

are peculiar, and unless very much maligned there is great danger that neither want of evidence to warrant extradition, nor over-scrupulous adherence to the terms of the treaty touching procedure after extradition, can always be relied on to save those who may have fallen under the Imperial suspicion or dislike.

By a resolution recently passed expressing its cordial sympathy with the purpose of the American Congress in authorizing the President to conclude treaties of arbitration, and its hope that Her Majesty's Government would lend a ready co-operation in the movement, the British House of Commons has put itself on record in favour of a peaceable and sensible method for the solution of international difficulties which must assuredly grow in favour as the world grows wiser. The cablegram says, moreover, that Mr. Gladstone "concluded with an eloquent appeal for a moderation of claims as the most effective means of preserving peace." This most sagacious sentence strikes at the tap-root of the whole difficulty. Much is to be hoped for from arbitrations, even when conducted as that now in progress in Paris is being conducted, and as a previous memorable one between the same great powers was conducted, but it is nevertheless evident that there is a serious incongruity between what one might suppose to be the underlying principle of arbitration and the manner in which the representatives, or rather the advocates of the two nations go about their duties. The ideal arbitration would be one in which the strife between the two parties should be to see which could in the most fair and friendly spirit aid in bringing out the simple facts—the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, in the case in hand. Why should not a great nation, like a truly honourable and upright man, be just as anxious to do justice as to get justice. How much of this spirit has been apparent in the conduct of this arbitration, and which party has shown the most of it are questions upon which it would be unseemly for us to offer an opinion, but a comparison of the methods actually used with the ideal standard is very suggestive, and sets in a striking light the wisdom of Mr. Gladstone's remark.

As was generally expected, the first ballots in the German election leave the situation almost as uncertain as before with reference to one great issue, the Army Bill. As was expected, too, the chances appear to be somewhat against the Government and the Bill. Meanwhile, the Chancellor and his Master seem to be as determined as ever that the Bill shall be passed, though the members of the Government are careful to explain that when the Emperor declares his determination to effect its passage he intends to use only constitutional means, whatever those may be. To readers at this

distance it seems strange to hear of Dr. Miquel, the Finance Minister, and others on the Government side, discussing the question as if the people's objections to the increase of the army were based solely on pecuniary grounds. No doubt the burden of taxation necessary for the support of such armaments must press heavily upon the masses. The question of ability to bear increased taxation cannot be determined by a comparison of the taxes paid by the Germans with those paid by the French or Dutch. The relative wealth of the peoples would need to be also taken into account. But the reports brought across the water must have been strangely misleading if the popular aversion to the measure does not have its origin much deeper—in a growing dislike of the spirit of militarism itself, which is taking the mass of the young men from their homes at the most critical period of their lives, just when character is being consolidated and life-purposes formed, and no doubt in very many cases just when their services are needed by their parents. Then, again, the question must continually suggest itself, Where is the rivalry going to end? Every increase in the German armament will, no doubt, be responded to by a still greater effort on the part of France and Russia. Can life be worth living when the whole nation has to be perpetually maintained as an armed camp? Is not this one of the chief contributing causes of the rapid growth of the dreaded Socialism?

A good deal of discussion has been had of late with reference to the Canadian Senate, and some curiosity is expressed as to what action, if any, the Liberal Convention may take in regard to it. Were the Convention representative solely of the opinions and sentiments of Ontario Liberalism, we presume the verdict would be pretty nearly unanimous in favour of its abolition, as being the unnecessary fifth wheel to the Confederation coach. But what view of the matter may be taken by the Liberals of the smaller Provinces remains to be seen. As is well known, the Upper Chamber was originally devised as a safeguard of the rights of the small Provinces, which were liable to find themselves at any time hopelessly out-voted in the representative Chamber. Any attempt to do away with it in the earlier years of confederation would have at once raised the cry that the liberties of those Provinces were in danger. It is now generally thought that the smaller members of the Confederation have pretty clearly demonstrated that they are fully capable of taking care of themselves in the Commons, and we do not remember that any case has yet arisen in which the Senate has been invoked in defence of the rights of threatened Provincial minorities, or has had occasion to prove its usefulness for the specific purpose indicated. But whether the representatives of the smaller Provinces are

so well satisfied with the teachings of the past in this matter as to be willing to forego this constitutional provision for their defence, we have no means of knowing. Certainly the Senate can never be done away with without their consent. It might be rash to say that there is no other use for an independent Senate to warrant its existence, but it seems to us that no fair-minded Conservative can deny that its usefulness, as at present constituted, is pretty nearly destroyed by its extremely partisan composition. Its highest function is more nearly judicial than legislative or political, but it is clearly impossible to place much confidence in the judicial character of a body when the opinions of nineteen-twentieths of its members could be accurately foretold on almost any question which can arise. We do not mean to imply, of course, that this proportion of the Senators would allow themselves to be influenced consciously by partisan motives, but that their political habits of thought are so fixed and so well known that their position on almost any question can be safely predicted.

We referred recently to the seriousness of the situation which would result in the United Kingdom should the combined efforts of Conservatives and Unionists result in the hopeless defeat of the Home Rule Bill. It cannot be supposed that even the most determined opponents of the Bill can look forward with complacency to a return to the state of things which existed before the English and Scotch Liberals led the Irish leaders to put their trust in constitutional methods. There is another side of the question which the Irish Home Rule would do well to consider. If it be true, as the latest reports would seem to indicate, that they are becoming restive under the conciliatory and statesmanlike course which is being pursued by their great leader, and are resorting to tactics intended to compel him to use heroic measures for forcing the Bill through Committee, they have need to remember that the more haste often means the less speed. Have they really counted the possible cost of a false step at this stage of the movement. It might perhaps be possible for Mr. Gladstone with his slender majority to turn a deaf ear to all arguments and proposed amendments and force the Bill through the House unchanged. But much prescience is required to foresee that this would give the opponents of the Bill their opportunity to sound the alarm throughout England. The well-known love of the latter for free speech and deliberative methods would make it much more easy to appeal to them effectively at the general election which must in any case be held before the Bill can become law. The defeat of the Liberal Government by a post-ponement of Home Rule, if not its abandonment. If a return to the