

Province could well afford to work side by side. There is ample room for both, and whatever brings to light the vast stores of natural wealth, which now lie buried beneath our hills or crop out here and there in our ravines will redound to the prosperity of both.

THE *Forum* for January contains a vigorous and somewhat slashing article by Mr. Dickinson S. Miller, on "Mr. Gladstone's Claims to Greatness." It is not proposed here to discuss Mr. Miller's emphatic denial of the attribute of statesmanship to Mr. Gladstone, but only to note a question of great interest which is incidentally raised. "The infusion of democracy into the much-adored British Constitution has resulted," the essayist tells us, "in a curious compound. . . . The reigning idea of English [and of course Canadian] political practice has become this: that the enfranchised English people are able to regulate by ballot the details of government." This the writer calls "an utterly mischievous perversion of the principle of democracy." "The power of a Minister when he is defeated on any measure whatsoever, to dissolve Parliament, and appeal to the people," is, he thinks, "a fact of vastly different import from the periodical submission to the masses of broad and evident issues." Canadians have sometimes congratulated themselves that their system of government is really more democratic than that of the United States, inasmuch as their control of the Executive is much more direct. Mr. Miller's rejoinder is, in effect, that this is really the weak point in the British and Canadian system, since the masses are not competent to pronounce upon details of government, but only upon broad and evident issues. But is not the less involved in the greater, the part in the whole? Surely a broader political education and a sounder judgment are required to pronounce wisely upon the more comprehensive than upon the narrower issues. If the people cannot be trusted to decide a single question of detail—though, as a matter of fact, such a decision is never called for, save when the question is one of transcendent importance—how can they be competent to deal with large and complicated matters of State policy? Again, unless genuine democracy—that is, government of the people, by the people, for the people—be a delusion or a dream, the English and Canadian system must be nearer the true ideal than the American, and its educating power, a consideration of great importance, must be proportionately greater. The tendency of the periodic system is naturally to fix popular attention upon men rather than measures. Nor is it without its bearing upon the discussion that the greatest of all reforms in either nation, the abolition of slavery, was wrought under the British system by an Act of Parliament, under the American by a dreadful and fratricidal war.

TARIFF-REFORM ideas seem to be gaining a good foothold simultaneously in Canada and in the United States. In the latter country a bill has, it is said, been prepared with the concurrence of President Cleveland and his advisers, by which it is proposed to effect a reduction of taxation to the amount of over \$60,000,000 a year. If this should pass it is safe to predict that the American people, having had a taste of the sweetness of reduced taxes upon the necessaries of life, will be pretty sure to demand the extension of the blessing. Increased volume of trade will probably bring opportunity for this without diminishing the revenue below the level of necessary expenditures. On the other hand, should the bill fail of success, as is perhaps most likely, during the present Session, the debate that it is sure to elicit, preceded and succeeded by discussions in the press, in the clubs, and at every street corner, can hardly fail to tell most powerfully upon public opinion, and may very possibly pave the way to a more radical measure at no distant date. The great end is already in a manner gained. The ice is broken, the glamour of protection to native industry which has so long bewitched the national judgment will not long withstand the light of free discussion.

As much capital is being made on English platforms against Irish landlordism out of the unfeeling and tyrannical dealings of Lord Clanricarde with his tenantry and estate, it is but fair to point out that, according to the *Dublin Union*, Irish Loyalists repudiate most absolutely and indignantly the assertion that he is in any sense or in any way a fair sample of an Irish landlord. The *Union* declares that, "as a man and a landowner, Lord Clanricarde is an exception"; that "he is no more a type of an Irish nobleman than Mr. Bradlaugh is a type of an English Nonconformist." At a recent meeting of the Landowners' Convention, Mr. Montgomery, one of its ablest and most representative members, drew a graphic picture of an imaginary landlord, in which the selfishness, heartlessness, and greed which have characterized Lord Clanricarde's treatment

of his tenantry were tellingly depicted in sentence after sentence of suppositional description. The various points made were, the *Union* says, met with repeated exclamations of concurrence, and no voice was raised to defend the original of the example so cleverly drawn and so thoroughly understood by the Convention. More significant still was the closing sentence of Mr. Montgomery's clever characterization: "Such a man would be altogether an abnormal and exceptional landlord; but he could imagine such a landlord, and he thought in his case it might be for the good of the country, and still more for the good of the landlords, that some compulsory power should be taken to force him to sell." And the principle of compulsory appropriation thus distinctly announced in cases of "absentee Irish landlords who were discreditable and disgraceful exceptions to their class" was, we are told, "heartily endorsed" by the members of the Landowners' Convention. There would be, it must be confessed, very serious difficulty in drawing the line between the rule and the exceptions, under any law of compulsory expropriation.

"AN Indian Mahomedan," writing to the *London Mail*, of the 26th ult., describes the two Indian Congresses that have come and gone, and announces the third one which was to take place on December 27 at Madras. These Congresses claim to be meetings of representatives of the more advanced thinkers belonging to all sections of the Indian people. The moving spirits are the highly educated Bengalees and Parsees. The objects of the annual assembly, which claims the comprehensive title of "Indian National Congress," are to discuss the defects in the Constitution of the Supreme and Local Legislative Councils, and to demand, on behalf of the people of India, the right to control, in a large measure, the affairs of their own country. These annual meetings represent one of the factors of the tremendous problem which will have, at some early day, to be solved by the British nation in India. The vast aggregation of distinct territories and tribes which make up the immense Indian Empire, the present unfitness of many of its peoples for constitutional self-government, and the terrible danger of famine which still overhangs so densely populated a country, and which can only be guarded against by a strong, active, and energetic central government, are but some of the difficulties urged as standing in the way of any extensive concessions to the popular demand. On the other hand, the representatives of "young India" protest, in tones growing more emphatic and determined every year, against the despotism of Anglo-Indian officials. "They claim representative institutions, at least in an embryonic form, and they profess to speak in the name of all the inhabitants of the regions under British rule, from the Himalayas to Cape Comorin, and from Bhamo to Quetta." Such movements gather headway slowly, and may be held in check by firm action and partial concessions for a time. But they are pretty sure to increase in volume and momentum with each succeeding year, and the demand of all India for representative institutions and virtual self-government is one which will before many years have to be met and answered. It should be added that thus far the Mahomedans have taken little part in the agitation, and their societies have in several instances distinctly refused to do so.

THOUGH Mr. Wilfrid Blunt's career has not been conspicuous for sound judgment or discretion, he has not hitherto been supposed to be lacking in veracity. But the story with which he is now regaling the ears of the Parnellites and Gladstonites—assuming the reliability of the press reports—lies quite beyond the bounds of the credible. Mr. Balfour's administration has been marked by great strength and determination, and by unflinching courage. It is possible that with these qualities is mingled some lack of sentiment and sympathy and other softer attributes which in a nature differently constituted might have done something to tone down the asperities to a greater or less degree inseparable from a vigorous enforcement of criminal law, in a country which has brought itself under Parliamentary ban. But the charge that Mr. Balfour had deliberately planned the death of a number of the Irish leaders by the slow and cruel processes of prison discipline and privation is quite too horrible, we should suppose, for even Radical belief. And then, admitting the possibility of the Irish Secretary being such a monster of iniquity, he is certainly not lacking in common sense and shrewdness. Why should he have chosen Mr. Wilfrid Blunt, of all men, as his confidant in regard to so infamous a plot? And how can the latter quiet his conscience, or justify his course, in having contented himself with privately warning Mr. Dillon and Mr. O'Brien that their lives were in danger, instead of denouncing the murderous intentions of Mr. Balfour from one end of the kingdom to the other? More light is evidently needed.