

elections, now inevitable, will take place earlier. Of course, there need be no connection between elections and loans, but most people will agree that it will be well if at the moment when the loan is offered the minds of the electors are not so much occupied with other things as to be unable to concentrate their attention on making the loan successful. Canada has done remarkably well in her home war loans up to the present time. There is no doubt that even greater success can be won for the next loan by a vigorous effort to bring home the need of the money and the merit of the investment to the mass of the people. Our American neighbors, in their "Liberty Loan" showed what could be done in this way, and we may learn from their experience. The terms to be offered will necessarily be liberal to the investor, much more so than those offered by the American Government to their people. There can be no safer, no better investment, than the securities of our own country. Both patriotism and profit—a very useful combination—should move all Canadians who can do so to lay aside something for investment in the new bonds. The banks and other financial institutions will, no doubt, be ready to do all that they can. But a more general participation of the mass of the people is much to be desired.

Limiting the Arbitrators

THE Government, apparently, had some difficulty in obtaining the assent of their friends in the Senate to the Canadian Northern Railway bill. To meet some of the objections naturally offered to the section providing for an arbitration of Messrs. Mackenzie and Mann's claim of sixty million dollars for their common stock, the Senate leader made an announcement that in the agreement to be made under the proposed law a limit would be set to the amount that the arbitrators might award. It is rather a strange fact that, while announcing this intention, and relying on it to obtain support, Sir James Loughheed would neither consent to put the provision in the bill, nor to state to the Senate the amount of the limitation. It was certainly a very amiable Senate which accepted such a mysterious condition. There is room for much doubt as to the wisdom of the proposed limitation. Instead of proving, as it was said to be, a safeguard to the public interests, it may be found an important advantage to Messrs. Mackenzie and Mann.

A Commission of railway experts appointed by the Government recently reported that the sixty millions of stock did not represent any cash, and that it had no real value. Sir William Mackenzie publicly claimed, in the face of this report, that the stock was worth par at least. To refer the whole matter to arbitration in the presence of this situation was an admission of liability that should not have been made. It was virtually an invitation to the arbitrators to ignore the Commission's report and treat as valuable that which the report said was worthless. What is now to be feared is that in fixing a limitation to the amount of the award an intimation will be given to the arbitrators that the Government are quite willing to pay that amount, and that any effort that may be made on behalf of the Government—if it be made—to show that the stock has no material value will be regarded by the arbitrators as not seriously presented. Thus the condition which seems to have influenced some of the Senators and

been regarded by them as a safeguard may prove a ground on which the counsel for Messrs. Mackenzie and Mann can build up a case for the award of the full amount of the limit.

Reform in India

NOWHERE, perhaps, has there been a finer manifestation of the power of the British people as colonizers and rulers than in India. Not without times of trial and sacrifice—the story of the Indian Mutiny is not to be forgotten—but nevertheless with, on the whole, a marvelous success, the British people, comparatively small in number, have long ruled the vast population of India, now numbering over three hundred millions, speaking 147 languages. Occasionally there are small manifestations of unrest in India. When the English King-Emperor a few years ago decided that he would visit India and participate in the Delhi durbar, there was much anxiety among the people of Great Britain as to the visit, many fearing that it would be made the occasion of hostile and dangerous demonstrations. Happily these fears proved unwarranted. All went well, and there is no doubt that the visit stimulated the loyalty of the Indian people to the British Crown. Germany, there is reason to believe, counted on disaffection in India in estimating the strength of the British Empire. Again India justified the confidence of Britain. The Indian princes and people gave freely of their blood and treasure in support of the Empire.

The system of government in India is necessarily of a complex character. More than two-thirds of the population occupy a territory which is divided into thirteen Provinces, all administered directly by British officials. Some sixty or seventy millions are in the Native States, ruled by their own Princes, having a large measure of independence, but all recognizing the suzerainty of the Emperor in England, who, through his Ministers in England, and through a British Resident at the seat of Native Government, keeps a general supervision over their operations, "interferes when any chief misgoverns his people, rebukes and if needful removes the oppressor, protects the weak, and firmly imposes peace on all." The system of government in the portion of the country administered directly by the British has something of a federal character, since besides the central power, known as "the Government of India," there is a Government headed by a British official for each of the Provinces. The Governor General, or Viceroy, is assisted by a Council of eight members appointed by the British Government, one of whom is the military commander-in-chief. Lord Kitchener was the commander-in-chief when Lord Curzon was Governor General. The two strong men were unable to agree, and as the India Office in London was disposed to support Lord Kitchener, Lord Curzon resigned. Besides the Executive Council, there is a Legislative Council of 61 members, partly appointed and partly elected.

The head of all British authority respecting India, under the King-Emperor, is the Secretary of State for India, who is a member of the British Cabinet. He is assisted by a small body of officials known as the India Council, most of whom have served in India. In Mr. Lloyd George's Cabinet the India Office was presided over by Mr. Austen Chamberlain. The recent commission on the Mesopotamia misfortunes having in its report reflected on

the Indian Government generally, Mr. Chamberlain felt that he ought to resign, and did so. His place has now been taken by Mr. E. S. Montagu, who has marked his advent by announcing the intention of the Government to conduct an inquiry into the feasibility of such reforms in the system of government as will give to the Indian people a larger share than they have hitherto had in the administration of affairs, and that for this purpose he will himself visit India during the coming winter.

Mr. Montagu, who is still among the younger set of British statesmen, a member of an eminent Jewish family, has already had a connection with India which tends to qualify him for the very important duties he has undertaken. Several years ago, when Lord Crewe was Secretary for India, Mr. Montagu held the post of Under Secretary, in which capacity he had to take charge of Indian affairs in the House of Commons. He then visited India and obtained a personal knowledge of its condition that must now prove very helpful to him.

At this moment a special difficulty has arisen in the Government of Madras, where the Governor's chair is filled by Lord Pentland, known to many Canadians as Captain Sinclair, who served at Rideau Hall on the staff of Lord Aberdeen, and married Lady Marjorie Gordon. Mrs. Annie Besant, a well known Englishwoman, theosophist, orator and agitator, who has been in India for some time, has been conducting a newspaper in Madras which has come under the ban of the authorities, and the lady has been interned. Mrs. Besant insists that she has not promoted any seditious movement, but has merely agitated for reasonable reform.

Evidently her zeal has carried her too far, for it is hardly probable that the Indian authorities would desire to suppress fair discussion. A body calling itself the "Indian National Congress" has declared in favor of an enlargement of the Legislative Council, with four-fifths elected members, and with the control of financial affairs which representative bodies usually have under the system of responsible government. It is in support of this policy that the Madras paper has fallen into trouble.

It is a striking fact that just when Mrs. Besant is proclaiming the need of some reform and declaring that the British authorities are against it, Mr. Montagu makes the official announcement in Parliament that he is to visit India for the purpose of conferring with the Indian and Provincial Governments with a view to bringing about some such change. There is much room to doubt whether India has advanced far enough in capacity for intelligent self-government to warrant all concessions that Mrs. Besant advocates, but it is evident that the British Government, pursuing a policy that has everywhere marked their treatment of colonial affairs, have every disposition to go as far as possible in giving India a measure of Home Rule. The recent invitation to India to be represented at the Imperial Conference was one sign of the desire to give India a stronger voice in Imperial affairs. Another step just taken is the announcement that young Indians will hereafter be eligible for commissions in the Imperial army.

All parts of the Empire will receive with satisfaction these evidences of the wish of the Imperial Government to extend to the Indian people in as large a degree as conditions will reasonably permit the liberty that is enjoyed in other countries under the British flag.