

reputation for bravery, he replied that it was by bounce, "by tremendous bounce." There is no bounce about Mr. Goldwin Smith, but there is an assumption of superiority and cock-sureness that is much more effective than any amount of bounce. It is almost irresistible, coupled, as it is, with a gift for arranging his material to suit his own view, which is well-nigh matchless. And then how charmingly he writes! It all looks so innocent of purpose, the conclusions appear so obvious. To think otherwise than Mr. Goldwin Smith seems so absurd. We have no doubt that he believes everything he says about Canada. His sincerity and honour are above suspicion. But he is hopelessly out of touch with everything Canadian, and is constitutionally and mentally unable to understand the country and the aspirations and genius of the people. His letter is made up of a succession of statements nearly everyone of which sounds to a Canadian ear like a wilful exaggeration. Half truths are more dangerous and damaging than lies, and in the hands of a great master of the literary art, and one, moreover, who sincerely believes them to be whole truths, the effect on the ill-informed must be disastrous in the extreme. Why should Mr. Goldwin Smith—a modern Hamlet—delight in throwing a big squirt of ice-cold water on every little sprout in Canadian life which gives evidence of underlying warmth and vitality? The attitude he assumes towards all Canadian desires and enterprises, if shared in by our people, would mean eternal stagnation. There is nothing new in his present letter. It is but a repetition of statements often made before, statements which, if not always entirely refuted, have been so dealt with as to rob them of their chief significance. To Mr. Goldwin Smith Canada is but a political expression, nothing more; there will never be a Canadian literature; there is no literary unity; there are two languages; deserts divide Canadians into four insignificant, more or less illiterate divisions which have no dealings with one another, and delight chiefly in photographic appeals to personal vanity. In short, everything is as bad as it can be, and there is no use trying to make it better. The Englishman scorns the Colonist and will not look at a book bearing a Colonial publisher's imprint; and as soon as a Canadian gains some literary reputation he bids a long farewell to everything native, and warbles only on the boughs of John Bull or Uncle Sam. And because he warbles in foreign lands his warbling is not Canadian "in the local sense." As for periodical literature, Canada has no chance against the competition of Yankee publications full of pretty pictures and costly contributions.

We are quite prepared to admit that the Colonist is handicapped in the literary world, but it is quite possible to exaggerate the difficulties of his position. He is too apt to distrust himself and his fellow-Colonists in an intellectual way, and to

magnify the productions of other lands. Hence his tendency to neglect native writers and native journals. And this tendency is ministered to and fostered by those very superior Colonials who affect everything that is foreign and scorn everything Canadian. For such people we have no place in Canada, and the sooner they remove themselves the better for the country at large. Amongst this class we do not rank Mr. Goldwin Smith. He may scorn things Canadian, but it is difficult to find anything that he does not scorn. To him there seems to be nothing left that he may admire and praise. It is most unfortunate. With his splendid genius, he might have given that impetus to Canadian literature and Canadian life and aspiration which is needed, which is bound to come, which has already come in a degree, and which nothing can check or destroy. Perhaps it is not strictly accurate to say that there is a national feeling in Canada, for a Colony is not a nation; but there is a Canadian sentiment strong and vigorous and animating, and this sentiment must and will find expression in native production and from a native press. What we want is men of faith and generous feeling, not belittlers and dismal sceptics. Canadian literature is all right. There is nothing the matter with it beyond what time will rectify, as is ably shown by our correspondent "Canadian." A little more self-confidence, a just and equitable arrangement of the copyright laws, and fewer cynics and pseudo-Canadians—these are necessary conditions for a healthy native literature, and we will have them by-and-by.

### THE RULE OF DEMOCRACY.

"My notion of Liberal politics is this—that we should always be on the lookout for every new idea, and for every old idea with a new application, which may tend to meet the growing requirements of society. Hitherto I have seen the leaders of the Liberal party like men standing on a watch-tower, to whom others would apply and say, not 'What of the night?' but 'What of the morning and of the coming day?' Where are you standing? No—where, but sitting on the fence, perpetually thinking on which side of it you will put your feet down in order to collect votes and unite the cabals of the different parties in the House of Commons."

The above extract from a portion of the Duke of Argyll's speech in the House of Lords, in the course of the debate upon the Evicted Tenants Bill, as given by Mr. G. W. Smalley in the *N. Y. Tribune*, is very suggestive in regard to the divergencies from a common point of view which have led to the division of the Liberal party in Great Britain. If we may take the Duke of Argyll as a representative of old-fashioned Liberalism—and it is probably not unfair to do so in all matters except those which touch too closely the property and privileges of titled landlordism, in regard to

which it would perhaps be too much to expect him to rise above all hereditary caste influences—it is easy to see that Liberalism of that type is one thing, Radicalism, or Democracy pure and simple, another and quite a different thing. The Duke's Liberalism is of the type which believes in "leaders" who actually lead, and of course, in followers, who actually and submissively follow. This comes out very clearly in the passage which we have quoted. The first question, if we are to try seriously to reach his standpoint and grasp his idea, is, who are the "We" who are to be on the watch-towers, looking out for the new ideas and the possibilities of new applications of old ideas? The whole shape and complexion of his Liberalism depends upon the answer to this question. Are they in any literal sense "representatives," and if so, are they—to adopt, for the moment, Mr. Gladstone's expressive classification—representatives of the "masses," or of the "classes?" And whence do they derive their rights of leadership? Are they born leaders, or hereditary leaders, or self-constituted leaders, or leaders chosen by certain ruling guilds? Leaders chosen by the people they can scarcely be, unless they are prepared to consult the views and wishes of the people, for the people will hardly be persuaded to choose leaders to thwart or ignore their own views, or to do all their thinking for them.

This question raises the previous one, which used to be much debated, with reference to the true position and functions of a member of Parliament or of Congress. There are, it was said by some of the old writers on political questions, two kinds of agents. It is the duty of agents of the one class to carry out the instructions of their employers to the letter, without regard to their own ideas as to what is better or worse. Their duty is simply to obey orders, leaving their employer responsible for consequences. The other kind of agent is the one who is employed on account of his professional skill, and instructed to do a certain thing, while the manner of doing it is left entirely to his own superior knowledge. Are political leaders the servants of the people in the former or in the latter sense? It is not necessary for us to attempt to decide this question here, in either way. We may, however, observe that the leader of the later kind is not necessarily destitute of principle or honesty. He may be supposed to know, at least in a general way, the views of the people whose representative he is, and to have been chosen as their representative because he was in hearty accord with those views.

Our present object is not to discuss the questions at issue between the Old Liberalism and the New, or between Liberalism and Radicalism, or even between Liberalism and Conservatism, but simply to point out what seems to us a strange want of perception of logical consequences in the minds