

the statement in the *Leader* article that although the writer had since 1888 grounds for believing that definite acts of wrong had been done, he had not had until within seven months the demonstrative proofs in his hand, the same question returns with double force in reference to those seven months, which include part of a session of Parliament. It cannot be that public opinion, even in party-ridden Canada, will accept the reasons assigned as satisfactory. These are as follows:—

During Sir John Macdonald's life it could not be done, because he had so committed himself it was impossible to strike where justice pointed without injuring what loyalty to the country regarded as of great importance, and fealty to a chief impelled us to protect—namely, the position and influence and feelings of the great man who was so wise and so beloved and so necessary to the nation.

This is surely a left-handed tribute to the deceased chieftain, as is the following to Mr. Abbott and his Cabinet:—

Towards the close of last session public opinion was so excited over the revelations before the committees that we feared the exposure of even a man of no consequence, who was also a member of the Ministry, might do injury to the Government, and we were assured that immediately on the close of the session the Cabinet would be reorganized.

THE correspondence between Mr. Ewart, of Winnipeg, and Rev. G. M. Grant, which was published in the *Mail* a week or two since, was very interesting by reason of the question at issue and of the great logical acumen displayed by the disputants, to say nothing of the importance of the principle in dispute. It would be out of place for us to enter into the merits of the argument, or even to express an opinion as to the courtesy of the course pursued by Mr. Ewart in the matter. We are glad, however, that Dr. Grant proposes to discuss the general question for the benefit of the public at an early day, and we venture to express the hope that he will not suffer his annoyance at the course pursued by his critic to prevent him from doing so, the more especially as it appears to us that the point at issue is really vital to the validity of the argument so ably presented in his review of Mr. Goldwin Smith's article on "Canada and the Canadian Question." It is, we are well aware, very difficult even to state clearly the point involved without running some risk of being misunderstood. We refer to it only because we are persuaded, as we have indeed often before intimated, that the failure to take the distinction in question clearly into the account leaves a weak link in the chain of many an otherwise strong argument in support of British connection. We trust that our position in reference to the question of political union with the United States is so well understood that we can discuss, or rather define, the point freely. The gist of the question is as we understand it just this: Is the relation of a colony, such as Canada still is, to the Mother Country so completely analogous to that of any (other) integral part of the kingdom or empire to the whole, that we can reason from the one to the other at pleasure? In other words, would the secession of a colony from the parent State, for the sake of commercial or other advantage, be as disloyal and dishonourable an act as the secession of any ancient and integral part of the nation, for a similar reason? Or can it, on the contrary, be argued with any degree of force that it is of the very essence of the colonial relation that it is but temporary and transitional and subject to radical change at any time when the growth and development of the colony shall have become such as to warrant it in assuming the responsibility of shaping its own career? We have often observed that most of those who appeal to the argument from loyalty assume the affirmative. In fact, the doubt or difficulty, if it be such, seems never to have occurred to many of the more ardent denouncers of treason. This is, if we mistake not, more frequently the case with English-Canadian than with English writers. Now, whatever may be the true answer to the question we have put, we are sure that many of those who from time to time write or speak upon the subject would do so much more effectively if they would accustom themselves to bear in mind—for most of them were, we dare say, born on the other side of the Atlantic—that there are two distinct classes of loyal Canadians to be reasoned with, and that the argument which may be most effective with the one class often loses much of its force with the other. The one class is composed of those who were either themselves born and brought up in some part of Great Britain, or have been so trained by native British parents that they can neither feel nor recognize any distinction between Canadian and British loyalty. The other class, which in the nature of

things is becoming relatively larger every year, consists of those who are at one, or two, possibly at several removes from the old land. Nine-tenths of these have never seen the Old Country; they have not been trained to much familiarity with its customs and modes of thinking and feeling, even at second hand. They are, in a word, Canadians, racy of the soil. They are loyal to the core—to Canada. But it is easy to see that their loyalty so far as the Mother Country is concerned is of very different tone and texture from that of the first class. In order to arouse their enthusiasm the argument must have a distinctly *Canadian* tone. It must contemplate the possibility at least of a distinctively Canadian nationality at some day in a future not too far off. We simply point out the fact of the existence of this second large class—a fact which any observer can easily verify—as one that has an important bearing upon the problem of Canada's future, and one that should be borne in mind by those who wish to face all the conditions and shape their arguments in intelligent relation to them.

THE second Royal Commission to investigate the administration of the affairs of the Province of Quebec by the late Government has been appointed and will probably proceed to business without delay. So far as we are aware, no exception can be taken to the *personnel* of the new Commission unless it be the rather serious one that it is composed wholly of men whose political sympathies are, or are supposed to be, on the side of the present Government and against the accused. On the Constitutional side there is the unusual fact that the Commission is called into existence by the advice and on the responsibility of a Cabinet Council, no member of which is a member of the representative branch of the Legislature—at a time in fact when no such branch of the Legislature exists. But while the appointment of the Commission thus still further complicates a political situation which was already complicated to a bewildering degree, we have no doubt that the step is the wisest one it was in the power of the new Administration to take, under the circumstances now existing. It is not perhaps too much to say that the main hope of the Government of obtaining a popular majority at the coming election depends upon the work of this Commission. The list of specifications touching the matters into which it is authorized to enquire is a most formidable one, and if one half the charges made or hinted at against Mr. Mercier and his colleagues can be substantiated, the effect upon the public mind cannot fail to be very great, unless indeed we assume a moral callousness almost incredible on the part of our French compatriots. Nevertheless the mixing up of constitutional with moral questions in almost inextricable confusion is greatly to be regretted. We can conceive that many an honest elector might still be in doubt whether to mark his resentment of the arbitrary and autocratic course pursued by Lieut.-Governor Angers by voting against his new advisers and leaving the unfaithful and dishonest ex-Ministers to be dealt with in due course by the people's representatives, or to show his detestation of boodling by condoning the autocratic action of the Lieut.-Governor. It is very unfortunate, to say the least, that the electors of the Province should have been put in a dilemma in which their votes are liable to be misinterpreted, whether they vote in one way or the other. To compel a free and independent citizen to choose between seeming to be careless in regard to his constitutional liberties on the one hand, or indifferent to gross mal-administration on the other, is surely a deplorable blunder, unless it can be shown to have been an unavoidable necessity. That it was not the latter we have shown in a former article. Admitting that Mr. Angers may have rightly felt it to be morally impossible to act for a moment longer on the advice of a discredited Ministry, it is evident that there was no necessity and no justification of his having recourse to the Parliamentary minority for his new advisers so long as there were still to be found in the ranks of the majority able men and statesmen, such as Mr. Joly, of unblemished reputation.

EVERY true lover of good morals in the Dominion will be glad if an honest and courageous attempt is being made to enforce the laws against the Quebec lotteries. The continued existence of these institutions for robbing the people of the sister Province, and in fact of the whole Dominion, has long been a reproach to all concerned. The law seems explicit enough against the lottery in every form, save that the two unfortunate exceptions—that in

favour of raffles at bazaars held for charitable objects, and that in favour of the distribution of prizes, etc., for the encouragement of art—may leave loopholes for the escape of those who may take advantage of these uncalled for provisions to evade the law. But for some reason not very easy to understand and impossible to defend, the law seems to have been all along a dead letter in Quebec. The reasons that would be assigned by many is that Quebec is French and Catholic. This implies either that the prohibition itself is capricious and not based on any sound principle of political morality, or that the Roman Catholic and the French-Canadian people are held to be amenable to a lower code of morals than that which prevails in English and Protestant Canada. It is inconceivable that either the Roman Catholic prelates and priests, or the French-Canadian people themselves, will admit the latter. It is almost equally inconceivable that either of them could undertake to maintain the former. But whatever the cause, the fact is obvious. The lottery which is proscribed and pretty well stamped out in the other Provinces has continued to flourish in Quebec, to the great loss, financial and moral, of the citizens. Now that an attempt is being made to put an end to them it should not surely be too much to expect that the clergy, the accredited conservators of morals and religion, will heartily support the movement which is so demonstrably for the good of their flocks. The attempt that is being made by certain newspapers to represent the movement as directed against the French race is too absurd to deserve serious refutation. The lottery itself is demonstrably a gambling institution, pure and simple. Gambling has been defined as "that form of stealing in which the person stolen from sustains the relation of assent and complicity." Certainly the lottery not only serves to enable dishonest men to rob the citizens of immense sums of money without giving any equivalent, but it works infinite harm to their morals by pandering to and stimulating that immoral feeling which prompts so many at the present day to wish to get the property of others without giving an equivalent. It is doubtful if there is any passion more demoralizing in its effects and tendencies in modern life than the gambling mania. It is time that every form of gambling was forbidden in every civilized state. This most pernicious form of it known as the lottery is forbidden by the criminal laws of Canada. It is time that those laws were impartially enforced, and we hope their rigid enforcement will soon rid Quebec and the Dominion of the curse of the lottery, in all its forms.

SIR EDWARD WATKIN evidently believes in the persistency of great ideas, and classes his scheme for tunnelling the English Channel in that category. It is far from improbable that the event will prove him right and that future generations of Englishmen, accustomed to rush under instead of over sea to France, in happy disregard of wind and weather and free from dread of the terrible scourge of sea-sickness, will smile at the recollection of the grounds on which the project was for so long a time opposed and hindered. Sir Edward's perennial Bill is to come up at the approaching session, it is said, in a new form. He now proposes to hold out the olive branch to the Government by offering to vest the works in the Lords of the Treasury, and to give them the sole right of determining the expediency of continuing such works, subject to such conditions, restrictions and requirements as they may prescribe. A further proviso of great value and significance to be incorporated in the Bill is that, in the event of such experimental works proving successful, the Channel Tunnel Company may be required within ten years to sell them to the Lords of the Treasury. This is going a long way in the direction of conciliation. It is hardly probable, however, that Sir Edward, with all his sagacity, pluck and pertinacity, will succeed in disarming the opposition of the Government, which has hitherto been fatal to the project. The hereditary dread of a French invasion is as yet too deeply-rooted in the mind of the average Englishman, though to one reflecting on the matter from this safe distance there is something ludicrously absurd in the conception of an army of Frenchmen emerging in England in single file through a hole in the ground and swarming over the land and taking possession of it before a sufficient force could be got together to stop up the burrow, or smoke out its occupants. For our own part we have never seen any good reason to doubt that the day will come in the not very distant future when the people, statesmen and citizens, will laugh at their former fears and push the tunnel through, to the great convenience and advantage of all coming generations.