

to which she could not have our hearty co-operation in attaining if she chose to place herself in harmony with the rest of the continent. But it is far from clear to us that it should be our part to develop a neighbouring nation, whose industrial and political system is patterned from those that we most avoid, and whose power, drawn from our good-fellowship, has been, is now being, and constantly would be, asserted to our disadvantage.

WE suppose it would be useless to point out once more that Canada's attitude is in no respect any longer directed and controlled by Downing Street; that her institutions are quite as much, and in the opinion of many of her citizens who understand both pretty well, more in harmony with popular sovereignty than those of the United States, and that her industrial and political system is patterned quite as much from that of the United States as from that the latter most avoids, if by that is meant that of Great Britain. The allegation that Canadian power, from whatever source drawn, "has been, is now being, and constantly would be, asserted to the disadvantage of the United States," is, we believe, without foundation. The great body of loyal Canadians will indignantly repudiate the charge. Will not the *Tribune* favour us with some of the reasons upon which such a charge is based? But apart from all that, what should be said of the spirit and magnanimity of a nation which would refuse to do a fair and profitable and friendly trade with its next door neighbour, for fear it might thereby be the means of indirectly strengthening that neighbour, and would so refuse for no better reason than because that neighbour chooses to retain the industrial and political system which best suits her people, and does not choose to pattern it subserviently after that of her more powerful neighbour? We refuse to believe that the people of the United States are actuated by motives or feelings so narrow and invidious. It would be utterly unworthy of them.

WITH the close of the arguments in the famous baccarat scandal trial, the case has entered on a stage more sensational than ever. Whatever the decision of the Lord Chief Justice, the bold arraignment of the Prince of Wales by the Solicitor-General will afford food for thought and comment all over England for much more than nine days or ninety days to come. "Audacious," and Sir Edward Clark's out-spoken words have been called, and people from whom we should have expected braver things seem to have listened with trembling horror, while the fearless pleader meted out the same measure to the heir to the throne that he would have given to a meaner citizen. Yet what is this but the even-handed justice we have been taught to expect, as a matter of course, in a British court of law. Even in the elder days of British jurisprudence a stern Chief Justice did not hesitate to maintain the dignity of his Court at the expense of a son of the Sovereign and not only the nation but the Sovereign himself applauded the act. Surely in these later days, when a member of the Royal Family, even though that member be the heir-apparent, puts himself in a position to be mixed up in a case of illegal gambling, and summoned to Court as a witness in consequence, there is no sufficient reason why he should be dealt with more tenderly than another offender. Rather should we expect that by reason of the graver responsibility he incurs in virtue of his exalted position his conduct should be subjected to even severer scrutiny. And yet from the beginning of this trial up to the moment when Sir Edward Clark took the floor to plead the cause of his client, almost all the references to and dealings with the Prince of Wales were tinged with an apologetic obsequiousness which seemed to suggest that he was made of different clay from that of other men, instead of having, by his own action, placed himself precisely on the same level with his baccarat-playing associates. Nay, the alleged cheating apart, he was evidently the most blame-worthy of the set, inasmuch as it was shown that it was he who carried about in his pocket the implements of the forbidden game, and, by fair inference, tempted his associates to violate the law. There was indeed one noteworthy exception to this unworthy cringing—that of the sturdy jurymen who shocked the spectators by calmly claiming a juror's right to put some searching questions to His Royal Highness. With reference to the main point it must be said that it is by no means clear that the Solicitor-General's logic was sound when he declared that it would be impossible for the military authorities to strike from the Army list Sir William Gordon Cummings'

name, and to leave on that list the names of Field Marshal the Prince of Wales and General Owen Williams. It does not seem to the uninitiated improbable that objectionable as the game itself may be considered, the army authorities may make a broad distinction between what they may regard as fair gambling, and cheating at cards, should the latter charge be proved against the accused. Be that as it may it is deeply to be deplored that the man who may, in the natural order of events, be called upon at any time to take his seat upon the British throne, should stand confessed in the eyes of the whole nation, not only as an habitual player of a disreputable game, but as aiding and abetting in the violation of a law of the realm, made for the protection of the nation against the terrible vice of gambling. His Royal Highness need not be surprised should he find, as soon as the voices of the press and people are freed from the restraints imposed while the case is before the court, that not only the "Non-Conformist conscience," but that of the friends of morality throughout the whole nation has been shocked by this episode in the private life of their coming king.

SIR JOHN MACDONALD.

WE believe that never since the death of Sir Robert Peel has the death of any statesman so profoundly affected the subjects of the British Empire universally as that of Sir John Macdonald. This is not the language of adulation or of exaggeration. It would, indeed, be well-nigh impossible to use language which should exaggerate the public sentiment of this country; and the feeling extends far beyond the western hemisphere, to every English speaking land. We know now that we loved our chief man and admired him and were proud of him. Many of us knew it before. We all know it now; and even those who did know it, now know it better and feel it more deeply.

It may appear to some that, in the remarks we have made, we have been forgetting the late Earl of Beaconsfield, a statesman to whom Sir John has frequently and not altogether improperly been compared. But this is not the case. Lord Beaconsfield was perhaps as great a man as Sir John Macdonald, although we venture to doubt this. He certainly was a man of more varied and versatile gifts. But, as a matter of simple fact, he did not enjoy, to anything like the same extent, the confidence of his own party or the friendly regard of his opponents. Lord Beaconsfield was rather a necessity for his party than their choice; they always stood somewhat in doubt of him; and the Gladstonians and many other Liberals detested him. Sir John Macdonald had the enthusiastic devotion of his party, the kindly regard of many who did not number themselves among his adherents, and the ill will of very few. The reception accorded to him during his last victorious campaign in the city of Toronto was a fair sign of the estimation in which he was held not only in the metropolis of Ontario, but among the more educated classes, and to a great extent by the whole people throughout the Dominion.

Few will maintain that this popularity was undeserved. Indeed, it was more than popularity that he enjoyed; it was affection and confidence. The superficial faults of character which he was supposed to possess were sometimes fastened upon by antagonists; but with very little effect upon his friends or the public. To them he was the chief-tain of whom they were proud.

It is not quite easy to write with perfect calmness of such a man when he has but just been taken from us. The glamour of his presence and speech is over us and we cannot and would not free ourselves from it. The influence of his remarkable personality is a thing not easily or willingly thrown off. There are many ways of accounting for all this.

In the first place, Sir John Macdonald was a man of real and very great ability. If we were to say he was a great man, we believe we could defend the thesis. Any definition of human greatness which should exclude such a man from the category would carry with it its own confutation. Sir John's abilities were manifest when he was at the age at which most men are still learning to exercise the gifts which were conspicuous in him. Whether in Parliament or out of Parliament, wherever he went, he made his mark, his superiority was recognized. And this superiority was not displayed in any particular department of work, but in the grasp which he had on the whole.

For example, although an effective speaker, indeed, it might be said, having regard to his own purpose and

ends, an admirable speaker, he was never what could properly be called an orator. We are not quite sure that oratory is always the gain to the statesman, which a superficial view of the matter might induce us to think it. Perhaps the most able English politician of modern times and the one who seemed capable of holding most completely the confidence of the English people was Lord Palmerston; and his mode of public speech resembled that of Sir John Macdonald far more than the verbosity of Mr. Gladstone or the consummate eloquence of Mr. Bright. It was the same with Lord Beaconsfield. Few men spoke more effectively. Few men were listened to more attentively. Few men had so great power of detecting the weak and the ridiculous points in an adversary, but he was not, in the proper sense of the word, an orator. Sir John Macdonald had a strong resemblance to the English Tory leader; but he seldom imitated him in the bitterness which often drew upon him the resentment and enmity of those whom he scourged.

It is not quite easy to analyze the elements of greatness and attractiveness in manysided men. But we imagine that one conspicuous reason for the hold which Sir John Macdonald maintained upon the people of Canada was their confidence that, whether he was always right or wrong, at least he had at heart the well-being of the country and the people, and that he was devoting his great powers ungrudgingly and unreservedly for the securing of those interests.

We do not imagine that even those who thought the worst of the departed statesman will question this assertion. He loved power, they said. Such an accusation may mean a great many things, some good and some bad. For the man who has the consciousness of power, who knows by inward conviction and by practical experience, that he is better fitted to do the work to which he has been called, than most other men, for such a man the love of power becomes almost a duty. There would be as great an error in one who was a born ruler abdicating place and authority without necessity, as there would be in an inefficient and impotent person striving to exalt himself to a position for which he has no qualifications.

The real question in this connection must rather be directed to the manner in which power is exercised and perhaps also to the manner in which it is secured and maintained. No one has forgotten the one great accusation brought against the Government of Sir John Macdonald in connection with what is called the Pacific Scandal. No one will think of defending bribery in any form. We will not plead that the Carleton Club of the Conservative Party and the Reform Club of the Liberal Party have been accustomed, from generation to generation, to spend large sums at English elections, without enquiring too narrowly into the destination of the expenditure. We would rather say to those who are never weary of raking up this incident: "Let him that is without sin throw the first stone." What is the essential nature of bribery? Surely it is the overpowering of the conviction of the voter; it is the inducing of a man to support a policy which he does not approve. We will not make the somewhat obvious remark, that a man who accepts a bribe cannot have any very strong convictions to dispose of, and does not deserve that his opinions should be respected. We will rather point out that the exercise of undue influence is one of the commonest features of every election, that intimidation is practised in a thousand different forms by candidates and their supporters; and we say plainly that although such intimidation may often be intangible and such as cannot be brought home to its author, it is morally much more criminal than the mere giving of money.

But enough of this. It has never been pretended that Sir John Macdonald either appropriated to his own use any money which he was accused of spending at elections; and it has never been even hinted, and there is no Canadian who will believe, that he ever made use of his high position and the many opportunities that must have been within his reach, in order to enrich himself. It would be far more true to say that he impoverished himself in order to serve his country. A man of his transcendent ability could have made money in many careers that were open to him. It is his glory that he preferred to be the ruler—in his own belief and intention, the benefactor—of Canada instead of aspiring to be one of the richest men in the Dominion.

There was one characteristic of his position and policy which gave him a peculiar hold on the people of the Mother Country, his unswerving loyalty to the British connection. Some may think that he made a somewhat excessive use of