

that while it must know and watch, whether for people, it must also trust.

We must accept the universal modern trend toward democratic forms of government. If an ideal democracy "is one which is so governed as to afford the fullest possible recognition of the rights of individual citizens, whilst these citizens in their turn are possessed of an adequate ideal of duty", if we work toward that ideal and succeed in lifting the government of dependencies and foreign policy in general out of the range of partisan politics, is it not credible that such a democracy could govern peoples on their path toward self-government? As a matter of fact, our democracy must.

Canadians will observe with deep interest the rise of the question of fiscal autonomy in India, and the article of the London *Spectator* on "India and the Empire" of March 10, 1917, furnishes practical comment on the chapters on India and Indian problems. The author may well claim that two years of the war have made some of his doctrine, which must have seemed revolutionary to half of his people, the common-places of newspaper discussion, and he himself admits that "much of what seemed to be the character of our democracy has vanished".

British Colonial Policy, 1783-1915. By C. H. Currey.
Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1916. Pp. 266.

There is a significant parallel, which Mr. Currey has not observed, between his heroes, "the theorists of 1830", and the present group of young Englishmen who co-operated in the creation of the last great Dominion and then gave themselves to the study of the whole Imperial problem in the Round Table movement. Durham, Wakefield, Buller and Molesworth are justly entitled to be called the fathers of colonial autonomy. History has not yet passed its verdict on the work of the other group.

In this brief and excellent survey of the evolution of self-government in the Dominions Mr. Currey sees a process at work which he personally hopes will find its term in (we