

facts before him, he will see that the mistake, if mistake it be, which attributes to French Canada a sneaking sympathy with Riel, is founded on reasons which ought to moderate any indignation in which he might be inclined to indulge. The Archbishop, under whom he was brought up, looks on Riel as an erring child; and though the Archbishop's countrymen may generally be more inclined to look on him as an erring brother than they were in 1879, the affection is often expressed when silence regarding the error is observed. Among people of another race, who have no sympathy with Riel or his acts, it is not surprising if the anomaly arrests attention and sometimes excites criticism. But to say that the French Canadians, as a whole, sympathize with the insurrection would neither be just nor true.

OVER the disputed right to regulate the control of the issue of liquor licenses the fight goes on. The ground is being disputed inch by inch. The assumption by the Parliament of the Dominion of the power to authorize the issue of retail licenses having been negatived by the Supreme Court, the Ottawa Government has brought forward a bill provisionally yielding the point, subject to the final opinion of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. As the power of regulating the issue of wholesale and vessel licenses is by the same authority declared to be vested in the Ottawa Legislature, their issue by the Government of Ontario would, meantime, be irregular. The final decision, like the first, will probably settle the question by marking the dividing line between the contested rights of legislation. If the present decision be correct, as it probably is, neither Legislature was wholly right or wholly wrong in its contention. But Sir John Macdonald certainly put himself in the wrong by the spirit in which he announced his intention to provoke the contest; and he was doubly wrong in assuming, in a litigious spirit and for party purposes, the exercise of larger powers of legislation than presumably belong to Parliament. The prominence and gravity of these facts cause Mr. Mowat's error of interpretation to be almost entirely overlooked. The objectionable spirit in which this controversy was begun is a fault which lies at the door of the Ottawa Government. Contests over the distribution of the legislative power should never originate except in honest doubt, and when they do occur they should be conducted without an exhibition of unseemly warmth, which only lowers the dignity of those by whom it is indulged in. Instead of grave judicial procedures, originated and carried on in a spirit of frankness, we see constitutional questions transformed into quarrels, and conducted with all the bitterness of internecine war. Does it never occur to the contestants that they are putting an undue strain upon machinery the weakness of which, induced by special conditions, is visible at several points?

A good omen is the simultaneous rejection by the Legislature of Nova Scotia and the Parliament of Canada of woman's suffrage. At Ottawa the clause conferring this franchise was struck out of the Government Bill by the House of Commons; at Halifax an amendment to a measure before the House embodying female suffrage was defeated; and in Ontario, at the last session of the Legislature, a similar proposal made by a private member failed to pass. We cannot hope that these frustrated attempts will not be repeated. The authors of the woman's suffrage movement will consider themselves entitled to the thanks of the sex in presence of defeat not less than they would if victory had crowned their efforts; and they will expect gratitude to be shown by the unenfranchised women bringing their influence to bear on their male acquaintances in favour of the right candidates. Should the response meet their expectations, a revival of the agitation may be looked for. The truth is the movement is wholly factitious; it rests on no strong conviction that it is necessary or desirable. As a rule the sex for whom the suffrage is asked does not want the boon, and would not willingly bear the consequences it would bring. Among women not one in ten thousand has asked to be allowed to vote, and very few sympathize with the fraction that has asked. A complete change of sentiment among women must take place before a desire to vote can be counted among their wants.

AN attempt is being made to unseat the Mayor of Montreal, M. Beau-grand, on the ground that, having taken the oath of allegiance to the United States Government, he ceased to be a British subject and is ineligible to hold office in Canada. The old theory expressed in the formula, "once a British subject always a British subject," is no longer upheld by the courts even in England; and by the law of Canada a British subject becomes by naturalization in the United States a foreigner here, and before he can resume the rights of a British subject he must pass through the same probation as any other foreigner. This, it is alleged, M. Beau-grand had not done. The proceedings against him have attracted the attention of French Canadian emigrants to New England, among

whom a sudden ardour for naturalization, as a means of acquiring political franchises in their new home, has sprung up, and if we are to believe the press, exotic in the land of the Puritans, which speaks in their name, they object to the door through which they passed when they left the paternal roof being closed behind them. But if there be a barrier to repatriation, which a man in the act of changing his allegiance can scarcely be supposed to contemplate, it is a barrier raised by the emigrants themselves. When the doctrine "once a subject always a subject" was upheld by the English courts, the French Canadian emigrants might have been citizens of the United States while residing there, and British subjects again as soon as they returned to Canada: now, though citizenship is confined to one country, freedom of choice remains, and a man cannot reasonably complain of the consequences of the exercise of his own deliberate preference.

It is strange and sad to think that a hundred years ago the leading minds of Europe were fully possessed with the belief that society had finally left the storms of the military period behind it, and was sailing into a calm zone of universal peace. Their dream now seems ridiculous, yet at the time it was not so. The rulers of the world had then to a wonderful extent been converted to philosophy and philanthropy. Turgot had arisen in France, and in England the second Pitt was an economist, a disciple of Adam Smith, and as ambitious of the triumphs of peace as his father had been of the triumphs of war. Even in warlike monarchs such as Frederic and Catherine, philosophy struggled with aggrandizement; the voice of reason reached their ears, and there was hope that their successors might be pacific. Joseph of Austria, Leopold of Tuscany, Tunucei at Naples, Aranda in Spain, Pombal in Portugal were rulers cast in the same mould. In this direction at all events, the author of "Candide" had done good. The bounds of the great nations were pretty well settled, though some territorial absurdities remained. The inhuman fallacies of Protectionism and the commercial wars which it brought in its train were being chased away by the beneficent truths promulgated in the "Wealth of Nations." On the very eve of the French Revolution Pitt, scanning the diplomatic horizon, discerned no cloud, pronounced the peace of the world assured, and looked forward to a reduction of armaments and a complete abolition of Customs duties. Unhappily the great movement of European progress, instead of continuing its quiet course, came to a violent and convulsive crisis in France. The French Revolution assumed the character of a military power waging desperate war against armed reaction; and when that series of wars was over and the existence of the Republic was assured, the army which the struggle had created passed, in an evil hour for humanity, into the hands of a Corsican, endowed with an incomparable genius for war, but as barbarous in his character and as rapacious in his aims as any bandit of his native isle. The struggle of the nations for independence against Napoleon left at its close Europe covered with vast standing armies, and the possession of these accursed engines has not failed to awaken in the masters of the legions the lust of territorial aggrandizement or diplomatic domination. Hence a new age of wars, among the main motives or pretexts of which have been aspirations or rivalries of race. Still the world and the classes which toil and bleed enjoyed a comparative immunity from devastation in the interval between Waterloo and the Crimean War. It was the worst feature of the Crimean War that it broke the spell of the long peace and let the demon of havoc loose again upon Europe. Franco-Austrian, Prusso-Austrian, Franco-German, Russo-Turkish wars have followed in quick and fell succession. Now apparently has come the danger of a war between England and Russia.

IN this case the pestilent agency of the great standing army is very clearly seen. Left to himself, the Russian peasant, who is as simple and good-natured as he is dull and torpid, would no more think of territorial aggression than do the horses which he drives or the sheep which he tends, though being the slave of a military government he leaves his home when the conscription calls, and is impelled by stimulants, spiritual and spiritual, against those whom his rulers choose to designate as his foes. But the officers of the army, which is maintained on an enormous scale out of the scanty bread of the people, being underpaid, poor and at the same time exceedingly licentious, intemperate and extravagant, are always craving for war. This is especially true with regard to the officers employed in Asia, where the dullness of remote quarters among barbarous races is added to the other causes of unrest. It is by the military party in Russia and in the interest of that party that a war which would wreck the fair fruits of industrial civilization, and carry misery into millions of homes, is in danger of being made. The Czar does not appear to have been personally inclined to war, and it seems certain that his Chancellor, De Giers, has been strongly opposed to it. But the Czar fears above everything to lose his popularity with the army, which is the sole support of his