

ences of the great majority, it is not too much to say that the method of international arbitration may almost be regarded as established, at least among Anglo-Saxon peoples and all other Christian nations, those which are unhappily sworn hereditary foes excepted.

We are glad to see it stated, no doubt on the authority of the firm itself, in recent elaborate articles illustrative of the extensive operations of the Massey-Harris Co., that the agricultural machinery manufactured by this Company is both lower in price and better in quality than that produced in the United States or any other country in the world, as proved by satisfactory evidence. We do not know what may have been the attitude of this Company towards the National Policy in the past, but it is gratifying to think that it has now attained a position which places it far above the need of special protection in the future. It is evidently now on a footing which must enable it not only to challenge competition on Canadian soil, but one which must make its managers anxious for the opportunity to carry the war into Africa by entering into competition for a large share of the United States' trade, as soon as the progress of tariff reform across the border shall have lowered the barriers to such an extent as to give opportunity for Canadian capital and enterprise to shew what they can do in the larger field which lies so temptingly near. The Massey-Harris Co. should be powerful advocates of tariff reform.

To a complaint by Senator Perley in regard to alleged exorbitant freight-rates on the Canadian Pacific Railway, whereby it is said, the legitimate earnings of farmers in the North-West are greatly reduced, Mr. Bowell is reported to have replied that it is an unsettled question whether the Government can control the Canadian Pacific Railway rates. The question is a very serious one and should be decided at the earliest possible moment in order that settlers and prospective settlers in the North-West may know what to depend upon and govern themselves accordingly. But should it prove that the Dominion Government has no such power, the fact will disclose an instance of most short-sighted and blameworthy legislation. For the people of the Dominion to be told that all their enormous contributions in cash and lands from the public resources for this great enterprise have resulted in giving a private corporation absolute control and monopoly, in virtue of which they are at liberty to exact the very highest rates which the necessities of the traffic may make possible, would be exasperating to a degree. The day is coming and cannot be far off when the right of Governments to control rates on all roads built by public charter, largely by public funds and in virtue of special powers and franchises trenching freely upon private rights, will have to be asserted and maintained. If the managers

of the Canadian Pacific are well-advised they will frankly concede the principle before it is brought forward for heated discussion. If they desire only what is fair and reasonable why should they object to submit the question of rates to a competent and disinterested Board appointed by the Government? Even a mixed commission, named partly by themselves, acting as a board of arbitration or reference, might serve the purpose. We do not pretend to judge whether the complaint voiced by Senator Perley and others is well founded or not, but if it be at all general the fellow-citizens of the complainants all over the Dominion should insist on a rigid inquiry.

We fear that it would be useless to attempt to bring "Ulster" and those who think and feel with him to a better state of mind with regard to the experiment of self-government in local affairs as a cure for the long unrest of Ireland. That it has taken much exceptional legislation to undo the wrongs which the Irish people suffered at the hands of their conquerors is unhappily true. That those wrongs have not yet been wholly undone is quite evident from "Ulster's" own letters. We might protest that "placing the Protestants of Ulster and elsewhere under the rule of a parliament elected by Roman Catholic priests" is not the most judicial description of a local Parliament in which Protestants will be as fully represented in proportion to numbers as Catholics, and will, we see no reason to doubt, be able to wield much more than a proportional influence, by reason of that superiority in education and wealth of which "Ulster" speaks. Does it not occur to those who reason as does our correspondent, that the Roman Catholics, who constitute the great majority of the population of Ireland, might with equal force object to being placed under the rule of a Parliament elected by the Protestants of Great Britain and Ireland and sitting at Westminster? We are no admirers or apologists of Roman Catholic priests and their methods, but even from the data furnished by "Ulster's" letters, it seems to us demonstrable that apart from the rule of a majority in local matters there is no possible place for the Catholics of Ireland save under the rule of a Protestant minority. Can those who refuse to give even a fair trial to majority rule, under a scheme which provides special safeguards guaranteed by the British Parliament for the rights of the minority, condemn that majority if they refuse to submit to the virtual rule of a minority without any such special safeguards? For our own part, we have great faith in the educating power of self-ruling responsibility, and should hope to see its effects in the gradual emancipation of the masses of Irish Catholics from priestly rule—an emancipation which has been to some extent already the outcome of the Home-Rule struggle.

The United States navy will not remain much longer a subject for ridicule. The building of new ships of war goes merrily on, and immense appropriations are annually voted by Congress to further the work. A cruiser recently completed has succeeded in sailing a little faster than any vessel of her class has previously done, and the achievement has called forth congratulations from the press of both parties, which sees in this record-breaking a triumph for American ship builders and in the new navy an object for national pride. Columns are filled with descriptions of the new vessels and careful estimates of their destructive power as compared with those of other nations, particularly England. The United States, it is affirmed, will soon rank with the great naval powers and become formidable on sea as well as on land. Scarcely a voice is raised to suggest that there may be reason for the patriotic American to view the navy he is taxed to build with alarm rather than with complacency. None the less, ability to bully Chili and overawe Hawaii will be dearly bought if it serves to foster or to strengthen the military spirit among the American people. The great armies and navies that curse Europe serve no useful purpose that could not be served by far smaller and less powerful armaments. Without them war, with its multifarious horrors, would be impossible, while in times of peace they bolster thrones which should long since have fallen, keep alive the fires of international hatred, perpetuate the spirit of caste, impoverish the land, and reduce hundreds of thousands to a position scarcely to be preferred to slavery. Such a characterization of militarism in Europe is trite enough in the United States. And yet, with this object lesson before her, America, secure from attack and unmolested for eighty years, must needs build a navy and in it copy faithfully the regulations of European countries regarding rank and discipline. Perhaps this new navy of the United States may serve useful purposes, but the cultivation of a warlike spirit will not be one of these. The sentiment that, in Canada as well as the United States, finds expression in the drilling of school-boys with wooden guns, and that in Canada has given us a Royal Military College, should have no home on the American continent. For this reason we are by no means sure that the growing distrust felt by workmen for the militia so largely recruited from their own ranks, and the disposition to look upon it as the sure ally and engine of capital in every dispute, is all bad. Anything that opens the eyes of the people to the antagonism between the spirit of militarism and that of true democracy serves a good purpose.

In the Charities Review for March Professor Francis Wayland, Dean of the Yale Law School, attempts to crystallize into a tangible shape an idea which is rapidly becoming a conviction in the minds