text of which is now before us, we learn that their lordships are satisfied that the provisions of these sub-sections do not operate to withdraw such a question as that involved in the present case from the jurisdiction of the ordinary tribunals of the country. It has again been suggested that the Dominion Government may cause the proceeds of certain lands in Manitoba, which are under Dominion control for educational purposes, to be appropriated in aid of Separate Schools. But such a proceeding would be so palpable a departure from the original intention of Parliament in making those reservations, and so gross an injustice to the Province, that it is hardly conceivable that any Parliament would sanction or permit it. In a word, then, the matter has been set at rest by the highest judicial authority in the realm, and it is scarcely within the limits of political possibility that the decision of that authority can be reversed or evaded.

CANADA can scarcely be deemed to have come out of the Canal Tolls dispute with *éclat*. The promise to discontinue the rebate at the end of the present season sounds very like an admission of wrong and an appeal to the magnanimity of the United States to let the wrong go on a little longer in order to make its discontinuance the easier. Better this, however, than persistence in an untenable policy at the cost of a canal tolls war, with great injury to the commerce of both parties as its immediate, and non-intercourse or worse as its prospective, outcome, unless, indeed, the Government felt sure that it was within its treaty rights and could count on the support of the British Government. In such a case its backdown under menace would have been wrong as well as cowardly. It is to be hoped that the President and his advisers will accept this assurance as obviating the necessity of putting the retaliatory Act in force. In fact, it is reasonable to suppose that our Government would take care to ascertain that fact before making its decision, else it would be exposing itself to the risk of a fresh humiliation. It is to be hoped, however, that the affair will not end here. Canada has certainly good reason to complain of the manner in which the United States has failed to secure the fulfilment of some provisions of the Treaty, and also of the narrowness and selfishness of its policy in withdrawing the carrying privileges which were one of the original conditions. The most satisfactory settlement would have been the verdict of an impartial tribunal, defining the rights and obligations of each party under the Treaty. Possibly this may have been proposed and refused so long as the objectionable discrimination was persisted in; it is hardly conceivable that it can have been refused absolutely by the United States. Be that as it may, our Government should spare no effort to secure, before the opening of another session, at least a friendly conference, if not a friendly reference, touching all the questions at issue between the two countries in relation to inland navigation and the common use of the water-ways.

THE new Foreign Secretary in the British Cabinet, when he steps into office, will not enter upon a sinecure. On the contrary, he will find himself immediately confronted with a number of questions, none of them perhaps of the very gravest importance, but each bringing its quota of anxiety and responsibilty, and all combining to make his official couch anything but a bed of roses. Most of the worries with which he will be confronted are more or less closely connected with India. Of these the almost chronic troubles with the Ameer of Afghanistan will be among the most perplexing. According to a recent article in the London *Times*, the causes of the present difficulties with that irascible potentate are two-fold. In the first place, the Ameer thinks that his territorial rights have been infringed upon by the Indian authorities in constructing the terminus of the railway which has been constructed from Quetta to the Afghan frontier, on a bit of land which he regards as his territory. True, the land in question is said to be barren and valueless for commercial or strategical purposes. Nevertheless, his highness resents what he regards as an encroachment upon his territory, and, his protest having been disregarded, has proceeded to boycott the railway station from his own side. The fact that the boundary has never been delimited renders it difficult or impossible to say whether the Ameer's claim is or is not valid, but it is easy to believe that in pushing forward the railway no great regard would be had to the outcry of a subsidized and semi-barbarous monarchy, though it would evidently have been good policy, to say nothing of the morality of the thing, had something like the same consideration been had for the sensitiveness of such a prince and people as the British would be the first to insist upon were the situations reversed.

THE other cause of the state of tension which just now exists between the Viceroy of India and the Ameer has its origin in what may be called the "buffer" system in Indian diplomacy. Afghanistan itself, as is well known, is cherished and used by the British Government as a "buffer" between its Indian possessions and Russia. In just the same way the small tribes which occupy the zone between the Ameer's territories and the north-west borders of British India are used as small buffers between India and Afghanistan itself. This arrangement is the source of much friction between the Ameer and the Indian authorities. The former complains that these little independent tribes make raids into his territory and afford places of refuge for his rebellious subjects. He would gladly subdue them, thus making his territories co-terminous with those of British India, but against this he is significantly advised by the Viceroy whenever he seeks his sanction for such a movement. His Highness is at present in trouble with two of these tribes, but it so happens that one of the two has a promise of protection from the British Government in return for services rendered in the last Afghan war, and the other is deemed necessary as a barrier for the defence of another tribe which is the loyal guardian, in the interests of Britain, of certain important passes in the Hindu Kush. Hence the Ameer finds himself checked on every hand, and, not unnaturally, vents his annoyance in protests and remonstrances not couched in the most respectful language, though he takes care to avoid actual rupture, knowing well that apart from the moral and pecuniary aid he derives from British sources, he could not maintain himself on the throne for a year. His difficulties are just now very seriously increased by the insurrection of the Hazaras in his own territory. Meanwhile it is likely that, unless a change of Viceroy and of Indian policy should follow the incoming of a new administration in England, the interview which Lord Lansdowne is seeking to bring about will be effected, sooner or later, and that a renewal of the previous good understanding may result. The latest news is to the effect that the Ameer has made excuses and declined to meet General Roberts, but as the Ameer cannot, in view of Russian aggression constantly threatened, afford to quarrel with Great Britain, he will probably soon think better of his decision.

FROM the same authority we learn that the Hazaras, who are now carrying on so formidable a revolt against the Ameer, are the inhabitants of the mountains between Herat and Cabul. By race they are Tartars, being descendants of the soldiers who followed Timoor into India. Their numbers are estimated at six hundred and sixty thousand. Their fighting men are almost all mounted on small but very hardy and sure-footed horses. As troops they are formidable. Though nominally subjects of the Ameer, they have practically retained their independence since the days of Timoor, and the Ameer has, no doubt, undertaken a very formidable task in attempting to reduce them to subjection. His troops may be better armed, but they are inferior in numbers to the Hazaras, and the latter have the advantages of those who fight on their own soil and are familiar with the country.

THE question of the relations between capital and labour will not down. It is bound to come more and more to the front. If it is not now, it is rapidly becoming the most perplexing question in its relation to legislation and civic, not to say civil, jurisdiction, in the United States. We had the other day a brief article designed to show that, on its merits, or as a matter of equity between man and man, it is by no means so simple a matter to judge righteous judgment between, say, the Homestead strikers and their millionaire employers, as the majority of those who dwell emphatically upon the right of a property owner to do what he will with his own, seem to suppose. Our thoughts have just now been directed afresh to the subject by two articles which accidentally appear almost side by side, in the New York *Nation* of the 11th inst. The first, headed appropriately enough, "The Tyranny of Labour," describes in graphic terms the intolerable annoyance and loss to which a certain employer of labour, who had $100,000 to expend in the renovation of a New York hotel, was subjected by the capricious and tyrannical interference of that modern potentate known as "the walking delegate." The story is too long to be re-told here. Suffice it to say that the employer in question, after again and again conceding the demands of this despotic individual, who went freely through the building, taking down the names of the men, forcing some of them to strike and others to join the Union, greatly against their will, was at last goaded into revolt and forced to discharge the union men and supply their places with those who were free from outside dictation. The result was that he obtained plenty of good men and that these were carrying on the work, with from eight to a dozen of the discharged union men watching the front and rear of the hotel, and constantly insulting and annoying them. All this is bad enough and very likely the end is not yet.

"A TYPICAL Protected Industry" is another article in the same paper, but treating of a different subject, and not intended to have any relation to the one above noted. It deals with the case of the Arlington mills, of Lawrence, Massachusetts. The design of the article is to show the effect of the McKinley tariff in enriching some of the men who helped to frame the measure and secure its passage. There is some dispute about the facts, but it seems to be pretty well established that Senator Vest was substantially correct, though technically wrong, in a recent statement to the effect that these mills, with a capital of $2,000,000, put a sum of more than $900,000 into dividend and surplus in 1891. Such a case could no doubt be paralleled by hundreds in the land which boasts its freedom, its equality, and its McKinley tariff. We are not told the number of men employed, or the rates of wages paid. But it is highly probable that the total amount paid as wages was far less than the sum thus placed to the credit of the owners of the mills, who themselves had neither toiled nor spun. Did, then, those men come honestly by this money? Is it morally their property? Does not the larger part of it represent the amount unfairly filched, under sanction of law, from the product of the hard toil, either of the employees who produced the fabrics, or of these other people, mostly labourers no doubt, who were compelled to purchase the goods thus produced at prices far in excess of their true value? Is it any wonder that the workingmen, in view of such facts, feel that they are the slaves of capital, that it has the advantage over them, that it uses this advantage to rob them of a large part of the products of their toil, and that they must in self defence combine and fight the capitalists? We do not now discuss the problem, or attempt either to apportion the blame or suggest a remedy. But, looking on this picture and on that, can we avoid the conclusion that the world's statesmen and its self-ruling peoples have some hard knots to untie within the next decade or two?

IT is natural and fitting that the United States, the birthplace of the "gerrymander," should also be the place in which the first determined effort to scotch or kill this adder in politics should be successful. The trials which have recently taken place in the supreme courts of the States of New York and Michigan are not without interest and instruction for us in Canada. In both cases severe if not fatal blows have been struck at the "gerrymander" as a force in politics. Both courts have declared the redistributions in question before them to be unconstitutional. The decision of the New York court is subject to appeal, and as it was pronounced by a single Republican judge, and is directed against the Act of a Democratic Legislature, there is reason to fear that, however righteous in itself, it may be over-ruled. But the decision of the Michigan court is not only final, but, as the court was of a mixed or non-partisan character, it is thought that its decision will have weight in other States in which the same question is to come up. Much additional moral weight is given, too, to this decision by the fact that it condemns impartially the Acts of a Democratic and of a Republican Legislature, seeing that not only the reapportionment Act of the last Legislature (Democratic), but also that of the Legislature of 1885 (Republican), is pronounced unconstitutional. As three elections were held under the last named Act, and much legislation no doubt passed by the Houses thus elected, the consequences of the decision must, one would suppose, be far-reaching and most embarrassing, if it should be pushed to its logical results. The ground on which the Acts are declared unconstitutional is briefly that the permission given to the Legislature to exercise "an honest and fair discretion, so as to preserve as far as may be equality of representation," cannot sanc-