

with the dynamite of pygmies; all is now a dreary plane where a heap of refuse soars a Mont Blanc, and a few nettles wave proudly posing as cedars of Lebanon."

Glaucus: "Why, look at the men who have succeeded as politicians, who succeed, and who will succeed. Is it not a jackasses' race in which, as you know, it is the last jackass wins?"

McKnom: "Something to justify such language may be found in states of society in which no great dangers menace and no difficulties, sufficient to rouse the popular indignation, have to be overcome. But let the hour of peril arrive, and the instinct of the many fixes with unerring appreciation on the deliverer. It is remarkable how true was the instinct of the Roman people in choosing their dictators; of the French people in cognizing one who could give the *éclat* and domination dearer to them than liberty; of the English in upholding in hours of storm or eclipse of fortune those who of all men were the best fitted to sway. The people of the revolutionary period in the States saw that Washington, who, if he lived to-day, would probably never emerge from obscurity, was their man. The majority of the people of Ireland apprehended, with a grip it was impossible to make them relax, how fitted Parnell was for the work they wanted done. This was remarkable, for he is the only man who without oratorical power has ever swayed the Irish Celt."

"Poor Parnell!" sighed Gwendolen. "How I hate those women who weaken instead of strengthen men. He is numbered with the tragic roll over whose blanching bones the sirens sing, and with which the howling, frothing waves of popular fury play."

McKnom, unheeding the interruption, went on. "Carlyle spent a long life preaching the gospel of the great man. History is a record of what great men have done and made others do. Supposing, then, there is a ruling faculty, can one analyze it? Can it be cultivated? Men of the most diverse characters seem to have possessed it. The uncouth Cromwell, the all-endowed Byron, Frederick the Great, Pitt, David, Napoleon, Sir John Macdonald, George Brown, Luther, Wesley, Loyola, Cæsar, Hannibal, Alexander, Moses, Joshua, Samson, Chinese Gordon, to take a few names of men which rise at random, and among women, Deborah, Semiramis, Boadicea, the sagacious Elizabeth, the sensuous Catherine, the holy St. Theresa, Joan of Arc. It would seem to be something that goes out from its possessor and is felt rather than apprehended by processes of reason. Now, as for instance in the case of Sir John Macdonald, it is associated with a seductiveness of address which from the beginning is yielded to willingly and the ascendancy steals on and surrounds you, and now with something that at first repels as in the case of Peel or as in that of Napoleon inspires dread, but which, notwithstanding, never fails in the end to impose its yoke. Let us take for illustration the two greatest forces Europe in the first half of this century produced—Byron and Napoleon. Byron was magnetic; his charm was irresistible; he inspired love at once, but he never failed to assert his ascendancy. Witness his power over Shelley (a far greater poet), over Moore, over Rogers, over even Walter Scott and all the distinguished men with whom he was brought in contact, and finally over Greece waking from her degradation, and modern Hellas, gathering strength from his winged words, found hope of courage in native swords and native ranks, and was ready to crown that brow kissed by all the Muses, had not death marked it for her own. In his verse we feel the mighty heart of the leader of men throb against our own as truly as imagination takes fire at the burning touch of the poet. Napoleon on the other hand at first always created fear. His small stature, slight frame and narrow shoulders, as we see him in the portrait of Guérin, had nothing to suggest awe. But even at school his teachers felt the power that was in him. Madame de Staël was a strong-minded woman, but she tells us how she first saw him on his return to France after the treaty of Campo-Formio, and paints with her powerful brush her sentiment of fear. Without power, he was even in danger from the suspicions of the Directory, rather an object of sympathy and favourable prepossessions; the fear, therefore, he inspired was caused by the singular effect of his personality on almost all those who approached him. 'I had seen men,' she tells us, 'very worthy of respect; I had also seen men of ferocity; there was nothing in the effect Bonaparte produced on me which recalled either.' She saw him frequently in Paris, but seeing him day after day was so far from reassuring her that she became more and more afraid of him. All equality, all familiarity, all comradeship fled at his approach. When he was made General-in-Chief of the army of Italy, Admiral Decrès, who had known him well in Paris, learning that he would pass by Toulon, tells us that he offered to present all his friends to him. He hurried, full of *empressement* and joy, to greet his friend and congratulate him; the door of the salon opened; he was about to rush forward to take his hand, when the attitude, the look, the sound of his voice sufficed to arrest him. 'Il n'y avait pourtant en lui rien d'injurieux, mais c'en fut assez; à partir de là, je n'ai jamais tenté de franchir la distance qui m'avait été imposée.' A few days afterwards the rough, huge hero, General Angereau, said to Massena, but only when they had got out of his presence, that *ce petit b— de Général lui a fait peur*. He could not understand the ascendancy which made him feel crushed at the first glance. Long afterwards, in 1815, General Vandamme, a man more energetic and brutal even than Angereau, said to Marshal d'Ornano one day they

were mounting the staircase in the Tuileries: 'This devil of a man exercises on me a fascination I do not understand. It amounts to this, that I, who fear neither God nor devil, when I approach him, tremble like an infant. He would make me pass through the eye of a needle to throw myself into the fire.' I conclude, then, there is a ruling faculty born with some men and possessed in different degrees, as the poetic, or the mathematical, or the logical faculty is, and it follows that it may be cultivated, developed, strengthened."

"Pshaw!" said Glaucus, "Napoleon had like to have married a widow who owned an hotel; but for chance which gave scope to his talents for war, he might never have been heard of; would probably have been a Boniface, self-indulgent, and too fond of good wine as he afterwards was at St. Helena."

"Bear with me," cried McKnom, who had during the interruption swallowed a glass of wine, and, with a wave of his right hand which had in it some impatience but more of natural rhetorical impressiveness,—

What McKnom said as to whether the archic faculty can be cultivated or not, must be postponed for the present.

NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN.

## PERSONAL VS. LOCAL REPRESENTATION.

THE Redistribution Bill, at present before the House of Commons, opens up questions of deep and lasting importance in relation to the essential nature of our representative system—questions all the more urgent, that they must be forced upon us with every decennial redistribution of electoral constituencies. In the light of these larger questions the bearing of the Bill upon the interests of political parties may well be left out of account. Whether the Bill can be fairly described as aiming at a purely artificial division of constituencies in the interests of the party in power, is a question which, however important in the politics of the hour, we shall for the present waive. We are rather led to enquire whether there is no measure by which the necessity of redistribution may be avoided, and such an evil as gerrymandering rendered impossible.

Now, it is obvious that this evil arises entirely from the division of constituencies by locality. From an early period the inherent defects of this system were more or less clearly recognized, and within the present century numerous changes of a profoundly revolutionary character have been brought about for the purpose of removing those defects. All the great Reform Bills of England have been directed towards this object, and it continues to be the aim of political reformers to make the representation in Parliament correspond as nearly as possible to the population which it professes to represent. In Canada this aim found expression in a catchword which was long a war-cry of one of her political parties—Representation by Population, or, in the abbreviated form which became familiar, "Rep. by Pop." This expression forms an admirable symbol of the universal principle which must govern a fair representative system; but as all universal principles must be limited by the conditions of time and place, the old party-symbol became narrowed to a particular demand of the hour, and in the realization of its transitory form its essential spirit seems to have been forgotten. For it is obvious that there can never be a real representation by population, as long as the population represented are divided into constituencies by a simple regard for locality. For such a distribution is beset by inherent defects which no ingenuity or honesty, or even generosity, on the part of those who arrange it can possibly remove. These inevitable defects may indeed be enormously aggravated by an artificial and unfair distribution in which the population is wholly misrepresented by the majority of electors being rendered powerless to obtain a majority of representatives. But, even if the distribution were kept free from every artificial injustice due either to dishonesty or to ignorance, there still remain imperfections which attach to the system by its very nature. For, even under a perfectly fair and natural division of localities, there must always be a large number of electors who remain entirely unrepresented. Every man in any constituency, whose political opinions require him to vote with the minority, is excluded from representation as effectively as if a special Act of Parliament had been passed to deprive him of the franchise for the crime of holding those opinions. There is surely something monstrous in a representative system which, while ostensibly giving a vote to every man with specified qualifications, at the same time neutralizes the votes of thousands of the duly qualified electors by the conditions under which they must be given.

Now, this imperfection must necessarily be a result of every representative system which separates the electorate into local constituencies, and there is no way in which it can be eliminated except by a method of election which will make legislative bodies represent the population without any necessary reference to the localities in which they live. The representation, in other words, must be personal, not local—a representation of persons and not of places. Such a plan, though admitting of considerable variety in its details, is exceedingly simple in its general principle. It collects the votes of the electorate from all parts of the country indiscriminately, and declares every candidate duly elected for whom the requisite number of votes is polled, though these may have been delivered in a

hundred different municipalities. To find the number of votes required for the election of a candidate, the total number of the electorate must be used as a dividend, and the number of the legislative body as a divisor; the quotient will be the requisite number of votes. Thus, to take a very simple hypothetical case, suppose the whole electorate to be 200,000, and the legislative body to be composed of 100 members, then  $2000 \left( \frac{200,000}{100} \right)$  would be the number of votes required to return any candidate.

Of course those who are interested in political literature know that this is the scheme of Mr. Hare. It is brought forward now, not for the purpose of discussing it on its general merits, but simply as indicating the direction in which our representative system must be reformed, if we would escape from the sickening controversies that seem incident to our decennial problem of redistribution. For the same reason I do not enter upon the general objections which have been urged against the scheme, and most of which banish before an intelligent and earnest study. But it may be worth while to notice one objection which will perhaps be suggested to some minds by that aspect of the scheme which is here urged as its main recommendation for Canadians at the present moment. It may be contended that every locality has interests of its own, which cannot justly be overlooked in the national Government, and that, therefore, it is but fair to give these interests their due representation in every legislative body.

In reply to this objection, it is sufficient to keep in mind that personal representation interferes in no way with the just representation of local interests. Neighbourhood will always form a powerful bond of union among men. As based on an irreversible fact of nature, the danger is that its influence in national politics will run to excess rather than to the opposite extreme. There will thus be a permanent tendency for the inhabitants of one district to act together in political life—a tendency which is sure to be enhanced by the fact that they are constantly acting together in municipal and industrial and other social relations. In fact, the system of personal representation would leave all the natural influences of neighbourhood unchecked by the artificial junctions and divisions of Redistribution Bills. Whenever, therefore, any real local interest was endangered by Governmental action, and required vigorous assertion in the Legislature, it would always be easy for the inhabitants to combine, and to secure at least as effective representation as under the present system.

If either of our political parties, or a new party, formed of the best men in both, were to take up the old battle-cry of Representation by Population, inspiring it with its fullest significance, there would be an outlook into other and nobler reforms, the hopelessness of which is disheartening nearly every patriotic Canadian at the present day.

Montreal, May 28, 1892.

J. CLARK MURRAY.

[All Rights reserved.]

## TWO KNAPSACKS:

A NOVEL OF CANADIAN SUMMER LIFE.

BY J. CAWDOR BELL.

CHAPTER VI.—(Continued).

WILKINSON assumed the responsibility of the boards and the fishermen proceeded to the river bank near the bridge to find the canoe. It was long, and, for a dug-out, fairly wide, but ancient and black, and moist at the bottom, owing to an insufficiently caulked crack. Its paddles had seen much service, and presented but little breadth of blade.

"I should like to place these boards," said Wilkinson, as he surveyed first them and then the dug-out; "I should like to place these boards, one across the bow and the other across the stern, but I really cannot decide which is the bow and which is the stern."

"She's a sort of a fore and after, Wilks, like the slip-ferry steamboats. I think, if you could find a bit of chalk or charcoal, and write bow on one plank and stern on the other, it would make her ship-shape and settle the business."

"I have no sympathy, Corry, with makeshifts and factitious devices. I wish to arrive at the true inwardness of this boat. At what end of a boat is the anchor let down?"

"In the *Susan Thomas* it was pretty near the bow, and I think I've seen yachts riding at anchor that way in Toronto harbour."

"In the time of St. Paul, however, there were four anchors, if I remember aright, cast out of the stern."

"I don't see how the anchor is going to help us. This long Tom Coffin has nothing of the kind."

"You are sadly deficient in observation, Corry, or you would have observed a rope, very much abraded indeed, but still a rope, by which the vessel may be said, even though figuratively, to be anchored to this stake."

"It's you're the clever man, Wilks; education has done wonders for you. Now, I remember that rope is the painter; that's what The Crew called it on the dingy, and of course it was fastened to the bow."

"But to the stern of the larger vessel."

"Yes, but here there is no larger vessel. If you want one, for argument sake, you'll have to imagine the post to be it. The coffin is bow on to the shore."