

but to the whole North-West, with its chain of embryo provinces stretching to the Rocky Mountains, that the point cannot be yielded for the sake of conciliation. The freedom and autonomy of all these provinces, for all the future, is at stake. It is to be hoped, however, that a calmer moment will succeed the present excitement in Quebec, and that wiser and more reasonable councils will ultimately prevail. It is of good omen that none of the political leaders of French origin have so far given countenance to the agitation, though it is on the other hand to be regretted that none of them have pointed out to their constituents that the agitation is uncalled for as well as dangerous. Meanwhile, though sacrifice of Manitoba's rights is impossible, and would be a fatal mistake were it otherwise, we have only to put ourselves in the place of our French-speaking fellow-citizens in order to be able to understand and to a certain extent sympathize with them in their disappointment. The more thoroughly we can do this, the better and the more easily shall we be enabled to preserve that calm and judicial attitude which the crisis demands. The Confederation has more than once already been shaken by internal tempests, more or less threatening to its stability, but it is probable that never before has it been placed in circumstances in which the combination of the *suaviter in modo* with the *fortiter in re* were so imperatively needed on the part of all who combine Canadian patriotism with Canadian love of constitutional freedom, and determination to maintain it at all hazard.

I CONTEND that, unless the Government and Parliament of Canada do all that is possible under present circumstances to fulfil that solemn agreement, the country must stand disgraced in the eyes of the civilized world." These are the words of Mr. T. W. Anglin, in a letter to the *Globe* on the Manitoba school question. We quote them simply as a terse statement of the moral argument of those who are calling upon the Dominion Government and Parliament to compel the Government and people of Manitoba to cancel or amend the School Act which has just been declared by the highest authority to have been within their constitutional powers to enact. The "agreement" referred to is that said to have been "made with the delegates of the people of the North-West by the Canadian Government." "An Act to give effect to that agreement was," we are told, "after due consideration, passed by the Canadian Parliament." It is obvious that there are several questions of fact involved in these statements. Were the individuals with whom the alleged agreement was made qualified delegates and true representatives of the people of the North-West? Was the Act of the Canadian Parliament referred to distinctly understood by the Parliament which passed it to be in the nature of a "solemn agreement" with the people of the North-West, binding for all future time, and, like the laws of the Medes and Persians, unalterable? By what right or authority do those who speak in so strong terms of the disgrace involved in not fulfilling that agreement take it upon themselves to declare that the Manitoba School Act is in violation of the Act passed "to give effect to that agreement," when the highest judicial authority in the realm has solemnly declared that no violation of the latter Act is involved in the former? It is, we think, evident that clearer answers than we have yet had must be given to such questions as these before even those who are most anxious to fulfil every promise made in their name twenty years ago will feel bound either to do "all that is possible under present circumstances" to compel the perpetuation of the Separate School system in Manitoba and the North-West, or to plead guilty to the grave impeachment preferred against them.

ANOTHER and a larger question is, however, forcibly suggested by the attitude taken by Mr. Anglin and many of his co-religionists in the discussion. It is that of the moral right, since we are upon moral grounds, of the representatives of a few first settlers in an immense territory to enter into agreements binding, or intended to be binding, upon the people of that country for all time to come. Does not the very statement of the facts in this case reduce such a claim to the borders of the absurd? Let us grant, for the purpose of the argument, that the individuals spoken of as "the delegates of the people of the North-West" were such in reality, and were fully authorized to speak in the name of all the then inhabitants of that great country. Let us grant further that the intention of both parties in making the agreement, and

of the members of the Canadian Parliament in passing the Act to give effect to it, was to perpetuate a separate-school and a dual-language system in all that country. Admit that that agreement is solemnly and perpetually binding upon the Government and Parliament of the Dominion, the whole North-West included, and what follows? That a few hundreds or thousands of settlers on the shores of the Red and Saskatchewan Rivers, on the one hand, and the Government and Parliament of the four original Provinces of Canada, on the other, had the moral right to bind irrevocably upon the necks of the Canadian nation, even after it shall have grown, as it must one day grow, into a nation of twenty, thirty, or forty millions, not only the institutions in question, but any other political or religious yoke which the convictions or prejudices of the early settlers in question might have prompted them to insist upon as a term of union. Surely there must be a limit, and one, too, that is very soon reached, to such a right. The weight of the dead hand must sooner or later be lifted from the shoulder of the living and growing nation. The day must soon come when Governments and Legislatures and peoples will see both the wrongfulness and the folly of trying to project their institutions and opinions into a future which is hidden from their view, and to fasten them upon successors who will claim the right to discard garments which they may think themselves to have outgrown. If there seems to be, as there no doubt may be in such cases, moral wrong somewhere, may not the blame rest upon those who undertook to make agreements for those whom they had no right to bind, rather than upon those who refuse to be bound by such agreements? We state the case strongly for the sake of the argument. Of course there is another side to it, and it would be easy to show that such a view pushed to its extreme would lead to disastrous consequences and destroy the basis of faith between nations. Where then is the line to be drawn, for there must be a limit somewhere? Turning for a moment from the moral to the political aspect of the case, it is easy, we believe, to find a solution of the difficulty in the words, "all that is possible under present circumstances"; for nothing can be much more certain than that, under present circumstances, it is politically and physically impossible for the Dominion Government to coerce Manitoba in a matter in which she has been declared by the highest authority to be within her rights.

TO the considerable and probably increasing number of persons who are utterly sceptical as to the blessings conferred upon the human system by its inoculation with the attenuated virus of certain loathsome diseases, by way of rendering it impervious to the inroads of those diseases in severer forms, the announcement that it is proposed, on the strength of experiments at the Pasteur Institute, to experiment with the system with a view to the prevention of cholera, will add a new terror to life. The fact that modern science has done so much for the amelioration of human ills in various ways is a cause for gratitude and appreciation. But the fact that it has failed and is constantly failing in so many of its experimentations is equally a cause for declining to accept all its hastily formed conclusions, or to submit to every doubtful and dangerous mode of treatment which enthusiasts may proclaim as a talisman against some particular evil. There are not wanting men of high scientific attainments who are rash enough to doubt whether even vaccination is the safeguard against small-pox which it is both popularly and scientifically supposed to be, or whether, even granting its efficacy in the case of that dread disease, its universal application is not the means of spreading the germs of other diseases and thus inflicting life-long injury upon thousands. But be that as it may, there can be little doubt that the wonderful achievements of science in many fields in which it has been applied to practical uses has created a faith in its powers which sometimes borders on superstition. The failure of the Koch system, after it had probably wrought injury to hundreds of those who were voluntarily or involuntarily experimented upon, suggests a caution in regard to other similar "discoveries." Few evidences of the tendency to scientific credulity are more remarkable than the confidence with which reference is constantly made to the Pasteur method as if it were a proved success in the treatment of hydrophobia, though it is, we believe, a statistical fact that there have been more cases of death from hydrophobia in France since it came into somewhat general use than before, and though some of the highest scientific authorities in various parts of Europe have, after investigation, pronounced strongly against its claims.

And now the holocausts of dogs and rabbits and guinea-pigs are, we suppose, to be offered up on scientific altars, with all the horrible tortures which scientific ingenuity can devise, in the hope of discovering a means of propitiating the cholera fiend. That which makes the fact of special interest to the public is the danger that we shall all, one of these days, when the cholera scare is upon the authorities, be required by law to submit ourselves and children to some process of inoculation with we know not what contamination. If only the men of science could succeed in impressing upon the minds of the civic fathers and the people generally the demonstrable fact that these terrible epidemics are propagated by filth and that the natural and sure specific for their eradication is universal cleanliness, the boon to humanity would be indeed beyond all estimation.

MR. GLADSTONE has done what was to be expected from him in taking upon himself the sole responsibility for the non-appointment of Mr. Labouchere, the redoubtable editor of *Truth*, to a Cabinet office. His explicit statement will set the public mind at rest, in regard to the matter, even though it fails to satisfy Mr. Labouchere himself. The improbability that Her Majesty should have gone beyond her prerogative and sought to obtrude her own personal feelings to any extent upon the Prime Minister, in his choice of a Cabinet, was from the first very obvious. Then, it was far from complimentary to the veteran statesman to suppose that, even had she done so, he would have violated the confidence reposed in him by virtue of his office, by making known the fact, which could scarcely have been made known in any other way. He alone would have been, in any case, responsible to Parliament and the people, and it would have been for him to determine whether he would or would not modify his list out of regard for her wishes. The Queen, herself, has too long occupied her high position and has seen too many Ministries formed by the Premiers of her, or rather, of the people's choice, to be in any danger of making such a mistake. It is but attributing to Mr. Labouchere a very human weakness to suppose that he was rather gratified than otherwise to suppose that he had been singled out as a special object of the Royal displeasure, and that, too, by reason of his courage and zeal in the public service in a matter in which the sympathies of the nation were very largely on his side. It is, of course, quite conceivable that Her Majesty may have no special admiration of his career and no special liking for his person. The opposite would be, under the circumstances, rather too much to expect of poor human nature, of which even queens have no doubt their share. But in the face of Mr. Gladstone's distinct avowal, and in the absence of any possible evidence to the contrary, it is in rather bad taste for Mr. Labouchere to persist, as he is said to do, in intimating his suspicion of unconstitutional interference on the part of Her Majesty.

LITERARY circles in England have been a good deal stirred ever since it became known that the famous Althorp library was being offered for sale. This library, housed in Althorp Park, near Northampton, the ancestral home of the great family of Spencer, is the result of the accumulations of generations, and for half-a-century past has been the most magnificent collection of early-printed books ever owned by a private individual. A writer in the *Christian World*, who has more than once had the privilege of inspecting the treasures of this great literary store-house, gives an interesting glimpse at some of its contents. The visitor thus privileged could walk through room after room, the walls of which were "lined from floor to ceiling with quartos and duodecimos," all in rich and many of them in superb bindings—masterpieces of the most skilled workmen of past centuries. . . . On every hand were to be seen long sets of rare travels, great folios full of choice engravings; here a volume of his dictionary enriched by notes in Johnson's hand-writing; there a book splendidly bound by Roger Payne, and containing original sketches from the pen of Flaxman. But interesting and valuable as were the contents of each of the rooms throughout which these treasures were distributed, the enthusiasm of the book-lover would reach the culminating point when he entered the "Old Book-room." Our readers will, we are sure, gladly put up with a somewhat lengthy quotation:—

But as all roads lead to Rome, at Althorp all galleries led to the "Old Book-room." Within this one apartment, twenty-six feet long and twenty feet wide, were contained more rare and precious books than, perhaps, any similar space in England contains. It is reported that the official