

'the agents of the Company had for weeks been haunting those same lobbies.' Our contemporary does not venture, perhaps it scarcely dares, to indicate the source of this powerful pressure. The Messrs. Kiely, although they are eminently respectable and energetic men, have no such strength in their own proper persons. The 'agents,' let it be understood, are the co-religionists of these gentlemen, and the potent 'influence' is that of the Minister who, for the present, rules the Cabinet and sways the destinies of the Province. Now there can be no objection to any legitimate exertions being made on any man's behalf, by his friends, religious, social, or political; but there is every objection to a grave injustice to the chief city of Ontario being perpetrated by a coterie, with the active support of a Minister of the Crown. One need not be a partisan of the Opposition to perceive that so dangerous a perversion of the functions of Government deserves the most severe and trenchant reprobation. A disbelief in the intrinsic virtues of party does not imply, but contrariwise excludes, indifference to principle or conduct in rulers. The non-party man would act a craven part, if he feared to lose his character for impartiality by warmly assailing unjustifiable acts or culpable disregard of the public needs and desires. The Government of a country is responsible for legislation as well as for administration, and if vicious measures are adopted, or good and necessary reforms are treated with negligence, flippancy, and contempt, upon the heads of Ministers the weight of public displeasure must fall, by whatever party-name they may choose to be called.

The recent election in South Waterloo should serve as a warning to Mr. Mowat and his colleagues; it is only one of a series to be continued, if they persist in the course they appear to have deliberately selected. A majority which has fallen from four or five hundred to a dozen is not to be accounted for either by the nationality of the opposing candidate, or the fact that he professed to be a Reformer. If the electors of South Waterloo had confidence in the leaders and wire-pullers of the party, they would have believed all the stories circulated against Mr. Merner, and rejected with disdain his pretended adherence to their party. Two

years ago, neither his German origin nor his Reform principles would have saved him from overwhelming defeat. His compatriots would not have preferred nationality to what was then supposed to be the orthodox political creed; and certainly it is no compliment to the Reformers to insinuate that they are so easily gulled or seduced from their party allegiance by a wolf in sheep's clothing, so poorly disguised as Mr. Merner was represented to be. It ought to be frankly admitted that the defection of so strongly Reform a constituency cannot be accounted for in any such manner. On the contrary, it indicates a breaking loose from the iron bands of party, a growing dissatisfaction at ministerial policy, and an eager longing for salutary reform in the management of public affairs. It is not too late for Mr. Mowat to respond to the changing aspect of the popular mind. It is too late to throw sops to selfish classes; yet, unless a serious revolution should occur within the Cabinet, the wretched device of giving votes to those having no logical or constitutional claim to them, so that there may be something to fall back upon in the hour of danger, will be repeated. Let the Government retrace its steps, cast off the malign influence which paralyzes it, and hear and obey the well-understood wishes of the people. If all this be done, ministers will have no reason to fear a divided and aimless Opposition.

It is difficult to say whether the interest taken in the question of University affiliation is the result of a growing public concern in superior education, or the evidence of a factitious agitation set on foot from rivalry and with dubious purpose. Certainly, if the asperity which has characterized the correspondence as well as the leading articles written on the subject, be any indication of the *animus* of some who have taken part in the controversy, we should reluctantly incline to the latter alternative. There is no reason why the subject should not be calmly and dispassionately examined, unless academic or professional jealousy has ruffled the temper or warped the judgment of the combatants. When too much feeling, and that of the angry rather than the earnest kind, manifests itself, there is too much reason to suspect that interest rather than principle is at the bottom of the affair.