

continue to trust to the British fleet for protection, that they should aid in the support of that fleet. Colonial pride, as well as colonial sense of justice and honour, should accept that principle without controversy. But "taxation without representation is tyranny," even though it should be self-imposed. Sharing in the maintenance of what would thus become the Imperial navy, would carry with it, as a first corollary, some voice in its disposition and management. Unless we greatly misapprehend the colonial, and also the British, way of looking at things, the two would be deemed inseparable. We doubt if even the British pride of spirit would permit them to accept what would be almost equivalent to annual donations from the colonies, given for the support of the navy and no questions asked, even were the colonies willing to proceed on that principle. But if this be so, would it not be rather indelicate, not to say presumptuous, on the part of a colony, to take the initiative, and say to the British Government, "We are afraid that the burden of maintaining your fleet is too much for you. We will help you, on condition that we are recognized as part owners and allowed to help you in its management." What but a snub could be expected in answer to such a proposal? Evidently the Imperial Government should take the initiative if it desires such a partnership. The method proposed by the *Post* seems to be the natural and direct one.

In maintaining that commercial unity is not an indispensable prerequisite to political union, the *London Times* is, we dare say, logically and historically correct. If it goes farther and contends that such a union can be as complete and as prosperous among states which maintain high or low tariffs against each other, as amongst those which are commercially free so far as each and all the members of the union are concerned, one may well demur. The spectacle of a Confederated Empire, whose members were continually erecting tariff walls with a view either to exact tribute each from its fellow state, or to keep out altogether the goods of that state, would hardly make one enamoured of such a union, especially if an occasional tariff war between two or more of its own members were among the probabilities. Can anyone suppose that if the different Provinces of the Dominion had retained each its own tariff, with power to change or increase the duties at any moment, without reference to the effects upon the other Provinces, the Confederation could have made the progress it has made in the direction of unity of feeling and interest. Then, again, without any disparagement of the power of the higher sentiments which are drawing the British colonies nearer to each other and to the common centre, it would be shutting our eyes to well-known facts were we to attempt to deny that the commercial motive

has played a very important part in this movement from the first. The high tariff of the neighboring States has been, to say the least, one of the most powerful of all agencies in promoting whatever of enthusiasm for Imperial Federation there is in Canada to-day. Could it be made absolutely certain that the Mother Country never will consent to impose a discriminating tax on the goods of foreign nations in favour of the colonies, Imperial Federation in Canada would receive a blow from which it would be long in recovering. The bearing of the fact, if such it be, is obvious.

The "leader-writer" of *THE WEEK* is in despair. His ignorance, presumption, and dogmatism are, we fear, ingrained, ineradicable and—colonial. It might have been supposed that after being repeatedly rebuked by "Fairplay Radical" and reminded in the delicate and dispassionate style peculiar to that writer, that it is the height of unwisdom for "people brought up and residing all their lives on this side of the Atlantic" to presume to know any fact, still less draw any inference, or express any opinion touching English political life, even said "leader-writer" would have carefully refrained ever after from committing himself to any statement concerning British affairs until it had been carefully tested in the proper laboratory. And yet even now, with the eminently undogmatic letter of "Fairplay Radical" before him as a model, he finds himself incorrigible. He is unfortunate, too. Just when he might have been supposed to be trying to persuade himself that all that he had read in cablegrams and English papers during these last months about an alleged outcry against the House of Lords was an hallucination of the colonial mind, here come this (Monday) morning more cablegrams intimating on the authority of such men as Hon. George Shaw-Lefevre, President of the Local Government Board, Sir George O. Trevelyan, Secretary for Scotland, and others of like standing, that Lord Rosebery finds himself forced to make in a few days an explicit pronouncement to the effect that the Government will move for the curtailment of the veto power of the Lords immediately on the opening of the coming session. This must be, of course, all a mistake, seeing that there is no outcry, and consequently no pressure of the kind indicated. He was not aware, until told by his mentor, that he had "led his readers to imagine that there is an enormous disproportion between the Conservatives and the Liberals in the House of Lords," though he does confess to having been under the impression that at least three of the most important Radical bills passed by the Commons during the last session were either emasculated or thrown out by pretty strong majorities in the Upper House. In view of his past experience with himself, he hesitates to make strong promises of refor-

mation, but he will certainly try to remember, even when he supposes himself to be stating matters of fact, as he was in the paragraph of Oct. 5th, without expressing any opinions on the merits, not only that if "Unionist" Lords would but call themselves Radicals, the Conservatives would have only a very moderate majority in the House of Lords, but that that House is even now full of Radicals (of the "Fairplay" type).

To speak more seriously, "Fairplay Radical" seems to be labouring under a "curious misapprehension" as to our meaning, which was, we dare say, badly enough expressed. His strictures are apparently based on the idea that we were espousing the cause of Gladstone and the Home Rulers, whereas we were only pointing out what we deemed to be the insufficiency of the remedy suggested by the *Spectator* for an admitted inequality. Even one who had been brought up and resided all his life on this side of the Atlantic may surely venture to do that, giving his reasons for whatever they may be worth, just as anyone else has a perfect right to take exception to those reasons and show their futility. Every intelligent Canadian knows that ever since the Home Rule Bill sent up by the Commons was so unceremoniously thrown out by the Lords, there has been an outcry against the latter, and that this outcry was intensified by subsequent doings in the Upper House. As to the relative number of British and Irish electors in sympathy with that outcry, we have expressed no opinion. That the majority are yet prepared to support it, to the extent of seriously curtailing the powers of the Upper House, we have not asserted or implied, nor should we care to do so. The general election only can decide that. That a number of the supporters of the Government, within the Commons and without, sufficient to endanger its position, demand action hostile to the Lords is simple matter of fact within the knowledge of every reader of English and Canadian papers. That those who are making the outcry, whether strong or weak, numerically—and we are not at all disposed to over-rate their strength—would spurn, as utterly inadequate, the remedy proposed by the *Spectator*, is surely too obvious for doubt. That is, in other words, what we were saying.

It is intimated, or at least currently reported, that the Manitoba Government will take an early opportunity to make a further change in the Manitoba School Law, by completely secularizing the schools. It is perhaps reasonable to infer that the conditional clause in Mr. Laurier's pronouncement, "If the schools are Protestant schools," may have led to this result. We have not the text of the Manitoba Act within reach, and do not remember exactly what kind or extent of religious exercises is now permitted or required, but we have no