

THE *Edmonton Bulletin* publishes a harrowing report of an alleged interview between Mr. Hayter Reed, the Assistant Indian Commissioner in the North-West, and certain Indian chiefs, some of whose people are said to have suffered and died for want of food and clothing. Chief Alexander, for instance, is reported as saying that thirty had died on his reserve, of sickness and hunger, among them five of his own children. Other chiefs told similar tales of suffering through want of supplies promised by the Government. If half of these sad tales is true, the Indian Department must stand convicted of culpable neglect and inefficiency, not to say heartless indifference or cruelty. The excuse said to have been offered by Mr. Reed is, in effect, that the Government delayed purchasing supplies, in the hope of being able to procure them from farmers in the district, and failing that, the contractor was obliged to bring them from Winnipeg, and was unable, through various delays and accidents, to reach the poor people in time to prevent suffering and death. Such a defence is surely insufficient. The Indian Department should by this time have had sufficient experience to enable its officials to guard against such contingencies, and the sums annually voted by Parliament must be ample, if properly administered, to save the poor Indians from perishing for want of food. The stories, if true, are a sad reproach to Canada, and throw a heavy responsibility on those whose want of foresight or energy has led to such calamitous results. Honour and justice, not to say Christian charity, demand that inquiry be made just as strictly as if the sufferers had been of our own colour.

It must be not a little discouraging to the many Canadians who are declaring their desire and determination to perpetuate British connection at all hazards, whether by means of an imperial federation or otherwise, to note with what complacency some leading English statesmen seem to contemplate a different destiny for us. Mr. Chamberlain, in his speech before the Toronto Board of Trade a few weeks since, did not shun the use of ill-omened words, or wince, as he might have been expected to do, when using them to denote the results which would in his opinion follow should a certain commercial policy be adopted. And now the veteran and venerable John Bright stands up to predict that, if the economical facts should prove so strong as to lead to an end which he is "perfectly certain will be accomplished," there will result "a tendency hardly resistible to get over the sentiment that it is better for Canadians to be associated politically with Great Britain than with the United States." Can it be that the views of the school of statesmen who were anxious to cut the North American colonies adrift a quarter of a century or so ago are being revived amongst English Liberals? It would certainly be grateful to Canadians who do not hesitate to declare their loyalty to Britain on all occasions, if British statesmen would protest a little more when discussing the contingency of final separation.

THE proceedings of the Baptist Convention, which met in Guelph last week to settle the educational policy of the denomination, are not without interest for the educated public. The two questions submitted to the large body of delegates assembled, the one regarding the location of the Arts College, soon to be erected, the other its relation to the Provincial University, had been very fully discussed for months in the denominational organ and other journals, and the discussion was continued with much animation for two days at Guelph. The choice of Toronto instead of Woodstock as the site of the new institution will commend itself to most judgments. The decision in favour of independence, rather than federation, leaves more room for difference of opinion, but no one can question that the representatives of the Churches had a perfect right to decide, as they did by an overwhelming majority, in favour of complete independence. The endowment of McMaster University, which is now between \$900,000 and \$1,000,000 should enable the new college to make an excellent start. The presence of another university, so well founded, side by side with those already existing can hardly fail to have a healthy and stimulating effect, especially if, as is claimed, the new institution adopts educational methods and ideals quite different from those of the national university. Should it succeed in developing its distinctive policy with energy and ability it is possible that friendly rivalry, and greater variety in educational processes and results, may prove in the end quite as beneficial to the higher education in the province, as the greater scholastic uniformity that would have resulted from federation or consolidation.

A CIRCULAR recently sent out by the Toronto Board of Trade not only elicited a very hearty and unanimous chorus of condemnation of the "bucket shops" as demoralizing and indefensible gambling establishments, but proved that these pernicious institutions exist in much larger numbers

and operate on a far more extensive scale in the cities and towns of Canada than could have been otherwise supposed. As a result of the agitation which the *Montreal Witness* probably deserves the credit of commencing, the Hon. Mr. Abbott has introduced in the Senate a Government Bill for the suppression of these shops in a very prompt and unceremonious manner. It provides that persons engaged in making bucket shop transactions shall be treated as guilty of a misdemeanour, and be liable to imprisonment for a period not exceeding five years, and to a fine not exceeding five hundred dollars for each offence; and frequenters of bucket shops shall be liable to imprisonment for one year. The moral sentiment of the country will heartily approve of these vigorous measures to root out a pestilent evil. But in what respect do the operations of the bucket shops differ in principle from many of those on what are regarded as legitimate stock exchanges? or how can the law which condemns the one logically stop short of laying its hands upon the other?

THE Prohibition crusade is still being pushed with great vigour in many parts of the United States, but an important limit has been set to the power of individual States to interfere with the traffic by the recent decision of the Supreme Court, that the law passed by the Legislature of Iowa two years ago, prohibiting railroad companies from carrying liquor into the State unless the railroad company could produce the certificate of a County Auditor showing the consignee to have legal authority to sell the liquor, is null and void, as being in conflict with the Interstate Act of Congress. With a view to counteract this check, bills have been introduced into both Houses of Congress to prohibit a railroad bringing into a State articles which the roads within the same State are not permitted to transport. To such legislation the objection, supposed to be fatal, is raised, that Congress has no power to prohibit the importation of liquors into one State from another, and cannot delegate to a State a power it does not itself possess. Meanwhile a resolution has been carried in the U. S. Senate for appointing a commission of five commissioners, not all of whom shall be either advocates of prohibitory legislation or of total abstinence, to investigate to the fullest extent, and from all sides, economical, political, and moral, the traffic in alcoholic liquors. This seems a wise and statesmanlike proceeding, and if the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, succeeds in choosing the right men for the work, their report should be a document of very great value as a guide to future legislation.

THE death of Chief Justice Waite, of the Supreme Court, has called forth expressions of profound regret throughout the length and breadth of the United States. Judge Waite was born in Connecticut in 1816, and graduated from Yale College in 1831 in a class which included several other men who afterwards became eminent, amongst them Mr. Evarts, Mr. Pierrepont, and Professor Silliman. He was admitted to the bar in Ohio in 1839, and spent the greater part of his professional life in Toledo. He represented the United States before the Arbitration Tribunal at Geneva in 1871, when he presented the American case with a skill and force which attracted much attention, and no doubt contributed largely to secure an award so favourable to his country. He was appointed by President Grant to succeed Chief Justice Chase in 1873, and had the great satisfaction of seeing his nomination unanimously confirmed by the Senate. During his term in that high and responsible position he had a number of grave constitutional questions before him. His discussions were generally admitted to be eminently fair and dispassionate, his judgments sound. As a lawyer he was considered sagacious and painstaking rather than original or brilliant. As a man and a citizen his character was irreproachable.

THE curious suit of General Badeau against the estate of the late General Grant is attracting much attention just now in the United States. The charges and counter-charges in the published correspondence are very numerous, but the condensed facts seem to be that General Badeau was employed by General Grant to assist him in preparing a part of the *Memoirs* for the press. General Badeau's duty, by his own admission, was not in any wise to contribute original matter, but consisted in "suggestion, revision, and verification." The remuneration agreed on was \$5,000 of the first \$20,000 received for the book, and \$5,000 of the next \$10,000—in all \$10,000—a liberal payment certainly for the assistance as described. When the book promised to become very profitable General Badeau asked for an entirely new arrangement, even going so far as to demand \$1,000 a month till the work was finished, and ten per cent of all the eventual profits. General Grant replied in vigorous terms, and denounced the proposal as "preposterous." This resulted in a rupture, and the refusal of General Badeau to continue the work for which he was engaged. After his death,