

WE have not now space to present adequately what is after all the test question for Canada in regard to such an arrangement as that proposed by Mr. McGoun. We must therefore, for the present at least, dismiss with a word a phase of the subject which would need for its adequate discussion a lengthy article. We refer to the commercial advantages offered. Mr. McGoun wisely recognizes the fact that a change involving consequences so costly and far reaching must be based upon considerations of mutual advantage. Patriotic sentiment alone is insufficient either to bring about the proposed Federation or to maintain it when effected. What is the compensation offered to the colonies, or, to be specific, let us say to Canada? It would be idle to suppose that any mere honour and prestige derived from having a feeble voice in the management of the British Empire would be deemed by the somewhat matter-of-fact Canadian a sufficient return for all the political expense involved in the inevitable surrender of a certain portion of his prized self-government, and the pecuniary expense involved not only in carrying out the Parliamentary and other arrangements referred to, but in contributing his share to the maintenance of the Imperial army and navy on the European scale. As Mr. McGoun himself admits, Canadians could not be made to feel that they need any particular military defence. The answer to the question, though wrought out with great skill and presented in its best form, may really be resolved into a sentence. It is the imposition by the Mother Country of a system of taxes upon certain imports in order to raise revenues for Imperial purposes and at the same time discriminate in favour of the productions of the colonies as against foreign nations. This trade policy, attractive as it may seem to the colonies, will prove, we venture to prophesy, not as it is intended to be, the pivotal structure upon which the whole scheme must turn, but the rock upon which it must split. In the absence of some reliable indication that the people of the British Islands, after their experience of the advantages of free trade and in view of their relations, present and prospective, to all the nations with which they do the lion's share of the world's commerce, can be persuaded by any inducements the colonies can offer to jeopardize this trade, and increase the cost of living to themselves, by the re-imposition of taxes upon food products, we must simply decline to regard this feature of the scheme as a matter for discussion. As we all know, the question is not a party one, nor is it regarded as in any sense an open one, in Great Britain. The leaders of both parties are equally emphatic in regarding any such trade policy as simply out of the question. On the other hand some such policy is obviously a *sine qua non* of the movement, so far as Canada is concerned. May we not, then, rest the discussion here, until the advocates of Imperial Federation can bring forward some tangible evidence of a willingness on the part of the leaders of political thought in the Mother Country to even consider this first and indispensable condition of the proposed Federation?

SIR DANIEL WILSON'S partial enumeration of the gifts which have been received from all quarters of the world in aid of the restoration of the library of the University over which he presides, illustrates in a most gratifying manner the breadth of sympathy pervading the commonwealth of letters. It seems, indeed, not unlikely that the calamity of the University may one day prove to have been a blessing in disguise by creating a wider and deeper interest in its work, and imparting new and stronger impulses, such as years of uniform prosperity would scarcely have begotten. The latter portion of Sir Daniel's address at the recent Annual Convocation of the University of Toronto was an eloquent and masterly defence of higher education. Of this plea it has been pertinently observed by one of the city dailies that it was "as remarkable for its force as it is that there should be any necessity for it." The question whether there is really any necessity for it in this day and in this country is one which must have suggested itself to many hearers and readers of this admirable address. It is true, as Sir Daniel observed, that an outcry against the mischievous diffusion of knowledge reaches us from Russia and finds a sympathetic echo in the breast of the ex-Chancellor of Germany. But is it true that there is "a tendency among our own intelligent working classes to regard with jealousy and disfavour anything beyond the Public School work, as though High Schools and colleges were designed solely for a privileged caste and not for the people?" We should be sorry to think so and shall be disappointed if the representatives and organs of the working

classes do not hasten to repudiate the inference. May it not be that Sir Daniel, listening to the utterances of the classes referred to from his elevated position as President of a State University, has failed to put himself at the point of view of the intelligent labourer? Is it not the case that the objection, of which we occasionally hear, is directed not against the higher institutions or the higher culture, in themselves, but against these institutions as supported and this culture as imparted at the expense of the many who cannot hope to share directly in their benefits? We do not pronounce an opinion here upon the soundness of the view suggested. We know, as indeed Sir Daniel Wilson's eloquent words sufficiently prove, that it is possible to construct a powerful argument to show that the money expended on High Schools and Colleges and Universities is indirectly profitable to the working classes even materially, to say nothing of a higher kind of benefit, to an extent far exceeding the cost to them in additional taxation. At the same time it must be admitted that there is force in the plea of the poor labourer who thinks it unjust that he should be compelled to contribute for the support of institutions whose advantages he cannot by any possibility secure for his own children. The question whether, in these days when millions upon millions are constantly being given for the extension of old universities and the foundation of new ones, the interests of higher education may not be safely trusted to the liberality of men of wealth and public spirit is certainly a debatable one. Still more is it worthy of consideration whether it has not been hitherto too much the tendency in both State and voluntary institutions of learning to regard quality rather than quantity as of the highest value in education, and whether a large proportion of the money given to both might not be made the means of doing a vastly greater amount of good if expended in such a way as to bring the best possible educational advantages within the reach of the greatest possible number. While in this way the chief objection to the expenditure of public funds for educational purposes would be removed, it would not, perhaps, be hard to demonstrate that the effect would be promotive rather than the reverse of the highest learning, by bringing a much larger number of the whole people within the sphere of the impulses and ambitions which prompt to lives of study and research, and tend to the development of talent.

IN nothing, perhaps, are our modern democratic institutions in greater danger of disastrous failure than in their attempts at municipal government. We need not go for illustration to the great city across the border, in which the corruption of the civic administration has reached such heights and depths that the clergymen have at last been impelled to come to the front and lead a great reform movement. While no such extremes either of inefficiency or of corruption are to be found in Canadian cities, it is none the less true that the administration even of Toronto reflects anything but credit upon the genius of its citizens for self-government. Passing by such well-worn and yet tempting themes as the Esplanade, the water-works, the Don improvements, etc., we have only to glance at the questions arising out of the prospective taking over of the street railways to find a striking instance of the incompetency to which we refer. It is admitted by all except an enthusiastic few that it would be folly for the city government, as at present constituted and organized, to attempt to manage for the citizens the railway which is shortly to become the property of the city. The consequence is that, after paying the very large sum that will no doubt be exacted as the price of purchase, our Civic Councillors will be obliged immediately to put the property again out of their hands, and into those of a private company. That is to say, not only will the citizens lose to the extent of the handsome profit which some enterprising company will expect to make as middlemen managing the concern, but in the future as in the past the interest of the management will be on the side of giving the citizens the smallest amount of accommodation practicable in return for the largest amount of money, whereas, the road being the property of the taxpayers, precisely the opposite principle should prevail. What a confession of incompetency is, then, implied in the admission that the authorities, to whom the business of the corporation has been entrusted by the suffrages of the rate-payers, cannot be trusted to select and appoint capable and honest men to manage the street railway for them! What stronger condemnation could be pronounced upon our present system. Surely the time cannot be far off when some one will arise with genius enough to devise a municipal system that can be trusted to oversee the business of the city and take care of the

property and rights of the citizens. Probably a much harder task would be to persuade the rate-payers to accept such a system, and to appoint, irrespective of party or ward, or personal feeling, the right men to administer it. Perhaps even this is not too much to hope for at some not distant day.

WHAT is to be the final outcome of the struggle between capital and labour, or is it a thing which can have, from its very nature, or rather from the human nature which begets it, no finality? Time was, not long since, when there seemed some reason to hope that a gradual approach was being made towards a better understanding between employer and employed. Now, on the contrary, the battle seems to gather strength and fierceness from day to day. In England, in particular, the hand of the labourer is against the employer and that of the employer against the labourer, and the day of peace seems farther off than ever. Combinations of capital are being formed to meet combinations of labour; strikes and lockouts are multiplying, and the whole nation is in a state of disquiet in consequence. As if still further to complicate the situation, a plane of cleavage has revealed itself in the trade unions themselves. The old unionism and the new have come into conflict, and at the recent Congress at Liverpool the new or socialistic unionism won the victory by getting the Congress to commit itself to an eight-hour labour-day. The significance of this result does not yet fully appear. William Clarke, writing in the *Christian Union*, points out that the difference between the two parties was not nearly so fundamental as has been supposed. Both parties, with a few exceptions, were in favour of the eight-hour day. They differed in opinion only as to the best method of securing it. But that is a question for the unions themselves. The question in which the public is specially interested is how to get rid of the perpetual strife and disorder, and bring about a permanent peace. Few will be persuaded to accept Mr. Andrew Carnegie's view that there is no labour problem. To adopt that theory would be to put ourselves in the position of the pedestrian who deliberately shuts his eyes and then declares that there is no obstacle before him—that the wall he is approaching does not exist, because he cannot see it. Such a philosophy may be comforting, but the illusion is liable to be rudely dispelled at any moment by a disagreeable experience. There remain, Mr. Clarke thinks, but two alternatives, Lord Derby's plan of keeping a ring fence around the combatants and leaving them to fight it out between themselves, and some mild form of State socialism. The former might do very well were it not that the wheels of industry are constantly being blocked, and social progress interrupted, while the contest lasts. As for the socialistic panacea, which has, we must in justice hasten to explain, nothing in common with the disorganized lawlessness sometimes advocated under that name, its meaning must be better defined and its practicability more clearly demonstrated, before it can make much headway in public estimation. As Mr. Clarke conceives it, it is simply regulation by the State. "Regulation of our huge industrial system," he argues, "there must be; and the question is whether it shall be regulated by capitalists in their interests; or by workers in their interests; or by the community in the interests of all." Having set out to state the problem, not to solve it, we may leave it to the reader to choose between these different solutions or to devise a better than either.

THE McKinley tariff, which is now a fixed fact, is naturally a prominent topic of discussion both in England and in Canada. There is great diversity of opinion in the Mother Country as to the probable effect of the tariff upon British commerce and manufactures. While some of the leading journals take a gloomy view and anticipate disastrous effects upon certain lines of British industry, others either make light of the matter or anticipate that any injury inflicted upon special trades will be amply compensated for by the stimulus given to ocean traffic. It is not to be wondered at that such differences of opinion prevail across the ocean, when even here in Canada, where it might be supposed possible to estimate effects with almost mathematical certainty, differences of opinion scarcely less marked are expressed. Here, however, these are largely the outcome of the party spirit which unhappily obtrudes itself on all occasions. The most notable utterances during the week past have been those of the Premier, and the Ministers of Justice and Marine in Halifax. The refrain of every speech was fearlessness in regard to the American tariff and a resolve to seek extension of trade with the Mother Country, and with the West Indies, the Australias.