ished state of the negotiations. That is, however, by the way. The Government organs have, we believe, been authorized to deny *in toto* the allegation so persistently made from unfriendly sources that they were, almost at the outset, embarrassed and nonplussed by a demand from Mr. Blaine for credentials and authorization from the British Government. The denial sounds reasonable, for it must have been well understood from the first that the Dominion delegates were without power to make a treaty, and sought only an informal conference, such as they surely have a right to hold with representatives of any country. But even so, it is evident that the Canadian Ministers must have laboured under a serious disadvantage in their efforts to ascertain the views of the American Administration, from the fact that they represented no national government, and were utterly without power to say what the British Government would or would not concede or ratify, in the shape of special arrangements for reciprocal trade. We should suppose that the circumstances must have been such as to cause the members of the Government to reflect seriously on the disadvantages under which the Dominion labours in consequence of its inability to perform any national function in its intercourse with the representatives of a foreign nation. The position is in fact rather a humiliating one for a people so fond as we are of speaking of ourselves as a self-governing people, a budding nationality, etc. Should the Opposition see fit, at the approaching session, to renew their time-worn motion in favour of our claiming the right to make our own commercial treaties, we shall be not a little curious to hear what the Government may have to say on the subject.

MR. BALFOUR'S first important movement in his new capacity as leader of the House of Commons has not been a triumph at the outset, whatever may be its subsequent success. If we may judge from the meagre accounts sent by cable, seldom has a great legislative measure, drawn up with deliberation by an able Government, been received with such an outburst of mingled derision and rage by political opponents. Whether this was the result of any unexpected deficiencies and limitations in the Bill itself, or whether any measure that the Government could have framed would have been greeted in the same way, it is not easy to determine. The fact that all parties in the Opposition ranks, including both divisions of the Home Rule wing, were of one accord in denouncing it, seems to indicate that it must be much less liberal in its provisions than was anticipated. It is not improbable that the Government, in framing the Bill, may have hoped to detach some of the nationalists and win them to its support as being an instalment of the Home Rule for which they have been so long and persistently fighting. If Mr. Balfour had any expectations of this kind he must have been undeceived more promptly than pleasantly. It is, perhaps, quite as probable that he had no expectation that his Bill would meet with favour—that the Government may, in fact, be "riding for a fall," to use the current expression, in order to be able to go to the country with the cry that nothing short of virtual independence and separation from the Empire will satisfy the Irish, or enable the Gladstonians to retain their continued support. Of course the more extreme the Irish demand, and the more radical the Home Rule measure offered by the Liberals, the smaller will be the chances that the latter will find favour with a majority of the British electors. Whatever the explanation, it is evident that the Government have framed their scheme on lines too narrow, have incorporated into it too many safeguards, and have especially given Dublin Castle and the judges much too prominent a place in it, to give it any chance of acceptance by the Irish Nationalists. Aside from other considerations, this is a tactical mistake. Whether it would be safe to trust the Irish people or not is a question on which we need not pronounce an opinion. It is in fact the great question. But it is evidently useless to try to cheat them into the belief that they are being trusted while the concessions made in one clause of their charter are cancelled in another. The alternatives are, a generous measure of local self-government, or Dublin Castle rule. If the Government is really in earnest in its proffer of the olive-branch, it will no doubt find it possible to modify its proposals very materially in the directions indicated by the fierce tornado of criticism and denunciation with which it has been greeted. If, on the other hand, it has no hope of being able to meet the demands of the malcontents, the Bill may yet serve an important purpose in forcing Mr. Gladstone to show his hand, thus affording fresh material for a vigorous Conservative campaign during the coming general election. It is quite possible that the latter is as much in the Government's thoughts as the former.

"FOURTEEN million persons in actual want!" Such is the official estimate given in the latest report made to the United States Government by its Minister at St. Petersburg. According to the same official report, says Mr. Smith, the Minister referred to, the territory afflicted by the famine comprises thirteen provinces of European Russia, having an area one-third greater than that of all Germany. Says the Countess Tolstoï, in a recent appeal:—

> In such great need as this individual persons can do nothing. And yet every day that we spend in a warm house, every mouthful that we eat, seems to reproach us with the thought that at this very moment some one is dying of hunger. All of us who live here in Moscow in luxury, and cannot bear to see the slightest pain suffered by our own children,—how should we endure the sight of the desperate or stupefied mothers looking on while their children die of hunger and cold? *Thirteen roubles* ($6) *will save from starvation till next harvest one person.* But there are so many that enormous sums are needed. Let us, though, at least, try what can be done.

Why is it that in the presence of a calamity so awful and one that appeals so directly to the sympathies of our common humanity, so little comparatively is being done by the outside world to save these millions of our fellow-beings from so dreadful a fate? Or, to come closer home, why is it that Canada has so far made no organized, strenuous effort to save at least a few hundreds? We cannot doubt that there are thousands of men and women in Ontario who, if the matter were only brought home to them in a practical shape, would most gladly contribute at least the six dollars each which would make each the saviour of one life. Some have, no doubt, contributed through some of the foreign agencies, but the amount so given is as nothing compared with what would be cheerfully bestowed were there some energetic home committee to issue appeals and forward contributions. It is not yet too late for such an agency to be formed, and it is greatly to be desired that some men of known business capacity, whose names will inspire public confidence, should undertake so noble a work. Meanwhile any who may wish to forward their contributions without delay can send them to Francis J. Garrison, Treasurer of the "Society of American Friends of Russian Freedom," by whom the circular appeal from which we have quoted is sent out. The address is 4 Park Street, Boston, Mass. Any information deemed necessary can no doubt be had from responsible persons in Boston.

PROFESSOR WORKMAN'S CASE—II.

IN a communication which appeared in THE WEEK of February 5th an outline of this case—as it is generally understood by the public—was given, and correction was respectfully asked for, if misstatement in any important point had been made through ignorance or inadvertence. It is desirable to discuss the case calmly, for it affects important interests, both private and public, and it is necessary that the public should be accurately informed as to the facts. No correction having been even attempted, our outline of the case may be accepted as substantially correct. It is therefore now in order to consider more in detail the position which the authorities of Victoria have deliberately taken up.

In the first place, what does their position mean, as regards the University, with the government of which they have been entrusted? Regretfully, it must be answered in one word, that it amounts to treason to the University. From the origin of universities down to the present day they have been regarded as intellectual and spiritual lighthouses; the patrons of scholarship, the homes where investigation is impartially pursued, the centres where learning is stored, and where the methods and principles of study are faithfully tested. Unless they are faithful to this ideal they are of no use, rather—like all pretenders—they are worse than useless. The Church, even in the Middle Ages, recognized the value of such organs of reason and the necessity of giving them self-government. Consequently, even when authority in Church and State was tending to despotism, Popes gave them an independence of Episcopal and other ecclesiastical rule and a large liberty that made them the important factors that history attests them to have been in the development of every country in Christendom. Possibly they were expected to serve the Church in return for their charters and franchises. They did serve the Church well, and they served still better those interests of truth and life—the highest interests of humanity, for the promotion of which every church is supposed to exist. It might be shown that almost every stimulus which the human mind received in the Middle Ages, every advance or widening of thought, was largely due to their influence. We owe to them the blessings of the Reformation. The German, Swiss, French, English, Scottish Reformers were the scholars of their time. The universities not only nurtured them, but gave to the movement itself that intellectual basis and coherence without which the greatest spiritual force passes away, without leaving permanent results in institutions and national life.

Now, it is admitted that the object for which a university exists is the same to-day as it was eight hundred years ago when Bologna was founded, or three hundred years ago when Edinburgh was added to the number of universities that then existed in Scotland. The tendency of modern far more than of mediæval times is to throw aside everything that trammels man in the search for truth. Preconceptions and interpretations that claim only the authority of tradition we are called upon to set aside or to test rigorously by rules of criticism that are of universal validity, and therefore binding on all reasonable men. Instead of punishing men for intellectual ability or for presenting truth from new points of view, or for the manifestation of the moral qualities of industry, energy, thoroughness and faithfulness, we feel that we cannot sufficiently reward such men. We claim that we have advanced beyond mediæval conceptions of liberty, and we believe that the greatest university to-day is not that which is oldest or has most money or most students, but that which has the greatest scholars and the most fearless thinkers. When a university has men of that stamp, we have no doubt that it should regard them as the apple of its eye.

It may be pleaded here that all this is true of public universities, but not of those that are denominational. Such a plea is based on a confusion of thought which may pass muster with Philistines, but which every university man will at once repudiate. There is no such thing as a private university, though there are private schools of various kinds. A university is based upon a charter given by the highest public authority for well-defined objects, and these objects are substantially the same in all cases. Whether a university owes its origin to a city, a province, a nation, a denomination, or an individual, it must be true to the fundamental law of its being, which law is implied and expressed in its public charter. The origin of a university may increase, but it can never lessen, the obligation of its charter. Especially, one would think, is the obligation incumbent on a university that had so honourable an origin as that which Victoria boasts. It was called into existence because the provincial university was in sectarian bondage. The Methodists of the country were in consequence forced by self-respect to found another university, and they established it on a more liberal basis than that on which Toronto stood. They appealed to people of all denominations for aid. Not only was the appeal responded to by individuals, but also by public bodies like the town council of Cobourg. In making this response they, as well as the mass of Methodist supporters, had a right to assume that Victoria would discharge the functions and obey the common law of a chartered university. Has it done so in the present instance? Let us see.

The position to which Professor Workman was appointed, the self-sacrificing labour which he voluntarily undertook, and his brilliant success, have already been referred to. One part of his duties was to interpret the books of the Old Testament, written in the Hebrew and Aramaic languages, which he and his students studied. If all that students expect and all that they ought to get is the interpretation of these writings according to tradition, no learned scholar is needed. The editor of a denominational paper, a pastor retired from active duty, a class-leader or —we say it without the slightest disrespect—a pious old woman from town or country would suffice to give in English the usually accepted interpretations. Neither Professor nor university is needed. But the University having been called into existence and the Professor having been appointed and having fully qualified himself, he very properly assumed, what the public and the University authorities would also naturally assume, that he should do his work faithfully. Now, the work of interpreting ancient books is not done by guess, or haphazard, or appeals to authority, or voting. It is done according to acknowledged rules. There are the laws of language, and admittedly we understand Hebrew and the cognate languages better to-day than in the eighteenth century. There are, too, canons of historical criticism which have been established since Niebuhr's time and which have been of immense service in the study of every department of ancient history. There are also rules of literary interpretation. A knowledge of ancient Oriental literary forms and usages enables the scholar to apply these rules so as to throw a flood of light upon what would otherwise be obscure. In addition, the great law of evolution is seen in the growth of society, and the development of literature, of jurisprudence, of science and art, as well as of everything that has life or that is the expression of life. Be it well understood that the interpretation of the books of the Old Testament according to these laws takes away no truth. Old rubbish of scribes and rabbis is cleared away, and the full beauty and power of the truth is seen. Nothing that is of the slightest value is lost, but much is gained. None the less, no man who has drank old wine, *straightway* desireth new; the new may be richer, but his taste has to be formed and until it is, he will cry "the old is better." He is not to be blamed for this, but what is to be said if in the nineteenth century he also stones the man who offers the choice of old and new. It may be said that we are too polite or too