

ease hospital, that the religious preferences of patients could be consulted in the matter, not only of ministers, but in a large measure, of nurses. An arrangement of this kind would satisfy all but extremists and bigots. If it failed to do so, and certain classes still demanded private or sectarian institutions, these should be supported entirely on the voluntary principle, being under official inspection and supervision, only so far as might be absolutely necessary for the public safety. The sooner all grants from public funds, whether of state or municipality, to sectarian institutions of every kind are withdrawn, the sooner will the only logical and just settlement of the whole question be reached.

The monograph on Crime in Canada recently published by Mr. Geo. Johnson, the Dominion statistician, is a useful and interesting document. Though there are so many modifying causes at work to vary the completeness and accuracy of such statistics from year to year that it is never safe to rely implicitly upon any conclusions drawn from them, yet where carefully compiled, as these no doubt have been, a variety of instructive general inferences can be drawn from them. The statistics cover a period of eleven years, viz., from 1882-1892 inclusive. With regard to the different kinds of crime it appears that taking the decade 1882-1891 by itself, murder and manslaughter show a tendency to decrease, while robbery with violence and burglary show a steady tendency to increase. A very gratifying evidence of the decrease of crime generally, as indicated by the number of convicted criminals, is the fact that while in 1883 there was one conviction to every twenty-six of the population, so that every group of of twenty-six persons would contain, on the average, one person who had been convicted of crime or misdemeanour, the size of the group of which this could be said has steadily enlarged until in 1891 the assertion would be true only of a group containing 153 persons. It is also gratifying to learn that native Canadians contribute much less than their ratio of criminals, for, while constituting 86½ per cent. of the population, they are responsible for only 68 1-5 per cent. of the crime. It is a surprise to find that the English contribute more largely to the criminal population in proportion to their numbers than other people, the Irish being second and the United States third in the list. Touching the vexed question of the effect of education in diminishing crime, we have the fact that in 1892 more than one-fifth of the convicted criminals were unable to read and write, as against one-sixth in the previous eight years. The illiterates are gradually increasing their proportion, while criminals with elementary education are decreasing accordingly. These are but a few of the interesting deductions which Mr. Johnson draws or enables us to draw from the statistics of crime in the Dominion.

The adoption of Mr. Gladstone's resolution that the Home Rule Bill shall be reported by July 31st marks another stage in an unique struggle. Theoretically, the objections to this mode of forcing a Bill through the House are very many and forcible. Practically, the Government have really no choice between the rigid application of the closure and the virtual abandonment of the Bill, for the session at least. The question has really become one between rule by the majority, albeit a small majority, and rule by the minority. To have hesitated at the last to adopt strong measures would have been really tantamount to a confession on the part of Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues of a want of full faith in the justice and efficacy of their own measure. The Opposition, especially the Unionists under the leadership of Mr. Chamberlain, will no doubt make effective use of the "tyrannical" course of the Government in the coming campaign. Nevertheless there will be this to be said, and the retort should be effective in proportion to its truth, that the chief necessity for the closure arose from the fact that the amendments proposed and the speeches made in Committee against the Bill were obviously not intended to amend or improve but to defeat and destroy it. Had the fact been otherwise, had the discussion and criticism been directed no longer against the principle of the Bill after that principle had been affirmed by the House, but with a view to its improvement, the Government would not have dared to set a limit to the fullest discussion. In this distinction we come perhaps as near as may be to the ground on which the application of the closure may be justified, so far as it is in any case justifiable. No doubt the closure will have the effect of preventing discussion of details which ought to be more fully discussed, but this result will be incidental rather than designed. From the party point of view, Mr. Chamberlain can, we suppose, hardly be blamed for adopting the plan of ignoring the resolution of the House and throwing upon the Government the onus of applying the closure in every possible case. This may be and probably is good party tactics, and Mr. Chamberlain's forte is evidently that of the shrewd tactician rather than the broad statesman. But, in the absence of clearer light, it seems not a little strange that one section of the Opposition should resort to such tactics after the Opposition leader, Mr. Balfour, had formally consented, if the cablegrams are reliable, to the time limit fixed in Mr. Gladstone's resolution.

"Where are we if we once enlist under the banner of the so-called Higher Criticism? What certainty shall we get about anything? Where shall we find ourselves at last when our souls are departing?" These words of the Bishop of Liverpool in a recent sermon are a noteworthy specimen of a kind of substitute for argument which

is becoming far too common in these days. We are continually meeting with similar appeals not to men's reason but to their fears, from the lips and pens of those who fear the effects of literary and historical criticism upon religious faith. What can be more illogical and ineffective as a reply to one who thinks he has discovered a new truth in science or theology than to declare that the establishment of such a truth would shake the foundations of some old dogma, or, in the opinion of the objector, lead to certain undesirable moral results. One would suppose that the first and only question worthy of consideration by a disciple of One who always and everywhere set the highest value upon Truth would be simply the question of evidence. "The truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth," so far as human faculties are capable of attaining it, is surely the only motto worthy of those who should be the leaders of thought and the teachers of morals in our days. The tendency of so-called orthodoxy to take alarm at whatever threatens to bring into question any of the dogmatic forms into which religious thought was cast in the narrow moulds of seventeenth-century thought, is surely unworthy of the honest searcher for truth. A striking example of this ecclesiastical timorousness was afforded in the warfare waged against "Modern Science" twenty-five or thirty years ago. It would be as unwise now to accept at once the hasty deductions of the Higher Criticism, as it would have been to fall in with the crude generalizations of the scientists of that earlier period. But surely the influence of every apostle of truth should be uniformly in favour of the freest investigation in every field of inquiry, scientific or religious. The highest tribute that can be paid to revealed truth is the utter fearlessness of the believer who courts the profoundest and most critical investigation of the foundations of his faith. To seek to scare inquirers from any path of research by holding up the bugbear of alleged uncertainties of creed or moral dangers, is unworthy of the followers of Him who fearlessly declared "I am the Truth," thus identifying Himself with the results of all honest and devout inquiry to the end of time.

At the last meeting of the Historical Section of the Canadian Institute, a few weeks ago, on motion of Dr. Canniff, a delegation was appointed to wait on Sir Oliver Mowat to ask for a small grant to aid in the collecting of letters, papers, and other documents relating to the early history of Upper Canada, and relics of pioneer life in the Province. The delegation was courteously received, but no answer has yet been given. The Pioneer and Historical Association of the Province of Ontario, which is composed of representatives of the Historical Societies in different parts of the