

tating a filibustering expedition into the very territory which has now been transferred to England. The story lacks probability, and it is not needed to explain any jealousy which the French may feel in view of England's success. The strip of land which has been ceded by Belgium will be useful to England mainly as a connecting link between her possessions in different latitudes in Africa. France would hardly care for such a strip as a separate possession unless, indeed, she were aware, as she may have been, of England's wish to procure it, and was anxious to prevent her from so doing. Even in that case she would hardly, under present circumstances, have been rash enough to put herself in the wrong even with Belgium, by invading her possessions—an enterprise which the other nations would hardly have permitted her to prosecute with impunity. There can be no doubt, we fear, that French statesmen, especially several of those who are now having their probably brief turn at the head of the State, cherish an intense and growing dislike to England; but they have already given too many hostages to fate to make it likely that they will care to come into collision with her, especially in a matter in regard to which the latter is so clearly within her right. It is not improbable that they may agitate afresh the Egyptian question; but it is not easy to see on what ground they can raise even a diplomatic quarrel over the Belgian treaty.

The *Montreal Witness* maintains, not without much force, "that the public has a right to know, and should have the means of ascertaining, that the conditions upon which it grants valuable privileges, or subsidies, to industrial companies, are fulfilled by those companies." This doctrine the *Witness* would extend to the industries and concerns which are protected either by customs duties, subsidies, government grants, jobs, or advertising contracts. All who are thus favoured, the *Witness* argues, should be compelled to make public their business methods and their profits. Why not? If they are making only reasonable profits, why should they object to having the fact made known? It would remove wrong impressions from many minds, and free the parties themselves from the suspicion of receiving help from the public which they do not really need, or to a greater amount than they really need. There is, for instance, a very widespread belief throughout the country that Mr. Drummond, of Montreal, is enabled by reason of the sugar duties to realize a very large yearly income, at the expense of the consumers of sugar. When Mr. Laurier repeated a statement which has been so long current without correction that most persons have accepted it as true, to the effect that Mr. Drummond is in receipt of a yearly salary of \$60,000 from the company of which he is the head, Mr. Drummond denied the statement, but

declined to say in what way or to what extent he is really profited by his connection with a business which is, in effect, subsidized at the public expense, on the ground that it is a private matter, with which the public has no concern. But surely the public are most intimately concerned in knowing whether the aid thus given the company by means of the larger price each individual has to pay for sugar by reason of the tax, is really needed to sustain the refining industry or not. There is certainly much to be said in support of the contention of the *Witness*. Our chief difficulty is that we are not aware that any conditions are imposed in such cases.

The outlook is dark, we fear, for the future of the live-cattle trade with England. It has long been evident that the only reasonable hope for a removal of the embargo rested upon the assumption that the British veterinary experts would be absolutely unable, after the closest investigation, to find any indication of the existence of contagious pleuro-pneumonia in a single Canadian animal. Now that those experts have informed the President of the Board of Agriculture that the lungs of certain slaughtered animals showed signs that were always present in cases of contagious pleuro-pneumonia, and that were not met with in animals with any other disease, all ground for hope of a favorable result seems to be taken away. We are not of the number of those who see any reason to suspect the good faith of either the British Agricultural Department or its veterinary experts. We fully accept Mr. Gardner's emphatic repudiation of any secondary motive on his part or that of the Government. At the same time one cannot but be struck with the extreme vagueness of the evidence upon which the conclusion, if an unfavorable one is reached, is based. Does the induction rest on a sufficiently broad basis of facts to make it trustworthy? Does not the brief cablegram, whose substance we have quoted, seem to beg the question in a manner akin to that of a once famous syllogism against the possibility of miracles. Miracles are contrary to experience, and are therefore not to be accepted. It is contrary to experience that these symptoms, whatever they may be, are ever found save in cases of contagious pleuro-pneumonia. But how is pleuro-pneumonia to be detected in its earlier stages? By the presence of these signs. As in the theological question the assertion that miracles are contrary to experience assumes the very thing to be proved, and would be invalidated by proof of a single miracle, so in the latter a single case of the presence of the signs in question in an animal that had not contagious pleuro-pneumonia would invalidate the conclusion. But as those signs are discoverable only after the death of the animal, it is evident that there is no possibility that the surgeons

can ever discover a case which would belie their reasoning, even though dozens of the slaughtered animals should, as a matter of fact, have the signs without having the particular disease. The whole matter turns upon the completeness of the negative induction which forms the basis of the general statement.

"Trinity University and University Federation" is the title of an essay addressed to the "Council of Trinity University and the Members of Convocation," by Herbert Symonds, M.A., Rector of Ashburnham, and formerly Professor of Divinity in Trinity College and Clerk of Convocation. Coming from such a source, the pamphlet, which is a strong argument in favour of the federation of Trinity with the University of Toronto, can hardly fail to attract a good deal of attention, not only from those to whom it is directly addressed, but from all those Churchmen of Ontario who are interested in the University. The practical question thus again raised is one whose discussion and decision belong to the adherents of the church in question. For an independent journal to enter into it directly might seem almost an intrusion. But some of the political and educational principles involved are matters of general interest, and in so far as the essay before us treats of these it is not without a public side. Of course the main argument in favour of affiliation is that better educational facilities would be had under the ægis of the larger and wealthier institution. These are consequent on the greater number of professors and lecturers, whose services may be made available; the better equipments, especially for the study of science; the more complete subdivisions of subjects and courses, with a view to the specialization which is now so much sought for, etc. Over against these, however, the student of educational questions will be likely to set sundry other advantages, which may not be so obvious to the public, but which will no doubt be carefully weighed by those more immediately concerned, before they consent that the old university shall lay aside its character and take its place as a college of the Provincial University. Among these special advantages may be mentioned the freedom which the true educator so much prizes in regard both to subjects of study and methods of teaching; the individuality which should be one of the strong attractions of the independent institution, and the privilege of selecting and controlling its own staff throughout. Nor can it be altogether forgotten that in the smaller institution the opportunities for direct, personal contact with the individual student, and for bringing constantly to bear those subtler influences which have so much to do with the moulding of character, which is the highest end of a Christian school of learning, are much greater than in the state-ruled institution. Without going more fully into the subject,