

are shut out under his strict definition from the scope of a chair of Political Science and handed over to the wider domain of Social Science, have already found admission to several of the leading American Universities, to go no further. Last year a special course of lectures was inaugurated at the Johns Hopkins' University, dealing with such subjects as charities, sanitation, child-labour, taxation, tenement houses, and statistics. At Harvard such problems as charity, divorce, intemperance, and the labour question are brought by Professor Peabody into the Department of Ethics. Columbia, Cornell, and the Universities of Pennsylvania and Michigan are also incorporating branches of Social Science into their courses and lecture systems. The fact that the wide range and great complexity of the problems presented render the systematic study of Sociology extremely difficult only strengthens its claims to a place on the University curriculum, by enhancing its value as an educational instrument. The additional facts that its data are within the reach of every-day observation, and that its practical relation to the well-being of society and the highest interests of the race is of the most intimate and vital character, clothe it with an importance which will not permit its claims to be much longer overlooked, or deemed inferior to those of dead languages and mediæval systems of philosophy. Political Science proper will no doubt afford ample work for a single Professorship, but the question whether a companion chair of Social Science should not be founded at an early day is well worth the consideration of the University authorities.

"WITH a Democratic Government politics can be saved from corruption only by a large number of citizens taking an active part in politics who have given a serious and honest attention to the questions at issue and are determined to make their weight felt." In this obviously true statement Professor Ashley fully justifies the claim of political science to a place in the curriculum of every modern university worthy of the name. His further remarks: "that on this continent single individuals, or small groups of individuals, have gained control of industrial or mercantile operations vastly larger than in Europe; and that, on the other hand, associations of working men bigger than any over there have come into existence," are every day receiving ample illustration. The latter of the two is just now deserving of special attention in view of the fact that the recent combination of all classes of railroad employees in the United States into one great organization bids fair, if successfully worked, to exhibit the power of the labour union on a scale hitherto unprecedented. The scheme is a vast one, and may fall to pieces by reason of its own weight, but, on the other hand, the conception carries with it the possibility, which may any day become a reality, of an organization of working men becoming absolute master of the railway system of the continent. With such possibilities ahead it is surely time that Political Science should become the special study of all classes of educated citizens.

Two distinct questions, one legal, the other moral, are involved in the present phase of the Manitoba Railway difficulty. The former concerns the status of a provincial railway as determined by its crossing or connecting with a railway chartered by the Dominion Government. It is now boldly maintained, in effect, in a letter to a contemporary, by Mr. R. M. Wells, a solicitor who was formerly Speaker of the Ontario Legislative Assembly, that by virtue of the Dominion Railway Act of 1883, the instant a Provincial Legislature passes an act incorporating a railway touching or crossing at any point a railway chartered by the Dominion Parliament, or pronounced a work for the general advantage of Canada, that instant the Provincial charter becomes invalid, any company formed under it ceases to have a legal existence, and the road in question passes under the sole jurisdiction of the Dominion Government. From this the inference is easy that the Red River Valley Railway has no legal charter, and the Manitoba Government no right of control in regard to it. It is, in short, a Dominion road, pure and simple, with which the Provincial authorities who built it have nothing to do. Not only so, but should this interpretation prevail it would become practically *ultra vires* for the Government of any Province to charter or construct any local railway whatever, since the object of such a railway could scarcely be gained without its either crossing or connecting with some one or other of the great trunk lines which have been declared to be "for the general advantage of Canada." If this is in substance the important question to be decided by the Supreme Court next week when it pronounces upon the points raised by the solicitors of the Canadian Pacific Railway, it certainly involves one of the most important legal discussions that has ever yet been raised between the Dominion and the Provinces. We fail, however, to perceive on what ground the question can be called "constitutional," seeing that it is concerned, primarily, with the effect of an Act of the Dominion Parliament, which may surely be modified, or repealed, if necessary, by the same power which enacted it.

THE moral question involved in the railway dispute has to do only with the conduct of the representatives of the Canadian Pacific Railway. To most of our readers the fact that Mr. VanHorne, Mr. Wells, and other advocates of the Company can see no breach of faith or other moral wrong in its attempt to prevent the completion of the Red River Valley road, will, we venture to say, seem to furnish a striking instance of the power of self-interest to impair the moral eyesight. Many changes are rung on the key-note fact that the agreement made was not with Manitoba but with the Dominion Government. To the non-legal and impartial mind the spirit and intent of the obligation, as understood by the Parliament and people, can be made clear by a simple supposition. Suppose that it had been openly stated by Mr. VanHorne, or some other representative of the Company, while the bill for retiring the Monopoly obligation by the guarantee of the Company's bonds was under debate, that the effect of the arrangement would not be to enable the Manitoba Government to complete the Red River Valley road as projected, but that the Company still hoped and intended to prevent the completion of that and similar competing lines in Manitoba by invoking a clause of the Dominion Railway Act, how many votes would have been recorded in favour of the guarantee bill? Would not every honest member of the Government and the House have said at once, "Why, that would be to defeat the prime object of this bill, and to snatch away on a side issue the very consideration in return for which this guarantee is to be given!" It is useless to mince the matter. Columns of special and specious pleading will not avail to change the common sense conclusion of the people of Canada. Seeing that the manifest and avowed object of the obstruction is not to secure safe crossings but to prevent any crossing, no amount of sophistry can save the Company from the deep reproach of seeking to evade the spirit of its covenant, unless and until it can prove that its representatives believed Parliament and the people to understand the agreement in the sense in which Mr. VanHorne and his associates now seek to interpret it.

CANADIANS are intensely interested in everything which affects the good feeling which should always exist between the United States and England. They will therefore be disposed to disapprove Lord Salisbury's sneer at American statesmen and popular institutions. However scant the courtesy with which Lord Sackville and the British Government were treated in the summary dismissal of the former, it cannot be forgotten that President Cleveland was within his right, and that Lord Sackville unquestionably transgressed the laws of diplomatic etiquette. But, apart from the question of provocation, it surely comports ill with the dignity of the Prime Minister of Great Britain, or with the best traditions of his high office, to interlard a public address with sneering references to the Government of a great and friendly nation. Such expressions from the lips of one so well versed in all the amenities of diplomatic life as Lord Salisbury are especially surprising. Such darts often remain and rankle and cause mischief long after the immediate occasion has passed by.

THE protest of the Government of Queensland against the appointment of Governor Blake, of Newfoundland, to the Governorship of the former Colony, raises a question of some importance to all British Colonies. The reply of Lord Knutsford to the effect that the Imperial Government cannot allow Colonial ministers to share in the responsibility of such appointments has, of course, the true constitutional ring. But if it were meant to imply that it is impossible for the Imperial Government to give any heed to the remonstrances and protests of Colonies against individual appointments which, for any special reason, may be obnoxious, it would surely be pushing the doctrine of constitutionalism to an absurd and dangerous extreme. And yet if this was not Lord Knutsford's meaning it is hard to see the force of his reply. As the *Standard* has intimated, there is surely no reason why a Colony should be treated with less courtesy in regard to the appointment of a governor, than a foreign nation in regard to that of an ambassador. There is, on the contrary, a stronger reason for consulting the views of the Colonial authorities, inasmuch as they have not the right, which as a recent event shows, a foreign Government may freely use, of handing a card of dismissal to an objectionable appointee. There is little doubt that the view which has been expressed by the *Standard* and which will probably be strongly supported in the Commons, will prevail, and lead to the substitution of some unobjectionable name for that of Governor Blake.

It cannot be said that the result of the Presidential election was a surprise to Canadian onlookers. Though in the earlier stages of the campaign the re-election of Mr. Cleveland seemed probable, it has for some weeks past been obvious that his opponent was gaining ground, and many shrewd observers had come to the conclusion that the chances were rather