

should deprive him of the ordinary rights of citizenship. To the outside observer it would certainly seem to be more just as well as magnanimous, and to comport better with the dignity of Privy Councillors, to refuse to take cognizance of any act, not unlawful or improper in itself, done by any employé in his capacity of a private citizen. Public opinion condemns the private employer who dismisses an employé in consequence of any exercise of a political right, even though such employer should be a candidate for office and the employé an active opponent. Why should the Government of the Dominion be less mindful than a private individual, or corporation, of the rights and liberties of its servants? There is also much force in the contention of one or two of those who took part in the debate that the very fact that a certain person is a candidate for re-election argues that he is not at the time a member of the House. Any opposition offered to him at the hustings is, therefore, opposition to a private individual, and so cannot trench upon the dignity or privilege of a member of Parliament.

In commenting, a week or two since, upon the reversal by the Supreme Court, on technical grounds, of the decision of the Election Court in the Glengarry election case, we inadvertently referred the ambiguity which gave rise to the difference of interpretation to the Franchise Act, instead of to the Controverted Elections Act. In doing so we used the term "Franchise Act" somewhat loosely to include the whole body of legislation governing electoral representation in the Commons. The obligation laid upon us to point out the mistake, and make this correction of what might seem a trivial slip, arises from the fact that whereas THE WEEK's remark reflected upon the present Government as authors of the Franchise Act, the censure should have been directed against the Mackenzie Administration which framed the Controverted Elections Act of 1875. The Franchise Act has, no doubt, enough to do to answer for its own sins, and we cheerfully make the *amende*.

Now that the terms agreed upon for the surrender by the Canadian Pacific Railway of its North-West Monopoly have been definitely announced, members of both political parties seem astonished at their moderation. By the arrangement, as stated by Sir John A. Macdonald to his supporters, in caucus, the Government are to guarantee the bonds of the company to the face value of \$15,000,000, and bearing interest at the rate of 3½ per cent. The bonds are to run for fifty years. To meet the interest the thirteen million acres of land now held by the company are pledged, and in addition the amounts falling due on account of previous land sales, aggregating \$1,500,000. The land is to be managed by three commissioners, one of whom will be a member of the Government. All proceeds from the land sales are to be paid to the Government, and by them invested to meet the interest on the bonds as it falls due. In addition the Government will if necessary hold back the amounts payable to the company for the carriage of mails and Indian and military supplies. The mail subsidies at present aggregate \$215,000. In reply to a question Sir John A. Macdonald is said to have stated that only the interest, not the principal, of the bonds was to be guaranteed. A further proviso of great importance is the stipulation in regard to the manner in which the \$15,000,000 are to be expended. According to the reports of the explanation made in caucus, \$5,000,000 are to be devoted to the payment of floating liabilities, \$5,000,000 to be spent on the roadbed and rolling stock, and \$5,000,000 expended in the construction of elevators. A most remarkable statement, and one of great interest to the party politicians, is attributed to Sir John, to the effect that the visit of Messrs. Greenway and Martin had nothing to do with the opening of the negotiations with the Canadian Pacific Railway for the withdrawal of the monopoly in the Territories.

THE Senatorial Committee which has been entrusted with the inquiry in regard to the climate and resources of the territory drained by the Mackenzie River and its tributaries is pursuing the investigations with commendable vigour and eliciting information of much interest and value. Few Canadians even are aware, probably, of the extent and value of the arable and fertile lands in this vast region of the great North-West. All the evidence thus far adduced goes to show that the tract fit for cultivation and settlement in that region is immense, and that a considerable part of it, especially the portion constituting what is known as the Peace River District, is a magnificent country, capable of great future development. The facilities for internal commerce afforded by the Mackenzie, Peel, Great Slave, and Liard rivers, are already used to advantage by the Hudson Bay Company in the collection and export of the valuable furs with which the country abounds. The report of the Committee will, no

doubt, be a document of great interest, and will do much to direct attention to the resources of the region, and eventually to turn a current of immigration in that direction.

THE astonishing proposal, made with the sanction of Archbishop Fabre and a number of prominent French-Canadian citizens, to erect a colossal statue of the Virgin Mary on Mount Royal, has naturally given rise to a good deal of excitement in Protestant circles in Montreal. The project is one which obviously cannot be defended on any principle of religious toleration. A statue of the Virgin Mary would represent a distinctly Roman Catholic dogma, and one that is peculiarly objectionable to Protestants. Its erection in a conspicuous place, on public grounds which are the common property of the people of all creeds and nationalities, would be an outrage on the spirit of toleration and fraught with danger to the harmony of the community. It could be regarded as nothing less than a public declaration to all comers that the people of the city and province were agreed in that veneration for the Virgin, which is regarded by Protestants and all other classes except Roman Catholics as little short of a gross and superstitious idolatry. The Catholics have a perfect right, which no true Protestant, or other citizen who understands the first principles of religious liberty, would gainsay, to erect any statues they please within their own ecclesiastical precincts, but they have neither civil nor moral right to outrage the feelings and faith of their fellow-citizens by setting up a distinctly and distinctively Roman Catholic symbol in a public park. The persistence of the majority in attempting to do so would be sure to give rise to consequences which all good citizens would deplore.

MORE for the principle it implies than for the sum of money it renders available for direct educational work, the statute passed by the Senate of Toronto University, on Friday evening, abolishing after the next Junior Matriculation, all scholarships, prizes, and medals hitherto paid out of the revenue of the University, marks an important change in the policy of that institution. This change is one of many indications of a gradual revolution in theories and methods of education, which is going on not only in Ontario, but all over the English-speaking portion of this continent. Signs of the same change are also beginning to manifest themselves in England. There is an unmistakable tendency to revolt against the whole system of competitive examinations in schools of learning, and the "cramming" of which that system is the prolific source. Earnest and thoughtful educators are coming to see that reading for honours, as generally done, is not only not synonymous with true education, but is often directly antagonistic to the best educational processes. They are coming to believe in the possibility of awakening earnestness and even enthusiasm in the pursuit of truth for its own sake, in our schools and colleges, without the artificial, and not very ennobling stimulus of prizes and scholarships. They perceive more and more clearly, that to make the goal of effort something outside and apart from mastery of the subject in hand, is incompatible with the best methods both of study and of instruction. It is creditable to the discernment and the spirit of the students of the University that the majority of them are, as is understood, heartily in favour of the change now inaugurated. The action of the Senate, of course, does not affect any prizes or scholarships established by other than University funds.

THE dangers to public and political morality resulting from an immense surplus in the national treasury have received a fresh illustration at Washington. For eight days the House of Representatives was in "dead lock" over a remarkable attempt at a most summary disposal of a part of the surplus. This was nothing less than a bill to refund to the various States of the Union the amount of a direct tax levied over a quarter of a century ago. The bill involved the repayment of more than \$17,000,000. It passed through the Senate with slight opposition, exciting there what seems, in view of the character of the measure, wondrously little interest. It was favourably reported by the Judicial Committee of the House, and, having been given by the Committee on Rules a special assignment in advance of other measures, an attempt was made to rush it through the House by the "previous question" method. After a struggle, prolonged for eight days, the minority finally succeeded in securing an adjournment of the House. This will not, probably, prevent the passage of the bill by the majority who favour it, but it has given opportunity for the full discussion which its promoters seemed anxious to avoid. This is not strange, as apart from the many objections to a scheme which is understood to promise a rich harvest for the lobbyists who are pressing it, the principle involved, of redistribution of national funds amongst the States,