

THERE is another question, of a more general character, to which the minds of young politicians must now be turned, though it is one which can only be indicated, being far too wide for discussion within the limits of a paragraph. The young men are convened as "Liberals." But do they mean to be Liberals or Radicals? The two sets of opinions are fundamentally distinct and their divergence is growing every day more apparent, notwithstanding that common antagonism to the Tories keeps the holders of both for the present in uneasy union under the same political roof. Toryism is dead at the root: its desperate effort to find a new source of life in a jesuitical affectation of extreme Democracy is merely its last convulsion, and it will have ceased to intrigue and trouble long before the youths who attend this Convention will have become gray-haired men. The two great parties, if parties continue to exist, the two hemispheres of political thought in any case, will then be Liberalism and Radicalism, which will stand forth in pronounced antagonism to each other. Liberalism is the belief in freedom, in self-development, in the self-improving effort of the individual man; under that banner all its victories during the last century, in every sphere, political, religious and commercial, have been won. It accepts the laws of economical science, and sets its face against Socialism. It has always respected the rights of property and of private contract as the springs of industry and the life of trade. In government its maxim has been economy, that to every citizen might be left, as far as possible, the full fruits of his labour. In foreign policy its principles have been non-interference and peace. Radicalism, as represented by such politicians like Mr. Chamberlain, is so far identical with Liberalism as it places government on a popular basis. But to a government elected by universal suffrage it would assign regulative authority which to the Liberal appears incompatible with due freedom of self-development. Instead of economy in government it proposes heavy taxation of all whom it designates as rich for the benefit of its special clients, the proletariat. Liberty altogether it regards with an evil eye; non-interference is a word hateful to its ears, and it treats with scant respect the teachings of Adam Smith. Its tendency is to merge the individual in the State, and for self-exertion and self-help to substitute the beneficent action of the Government of its choice. It is, in fact, closely akin to Socialism, and the border between the two is ill-defined. When Mr. Chamberlain threatens to make all property-holders pay ransom, he reproduces in milder phrase the doctrine that property is theft. To assist in deciding the choice of the young politician between Liberalism and Radicalism is, as we have said, beyond our present scope. But three remarks may be made: first, Radicalism, like Socialism and Nihilism, is the offspring of a struggle between privilege and poverty in the Old World, to which we have no counterpart here, while the regulative interference which it proposes is much better suited to the ignorant and submissive masses of Europe than to the educated and self-reliant communities of this Continent. Secondly, it is a mistake to think that the only regulations are those made by legislatures, and to forget that regulations equally binding are being constantly framed by social opinion, which restrains excessive individualism in the members of a civilized society, in regard to the use of property among other things, as effectually, though less formally, than it would be restrained by a Government of "authoritative Radicalism." Thirdly, it is an equally great mistake to suppose that liberty is isolation or selfishness. The great prophet of liberty was Milton, who deliberately sacrificed his eyesight to the defence of the Commonwealth.

RIEL's counsel in appealing against his conviction insist strongly upon his alleged insanity. The only chance for the defence was to prove that he was insane when he started his second insurrection. But instead of doing so, they undertook to prove that he was insane several years ago and that he is not much better now. Comte was insane in early life, but even the dubious value of the Positive Philosophy does not prove that he was insane when it was written. Riel's counsel missed the only opportunity they could ever have of proving that he was not responsible when he planned the Duck Lake massacre and plunged the country into the horrors of insurrection; and the natural inference is that the means of proof were wanting. To set up inferential insanity last March, when Riel possessed unusual mental resource, is a plea in opposition to the facts offered as substitutes for evidence. In doing this, the privilege of counsel is stretched to its utmost limit; and when men who took part in his defence assert, at public meetings, the unsound mental condition of their client they pass the uttermost bounds of excusable license. In political cases some latitude may be allowed; but the attempt to bring popular prejudice to bear upon the Crown in favour of Riel introduces a new method of conducting a defence. The sympathizing *habitant* implicitly believes Riel's counsel on their word; he looks on them as exceptionally good authority on the point, and when he is told that Riel is insane, he is horrified

at the prospect of an irresponsible man being hanged, and he is ready to sign all the petitions for clemency that may be presented to him. Petitions got up in this way lose all their value. The pretence that Riel has not had a fair trial greatly swells the list of petitioners, and it is wholly unfounded. It is quite clear that most of the petitioners signed under a misapprehension of the facts: a consideration which deserves great weight in any estimate of the nature of the popular demonstration which these petitions are assumed to embody. But the duty of the Executive lies out of the path of the petitions and is altogether apart from them.

INSURRECTION is an event which, at the right time, it is desirable to efface from the public recollection. The right time for oblivion is when the insurgents have suffered for their fault, or resumed their place and their duties among the rest of the citizens, and all danger is past. When that time comes all reminders of triumph and submission are out of place, and can only produce irritation where mutual good-will ought to prevail. For these reasons we cannot help thinking that the resolution to give a medal to every volunteer who went to the North-West is ill-considered and had better not have been taken. War medals are generally given to perpetuate the memory of some special exploit or unusual feat of arms. By this rule only the men engaged in the charge of Batoche would be entitled to a medal. But if henceforth an arduous march is to entitle troops to this form of decoration, its value as a recognition of services will lose much of its force. And if this is not the meaning of the proposed medal it cannot be said to have any meaning at all. The occasion revives a recollection which has too long been allowed to slumber. A medal was struck for the volunteers of 1812, but never distributed; the ostensible ground for withholding it being that it would be invidious to attempt to discriminate between different degrees of merit, and impossible to do so with justice. The medals, which were of silver, were purchased out of the surplus of the Patriotic Fund, the greater part of which was raised by voluntary contributions in England. What became of the medals? To this question a committee of the Legislature addressed itself in 1846. One box containing medals was, according to the evidence, in the vaults of the Bank of Upper Canada, another was in the keeping of a private citizen. The committee satisfied itself with the promise that these medals should be handed over to the Toronto hospital, whose funds were to be enriched by the value of the silver they contained. It is said that this promise was never carried out; the late Mr. Brent, Secretary to the Hospital Trust, was certain that neither the medals nor the proceeds of their sale ever reached their destination. It is not out of place to ask that enquiry about the fate of the medals should now be made. Stories about the disposal of the medals are told, and have been committed to print in a numismatic journal which we prefer not to believe, except upon indubitable evidence. If there be any living person whose reputation is involved in this mystery he owes it to himself to make public a statement of the facts.

If the writers who, in the reputed organs of Canadian Liberalism, support Mr. Parnell and his designs are Irish Roman Catholics, backing up their own leader and playing their own game, there is no more to be said. At least, the only thing to be said is that it would be more ingenious on their part if they would drop the mask of Home Rule, discard the subterfuge of Local Self-Government, and avow, as frankly as the agitator whom they support does, that they are sworn enemies of Great Britain, and that their object is the dismemberment of the United Kingdom; to which perhaps as Roman Catholics they would not be sorry to see added the humiliation of Protestantism by the destruction of its foremost power. It would of course be useless to ask them to do common justice to the British people. They cannot be expected, any more than their compatriots and co-religionists, to refrain from saying that Ireland has no voice in British councils, when she is represented by a hundred members; that her affairs receive no attention, when they are absolutely blocking Parliament; that she is deprived of all liberties, when she has every liberty enjoyed by Englishmen, saving that her police is centralized in order to prevent Irishmen and Irishwomen from being murdered by the hundred; and that she is the worst governed country in the world, when no country in the world is more prosperous and contented than that part of her which is Protestant and loyal. But if these writers are Liberal, and their object is to strengthen the Liberal party by the enlistment of the Irish vote, let them take warning from the fate of the Liberal party in England. Let them take warning above all from the fate of Mr. Gladstone, who, after all his achievements and sacrifices in the Irish cause, after giving Ireland religious equality and the Land Act, finds, by way of reward, his Government overthrown by a coalition of the Irish with the Tories, himself covered with the grossest insults and his life threatened by Irish assassins. Such has been