

in a state of political bondage, the speaker would experience a reception that would not encourage him to continue his remarks in the same strain. Some of us have lived in Scotland, all of us have learned more or less of its history, and we know something of the independence of its people. It has the best educated peasantry in the world, even now, after all that has been done to improve the education of other countries; and we imagine that a peasantry and a working class whose spirit is represented by the liberty-loving Burns do not stand in need of any "association" to win them "liberty."

It is quite possible, and we quite believe, that many things are out of joint in Scotland, as in other countries; but they are not to be set right by revolution. The circular before us refers to the condition of the Crofters in the Highlands; but their case is in no way affected by the union of the Parliaments of England and Scotland. There may also be local grievances with which it is not easy for the Imperial Parliament to deal; but these are not peculiar to Scotland or Ireland or Wales. They are found in England also; and if English and Irish members of Parliament have votes on Scottish affairs, Scotch and Irish members equally have votes on English affairs. But of whatever kind the evils may be, this is not the remedy. There is at this moment before the English House of Commons a local Government measure, introduced by Mr. Ritchie, which, as far as we have been made acquainted with its contents, would seem to meet the local needs of all parts of the United Kingdom.

Returning to our circular, we must confess that we find it so bristling with fallacies that we can deal with only a few of the many subjects which are brought before us. The manifesto begins by declaring the "right of the Scottish people to manage their own affairs." A very plausible claim. We may remind our readers that, as far as it is a reasonable one, we believe it may be satisfactorily met by some extension of local government. When, however, the claim is made for a separate Scottish parliament, sitting at Edinburgh, we ask seriously on what ground it is made, and how far it is to go.

For a moment, let us remove our eyes to another country. What should we think if Brittany were to put forward its claim to Home Rule, on the ground of its distinct nationality, and of the popular sentiment of the five departments which are contained in that ancient province being overruled by the prevailing public opinion of France? We smile at the notion; and yet the Bretons are mostly Celts, a great many of them speak a language akin to the Welsh, and they are generally monarchical and ecclesiastical in their sympathies.

But we will go back to Scotland. On what ground do a certain number of the people living within the country which we call Scotland want to manage their own affairs? Is it on the ground of nationality, or of religion, or of ancient history? or what? Suppose we take history. Shall we, then, go back to the time when the kingdom of Northumbria stretched from the mouth of the Humber to the mouth of the Forth? The very name of Edinburgh perpetuates the memory of this kingdom; and we believe a better case could be made for "restoring Home Rule" to the ancient Kingdom of Northumbria than to the ancient Kingdom of Scotland. In the one case, we should have a fairly homogeneous population, in the other not.

If we make race the basis of nationality, then the counties of Berwick and Northumberland, the one in Scotland and the other in England, are certainly more nearly allied than those of Berwick and Inverness or Argyll. Some time ago Professor Blackie went about, wrapped in a Highland plaid, although we strongly suspect him of a Teutonic origin, pleading the cause of the Celtic population of Scotland and their language. We imagine that he was chiefly instrumental in having a Gaelic chair set up in the University of Edinburgh. Let him be consistent in his Home Rule proposals. Let him draw his line between the Celtic and the Teutonic populations of Scotland, and declare that it is a monstrous piece of tyranny that the children of the Gael should be compelled to appear in a parliament in which they are constrained to be silent or to speak the language of the hated Sassenach. It might be difficult to carry it out, but the theory would, at least, be intelligible.

The putters-forth of the Home Rule circular are, however, superior to any considerations of logic or consistency. In the most absurd manner, they fall back upon "the most shameful corruption" by means of which "the Union was carried through," and all that kind of nonsense which is really unworthy of rational and educated men. What country is there on the face of the earth which has not been, in part, consolidated by means which could not always be approved? When we remember Louis XI. of France and even Louis XIV., we can see plenty of cause for finding fault with their manner of unifying the country. But we imagine that any foreigner who should visit those parts of France which they welded into the great

nation, and should explain that it was their duty to resume their own autonomy on account of the means by which it was destroyed, would experience a warm reception at the hands of those fervent Gauls.

We cannot quite approve of the conduct of Frederick the Great to Austria, even when we remember previous provocations, yet who would think of restoring Silesia to the southern Empire? We have not yet forgotten the Danish war; and neither England nor France can be proud of their relation to it. But not only is all that followed from that an accomplished fact; but it is accomplished for the peace and well-being of Europe.

There are many impartial historians who believe that Edward I. had so far a claim to be considered Suzerain of Scotland, that he might at least assert his feudal superiority over that portion of the northern Kingdom which belonged to the ancient Kingdom of Northumbria; that is to say, the part which lies between the Tweed and the Forth. Will, then, Scottish Home Rulers allow that this part of Scotland shall sustain a different relation to the Imperial Parliament from the rest? In such absurdities do we involve ourselves when we appeal to ancient history.

It would be easy to go through the list of grievances enumerated in this circular, and to show either that they are imaginary or that the proposed change would furnish no remedy for them. If there are grievances, as there are everywhere, let them be made clear, and let such changes be made in local government as may make it easier to remedy them. But it is a monstrous thing to make such needs a reason for the proposal to convert a united kingdom like Great Britain and Ireland into a Confederation.

We have only touched upon the grievances which are enumerated in dismal detail in this circular. It would be easy to show that most of them are imaginary or greatly exaggerated. It would not be difficult to set beside them a number of English grievances at least as real. But it would be very difficult to discover a remedy more objectionable than that which is proposed by this new Association. It may be necessary for us to return to this subject again.

OTTAWA LETTER.

THE great peace that folded its wings upon our legislative halls immediately after the memorable division, which will be two weeks old by the time this chronicle reaches its readers, still refuses to depart from them. The occasional representative, seated in a Library alcove marked "For Members Only," continues to clasp his hands behind his head, tilt his chair, and yawn mightily. The footsteps that fall through the corridors still have a listless echo about them, and the little knots of members near the doors of the Chamber have not yet regained their air of earnest conference and anticipation. Conservative chuckles and Liberal lamentations alike have been lost in the tide of new discussion that beat so long and impatiently against the barriers of the Reciprocity Debate, but the vocal demonstrations which have succeeded them have lacked their stimulus. Notwithstanding the fact that the time of the Session thus far has been devoted to the full and serious discussion of but one matter of importance while several others remain for the consideration of Parliament, there is a very wide and general sense that the effort of the year has been made, the stand taken before the country which, with the economic education of the people which it entails, must result importantly to both parties before very long, and that the House is entitled to a period of comparative repose. The Daniels of the debate, certain gentlemen on both sides of the Speaker, who, notwithstanding the counsel and the decree of all the presidents and princes and governors and captains of their constituencies, have voted contrary to the counsel and the decree, are probably making the most of the peaceful interval. The anticipation of their respective dens of lions, and of their well-merited importance on the occasion of at least one political banquet on their return, must weigh upon their spirits somewhat. Unless, indeed, they be sustained by such a faith in the rescuing power of the Deity of Political Parties, whom they serve continually, as Daniel never had.

The cessation of the Reciprocity and Anti-reciprocity drum-beating is a grateful and refreshing one to the galleries no less than to the House, for deeply interesting as the future of Canada may be it is a regrettable fact that her prophets are not all Tupperts or Cartwrights or Lauriers or Chapleaus. And so there is no denying the fact that we have been bored, bored deeply, exhaustively, laboriously, and not always grammatically with our country's resources and expectations of late; and have turned to the slight variation the Fishery Treaty affords with almost Athenian enthusiasm.

The extent to which people will permit themselves to be bored in a good cause is phenomenal, by the way. Scores of ladies who might be