

appears to be much more favourable to the motion than the first, but as 19 of the chambers voting were from Canada, and most of the others, no doubt, from other protectionist colonies, it is probably no less emphatic than the former as a declaration on the part of Great Britain herself against any retrogression from her settled policy of free trade. At first thought, it is true, the majority seems smaller than might have been expected, and some of the Canadian delegates are said to have been encouraged rather than otherwise in consequence, and to have expressed their belief that the system of preferential duties will yet be adopted. Whether the vote affords any real basis for such an expectation depends quite as much upon the *personnel* of the majority as upon its size. How many of the British delegates and chambers voted in favour of the system of preferential duties? That is the crucial question. The Mother Country is not at all likely to permit the colonies to determine her fiscal policy for her. If any considerable number of the British delegates voted approval of the principle, even in the very diluted form in which it was presented at the last in Sir Charles Tupper's motion, there is some ground for its colonial advocates to hope for its ultimate success. But if, as we suspect, the minority was composed almost exclusively of colonial delegates having protectionist proclivities, and actuated by selfish motives, their votes count for little so far as any indication they may be supposed to give of a change of opinion in the direction of preferential tariffs is concerned. In any case it is clear that the day when the preferential policy can prevail is too far in the distance to suffice for the needs of Canada in the present crisis of her affairs. She cannot afford to wait for it.

A MEAGRE cablegram informs us that after the defeat of Sir Charles Tupper's motion above referred to and the passing of Mr. Medley's resolution to the effect that a fiscal union between Great Britain and her colonies by preferential duties, being based upon protection, would be politically dangerous and commercially disastrous, while the arrangement that would best conduce to intimate commercial union would be for the self-governing colonies to adopt, as closely as circumstances will permit, the non-protection policy of Great Britain, a motion moved by Sir Charles Tupper, seconded by a Jamaica delegate, in favour of general free trade throughout the Empire, "was carried unanimously amid continuous cheering." This seems very like a step in the right direction, though in the absence of fuller details its exact meaning can hardly be determined with certainty. It must mean in some sense a lowering of duties on the part of the protectionist colonies, and is so far a hopeful omen. If it means, as is likely, a reduction only to countries within the Empire, it involves the principle of discrimination against foreign nations. This would almost certainly fail to receive the approval of the British Government, as it would conflict with treaty engagements and provoke foreign retaliation. But it is refreshing to find Sir Charles Tupper, who has probably done more than any other living man to fasten the shackles of protectionism upon Canadian commerce, moving for the reduction of tariffs on any principle. From a reduction of duties within the Empire to a reduction, without such limitation, upon those articles which we import mainly from Great Britain is but a step. The difference in result would not be very great, and all the possible complications and dangers arising out of the preferential feature of the proposal so heartily endorsed by the Congress would be avoided. There is no question of Imperial taxation of the food of her people in the interests of colonies, which in their turn tax British manufactures without regard to the interests of Great Britain, in such a proposal. It is hardly to be supposed that Sir Charles Tupper, as the accredited representative of the Canadian Government in England, would have made or supported such a motion without the sanction of his Government. It is not more supposable that the Canadian Government would sanction such a motion without being prepared to give it effect in legislation. It is true that in the shape we suggest, the policy would be virtually that proposed in the resolution moved in behalf of the Canadian Opposition a few weeks since and rejected by the Government. But the Government may well say that they wished to test the possibility of obtaining the preferential tax in favour of colonial products before committing themselves to the broader policy. It is devoutly to be hoped that in this successful motion of Sir Charles Tupper is to be found the key to the Finance Minister's somewhat oracular utterances in his budget speech a few months since.

DEMOCRATIC Canadians are sometimes disposed to wonder, perhaps to smile, at the fondness of their elder brothers across the ocean for having some scion of nobility, and if possible of royalty, associated with every great charitable institution and enterprise. This may be a national weakness which we, on this side of the Atlantic, have outgrown. Nevertheless the fact remains that many of the noblest charities in the world have been brought into being and are doing their great works of mercy under the patronage of a royal name. A new and most deserving charity is that now being founded under the patronage of H.R.H. the Duke of York, to be called the "Albert Edward Sailors' Rest." In this way it is proposed that his brother's memory shall be associated with great East London and its vast docks. A most valuable Institute at the Millwall docks is to be opened on July 14th by H.R.H. the Duchess of Teck. The Board of the British and Foreign Sailors' Society hope also to strengthen their stations at the large Victoria and Albert docks and at Shadwell, and to develop these Rests and Institutes at other needed centres. But to be able to do this, in view of recent extensions in Russia, South America, and other parts, they ask that the "Memorial Fund" shall be not less than *ten thousand pounds*. This Society is doing a noble work in many parts of the world and is worthy of the most liberal aid of all friends of the sailor everywhere. As illustrations of its operations it is stated that in the port of Rio de Janeiro a brave young agent of the Society has just fallen a victim to yellow fever at the early age of twenty-two, after heroically ministering to British and Foreign seamen. The benefit of such Institutes abroad is seen in a report just received from Her Majesty's Minister, the chairman of the committee at Monte Video, that from April to December, 1891, 2,605 naval seamen slept in the small Sailors' Home paying their way, while 3,840 made use of it during these nine months, and at the same time 3,368 meals and 962 beds were given to distressed merchant seamen. The Society has worked in London for seventy-four years. Seamen of all nations and from all ports visit this great seaport. To East London, its poorest district, came last year (including ships from foreign countries, British possessions, coastwise and repeated voyages) a fleet of 50,951 vessels of 13,141,455 tons. An expert reckons that on board of this fleet there would be 690,335 seamen. These men are scattered over a vast area and cannot possibly be reached by a central institution. Contributions to this fund will not only help in reaching this vast aggregation of the world's sailors and ministering to their needs, but will strengthen the hands of the Society for extending its operations in all parts of the world where the miseries of sick and suffering sailors appeal especially for its helpful ministrations. Aid for the "Memorial Fund" will come from many lands, but the Directors hope that not less than one thousand pounds will be received from Canada. In view of the fact that Canadian sailors are to be found everywhere, and that our merchant marine takes a high rank in point of strength among those of the seafaring nations, it is to be hoped that this expectation will be speedily realized. Contributions from Canada may be sent to the Hon. Sir Charles Tupper, High Commissioner, London.

THE results of the British elections, so far as known at the time we are writing, bid fair to confirm Mr. Gladstone's confident predictions of a decisive Liberal victory. Of that, however, our readers will be much better able to judge when these lines are before them than we are at this moment. But whether in victory or defeat, Mr. Gladstone will still stand out before his admirers as one of the most remarkable instances of extraordinary powers exhibited in extreme old age which the world has ever seen. Almost any one of his speeches might be quoted by way of illustration, but in two special cases of which records are to hand his wonderful intellectual breadth and acumen have been shown in a striking manner. We refer to his interview, a few weeks since, with a deputation from the London Trades Council, on the question of a legal eight-hours labour day, and his more recent reply to the speeches made at the great Ulster demonstration. In the former case the masterly way in which he drew out the views and arguments of the shrewd men who led in the conversational discussion, while by an occasional observation or question he led them to see their own inconsistencies, or set before them the consequences to which their principles and proposals would logically lead, but from which they would themselves be among the first to recoil, sets in a clear light his wonderful power to grasp a large

question in all its length and breadth, and to forecast its issues. Whether and to what extent his replies to the Ulster Protestants may be regarded as disposing of the grounds of their objections and fears, is a matter in regard to which opinions may differ. But there is scarcely room for difference of opinion as to the effectiveness of his answers considered simply in relation to the speeches actually made on the occasion referred to. To illustrate would require too much space, but one has only to read from both sides to see how much he gets the better in the argument regarded merely as argument. We are often disposed to think that there is in these days a good deal of undue hero worship, and that many of the men who are held up to view as a species of intellectual giants are not nearly so exceptional in height as their admirers would have us believe. But one can hardly follow the course of Mr. Gladstone from year to year without feeling that here at least is one man who does actually tower as an intellectual colossus above his fellows.

IN the absence of fuller information it is impossible to judge whether the owners of the steamer *Coquillan*, which has been seized by a United States revenue cutter for alleged violation of the revenue laws, have any just ground for complaint or not. If the vessel is guiltless, as is said to be alleged, of any infraction of law, there is no doubt that redress will be had on due representation and proof of the facts. If, on the other hand, there has been violation either of the revenue laws, or of the *modus vivendi*, there is nothing for the owner to do but submit to the penalty. It would be very unwise for our authorities to become excited about the affair, or to commit themselves in any way until full enquiry has been made. It is in the least likely that after agreeing to settle all the outstanding difficulties by arbitration, the two nations will permit any new difficulty to arise out of a matter in which the question of right and wrong is one of simple fact. The only sound and safe principle for our Government to act upon is to put itself always in the right and then maintain its position. Had it been careful to do this in the matter of the canal tolls, it is probable that it might have saved itself and the country the humiliation of having to reconsider and retrace its steps, as it now will probably have to do. We can well believe that the British Government will not attempt to sustain it in any course which violates even the spirit of the Washington Treaty.

OTHER nations will naturally follow with some curiosity and interest the future course of the Washington Administration in its treatment of Captain Borup, the *attaché* of the American Legation in Paris, who has been recalled at the request of the French Government, on the charge of having procured plans and descriptions of French fortifications for illegal purposes from a clerk in the Naval Department. Mr. Coolidge, the American Minister to France, seems to have acted with a commendable sense of honour in frankly admitting the turpitude of Captain Borup's act and promptly requesting his recall by his own Government. A Washington despatch, which sounds in some respects as if it might have been inspired, as it purports to be, from high sources, defends Captain Borup against the charge of having sold the information surreptitiously gained to Germany or Italy, saying that no officer in the service is more respected than he, and then proceeds in the following curious strain:—

They (the authorities of the Washington War Department) are not surprised that he should have gained the displeasure of some of the French war office authorities, for his success in obtaining many of the military secrets which the French Government guards so jealously has naturally caused him to be watched with suspicion, but our officials would never believe for one moment that he would play the part of a spy for some other Government. If he has, in the opinion of the French authorities, overstepped the bounds of propriety in securing information, the officials here feel satisfied that his action has been entirely in the interest of his own Government. There may be some question whether a military *attaché* ought to go on collecting the military secrets of other Governments. Individuals may disagree on this point, but generally speaking military people go on the theory that everything is fair in preparation for as well as in war. This is startling doctrine, but quite in harmony with Captain Borup's alleged admission that he had paid for secret official documents, and his attempted self-justification on the astounding plea that in doing so he was but following the practice of all military *attachés*. Things would surely have come to a deplorable pass if it were true that the military officers attached to all legations at foreign capitals felt it their duty to act the part of spies, using