

of Canada no harm to look at the matter from Mr. Rives' point of view. His comparison of the respective debt-burdens of the two countries is rather startling. We have not the means at hand for testing the accuracy of his figures, and his data are not given, but assuming their correctness, the fact should certainly "give us pause." His comparison of the Dominion with the State of Pennsylvania is well adapted to remind us that our resources are, relatively speaking, in a singularly undeveloped state. Mr. Rives also sets the difficulties in the way of Commercial Union in a very clear and strong light. Mr. Goldwin Smith's address, Mr. Rives' analysis of the situation and Mr. Smith's reply together contain matter enough to employ the best Canadian minds for a good while to come. Is it, or is it not true that Canada's paucity of population, and the undeveloped state of her resources are, as Mr. Goldwin Smith explained, due to her commercial isolation? If so, how is that isolation to be brought to an end, and a healthful stimulating business intercourse with our neighbours and the outside world to be gained in its place? If, as Mr. Rives declares, "interest and sentiment are in the balance," if, in other words, the loss of all hope of independent national existence is the price Canadians will have to pay for access to the markets of the continent, the reply unmistakably is that Canada's choice is already made. She will not sell her individuality for any commercial advantages whatever. If annexation is the only condition on which she can be admitted to trade more freely with her neighbour, then she must do as best she can without such trade. Such is clearly her present conclusion. But why should Mr. Rives assume that we are shut up to these alternatives? Why should he fail to take account of the possibility of the two peoples freely trading with one another without either a political or commercial union? They have done so before to a large extent, with mutual profit. Why does he quietly ignore the fact that the freest mutual intercourse would be no less beneficial to the United States than to Canada, and that it is possible for his country to possess it, without either becoming responsible for Canada's heavier debt, or limiting her freedom in tariff legislation by any system of Commercial Union? The great fallacy that seems to underlie the discussion to a very large extent, is the tacit assumption that the opening of markets to another country is purely and simply a *giving* process. May it not with equal justice be regarded as a taking process, seeing that the United States cannot give us her markets without taking our products, and greatly profiting by the transaction? The fact that while enriching her own people she will also be enriching her neighbours, ought not to weigh unfavourably with a great and magnanimous nation. The richer and more populous Canada becomes the better for her next door neighbour, and *vice-versa* if they but act the neighbourly part.

LAWS many and stringent have been from time to time enacted or proposed for the prevention of bribery at elections. As a rule these have been designed to guard against the corrupt acts of private individuals acting on behalf of one or other of the candidates. The bill which Mr. Charlton is now introducing in the Commons is perhaps the first in recent times which has for its distinct and avowed object the prevention of bribery by the Government of the day. The aim of the Bill is to enact that a promise by a candidate of a railway, or of a railway bonus, or of a public work; the grant of money for such enterprises within ten months of an election; or the offer or pledge by a Cabinet Minister within ten months of an election to make such grants, shall be deemed a corrupt act, and shall render the election of the ministerial candidate void. We have on former occasions expressed our conviction that the subtle form of bribery aimed at in this Bill is by far more powerful in corrupting the public morals, and more dangerous to popular liberties under democratic institutions, than any form of corruption of a private and personal character can possibly become. It is a bribery of constituencies, and thus may be made to operate by wholesale. It appeals to the most selfish and politically unworthy motives, and thus tends to degrade public spirit, destroy patriotism and convert the whole business of self-government into a game of grab. That this system is now practised by the Dominion Government, and to a smaller extent, perhaps, by the local Governments, that it has been reduced almost to a system, few will care to dispute. The danger it threatens to the future of the commonwealth can hardly be over-estimated. Once let the sense of honour of the constituencies become debauched, and an unscrupulous Government could maintain itself in power indefinitely, and rule at its own sweet

will, so long at least as it could succeed in collecting funds enough from the people to enable it to carry out the system. The evil is no imaginary one in Canada. Without provoking the charge of partisanship from one party or the other by attempting to particularize, we may venture to assert that there is no one of our intelligent readers, who has paid any attention to the subject, who does not know that there are many constituencies in which the first and crucial question, whether in a Dominion or Provincial election, is, What will the Government do for us if we elect its candidate? or, What will it refuse to do for us if we fail to elect him? The spending of a sum of money in the constituency, or even the promise to spend it, is too often sufficient to decide the course of a sufficient number of expectant electors to turn the scales in the direction required. The public will watch with curious eyes to see what attitude the Ottawa Government will take in the matter. Of course the Opposition will support the measure. There will be no great proof of virtue in their doing so, until, at least, their prospects of capturing the Treasury benches are much more promising than they now appear to be. But how about the Government and its supporters? The Bill puts them in a dilemma—was no doubt designed to do so. If they really wish to use no corrupt or undue pressure of the kind indicated, they can hardly object to the proposed enactment. Opposition to it will naturally engender or confirm suspicion. And yet it would be by no means pleasant for them to accept at the hands of the Opposition a measure so evidently aimed at themselves. The proudest and most admirable position they could take would be to say, "We repudiate the insinuation but accept the Bill, and will help to make it as stringent and effective as possible." We hope they will do so.

WHATEVER conclusions in other respects may be drawn from Mr. Van Horne's letter to Mayor Clarke, touching the viaduct scheme and related railway questions, on one point there can be no room for doubt. It is clear that both the citizens generally, and those officially appointed to guard their interests in particular, have in the past been singularly short-sighted. It is now well nigh incredible that less than five years ago the city should have tacitly consented to the series of operations by which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company proceeded to carry out their grand design for securing almost complete possession and control of the most important part of the water front of this growing city. It would indeed seem as if the magnificent achievements of that Company in building its trans-continental line, and the stupendous boldness of its plan for monopolizing the water-front, had combined to throw a glamour over the minds of mayor, aldermen and citizens, depriving them, for the time being, of their ordinary perception and foresight. It is but too evident that, now that all have come to their senses, they will have to pay pretty dearly for their temporary hallucination. Into the merits of Mr. Van Horne's contentions we shall not attempt to enter. The points made are so numerous, and involve so many difficult questions, both technical and legal, that the most serious consideration of those specially qualified for such investigations will be needed to guide the city through the labyrinth. It is passing strange that so wide a divergence should be possible between the estimates of two bodies of men, equally well qualified, one would suppose, as to the cost of carrying out the proposed viaduct scheme. The reply of those who prepared the estimates for the citizen's committee will be awaited with interest. Even the most unexpert may, however, readily surmise that many of the factors which enter into Mr. Van Horne's startling product will be found to dwindle very sensibly on close scrutiny. It is noticeable, too, that he takes little account, seemingly, of the very valuable property and franchise which the carrying out of the viaduct scheme will bring into the possession of the city, the new sources of income it will make available and the appreciation of the values of the properties benefited which will surely result. But whatever the cost and difficulty in honourably undoing what has been wrongly done in the past, and whatever the expense of carrying out a comprehensive scheme for the future, on one point the citizens will now be all of one mind. They will, surely, be agreed that the city, and the city alone, must have control of the water-front and the means of access to it, both from city and lake, and that nothing in the shape of monopoly or exclusive control of any of the avenues of approach shall be granted to any private company or interest, on any consideration. To insist on less than this would be recreancy to their own interests and a culpable betrayal of the interests of the coming generation.

THE Bill introduced by Mr. Hall in the Quebec Legislature, providing for the admission of holders of a B.A. degree from a British or Canadian University to the study of the liberal professions without examination will afford a good test of the Liberalism of Premier Mercier and his Government. The boast is often made on behalf of the Quebec majority that its treatment of the English-speaking minority is of the most fair and liberal character. It seems impossible that it can be seriously, or at least honestly contended that the degree of such an institution as McGill is not as good a guarantee of fitness to enter upon the study of law or medicine, as one granted by any French-Canadian University, or as an examination conducted by the representatives of a Law or Medical Society. The fact, for such we presume it is, that at a recent meeting of the Montreal bar, a majority of more than two to one voted against the principle of Mr. Hall's Bill, is of bad omen for its success in the Legislature, especially as the majority seems to have been mainly or entirely composed of all the French-Canadian barristers present, with three honourable exceptions. Yet it is perhaps not unreasonable to expect the people's representatives in the Legislature, drawn from various classes, and accustomed to look on different sides of public questions, to be able to take a somewhat wider view of such a matter than the average members of the professions affected. An Episcopalian Doctor of Divinity, speaking at the recent Installation of the pastors of Plymouth Church, Brooklyn, compared the denominational newspapers of the time to the convicts whom he sometimes addressed in the penitentiaries, who were so hooded that they could see only in one direction, and were quite unable to look around them. The simile might, with at least equal force, be applied to the members of any profession, not excepting that to which the reverend critic himself belongs, in any case in which the customs, traditions or supposed interests of that profession are involved. But, be the case as it may with the members of the Quebec Legislature and Council, there can be no doubt that Mr. Mercier's influence would, if thrown on the side of fair-play Liberalism, easily secure the desired reform and cause the students of Protestant and Catholic Colleges to be placed upon the same footing in regard to the study of the learned professions. The course of the Quebec Premier and his Cabinet in the matter will be watched with curiosity and interest.

IT seems to be pretty generally agreed that when the charter of the Toronto Street Railway lapses, the city will take this profitable business into its own hands, either to be carried on as a department directly under civic management, or to be leased on some juster and more remunerative plan. It is not likely that so large a business could well be carried on by the city under the present municipal system, but if the better organization for which we hope should be effected, it is not easy to see why an efficient management could not be provided, to the great gain of the citizens. A little pamphlet, with the expressive title, "Mostly Fools," has lately been issued in New York, which contains some hints and lessons it would be well for the people of Toronto to think about, before again handing over this or any other natural monopoly to private individuals. The writer well says that the principle upon which great fortunes are built is that "to take thousands of dollars from the few is well, but to take pennies from the millions is better." As an example of the manner in which great monopolies are generally worked, when once secured, the writer takes the Manhattan Railway Company. Its gross earnings last year were \$9,080,000; its operating expenses, \$5,422,000; leaving a net profit of \$3,658,000. To conceal the enormous proportions of this profit two companies, having each a capital stock of \$6,500,000 were merged into one, with a capital stock, not of \$13,000,000, but of \$26,000,000. "In the arithmetic of monopolists two and two make eight, not four." Had this road, says the author, been built by an honest commission representing the city, it would have cost not to exceed \$16,000,000, and the interest upon this—as New York borrows at three per cent.—would have been \$480,000 a year. Deducting this amount from the \$3,658,000 they now pay, "there remains a balance of \$3,178,000, which is the sum the people now pay for the privilege of riding through their own streets." This, as the *Christian Union*, from which these particulars are taken, says, amounts to "a tax of one and three-fourths cents on each ride, or of \$10.50 (a week's wages) a year to every workingman or working girl who uses the road twice a day." The case in Toronto is not so bad as that, but the difference is one of degree only. Why should not the people of the city see to it that they have the privilege of riding on their own