

his friends, or do any other thing that the average respectable citizen cares to do, he needs but to reside a few weeks in Canada to discover his mistake. It is true that "it is not lawful for any person on that day to bathe in any exposed situation in any water within the limits of any incorporated city or town, or within view of any place of public worship, or private residence." But this "Law Against Sunday Bathing," as the *Pall Mall Gazette* styles it, properly understood, merely prohibits a kind of bathing which would be reprehensible on any day. This and some other of the Sunday laws forbid on Sunday what would be equally objectionable on any other day, simply because, we suppose, these things are likely to be done on the holiday and not on the working days.

IT is very likely that some of the Canadian Sunday laws are examples of right legislation based on wrong principles. We have no doubt that many of the prohibitions were originally enacted on religious grounds, though the principle is now pretty generally conceded that the State, as such, has nothing to do with the enforcement of religious obligations, further than to protect those of its citizens who wish to conduct religious services, from unnecessary interference or annoyance. Nevertheless it is interesting to observe that the same end, the legal enforcement of a day of rest, is now being approached by an entirely different route. Labouring men of all classes are learning to recognize the great fact that one day's rest in seven is a requirement indicated and demanded by the inexorable laws of their physical being. Students of sociology are reaching the same conclusion on scientific principles. These concurrent tendencies bear conclusive testimony to the fact that the original law of the Sabbath had for its end the physical as well as the spiritual welfare of the race, and that the declaration of the Founder of Christianity that the "Sabbath was made for man" was the enunciation of a universal law of physiology as well as the condemnation of a superstitious subserviency to the letter in violation of the spirit of the Jewish Sabbath legislation. The reaction in favour of a legal day of rest is one of the remarkable signs of the time. Strict laws for Sabbath observance have no warmer supporters in Canada than the labour unions, whose members certainly are not supposed to be actuated by Puritanic scruples. France, Germany and Hungary, on the continent, have lately enacted laws to enforce the observance of one day in seven as a day of rest. There is every reason to believe that workers of all classes, workers with brain as well as workers with hand, will recognize more and more clearly as the years go on that their true interests, social and intellectual as well as physical, are intimately bound up with the strict enforcement within the widest practicable limits of a weekly Sabbath. In the French Bill imposing on all industries the obligation to give one day of rest in seven to women and children, no special day was named, the particular seventh day being left to the discretion of employers. But the advantages of having the same day observed by all are so great and so manifest that without doubt Sunday will sooner or later be fixed upon. In view of this marked tendency towards a universal rest, Canadians can well afford to endure the scoffs, even of a popular novelist. While she observes the nations of Europe hastening to enact legislation similar in many respects to that which has produced so good results on the whole in her experience, she need not be in haste to make any radical changes in her own Sunday laws.

JUST now all eyes are turned to Quebec, where something like a deadlock seems to have stopped for the time being the working of the executive machinery. It may probably be accepted as fact that a difference of opinion has arisen between Lieut.-Governor Angers and his advisers, and that the former is in communication with his official superior and fountain of authority, the Governor-General. Two grave constitutional questions are being raised as the result of the enquiry and report of the Senate Railway Committee. The first touches the right of the Senate, or the Parliament of which it is a part, to conduct an enquiry into the conduct of a local administration. It has been said that no matter how corrupt or mischievous such an administration may be the Dominion Parliament cannot call it to account. We have no doubt that this position is constitutionally sound, but it does not seem to us to cover the case in question. Had a committee either of the Senate or of the Commons attempted to institute an enquiry into some act or policy of the Quebec Government, alleged to be wrong or corrupt, such

committee would have unquestionably been going beyond the sphere of Parliament, and trenching on ground exclusively reserved to the Province under the Constitution. But the case is very different, in which a Committee of the Senate, in following out a lawful investigation, comes upon a transaction to which one or more members of a local administration were parties. In that case it has to do with the individuals as such, irrespective of their official positions. The fact that they are members of a local Government is a mere accident, with which the investigating committee have nothing to do. It would be a strange constitutional doctrine and one fraught with dangerous consequences to claim that the fact that those men were members of such local Government secured them exemption from such enquiry, and that the investigation must be baulked in consequence. Were the circumstances reversed, a committee of a local legislature would, we hold, be equally free to enquire into the doings of members of the Dominion Government, as individuals, in relation to the subjects under investigation. As a matter of fact, however deeply Premier Mercier himself and perhaps some members of his Cabinet, may be involved in the guilty transactions disclosed, there is, we believe we are safe in saying, no evidence that the wrong-doing was an official act of the Quebec Government—though we do not see that even were it otherwise, that fact could have estopped the Senate Committee from prosecuting its enquiry. Hence, while we always have been and still are prepared to take strong ground for the upholding of Provincial Rights—believing the autonomy of the Provinces within clearly defined constitutional limits to be the palladium of the Confederation—we are quite unable to see that the Pacaud affair has any relation to that autonomy. Had the Senate Committee proceeded to pronounce an opinion, as some of its members are said to have proposed, upon the character or acts of the Quebec Government itself, there would have been ground for raising the cry that provincial rights were being invaded. It is well that wiser counsels prevailed. We are prepared to go even further than we have gone and maintain that had the Senate Committee seen fit to enforce its summonses upon some members of the Quebec Cabinet, to appear before it as witnesses, it would have had a perfect right to do so. It would of course have had no right to enquire into any of their official acts, but no reason can be given why their private rights should be greater or less than those of other citizens.

THE second constitutional question seems to us a much more difficult and complicated one. It concerns the prerogatives of the Lieutenant-Governor in relation to his constitutional advisers. Munro (*Constitution of Canada*) says that the Lieutenant-Governor "may dismiss his Ministers or call on them to resign, but for the due and proper exercise of his power he is responsible to the Governor-General in Council." This will not, we presume, be disputed. When we, a few weeks ago, referred to this right of Lieut.-Governor Angers, and pointed out that he was morally bound to take some official action in view of the facts brought out by the Senate Committee, a contemporary accused us of being actuated by partisan motives, and saying nothing about Governor Letellier's fate, though, as a matter of fact, we referred to that fate in the next paragraph. The fact that the Governor-General was at that time constrained by the Dominion Government and Parliament to dismiss Mr. Letellier emphasizes the last clause of the sentence above quoted, touching the responsibility of the Lieutenant-Governor, and shows the wisdom of Mr. Angers' course in consulting the Governor-General, as he is believed to be doing, before taking action. But the dismissal of Mr. Letellier cannot be said to prove that his act in dismissing his advisers was unconstitutional or wrong. It will be remembered that in the first instance the motion declaring his dismissal of his Ministry to be at variance with constitutional government was carried in the Senate but defeated in the Commons; that it was not until a new Parliament had been elected and a change of government brought about, that the motion was carried in both Houses; and that the Governor-General still declined to dismiss Mr. Letellier until he was instructed by the Home Government that in such a matter he ought to follow the advice of his Ministers. The dismissal was, therefore, merely the act of a party, and the only rule established by the precedent was that a Governor, and by consequence of course, a Lieut.-Governor, must act by the advice of his Ministers in such a matter. That rule has, it seems to us, an important bearing upon the present case. It is

stated, though the despatch may not be correct, that Mr. Angers declines to sign any important documents for his Ministers while they lie under the imputation now resting upon them, and that he has forbidden the Clerk of the Council and the Assistant Treasurer of the Province to sign or issue any document authorizing the payment of money. It is also stated, on what seems to be good authority, that he insists on the appointment of a Royal Commission nominated or approved by himself. Now, while it seems clear that the Governor has the constitutional right to demand explanations from his advisers, and to dismiss them in case those explanations fail to restore his confidence in them, it is by no means clear, to the non-legal mind at least, that he has the right to take any executive power in regard to money or other matters into his own hands, insisting that he is not responsible to the people, or to insist on a commission of his own choosing. It will be remembered that at the time of the Pacific scandal the Governor-General did neither the one nor the other. It may be presumptuous for the lay mind to venture on such high ground, but it does seem a common sense view of the matter that Governor Angers must choose between two courses. Either he must take the responsibility, as Mr. Letellier did, of dismissing his advisers and choosing others, or he must follow the example of the Governor-General in the Pacific scandal affair, and allow his Government to appoint their own commissioners, or Parliamentary committee, leaving it to the Legislature and the people to pronounce upon the conduct of the investigation.

MUCH is being said and written with reference to the strong tendency of present-day populations to drift to the cities. The tendency is no more unmistakably shown by the Canadian census than by that of the United States. We are not sure whether it is more marked in America than in Great Britain and Europe. The causes of the movement are no doubt various, but we cannot agree with the writer of an interesting article in the *New York Times* of a few weeks since, that they are in the main other than strictly economic. It is true that these great movements of population have been much facilitated by travel. In fact they would have been impossible otherwise. It is true, also, that but for the same enlargement of the means of transportation of food and other necessities, the sustenance of the vast aggregations of people in our modern cities would have been impossible. Could their coming together have been accomplished by any means, nothing but famine and death could have ensued. It is true, too, no doubt that the discontent produced by the monotony of rural life and the craving for larger interests, opportunities and excitements, have no inconsiderable effect in accelerating the movement. From this point of view the plan adopted on a small scale by the Mennonites in Manitoba—a plan which someone is just now proposing to try on a much larger scale in some parts of the United States—is interesting and hopeful. In our own North-West, for instance, the isolation of the farmer's family must be terribly depressing, especially in the winter months, and we fancy that to most persons who have had opportunity to observe it, as to us, the great wonder must have been that the custom of living together in hamlets or villages does not universally prevail. Whether it will ever be found feasible for the rural populations to cluster together in still larger communities, say towns of five hundred or a thousand inhabitants, may be more doubtful, though it is unsafe to set limits to what may yet be accomplished through the medium of improved facilities for rapid travel on country roads, by the application of the electric or some other motive force. But this is somewhat aside from our main point, which is that we see no reason to doubt that the changed economic conditions are after all the chief cause of the drift to the cities which is so much deplored by many. The movement is chiefly on the part of the young, and, so far as we have been able to observe, young men and women in nine cases out of ten leave the country simply because there is nothing in the country for them to do. They go to the cities in search of occupation, which cannot be found in the country, or of more remunerative occupation than any to be found there. This lack of employment is partly the result of the introduction of the labour-saving machinery, by which one man, with the aid of horses or steam, is able to do the work which under former conditions would have required three or four. It is, in a still larger degree, the result of the changed methods of manufacture brought about by the use of machinery, minute subdivision of