

THE Imperial Federation movement, if it leads to nothing else will at all events have given Canada her place, for the time, in the British Reviews and Magazines. In the *Scottish Review* there is an elaborate and careful study of her political development. The writer's general attitude is Conservative. On the question of connection his conclusion is "that the great forces which are silently at work developing a national character may become more powerful as the years pass than the sentimental feeling which now binds Canada to the parent State"; but that it will be with the greatest reluctance on the part of Canada that the connection will be severed. With regard to Imperial Federation the verdict is that "it is quite evident that, while there is floating through the minds of the advocates of Imperial Federation a vague idea of the desirability and necessity of Imperial unity, no one has yet been able to outline a plan which has a practical basis of action." Not only so, but any attempt to outline a practical plan is deprecated as the sure ruin of the vague idea. The curious fact is stated, as attested by the best authority, that in 1867 a question arose about the title of the Federation, and it was proposed at first that it should be called the Kingdom of Canada; but Lord Carnarvon rejected that name on the ground that it might be offensive to the Government of the United States, which had just been showing its resentment at the establishment of an empire in Mexico. Was there not another voice, besides that of diplomatic delicacy, which, though unrecognized, protested against an attempt to introduce monarchy into the democratic hemisphere? In the diagnosis of Canadian institutions there is one curious sentence—"The permanency of the Executive is a feature of their government which the Canadians have learned to value by comparison with the elective system of the United States." A singular instance of this enchantment still exercised, even over minds politically educated, by surviving forms when the realities have long been dead! The American Executive is elective, but holds office for a term of four years certain. The Canadian Executive, that is to say the Prime Minister with his Cabinet, is elective also, being the nominee of the majority, and may be turned out any day. The Crown, it is true, is permanent, and so are the Lion and the Unicorn on the Royal Arms.

IN *Macmillan*, Mr. Boswell Fisher, a Canadian writer, analyses Canadian Loyalty with philosophic freedom. He dwells with deserved emphasis on that which is now the great fact in our political situation, the growing strength of the French element. Not only is New France increasing in numbers and her territorial extension, edging the British gradually out of the City of Quebec, and even, it is said, out of the Eastern Townships, as well as encroaching upon New Brunswick and Ontario; but she is becoming more thoroughly national than ever and, in spite of her pre-revolutionary character, more actively desirous of renewing her connection with the Mother Country. At the great St. Jean Baptiste Conference in last June, when representative French Canadians met from all quarters both of Canada and the States, unambiguous utterance was given, Mr. Fisher tells us, to the national sentiments and aspirations both by clerical and lay leaders. The people were reminded of their glorious struggle against the heathen Indian and the heretic Briton. All the efforts of England and her statesmen, they were reminded, to amalgamate the races had been shattered by the resistance of what was once a handful of citizens, but to-day was a great nation. They were warned by a prelate not to speak English too well or to allow a foreign tongue to be domesticated at their hearths. The leading poet, in evident opposition to Sir George Cartier's well-known description of himself as an Englishman speaking French, said, "We are Frenchmen who speak English when it suits us." He added that they were grateful to England for their liberties, but that their love and affection were for France, their glorious Mother Country. It does not appear that any Anti-British feeling found vent; on the other hand, in none of the speeches could Mr. Fisher discover a single expression of sympathy with the English-speaking Canadians or any patriotic aspiration for Canada as a whole. This French nationality, growing in extent and intensity as it does, is surely a momentous fact both in itself and as it interposes an ever-widening barrier of matter incapable of assimilation between the Eastern and Western Provinces of British Canada. Moreover, a body of political influence so compact, and amounting already to 30 per cent. of our population, is in a fair way, as the rest is split up into sections and parties, to become politically dominant over the whole. Living on little and very home-keeping, the French race is likely to spread over the poor lands in the vicinity of its own Province while the more enterprising British will betake themselves to the richer lands and the centres of wealth in the United States. After deliberately comparing the forces Mr. Fisher comes to the conclusion that the preponderance is against the perpetual continuance of the present connection. Let us hope he will escape the storm of brickbats which, as

the *Richmond Liberal* says, has been showered on the heads of some who have said precisely the same things and followed exactly the same line of argument. But we are approaching the end of the brick-bat style of discussion. When Imperialism, in the midst of its angry abuse of opponents, itself proclaims the impossibility of believing that our present form of incomplete nationality can be permanent, it must surely begin to see that speculation on the future is inevitable and that all minds cannot be expected to run in the same groove.

WE cordially agree with the *Telegram* in the principle which it lays down in connection with the French officers' libel suit against the *News* as to the responsibilities of journalists. To diminish those responsibilities we can have no desire. The power of the press must, like all powers in a moral civilization, submit itself to law, and only through such submission can it be either useful to the commonwealth or lasting. Let the malicious libeller suffer the penalties of his offence and let them be extended in full measure to the libeller, worse than malicious, who traduces character and wounds personal feeling for the sake of stimulating the circulation of his journal. But to error arising out of misinformation or misinterpretation of facts, when there is no malicious or mercenary motive, the public will find it necessary to be kind. Early intelligence is demanded; a paper which falls behind is ruined; there is little time for scrutiny, none for cross-examination; whatever is received from an apparently trustworthy source must be published, subject, of course, to subsequent correction, and it is impossible to discriminate between pleasant intelligence and that which may give annoyance in some quarters. Gross carelessness is of course culpable, but, apart from this, the motive will generally be found a sufficient criterion; where there has been no malice nor any mercenary object, mistakes are not proper subjects for punishment, and if they are punished either the press will be gagged or a premium will be given to that sort of journalism which, having no character to lose, is ready to run any risks for gain. We speak in the interest of the dailies more than in our own: a weekly journal is seldom placed in any dilemma as to the giving or withholding of news, for which, in common with the rest of the world, we are indebted to the dailies. We cannot help also regarding, like the *Telegram*, with some jealousy the selection of Montreal instead of Toronto as the place for proceedings of this kind. Why cannot a journalist of Ontario be tried in his own Province and in the place where the alleged libel was published?

OWING to the protraction of the Session by the Franchise Bill, the Royal Canadian Society meets this year amidst the din of Parliamentary warfare. Possibly the contrast may have suggested the opening portion of the graceful and sensible address delivered on the occasion by the Governor-General. It can scarcely be doubted that the scientific spirit as it gains ground will extend its influence to the political sphere, and bring the irrational violence of partyism more under the control of reason; though it is curious to see how some of the strongest adherents of Evolution, the English Radicals among the number, when they engage in politics lay aside their scientific theories and decide such questions as that of the franchise by abstract principles of assumed right, or rather by party passion. Literary culture in the case of Lord Salisbury, which is one of those cited by Lord Lansdowne, has unfortunately availed only to furnish forcible and pungent language for the expression of views and sentiments totally devoid of the breadth and calmness which culture is supposed to bestow. It is difficult to understand how a man who has studied history in a comprehensive and practical spirit can behave like a political gamecock. Lord Lansdowne is perfectly right, as it seems to us, in the view which in the latter part of his address he suggests, as to the proper functions of the Royal Society. Let the Society devote itself, mainly at least, to subjects of local research. Let it preserve for ethnology whatever is worth preserving in the history or the lore of the fast-perishing Indian. Let it tell us all that science can tell about our soil, our mines, our forests. General literature needs no assistance from the State.

FROM statistics given in the *New York Nation* it appears that there has been of late years, in the United States, a great substitution of native wine and other light drinks for whiskey. Comparing the quantity of spirits consumed per head in 1860 with the quantity consumed in 1884, it seems that there is a decrease of about fifteen per cent. The consumption of native wines and malt liquors has on the other hand largely increased, that of native wines having risen since 1860 from 1,880,000 gallons to 17,000,000 gallons. Surely this change must, by every one who looks at the matter, be deemed a gain. The same thing might take place in Canada if Canada were only allowed to grow wine. Whiskey notoriously