

cause, the revolt of the farmers against the national policy of high protection. The astounding result of the local election in Hamilton reminds us, however, that another influence is at work which may also aid materially in bringing about such a change. There is, so far as we have been able to discover, but one way in which the conversion of a minority of eighty into a majority of seven hundred for the Liberal candidate in Hamilton can be accounted for. The change must have been wrought by the votes of the unemployed, and others who are feeling the pressure of hard times. All experience shows that no force is more potent to effect the overthrow of Governments in democratic communities than a period of depression. That the present is such a period in Canada is so clear from various indications that it has been a wonder to many that Sir John Macdonald and other members of the Cabinet should have seemed to deny or ignore the fact, when dilating upon the prosperity of the country. To hundreds out of employment, or but partially employed, such assurances must have sounded almost like cruel irony. One of the first remedies which suggests itself, to labouring men of all classes as well as to farmers, when they begin to suffer from the effects of "hard times," is a change of Government. The faith of the many in the power of Governments to bring prosperity or adversity is remarkable. To this, as is well known, was mainly due the overthrow of the Mackenzie administration, and the triumphant return of Sir John Macdonald and his party to power in 1878. It would not be wholly surprising if a similar cause should lead to their overthrow, and the return of their opponents to power in 1891. But we shall be able to speak with more confidence in our next issue.

THAT was a very suggestive article in which our Montreal correspondent, "Alchemist," two weeks ago, gave some account of the first meeting of an association of representative young French and English professional and business men, formed for the frank discussion of the relations of the two peoples, in the province of Quebec and in the Dominion. The discussion, though most friendly, showed apparently about as many different opinions on the questions taken up as there were individuals present. This will, we dare say, be a surprise to many who are accustomed to think of our French compatriots as being all of one mind in regard to those difficulties which have, or are supposed to have, their origin in differences of race and religion. If the French members of the club whose opinions are reported may be accepted as fairly representing at least the more intelligent of their fellow-countrymen—and we see no reason to doubt that they may be so accepted—it is evident that the popular English and Protestant conception of the French as moving in solid phalanx, under the intellectual as well as the religious guidance of their clergy, is very wide of the truth. One, it appeared, looked forward to the establishment of a French-speaking and Roman Catholic nation on the banks of the St. Lawrence, another had no such anticipation; one was an Ultramontane Conservative, another an extreme Radical, a third a moderate Liberal; one was in favour of making religion, *i. e.*, Roman Catholicism, the chief factor in the public schools, another desired their complete secularization, and so forth. In short the whole tone of the discussion confirmed the truth of the assertion made by one of the French members that they represented a greater divergence of opinion on almost every subject than any which existed between them and the English-Canadians present. And there can be no doubt that this tendency of our French fellow-citizens to think for themselves is increasing with the spread of education and intelligence. An incidental confirmation of this view may, we think, be found in the fact that the prelates of the Roman Catholic Church in the French Province are becoming more and more chary in the utterance of opinions or mandates on political and other topics, not coming strictly within the ecclesiastical domain. Even the "solid French vote" in the House of Commons is no longer at the disposal of one party or the other. The formation of such an association as that described by "Alchemist" is an excellent idea. Its influence will be along the right lines, the only lines, in fact, in which the two races can live permanently and harmoniously together as members of one commonwealth—the lines of better acquaintance, growing intelligence and good fellowship. No influence is more potent in removing misunderstandings and toning down prejudices than free intercourse and friendly discussion. We hear a great deal about loyalty in these days, but there are no better Canadian loyalists than those who are doing what they can to promote harmony where possible, and genuine toleration

when harmony is impossible, between the French and English-speaking citizens of the Dominion; no worse foes of the Confederation than those who play upon racial and religious passions, for partisan or other purposes.

AN important contribution to the enquiries now being made both officially and unofficially into the question of game and fish preservation comes to us in the shape of a small pamphlet, "Is Game of Any Value to the Farmer?" suggests the course of its argument. Mr. Harris sets forth in a striking manner how greatly an abundance of fish and game adds both to the attractiveness and to the economic wealth of a country, and the irreparable loss which is being inflicted upon this Province by the rapid extermination of both. He shows that the legislation hitherto enacted with a view to their preservation, consisting mainly of attempts to establish close seasons, and to limit or prohibit the export and even the sale of game, while it may do something to check the exterminating process, is quite inadequate to stay it. Much more does it fail to re-stock the forests, marshes and streams. The remedy which Mr. Harris would suggest is, in a word, legislation to encourage game preservation as a business. The results which he claims would follow are indicated in the following extract:—

If the farmers were encouraged by protective legislation to preserve and protect, not only would the cultivated farms soon abound in game, but the wilder parts would become stocked, and of greater value; our food supply would be increased, the local demand supplied, and an export trade established. The new enterprise would receive encouragement from many influential quarters; capital would be invested in or advanced to aid in stocking properties; county clubs, leagues and associations would be formed; young birds would be protected and artificially bred; trees, valuable for wind-breaks and shades, would be planted for cover; vermin—more destructive than man to game—would be destroyed, and an overflow soon created tending to stock the surroundings, and an immense extent of country would be educated into the mysteries, business and profit of game preservation.

Mr. Harris quotes also some interesting facts and statistics showing that in many parts of the United Kingdom the reduced value of farm lands has of late years caused game-producing to be developed to the very highest extent, with the result of increasing from two to five fold the renting value of farms, or estates, in various localities. With the principle that underlies Mr. Harris' argument we have, in a previous number, expressed our agreement. Any legislation, and any expenditure of public money for the preservation of game and fish, should have in view the benefit of the many rather than the pleasure of the few. The reproach which it is sometimes sought to attach to "pot-hunting," as if it were less legitimate to kill birds or fish for profit than for sport, must be taken away before the people will heartily sanction and second any protective legislation that may be passed. In regard to the feasibility of the methods proposed by Mr. Harris, it would be presumptuous in us to express an opinion without fuller knowledge of the whole subject. The idea of enlisting the farmers and country people generally in enforcing protective measures, by making it directly to their advantage to do so, is certainly practical, and, for aught we can see, practicable. The main difficulty that suggests itself to us has relation to the size of the farms which would be necessary. In some, at least, of the instances of marked success in England and Scotland referred to by Mr. Harris, the farms or estates contained from 2,500 to 11,000 acres. Evidently the attempt to establish a preserve on a farm of 200 or even 500 acres would be a failure, if not an absurdity. But popular sentiment in Canada is decidedly averse—and healthfully so, we think—to the acquisition of large landed estates of any kind, either by individuals or by corporations. Possibly the objections might lose much of their force in the case of waste lands, or lands nearly useless for agricultural purposes, of which there are, of course, large tracts in many parts of the Province; especially if, as suggested, the farmers and country people themselves should unite in the purchase, protection and use of such tracts as game preserves. Mr. Harris' views are eminently worthy of consideration, and we are glad to see that it is proposed to give his pamphlet a very wide circulation.

THE British Government is evidently making good use of the opportunity brought within its reach by the schism in the camp of the Irish Home Rulers and the consequent temporary paralysis of the Opposition. Various measures, such as the Tithes Bill, which they could hardly

have hoped, under former conditions, to pass without a fierce and prolonged struggle, have been pushed forward with marvellous facility. No doubt the announcement of their intention to appoint a Royal Commission to enquire into labour questions is a bold and clever stroke of policy. It is clear that the great successes of the Gladstonian candidates in the Eccles and Hartlepool elections were due quite as much to their attitude in regard to labour questions as to their support of the Home Rule policy. It is also pretty well understood that the Radical leaders have been contemplating and probably preparing for further advances in the same direction, such as would tend to increase very materially their popularity with the labouring classes. The Government have evidently stolen a march upon their opponents and captured a considerable portion of their thunder. It is by no means likely, however, that they will be permitted to reap the fruits of their new policy without a struggle. The movements of Royal Commissions, in such investigations, are almost invariably slow, and the results, in the shape of practical measures of reform, uncertain. It is possible that the appointment of such a commission may be regarded with more or less of suspicion by those most deeply interested. They may, in fact, see in it but a device to gain time, and postpone troublesome discussions until after the coming election. Should, therefore, the Liberal leaders see their way clear to adopt a popular programme of reform in labour legislation, they may still be able to hold the advantage they have already gained by their friendly attitude. Mr. Gladstone himself is not the man to be easily outgeneralled in a contest of this kind. It is in the highest degree unlikely that he and his lieutenants are spending the period of suspension of hostilities in the supineness of despair. It is far more probable that, recognizing that the Home Rule agitation is, for the present, pushed hopelessly aside, they are busy in revising their policy preparatory to a new departure and a vigorous campaign. If, however, it be true, as reported by cable, that Mr. Gladstone has just been investing £12,000, or some other large sum, in the purchase of a Liverpool advowson for his son, the fact can hardly fail to give a shock to the members of the Liberal Society, if it does not seriously impair his prestige with the whole body of his Nonconformist followers. It was not, perhaps, to be supposed that so staunch a churchman should see anything wrong in purchasing a "living" as a purely business transaction, especially as he has, we believe, already done the same thing for one or two other sons. But such an investment at this particular time, when the disestablishment agitation is being vigorously pushed, and when he himself is committed to the principle in the case of Wales and Scotland, seems so much like a vote of confidence in the stability and perpetuity of the establishment in England that it must at least go far towards convincing the advocates of religious equality, that the great and final step in the severance of church and state must be taken under some other leader.

"THERE are no more moles in the sunbeam than in the rest of the room," says the old proverb. To what extent is the explanation it suggests available to explain the alleged increase of gambling and other vices in the upper circles of society in Great Britain, about which so much outcry has of late been made, particularly since the "Baccarat" scandal of a few weeks ago? This and similar disgraceful incidents have caused some of the most influential English journals to take a very disheartening view of the state of morality, especially in the *Upper strata* of British society, and to convey the impression that the English race is, indeed, on the "down-grade." The *Spectator* takes a somewhat reassuring view of the case. While not denying that gambling and other vices are deplorably prevalent in circles in which we might hope for better things, the *Spectator* goes on to say that it is always the most difficult thing in the world to compare the prevalence of any kind of evil or crime in such a century as ours, with the prevalence of the same evil or crime in a comparatively undeveloped period, if only because we hear so much more of it in days of cheap newspapers and cheap telegrams than we could possibly have heard in days when newspapers were few and telegrams had not even been "conceived." The *Spectator* proceeds to recall some facts and incidents which have come down to us from the days of George II. of which date, Thackeray tell us in his "Four Georges," that "when we try to recall Social England, we must fancy it playing at cards for many hours every day." "Even the Nonconformist clergy," he says, "looked not unkindly on the practice." "As for the