

letter we infer that he himself is not in love with the system, or at least with the feature of it which constitutes its best justification in the eyes of the Canadian tax-payer—the enforced deductions from the salaries of the employees. The fact that it thus treats the members of the Service as if they were overgrown children who could not be trusted to do their own insurance is, to our thinking, not the least among its objectionable features. We should be very sorry to imply that the members of the Service who have for years submitted to the deductions referred to, in order that the amounts deducted might go towards making good the superannuation allowances, are not entitled to those allowances when the proper time comes. The good faith of the Government and Parliament are pledged in the terms of the Superannuation Act. That Act could not honourably be changed or repealed without making full provision for compensation to all who had contributed more or less from their salaries in accordance with its provisions. As to the *personnel* of the Service, our correspondent, in the last paragraph of his letter, says by implication much harder things than we have thought of saying. The distinction which he seems to make between the members of the Service and the people is one which the public will be slow to recognize. Nor is it quite clear that the members of the Service themselves are not at least as much to blame for the “bullying” of Ministers into making improper appointments, as the influential friends who may have used their influence to bring about the appointments. We are quite unwilling, moreover, to admit that the fault is primarily that of the persons who do the “bullying,” so much as that of the Ministers who allow themselves to be bullied into betrayals of trust. Much less are we willing that “the people,” for whom our correspondent seems to have a good deal of undisguised contempt, though they are really the employers whose taxes pay the salaries in question, should be so illogically confused with the party wire-pullers who are mainly responsible, next to the Ministers, for the bullying and bad appointments. On the two main points, however, we and our correspondent are, we presume, heartily agreed, viz., that all appointments to the Civil Service of the country should be made simply and solely on the merits of the competitors, and that the persons so appointed should be paid a fair remuneration for their services and left to provide for their own futures, like any other citizens. Touching Mr. Mulock's proposal we know nothing but what appeared in the newspaper reports of his speech, but we apprehend that his idea was to make up the superannuation fund from the enforced contributions of the members of the Service, thus putting the system on a business basis. This would be, we fancy, quite a different thing from the present arrangement, under which the consolidated revenue must be drawn on for a much larger sum than the amount contributed to it from the one and a-quarter to two per centum taxation of salaries of the employees.

A SIGNIFICANT hint was that conveyed in one of the despatches in the Newfoundland correspondence to the effect that in case of the failure of the reciprocity negotiations between the Government of Canada and that of the United States, the British Government might find itself called upon to reconsider its refusal to assent to the Blaine-Bond draft treaty. The despatch itself, in which this intimation was given, is promised but not yet brought down, but the inference in regard to the point in question seems to be unmistakable. As indicated in preceding comments, we have all along been disposed to wonder at the apparent readiness of the Home Office to interfere with the wishes of the smaller colony in this matter, in deference to the wishes of the larger. We have also been unable to convince ourselves that had it been the other party's ox which was gored, our Government would have been much less angry than that of our sister colony now is. The long-talked-of Conference at Washington having failed, so far as the question of reciprocity was concerned, the question now arises whether the British authorities will withdraw their objections to Mr. Bond's draft treaty and permit Newfoundland to work out her own salvation or destruction, as the event may determine. If so, will the treaty in its operation harm Canada? Mr. Harvey, on behalf of the Island Government, maintains that it will not. Newfoundland, having refused to accept the proposed *modus vivendi*, will no doubt press for the consent of the British Government with all possible energy, and whatever may be thought of the character of her proceedings in other respects, she has certainly proved herself not lacking in that particular quality. We can

only wait the event. Meanwhile it is so far satisfactory to learn, on the authority of Mr. Blaine, that the enforcement of the Bait Act against Canada was no part of the bargain between him and Mr. Bond, and that the matter was not mentioned between them. Probably the Newfoundland question may come up again in Parliament before the close of the session. One naturally feels not a little curiosity to know what will be the attitude of the Opposition in regard to it. They seem hitherto to have pursued a hesitating and timorous policy, or rather, perhaps, to have had no policy at all in reference to the matter. It would seem, to say the least, a strange inconsistency should the party whose platform is based upon reciprocity for Canada, and which has just been demanding for their own colony the right to frame her own commercial treaties, be found denying, or hesitating to respect and defend, the right of a sister colony to do the same thing.

WE received from Mr. Ewart, too late for its intended use, a note supplying a few words which had been accidentally omitted from his letter on the Manitoba School Question, which appeared and on which we commented last week. As Mr. Ewart deems the omitted words of special importance to his argument, we repeat the sentence and context with these words supplied:—

The argument now runs this way: The State ought to protect itself from vice by education. Religion is “an indispensable factor in all education every day in the week.” Therefore it is the duty of the State to educate; but to have nothing to do with religion! The true Protestant should observe that his conclusion, “it is the duty of the State to educate,” is contradicted the moment he asserts that it is not the duty of the State to teach “an indispensable factor in all education.” The correction, it will be observed, does not affect our position in the slightest degree; because, as we have before seen, there is no contradiction whatever between the Protestant's conclusion that “it is the duty of the State to educate,” and his assertion that “it is not the duty of the State to teach an indispensable factor in all education”—meaning religion. The fatal fault in Mr. Ewart's argument is his failure to observe that in the first proposition the Protestant, whose views we attempted to interpret, uses the term “educate” only in a very restricted sense—as was, we think, clear from the whole tenor of our reasoning—to denote merely such elementary and rudimentary mental training as is deemed indispensable to intelligent citizenship. In the logical terminology, of which Mr. Ewart seems fond, his syllogism is made worthless by the vice of an “ambiguous middle term.” To suppose us to assent to the statement, “It is the duty of the State to educate,” using the word “educate” to include the whole training of the child, mental, moral and religious, is to credit us with giving away our case with a simplicity so transparent that it would hardly be worth the while of a clever logician like our correspondent to expose it.

THE sad downfall of a member of one of the most respectable families in Toronto, under the influence of the mania for stock-gambling, which is unhappily so prevalent in our day, conveys a moral which not only young men in similar situations but the public generally will do well to heed. Gambling, in the multitudinous forms which it has assumed in these days, is unquestionably one of the most degrading and dangerous vices of the age. It rivals intemperance in the insidiousness of its advances, and in the terrible misery it entails upon the innocent, no less than upon the guilty. While the whole country is shocked and disgraced by the prevalence of the grosser forms of the vice, as it is found to be flourishing, in spite of the laws and the police, in Montreal and other cities, the occurrence of such incidents as that in which young Mr. Brown was the actor, warns us that our own fair city is not exempt from the evil, in its most insidious and dangerous forms. Surely the executive forces of organized society, that is, our Governments and Legislatures, have a duty to perform in the premises. The necessity of putting down gambling in every form with a stern hand is one which communities are painfully slow to recognize. The thing itself is evil and only evil, for its underlying motive in every case is the desire to get something for nothing, a desire which is not only morally wrong, but essentially mean, and one which should, therefore, be abhorrent to every honourable mind. No high-minded man will, under ordinary circumstances, take advantage of his better information, or shrewder intellect, to gain a pecuniary advantage over his less fortunate neighbour. He would feel insulted to be thought cap-

able of so doing, and the man known to have done so would be despised and spurned by any social circle that has not itself fallen to a deplorably low level. And yet it is capable of demonstration that this is essentially the basis on which all forms of gambling, stock-gambling included, rests. The only truly honourable man in business is the man who would scorn to take the property of another without rendering a fair equivalent. Can anyone doubt that the application of that just law in business transactions would destroy every form of gambling, root and branch? It is worth while to say this just now as emphatically as possible, because it too often happens that the very friends who suffer most keenly when someone whom they trusted has succumbed to temptation, may have been largely instrumental in his downfall by ministering unwittingly to the passion which gained strength day by day until it overmastered honour and conscience. It is surely time for serious reconsideration of the question of the morality of the whole class of business transactions which so frequently culminate in the downfall and ruin of those who might, under better auspices, have taken rank among the most useful and honourable citizens. Agitation and education against the vice of gambling, in its essential principle, are greatly needed. Parents, teachers, the pulpit, the press, and all other moral agencies should unite in this much-needed educational work. Stringent laws, rigidly enforced, should play their part in the education of the public conscience in the matter. In a word, is it not high time that all the morally conservative forces of society should unite in a grand crusade against the gambling customs which are doing more than almost any other vice to sap the foundations of the social structure, by destroying the basis of confidence between man and man?

RECENT despatches from Buffalo, New York, say that two inspectors are just now kept very busy in that city in examining into cases in which Canadian seamen are alleged to be employed on American vessels, and that the provisions of the law against aliens are being rigorously enforced against all such who will not take the oath of allegiance and promptly become residents of the United States. At first thought such a procedure appears to be unfriendly and small in the extreme. And yet every logical protectionist on either side of the line must, on fuller consideration, admit that it is but the carrying out of the protective principle to its legitimate issue. In the last analysis every protective tariff must have as its chief aim the protection of domestic labour from foreign competition. In other words its main object must be to prevent in the protected country the use of any commodity not produced by the labourers of that country, while resident in it. Hence it seems impossible to escape the force of the argument which insists that to forbid the importation of articles of foreign manufacture and at the same time to permit citizens of a foreign country to cross the lines day by day to engage in such manufacture is logically indefensible. However we may admire the magnanimity of those advocates of the N. P. in our own Parliament who somewhat loftily refused to stoop to the littleness of imitating the policy of the United States in this particular, by legislating to prevent citizens and residents of that country from labouring in Canada while domiciled on the other side of the boundary line, it is clear to the slightest reflection that their magnanimity was indulged in at the expense of their consistency. It is a trite saying and no doubt in many cases a true one, that the best way to secure the repeal of a bad law is to enforce it stringently. On this principle those who believe protective tariffs to be unsound in principle and unworthy of an advanced Christian civilization, should be glad to see the theory of protection carried out with such hard-headed and hard-hearted logic.

THE action of the United States Government in voluntarily paying the sum of \$25,000 to the Italian Government as an indemnity to be distributed among the heirs of the three Italian subjects killed in the New Orleans massacre, is the natural sequel to the paragraph touching the general question in the President's message, on which we commented at the time. The position originally taken by the Washington Administration in regard to the matter was so untenable, or at least so inconsistent with any high sense of international obligations, that it is a decided relief to find it now tacitly repudiated. For a nation to seek to evade responsibility for the acts of her citizens on her own soil, on the ground that these acts were a State, not a national affair, was not only unworthy of high-minded people, but was such a course as could be