

❖ ASSOCIATE EDITORIALS. ❖

THE treatment which the recent temperance petition received at the hands of the City Council is a convincing evidence that the secret of electing true representatives of the people has not yet been discovered. This is a difficulty which seems to follow in the wake of public elections. People have not yet become careful enough in selecting their representatives—in distinguishing between the real man and the deceptive man, between he who has an interest in the good of the community and he who assumes such an interest as a cloak for his own self-seeking. Before an election it is the simplest thing in the world to find men who will pledge themselves if elected, to stand by the wishes of the people, but it is a very different thing to find men who will remain true to their pledges after they have been elected; yet we do not say that even this is an impossibility. Very few of the members of the City Council who voted against the temperance petition would have had moral courage enough to have done so a week before the election. At that time they had some object in appearing to be in harmony with the desires of the people, but now they are independent, and can afford to sacrifice the wish of over twelve hundred of the best and most respectable citizens to their own individual ends. If the temperance people had asked for something extreme and unreasonable—something, the granting of which might possibly be detrimental to the higher interests of the city—there would have been some excuse for the action of the Council; but, in the absence of such a possibility, their conduct is inexcusable. There is not a man of sound judgment in the city who would dare to say that the closing up of the lowest saloons would conflict with the higher interests of the city.

JUSTICE vs. TORONTO.

PRINCIPAL GRANT'S address before the University Council has created quite a sensation among those who are really interested in the advancement of higher education. Even ardent supporters of Toronto University have read it with astonishment. They can hardly allow themselves to believe that the charges contained in it are true—that the Minister of Education and the authorities of Toronto University could actually stoop to such grovelling trickery and contemptible discourtesy. Yet, what is to be done but believe? They have patiently awaited a reply from those accused; yes, they have even implored a reply—a clearing away of the charges, but in vain. The Minister of Education and the head-charioters of the Provincial University are serenely mum. There is not so much as a groan to be heard from them, though the blows are falling thickly and heavily upon them. If the letters published in the *Toronto Mail*, from all parts of Ontario, do not bring from these men an attempted explanation, or a straightforward, manly acknowledgement, we must conclude, as we have frequently

done before, that the Senate of the Provincial University is a most remarkable organism—an organism whose skin is too thick and callous to admit of much inward vitality. The undisturbed silence which it maintains at present, compared with its egotistical clamouring at other times, reminds us somewhat of old reynard. When everything is still, he bravely and fearlessly comes forth into the clearing and howls as if he were the only creature worthy of existence, but when he hears a defiant dog in the distance, he quietly withdraws to his den to await a better opportunity for satisfying his cravings. It is, no doubt, humiliating for a dignified, self-sufficient, body of men to have to come forward and acknowledge charges which a half-manly schoolboy would blush to own. But we do not ask them to do so, if they can conscientiously deny them, and give the public satisfactory reasons for doing so. We only ask them to say guilty or not guilty, and surely this is not an unreasonable request. The Senate of Toronto University may, however, continue to maintain what seems to it a heroic silence—it may think that, owing to its magnanimity and surpassing greatness, it does not require to pay any attention to these charges—it may refuse to satisfy the curiosity of Queen's by answering. But we would like to remind the gentlemen of whom this honorable body is composed, that Queen's is not alone in demanding an answer. The thinking public demands an answer—the interest of higher education demands an answer—fair-play and justice demand an answer, and will obtain it even in their silence. Abuse may be answered by silence, but reasonable arguments require a different treatment. Before concluding, we would like to ask the honourable Minister of Education what he has to say for himself. If he believes in co-operation, as he apparently did while helping to hatch the Federation scheme, why does he not believe in it now? Why does he not do all in his power to establish a uniform matriculation, instead of discouraging those who are attempting to do so? If everything was to be obtained by complete co-operation, surely something, at least, would be gained by partial co-operation. By advocating the former and discouraging the latter, does not the Minister of Education appear to be inconsistent and untrue to principle—to be acting the hypocrite by advocating one thing and doing another? Surely he has not thrown away his old manly principles and become a cat's paw for the Senate of the Provincial University—a hook in the end of a stick by which these men can drag in what they are ashamed to go after themselves. If he desires to retain the respect and confidence of the public, he must remember that he is Minister of Education, not for the city of Toronto, but for the Province of Ontario, and that, therefore, the people of Eastern Ontario have a right to expect and demand justice from him. If the geography which he studied in his youth had only a map of the city of Toronto in it, then it would be well for him to ask Mr. Mowat to supply him with a geography which contains a map of the whole province, so that he may learn to understand the extent of his responsibility.