

never can be to him, what it is to his neighbour who was born in England, Scotland, or Ireland. And, naturally enough, the ambition of this native-born Canadian is to develop a distinct Canadian nationality, with a life, a character, and a destiny all its own, rather than to make it a feeble, imperfect copy of the British. Divided and scattered as the population of Canada still is, the existence of this distinctively Canadian type—a type midway between the British and the American—is already a fact, recognized by every observant visitor. Is not this fact the most potent factor in Canadian development, and, at the same time, the one least taken into the account by most of those who speculate about the future of Canada?

WHATEVER may be one's view of the merits of the Anti-Jesuit agitation, most thoughtful observers must come to the conclusion that it is being, in some respects, seriously mismanaged. The playing at cross-purposes which is at times but too apparent is no doubt the result of partizan feeling, which it is impossible to suppress at once, and so cannot fairly be made a reproach to the movement itself, but only to certain of its supporters. But it can scarcely be doubted that the resolution to petition the Governor-General, as an alternative policy, to dismiss his constitutional advisers and appeal to the country is singularly ill-advised. To suppose that the Canadian people, after having wrought and fought for half-a-century to obtain full Responsible Government, should now seek to overthrow the fabric reared with so much toil and care, by asking the Governor-General to take the prerogative of dissolution again into his own hands, seems almost to border on the absurd. It is not easy to see how anyone who understands and cherishes the representative system can put his name to such a petition. True, substantially the same objection lies against asking his Excellency or his advisers to disallow the Act in face of the overwhelming vote in the Commons against disallowance. It seems as if the only logical course open to the people, assuming the great majority to be in favour of disallowance, is to move as individual constituencies against the members who no longer represent their views. Very few members would care to withstand a distinct demand for their resignation made by the great majority of their supporters. Here is a clear channel through which the Government may be effectually reached. But, strange to say, we have as yet heard of no instance in which the voters in any constituency have called for the resignation of their member in consequence of his obnoxious vote in the Commons. It may be questioned whether still another serious mistake is not being made by the committee's adopting the method of secret working, as seems to have been done in Quebec, and to some extent in Ontario. Outsiders cannot, of course, know all the strong reasons which may appear to render this necessary, but secret councils of any kind seem eminently un-Protestant, and it is surely a pity that those whose motto is "Light" should borrow in any respect the tactics of their Jesuit opponents.

A CONTRIBUTOR, "A. M. B.," presents in another column an outline of a proposed Imperial Congress, intended, we presume, to form the supreme legislative authority in the proposed Union of the Empire. The scheme is, so far as we are aware, the first attempt that has been made, at least in Canada, to give to Imperial Federation that "definiteness of development," the lack of which has hitherto been the chief obstacle in the way of its practical consideration. We shall gladly do what we can to elicit the views of Canadians, and to secure for the scheme critical consideration in the other colonies and in England. In order the better to effect this we shall refrain for the present from offering our own opinions or criticisms. It may not be amiss, however, to ask, without comment, as perhaps suggestive of points on which the light of criticism may be directed, a few of the many questions which crowd upon us as we read the details. The centre of interest is, as a matter of course, the Imperial Congress. This is to be presided over by a new British Cabinet Minister. What will be the relation of this minister to the Premier of Great Britain? What the relation of the Imperial Congress to the British Parliament? As all measures, in order to become law, would have to pass through the Imperial Congress after passing the two Houses of Parliament, does this imply authority in the former to block or defeat a measure that has been passed by the Commons and the Lords, and, if so, can the British Parliament and people be expected to take kindly to such an arrangement? If we understand the scheme, Great

Britain and Ireland would be represented in this Supreme Congress by but three representatives, and each of the federating colonies, Canada for instance, by the same number. Would not this put the forty millions or so of the "tight little isles" in a minority to which exception might with some reason be taken? Would all measures passed by the National Senate and Parliament (a novel distinction, it strikes us, as we had always supposed the latter to include the former) have to pass through the National Congress in order to become law? If so, would it not be rather hard on those venerable and hitherto supreme bodies? If not, who is to decide and how, what subjects of legislation shall come and what shall not come within the purview of the Imperial Congress? Finally, for the present, whence is derived the benefit to Canada, which is to compensate her for the expense and the sacrifice of autonomy necessarily implied in such an arrangement? These are but some of the points upon which, as it appears to us, fuller light is needed, and to which the attention of critics may be profitably directed.

NEW SOUTH WALES is, we believe, the only one of the Australian Colonies which does not pay or "indemnify" the members of its lower House of Parliament. Commenting upon the fact that an attempt is now being made in the parent colony to remedy this defect, the *Colonies and India* is terribly severe upon the "popular" legislators of that colony. "We have all along protested," it says, "that it would be an act of gross injustice to the New South Welsh taxpayer to squander his money on the mob of briefless barristers, plundering land-agents, and itinerant carpet-baggers, who succeed in cajoling constituencies to send them to the well-known bear garden in Macquarie Street, and whose goings-on, as reported in the Sydney papers from week to week, have become a standing disgrace to Colonial Legislatures." It seems at last, however, to have dawned upon the mind of the editor that it is possible that the two facts of the non-payment of members and their general worthlessness, may stand to each other in the relation of cause and effect. This sensible conclusion is materially strengthened by the recollection that in the younger colonies of New Zealand and Victoria, where the system of indemnifying members is in vogue, the character of the legislators is very much better. As a result of this comparison, the *Colonies and India* now admits it to be possible that the system of paying members may have brought out the better class of members in the other colonies, and may, after all, be a "desirable institution to adopt." Had the *Colonies and India* not been misled by the practice in Great Britain, in which the abundance of men of wealth and leisure destroys the analogy, it might have long ago seen that it is unreasonable and unfair to expect that, in a young and sparsely peopled colony, a sufficient number of men of the right stamp will come forward to do the work of legislation for nothing. They cannot afford to do it. Those who come to the front, and profess their willingness to serve for naught, will very often be found to be self-seeking adventurers, who trust to their wits to find means of recouping themselves for the pretended sacrifice—a sacrifice which no body of colonists has any right to expect.

THINGS must have come to a sad pass in regard to Ireland, if it be true that the Government finds it very difficult to name a successor to the Vice-royalty. It is not easy, it must be confessed, to reconcile such a fact with the explanation of the retirement of the Marquis of Londonderry which has been put forth, viz., that the crisis which called him to the helm is past, and smooth water again reached. Even English noblemen do not usually refuse a position because its duties are too light, if it is honourable and lucrative. The idea of sending a Royal Prince to preside in Dublin Castle, if ever it was seriously entertained, must now have been abandoned, in view of the chorus of disapproval with which it has been received in all quarters. The immediate outcome of this novel difficulty will be, it is not very rash to predict, that no successor to the retiring Viceroy will be sent. What substitute will be tried, or what effect the change will have on the fortunes of Ireland and its relations to Great Britain, it is hard to conjecture. It does not, however, follow that the transfer of the duties of this office to a commission, or to the Secretary of State direct, will be necessarily a step in the direction of Home Rule, though most persons will so regard it. It is quite possible that the *Times* may be right in arguing that the maintenance of the Irish Court favours the Nationalist views, and that its abolition may be made to tend in the opposite direction.

MR. PARNELL bluntly told Attorney-General Webster, in his cross-examination before the Commission Court, that a certain statement made by him in Parliament in 1887 was untrue, or if not untrue very extravagant and boastful, and that he did not doubt that it was made with the deliberate purpose of misleading the House. On returning to the witness-stand next day Mr. Parnell said that he had consulted Hansard and found that the statement in question had reference to a different society from that he had supposed, and was "fairly accurate" in respect to that society. In view of this modification it is intimated in certain quarters that those journals which commented adversely upon Mr. Parnell's first statement are bound in fairness to modify or withdraw their criticisms in the light of the second statement. For our own part we should have been quite ready to do so, if we could, for we admire the cool, clear and wonderfully frank manner in which Mr. Parnell gave his evidence and replied to all questions. It would have been a pleasure to be able to believe in the perfect rectitude and honourable intention of so clever a leader. But, unhappily, we are unable to see that the explanation lessens, in any material point or degree, the gravity of the charge. The fact remains that Mr. Parnell coolly declared himself capable of solemn falsification on the floor of Parliament. A man, conscious of absolute rectitude and honourable intention, would, it appears to us, have at once indignantly protested that it was simply impossible that he should have made any statement at any time which he did not at the time believe to be strictly true. The ready acceptance of the theory of falsehood or exaggeration is equivalent to an open admission that such tactics would have been resorted to had the occasion demanded. The main question, so far as onlookers from this side of the Atlantic are concerned, is one of character. When it has been established on a man's own evidence that he is capable of a certain discreditable act, the question whether he was actually guilty of that act at a given time and place becomes a matter of secondary importance. At the same time we gladly admit that the prosecution seems so far to have utterly failed to connect Mr. Parnell or the National League with any act of violence or outrage.

THE astounding bribery that was almost openly resorted to during the late Presidential election has had the effect of opening the eyes of a good many in the United States to the danger inherent in their electoral system. All efforts to reach the evil through the courts, or even to secure any searching investigation have proved abortive. It is pretty clear that the wire-pullers of both parties are about equally indisposed to having their methods too curiously inquired into. But a number of the States have been driven, in alarm at the wide-spread corruption, to adopt more stringent laws for the prevention of bribery and intimidation. In most cases the Legislatures have contented themselves with adopting a system somewhat akin to the Canadian, especially in the provision made for the secrecy of the ballot. The Legislature of Massachusetts has now before it a measure which goes much further, and which, if passed, can scarcely fail to prove still more effective. It provides that every political campaign committee in state, city, town or district, which expends over \$100, shall have a treasurer, through whose hands shall pass all the money received or expended, who shall keep a detailed account of all receipts and expenditures, and shall, within twenty days after election, "file with the secretary of the commonwealth a return, setting forth all the committee's receipts and a detailed statement of all its expenditures and disbursements." A similar detailed statement is required from the person elected to Congress or any state office. These statements, as a matter of course, are to be made under oath. These provisions are similar in principle to those which have proved so effective in England. This system provides so simple and direct a check upon undue and corrupt expenditures and so ready a means of tracing such expenditures that it is a wonder it is not adopted in substance by every State and Province which is really in earnest in striving to secure purity of elections. It is much needed as an addition to our Canadian legislation.

UNHAPPY is the man who, occupying a position of prominence, and being called upon to express opinions upon questions which excite public interest, finds himself at the mercy of the press news-agents in the matter of making known his sentiments to the public. That public, in its turn, is less unhappy only in the proportion in which it may be less deeply interested, seeing that it is obliged to rely upon the same medium for its information.