

understand. But that a man of education and refinement should be able to steel his heart and nerve his arm to take the lives of wife and children whom he loved, rather than have them live to know of his own breach of pecuniary trust; or that a young man of good antecedents and abilities, educated and intelligent, with an attractive and trusting wife beside him, and the world before him, should plan with fiendish deliberation, and carry out apparently without regret or remorse, the murder of a young fellow-countryman whom he had lured across the ocean with false pretences, and should do all this apparently for the sake of a gain so trivial as to be scarcely appreciable beside the horrible guilt of the crime, and the danger of almost certain detection and punishment—such cases as these seem to upset all our preconceived notions of human character and motive and to reveal phases of depravity unique and mysterious. The first of these instances is, as we all know, a fact of very recent history. Far be it from us to put the second in the same category, thus assuming the guilt of an untried man. However impossible we may find it at present to avoid the conclusion to which a lengthening and strengthening chain of circumstantial evidence seems to be irresistibly drawing us, it would be unjust and un-British to forget that the accused is as yet legally innocent. Nor is it beyond the range of the possible that some new discovery at present unimagined may at any moment turn the current of suspicion into another channel, or even clearly establish the innocence of the prisoner. In the presence of a crime so shocking and unaccountable, by whomsoever perpetrated, all other considerations are for the moment swallowed up in the question of the guilt or innocence of the unhappy Burchell. But when these questions of absorbing present interest shall have been settled, others of a different kind will come up for discussion. Among these not least in practical importance will be that of devising some more effective mode of checking and counteracting the villainous traffic in credulity by which it is evident young Englishmen are being lured across the ocean only to find themselves heartlessly deceived and sometimes utterly ruined!

THE Ontario Education Department made a wise change when it some years ago ceased to distribute the grant in aid of Public Schools on the basis of "payments by results," and adopted the present mode of payment by average attendance. The discussion which took place in the House the other day in connection with Mr. Martin's motion in favour of further increasing the grant to poor schools, and of changing the basis of distribution for the benefit of the sparsely settled districts, revealed a pleasing degree of satisfaction with the present methods, and at the same time brought out a commendable readiness to help settlers in new localities. From the general tone of the debate and the remarks of the Attorney-General at its close, it is pretty certain that an addition to the \$25,000 now appropriated for poor schools will be proposed and cordially voted. This appreciation of the disadvantages under which the pioneer settlers in new districts labour in respect to the education of their children speaks well for breadth of view of the members generally. The difficulty in supporting schools is often one of the most serious hindrances to the settlement of such districts. The House must have been no less surprised than pleased to learn from the Minister of Education that the grade of teachers employed in the localities referred to compares well with that of those in the more densely populated and wealthier districts. The fact speaks well for the former, whatever it may imply with reference to the latter. None the less is it in closest accord with the general principle underlying our school system that special aid should be given to those who have special hardships to encounter. We join heartily with the *Globe* correspondent in the House in deprecating the use of the term "Poor Schools," or making the appropriation bear in any respect the appearance of a charity. The correspondent's suggestion of "Pioneer Schools" is worth adopting.

A UNIQUE incident occurred the other day in Parliament when, Mr. Mills having moved an amendment to the motion that the House go into Committee of Supply, the Premier and Cabinet accepted what should have been, according to all precedent, regarded as a motion of want of confidence, and caused it to be carried unanimously. The motion, it is true, affirmed two principles so evidently just, that they ought to be accepted as axioms of administration, viz.: "That in the expenditure of public money the public interest and not party favouritism should control; and in the choice of places for the erection of public

buildings for post office, Custom House and Inland Revenue purposes, regard should be had to the amount of revenue collected and of public business done." Sir John A. Macdonald in promptly approving the motion and declaring his intention of voting for it, gave the House and the public another instance of the ever-ready tact and wit which are among the chief sources of his marvellous success in leadership. The resolution was very cleverly framed, and simply constructed a cap which the Government was challenged to put on by opposing it. To have evaded the issue would have had, to some extent, the same effect. The Premier proved altogether too wise a bird to be caught by so transparent a stratagem. By supporting the resolution he took the most effective course to turn its point and make it harmless. Nevertheless the debate which ensued, if that can be called a debate in which the speeches are all on one side, enabled the members of the Opposition to give instance after instance of alleged partizanship in the distribution of the public funds for the purposes named. The abuse is one which is inseparable from Party Government. It seems impossible to deny that under the present Ottawa Administration it has become notorious and most grievous, and the feeble efforts of the Government speakers to parry the force of the cases presented by speaker after speaker were almost confessions in themselves. Sir John's contention that a Government must take the advice of its supporters, and cannot follow that of a defeated opponent, if accepted, proves too much, and sounds the condemnation of the whole system. If it be true that the friends and supporters of the Government must have the virtual direction of the appropriations for the purposes named in the motion, it clearly follows that constituencies, like those of Prince Edward Island, which return only opponents of the Government, are to be punished by being robbed of their fair share of the public funds. This is carrying out the dictum, "To the victors belong the spoils," with a vengeance. Dr. Weldon defined the sale of parliamentary influence for personal gain as the crime of crimes. Is it really a worse political crime than the abuse of Government influence, and the breach of the greater trust involved in a partizan distribution of the public funds amongst the constituencies? If such a result is inevitable under the present system surely it is high time some better system were adopted, e.g., the constitution of a permanent, non-partizan Commission to make all public appropriations. Were not the people blindly wedded to their parties such debates as the one under consideration would open their eyes and lead to a very sudden and radical reform in the mode of procedure.

DIRECT charges of bribery in elections are, unhappily all too common in the party press, and even on the floors of Parliament, but it is not often that an "honourable" member of the House of Commons avows and glories in his own personal readiness to resort to such means. That distinction is, so far as we have observed, peculiar to Mr. H. H. Cook, member for Simcoe, E. R. The Hansard report of the speech made by Mr. Cook during the debate on Mr. McCarthy's dual language motion contains in some of its parts liberal and even lofty sentiments, such as would do honour to both the head and heart of him who uttered them, were not their effect marred by the shameless avowal with which that speech was closed. Referring, irrelevantly enough, to circumstances connected with his own election, and stung, apparently, by some gestures by which Sir John A. Macdonald suggested the "itching palm," and, we suppose, the means by which the speakers, had soothed it, Mr. Cook proceeded to state that a certain large sum of money had been sent from Ottawa to be added to funds contributed by others, to aid in securing his defeat at the last election. He then proceeded as follows:—"The right honourable gentleman knows so well how these things are done that he cannot afford to impute motives to others. Of course we will say openly and fairly that when we meet a man of that sort we do not intend to give him many advantages over us. If he endeavours to fight us with such weapons we are ready to meet him with the same." Mr. Cook proceeded to explain that he did not wish to be understood as using the "we" in the plural. Here then is what is clearly equivalent to an open admission and avowal by a member, on the floor of the House, that he had resorted to bribery on a large scale, in order to secure his election in the past and that he was ready to do so again in the future. And yet, neither did Sir John A. Macdonald, who it was clearly insinuated had been guilty of the same crime, rise to declare the insinuation a foul calumny, nor did any other

member on either side of the House come forward to rebuke a statement which should have been regarded, were the ethics of party politics as lofty as they should be, as a confession of unfitness to sit in a Parliament whose members should be all honourable men. Of what avail is it to make laws to punish electoral corruption in the courts, if a member of Parliament can boast, even on the floor of the House, of having resorted to it, and yet retain his caste among honourable members!

UNHAPPY Canada! is there really no future for her? Balancing the opinions and demonstrations which meet us day by day, one against another, we seem shut up to the melancholy conclusion that there is nothing for her but national extinction. That she cannot long remain in her present colonial position, everybody admits. Imperial Federation is over and over again shown to be impracticable or impossible, and undesirable, if it were both practical and possible. As to annexation, the people will have none of it, and if they would it would be national extinction. Independence, then, remains the only hope, as it is, indeed, the only project which really carries within itself the promise and potency of nationality. But independence, we are told, is hopeless. Why? Because Canada is but "a string of territories, geographically divided from each other, commercially unconnected, and devoid of any national boundary, either physical or ethnographical, such as now constitutes the Dominion. Without a partnership of the heart, without identity of character, without community of aspiration, is there any object in creating a separate community, or any chance of its holding together when it has been created?" This quotation condenses within two sentences almost everything that can be said in answer to the question we have asked. The difficulties are confessedly formidable; are they necessarily insurmountable? Are they not, too, somewhat exaggerated? Though geographically divided, the provinces are united by railways and water-courses. They are not wholly devoid of commercial connection, or of natural physical boundaries, and they have, as all travellers perceive, at least the beginnings of ethnographical, or at least of distinctively Canadian characteristics. Rhetorical overstatement adds force to style, but is sometimes mischievously misleading. We allude to this subject, however, not to deny the existence of very serious difficulties in the way of future independent nationality, but to make a single observation. When we complain that there is now no "partnership of the heart," in other words, no common spirit of Canadian patriotism to hold the provinces together as a nation, are we not confusing effect and cause? Can the national spirit exist before the nation? Is nationality the offspring of patriotism, or patriotism the offspring of common nationality? Is it not, in other words, rather unreasonable to expect a Canadian national feeling to spring forth full-fledged before there is a Canadian nation to beget the feeling? May it not be that a consciousness of sharing the responsibilities, the dangers, and the grand possibilities of distinctive Canadian national life is the very thing needed to draw the provinces together in a partnership of the heart and a "community of aspiration?"

THE recent disaster to the University of Toronto, and the need of prompt and liberal measures for its restoration, naturally tend to bring under review the ground upon which the higher institutions of learning are entitled to claim support from the public funds. The general question is too large for discussion in a paragraph, but there is one phase of it at which we cannot forbear to glance. Is a University, or let us say a College education, a thing to be desired for its own sake, or only as a means to an end? Is it a thing to be coveted by all, irrespective of native abilities, or is it fit only for the select and clever few? Is it a training ideally desirable for men and women as such, without regard to prospective occupations, or is the College performing its proper and highest function when it is preparing a limited number for learned professions and pursuits? Most of those who have given any thought to such questions are familiar with the ideas of Sir William Hamilton and other educationists and philosophers whose views agree with his. Are such views not only Utopian but erroneous? Is it a mischievous, as well as an impracticable dream, that leads enthusiasts to hope for a good time coming when higher education, the highest education available, shall be regarded as the birthright of the race; or to put it in a somewhat less startling shape, when a College education