

troops can be had; while the Australians have settled the question for themselves as to who shall pay for them. Let us quote again:—

It begins to be admitted that were Canada and South Africa and Australia and New Zealand members of one body with us, with a free flow of our population into theirs, we might sit secure against shifts and changes. In the multiplying number of our own fellow-citizens, animated by a common spirit, we should have purchasers for our goods from whom we should fear no rivalry; we should turn in upon them the tide of our emigrants, which now flows away, while the emigrants themselves would thrive under their own fig-trees and rear children with stout limbs and colour in their cheeks, and a chance before them of a human existence. Oceana would then rest on sure foundations, and her navy—the bond of her strength and the symbol of her unity—would ride securely in self-supporting stations in the four quarters of the globe.

The fault of this is its rhetorical exaggeration; but it is an exaggeration that some of us like better than exaggeration in depreciation. There *would*, for instance, be rivalry in manufactures, and rivalry of the sharpest kind; but there is rivalry between the various firms and towns of England, and the new rivalry would be a rivalry of merit in goods and of enterprise in pushing them, rather than a rivalry of tariff; there would be, in fact, just the difference between a competitive examination and a dog-fight—if that is not open to the charge of exaggeration too. But, setting aside the rhetoric, there is no doubt that Mr. Froude states forcibly the changed and improved condition of colonial policy, and of feeling regarding the Colonies, in England.

As has been pointed out, Mr. Froude did not visit Canada, and so he missed much he might have seen, and we have missed all that he might have said. How much we have missed may be judged from what follows:—

I have travelled through lands where patriotism is not a sentiment to be laughed at—not as Johnson defined it, “the last refuge of a scoundrel,” but an active passion; where I never met a hungry man nor saw a discontented face; where, in the softest and sweetest air and in an unexhausted soil, the fable of Midas is reversed—food does not turn to gold, but the gold with which the earth is teeming converts itself into farms and vineyards, into flocks and herds, into crops of wild luxuriance, into cities whose recent origin is concealed and compensated for by trees and flowers; where children grow who seem once more to understand what was meant by “Merry England.”

It would have been something to have been written about like that by such a man, in a book which is sure to be read and quoted. It would, one judges, have been possible for Mr. Froude to find as merry a Canada on our snow-covered hillsides, or in our winter woods, or our gay cities, as he found under the Australian sun and amid the Victorian vineyards. Pity that the ice-ridges of Lake Erie are partly responsible for our loss in that particular. It will be pleasant, as well as necessary, to return to Mr. Froude's book in another issue.

M. J. G.

### ENGLISH FEELING ABOUT HOME RULE.

THE fact is, and it is the most encouraging element in a situation otherwise gloomy enough, that on the Irish question Englishmen are no longer looking for a “lead” to party leaders and the manufacturers of political cries. They have mastered, at all events, the principal points in the controversy, and they will not easily loose their hold upon them. The policy of “public plunder,” which Mr. Gladstone denounced with so much fervour in the autumn of 1881, the passionate desire avowed by Mr. Parnell to shatter the last link that unites Great Britain and Ireland, the dependence upon the Irish-American enemies of England, are now matters of common knowledge. To quote the words of Mr. Lecky, in the remarkable letter we published, which has produced a profound impression on public opinion, “If any English politician has still illusions on the subject, he has an easy way of dispelling them. Let him read, for only three months, *United Ireland*, the most accredited organ of the party. . . . I will venture to say that any English statesman who reads that paper, and then proposes to hand over the property and the virtual government of Ireland to the men whose ideas it represents, must be either a traitor or a fool.” The testimony of Mr. Lecky is the more valuable because, as an historian, he has defended “Grattan's Parliament,” and has measured swords as a champion of the Irish character and Irish nationality with Mr. Froude. But Mr. Lecky acknowledges that the restoration of Grattan's Parliament is impossible, and that an Irish Legislature such as Mr. Parnell demands would be only an instrument, and a most efficient one, for accomplishing separation. He has no faith in the value of the “paper restrictions” which fascinate speculative persons like Mr. Brett, and amuse political cynics like Mr. Labouchere; for he perceives, as clearly as Sir James Stephen, that the true remedy for the evils from which Ireland is suffering must be sought, not in elaborate institutions that Irishmen, with all their good qualities, are incapable of working, but in “the restoration of the liberty of the people” by the enforcement of the law. The statement of Mr. Lecky that at the present time there is far more of the liberty of the individual in Russia and in Turkey than in Ireland is abundantly confirmed by the varied and copious evidence published in our columns, and if statesmen have courage enough to tell the whole truth, there is not one in the

ranks of either party who could rise to deny the charge in his place in Parliament. The national conscience is slowly awakening, and those who have forced on the Irish question for settlement may, perhaps, have done a service to the State, though not by carrying out their own views. In Ireland, despite an apparent dead level of submission to a hateful tyranny, discontent and disquietude are spreading, even among the classes who have formed the backbone of Mr. Parnell's agitation. The economical consequences of separation, which have been clearly explained by Mr. Jephson, are not yet realized by the Irish masses, but there is already a suspicion that Ireland may lose her best markets for agricultural produce while grasping at imaginary possibilities of industrial and commercial wealth. The immediate stress, however, of the despotism of the “village tyrants” is the most intolerable part of the burden, and if there were any prospect that the law would grapple in earnest with the forces of lawlessness, there would be a revolt on a great scale. The facts cannot be concealed, and Parliament will have to look them in the face. It must not be forgotten that when the Land League attempted to defeat Mr. Gladstone's legislation in 1881, and proclaimed a “No rent” campaign like that which the National League is carrying on at present, it was suppressed as an illegal organization by the Executive acting on its inherent right, and not in virtue of any coercive statutes whatever.—*London Times*.

### THE DUKE OF WESTMINSTER ON IRISH AGITATORS.

At a banquet given by the Mayor of Chester, January 12, the Duke of Westminster, in responding to the toast of the “Lord-Lieutenant of the County,” thus referred to Irish affairs:—

We find a body of men, called Parnellites, who have obtained a most powerful hold over the people of that deluded and unfortunate country. They have, I think, obtained that position by the aid of the most intense cruelty and the most extreme extortion—by money raised out of the pockets of those who could ill afford it, by the aid of assassination and murder, and—to their shame be it spoken—with the assistance of some members of the priesthood of the Roman Catholic Church. They profess that they wish to separate Ireland from the kingdom of England. They know that this is a thing they will never get, that they can never get, and by God's help and our own right arm—which, Heaven knows, is powerful enough—they shall never get it. The common sense of the country must know that these aims which they profess are absurd, and that their real objects are in their heart of hearts, as I believe, that these leaders of their party may go on obtaining money to spend it upon themselves. Beyond this is that infamous band of Irish-Americans over the water, egging them on with no other object than to create a running sore in the side of England. But the Parnellites must have something to show to account for the money they have received, otherwise their game would be up. We can only hope that this game will not be allowed to go on. They have no spark of feeling for the welfare of their own deluded country. This is the last thing the Irish-Americans think of. Their great object is to inflict a deadly wound in the heart and side of England.

### PUBLIC OPINION.

THE pretence that Commercial Union would interfere with our relations with the Mother Country, and on that account should be discountenanced by all loyal subjects, is hardly worth argument. Feelings of loyalty had no influence with the framers of the N. P. Although Canadian exports were admitted freely to Great Britain that was not considered a sufficient reason for treating British exports more favourably than exports from the United States. The supporters of the Government have always proposed to be in favour of free trade and opposed only to what they called one-sided free trade. Yet they did not hesitate to subject English imports to a protective tariff, and they now seem disposed to raise a howl that nothing but the blindest partisanship can see anything but destruction in free trade with the United States. If our relations with Great Britain were not considered in the one case, and the matter was dealt with wholly from a Canadian standpoint, there is no reason why they should be considered now. If the interests of Canada in matters of trade are so bound up with those of the United States as to demand something more extensive than the former treaty of reciprocity, the supporters of the Government are not the parties to raise an objection on the score of prejudicing the interests of English manufacturers. There is no proof that improved trade relations with the United States would effect our relations with Great Britain either politically or commercially, in any way disadvantageous to the present connection. On the contrary it is beyond doubt that such an arrangement would be a source of infinite strength to Great Britain. It would remove every one of a number of causes of irritation that now exist, and establish the relations between Great Britain and the United States on a firm and lasting basis.—*Halifax Chronicle*.

THE most terrible weapon of the American Socialist is his jaw-bone. He has the same variety of jaw-bone, too, with which Samson did such execution among the Philistines. Make no account of his dynamite; but when he waves his jaw-bone at you, seek shelter.—*Philadelphia Record*.