

Peninsula colours, and the ashes are treasured to this day. When colours are changed and the new ones supersede the old, these old ones become a sort of perquisite of the officer commanding the regiment. Surely it would be better to burn them than to let them run the chance of coming to the auctioneer's hammer. The first battalion Seaforth Highlanders were, until lately, at Fermoy, the very town where the old 74th burned their old colours. One would have thought that the officers of the regiment would have subscribed enough to save the colours and follow the example of the 74th. No words are too strong. It is as bad as the sale of a human soul.

The New
Oxford LL.D.

Why the University of Oxford should select the Hon. Mr. Bayard for the degree of D.C.L. is one of those puzzles which are not easily solved. Who is it that suggests these names? What has Mr. Bayard done for England or Oxford—literature, science, or art—to deserve recognition? He is the man who kicked the English ambassador out of Washington. He is the representative of the nation which has been acting the part of Fee-Fo-Fum, I smell the blood of an Englishman. An honorary degree is supposed to be granted *honoris causa*. If the concession is made because Mr. Bayard makes a good after-dinner speech it does not appear to be a sufficient reason for selecting him. If it is intended to conciliate the States it will only serve to discredit Mr. Bayard in his own country as "an anglo-maniac," and will not conciliate the Americans in the least. It will only be another reason for their saying how spiritless these English are! The more you kick them, the more they like it! Let us do it again. Mr. Bayard is a very pleasant, nice gentleman, who has made himself personally popular in England. But Universities are or ought to be the reflex of the national mind. Instead of that their governing bodies in some cases seem to think that they are doing a national service in honouring those who have not deserved well of the Republic instead of those who have faithfully served her.

* * *

A Non-Professional View of the Situation.

ONE of the old philosophers, says Lord Bacon, used to aver that life and death were just the same to him.

"Why, then," said an objector, "do you not kill yourself?"

The philosopher replied, "Because it is just the same."

An unbiassed reader of Canadian party organs at present would be justified in assuming this philosopher's attitude towards the two great political parties in Canada. They appear to be just the same,—both equally bad.

The offensive qualities of both parties are quite sufficient to make a self-respecting nation blush for its chosen legislators. And this, politically speaking, is called educating the people, and is looked upon as a process absolutely necessary to enable the electors to return a representative body to parliament. "Never say anything good of a political opponent until he is dead," seems to be an axiom with party-politicians.

The unprejudiced mind is, therefore, in sheer desperation, constrained to favour one or other of the state parties rather on the weakness of its demerits than on the strength of its merits. But how many unprejudiced minds will go to the polls on the coming twenty-third of June?

Prejudice, if not absolutely a fundamental principle of

party government, is so strong a factor in the resolving of public opinion that professional politicians seldom hesitate to appeal to it, and just as seldom appeal to it in vain.

It is related that on one occasion Adam Ferguson suggested to Dr. Johnson, as a pleasing generality, that luxury corrupts a people and destroys the spirit of liberty. Johnson replied, "Sir, that is all visionary. I would not give half a guinea to live under one form of government rather than another. It is no moment to the happiness of the individual."

"But, sir," persisted Ferguson, "in the British constitution it is surely of importance to keep up a spirit in the people, so as to preserve a balance against the crown."

"Sir," replied Johnson, "I perceive you are a vile Whig. Why all this childish jealousy of the power of the crown? The crown has not power enough."

This little incident happened in the early days of party government in England.

There are in Canada to-day many political Johnsons,—who, theoretically affecting a calm, judicial, unprejudiced attitude towards the public questions of the day, at the first approach of the touchstone of faction, will throw judgment to the winds and vote with the party.

On two memorable occasions, however, did a large body of the electorate of Canada display a moral strength sufficient to make party spirit subservient to wisdom, morality and patriotism. In 1874 a corrupt government was taught a salutary lesson, whilst in 1878 a distinctive fiscal policy was inaugurated which the country has repeatedly since endorsed. On both of these occasions there were issues at stake weighty enough and comprehensive enough in character to appeal to the intelligence and common sense of the people, and it must be acknowledged that the people amply justified the responsibility vested in them.

The coming elections, however, present no really great issue to the electorate. The Manitoba School Question, upon which the outcome of the elections seems largely to depend, is not a great issue; nor can any amount of agitation, religious rancour, or political animosity raise it to the elevation in the public mind occupied by the Pacific Scandal or the National Policy. It is merely a vexed question which, according to high and unquestionable authority, should never have been allowed to leave the sphere of the judicial courts,—which on grounds of national prudence and proper state policy should never have been sent to the polls.

The issue on this point between the two parties is not so much one of justice as one of prudence and political expediency.

If, therefore, the attitude of the Conservative and Liberal leaders towards the Manitoba minority, as evinced in their campaign speeches, be any criterion of the trend of public sentiment throughout the Dominion, one would be led to conclude that the preponderance of public feeling is on the side of remedial reforms or relief. From this it would likewise follow that, could the votes for remedial relief be cast irrespective of party influence, there would be a large majority in its favour. It is unfortunate for the solid welfare and progress of Canada that such an issue has been permitted to exercise its disturbing influence on the minds of the people to the exclusion or obscuring of graver national questions. It has in it the worst elements of national discord and appeals point-blank to the most pernicious kinds of prejudice, namely, religious and racial. All true lovers of Canada must regret this. The population of Canada is made up of a mixed people without as yet entire cohesion, and the spirit of the country should be broad as the land itself. We claim to be a liberal-minded and