

the causes which produce them in full operation. The argument proves too much. If logically applied it would strike at the root of most of our hospitals and other charities, for there can be no doubt that in very many cases at least, the sickness, poverty, and insanity, which give rise to these institutions, are the result of the mistakes or wrong-doing, either of the sufferers or of others, perhaps of parents, or grandparents. If the establishment of such curative institutions were in any way antagonistic to the adoption and use of the wisest preventive measures, there would be great force in the objection, but we have no doubt that many of those who are most active in thus seeking the relief or cure of the victims of their own vicious habits, will be found foremost among the promoters of all proper means for lessening or removing temptations to self-destructive indulgence. The projected institution will, we may be sure from the history of similar institutions elsewhere, be a blessing to many, and the public-spirited gentlemen who have taken the matter in hand deserve well of their fellow-citizens. We cannot doubt that the balance of the stock will be speedily taken up. On one point, we confess, we should be glad of a little more light. It is not quite clear whether the institution is to be run on purely business principles, or partly on philanthropic principles. It is proposed to make provision for a certain number of paying patients, and the income from this source, at the rates proposed, will, it is calculated, yield a profitable return on the capital invested. Is this possible profit to be limited in any way, so as to insure that the institution may not hereafter degenerate into a mere money-making establishment? If not, is there not danger that commercial considerations may some day interfere seriously with the higher and nobler aim, "the physical, social, moral, and spiritual improvement of the patient?"

PROBABLY the most serious charge of unfair dealing that has been brought against Premier Mowat's Administration is that of the so-called "gerrymander" of the City of Toronto. Seeing that the result of the peculiar method applied in the case of Toronto alone, is unquestionably to enable the friends of the Government to elect one representative, whereas otherwise, in ordinary circumstances, three opponents would be almost certainly returned, the exceptional arrangement under which electors are permitted to vote for but two candidates in a constituency entitled to three representatives has certainly a suspicious look. It is possible sometimes to apply a sound principle in such a manner as to secure a partisan advantage. Few even of Mr. Mowat's supporters will claim that if Toronto had been certain to return three Government supporters instead of three opponents, the present expedient for guarding the rights of the minority would have been adopted. But apart from any consideration of the motives that may have operated in this particular case, it must be evident to any one on a little reflection that, if it is desirable to obtain a fair expression of the opinions of the whole electorate, some such method of securing minority representation will give much better results than the ordinary system. Suppose, for instance, that some really important political issues were involved and that three-fifths of the Toronto electorate adhered to one party and the remaining two-fifths to the other, what could be more unfair than a system which would enable the three-fifths majority to elect all the members and leave the minority unrepresented? Yet something like this actually happens in every general election to the Dominion Commons, or the Provincial Assembly. Though the whole body of electors in either case may be almost equally divided between the two parties, it usually happens that the successful one elects two-thirds or three-fourths of the whole number of members, leaving the other to that extent without representation. When the ordinary tendencies of the system are helped by a "gerrymander" of the constituencies, the result becomes a positive and glaring injustice. It is not easy to see how the evil can be avoided in the case of constituencies returning but one or two representatives, save, of course, by an honest redistribution of the constituencies. There is a good deal to be said in favour of the cumulative system of voting, though in the absence of an actual test it is hard to say what the effect would be, or whether it might not give rise to greater evils than those it would be designed to cure. But in the case of constituencies returning three representatives the plan now used in Toronto might be adopted with good results. The unfairness in the present instance arises, so far as we can see, wholly out of the fact that this city is alone in having three representatives and the effect is, consequently, to

make the return of one supporter of the Government sure. If all the constituencies, or a number of them impartially selected, were enlarged so as to be entitled to three members on the basis of population, and the method were extended to them without distinction, the result could hardly fail to be favourable to just representation.

WONDERFUL changes have been wrought in British politics within the last half-century by successive extensions of the electoral franchise, but should the limitation of it now proposed in the "one man, one vote" principle, which has been incorporated in the Liberal programme, be carried into effect, as it almost certainly will be before many years, the results will be hardly less far-reaching than those of any of the former radical advances. Sir George Trevelyan, in a recent address to the City of London Liberal Club, made some statements bearing upon the subject which show that plural voting is now a much more potent factor in deciding the issue of elections, and by consequence the legislative policy of the nation, than those unacquainted with the facts would have thought possible. While the humbler householder has but a single vote, his richer neighbour may have from two to fifteen, or indeed to almost any number. Under the system which prevails in this country the practical injustice resulting from plural voting is limited by the necessity of the voter depositing his ballot in person, and his physical inability to be present in more than two or three different polling districts within voting hours on a given day. The consequence is that the new Ontario requirement, that the elector can vote only in the district in which he actually resides on polling day, will affect the result to a much smaller extent than might be supposed. In the mother country, in Middlesex and Surrey at least, and we presume the practice is uniform, it appears that property-holders are actually permitted to record their votes without going into the polling district. The result is, Sir George tells us, that the real residents, in the constituencies named, are swamped by thousands of people who neither reside nor hold property (!) in those divisions. In England and Wales, he computes, there are at least half a million property votes, every one of which may be said to be held by a man who is a resident voter somewhere else. Critical questions affecting property—such as that of the taxation of ground rents—are not even settled by the landowners themselves, but by privileged men, mostly ground-landlords, who have more than one vote. In like manner brewers and owners of public houses may have any number of votes, by the exercise of which they can swamp the opinions of the majority upon the great question of compensating the liquor interest. Other cases of a different character, but less flagrant only in degree, are adduced as showing the essential injustice wrought by the system of plural voting. Under the occupation franchise, for instance, a man who lives away from his shop has two votes, while the man who lives over his shop has but one. It is very evident that the distribution of the franchise in the mother country is yet far from having been placed upon a logical basis, and that the demand for reform in this particular has reason and justice in it.

WHAT will be done when the world becomes full of inhabitants, with no vast habitable spaces left as a refuge for the surplus population of the crowded centres? When wars shall have ceased, as they almost inevitably must at some point in the advance of civilization and science, and when improved sanitation shall have still further diminished the death rate, it would seem that to reach the limit of population will be only a question of time. We do not suppose, however, that the problem need trouble any one now living, however perplexing it may become a few centuries hence. And yet, according to the calculations of Mr. Giffen, the celebrated English statistician, the event must be nearer than most of us may suppose, unless we set our account for a vastly greater density of population than any yet existing. Mr. Giffen, in his evidence a short time since before the Colonization Committee, said that only about 100,000 square miles of territory remain to be occupied in the United States. If this be correct, only about thirty millions more will be required to settle every bit of American soil as densely as the old settled States, and the probability is that these thirty millions will be forthcoming within a quarter of a century. Australasia has, Mr. Giffen reckons, more than five times as much room for immigrants as the United States, and Canada four times as much. South America has, it is true, a little matter of a million and a half of square miles to fill up, but, for some reason not quite apparent, Mr. Giffen

thinks South America unsuited for any immigrants but those of Latin stock. We do not know what allowance he makes for Africa. The great statistician believes that any large scheme of emigration or colonization from Great Britain can now be regarded only as visionary, and that it is time the British people should begin to act as if the outlets for their overflowing population were closed. The conclusion does not, however, greatly alarm him. When they can no longer emigrate, he says, they must begin to educate, meaning, we suppose, that the producing power of the soil, which is of course the only original source of food supply, can be developed to an extent as yet scarcely dreamed of under the unscientific and wasteful methods now in vogue. If even every rood of fertile soil can be made to support its man, as it probably can, the time may come when the whole surface of the islands will swarm with human beings like a hive with bees. Would life be worth living under such conditions? That depends we suppose, on the kind of human beings to be developed.

It has come to be regarded almost as a law of nature, inexorable, however cruel, that to throw open savage lands to settlement and civilization is to put in motion forces that must lead first to the retreat and finally to the wreck if not to the extinction of the aboriginal population. But nature cannot at any rate be held accountable for the acceleration of these processes caused by the greed and cruelty too often manifested by the colonizing race. England's record in this respect may, in comparison with that of other nations, be fair, but even in the present generation it has not been free from dark blots. Some of these have been brought to the attention of the British public by the Aborigines Protection Society, whose annual report we find summarized in the *London News*. The report begins by attributing the famine around Suakim to the bad advice Englishmen have given to the Egyptians, "leading them to spasmodic and abortive interference with native institutions which would have secured some sort of national progress if left alone." After a passing reference to the "abominations of the protégé system" in Morocco, the report comes to deal with the colonies and protectorates from the Gambia to the mouth of the Niger. Here, it is said, thousands of lives have been sacrificed, mischievous raids made on native tribes, and lawless floggings and tortures inflicted by English officials, "who appear to have discarded all the qualities proper to Englishmen, upon taking service in the Gold Coast or Sierra Leone constabulary." Coming to Swaziland and Zululand, still more emphatic language is used. In the latter "persistent neglect and deliberate abuse of obligations" are said to have been the parents of the present "systematic misrule." Outside of Africa, the state of things reported is little better. In West Australia, "shooting down inconvenient natives" is said to be the practice of some colonists. The report is almost uniformly dark. It mentions, however, the growth of a healthy public opinion "with reference to the treatment of aborigines in most of the Australasian Colonies and in the Canadian Dominion." When the treatment accorded to Canadian Indians is compared with that described in the statements we have quoted, the implied compliment paid us certainly seems deserved. None the less, the Indians of our Northwest have suffered in the past from mal-administration, and it may well be doubted whether we have yet solved the problem of their preservation and civilization.

THE recent annual meeting of the British Liberation Society was naturally a somewhat hopeful gathering of the friends of Disestablishment. Though it might be hard to find much evidence of the progress of their views in England, they were able to look forward with a good deal of confidence to the early triumph of the principle of religious equality in Scotland and Wales. In the Principality the injustice of the Establishment is so glaring, in view of the great numerical superiority of the Dissenters, that its continuance is felt on all hands to be impossible. The recent vote in the Commons is also accepted as virtually decisive in regard to Scotland. Considerable effort has been made by the friends of the Establishment to explain away the significance of this vote, but the stubborn facts of the case cannot be explained away. Those facts are that Dr. Cameron has three times pressed the House of Commons to a vote on his motion "that the Church of Scotland ought to be disestablished and disendowed." In March, 1886, in a Liberal Parliament, the motion was defeated by a majority of 112. In 1887, in a Conservative Parliament, the majority fell to 52. And now in 1890, in a Conservative House,