

be the state of feeling at Cape Town Mr. Merriman knows better than we do; in Canada we discern not the slightest tendency to contribute to Imperial expenses of any kind. To us, in fact, the means are wanting. Besides, if the Colonies contribute to armaments, whether military or naval, they will claim a voice in the disposal of the armaments and in questions of peace and war. But how difficult it would be to get the British Parliament to divest itself of its diplomatic supremacy Mr. Merriman does not fail to see. "People," says Mr. Merriman, "talk glibly of Federation and of Representation who would be shocked at the very mention of the contribution and taxation which are their inseparable concomitants." Exactly so; and of the two assignable objects of Imperial Federation, contribution to common armaments and submission to a common tariff, neither appears to have any chance of acceptance. Association without any definite object would be futile. Enthusiasm will continue to be evoked for a moment by platform generalities, but will die at the touch of practical detail. Mr. Merriman, who surveys the subject with a statesmanlike eye, taking fair notice of objections, has acutely remarked that the affection of the Colonies is for the Mother Country, not for each other, and that between Colony and Colony there exists no such bond of national feeling as would be needed to hold together a Federal nation. He exhorts us to the cultivation of such a sentiment. But how can we cultivate it if the circumstances and relations of the communities are such that it does not spring up of its own accord? Sentiments cannot be raised like cucumbers, though public meetings may cheer the idea. Besides contribution to Imperial armaments, Mr. Merriman embraces, though less decidedly, the proposal of a Council of Advice, composed of the agents of the Colonies in England. But surely, unless the agents had power to represent the Colonies, their palaverings would be mere moonshine; while no Colony would entrust such power to a man resident in London and acting without the control or knowledge of the Colonial Parliament. It seems to us that there are some prevalent fallacies from which Mr. Merriman is not entirely free. He lumps the Colonies and India together under the name of Empire; but the cases are totally different: it is to India alone that the relation of Great Britain is really imperial; nobody suggests the abandonment of the Indian Empire; nor could England, so long as she retained it, be reduced to "a Holland," even supposing that she were not far greater than any Holland in herself. Again, Mr. Merriman appears to identify colony with dependency, and to suppose that Colonies are not valued, materially or morally, by any one who does not believe that they will forever remain in a state of political tutelage: a strange confusion of ideas, especially when it is considered that the Greek Colonies, the first and not the least memorable example of successful colonization, were all independent from the outset. Not a syllable has ever been said in depreciation of Colonies by any advocate of Independence. It is also a fallacy, and one very prejudicial to a right view of this case, to confound dependence with mutual citizenship, and to imagine that when dependence ceases mutual citizenship must also come to an end. There is no reason why, if a Colony became a nation, its citizens should not retain the privilege, on settling in England, of resuming British citizenship without naturalization, the same privilege being reserved to Englishmen in case of their settling in the Colony. This is practicable, and it is even conceivable that a Federation of this kind may some day include the English-speaking people of the United States. Anything else, we feel convinced, will, to use Mr. Merriman's phrase, "evaporate in talk." The advocates of Imperial Federation may, perhaps, be encouraged by the statement that Lord Rosebery has proclaimed their scheme a part of the Liberal programme. But if he has, he is merely a private interpolator of the Koran. Not a thread of anything of the kind is to be found in the texture of Mr. Gladstone's umbrella. Mr. Chamberlain, so far as we know, has said nothing on the subject; and Mr. John Morley, who is Mr. Chamberlain's literary mouth-piece, treats "Pan-Britannic gimcrackery" with disdain.

THAT England, if she granted independence to her Colonies, would not become again the England of Elizabeth or Cromwell, but would sink into a Holland, is a saying of Professor Seeley which has had great vogue and seems to have particularly impressed Mr. Merriman. Yet of this oracular utterance the first part seems to be true without significance, and the second to be significant without truth. That the times of Elizabeth or Cromwell will never return is a fact incontrovertible, but barren of instruction. That England, if she ceased to hold her Colonies as nominal dependencies, would sink into a Holland, is about as random and as baseless an assertion as a controversialist ever made. Holland is, for her size, a most respectable power, and her people, though debarred from the glories and excitement of military aggrandizement, enjoy a quiet and substantial happiness. But her population is only four millions, and her foreign possessions are insignificant compared with the British Empire in India. The

commercial supremacy which she once enjoyed was almost as artificial a creation as the land, painfully redeemed from the ocean, on which some of its emporiums were built. In this respect she may be classed with Venice, which a combination of accidents once made the diminutive centre of a mighty traffic. The exceptional influences having been withdrawn in the case of Venice by the change of the routes of commerce, in that of Holland by the rise of more powerful competitors for the carrying trade, a subsidence of the artificial prosperity followed, and each power was reduced to its natural basis, Venice sinking almost into a maritime Petra. A similar subsidence must be looked for in the case of England as other mercantile marines and other centres of manufacture arise, apart from any change in her relations with her Colonies. But her thirty-five millions, with all their qualities, will remain; nor is there any reason why she should cease to give birth to the heroic adventurers by whose exploits, from the days of Drake and Raleigh down to those of Brooke, Livingstone and Gordon, far more than by the policy of her aristocratic government, her fortunes have been advanced. To suppose that the mainstay of her greatness is the privilege of sending out puppet governors to Colonies already virtually independent would be as fatuous as to imagine that the strength of her navy resided in the figure-heads.

MR. JUSTICE FERGUSON declares that life and property never were less secure in Ireland. Members of the Government deride this statement and assert that there has been an immense change for the better in the last two or three years. If there has, it is due to the administration of the Lord Lieutenant who has received such scurvy treatment at their hands. Whether Mr. Justice Ferguson is free from interested bias in what he says we do not know; the members of the Government certainly are not. Boycotting, it is allowed on all hands, is rife; and there is proof enough that the spirit of terrorism still prevails, though its more murderous manifestations have of late been suppressed by the vigour of the law. Mr. Parnell, after long encouraging outrage by silence or faint blame, has no doubt passed the word to abstain from it for the present. He wants a quiet Ireland till the election is over. But it seems not quite certain that his orders will be universally obeyed. Rumours are cabled to us of disaffection among his followers, which, though probably exaggerated, are not unlikely to have some truth in them. He has, no doubt, by his arbitrary arrogance given the Irish a foretaste of the sort of freedom which surely awaits them under their own demagogues when they shall have been emancipated from British rule, and it is natural that such of them as dare to have souls of their own should wince and kick against his dictation. Moreover, he is a landlord: the large sum of money which he has received as a fee for his disinterested and patriotic exertions has enabled him to get his estate out of the hands of his mortgagees, and his sympathy with agrarianism, no doubt, has now its limits. But the main object of a Land Leaguer is agrarian; if he cares for Mr. Parnell's political aspirations it is only so far as he believes that the cause of agrarianism and nationalism is the same, and that if freed from the restraints of British law he would be at liberty to despoil his landlord at his will. It is not at all improbable, therefore, that Mr. Parnell may in some degree lose his control over the agrarian insurrection of which Mr. Davitt is the chief; and in that case, as winter draws on, the curb of the Crimes Act having been removed, it is too likely that agrarian outrage will be renewed. Such evidently is the belief of the Irish landlords.

THE attempt to draw a parallel between the case of Ireland and that of Canada, and to evoke Canadian sympathy for Irish Nationalism on the ground that the Nationalist is contending for the same thing for which Canada once contended, seems to us, with due respect for a very able writer, to imply a strange misinterpretation of facts. Ireland is an integral part of the United Kingdom supposed to be seeking separation from it, though the worthiest and foremost Irishmen seek nothing of the kind. Canada was a distant dependency seeking, not separation, or any change in her external relations, but Parliamentary and Responsible Government, which up to that time she had not enjoyed. Parliamentary and Responsible Government Ireland has already in full measure. She has more than her due proportion of representatives in the United Parliament; and nobody has yet attempted to show why, if the Irish members would conduct themselves as the Scotch members do, and, like them, act together on questions of local interest, Ireland might not have just as much self-government as Scotland. Nothing like the oligarchy of the Family Compact exists in Ireland; and as to the Viceroyalty, we have pointed out before that the House of Commons more than thirty years ago voted its abolition by an overwhelming majority, and that the Bill was dropped only in deference to the opposition of Irish members. Extension of local institutions for Ireland, as well as England, Parliament had already taken in hand when the Irish rebellion