

from Bombay may have a very serious meaning. Lord Harris, the Governor of Bombay, stated in a recent speech that an extensive machinery is at work throughout India to excite disorder under pretext of preventing the killing of cows. This opinion is re-echoed from the other side of India, by the Editor of "Reis and Ryt," who, the Spectator says, is a very able man, and one not likely to be taken in. The fear is, that there may be a plot on foot intended to rouse the Hindoos all through Northern and Eastern India. Should this be done, the immense area over which the insurrection would be distributed would be very embarrassing to the Government. They might have to meet serious riots over the greater part of India, in which case it would be practically impossible to prevent innumerable massacres on a larger or smaller scale. The Hindoos, to whom the cow is a sacred animal, are almost everywhere in the majority. They comprise also the fighting tribes of India, such as the Maharrattas, the Rajpoots, the Sikhs, and the Goorkhas, so that in case of a Hindoo uprising of the kind indicated, the British would be left with no fighting Asiatics behind them, except the Mussulmans. To these it would be highly inexpedient to appeal, for that would give the contest the appearance of a religious war, and would leave the British at the end of the struggle with the majority of the population against them and with very undesirable and exacting allies in the Mohammedans. The cause of the trouble is not, like that of the Great Mutiny, one which can be obviated. The greased cartridges might have been displaced by a substitute, but the killing of cows cannot be prohibited without doing grave injustice and injury to Christians as well as Mussulmans. It is to be hoped, however, that the note of alarm which has been raised may prove to be more or less sensational and that there is no real danger of more than local riots such as that in Bombay. It is scarcely probable that the lessons learned in the former revolt have been so soon forgotten by the natives of India.

It is difficult to determine from the party press whether the addresses of Mr. Laurier or those of Sir John Thompson have been received with the greater favour in Ontario. Each has presented the views and policy of his party with great ability and, on the whole, with more than usual definiteness. If Mr. Laurier's cause was more popular with the masses, the Premier's was more effective with the classes who are directly interested in the policy of protection and who are in many respects the more influential. Without entering afresh into the trade question, we must confess our disappointment with Sir John's silence in regard to two other matters of scarcely less importance to the national well-being. Mr. Laurier and his supporters referred in al-

most every speech to the twin iniquities of the Franchise Act and the Gerrymander. So far as we have observed, Sir John has maintained a policy of silence in regard to these two enactments, carried through by the Government of which he was a member and of which he is the legitimate successor and heir. If there was any attempt at rejoinder by any of his colleagues, it was in the shape of a *tu quoque*, addressed to the Ontario Government, and referring only to the Gerrymander. But this is no argument for a high-minded statesman. The Dominion Government cannot surely be bound to follow the evil example of a Provincial Legislature, in any case, especially when that example is itself but a copying, in a mild and modified form, of its own previous procedure. Sir John took special pains to reply specifically to nearly every argument advanced by Mr. Laurier against the National Policy. Can his studied silence in regard to the other great questions be fairly construed as a confession of inability to defend the Acts in question? If so, would it not have been both more manly and more statesmanlike to have frankly confessed that one or both of those measures, of which Liberals complain so bitterly, and which they stigmatize so strongly was wrong and that early steps would be taken to make them right? Can we doubt that such a course would, as a matter of policy even, have won the applause of the whole people, and have stamped the Premier in their estimation as an honest and magnanimous statesman?

The miners' strikes in Great Britain have been, as usual, marred by acts of violence committed or attempted against the non-unionist labourers who were willing to take the places of the strikers. Such acts are indefensible and foolish. They are indefensible, being in violation of the rights of free citizens to dispose of their labour as they may deem best. The modification that they must not in so doing interfere with the rights of others, is inapplicable here, for the striking workmen have no more right from the legal point of view to the work in question than have the non-unionist workmen against whom they are so incensed. But the violence is as unwise in the interests of the strikers as it is illegal and unjust. It alienates that public sympathy which is one of the strongest influences which they can invoke in their struggle against reduction of wages. But while we can have nothing but condemnation for their lawlessness, we can well understand, as must everyone who puts himself for a moment in their place, their resentment. It is undeniable that to the efforts and sacrifices of organized labour the labourer in every sphere of manual employment owes very much. The miners who, while refusing to join the unions, or to share their struggles and sacrifices, take the places of those who have gone out, enter

immediately into situations which have been made better in many respects besides that of wages, by the pressure which has been from time to time brought to bear through the labour organizations. To what ever extent their present struggle proves successful in keeping up the rate of wages, every miner in that vicinity, if not in the whole kingdom, will be the gainer. This fact, with all that it implies, must be borne in mind before we can fully understand the full grounds of the striker's indignation and wrath against those who are doing their utmost to defeat their efforts while among the first to profit by their successes. (One against this, it is true, must be set the terrible anguish of the able-bodied man who sees, it may be, his wife and children suffering from want of food and clothing, which his labour alone can supply, and who can see nothing but selfish tyranny in the attempt of his fellow-workmen to prevent him from doing the work offered.

The strength of the Prohibition Convention which met last week in Toronto and the unanimity with which the delegates determined to make the best of the situation and devote all their energies to the task of obtaining the largest possible majority at the approaching Provincial plebiscite, have placed the movement for Prohibition at a point of vantage it never before occupied. The Prohibitionists are wise in their generation. When influential delegates began to set aside their own personal and party predilections in order to unite their forces with others who are seeking the same end by different methods, they give one of the strongest possible pledges of moral earnestness and treble the possibilities of ultimate success. The opinion, which has been expressed with some force, that the plebiscite is unconstitutional and un-British, seems to have been effectively met with the sufficient answer that Canada and the Empire are self-governing, and that the constitutional both are sufficiently elastic to admit of the plebiscite being made a part of the constitution by usage, if the people so will. The mode is no doubt objectionable to many. These have a right to oppose its introduction. But it verges on the absurd to argue that the hands of a people who pride themselves on their democratic system of government are so tied by that system that they may not vote at the polls directly for or against a radical innovation in legislation, but can express themselves only indirectly through their representatives, in the choice of whom they are influenced and ought to be influenced by a hundred other considerations. A constitution which would so hamper the free expression of the popular will, would need to be promptly amended or ended. The fact is, as every one who reflects carefully upon the question must see, that the proposed legislation is of such a kind as can be justified by no less than the direct mandate of a very large