

on behalf of the United States Government. As the United States Government has no power to ratify a treaty, and as the Senate which has such power has not been consulted, the foregoing agreement must have been made, we suppose, as contingent upon the Senate's action. The resolutions further declare, it is said, that the House is aware of the interference of Canada in relation to this matter, and regards the same as a menace to the independence of the Colony, and an attempt to make it subservient to the Dominion. If the facts are as alleged, we cannot deny that our fellow-colonists have some reason to be angry. However strongly we might deprecate such an arrangement between the Island and the Republic, we cannot put ourselves in our neighbour's place without sympathizing with her in protesting most vigorously against any sacrifice by the British Government of her interests, in deference to the wishes of Canada. If the case be as reported, it is not improbable that there is some connection between the action taken by the Canadian Government to secure delay in the ratification of the Convention and its own proposals looking to a reciprocity treaty for the Dominion. Nevertheless, we can readily understand how keenly we Canadians would resist any successful interference of the Government of Newfoundland with any treaty negotiations between ourselves and another nation. Nor is it easy to see that Canada's superiority in population and influence in any way affects the principle involved. It may be, however, that the action of the Newfoundland Legislature, even if correctly reported, is founded on suspicion rather than on knowledge, and it is but fair to suspend judgment, pending the explanations that will, we suppose, be made at the proper time by our own Government. It is not easy to see how Canada's interests could be affected in any such way as would justify her interference, by any commercial arrangement that might be entered into between the neighbouring Colony and the United States, and it is no less difficult to believe that the British Government would do injustice to one Colony in deference to the wishes of another.

A SIGNIFICANT argument was used by Hon. Mackenzie Bowell, in addressing the Conservative nominating convention at North Hastings the other day. After a somewhat elaborate defence of the course of the Dominion Government in refusing to disallow the Jesuit Estates Act, the Minister proceeded to point out how awkward would have been the present position of the Government in relation to the demand for the disallowance of the Manitoba School Act, had it not on that occasion taken its position firmly on the ground of Provincial Rights. Supposing, said he, that the Government had disallowed the Jesuit Estates Act, could it, in justice to the Roman Catholics of the Dominion, have refused to disallow the Manitoba School Act? Could not his Grace Archbishop Tache have gone to Sir John Macdonald and have said to him: "At the instance of Ontario you interfered with an Act of the Quebec Legislature which affected our people; we now demand that you disallow the Act of the Protestant Manitoba Legislature, which interferes with our rights?" The argument is perfectly valid. Once admit that the Provinces have no legislative rights which the Dominion Government is bound to respect, if for any reasons of so-called public policy it may see fit to override them, and there is no longer any guarantee of the harmonious working of the Confederation. But apart from the broader principle involved, this utterance of one of the responsible Ministers of the Crown, though somewhat non-committal, can hardly be regarded otherwise than as an intimation that the Manitoba Act will not be disallowed. Should the contrary policy be pursued, and that Act be vetoed before the expiration of the year within which such veto may be used, not only the Conservatives of North Hastings, but the friends of unsectarian schools throughout Canada, would have good reason to complain of the bad faith of Mr. Bowell. At no time, and certainly not in a crisis like the present, when the whole country is on the *qui vive*, can a member of the Government escape responsibility for his public words. It is true that Sir Hector Langevin, the Minister of Public Works, did, some months ago, in addressing a Winnipeg audience, make use of language which seemed equivalent to an intimation that the Act in question would be disallowed. It is no part of our duty to attempt to reconcile the apparently conflicting statements of the two Ministers. But however desirous the Minister of Customs may just now be of pleasing his constituents in North Hastings it seems highly improbable that he would lightly or insincerely make a statement which is capable of being

used with so much effect against the Government, during the present campaign in Quebec.

OUR thanks are due to our correspondent, Mr. Thomas Cross, of Ottawa, for the extracts from the German Emperor's second speech on Education, and the accompanying remarks, which appeared in our correspondence columns last week. We have certainly no desire to disparage the young Kaiser or to under-estimate the work he is doing in the high position in which he has been placed through no merit of his own. The career of William III., up to the present time, is remarkable. History has, perhaps, a few instances, but they are exceedingly few, in which a young man, on succeeding to the Monarchy of a powerful nation, has so happily falsified the promise of his youth and the prognostications of his critics. Considering the temptations incident to such a position and such an environment, the people of other nations, as well as his own countrymen, may readily forget whatever seemed unfilial in his conduct during the too brief reign of his lamented father. In view of the same considerations we may well overlook, too, the marvellous egotism which so seriously mars whatever is admirable, even in the speech from which our correspondent quotes. Were we a German citizen we could not, we confess, so readily so far overlook the contradictions in thought which are apparent in the passage which the Kaiser quoted with approval from the *Hannoverscher Courier*, or accept the limitations it imposes upon that freedom of thought which is generally esteemed one of the best fruits of political development, as to find in it the education which makes good citizens. The ideas of education which lead one to admit that "the fullest liberty must be granted to the teacher in presenting the relations of the melancholy past," but immediately to add in effect that only he whose liberty of thought leads him to stand "on the ground of Monarchy and the constitution" is fit to be a teacher, and which make him refuse to consider how these two contradictory propositions stand related to "a studious care for the formation of character and of independent thought and judgment" are, we confess, so foreign to our conceptions of liberty, that we fear we should be incapable of doing them justice. That freedom of thought which is conditioned by the premise that the subject must think just as the hereditary Kaiser, be he a wise man or a fool, may happen to think, will not be accepted by many in the last decade of the nineteenth century as indicating a very advanced stage of political evolution. It may be that the German people "bow their necks meekly, generation after generation, to a system of government with so much of monarchical and military despotism in it," because they are "well educated" according to the Kaiser's ideas, but hardly we should think because they are intelligent. We may not stay to enquire whether the people of Germany have really reached a higher plane, either politically or ethically, in the process of evolution, than those of Great Britain. Nor shall we stay to point out the glaring injustice which is so often done to the United States, in forgetting or ignoring the fact that it has been for a quarter of a century the sink into which have been freely poured the offscourings of Europe, and the really wonderful work it has done, or rather begun, in teaching these the rudiments of self-government. But we cannot conceal our inability to understand how that work of evolution, which our correspondent rightly says must be looked to for sound political development, can be possible under a system which, instead of relying upon use and practice, nature's methods of carrying on the developing process, for the perfection of the self-governing faculty, chooses to leave the direction of the affairs of the State in the hands of any one man, even though he be a gentleman of the highest type in a certain conventional meaning of the term. Nature's path of development leads usually through effort and struggle and conflict, such as, in the sphere of intelligence, are the outcome of responsibility. Her methods do not favour the continuance of leading-strings beyond the point of absolute necessity.

THE action of the Czar of Russia in returning the Guildhall Memorial pleading for more lenient treatment of the Russian Jews is one of those events concerning which one scarcely knows what to think or say. The very fact of sending such a memorial has, of course, a flavour of interference with the concerns of another nation, and an implication of reproach, such as any Monarch or Government is naturally disposed to resent. Russian correspondents of English papers, wise it may be after the event, deplore the

fact that this expression of British sympathy has but aggravated the already intolerable hardships and sufferings of the wretched Hebrews. The Jews themselves, it is said, bitterly regret the well-meaning but injudicious expression of sympathy which has resulted so disastrously to them. And yet had those influential and representative Englishmen who signed and forwarded the memorial contented themselves with the thought that they could do nothing, and refused to put forth the only effort in their power on behalf of the sufferers, it is very likely that they would have been still more worthy of censure. The snub thus administered to the Lord Mayor of London and other Englishmen in high places is certainly a severe and exasperating one, but it is not of the kind which can be diplomatically resented, albeit the British Prime Minister was the medium through which it was conveyed. That the incident will have its effect on the feeling of Englishmen towards Russia can hardly be doubted, and it is conceivable that the soreness thus caused might have results of a very serious kind in the case of certain future contingencies. In a broader sweep of speculation, the incident suggests startling questions as to the possibility of permanent peace and friendship between a nation capable of such barbarities, and the freer and more enlightened peoples of Europe. If the revolution does not first come from within, it is pretty certainly only a question of time when a Government so despotic must come into contact with its more merciful and refined neighbours until the one or the other shall be shattered by the shock. Meanwhile a little ray of hope has fallen upon the dark lot of the poor victims of intolerance through the noble action of the wealthy Jew who is making provision for the transportation of large numbers of his oppressed fellow-countrymen to the United States, where they are to be cared for during the regime necessary to enable them to acquire the language and the power of self-support in the great Republic.

THE Tithes Bill has at last passed Committee in the British House of Commons. The debate on this Bill presented some very curious features. For instance, the clause of the Bill which relates to the remission of a portion of the tithe under certain circumstances was assailed simultaneously from both sides of the House. The Government proposal was that when the tithe exceeds two-thirds of the annual value of the land all tithe in excess of that amount should be remitted. On the one side it was urged on behalf of the farmer that this remission was insufficient, and a motion was submitted that "one-half" should be substituted for "two-thirds," in the clause in question. On the other hand, the opponents of the Bill denounced all proposals of remission as simply grants to that extent made to a class at the expense of the nation. The tithe, it was urged, is national property, and as such should be a first charge on the land, taking precedence of every other charge, even that of rent. Sir William Harcourt, in his characteristic style, was very sarcastic at the expense of the friends of the tithe. Some of them were prepared, he said, to rob the Church to the extent of one-half its claim, in the given cases, and others to the extent of only one-third. In order to understand this attitude of the opponents of the Establishment, Canadians will need to bear in mind that the most vehement enemies of State Churchism do not wish to see the tithe remitted, as that would, they claim, benefit only the landlord, who holds the land subject to tithe as a legal impost. They desire to see the tithe maintained in its integrity as the property of the nation, but the proceeds of it alienated from the support of a Church, which in Wales is only that of a small minority, and devoted to some purely national use. Sir M. H. Beach defended the Government proposal as a compromise, and it was carried on a division. Mr. Morgan, on behalf of the Welsh members, who had fought the Bill with great pertinacity, must have a subtle sense of humour, for he subsequently proposed that Wales should be exempted from the operation of the Bill, though, as every one knows, it was framed and is being passed for the especial benefit of Wales. The Government, and other friends of the Establishment, no doubt hope that the Bill, making the tithe collectable from the farmer, instead of from the peasant occupier, will reconcile the latter, by blinding him to the fact that the money will still be taken out of his pockets, as the landlord will, no doubt, add it to the rent. The attitude of the opponents of the Establishment makes it clear that the measure will be futile for this purpose, and that the question of disestablishment is one of time only, and in Wales, at least, of a comparatively short time.