

great undertakings. A few figures will give some conception of the magnitude of the work. From 10,000 to 15,000 men were employed on it. These men lived in villages built for them along the line, each village having its school, chapel, hospital, reading-room, etc. The canal itself dwarfs the famous Suez Canal by comparison of size. While the latter is but 70 feet wide at bottom, this is 120 at the bottom and 170 at the top. At present it takes about ten hours to traverse its length, though, as we recently had occasion to remark in another connection, it is not improbable that the rate of speed may be greatly increased at some early date by the use of electricity. The conception which has in this case been realized suggests great possibilities for many other cities now inland, in the future. But in view of the enormous expense involved, it will probably be usually necessary that the great and wealthy cities shall exist, as a terminus for the canal. To build the canal in order to create the cities and the traffic will not often be found practicable.

What has become of University Extension in Canada? In England it is making great progress and bids fair to revolutionize in some respects the educational methods of the country. In the United States, too, very substantial progress is being made, with indications of still greater results in the near future. But in Canada, since the short-lived and seemingly abortive effort that was made a few years ago, we hear little or nothing of the movement? Of course such a country as Great Britain has advantages for carrying on the work such as no younger country can possess. The density of population, the nearness of the cities and towns to each other; above all, the large supply of educated and scholarly men whose services are available, constitute a group of favorable conditions such as cannot be found on this continent. The United States has the large population, but it is extended over a vast territory. It is as yet but scantily supplied with the educated men, and most of those whom it possesses are already hard worked, many of them over-worked as college professors, or in other literary pursuits. Yet, with characteristic enterprise, our neighbors are overcoming this main difficulty by training a set of teachers specially for this work. Amongst ourselves one or two universities, Queen's in particular, have in the past done some good Extension work on their own account. Whether this is being kept up during the current season we do not know. We hear occasionally, too, of volunteer work of this kind undertaken by individuals, amongst whom Mr. William Houston, M.A., of this city, deserves honourable mention. But of organized, systematic effort to bring some of the advantages of college training within the reach of the many clever and mentally hungry young men and women who cannot go to college, there is literally

nothing. We have not space to enlarge, but there is certainly room and need for an organization of this kind. We are not sure that the Extension plan is not destined to supersede, to a considerable extent, the regular routine of the colleges at some future day. Possibly a little jealous fear of such results may account for the apathy of our universities in the matter, but it is more reasonable, as well as more charitable, to assume that their failure may be attributed to the fact that their professors are kept working to the full extent of their abilities in their respective colleges. Evidently if University Extension is to accomplish anything in Canada, it must be carried on independently of the universities. Let the next movement be projected on that basis and we may hope for better success.

Two cases of punishment for "contempt of court" have recently attracted a good deal of attention, the one in Canada, the other in the United States. Each may be regarded as in a measure typical of a certain class of offences coming under the designation quoted, and the fact that in the former instance the sentence of the court was received with widespread, almost universal disapproval; in the other with equally widespread approbation, may serve to show the direction in which the currents of public opinion run in regard to the two classes of cases. We assume that the ideas and sentiments of the people of the two countries in regard to the administration of justice are substantially similar. In the Canadian case the judges in one of the provinces condemned to fine and imprisonment the editor of a paper who commented with what was deemed to be unwarrantable freedom upon the action of a judge of a superior court, who had forbidden the carrying out of the order of a judge of lower standing, and thereby prevented the correction of one of the most shameful electoral wrongs ever perpetrated by a partisan returning officer. In the American case the officials of a township in New Jersey set at defiance the orders of a court authorizing a judicial examination of the registry lists in that township, when it was notorious that these lists had been "stuffed" until they contained more names by some thousands than the total number of legal voters in the constituency. The prosecuted officials, including the police justice, and, if we mistake not, even the attorney-general of the county, attempted to excuse themselves for disregarding the injunction of the court, on the ground that it was served in a rough and disorderly manner. The judge promptly affirmed that the order of the court was to be obeyed whether it was served politely or impolitely, and imposed heavy penalties in fine and imprisonment. The judgment has been heartily approved by the independent press and, in fact, by all except rabid partisans of the party whose ticket the fraud was intended to help. The

broad line of demarcation between the principles involved in the two cases is easily traced. The common-sense of all justice-loving people sees the absolute necessity that courts should have power to enforce their decrees, but fails to see that the judges themselves should have immunity from reasonable criticism more than other men in official positions, whose reputations are sufficiently protected by the ordinary laws of libel. Judicial absolutism will not be long tolerated, more than any other species of absolutism in a free country.

Revenue increased from \$36,921,871 in 1892 to \$38,168,608 in 1893; expenditure increased from \$36,765,894 in 1892 to \$36,814,052 in 1893; surplus of revenue over expenditure, \$1,354,555. Such is, in brief, the financial history of the Dominion, or rather of its Government, for the year now closing. The statement certainly shows good financing, in some respects. The balance, if there must be a balance, is on the right side, yet the surplus is not large enough to afford much ground, in itself, for an outcry that too much is being taken from the people. Not only do the public accounts thus show a good deal of skill and care on the part of the Minister of Finance in gauging so accurately, beforehand, the year's commerce; it also shows a very gratifying degree of steadiness and stability in the trade of the country. Had there been any great falling off in this respect, the nicest computations would have been at fault. It is clear that there has been no material falling off in importations; hence it is reasonable to infer that there has been no serious reduction in the purchasing power of the country, that is, in the earnings of the people. In view of the large deficits in both Great Britain and the United States, this is matter for congratulation. Substantially the same thing may be said touching the increase of deposits in the savings banks by \$1,190,000 during the year. There is always room for dispute as to whether this is a favorable indication, or the opposite. By some it is urged with a good deal of plausibility that the fact that a larger amount of surplus capital is available for deposit, at so low a rate of interest as that paid by the savings banks, argues a stagnation of business and a consequent want of opportunities for more profitable investment. Be that as it may, the fact that the surplus exists is in itself proof of industry and thrift, and of a certain measure of prosperity.

Nevertheless, the perplexing questions suggested by these few figures are legion in number, and some of them vexatious in character. In the first place, one cannot forget that Canada is in important respects in a position very different from that of Great Britain, or even that of the United States. Her territory is immense, her resources vast, her possibilities unlimited. Instead of remaining almost stationary, her