

only a gross violation of sound administrative principles, but also the establishing of a mischievous and demoralizing precedent? We are curious to know, and we think the Parliament and people of Canada have a right to know, on what grounds the Premier can reconcile it with his own sense of public duty. Would he not be one of the first to condemn such an act in a political opponent, were such at the head of the Government, as an open betrayal of the public trust? Has he not always approved the well understood principle of Canadian politics, that no public official should be permitted to engage actively and offensively in a party canvass? So far as we are able to see, and we have honestly striven to look at the matter on all sides, the act admits of no justification. It simply amounts to this, that the Premier takes advantage of his position as the virtual Head of the Canadian Executive to use the public funds, supplied by the taxes of the whole people without distinction of party, for the employment of a personal agent in a partisan canvass. In other words he compels his political opponents to help pay the expenses of his own agent. And so long as his majority in the House supports him the party so grossly injured has absolutely no redress. Is the country then really under personal government? We wish to speak with all respect of the veteran Premier, whom the people have kept so long at the head of the State, but we cannot conceal our conviction that in this act he has struck a serious blow at our non-partisan Civil Service. It cannot be that the more independent and broad-minded of his supporters fail to see how indefensible it is, or how the bad precedent may return some day to plague its inventors. We wish to put the matter strongly because it seems to us a case in which the independent press should speak. If there is any possible justification of this procedure we shall be grateful to any one who will point it out. We say nothing of the manner in which Sir Charles conducted his canvass, or of his epithets of which the Opposition complain, because those are but the accidents of the case. Of course, as we have before said, Sir Charles' own plea, that he came to help save the country, is but insult added to injury so far as nearly half the people of Canada are concerned.

CAREFUL readers of the debate in the Commons, so far as it has proceeded, on Mr. Jamieson's motion affirming that the country is ripe for Prohibition, must have observed that a great deal of the discussion was beside the real question at issue. Arguments from facts and statistics to show that terrible evils result from the use of intoxicating drinks may or may not be necessary to impress the minds of members with a deep sense of their political and personal responsibility to do all in their power for the suppression of those evils and of the traffic which gives rise to them. But manifestly those arguments have no bearing upon the actual question at issue. That question is not whether the use of intoxicants is the source of a very large percentage of the vice, misery and crime which afflict society. No man in his senses can deny that. Nor is the question whether, in view of all these facts, it is desirable that the manufacture, sale and use of intoxicating liquors should be totally suppressed. On that point there is much difference of opinion, but, even were all the members of the House agreed on the principle of Prohibition, it would by no means follow that the time has arrived when it is expedient to embody that principle in law and attempt to carry it out in practice. It may be said that the great number of signatures affixed to the petitions must be taken to prove that the great majority of the people demand such an Act and are ready to enforce it. But this by no means follows, as an analysis of those signatures would no doubt show. We say nothing of the great financial difficulty that would ensue from the loss of revenue, were a prohibitory law passed and put in operation, for we do not think that any financial consideration should be set over against a moral obligation. But it must be clear to everyone that the enforcement of such a law as that proposed would be a matter of enormous difficulty. How large a percentage of those whose names appear on the petitions belong to the class who could be relied on to bring personal influence and energy to bear for the enforcement of the law, especially in the cities, where the great struggle would take place? Every reasonable person must admit, as indeed the history of prohibitory legislation has amply proved, that no law of the kind can be enforced in a free and democratic country by a bare or slender majority. Nothing short of an overwhelming public sentiment in its favour

can avail. Is there at present in Canada any such overwhelming sentiment? How large a majority of those with whom it would rest, in the last stage, to say whether such a law should be carried into effect or not, can be shown to be in favour of total prohibition? Is there a majority so powerful and so much in earnest that they can be relied on to back up the officers of the law? That is the real question. The most earnest advocate of Prohibition must admit, unless wholly carried away by enthusiasm, that to pass a prohibitory law and fail to enforce it would throw back the total abstinence movement for many years and plunge the country into a state worse than the former. There is much to be said in favour of a plebiscite to determine the question, but, even should a plebiscite be resolved on, it would never do, for reasons above indicated, to let a bare majority, even of the electors, decide such a question. Nothing less than two-thirds or three-fourths of the people could warrant such a measure, or secure even a passable enforcement of it.

THE remarkable educational movement known as "University Extension" is making great strides in Great Britain and the United States. Unless we sadly misread the signs, it is bound to undergo a wonderful development in the near future. It is but in keeping with the spirit of the age that this enterprise should be laying hold on the sympathies of large-minded educators, and of the more philanthropic and public-spirited of educated men of all classes. For the first time in the history of the race, the genius of learning seems disposed to come forth from the university and college cloisters and bring the methods and opportunities for higher culture within the reach of the many. As the *Christian World* observes:—

The needs of the nation are finding a voice. Multitudes of people scattered throughout the country, eager for knowledge, keenly alive to intellectual problems, and struggling hard to educate themselves, are asking whether the Universities of the land have no duties towards them. They cannot spare either the time or the money required for a course either at the older seats of learning, or at the local colleges which have sprung up during the last twenty years. To the Universities they cannot go, the Universities must come to them.

And the Universities are responding, as never before, to the call. Few, probably, even in educated circles, are aware how much has already been done in this direction in England, where such Universities as Oxford and Cambridge, London, Durham, and Victoria have the signal, and it may pretty safely be predicted, the immortal honour of having led the van of this evolutionary—perhaps it would not be too much to say revolutionary—movement. From facts recently published in the *Quarterly Review* and elsewhere, it appears that during the last year no less than 40,000 students have availed themselves of the new opportunities thus brought within their reach. "Almost every town of importance has become an outpost of University influence." The recent visit of Professor Moulton, of Cambridge, has united with other influences to give a great impulse to this movement in the United States. The system is one well adapted to the spirit of American institutions. It has, too, within it that which cannot fail to appeal strongly to the well-known liberality in educational matters of the wealthy classes in the United States. A great work, to some extent along the same lines, has, indeed, been going on for years in the development of what is known as the Chautauqua system. But the superiority of University Extension is that it adds the presence and stimulus of the living teacher to the opportunities and inducements afforded by the carefully graded courses and examinations. Its methods are also by so much the more flexible in that they take account of the smallest instalments of real work done, inasmuch that the mechanic or the clerk who takes but a single subject for a single term may have the satisfaction and the stimulus to further exertion which come from University recognition of their work. It would be a great mistake, Prof. Moulton assures us, to jump, as many will be ready to do, to the conclusion that the work done at the outposts under this system is superficial and comparatively worthless from the scholarly point of view. Of course a good many attend the lectures who do little or nothing in the way of systematic study. Even these can hardly fail to derive a certain amount of benefit. But it is none the less true that much of the work done by those who take the prescribed studies and examinations is quite as good in quality as that of the regular college students and sometimes better. This can be readily explained in view of the greater earnestness, enthusiasm, maturity of mind

and concentration of force upon a single subject, which will often be found in the extension student. This movement may be taken, we believe, as embodying the answer of the spirit of the age to the complaint we so often hear that the masses are being over-educated and that great social and economic evils are likely to result. The answer is—and who shall dare to say it is not the true solution and the only one worthy of the new century so soon to dawn—"More education, not less." Make education universal. Why not? The two great hindrances on the side of those Universities which are alive to the importance of the movement—as, unhappily, some are not—are want of money and want of men, suitable men for lecturers. Both will be forthcoming; the former as men of wealth touched with the "enthusiasm of humanity," come to see what magnificent opportunities for a work of the noblest philanthropy are herein set before them; the latter as students, like-minded, awake to the fact that herein are opening up avenues to a new profession of the noblest kind, one that will give ample scope for the highest educational talent, and will have the promise of unlimited opportunities for the most enduring usefulness.

At a recent dinner of the Fair Trade League of England, speeches were made by several distinguished guests in favour of closer trade relations between Great Britain and her colonies. To us it has always seemed clear, in opposition to opinions that have been advanced by distinguished advocates of Imperial Federation, that commercial union of some kind is the indispensable, and we may add the impossible, first step in the direction of any such federation. It is, we think, characteristic of recent discussions, that the necessity of commencing, instead of ending, with the adjustment of the new trade relations is coming to be more clearly recognized. On the occasion in question, Sir James Lowther said that the object they (the Fair Trade Club and the United Empire League) had in view would be best achieved by ascertaining upon what basis the various component elements of the British Empire would entertain proposals for fiscal union. Sir Charles Tupper "was convinced that to make the union (between the Mother Country and the colonies) closer, it was necessary, as he was sure it was practicable, to make a new fiscal departure. He did not undervalue sentimental bonds, but if we wished to strengthen those bonds further measures would have to be adopted, and the tie of self-interest would have to be joined with that of sentiment." Sir Charles Tupper, by the way, is reported as having made the extraordinary statement that the fiscal policy his party had adopted in Canada was "never called in Canada, a protective policy," but this must surely be a mistake of the reporter. That is, however, aside from the point. Sir Julius Vogel said that "if they were to make their movement successful and to avoid the dilettante character which, notwithstanding Sir C. Tupper's eulogy, undoubtedly attached to the Imperial Federation League, they must by an informal convention, for discussion of otherwise, lay down the details and particulars by which an Imperial Zollverein might ultimately be established." These are important statements by men whose opinions are entitled to weight. If it would not be presumptuous in us to do so, we would commend them to the attention of those friends of Imperial Federation in our own Parliament who are said to contemplate bringing before the House a resolution in favour of the summoning of a great conference of British and colonial delegates to consider the question of closer union. What tariff reductions Canada prepared to make in favour of British manufacturers? What changes in her free trade system can the Mother Country be reasonably expected to make in return for these reductions? When these two practical questions shall have been considered and an agreement reached by representatives of the two parties concerned, the first step will have been taken in the direction of the closer political union desired.

THE subject of the last paragraph suggests reference to a somewhat remarkable extract from a private letter which appears in a late number of *Imperial Federation* under the heading "An Impartial Canadian's View." The letter shows unmistakable evidence of ability and of a thorough knowledge of Canadian affairs, and, without admitting the conclusiveness of the reasoning, we think it eminently worthy of consideration in connection with the important question of our future relations to the Mother Country. The writer, who is a resident of Ontario after expressing his gratification at the great interest which