarters. Our barley market is reduced by the growing preference for the lighter kinds of ale, in which barley is less used, as well as threatened with destruction by the American tariff. The cattle trade with England is a failure; so is, and so must be, the horse trade, since horses sent to a distant market, if they do not take its fancy at once will consume a great part of their value in standing at livery. Minerals we have good store, but the fatal policy of the Government denies them a market, and at the same time forbids the importation of machinery and discourages the inflow of capital to work them. Farm land has gone down in value at least thirty per cent. over the Province; the exodus continues; and it is said that the area of land under grain has actually diminished. The growth of Toronto and the rise of real estate there, though vaunted as proofs of prosperity, are all at the expense of the smaller towns, from which the people are rushing, as they are in other countries, to the great city. When money is made here, it is to a serious extent carried over the water to be spent. Our debt to England is being augmented by the im-

portation of British capital for investment on a large scale. What then is it which pays the interest on all the capital of our Banks and Loan Societies, and what guarantee have we for the continuance of the power to pay in the future?

We cannot speak of our Banks without noticing the withdrawal of Mr. Henry W. Darling from the Presidency of the Bank of Commerce, which it has been his task to pilot over a somewhat dangerous sea. The breadth of his commercial view and his power of handling great commercial questions, with his general ability and energy, have been very valuable not only to the Board of Trade which signally recognized his services to it, but to the commercial community at large, and it is to be hoped that opportunities of rendering similar services will not be wanting to him in the future.

—On both sides of the Line we have been doing our best to “get rid of the timber,” which has been treated as if it cumbered the ground. What has not been used for building or for fuel has been burned where it stood, while the waste has been enormous. The result now is, not only a decline in the quality of marketable timber, but the prospect of a dearth in the near future; for timber, unlike grain, does not grow again in a year or even in a generation. In Canada, we have hitherto supposed that our forest-wealth was inexhaustible. The same mistake was made by the fur-traders in regard to the peltry trade. We have gone on for years selling, often far under value, or, with an easy morality, making grants to politicians of extensive timber limits, and we are to-day only awaking to the consequences of our folly. Even the railways which we have lavishly bonused have been active agents in denuding the land of its treasure. A protest addressed the other day by Mr. William Little to the Montreal Board of Trade contains some startling proofs of the waste. The annual conversion into sawn lumber of the forest areas of the United States has been so enormous that it appears that in

the once heavily-wooded districts of Maine and Michigan there is now left standing not more than a year or two's yield. Mr. Little states "that the forests of the vast territory extending from the confines of New Brunswick to the head waters of the Mississippi are almost on the verge of immediate exhaustion." What has been cut for shingles, added to the amount sawn into lumber, has made great inroads, chiefly on the rapidly disappearing stock of spruce and white pine. The same writer observes, that so frightful has been the forest slaughter that the 29 billion feet reported as standing ten years ago in Lower Michigan have dwindled to 3 billion feet, or one-tenth the amount standing in that year. The same reckless consumption has been going on in Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont; the spruce in the Adirondaek region of New York, which was estimated ten years ago at 5 billion feet, with a limited amount in the mountain districts of Pennsylvania, has now, it appears, been pretty well harvested. "To-day," adds Mr. Little, "for every mill-owner who has five years' stock remaining, there are ten who have not one. The mills are being dismantled, burnt stump lands are being again cut over, all floatable timber of every kind is being taken to the mills to be converted into lumber, and mill-owners are now making onslaught on our Canadian pine to keep their otherwise useless saw mills in operation." The result of American recklessness is beginning to come home to our neighbours, and it will be well for us to profit by their experience. By forest destruction a hundred industries connected with lumber will suffer, as well as the lumber trade itself; railway and shipping interests will be affected; and even our climate will undergo, indeed it is already undergoing, a serious change.

—The demand of another half million for Schools in Toronto though since abated, has startled Toronto and made people ask whether this source of expenditure ought not to be brought under regular control. To exempt it from regular control was

fine sentiment but not economy. The system is an anomaly and in its primary aspect not equitable. Of those who use the public schools three-fourths are just as well able to pay for the schooling of their children as for their bread and clothing, while the natural obligation is precisely the same. There is no more equity in calling upon the man with one child to provide the six children of his perhaps less prudent neighbour with education than there would be in calling upon him to feed and clothe them. The compensation for the unfairness is the political and social security which the system is supposed to assure to us by educating a class which might otherwise through ignorance misuse political power and perhaps grow up criminal. But is the assurance fulfilled? Are the children of the lowest and most dangerous class found in the schools? Do not the returns of the Minister of Education give us reason to suspect that a large portion of those children at all events is allowed to escape? A law of compulsory attendance carried thoroughly into effect is the complement of the public school system without which the system itself cannot be just. It is strange that people should kick so resolutely against public relief for the destitute, as leading to demoralization, while they acquiesce in a school system which is nothing more nor less than a system of public relief on the largest scale for the class which takes advantage of the schools.

—The Official Report of the Committee on the Middleton case which is now before us fully bears out the opinion which we had formed. Let it be borne in mind that the charge against the General was systematic looting or connivance at looting. The appropriation of Bremner's furs, according to the indictment brought by Mr. Lister, was not an isolated transaction but part of a series comprising, besides the Bremner case, the appropriation of furs by the General, the appropriation by him of horses, and the appropriation by Mr. S. L. Bedson, with the General's connivance, of a pool-table and horses taken from

settlers at Batoche. Three of the four cases have fallen to the ground, the Batoche and Bedson cases being apparently abandoned, as nothing is said about them in the Report, while the appropriation of horses by the General is reduced to the taking, for the public service, of a single horse which was afterwards handed over to the Government auctioneer. The letter directing the confiscation and appropriation of the Bremner furs cannot be found: its contents have to be supplied from memory; the General did not look at it after it was written, and he positively denies having directed the insertion of any injunction to secrecy. Nor did he ever see the furs or inquire about them afterwards. Bremner now swears that he had nothing to do with the rebellion, the Indians having carried him off to their camp by force; but appearances were clearly against him at the time. Among other things, he had in his possession the rifle of a slain volunteer. A hasty order given five years ago turmoil of war and forgotten as soon as it was given, is in the the sum of the misconduct proved against General Middleton. The order was unquestionably wrong. The General's indiscretion in giving it is greatly to be lamented, and bitterly it has been rued. But when this has been said all has been said that reason and justice warrant, or that would have been said if influences and motives perfectly irrelevant to the merits of the case had not been allowed to interfere. A verdict ought to have been given on the charge preferred, which was that of systematic looting or connivance at looting, and given on that charge it must have been a verdict of acquittal.

—There are surely few events more deserving of oblivion than the Fenian Raids. It is difficult to see how anyone can desire to keep their memory alive unless he wants to fan the embers of international enmity. To us they were inglorious, to the Americans worse. Owing to bad combinations and a blunder on the field, our troops were put to flight by a horde of vagabond marauders. The American Government, on the

other hand, failed in the observance of international obligations and ought to have paid for its failure at Geneva. Its excuse was the moral support lent to the South by the Tory aristocracy of England and its partisans here. If American statesmen yielded, however ignominiously, to the Irish vote we, considering the action of our Legislatures, are hardly qualified to cast the first stone. Let us honour by all means the memory of all who died for the country, but let us not allow their sepulchre to be used by those who had no part in their sacrifice as the altar of an irrational and ignoble hatred. The Romans marked with a memorial stone the spot where the thunder-bolt had struck, but they did not annually bring to it votive wine and flowers.

The celebration of military anniversaries altogether perhaps belongs more clearly to the worshippers of Mars or of Woden than to believers in the Gospel. So long as separate nationalities exist, and there is no supreme tribunal to arbitrate between them in their quarrels, wars there will be, the qualities of the soldier will be justly prized, and deliverance in battle will be a cause for national thankfulness, perhaps a meet occasion for *Te Deums*. But the war over, the enmity between Christian nations ought to cease. Nor are those who desire to keep it alive and to trample year after year on the necks of the vanquished likely themselves to be heroes. The Duke of Wellington gathered round his board each year the survivors of Waterloo. But had it been proposed to crow over France and stir up her resentment annually by a national celebration, it is pretty certain that he would have rejected the proposal. Yet Waterloo was a glorious victory. Suppose the Duke had been asked to institute an annual celebration of his repulse before Burgos! If Federal and Confederate veterans can meet as brethren on the field of Gettysburg, and the North can applaud the unveiling of the statue of Lee, surely we may bury the evil memories of Ridgeway, much more those of a fratricidal war waged a century or three-quarters of a century ago between the two sections of our race.

Considering that this continent is the world of reason and industry, our militarism is curious. In England, an old war power, military distinction alone has never raised a man to high civil office. The Duke of Wellington was not a mere soldier; he was a great European statesman and the real political head of his party. But in the United States a whole series of mere soldiers has been elected to the Presidency or nominated for it. Civil services are neglected and an ex-President is turned out on the street, while pensions to the amount of a hundred millions a year are given to soldiers, a great many of whom were as mere mercenaries as ever sold their blood. The reception of the victors of Waterloo, of Sobraon, of Inkerman, was nothing to our reception of the victors of Fish Creek, Batoche, the march to Battleford, and its sequel, Cut Knife Hill. Evidently, democratic as we are, the old Adam of military feudalism is not quite dead in us. Yet it is surely time that we who flatter ourselves that we are not as those sabre-swayed and sabre-worshipping populations of the benighted Old World, should bring our practical standard of merit a little more into harmony with our ethical creed, and remember that equal honour is due to every man, be he a soldier, a physician, or a brakesman, who meets death in the path of duty. These remarks will not be out of place at a moment when a pulse of Jingoism seems to be again running through our veins, while the blatant voice of the "tail-twister" is again, though feebly, raised at Washington.

—The Women's Enfranchisement Association having sent a sisterly greeting to the Medical Association, one of the most philanthropic as well as one of the most experienced of Toronto physicians entered a caveat against fraternization on the ground that literature subversive of domestic morality had been mailed to his family. The ladies repudiate any connection with such propagandism and of course they speak the truth though the disclaimer need not have been coupled with a re-

flection on the character of the male medical students. The physician however must have been right as to the fact. He was right too if he thought, that though there may be a total absence of complicity or even of conscious sympathy, there is a tacit connection among the different parts of the "Revolt of Woman." What people who feel inclined to join any part of the movement practically have to determine is, whether they desire a revolution not only in the political relations of the two sexes, but in their domestic relations and in the character and duties of women. A more momentous question humanity could not have to consider. That part of the movement which is in facta revolt against maternity, and to which Dr. Richardson's protest applied, tends, though in a melancholy way, to repress itself. In the United States the native race, which is the seat of it, manifestly dwindles, while the foreign races to which it has not yet spread gain ground. The Bostonian author of "Looking Backward" tells women that they do all that can be expected of them if they "cultivate their own charms and graces." He apparently does not think it a part of their natural duty to preserve and perpetuate the race.

—Some recent editorials in the *Winnipeg Tribune* have the right ring, and if Manitoba can only be got to act in their spirit she may, with a good harvest, do well. She has allowed herself to be sacrificed to the game of old Eastern parties which were organized before she was born and in whose intrigues and rivalries she has no interest whatever. Her settlers have been plundered through the tariff for the purpose of buying support for the Ottawa Government by means of subsidies, grants to political railways, and bribery of all kinds in Quebec and the Maritime Provinces, with which she practically has no more connection than she has with the British Colonies in any other part of the globe. Her connection with Ottawa has so far been nothing but a bane to her and to everything in her except the retainers of the Government or the C. P. R.

and a single pampered law firm. If her school legislation is vetoed, it will be, as she must know, not because such legislation is beyond her lawful power, any more than the Jesuit Act was beyond the lawful power of Quebec, but because the Government at the next election, its hold on Ontario having been loosened, will rely on the Quebec vote. She has been made a political washpot through the subserviency of her representation. "Be no longer Tories or Grits," says the *Tribune* to the public of the Province, "be Manitobans." It is the sound and the only hopeful counsel. The folly of trying to stand well with the Government by electing heelers to the Dominion Parliament must by this time be apparent enough. These men have systematically betrayed the interests with which they were entrusted. They connived at and morally supported the retention of Railway Monopoly; they vote for the iniquitous Tariff. It is difficult to find men of worth who will leave their business for Ottawa. It is also difficult to prevent needy and shortsighted electors from being captured at election time by the paltry bribes of the Government or by false promises, such as that which seated a supporter of Government for Winnipeg. But one strenuous effort will suffice. The present system once knocked down will never be set up again.

—The condition of the British Legislature and of British politics generally is, as Lord Russell said that of the army in the Crimea was, horrible and heart-rending. Parliamentary government cannot be carried on unless the minority will let the majority govern. But the present Opposition will not let the majority govern. Hurried on not only by the violence of faction but by the violence of the disaffection with which faction has allied itself, and led by a man who is burning to avenge his own defeat and make his way back to power at any expense to the nation and the national institutions, it blocks all legislation and has reduced the House of Commons to helplessness and confusion, while the dignity of what was once the first

political assembly in the world is disgraced night after night by low brawls which the Speaker is unable to control. The hope of the Opposition is that by stopping the wheels of legislation and government it will force on a dissolution which, guided by the rather deceptive evidence of the bye-elections, it has persuaded itself will go in its own favour. In the meantime it does its utmost to inflame the worst passions of the people and to stir up Provincial hatred, not in Ireland only, but in Scotland and Wales, against the Union. The very idea of Parliament as a deliberative assembly has ceased to exist. In fact this state of things may be described morally as a civil war; people are beginning to say in their despair that civil war itself would hardly be a greater evil; it would at all events make genuine force and courage, instead of mob oratory and cowardly incendiarism, the arbiters of the national destiny. It has long appeared to us indeed that the nation could hardly be delivered from its peril except by a man who was willing to brave extremities, though it is in the last degree unlikely that he would have to encounter them, since the Continental and Revolutionary party, unless it can get hold of the Government, has not a particle of military force. The Government ought by this time to be aware that there is little use in attempting legislation while the legislative machinery is totally out of gear. Measures must first be taken to re-organize the legislature and make it capable of performing its functions. Strong measures they will need to be and strong measures are always objectionable, but they cannot be avoided in extremity. Lord Salisbury is rather too much of a grandee to fill the present bill. What is needed is a patriotic leader unencumbered by acres or by buckram, who would be willing to take his political life in his hand and try, before it is too late, to save the nation from Dismemberment and Socialistic Revolution.

—The cession of Heligoland to Germany, to which it naturally belongs, will oblige the Imperial Federationists to revise

their Federal catalogue. The islet when first occupied by the British army was a useful station in the struggle with Napoleon, especially in the commercial war against his Continental system. The possession afterwards lost all its value while it retained all its invidiousness. Yet insensate Imperialism shrieks with rage at the cession. So it did at the cession of the Ionian Islands, the possession of which was of no use whatever, and in which England would have had to lock up a small army in case of war. We were then told that with the first relinquishment of territory the sun of England's glory and power would set. It is still somewhat above the horizon. Germany is evidently pleased with the cession and is disposed to requite it by amicable moderation in Africa. The friendship of Germany is not only the sheet-anchor of British diplomacy in Europe but it carries with it the good-will of the Germans of this Continent which in certain contingencies might be of the highest value. The German Press in the United States is not anti-British, nor does it pander to the Irish vote.

—The question of compensation to publicans whose licenses are to be taken away still rages in England. Cardinal Manning comes forward to play the demagogue, and in true demagogic style accuses the Government, because it fears to do injustice, of being a partner in the drinking trade. The Cardinal is a conspicuous instance of the incipient tendency which we have noted in the Roman priesthood, now that they have no longer any kings or kings' favourites with whom to intrigue, to intrigue with the multitude. He was, as is well known, originally an Anglican archdeacon, and was strongly pressed by his brother-in-law, Bishop Wilberforce, on the Court for nomination to a bishopric. The Court smelt mischief and refused. Archdeacon Manning went over to the Church of Rome. The Prince Consort then said to Wilberforce, "You see in what a scrape we should have been if we had taken your advice and made Manning a bishop." "Ah!" was the incautious reply,

“but if you had made him a bishop he would not have gone over to Rome.” The Prince turned on his heel. Such was the story current at the time. The “Apostle of the Genteel,” as from his special solicitude for the souls of persons of quality he was once called, now apparently aspires to the leadership of social and industrial agitation. He patronizes strikes, heads crusades against the liquor trade, and promulgates doctrines about property of a strongly socialistic hue. It is not at all unlikely that the priesthood of the Church of Rome, having lost its old monarchical supports, despairing of mastery over intellect or science, and being detached by celibacy from interest in social order, may try to regain its power by an alliance with social revolution. The revolution being atheistic, the end of such an alliance is certain; but in the meantime there may be a serious addition to the troubles of the world.

—We are told that a broad line is to be drawn between public and private character; rightly, if it is meant that private character should be respected in public discussion; rightly, if it is meant that certain private vices have not been found incompatible with public virtues and great services to the State. But it is idle to say that a man does not carry into public life the character which he has formed in private. Among the political biographies, of which a stream is being poured upon us, two of the latest are those of Fox and Lord Derby. Fox’s character was formed at the gambling table, and in public life, with all his generous impulse and personal charm, he was the gambler still. His political career is *rouge et noir*. He begins as a headstrong advocate of prerogative, outrunning Lord North, then he lays his stakes on the other colour, furiously opposing the war with the Colonies, wearing the Revolutionary uniform, and exulting over the reverses of his country at Saratoga and Yorktown. He swears eternal enmity to North. The next moment he is trying to sweep away the stakes by a profligate coalition with the object of his denunciations. The

same recklessness marks his course to the end, and his unmeasured avowals of sympathy with the French Revolutionists can hardly have failed to inflame the panic and frustrate the efforts of Pitt to calm the passions of his party and keep out of war. Lord Derby's character was formed on the turf, so much so that his political nickname was the "Jockey." We have him in Greville's Memoirs, when he was leader of the Conservative, and not only of the Conservative, but of the Church, party at Newmarket "in the midst of a crowd of blacklegs, betting-men and loose characters of every description, in uproarious spirits, chaffing, roaring and shouting with laughter and joking." The "coarse merriment" of this highest of aristocrats draws a whole crowd round him. In public life he comes out first as a violent Reformer, getting on the table at Brookes's and threatening to send the King to Hanover if he will not pass the Reform Bill. Then he flies into extreme Toryism and rides that horse just as hard as he had ridden Reform. With the help of Disraeli, he jockeys Peel by a coalition with the Whigs against the third reading of the Coercion Bill when the party had voted in favour of the second reading. He jockeys Palmerston in the same way by a coalition with the Radicals against the third reading of the Conspiracy Bill after supporting the second reading. He carries a sweeping extension of the Franchise, against all Conservative principles, and, regardless of what may happen to the country, exults in having "dished the Whigs." To the recklessness of principle with which he handled the Conservative party or permitted it to be handled, and to its consequent degradation, is largely due the dangerous condition in which the country now finds itself. Let us not say then that in choosing public leaders private character is of no account. Brilliancy, facility, versatility, almost miraculous, Lord Derby undoubtedly possessed: he may have graced society and adorned debate, but to the State no greater disaster has happened in modern times than that which befell it when Derby supplanted Peel.

—At last we have a glimpse into the long expected Memoirs of Talleyrand. Mr. Blowitz, the French correspondent of the London *Times*, has got access to the manuscript and carried away some passages. For our part we have always doubted whether the memoirs would prove so important as the world thought. Such a fox was not likely to be frank and truthful even in a posthumous biography. Nor have we ever felt sure that there was anything very momentous to be revealed. Talleyrand had the art of making everybody believe that he was at the bottom of everything; we are not so certain that he was. Mr. Blowitz tells us that his extracts are not the cream; if they were, the rest would be skimmed milk indeed. No Talleyrand from the grave was needed to tell us that Napoleon “had great intellectual power but was wanting in morality.” More testimony would be needed to assure us that Talleyrand himself “never conspired except with the majority of the French people and in the national interest.” It is to be presumed that he never took bribes or lied except for his country’s good.

—M. Chesnelong, a French Senator, has been delivering an eloquent oration on the observance of Sunday as a divine ordinance for the preservation of man’s spiritual nature, and therewith on the necessity of religion. “Where God is not acknowledged,” he says, “there the public power is paralysed, justice is irresponsible, right is unprotected, liberty has no guarantee, society is shaken to its foundations; it has neither stability nor progress.” It will, perhaps, be said by sceptics in reply that the Japanese and Chinese have no religion, none at least which influences their actions, yet society in Japan and China holds together, while in Japan there is not only stability but progress. But to that again it may be retorted that in China there is not only stability but stagnation, while progress in Japan is not a native movement but a European inoculation, and moreover is still on trial. Perhaps it may also be said,

that neither a Chinese nor a Japanese is a distinct Atheist, since in their mind political and social tradition has a sacredness, at the bottom of which is a vague belief in some divine authority. Imperial Rome was more definitely Atheistic; but then Imperial Rome fell and her fall was owing to the collapse of duty. Certain, however, it seems that no national sanction of morality, public or private, has yet been produced apart from belief in divine authority and in conscience as its organ. Let the moral law be the product of as long an evolution and the accumulation of as many generations of tribal experience as you please, let it be as conducive as you please to the well-being of the community, still the question remains why am I bound to sacrifice my individual profit or pleasure to the product of Evolution, to tribal experience, or even to the well-being of the community? The community, if I make myself a nuisance to it, may hang me. But suppose I choose to take the risk; suppose I can escape the police. Napoleon, the offspring of Revolutionary Atheism in France, living absolutely without God in the world and sacrificing his kind without limit or remorse to his own ambition and rapacity, did escape the police, and with a little more prudence, or even if the winter of 1812 had been less severe, might have ended his career in triumph. The pangs of his Evolutionary conscience we may be sure he never would have felt. Hæckel plainly avows that Evolution is not moral, and an American writer of some mark has reproduced in set terms the doctrine of the Sophist who said that morality was invented by the weak to prevent themselves from being devoured by the strong. Napoleon himself recognized the necessity of religion as the foundation of social order, and accordingly restored it in France. That thoroughgoing Agnostic, Mr. Cotter Morison, in his *Service of Man*, could only propose that the bad should be killed off, without telling us by what criterion we were to recognize the bad, how the dividing line was to be drawn, or to what hands the Evolutionary guillotine was to be entrusted. Neither Nero nor, so far as we know, Napoleon gave any special sign in his youth of

the wickedness that was to come. The necessity therefore on which Mr. Chesnelong eloquently dilates is apparent, and is likely to be still more manifested as Atheism or Agnosticism advances: for whether there is any real distinction between Atheism and Agnosticism or not, Agnosticism must be as much as Atheism the grave of practical religion. But it is not enough to show the social necessity of religion. DeMaistre shows that an infallible Pope would be very convenient, but we do not accept this as a demonstration that an infallible Pope exists. What is needed, and very urgently needed, is a demonstration of Theism such as should satisfy those, now numerous enough, and not in France alone, who have ceased to believe in Revelation. Attempts have been made to furnish such a demonstration, we know; but for the most part on metaphysical lines; and, with all due respect for metaphysics, it must be said that nothing metaphysical produces practical conviction. Let M. Chesnelong, if he be a great religious philosopher as well as a great religious orator, devote himself to that task.

—The *Contemporary* for June has a profound article on the Theology of Dante. We cannot help suspecting that in Dante, as in Browning, mystical interpreters see more than is there. Beyond doubt, however, he is a perfect representative of mediævalism, theological, philosophical and political. When you have read him, with a part of Thomas Aquinas, and the lives of two or three saints, and when you have seen the cathedrals and the castles, you know what the Middle Ages were. But we are irreverent enough to think that Dante, if he has fed the imagination with his terrible pictures of hell and purgatory, has done Christianity no small wrong by presenting God as the keeper of torture-houses which are to those of the most fiendish of Italian tyrants, such as Eccelino di Romano or a Bernabos Visconti, what eternity is to a day. The inscription over the gate of the Dantean hell, saying that it was erected by Eternal Love, seems to Carlyle—at least he says

that it seems to him—full of profound morality. To us it seems not only the extreme of paradox, but the depth of blasphemy.

—Presbyterianism seems inclined to revision. Revision, with criticism so actively at work on all sides and Scotch professors on their trial for heresy, will be found an arduous undertaking. Still more difficult will be what Dr. McCosh and others propose, the construction of a simple creed for all Christians. But there is one thing which the Presbyterians may do, without the slightest disturbance of their practical religion on their organization. They may simply strike out the chapter of the Westminster Confession of Faith on “God’s Eternal Decree.” No moral being can accept the third article of the chapter and believe that God is good, while no rational being can believe that God has foreordained everything and yet is not the author of that which he has foreordained. By tracing the history of these articles, and showing how, with the extreme doctrine of Justification by Faith, they had their origin in antagonism to the Papal doctrine which had led to Indulgences, you may clear the religious character of their framers; but now they are, like the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed, a scandal in Christendom, and the scandal ought to be removed.

—Dr. Douglas, an eminent Methodist of Montreal, protests against the inclusion of archbishops and bishops in the table of precedence while the officers of other Churches are ignored. He is in the right: it is a relic of the State Church. Bishops under the State Church system were parts of the polity. Bishop Strachan was a part of our polity with a vengeance. The cask still retains the odour of the wine and State Churchism is not totally extinct. Every now and then we have a reminder that Protestants of the non-Episcopal Churches are

dissenters. But the modest state of the Anglican bishop is Apostolic simplicity compared with the pageantry in which a Roman Catholic prelate stalks through the social world. The smartest blow ever given to Episcopal pretensions was dealt, unconsciously perhaps, by a certain Lieutenant-Governor who, finding himself embarrassed by a question of precedence between the Anglican and Roman Catholic bishops, both of whom he had to invite to a dinner party, solved it by inviting a Methodist bishop, who was senior to either, and giving him precedence over them both. The Methodists did not know what a social vantage ground they were resigning when they gave up Episcopacy for the sake of Union.

—At the Anglican Synod a voice was raised in favour of religious schools for the Church of England. Nothing can be more logical or just. If one church has the privilege, why not all? The answer which the Roman Catholic priesthood makes in its heart and which Archbishop Cleary almost makes with his lips is, “there is no real religion but ours; all the rest is mere heresy or heathenism. It is our religion alone therefore that the State is bound to recognize and foster.” To this the State in the Province of Ontario and by the mouth of its Premier virtually assents. We all know the argument in favour of the secular system. There is also perhaps not a little to be said in favour of the voluntary and parental system, of which the teaching of religion is a part. The system of religious teaching for a single church and secularism for the rest has no foundation in anything except the exclusive pretensions of the Church of Rome and the political necessities of the Grit party.

—In the matter of tests and of dogma generally, Methodism is more at its ease than the other Churches. It had the good-fortune of owing its birth, not like the Churches of the

Reformation to a dogmatic controversy, but to a Gospel movement against the irreligion, worldliness and licentiousness of the eighteenth century. Far from founding itself, like its predecessors, on dogmatic or ecclesiastical division, only with the greatest reluctance was it brought to assume the form of a secession. Its tests, a portion of the Articles of the Church from which it sprang and the general spirit of its founder's discourses, sit pretty lightly upon it; and, if we may trust our own observation, in a Methodist Church a dogmatic or doctrinal sermon is seldom heard. Methodism however appears, like the other Churches to have its thorn in a growing jealousy of the powers of the ministry which was somewhat brusquely expressed by a lay reformer, when at the Conference he declared that Methodism was more burdened by priestcraft than any other denomination. It is the nature of every clergy and of every order of men in authority to extend its power, and they all require watching in this respect for their own good as well as for that of the Church or community. But this reformer of Methodism, if he wishes to reform, not to destroy, must be wary in his innovations, for his hand, he may depend upon it, is laid on the very life of the organization. Wesley may claim a place among the foremost of ecclesiastical statesmen. If his statesmanship moved on the lines of circumstance, that is what all true statesmanship does. If we wish to measure his sagacity we have only to compare the fortunes of his work with those of the other new Churches founded about that time or since, from Moravianism down to the latest of the progeny, the 'Church of Robert Elsmere.' Some of his ordinances were of the time and embodied an enthusiasm which has since cooled down. But the combination of a strong ministry, as the uniting, animating, regulating and propelling force with a spiritual democracy of laymen called, each of them, to play an active part in Church work, was for all time, or at least for as many years as Methodism may be destined to endure. It is the grand secret of Wesley's statesmanship, and reformers who are dealing with it are dealing, we repeat, with

the vital part of the organization. After all, the authority of the Methodist minister, whatever it be, must rest upon a moral and popular basis. It is not like that of the Roman Catholic priest, sacramental or thaumaturgic; nor does it claim an origin and sanction above the heads of the Christian people, such as Apostolic Succession. It has no priestly confessional wherewith to keep the conscience in chains, no Episcopal excommunication wherewith to crush revolt, no *index expurgatorius* wherewith to paralyse opinion. Watching, we say again, it may require; but watching ought to be enough for it. A larger infusion of lay influence into the government may be needed, and it seems that measures of that kind are in progress. But speaking simply as onlookers, we would say before Methodists pull down Wesley's ministry they will do well to consider maturely how without it the Church of Wesley can continue to exist.

—Some people were rather startled by seeing that the Methodist Church was going to have Sisterhoods. The principle of Rowland Hill's saying that "the Devil ought not to be allowed to have all the best tunes" applies, we presume, to other powerful agencies as well as music. Nor does the abuse of a thing do away with its use. So, we presume, thought Dr. Johnson, who advocated the measure. Vows and asceticism would be foreign to the spirit of Methodism, or of any Protestant Church, though Methodism was cradled in something very like asceticism. But devotion to good work and sisterly coöperation in it cannot be foreign to the spirit of any Church. Associations and openings for beneficent activity of this kind may lend a new and happy interest to lives now lonely and vacant. As to the question of dress, which seemed to disturb some minds, it may be presumed that these ladies will have too much good sense to emulate the inverted vanity, which by a shroud-like costume parades self-mortification in the public eye, and is the counterpart of the Pharisee's habit of standing to pray in the

synagogues and at the corners of the streets. Church architecture, anthems, flowers, and now Sisterhoods! Methodism is evidently putting off its primitive austerity, and it is easy to understand that there may be searchings of heart among the more austere.

—The increasing number of books published in England about Canada is a gratifying sign of growing interest in the subject, but it is strange that the books should so often be written by men who do not know this country. Mr. Greswell, whose "History of the Dominion of Canada" has been brought out by the Oxford University press, is a good though a very dry writer on British colonization in America, on colonial subjects in general, on maritime discovery, and even on Indian ethnology, but with the Dominion of Canada he seems to have no special acquaintance. The political part of his history is almost a blank, less than a hundred pages out of two hundred and seventy-seven being given to the whole story since 1837. His early history is little more than a condensation of Parkman; his later history is little more than a condensation of MacMullen. He stops where MacMullen stops, so that we miss all the modern part of the story. This applies to the North-West and British Columbia as well as to Canada proper. As a matter of course, he uses only the political map, which represents Canada as a vast and unbroken panse, including the North Pole. A map marking the economical limitations would have presented a different aspect of the case.

—The chief attractions of the Exhibition of the Provincial Art School, recently held in the Education Office buildings, were those connected with industrial art. Particularly good were the pupils' exhibits in the practical branches of mechanical and ornamental designing, china painting, wood-carving, model

drawing, and modelling in clay. These departments of art, as they enter into trade and manufactures, our Provincial authorities do well to encourage. Useful also must be the help the schools afford in other practical branches, such as building construction, civil engineering, wood engraving, lithographic drawing, as well as in freehand drawing, crayon and charcoal drawing, and drawing from the antique. It is in the latter, we notice—for a very artistically designed plaque—that the gold medal of the year has been awarded. The recipient is a young lady of the Kingston Art School. One of the silver medals has also been deservedly won by a pupil of the Art School of Hamilton, for a tasteful design in tile decoration. The London Schools figure strongly in china painting, of which there are some pleasing examples. In water and oil colour drawing, some of the exhibits from the Ladies' Colleges in Whitby and St. Thomas, and particularly from Albert College, Belleville, are excellent, though, as a whole, the oil-colour work is amateurish and crude. In landscape painting, but one, or at most two, specimens seemed to be satisfactory. A few studies from the antique, of curios and bric-a-brac, with several canvases representing in one case an Indian rug, and in another a group of old quarto volumes in vellum binding, were good, both as to colour and drawing. Some few fruit pieces were also well done, one especially of a barrel of rosy apples tilted over on its side, the fruit rolling out on the ground. In a few other departments there was also much commendable work. *Apropos* of Art, we have to correct an error into which we were led, partly through delay in the issue of the catalogue, in speaking of the Exhibition of the Ontario Society of Artists. Mr. R. L. O'Brien, it seems, did contribute several paintings, though two or three only were of importance.

THE BYSTANDER.

AUGUST, 1890.

MR. 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 Ultramontanism 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 array. 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 sea-board 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 acceptancé 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 cnemies, to each other. A quarrel which was the work of cvil 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.

THE BYSTANDER.

SEPTEMBER, 1890.

IN the fiscal region the clouds, heavy as they look, are decidedly breaking, both here and in the United States. At the time of our writing the McKinley Bill seems sure to pass, possibly with a breach in its principle made by the reduction of the duty on barley. But to buy its passage, its framers have been compelled virtually to abandon the Force Bill, and they would hardly have deemed that compromise necessary if they had not known that the obstruction with which the Democrats threatened their Tariff Bill would have had public opinion to back it. Before the McKinley Bill left the House for the Senate it had been seriously scarred by the protest of Mr. Butterworth which drew forth expressions of sympathy from all parts of the Union. Mr. Blaine, the Republican chief, is declaring for the principle of Reciprocity, and is at open war with the hoggish monopolism of Mr. Reed. He applies his principle at present only to the relations with the South American Republics, but the McKinleyites see plainly enough that in its scope it comprehends all quarters of the compass. Mr. Blaine is not a manufacturer, and he is the shrewdest, if not the most scrupulous, man of his party. He discerns that the game of keeping alive war-passions for the purpose of sustaining the war-tariff approaches its end, and that when it comes to wasting surplus revenue in pensions, to the extent of a hundred and thirty millions a year, besides squandering other public money, for the purpose of staving off reduction, the sufferance of the people is likely to be pretty well ex-

hausted. The McKinley Bill was not directed against Canada: it was an attempt to give the American farmer an apparent interest in protection, and it is a proof of consciousness on the part of its framers that the farmer, slow as is his intelligence and fast-set as he is in his party lines, begins to see through the fraud which has long been practised on him, and to suspect that he is paying for the manufacturer's gains. Among the leading manufacturers themselves, some, we are assured, are becoming aware that the system cannot last, and will subscribe to the bribery fund no more. Mr. Dawes, the Massachusetts Senator, declares for free iron and coal. New England, her monopoly having been fatally infringed by other States, both West and South, whose competition the monopolist likes just as little as that of the foreigner, is now herself coming to reason, and it would not be surprising to see her before long pass over openly to the side of Free Trade. Under the heading "light from Kansas," American journals are reproducing a remarkable editorial from the *Champion*, a leading journal of Kansas, which is the banner Republican State. The *Champion* formally avows its conversion to Tariff Reform and its renunciation of Protection, which it has hitherto supported, but which it finds to be a fraud, enriching the East only by impoverishing the West. Wherever you turn in the United States you find signs of a movement of opinion. Cleveland, it should be remembered, though he missed the Presidency, had a popular majority over Harrison, and it was only bad tactics on his part, combined with a lavish use of money in corruption by the monopolists, that prevented his re-election. Yes, the clouds are breaking: the night of monopoly is far spent; the day of liberation is at hand. It is the day of liberation for industry as well as for commerce; for how without the free disposal of the products of industry can industry itself be free? We repeat that the McKinley Bill is a measure of internal policy, not of hostility to Canada, while Mr. Hitt's Resolution pointing to Commercial Union, though its progress has been blocked by other business, is so far from

having been laid aside that the framer looks forward to pushing it, as soon as he has the opportunity, with full confidence in its ultimate success.

—Our own Protectionist Government has been confronted by the same necessity as the McKinleyites, and has met it in the same way. The farmer here, as in the United States, is beginning to see through the imposture and to perceive that he is the sheep whom everybody is shearing. Something must be done to make him think that he has an interest in Protection. In the Tariff Act there was a standing offer to the Americans of reciprocity in natural products. This, and the avowal of principle which it embodies, are now shamelessly thrown over and farm products are subjected to protective duties in the pretended interest of the farmer. Nothing more than this somersault was needed to show that the object of the Government in its fiscal policy is party victory, not the material welfare of the people. Thus politicians play their game and the people pay for it. Protectionism itself was adopted by Sir John Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper manifestly from a political motive. Both of them were for Reciprocity till after the election of 1878. Sir John Macdonald's watchword was Reciprocity of Trade or Reciprocity of Tariffs, implying that he was for Reciprocity of Trade if he could get it. Up to the time of the election he expressly disclaimed Protection, declaring that his policy was not Protection but Re-adjustment. He embraced Protection only when he saw, or thought that he saw, that the manufacturers' vote and the manufacturers' funds would carry elections for him and keep him in power. He will go into the next contest with great advantages on his side; with the influence of a party long entrenched in office, and with an election fund swelled not only by manufacturers' subscriptions, contracts, government grants for works, and such aid as he may draw from the C. P. R., but by the subsidies to Provinces, which a fatal blunder in our

Constitution permits, and of which promises will no doubt be lavishly held forth. But Tariff Reform has in its favour, we feel assured, a great preponderance of opinion as well as the manifest interest of the community. If the people can only be got in any tolerable measure to vote as they think, Dagon will come down.

—A belief prevails that the next session at Ottawa will be early and short, and that it will at once be followed by a dissolution, the Prime Minister thinking that the time has come again for snapping a verdict. Perhaps he deems the moment favourable while the irritation caused by the McKinley Bill is fresh and before the pressure of that measure and of his own equally noxious policy has been felt. We heartily concur in the protest which some of our contemporaries are raising, and which we have ourselves more than once raised, against this abuse of the prerogative of dissolution. It is a manifest violation of popular right, the Constitution having empowered the people to elect their representatives for a term of five years; it is destructive of the independence of Parliament, which is thus made to sit with the sword of a penal dissolution always hanging over its head; and it may be employed to perpetuate in power, by tricky trading on circumstances comparatively accidental, a Government which has lost the settled confidence of the country. Parliament, unless close to the end of its legal term, ought to be dissolved only when a constitutional crisis renders it impossible to carry on the Government without an appeal to the people. Such is still the doctrine of the best constitutional authorities even in England where the restraining force of tradition and the more responsible character of the statesmen would make an unlimited power of dissolution less dangerous than it is here. In spite of all the vaunts of democracies about their freedom, their servility is sometimes astounding. Let the power of intrigue or corruption once get them down and it may do pretty much what it likes with

them. Is it not enough that a Prime Minister should be allowed to fill one branch of the Legislature with his personal retainers, and virtually to barter seats in it for contributions to his election fund, but the other must be reduced to a mere creature of his will by making its tenure dependent not on the law but on his pleasure? The Governor-General, it is alleged, can do nothing to guard public right: he must obey without questioning the order of his nominal servant. Such was not the view taken at all events by Sir Edmund Head. If it be the true view, we can only express our wonder that any British nobleman, when he can live in honour at home, should think it worth his while to come here merely for the purpose of lending his name and his ostensible authority as a sanction and mask for the practices of unscrupulous politicians.

—The attention of Equal Rights men is exultingly called by the Liberal allies of Ultramontaniam to the dealings of the British Government with the Pope, and especially to the announcement which is stated to have appeared that Cardinal Manning is to take rank as a matter of courtesy after the princes of the blood and before the Lord Chancellor and the Anglican Prelates. We are tauntingly asked what we have to say to this. What we have to say is that if the announcement is true the nation is dishonored. When it is remembered that the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill was always believed to have been passed specially to satisfy the indignation of the Queen herself at Papal aggression, we may measure the humiliation which the Court undergoes. We are desired at the same time to note that the British Government has accredited an envoy to the Pope, though the Pope is no longer a political sovereign. We do observe it, and we pronounce it a policy as weak as it is ignominious and a dereliction of principle, which is sure, like all derelictions of principle, to recoil upon its authors. In politics, we say once more, the name

of priest is perfidy, as all will find who seek his treacherous aid. It is a day of shame for England when she owns that to preserve order in her realm and save the Union from disruption she is fain to crave the assistance of a foreign priest. It is precisely against the policy of this sort that the friends of Equal Rights here have taken up arms, which they do not mean to lay down, let who will waver or turn tail. The wretched necessities of the British Government with its rebel Ireland are not ours. We have a word of warning to address to the quarter from which this taunting appeal comes. The leaders of the Liberal party know well that in consenting to the endowment of Jesuitism and in supporting Separate Schools they are bartering Liberal principles for the French and Catholic vote. They might at least have the grace to be silent and to abstain from forcing their apostasy upon our notice. This, prudence as well as decency enjoins on them. They are on the eve of a struggle in which they will unquestionably have to contend against formidable influences, and will need every vote they can muster. There are people who prize very highly the advantages of free trade with the Continent but who prize still more highly the great organic principles of our moral civilization; and common as indifference to principle may be, there are probably enough of these "fanatics" in not a few constituencies to turn the scale even by abstention. The worst thing that can possibly happen in the eyes of a genuine Liberal is the advent of false Liberals to power. The Equal Rights movement has triumphed in the North-West and wrested from priestly rule that realm of promise: it has no intention of dying here, however convenient to the Machinists its death might be.

—The dullest summer's business known for many years is the report of the country store-keeper, not a few of whom have had to cast the burden on their creditors, by whom debts have been compromised, sometimes in forgetfulness of the stern fact

that the overcrowded ranks will have to be thinned. Large importations from abroad, overproduction at home, and facility of bank accommodation lead to laxness in crediting and unsoundness. Had the harvest been bad there might have been a crash. Happily the harvest is good. Yet the farmer will not have much to spare. In addition to interest on mortgages, the insidious vendors of parlour organs, sewing machines, patent churns, beehives, washing machines, and notions of all kinds, willing to sell for a promissory note at a long date, have been busy and their notes have to be met before the store-bill can be paid. Shareholders in cotton mills have little reason to bless the Protection which has turned capital into unproductive channels, and English capitalists are little inclined to take such unpromising investments on their hands. At least three mills are in liquidation, and of the remaining twenty-one not more than two or three are paying dividends in spite of the combine. Combines are the order of the day. Among them are one to keep up the price of salt, one to keep up the price of agricultural implements, and one to keep up the price of imported plate glass. For the lumberman the prospect, bright in the spring, has since become dull. The lumber business is sluggish both in the home and foreign markets, and the South American field has been almost closed this year. The business is mostly in the hands of firms enriched by former operations which can tide over a dull year. Yet it cannot suffer without evil consequences to thousands engaged in this industry or dependent on it. The pressure for money has enabled the banks to employ all their available funds during the summer at good rates, and values of stocks generally have improved under the influence of a bull movement inspired by good harvest prospects and high prices for grain. The land boom in Toronto happily is over and the inflow of money from a distance has ceased. There is as yet little shrinkage in values, and speculators in suburban property, if they can afford to hold, may yet come off scatheless. The bricklayers' strike was a blessing in disguise, as it checked the speculative building. There are

too many vacant houses, but the winter influx of residents may reduce their number. If Toronto grows, however, it is at the expense of the smaller towns. We must not forget that British money has been pouring in, and its incoming, while it gives a stimulus and creates an appearance of prosperity for the time is in the end an increase of debt.‡

—It was not THE BYSTANDER but the Government Report which said that the value of farm property in Ontario had fallen thirty-three per cent., though we have verified the statement for ourselves and believe it to be not at all over the mark. We are told that land in New England, also, has fallen off in value, that many farms there are being deserted, and that there is a migration from those districts as well as an exodus from Canada. This is true; but the soil of much of New England was poor from the beginning and has been largely worked out, whereas the soil of Ontario is good and has been comparatively little worked out. Besides the United States do not lose the men, who only move from the Eastern to the Western parts of the country, as people are moving from the rural districts to the towns in Great Britain, whereas Canada does lose the men, and to a nation which Loyalists always describe as hostile. The emigrants, it should be observed, leave just at the age when their value is the highest, after the country has been at the expense of rearing them. A local journal finds that it has three hundred subscribers on the other side of the line, and believes that in fifteen years it must have lost a thousand in that way, while in the county in which it is published, and which is one of our choicest, population had been almost at a standstill. We commend this to the attention of Government organists when next they seek to console Ontario for its losses by pointing to those of New England. The fact is that the present system of government in this country owes its continuance in no small measure to the constant elimination of the most active and inde-

pendent spirits by the exodus, of which the policy of the Government is largely the cause. We say largely, not wholly; there are other causes at work; but the main cause, where the land is good and not worked out, is a policy which precludes the farmer from either selling or buying in the best market and at the same time prevents the development of the natural resources of the country. If our mineral wealth could be developed, the farmer would have a larger population to feed, and he would not have to pay for its creation as he has to pay for the creation of any additional number of consumers offered him by Protection. But how can the mines be worked without a market for the ore and without liberty to import machinery? "Develop our mineral resources," Restrictionists cry; as though any resources could be developed when the products cannot be sold.

—Our lively contemporary, the Bobcaygeon *Independent*, ascribes agricultural depression to mortgage debt, and describes the farmer as toiling only to feed a "privileged" and non-producing class. This language surely is strong. Whatever there may be in feudal communities, there cannot be said to be any privileged class in a community like ours. If the lists of the shareholders in the Loan Societies were published they would be found to contain people of all classes, including a good many of the farmers themselves. Nor have we many non-producers unless that term is applied, as the labour journals are apt to apply it, to all who do not work with their hands. A civilization sustained only by people who worked with their hands, our contemporary will admit, would not be high. If a man wants to improve or stock a farm and has not the money, he must borrow; and if he borrows he must pay. We believe it will be found that taking any large area the value of the properties has been increased by the money put into them far beyond the amount of the loan. Of course if the prices of produce fall and the value of the land falls with them

the weight of the debt increases in proportion, and this, we fear, is now the case. Moreover, there is danger from the redundancy of capital seeking investment in mortgage, and especially from the mass of British capital which has been pouring in of late years. The rival Loan Societies in their effort to get out their money can hardly fail sometimes to thrust it unduly on the farmer. So long as the borrower comes to the lender you are pretty safe, but when the lender solicits the borrower peril begins. So far, we believe, the number of foreclosures compared with that of loans has been very small.

—Curious inquirers have been reckoning up the salaries of the Tupper family and profess to find that the aggregate charge amounts to as much per head of the Canadian population as the cost of the British monarchy to the population per head of Great Britain! Suppose it did; if work is done and well done there is no ground for complaint. The salaries of our public servants are too low and their relationships do not add to the cost. Provided there are no illegitimate gains we may pay the regular salaries without grudging. The amount which the whole Tupper family is alleged to receive from the public is not much more than is paid to a single member of the British Cabinet. The High Commissionership in itself is we venture to think an office of doubtful utility to this country; it is a pipe through which partisan views of an extreme kind about Canada and her affairs are being always poured into the British Government and the British public. But the pay considering the expensiveness of London society is not too high. As to our official stipends, we repeat, there is no ground for complaint. What is really objectionable is the indefinite gain made by nepotistic influence or by a monopoly of backstairs business with government departments. Nor is it well that the son of a Minister, and of a Minister of Railways, should be in receipt of a large salary from a railway which is an applicant to the Government for legislative favour. Wages we

should be glad to see reasonably raised, if we could be sure that other emoluments would be foregone.

—Mr. John King pleads for the better protection of journals against vexatious libel suits brought by irresponsible plaintiffs. His plea is just, though libel unfortunately is not the only legal field in which we are exposed to litigation at the hands of people who cannot pay the costs. But there is also something to be said on behalf of those whose reputation is exposed to the attacks of journalists trading in libel and enabled to defy its penalties by their lack both of character and of cash. People need not greatly tax their memory to recall flagrant instances of this kind in our own community. It is said that such libels may be safely treated with contempt. General abuse may be safely treated with contempt; but it is doubtful whether a specific charge can: it is remembered and repeated when its source is forgotten. Citizens have a right to reputation, and that right is at present not in all cases effectually guarded. Perhaps to guard it effectually in the case of public men, so long as a jury is the tribunal, would hardly be possible. One of the most eminent of Canadian judges was heard to say that in the trial of a libel suit brought by a party politician, no efforts of the presiding judge could secure justice against appeals to the political prejudice of the jury. The result of a system which morally constrains the plaintiff in a libel suit to go into the witness box too commonly is that instead of the libeller being tried for libel the man libelled is tried for his general character. A journal ought not to be allowed to bring charges without evidence, and then wring out evidence from the accused person himself by cross-examination: it ought to be compelled to make good the charges with evidence of its own. Honourable journalism would be no gainer by a lax law of libel.

—Education has been holding its summer meetings. Our parting word to it shall be, Improve the High Schools. More

than once we have expressed the conviction that at the High Schools the education of youths destined for business or ordinary callings ought as a rule to end. It is a mistake to bring on to the University any boy who has no aptitude for learning or science and there practically bid him work or be idle as he chooses, with too many chances in favour of his being idle. If we are right in this, the High School is for youths in general the finishing-place of education, and its importance and that of its headmaster are great. Improve the High Schools, get thoroughly good men for the headships and masterships, and, that the incomes may be such to draw ability, increase the fees, which are now absurdly small, to a reasonable amount, retaining perhaps a few places as bursaries for pupils from the Public Schools. Let the High Schools be perfectly organized and used as places of Secondary Education for the community at large, not, as is too much the case at present, employed merely to qualify teachers, male and female, for the Public Schools. From the Report of the recent Departmental Examinations, it would seem, that considerably over three-fourths of the candidates make use of the High Schools for the means of professional training, two-thirds of the number being women; and the same thing, we believe, happens every year.

—A perusal of General Middleton's Parting Address will we are sure convince any fair-minded reader that the General's crime was nothing worse than a blunder, the chief responsibility for which moreover rests not on the military commander but on the civil assessor whom the Government placed at his side, and whom if the members of the Parliamentary Committee had been intent on justice, they would not have failed to call before them. The indictment against the General, as his Address says, comprised four particular charges, which were put forward by Mr. Lister, M.P., as a series collectively sustaining the general charge of peculation and connivance at pillage. Of these the Committee at once dropped three, ostensibly be-

cause they had no authority to investigate them, but really knowing that there was not a shadow of ground for anyone of them; if it was authority that they wanted they might have had it by stepping across the hall. The spoil which, had the General's hasty and ill-advised order about mementoes taken effect, would have fallen to his own share was not furs to the value of \$5,000, as his traducers assert; but a fraction of one-eighth of a lot, about the value of which he could know nothing, and the whole of which probably was not worth half \$5,000. Does anybody believe that he would sully his reputation and risk professional ruin for such a piece of pelf as this? A British officer, in a country where he had few friends, some enemies, and we fear not any very good adviser, without skill in fence of tongue or pen, having his character made the sport of politicians whose motives were too apparent, was an object of natural sympathy to men who would abhor the thought of apologizing for dishonour. The politician with whom charges of corruption and malversation are the every-day weapons of party warfare, and who by familiarity has grown callous to them, hardly knows what a wound they inflict upon a soldier's breast. It is surprising that any Canadian who wears a uniform should have failed to feel for the General in the cruel position in which he was placed. The question whether the command ought to be held by an Englishman or a Canadian was perfectly irrelevant and its introduction could only serve to pervert justice. Happily it signifies little who commands, as there is not the slightest chance of war with the only nation which would be likely to attack us on land; otherwise our troops would run no small risk of immolation on the altar of Nativism if they were to be commanded by a native general who had never seen service or perhaps handled a brigade. If there is any question about payment for the furs the responsibility surely rests upon the Government, through its agent Mr. Hayter Reed; not that anybody, so far as we can see, has very much to answer for. If a man renounces the protection of the Government and its laws by going into a rebel

camp, his goods and chattels must take their chance; and there was against Bremner, as General Middleton shows, a strong *primâ facie* case. The country will hereafter look back on this affair with anything but pride.

—There have now been three mutinies in the British army, once the paragon of discipline and duty. At the same time there have been disturbances in the English police. If the public force were to become untrustworthy utter confusion would set in, and it will be surprising if the prospect of such a catastrophe does not make even faction pause. In his eagerness to bring back the reign of the political Messiah, to which he regards any other government as an unhallowed obstacle, Mr. Gladstone has filled the country with anarchical as well as with disunionist sentiment and set the spirit of disturbance everywhere at work. People in England are beginning to compare the state of the army with that of the French army in 1789, and to fear a repetition of the same train of events. The case is not so bad as that; yet it must be owned that there are some ugly traits of similarity between the condition of England at the present hour and that of France on the eve of the great deluge. One of them is the growing hatred of all authority. Another is the levity with which people of the higher and wealthier class seem to be dabbling in revolution, and which reminds us of Philippe Egalité and the doomed triflers of his train. In the case of Philippe, vanity, the satiety of pleasure, and the desire of a new excitement were the moving causes: in the case of the English there is mingled with these perhaps an impulse of a higher kind; but the social symptom is not the less alarming. Together with mutiny there is industrial war on the largest and most menacing scale. Professional incendiaries are licensed to indulge their malignant ambition by throwing a whole section of the realm into confusion, paralysing trade, wrecking or depreciating a vast amount of property, and depriving thousands for a time of

their bread, besides breaking up social order and poisoning the heart of the community. Soon it will become a question how far society is bound to suffer its most vital interests to be the sport of agitators like these. The House of Commons adjourns after a session lost in obstruction and marked in ever-increasing measure by factious violence, disorder and even outrage. Nor is there the slightest reason for hoping that this assembly, now the depository of supreme power and in effect the sole government of the nation, will meet again in any better temper or more fitted to legislate and rule. Too little is seen anywhere of the courage of conviction: the sinew of the nation seems to have been unstrung for the time by scepticism and the failure of the beliefs on which character has hitherto been formed and action based. Hardly any man of mark, except Mr. Balfour, comes forward on either side: and when Mr. Gladstone is gone, if the Radicals win, we may see the destinies of the greatest of nations committed to Sir William Harcourt, Mr. Labouchere, and Mr. John Morley. However, there is still great store of force in England and national peril may bring it forth.

—The opinion seems to gain ground that there is a secret understanding between France and Russia. If there is, there will most likely be war, for such an understanding can have no peaceful object. On the other side will apparently be a firm union of England and Germany cemented by Lord Salisbury's diplomacy, the success of which even Home Rulers are compelled to acknowledge. With them will be Austria, thanks to the wise moderation which Bismarck knew how, on occasion, to unite with daring. From the field of Sadowa the Stephans-thurm was almost in view, and the victorious army cried, "On to Vienna!" But Bismarck at once called a halt. Having rid Germany of Austrian domination he took from Austria not a rood of land, he subjected her pride to no sort of humiliation. Thus of his defeated enemy he made at once a fast friend. If

the old hero shows less calmness than we could desire in his fall, let it be remembered that not only has he lost power but he sees his work in danger of being undone by the rashness of an unbalanced youth. To make matters worse, the youth, it seems, has now fallen under the influence of an intriguing woman, the organ of a family grudge against the statesman who, in making Germany a nation, had to discrown the King of Hanover. The young George III., Bute and the Princess Dowager cashiered Chatham, but their act has not been ratified by national gratitude.

—The sad news seems to be true that there is going once more to be a potato blight, with disease as usual in its train, over part at least of Ireland. Thus, while politicians are wrangling about their Land Tenure Bills and their Home Rule projects, the finger of nature points to the fundamental evil. The Celt is not a farmer, in the proper sense of the term, in Ireland any more than he is here. His crop is the potato, grown with little toil, the treacherous plant of indolence and thriftlessness. Upon this he heedlessly multiplies till its periodical failure brings famine. What change of land laws or political institutions can cure this? Under the same laws and institutions, with the very same political relations to Great Britain, the Teuton of Ulster is a prosperous man.

—Lord Coleridge has been fluttering the British Press by warning his friends against blind deference to the opinion of journalists. He says he has known many journalists and that if they had talked to you over a dinner table you would have thought nothing of them. The criterion is characteristic of a famous diner-out. A man may be silent or dull in company and yet be a great statesman or publicist. Lord Coleridge has an easy task in arguing that blind deference ought to be paid to the opinion of no man or journal. He may also do good by admonishing people to clear their minds of all false glamour

belonging to the editorial "We," and take the editorial for what it is worth. But he will hardly deny that used not as oracles but as helps to political thought and sources of political information the editorials of the London Press are worth a good deal. They are worth at least as much as most of the speeches in Parliament, which in truth are reproductions of the editorials. The Press has superseded Parliament as the forum of national debate. A man who reads only one paper and treats it as his oracle is a slave: in the rural districts there are still such people; but in the cities most men see two papers. Among the educated class the power of the Press, moreover, is now divided with the daily journals by the magazines. On the whole we are pretty well guarded against journalistic dictatorship. Ontario suffered from it twenty years ago: she now suffers from it no more. The serious question—one of the most serious for civilization—is, what is behind the Press? How many journals are there which are free from clandestine influences alien to the common weal? If Lord Coleridge would turn his inquiries that way he might be of great service to the State.

—The cession of Heligoland is as minute a thing of the kind as there could be, but the point of a pin suffices to prick a bladder, and the cession when it is seen to be followed by no bad consequences to the prestige any more than to the strength of England may suffice to put an end to the notion that her greatness depends on her blind and unreasoning retention of everything which by any means and under any circumstances has come into her hands. A general who, finding his lines too much extended, should make it a point of honour not to contract them would show as much good sense as those who protest in the name of national pride against the abandonment of a dependency which has ceased to be a source of strength and become a mere source of danger. What can be more ridiculous than Lord Rosebery, vapouring in the high Imperialist strain

about Heligoland while he is conspiring with Mr. Parnell and the Clan-na-Gael to break up the United Kingdom? In fact, a great deal of the exaggerated Imperialism now afloat in England is salve for the honour of those who would surrender Ireland to Parnell. They seek to delude themselves and the country by pretending that the sacrifice of union at home is to be merged in the ampler and grander union of a Confederated Empire. England has repeatedly ceded by treaties of peace conquests made in war and has been none the worse for the transaction. She has ceded two kingdoms, for her kings long bore the title Kings of France, and one of them was for a few years King of Corsica. Her strength lies in herself; her weakness lies in distant and defenceless dependencies: to this conviction when the reign of gasconade is over her statesmen will return and Heligoland will not be the last useless and exposed outpost from which they will draw back their forces to guard the heart of the Empire.

—A writer in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* speaks of the astonishing spread of Socialism. Every one now, he says, calls himself a Socialist. This would be startling news, and we should think that society was coming to a grand crash or to a grand transformation, if Socialism were not so equivocal a term. What the Socialist proper seeks is a forcible redistribution of property, together with a confiscation of industrial liberty, which would probably carry with it other liberty, by the State. We doubt whether there is one person among ten thousand in France or in any other country who seriously believes this to be either practicable or desirable. No man at all events can suppose that it could be brought about without the most desperate of civil wars. But the term Socialism is used in the most equivocal manner. It is applied, as we before had occasion to remark, to mere extensions of the powers of government in the field which already belongs to it. It is applied to Factory Acts, to Liquor Legislation, to sanitary

reforms, to compulsory education, and a number of other measures, not one of which, we repeat, is so Socialistic as the law requiring us to keep the seventh day as a day of rest. Each of these measures ought to be discussed on its own merits and with reference to the needs and aptitudes of the particular community. It is quite conceivable that there may still be a number of matters which can better be settled by collective than by individual action. As to this there are only two things to be said; first, that man, having after a struggle of ages against kings and priests won a certain portion of liberty and some power of self-development, we do not want to see him at once deprived of either by tyrannical philanthropists; and secondly, that before we give the State much larger powers we should like to know who is to be the State.

To talk of Christian Socialism seems absurd and somewhat Jesuitical, though the phrase was invented we believe by Frederick Maurice, one of the best and most beneficent of men. Christianity has nothing to do with Socialism. The primitive Church of Jerusalem, though its members had all things in common, was not Socialistic. It did not question the right of property. Ananias's field, as Peter told him, was his own until he chose to bring it into the common stock. Nothing is more certain than that the Church in becoming the religion of the Empire accepted the institution of property, whatever rhetorical passages against wealth or the claims of its possessor may be culled from the declamations of the Fathers. Nor were the fraternities of Monks Socialistic. They held the corporate property in common, but they maintained the right of the abbey against all outsiders. Property and liberty, with duty and charity, may be said to be the doctrine of the Christian Church, which looks to the gradual ascendancy of duty and charity over selfishness in the use of property and liberty for the social transformation which the Parisian Socialist seeks to bring about at once and by sharper instruments. So far the Church though slower in her processes may fairly be said to have been surer than the Jacobins. The Socialist proper is not

to be cajoled by the phrase Christian Socialism. He knows very well that Christianity is his enemy. It destroys his motive power by teaching that happiness is spiritual, not material, and by bidding men look forward to another life. It discredits his method by commending as the great instrument of improvement not revolution but self-reform.

—A work of some interest has just appeared on the Criminal Class by Mr. Havelock Ellis. The writer, rather in his own despite, proves that there is no such thing as a criminal class in the sense of a class by nature predestined to crime. Neither by the shape of the head, the countenance, the complexion, the size of the brain, nor by any other bodily mark, can the man who will commit crime be identified. This baffles two sets of theorists, those who, like the late Mr. Cotter Morison, propose to get rid of crime by summarily putting to death such as are disposed to it, and those who wish to treat criminals as ill-starred and irresponsible beings, objects not of righteous resentment but of pity and the tenderest care. Criminals in the main are simply people who give way to temptations which other people resist. Their progress in crime is usually gradual, which shows that they set out like other people with a moral sense over which their evil passions or propensities are by degrees allowed to prevail. Education and circumstance of course make an enormous difference and must in the eye of God indefinitely diminish guilt; but even the pupils of Fagan know that they are doing what the community condemns, otherwise they would not run away from the police. The argument against capital punishment on the ground of irresistible predisposition would be equally applicable to all punishment, and in every case alike it is met by the retort of Bishop Butler: if the murderer is but the instrument of fate so is the hangman. We are not particular about names, and if those who object to the name of justice, as implying free-will on the part of the community, prefer that of "social reaction against

crime," we are content to let them have their way, provided that social reaction against wilful murder takes the form of setting the murderer on a scaffold with a halter round his neck and suddenly withdrawing the bolt. It is a good feature at all events in the new Act of the State of New York that it transfers the keeping of the condemned in the intervals before their execution from the local to the central prison, where it is to be hoped they will not be quite so open to morning calls, donations of flowers, and other tributes of the maudlin sentimentality which, as the example of the Rousseauists teaches us, is often as little connected with real tenderness of heart as it is with good sense, and which can only pervert the mind of the criminal by masking from him his real position. If this is a moral world, genuine kindness to the condemned would lead us to let him be fully sensible of the awfulness both of his act and of its punishment, that he may prepare himself as well as he can to go before the Court of Divine Justice.

—It is commonly stated on contemporary and respectable authority that seventy thousand persons suffered the death penalty during the thirty-eight years of the reign of Henry VIII., and the statement, incredible as it seems, derives some confirmation from a document preserved by Strype, in which a justice of the peace complains of the laxity with which the law is administered in his county though forty malefactors had been put to death there in a year. Madame de Sévigné, in letters overflowing with sensibility towards people of her class, talks with revolting levity of scores of peasants hanged or broken on the wheel. The modes of execution were not less barbarous than the numbers of victims were appalling. The details of the execution of Damien for slightly wounding Louis XV. sicken the reader, yet over that hellish spectacle gloated the rank and fashion of France. We may thank Heaven at all events for the progress of humanity, even when humanity, running into humanitarianism, assumes grotesque and irrational forms.

There can be no doubt that the adoption of "electrocution," as it is called, by a name not less hideous than the thing, instead of hanging, had for its motive humanity. The result however has been a scene at once ridiculous and revolting at which, and at every incident of which, two hemispheres have looked on, for the clause of the Act forbidding the publication of details has, as might have been expected, been totally set at naught. In the days of barbarism a brutal crowd gathered to see an execution: in our more civilized days the whole community is brutalized by an elaborate report embracing not only the bodily pangs of death but the moral tortures which precede it, and which in Kemmler's case appear to have been enhanced in the attempt to relieve them by concealing from the doomed man the hour fixed for his execution. After divers experiments in the abolition of capital punishment, the world seems to have come round to the conclusion that nothing will prevent murder but the terror of death; and if this is so, there is little reason in striving to divest death of all its terrors. Any one of the ordinary modes of execution is painless compared with the modes in which murderers usually kill their victims. Kemmler had chopped a woman to pieces with a hatchet. *Que messieurs les assassins commencent.* We do not want to torture the murderers, but we need not be at such desperate pains to make their exit from life more agreeable than they make ours. When a man has been convicted of a deliberate and perhaps mercenary murder, there is a good deal to be said for the ancient practice of hanging him, provided it be done with solemnity, and that the reporters be kept under real control.

—To punish us, we suppose, for our irreverent treatment of Mr. Cabot Lodge some one sends us *The Illustrated American*, a journal of high typographical pretensions, with as laboriously venomous a libel on British character as we remember ever to have read. The paper, though styled American, and bearing on its cover the eagle screaming at the uni-

verse, shows signs of Hebrew ownership or inspiration. But this would only add to the significance of the article. The Hebrew studies the market and he finds that what suits the American market is Anglophobia. Of course he seasons high. An Englishman, according to this writer, is never really "a gentleman;" he never possesses the refinement of character, the delicacy of taste, the grace of manner and the freedom from ostentation in the use of wealth which the writer and his compatriots display. Moreover, unlike them, he is given to "making his pile and skipping," to carrying his country upon the sole of his foot. American Anglophobia is a thing the existence of which some may be ashamed to admit, but no one who knows the American Press can seriously deny. Mr. Carnegie, who affects to treat it as an illusion, himself actually feeds it by his irrational and demagogic invective against aristocratic and monarchical institutions. Though disagreeable, it is not dangerous, so long as the question is merely between Great Britain and the United States. It only makes the negotiations about the Fisheries and Behring Sea more acrimonious and tedious than they would be if Great Britain were not concerned. The danger will arise if Great Britain goes to war with any European Power, especially Russia, to which the Americans have always shown a singular and somewhat servile attachment, winking hard at Poland and Siberia, while they passed resolutions of sympathy with oppressed Ireland. Anglophobia would then too probably tempt to breaches of neutrality which a popular government would have neither the wish nor the power to control. That the most offensive manifestations of Anglophobia are not genuine expressions of American feeling, but hypocritical tributes to the Irish vote, is true; but this would not mend the matter. A war between Great Britain and Russia or France would be the opportunity of the Clan-na-Gael. It bodes ill for the success of the Peace Society that the Geneva arbitration has had little effect upon American sentiment even as regards the particular injuries for which so full an atonement was made.

—John Henry Newman, now restored by death from the Cardinalate to humanity, was a man of the highest moral and spiritual aspirations, of rare intellectual gifts, of fine sensibilities and of exquisite culture. The example and influence of a life in which these were displayed are his contributions to the store of mankind. His intellect was rather keen and subtle than powerful and robust. His training included no science, nor anything which could take the place of science, like mathematics or the critical study of history. Philosophy he had studied; but in the school of Aristotle and under strong theological influence. Thus he was well-equipped both by nature and education for literature, devotional and general, but not so well-equipped for the pursuit of truth. Truth, indeed, in the strict sense of the term, he never pursued, though he earnestly strove to attain the best system for the salvation of souls. What he set out to seek, in his "Tracts for the Times," was not truth but a basis for clerical authority independent of the State, the power of which was falling into the hands of Liberals and Dissenters. That basis he found in Apostolic Succession and the power of the Sacraments, with which he combined a vision created by his own poetic imagination, with little reference to history, of the Medieval Church. The training which he underwent in building up his Catholic theory of the English Church, propagating it and accommodating the facts of history to it, was not favourable to his intellectual veracity. It was hardly possible that any man of intellect should sincerely believe that the doctrine and ritual of a State Church, formally designated by the State as Protestant, had remained without interruption Catholic, that the Prayer Book not the Articles was the canon of doctrine, that the Articles meant the opposite of what they plainly said, and that the Reformation had been the act of the clergy and not of the Royal Will. Newman's hollow theory, of course, at last broke down under him; the more ardent of his disciples, such as Ward, pressed on to the logical conclusion; and one day he found himself on his knees before a Roman priest praying for admission to the Church to

which Apostolic Succession, the High Church view of the Sacraments, and priestly authority belonged. He took the step as we suspect reluctantly; for he could hardly fail to enjoy his brilliant leadership of the Tractarian party and probably had a vision of the Church of England restored to Catholicism by his teaching and under him reunited to Catholic Christendom. But having taken the step he showed the usual zeal of the neophyte, flung himself into the most extreme Romanism, attacked both with argument and mockery the Church which he had left, and did despite to his reason by frantically proclaiming his belief in the most monstrous legends and impostures, such as the liquefaction of the blood of St. Januarius, the House of Loretto and the Holy Coat of Treves. We may surmise that he provoked the smile of an old-stager like Cardinal Wiseman, and still more of an old-stager like Cardinal Antonelli. But this mood in time subsided. Newman, no doubt, soon found that the modern Rome of the Jesuits was a very different thing from the Church of the Middle Ages, far more from his poetic reproduction of it. When the Vatican Council was held Newman was found formally accepting Papal Infallibility but practically paring it down to nothing. The old-stagers viewed him with suspicion, and preferred to his high philosophies of Development, wisely after their generation, the low and safe ambition of Manning. The "Apologia," which like most autobiographies is full of self-deception, seems to show that the autobiographer was not entirely at peace with his own intellect. The "Grammar of Assent" furnishes an apparatus for quieting your belief of things of which there is not sufficient evidence and of the truth of which you do not at heart feel assured. That Newman reconciled himself as he did with the Anglicans and Oxford may have been merely a proof of softened feeling, combined with literary sympathy; but it may also have been an indication of his having grown less confident that there was no truth or salvation out of the pale of Rome. He however accepted the Cardinal's hat which, having been withheld by Pio Nono,

was conferred by that fanatic's more liberal and statesmanlike successor, and whatever may have been working in a mind by nature restless and sceptical he remained outwardly a devout son and an exemplary prince of the Papacy. From the spectacle of a gifted intellect and a fine nature thus perverted to the service of a reactionary chimera and prostrated before the Holy Coat of Treves, the moral to be drawn is that whatever doubts may beset us and whatever storms of controversy may shake the world around us, our only hope is to remain firm in our allegiance to the truth. Whether weak man finds the truth cannot possibly signify to Omnipotence. The only thing which can possibly signify to Omnipotence, and which, if this is a moral world, does signify, is whether he seeks it.

—In Ruskin we shall lose the high-priest of the Beautiful: of the beautiful in Painting and Architecture: to Sculpture he paid less attention, his genius having been cast in the medieval and religious, not in the classical mould, while statuary belongs to Greece, and is even in the eyes of medievalists tainted with heathen worship of the body. As a critic of particular works of Art or particular masters, we must leave him to the judgment of experts, who, we believe, do not bow to his authority: certainly he is variable in his criticism as well as extreme, and in his antipathies sometimes extravagant. But more than any other man he has taught us to love and study beauty; beyond any of his contemporaries, perhaps beyond any other writer, he has opened its mysteries to us; the enhanced delight in it and the growing passion for possessing embodiments of it, which are everywhere seen, even in these commercial communities of the New World, we owe in great measure to him. We owe to him likewise a deeper and more intelligent appreciation of the beauties of nature, which he opened to us through the study of Art. His insight and enthusiasm were seconded, and he was able to propagate his æsthetic religion, by an incomparable gift of descriptive language, which has placed him high

among English writers and on a level with the other two great masters of our tongue in his day, Macaulay and Carlyle, though on a pedestal of a widely different kind. Above all other teachers of æsthetics he has connected the æsthetic with the ethical. The "Seven Lamps of Architecture" is in its way unique as well as exquisite. Probably, like most discoverers and enthusiasts, he carried his theory too far. History would have told him that genius for Art may exist apart from virtue. His Venice, at the very time when she produced St. Mark and the rest of the "Stones," was a city of harlots, and his own Turner was as far as possible from being ethically the counterpart of his divine works. Yet exaggeration does not annul truth, and the connection of the Beautiful with the Moral is a truth the profound significance of even Ruskin's pen has not exhausted. In virtue of his power of enforcing and illustrating morality in its æsthetic aspect, Ruskin may be numbered among the moral teachers of the age. It was the sense of his power in this respect, probably, that at last tempted him to leave the domain of which he was monarch, and, laying comparatively aside Art Criticism and the Philosophy of Beauty, to assume the part of a Social and Economic Prophet. In that field, alien to his gifts and his training, he still had a following, even an enthusiastic following. This he owed not only to the talisman of his style but to the loftiness and fervour of his own social aspirations, seconded though they were neither by special aptitude nor by knowledge. He had contracted a dangerous belief in his own infallibility and he forgot that if intuition has a place in æsthetics, in politics and in economics it has none. It is needless to dwell on the difference in value between his writings on his own subject and those in which his æsthetic soul dashed itself almost insanely against the tendencies of a scientific and economic age. Towards the end probably some of his utterances had begun to betray the progress of the disease to which he succumbs. If the poetic youth of the world is over, and its scientific manhood has come, the last pulse of youth could hardly have found more admirable expression than in the writings of John Ruskin.

—In the present century the influence of Germany has made itself felt not merely in the sphere of arms and politics, but also in nearly every department of thought and culture. Not least in the domain of Shakespearean scholarship have German ways of thinking been potent in marking out the lines and methods of work. This influence has not been wholly beneficial, although much is due to German diligence and German examples. The prevailing bent towards generalizations and abstractions has, doubtless, in some measure, turned the study of Shakespeare from its proper objects and given birth to much that is useless and a good deal that is absurd. Against this false tendency, Professor Corson's recently published *Introduction to Shakespeare* protests, and seeks to exemplify truer and more fruitful aims and methods. Much German criticism is occupied, for example, with establishing such theses as that Shakespeare's aim in writing the *Merchant of Venice* is to show forth man's relations to property, or to exemplify the legal maxim, *summum jus summa injuria*; that *Romeo and Juliet* is intended to instil the lesson of moderation; that *Coriolanus* is a political pamphlet to expose the weakness of democracy; while *The Tempest* is an allegorical presentation of contemporary history. It might be hinted that if such be the purpose of these dramas, they are striking failures. Many generations have enjoyed the power and beauty of *Romeo and Juliet* or *The Merchant of Venice* without carrying away the lesson. Nay, if *Romeo and Juliet* be a warning against the impetuosity of passion, the poet has awkwardly aroused our sympathies on the wrong side. It is certainly more complimentary to Shakespeare's power to suppose that the effects at which he aimed were those actually realized on the audiences gathered at the Globe Theatre and on the majority of his hearers and readers since—the pleasure and elevation of feeling roused by the contemplation of human personages depicted with unflinching fidelity, and of human passions displayed in their highest manifestations.

What we know of Shakespeare's life and of himself, what the candid student can gather from his works, all goes to show that he wrote to please. His audiences wished to have their interests awakened and their feelings kindled by representations of human life. They did not go to the theatre to be taught lessons in moderation, or the principles of law or government; nor is there anything to show that the poet, on his side, had any bent towards the didactic or any desire to unfold philosophical ideas. Shakespeare was indeed primarily artistic. His mind did not work by processes of reasoning. He did not first grasp abstract truths and then proceed to illustrate them by concrete examples. It was the concrete world that interested him. He lived and saw and felt rather than studied and reasoned. "When the transcendent power of the Plays is considered," says Mr. Corson, "the learning, strictly speaking, which is exhibited in them, is surprisingly little. The Plays bear more emphatic testimony than do any other masterpieces of genius, to the fact that great creative power may be triumphantly exercised *without* learning (I mean the learning of the schools)." Shakespeare's works afford quite remarkable evidence of his lack of bookishness, of his disregard of the student's point of view. His false geography and history prove great ignorance or great indifference—probably both. If it be argued that he shared that indifference to historical accuracy with his age, this only shows how ages differ and how unsafe it is to transfer from our own time to his either the historic sense, or the tendency towards generalizations and abstractions. But if the age of Elizabeth had but little of our passion for the generalizations of experience, it had, in a degree far beyond us, the desire for representations of concrete life. And for the gratification of that desire, no one could have been better qualified than Shakespeare. Shakespeare had the fundamental requisite for artistic work, the power to see and to feel. He also had the second—the power to reproduce his perceptions in an artistic medium, so that others can share them. The best study and criticism of Shakespeare

is that which enables us to do this. Analytic methods are good only so far as they contribute to this result—so far as they open our eyes to the significance and richness of his pictures. They are but the scaffolding which we erect to get a nearer view of the building; when this has served its end it must be got rid of; we must fall back and take in the structure as a whole. If we wish to look at Shakespeare's plays as he looked at them, we must consider them concretely, as embodiments of life, not of abstract principles. The best commentary on a play of Shakespeare is to see it well put on the stage. Of course, the actor's interpretation is always inadequate, often faulty, not seldom positively false. The true lover of Shakespeare will accordingly find usually a keener delight in reading the plays for himself. His perceptions are probably finer than the best actor's, as actors usually go, and there is besides much subtle beauty and power which no stage rendering can reveal, which need the leisure and microscopic examination of the study. Notwithstanding, the pleasure afforded by the truest appreciation of Shakespeare is of the same kind as that which the theatre-goer gets, and the true way to regard Shakespeare is as a delineator of human life, not as a theorizer upon it.

What then are we to say of the philosophic truths which have been drawn from Shakespeare's plays, and of the lofty moral lessons which seem to be so patent in many of them? Are these non-existent—arbitrarily read into the plays by the critics? No; they are implicit. The great principles of morality are generalizations of experience amended and confirmed by the observation of successive generations. And as Shakespeare's work is the result of unwonted clearness of vision for the facts of nature and life, so those great fundamental principles underlie his plays, as they underlie the events of the actual world. Shakespeare's work is profoundly wholesome. He neither misrepresents nature, in the fear of undermining, or with the aim of encouraging what the sense of men call right, nor for a moment does he blink the stern penalty which is exacted on the inner nature, though often not on the external

fortune of the weakling and the evil-doer. "Shakespeare is always, and pre-eminently, and exclusively, the dramatist; but as a dramatist he is distinguished from all the contemporary dramatists, in his working more strictly than any of them under the condition of moral proportion (and by moral proportion I mean that which is in harmony with the permanent constitution, with the eternal fitness of things), and this he did because, as must be inferred, he felt more than did any other of the contemporary dramatists the constitution of things, and knew that the constitution of things could not be violated with impunity. To unite moral proportion with a more or less unrestrained play of the passions is the great artistic achievement of Shakespeare, in his tragic masterpieces. And when a critic looks into his plays with an eye for the doctrinal, he can easily find it there, because the best results of human philosophy in its several departments have been induced and deduced from careful observations of the permanent constitution of things, and therefore correspond more or less with the philosophy concretely embodied in the plays. The concrete philosophy and the abstract philosophy are based on, or derived from, the same permanent constitution of things.

—THE BYSTANDER has already explained that the object of the series which this number closes was to fill, as well as we could, a dangerous gap in the advocacy of a commercial policy which we hold to be essential to the interests of the whole Dominion and absolutely vital to these of the North-West. For the general objects which THE BYSTANDER was originally intended to promote, independence in the discussion of public affairs and interest in literary questions, provision is now happily made on a larger scale by the growth of an independent press and by the establishment of a literary journal. We are glad to hear that *The Week* is likely to be re-stocked and sent forth on its course with renewed vigour. The effort to give Canadian intellect an organ in the shape of a magazine or a

literary paper has been arduous and costly ; much labour has been expended on it, not, presumably, without sacrifice of other work, nor has its course been unchequered by failure. The area is small and poor, being practically confined to Ontario and Montreal, and there is no use in denying the fact that the literary products of a dependency are at a discount in the dependency itself. The struggle against the literary journalism of the mother country and still more against that of the United States is almost desperate. But those who have taken part repine neither at the expenditure of money and labour nor at the limited character of the success. Whatever political destiny may be in store for us, whether Ontario is always to remain apart or to be united with the English-speaking race of this continent, there is no reason why she should not be made and always remain a centre of intellectual life. Those who have been unsparing in their efforts to bring this about may fairly plead that they have shown patriotism in their way, albeit their way may not be that of the Jingo. One at least, though perhaps not the most important of the elements of nationality, they have done what was in their power to produce.