

alone should consent to be placed at a disadvantage in their special pursuit, on principles of public philanthropy. The business of indirect taxation is a puzzling one in any case. Like most other questions of practical politics, it has, after all, to be dealt with as a matter of expediency.

THE prolonged debate which took place in the Local Legislature last week on certain Educational questions may, we suppose, be rightly regarded as intended by both parties for effect outside the House rather than within it. It was the campaign debate of a moribund Assembly. The issues presented were not very large, nor were there any very wide and irreconcilable differences of opinion or policy between the two sides of the House. Mr. Meredith's rejected Bill, declaring broadly that under our Educational system every rate-payer must be held to be a supporter of Public Schools until by his own formal act he has declared himself a supporter of Separate Schools, was, confessedly, intended but as a clearer affirmation of a principle on which all are agreed. Remembering the confusion which arose under certain provisions of the existing law, and viewing the subject from an unpartizan standpoint, it would probably seem to most persons better that the matter should be made clear by a distinct enactment, than by the Government's interpretative clauses and book-keeping expedients; but the difference is, after all, only in method. A somewhat wider divergence was that in regard to Mr. Meredith's Bill to prescribe the use of the ballot in the election of Separate School Trustees. Of this proposal it is to be said that the compulsory use of the ballot either would, or would not, affect materially the result of such elections. To say that it would is to admit the utility and necessity of the Act in order to secure the free expression of the rate-payers' opinions, which it is the object of the election to obtain. To say that it would not is to lessen the importance of the change without giving any positive reason why it should not be made. It is also to affirm what nothing but experiment can prove, while in proportion to the degree of doubt the argument is on the side of the ballot. It is logically pretty clear, moreover, that whatever reasons are conclusive in favour of the ballot in political and municipal elections must hold good, to a greater or less extent, in the case of all elections to public office. We know no good reason why the ballot should not be made compulsory in the election of both Public and Separate School Trustees. It could hardly cause less interest to be taken in regard to the former, and if it gave rise to more, that would in itself justify its use. Moreover, why should not our democratic system be made uniform and symmetrical throughout?

THEORETICALLY, Mr. French's Bill to repeal those clauses of the School Act which give Separate Schools the right to representation on the High School Boards is sound, but from the practical and utilitarian point of view the existing arrangement is the better one, so long as the Separate Schools exist. Sound political principles certainly condemn all special representation of classes or sects. But the Separate School system, as engrafted in the Constitution, is based on the Sectarian or class idea, and so long as our Catholic fellow-citizens, as Catholics, have a special elementary school system of their own, so long it is desirable that the fact of their educational separation from the rest of the community should be recognized, and every facility given them to become reunited in the management and use of the High Schools. It was proposed by still another member of the Opposition that Separate School teachers should be required to submit to the same examinations as Public School teachers. The answer of the Minister of Education to this is probably decisive. The right which the Separate School supporters now enjoy, of qualifying and licensing their own teachers, is in the constitutional bond, or implied in it. They would no doubt stand upon the bond. That bond cannot be destroyed piecemeal. Meanwhile it is very gratifying to learn from Mr. Ross that the Separate Schools are improving so rapidly in efficiency, and that their teachers compare so well with those in the Public Schools. That is, however, no answer to the argument against which it was directed. The real question involved is that of the right of the Government and Legislature to inquire into and direct the expenditure of the public money, and to satisfy themselves that it is efficiently used for the purpose for which it is given. Should the supporters of Separate Schools choose to content themselves with poorly qualified teachers and inefficient schools, there would be, we fear, no help for it under the present system. Two remarks in regard to questions of fact touched upon in the course of the debate,

we may venture to add. When Hon. Mr. Fraser stated that the law provides for Separate Schools for other religious denominations, did he mean to assert that if the Presbyterians or Methodists should decide to establish schools of their own they would be relieved from the payment of Public School taxes, and the machinery of the law and the Education Department put into operation to collect taxes for them from their own adherents, as in the case of the Catholic Separate Schools? If this is the fact it will be news, we fancy, to most Protestants. But if the right of which Mr. Fraser speaks is simply that of establishing and supporting schools of their own, besides paying their quota for the support of Public Schools, just as some of the denominations now support their own colleges and universities, the parallelism fails in the main point, and Mr. Fraser's retort is futile. Again, Mr. Fraser, in his eloquent and effective speech, challenged comparison of his co-religionists, in point of intellectual culture and ability, with the members of other denominations. With regard to the few, who, like himself, have had superior advantages and made good use of them, his challenge is safe. But is he prepared to maintain that the average of education and intelligence of the Catholic population in the mass, in Canada and elsewhere, can bear comparison for a moment with that of Protestants in the mass? This is the crucial test.

IT is, we think, greatly to be regretted that the Legislature under the guidance of the Premier, refused to affirm in some shape the principle of Mr. Whitney's Bill to prevent bribery at elections. There is obvious and glaring inequality in the existing law, to say nothing of its ineffectiveness as a deterrent. The infliction of a fine, which is really no punishment at all to the wealthy man, may result in the imprisonment of a poor man for precisely the same offence. Experience has proved, too, that the disqualification, which Mr. Mowat thinks so severe a penalty, is of little avail as a deterrent. One of the principal causes of its failure is, we have no doubt, the fact that the penalty is of a political nature, and thus tends to perpetuate the too prevalent notion that bribery and kindred acts are political rather than moral offences. The chief difficulty in putting down bribery and other forms of corruption is, as Mr. Meredith pointed out, that these things are regarded by so many as venial. The law is an educative as well as a punitive force, and electoral corruption will not be rooted out until it is distinctly branded by law as a moral, and not simply a political crime. There is force in the Premier's objection that imprisonment should not be inflicted without the option of trial by jury, but it is not easy to see why such option should not be given in Canada as in England. In any case the hardship of imprisonment by the decree of judges would be no greater than that of imprisonment under the present system for inability to pay a fine. There is no trial by jury in that case. It is very likely that Mr. Whitney's bill may have stood in need of modification and amendment. But it is too clear that bribery of electors in various forms is disgracefully and demoralizingly prevalent in Canada. It is equally clear, we believe, that it will not be eradicated till public sentiment is educated by a law which makes both the giving and the receiving of a bribe criminal offences and punishable as such. We cannot agree with Mr. Meredith that the acceptor of a bribe is so much less guilty than the giver, save as his criminality may be lessened by his want of moral education. Such education a law on the lines of Mr. Whitney's bill would give, if properly administered.

THE Kingston *News* accuses THE WEEK of "lapsing into localism," because we did not oppose the Legislative grant in aid of Toronto University, though we admitted, after the appropriation was made, that the whole question of the relation of the State to higher education is open to debate. As we respect and wish to retain the good opinion of our contemporary, we may explain that, in our opinion, the exigency of the Provincial University did not afford, under the circumstances, a favourable or even a fair occasion for raising the broad question referred to. The University of Toronto is, as a matter of fact, the property of the Province. It is under the control of the Government. The Government was responsible for the failure to keep it adequately insured. We do not see how it is possible to deny or evade the force of the argument urged, if our memory serves us, by Mr. Cockburn, that the Government, that is, the public whose agent it is, was bound to make good the loss sustained through its defective management. Be that as it may, the University

represents a very valuable public property, and so long as it is retained as such, the Government must, on business principles, keep it in repair and in efficient working. Were it proposed to found a new institution, or even to increase materially the endowment of the old one at public expense, the question raised by the *News*, or rather by ourselves, would be in order. This is as the matter appeared to us. Of course, we may have erred in judgment, but we are not conscious that the matter of locality affected either our views or our action in the case.

IT is both amusing and instructive to read the comments of the English party journals upon Lord Randolph Churchill's remarkable speech on the motion for the reception of the Parnell Commissioners' Report. The display is, it is true, similar in kind to that which meets our eyes every day, in reading the criticisms of our own party papers on the speeches made in the Commons and the Local Legislatures. But there is a certain dignity of style, some would perhaps call it ponderosity, in the British press which has the effect of emphasizing such contrasts of opinion. A mere catalogue of the epithets, complimentary and the reverse, particularly the latter, which have been applied to Lord Randolph's speech, would be quite a formidable document. It is an "extraordinary blunder," "a laborious compilation from the oratory of the Gladstonians and Parnellites," "very powerful and very dramatic," a "portentous disquisition," an "entertaining of a jaded public" with "coarse vulgarities," a "powerful speech," and so on. Though the speech undoubtedly did the Government some injury, its chief significance is in its bearings upon the future of the orator himself. That speech has effectually dispelled any hopes that may have been entertained by Lord Randolph or his friends, of his return at an early day to the ranks of the ministry. He would, evidently, always be a dangerous man to have in a cabinet. Though he has thus cut himself adrift, for the present at least, from his own party, it seems hardly possible that he can enter the ranks of the Opposition. It would, indeed, not be surprising were he some day to come out as a full-fledged Radical, but the time is probably not yet come. His audacious recklessness is occasionally combined with an apparently sincere righteous indignation, which compels a degree of admiration. But he has, as yet, given no evidence of the "staying power," which springs from adherence to fixed and settled principles, either political or moral. In spite of all his erratic tendencies he has probably a "career" before him, but he would be a rash man who should venture a prediction as to the kind of the career.

ANOTHER phase of the iniquity begotten of greed for money and carried on by appeal to the same degrading passion, is seen in connection with the Louisiana lottery. The newspapers chronicled, but a few weeks ago, the infamous attempt made by the managers of this concern to purchase the Legislature of North Dakota, and how near that impecunious body was to accepting the immense bribe offered. Only the energetic efforts of a few honest and influential men to arouse public indignation prevented the consummation of the crime. The object of the Company, it may be necessary to explain, is to secure a renewal of their charter, which shortly expires and which, it is feared, will not be renewed in Louisiana. They actually offered to advance to the North Dakota Legislature two or three hundred thousand dollars, without interest, to buy seed corn for the farmers of the State, with the generous proviso that should this year's crops prove a failure repayment need not be made. This bribe having been finally spurned, the managers seem to have fallen back in sheer desperation upon Louisiana. Taking advantage of the distress caused by the recent floods, they offered fifty thousand dollars to the city of New Orleans to repair the levees and one hundred thousand to the Governor of the State for the same purpose. Governor Nichols promptly returned the cheque, sternly refusing to put the State under any obligation to the Company. We are not sure whether the city accepted or refused the bribes. It is felt that there is still great danger that some State Legislature of feeble virtue may be induced to renew the charter of this most pernicious concern. If the vice and misery it produces could be portrayed in their true colours and proportions the picture would no doubt be appalling. It is quite a common thing for respectable young men, in various employments, to make a practice of investing all their spare dollars in lottery tickets. Lured on by the hope of some day winning the great prize which never comes, they be-