

brain are the best qualifications for manual toil. We recur to it to express our gratification that some of our leading dailies—we are sorry that we cannot say all of them—are taking the right position and pointing out the fallacy of such an outcry. But a week or two since we were glad to see an article in the *Toronto Mail*, showing that the only radical cure for the evil is to be found, not in less, but in more and better education. A recent number of the *Globe* also has an article enunciating the sound principle that “education, like virtue, is its own reward.” The *Globe* calls attention to the fact that is generally overlooked, that “the professions are not nearly as much overcrowded as the mechanical trades, and that the latter are not as much overcrowded as the work of unskilled labourers.” It is to be hoped that these and other influential organs of public opinion will continue to insist upon the higher and broader view of the nature and use of true education, and at the same time to vindicate the dignity of labour, and hasten the spread of the wiser sentiment which perceives no incongruity, but the opposite, between the possession of the most highly cultivated intellect, and the diligent use of the trained eye and skilled hand, under the direction of the cultivated brain, in the various kinds of useful manual industry, above all in the ancient and most honourable employment of tilling the ground.

Before this paragraph meets the reader's eye the Evicted Tenants Bill, which passed the British Commons a few days since by a considerable majority, will no doubt have been thrown out by the House of Lords. Its rejection will probably be the last important event of the session. To what action it may lead on the part of the Government is not yet known. It seems, however, rather improbable that the latter will deem this event to so far fill up the measure of the Lords' iniquities as to warrant the appeal to the country which some are predicting. Notwithstanding its many hard-fought battles and hair-breadth escapes, the success of the Government has on the whole been such as is likely to encourage it to bring on another session, and give the Upper House an opportunity to reject other radical measures, some of which may appeal more powerfully to the Liberal sentiment of the whole kingdom than any which have as yet been thrown out. It is rather remarkable, or at least significant, that the abstention of the Unionists from taking any further part in the discussion of the Evicted Tenants Bill, after the ruthless application of the closure had made the policy of obstruction impossible, has awakened so little popular feeling. This action was, no doubt, intended as the strongest protest which could be made, under the circumstances, against the taking away of what the opponents of the Bill regard as the

right of free debate. It would seem, in fact, as if the public were now taking but a languid interest in the proceedings of Parliament, whether because the long and exciting session has exhausted the power of attention, or for some other reason.

In Canada as in England, widely different opinions are held with respect to the merits of the Evicted Tenants Bill itself. That it can be defended, if at all, only on the ground that desperate diseases require desperate remedies, is obvious on its face; but the fact is that it has long since been admitted, openly or tacitly, by both parties, that the state of Ireland is such as to make further exceptional legislation imperative. The past history and present condition of the large body of tenants for whose benefit this exceptional treatment is proposed is and has long been unique. Precedents have had to be again and again created for the occasion. It may, in fact, be said, with a good deal of truth, that exceptional treatment of the land question in the seventeenth century, and exceptional legislation during the eighteenth, have made exceptional dealing a matter of justice and necessity in the nineteenth. All parties in the Commons seem to be pretty well agreed that good statesmanship demands that some extraordinary measures be taken to bring to an end the very undesirable state of affairs which still exists as a result of the wholesale evictions of a few years ago. The main difference of opinion is with regard to the extent to which the necessary settlement should be made, if necessary, without the consent of the landlords affected. As to the possibility of a satisfactory and permanent arrangement being effected without the exercise of compulsory powers in the case of certain of the landlords in question, those who have followed the course of events during the last decade can judge for themselves.

The letter of “Fairplay Radical” invites a word of comment, by way of elucidation, not of controversy. The subject is very important, but we should hardly throw much light upon it by designating any views not in accord with our own “absurd,” or by implying that those who are unfortunate enough to hold them are not to be classed among the “sensible.” In our previous remarks we tried to show that general combination—not simply combination of the employees of a single firm, or even of those of the same craft—with its power of “sympathetic” striking, was the only effective weapon of the trade-unions, the only means by which they could hope to cope with the tremendous strength of accumulated and combined capital. When President Cleveland declared, in effect, that such combination, resulting as it did through the “sympathetic” strike, in obstructing interstate commerce and preventing the carrying of the mails, was of the nature of a conspir-

acy and could not be permitted, he thereby wrenched this weapon out of the hands of the labourers. Nor could we, nor can we, see any inconsistency in admitting that he was right in doing so, under the circumstances, and at the same time calling the power to form such combination a “natural right” of the working man. The case is but one of a thousand in which individuals and citizens are compelled to surrender natural rights in order to promote the interests or meet the exigencies of organized society. But it is implied in the very nature of the case that in return for such surrender some greater advantage must be gained for the whole community, in which advantage those making the surrender shall share.

We have not committed ourselves to the opinion that compulsory arbitration is the only, or the best, substitute for the power of general combination, but have stated the fact that public opinion seems, to a large extent, to be looking in that direction. “Fairplay Radical” says that it is “absurd” to assert that the employed is being deprived of the natural right of combination. He affirms that “neither the President nor anyone else tries, or wishes, to interfere with the right of combining to abstain from work.” This is astonishing, in view of the action taken by the U.S. courts, as well as by the President, and the almost universal denunciation by the American press of the iniquity of the strike on the part of the railroad employees when they had no complaint of their own against their employers, and no immediate interest in the quarrel between the Pullman Company and its workmen. We had thought, from our reading of the papers, that if there was anything upon which the great majority were pretty well agreed, it was that the general combination to abstain from work was an outrage against society and the nation, which must not be tolerated. We are quite unable to understand the relevancy of our correspondent's illustration from the case of domestic servants. We are not aware that the servants have, in this country, a union of any kind. Should they form one, and should this union quarrel with the masters and mistresses and strike, and should every other labourer's union in the community strike with them, on the sympathetic principle, and to show the “solidarity” of labour, the question might fairly arise whether society should not, in self-defence, compel both masters and servants to settle their quarrel by arbitration, rather than let the business machinery of the whole country be brought to a stand-still for an indefinite period.

“The Sugar Trust has the people by the throat. It is now a battle between the people and this great monopoly.” These words, which, if the Washington despatches