

and interests of the whole people, should make it a matter of conscience to see that any incidental advantages accruing from the public service should be fairly divided, in proportion to numbers, between the respective parties. Does the *Globe* think this too transcendental, or "savoured of cheap hypocrisy?" Is Liberalism in politics, then, nothing but a name? Will the *Globe* tell us what is the attitude of the Liberal party of Ontario towards civil service reform? It can hardly be denied that had the Mowat Government so desired, it could, during its long lease of office, have had the civil service system of Ontario as firmly fixed on a non-partisan basis as is that of England. Does it not approve of such a system on principle? "All parties do it and will continue to do it," is an argument that would not sound well from the lips of Alexander Mackenzie, or Edward Blake, or William Gladstone.

THE peculiar punishment inflicted in the case of the ten-year-old boy, who was convicted by a magistrate's court in Cobourg the other day of having stabbed a boy companion, suggests some uncomfortable reflections. The magistrate was undoubtedly right in refusing to send a lad of that age to prison, there to breathe an atmosphere which could scarcely have failed to stimulate his criminal propensities. The magistrate is reported as further observing that if the boy were sent to the reformatory at Penetanguishene for five years, his morals might not be improved when he came out, and that but for the expense to the municipality he would have preferred to send him to the Industrial School at Mimico. What he did do was to sentence the young culprit to receive, at the hands of his father, twenty-four lashes on the bare back with a birch rod, and to complete the term of one month's close confinement in the county jail. The flogging, we are told, was duly and conscientiously administered, and the boy remanded to close confinement. The magistrate's novel mode of punishment was, it is said, generally commended by the townspeople as wise and salutary. We cannot join the chorus of approbation, even though the same plan was recently adopted in a similar case by an English magistrate. Assuming, as we surely may, that the main object of all concerned was not to deal out vengeance, but to save the boy if possible from a life of crime, and to deter other boys from the commission of similar crimes, the main question is as to the fitness of the punishment to accomplish either or both of those ends. Some deterrent effect it might, perhaps, have in the case of others, though as those likely to commit similar offences could not be present to get the full benefit of the object-lesson, and as but a small number, if any, would ever know of it, and especially in view of the rarity of such crimes by children of tender years the value of the infliction as a deterrent cannot certainly have been very great. As to the boy himself, it is at least questionable whether the operation would not be quite as likely to strengthen his revengeful impulses as the opposite. There are, no doubt, many more objectionable punishments than the infliction of intense physical pain, and it is conceivable that the involuntary association of such pain with the act for which it was administered might deter the boy from a repetition of the crime in the madness of another fit of anger. On the whole it is doubtful if this new mode of administering justice can be reconciled with sound penological principles. But there are two points in connection with the affair to which, as it seems to us, attention should be specially called. First, the magistrate's evident belief that the Provincial Reformatory is not a place of reform. Second, the fact that while he had confidence in the Mimico Industrial School as a reforming agency, he was unable to give the boy the benefit of it for the want of a little money. Are not both of these humiliating admissions? This is not the first case in which of late it has been more than hinted that the Reformatory is little or no better than a common prison as a place of moral reform. Surely this ought not to be so, and the matter of management demands investigation. As to the pecuniary difficulty, in the case of the Industrial School, if, as we have no doubt, that is the place to which the boy should have been sent, it is clear that if the father was able to meet the expense he should have been compelled to do so. If he was utterly unable, what must be thought of the wisdom and spirit of the municipality which would let so small a matter stand in the way of doing its best to save the boy and make him a useful citizen, especially when it might have looked to the lad himself to make repayment in after years. Are we not yet far from the ideal Christian civilization?

IN deciding in favour of a system of night schools for the technical training of artisans and others who are unable to avail themselves of existing opportunities, the City Council is moving in the right direction. It is to be regretted that the movement has to be delayed in order to obtain legislative sanction, but it is scarcely conceivable that the Legislature, when it meets, can put any obstacle or unnecessary delay in the way of so laudable a movement. We have not seen the plan proposed—if, indeed, one has been outlined—but we hope the instruction provided, while sufficiently elementary to meet the wants of the least informed, may also be thorough and comprehensive. Whether the present system of protection to home manufactures be continued or not, the success of Canada as a manufacturing country will always—other things being equal—be in direct ratio with the skill and intelligence of her artisans. As we have before pointed out, this is a work in which the universities, both provincial and independent, could and should afford invaluable assistance, either by cooperating heartily with the city authorities, or by establishing courses of familiar and practical lectures on their own account. The remark applies to those located in other cities and towns as well as to those in Toronto. We are sure it would not be beneath the dignity of the universities or their most learned professors to engage heartily in this work—a work which would give them a hold upon the public and a place in popular appreciation which they cannot otherwise hope either to gain or to retain. Why should they not vie with each other in thus demonstrating their right to be, and proving that their mission is not merely to fit a few dozens or hundreds of young men for the learned professions, but also to be the friends and promoters of all intelligence and all knowledge?

FOLLOWING an easily understood law of association, the mind reverts to the praiseworthy and not unsuccessful efforts that are being made to bring some of the great English universities into touch with the people, who have hitherto seemed to move on an entirely distinct plane. That which just now suggests itself is not so much the "University Extension" work, though that is worthy of all imitation, as that which is being done through the agency of Toynbee Hall, and similar institutions, which are being founded in the great centres of population. Through all time the seemingly unavoidable tendency alike of the ancient schools of philosophy and of the great universities whose history is coeval with the modern revival of learning has been to set a great gulf between the life and thought of the scholar and student and that of the toiling masses. One of the most hopeful movements of this unique age is that whose object is to do away with this undesirable state of things; and, now that philosophy is being brought down from heaven to earth, to introduce her to the homes of the common people. This, though not the primary object of the founders of Toynbee Hall, is becoming an important part of its remarkable work. In a late number of the *Christian Union*, Mr. Robert A. Woods gives an interesting sketch of this institution and its operations. The educational work, he tells us, takes almost equal rank with the general social work. There is a variety of courses in different grades, by residents, associates and their friends. The students are both old and young, and, instead of being all well-to-do, are nearly all poor. They come with an eagerness which might put to shame many of the university students proper to the lectures, which are made as simple and practical as possible. For instance, one of the most interesting classes is that in Political Economy, in which the lecturer is younger than most of his pupils. The class, made up of from twenty-five to forty men of the artisan class, will listen intently for an hour and a-half, often interposing questions. Added to these are series of lectures by public and literary men, admittance to which is free. In this way the people of the East End of London have an opportunity of listening to many of the foremost men of the nation every winter. Admission to about half the regular classes is also free. These are but some of the many ways in which Toynbee Hall acts as an educational centre. Of its libraries, clubs, evening classes at the board schools, etc., we have not space to speak, nor yet of the remarkable social and charitable work, which is the chief reason for the existence of the institution. We have been led to refer to it specially on account of its suggestiveness of the manner in which the professors and students in our own colleges, adapting their plans and efforts to the very different environment, might become, if not leaders, at least most effi-

cient helpers in the social, charitable and educational work, for which there is but too ample room and need in our Canadian cities.

UNDER what circumstances have the leaders of a popular party, such as that to which the Gladstonians belong, a right to use such a weapon as Parliamentary obstruction? This is the question to which Lord Hartington, one of the most moderate and sagacious of British statesmen, addressed himself in a recent speech at York. The form of the question implies that there may be cases in which obstruction is justifiable, and that Lord Hartington tacitly admits. Such cases are, as defined by him, those in which some unjust step is threatened which can never be retraced, some act of spoliation, for instance, that once committed is irreparable. On what, he asked, do the rights of a democracy depend if not on the power of a freely-elected majority to use that majority—unless in the most extreme cases, when its use would be in a sense its conspicuous abuse—for the carrying out of the popular will? If that will is to be foiled by the endless talk of minorities, the power of the democracy is destroyed, the authority of Parliament is crushed, the popular sceptre is broken. Setting out from these premises, Lord Hartington goes on to apply the test above formulated to the two measures against which obstruction was deliberately and avowedly and successfully used during the late session. These were the Irish Crimes Act and the Licensing Bill. Whether Lord Hartington succeeds or fails to show conclusively that in neither of these cases was the step proposed so violent and unwarranted, the injustice attempted so clear and irremediable, as to justify the use of the desperate weapon which strikes at the authority of Parliament, and refuses to the popular majority the use of its own fairly-earned advantage, it is not to our present purpose to enquire. What strikes us in the matter is the utter hopelessness of getting rid of obstruction on any such principles, since, in order to apply them, it would in each case be necessary first to bring the minority to admit that the legislation to which they are desperately opposed does not come within the category of measures against which obstruction is permissible and right. This will generally be found to be the very question at issue. No obstructing minority is in the least likely to admit that the consequences involved are not of the most serious and far-reaching and irreparable kind. What, then, is to be done? Is Parliamentary authority to be destroyed and democratic government proved a failure? Two or three questions, it seems to us, suggest at least the direction in which the solution must be sought. Take the cases referred to as concrete examples. Had not Parliament already in its rules of procedure the means by which, if vigorously used, the obstruction might have been overcome? If not, had it not power to construct and adopt such rules? We should shrink from pointing the British Parliament to the American Congress as a model in most respects, but late proceedings connected with the passing of the McKinley Bill show that it is found possible there to put down obstruction very effectively when once the majority have resolved to do so. Even the Trades Union Congress which lately met in England, notwithstanding the turbulence of some of its meetings, showed, the *Spectator* being witness, that it knew how to prevent obstruction from putting a stop to business. Why did not the majority in Parliament enforce, and, if necessary, enact similar rules? Would it have hesitated to do so had it been as sure of its majority outside of the House as it was of that within? In short, it seems to us that when the majority feel it to be their duty, in the interests of good government, to pass a certain measure, it becomes their duty to adopt and enforce such rules as will enable them to pass it. When a majority fails to do this it is not easy to avoid one of two inferences. Either it lacks capable and resolute leaders and is weak in consequence, or it is not sure of its majority in the electorate. In the latter case nothing is left but delay, dissolution or compromise.

THE sensation of the week in British politics has been the unexpected arrest of Messrs. Dillon and O'Brien on charges of conspiracy, in inciting tenants not to pay their rents. The real motive which has prompted Mr. Balfour to this sudden and energetic action it is not easy to divine, in the absence of a fuller knowledge of the facts. To suppose, as is alleged by Home Rule sympathizers, that his design is to prevent these advocates from making their proposed American tour, is to give him credit for much less shrewdness than he has hitherto displayed. He can hardly be so ignorant of human nature as not to foresee