

principal institutions. They simply went abroad to get what they could not find at home. The time was when from lack of means, or in consequence of the crudeness and immaturity of educational methods, this was necessary as, to some extent, it may always be expedient. But the time has come when in education, as in everything else, we should undertake to supply the very best of its kind, and not be dependent on foreign assistance. The higher education demands the best scholarship that can be produced, and eminent names are not wanting in proof that we are equal to what we require.

As to the higher education of women, there can hardly be a doubt that in one way or another, provision should be made for it. The majority of women may not want it, as the majority of students in our colleges may not desire, while they are certainly not qualified for the special training of which we have spoken. But intellectually as well as morally women no less than men must have what they want and are capable of receiving. Where there is an ardent craving for knowledge, that craving must be met, and to say nothing of the uses to which such acquirements may be put, who can show that the discipline imparted or the enjoyment derived may not be as real and satisfactory in the case of women as men? Certainly there must be hundreds of graduates from the higher seats of learning who would be more than glad if their studiously inclined, book-loving daughters could have the advantage of such studies as they had. Are there not thousands of graduates even who are well assured that their daughters would make much better proficiency?

As to the matter of co-education, that has nothing to do with the question whether the education of woman shall be lower or higher; that is a matter of prudence and expediency. But the question is whether a good in itself and a good all the greater because it gives discipline to the mind, as also the possession and enjoyment of knowledge, is not as good for women as men, and at least for such women as are eager for study and would make good use of their opportunities, while so many students in colleges fling them away.

—N. Y. Churchman.

HIGH LICENSE.

THE License question problem is so difficult and complicated that we are glad of any help in solving it. While therefore not wholly agreeing with the following we submit it for consideration.

"The movement in the matter of high license fees is likely to become an important factor in restraining the liquor traffic. It carries with it so much of reason and expediency that even rum-sellers can scarcely oppose it, except on the ground of requiring no licenses at all. In Bloomington, Illinois, there are thirty-two saloons, paying each a license of \$600 a year and yielding to the town one-third of its revenue. This high rate was established twenty years ago, and the saloon-keepers would stubbornly resist any movement toward a reduction of the fee. In Omaha and some of the other towns of Nebraska the license required is \$1,000. In Chicago an agitation is now going on which would make the license fee \$500 for selling whiskey and \$250 for selling ale and beer. In St. Louis a bill was passed on the 19th of March, according to the terms of which a tax of not less than \$25 nor more than \$200 is to be levied on each license for State purposes, while for county purposes an additional tax is to be not less than \$250 nor more than \$400. In addition to this the signatures of two-thirds of the taxpayers in a town or township must have been obtained, while the County Court and Collector may have discretionary power about granting a license. Last week a petition numerously signed by leading citizens of New York was taken up to Albany praying the Legislature to pass an act making the license fee in each case \$500, and not to grant licenses in excess of one to each five-hundred inhabitants. Such methods of dealing with the rum traffic cannot fail of the approbation and support of all good citizens, and are much more likely to accomplish good and permanent results than any attempts at total prohibition.

"In the first place, they contemplate an expedient and wise treatment of a difficult subject by means of wise regulation. They do not undertake the impossible or impracticable. They do not presume that the law can do everything in the case nor, again, that it should aim to do nothing. It is to pursue that middle way which would neither completely shut down on the sale of liquor as though it were an unmixed evil, nor allow the free sale of it as though it were an unmixed good. It is to strike the balance in a mixed question of good and evil, use and abuse, and is, in view of all the circumstances, the best thing that can be done, so far as it can be determined by the intelligence and judgment of the community.

"In a great city like New York, for instance, total prohibition would seem to be out of the question. No less so is a free sale of liquor, if the community would not be subject to an intolerable burden of taxation, poverty and crime. But it is not out of the question that the number of dram-shops be limited to the requirements of the community, and that dram-sellers largely bear the burden for which the traffic is responsible. Both of these propositions so stand to reason that rum-sellers themselves can hardly dispute them.

"In the next place, high license fees may be made to yield as large revenue as any number of smaller ones, while their tendency is to limit the number of dram-shops, making them of the better sort. A hundred licenses at \$500 means the same thing, so far as money is concerned, as five hundred licenses at \$100, but in the character of the establishments it means a great deal more. It means that the one hundred are somewhat in keeping with the licenses paid, while the four hundred have been dropped or culled out because they were probably superfluous.

"The object of license laws, it should be remembered, is not to license as many dram-shops as possible, but as few as possible, when taking into account all the circumstances of the community. Of vastly more account than raising revenue, or of making the liquor traffic a means of gain to those who engage in it, is the public welfare. Certain it is that the tendency of high license is to correct the evils of a traffic which cannot wholly be restrained, and which leads to enormous abuses if subjected to no law."—N. Y. Churchman.

A DEFENCE OF ENGLAND.

WE are quite accustomed to the assertion that nothing in history except some affront offered to the American Republic, "can afford a parallel in hideous criminality to the long and dark list of wrongs which Great Britain has been wont to inflict upon all the weaker or the uncivilized peoples with whom she has been brought, or has gratuitously forced herself into unwelcome contact." If the writer who has relieved his righteous soul by this outburst, will step to the Canadian side of the Line, he will find Indians not worse treated, nor less happy in their relations to the whites, than are those on his own side, and he will see French Canadians, originally a conquered race, living on terms of perfect equality, and in perfect amity with their conquerors, as well as in the full enjoyment of their ancestral religion, which was guaranteed to them by the British Government in spite of the protests uttered against the recognition of Popery by the offended Puritans of New England. Of our behaviour to the Negro none of us have much reason to be proud; but those who at last emancipated voluntarily and paid the cost, may surely hold up their heads beside those who emancipated under the pressure of necessity and as a measure of war. No man of judicial mind and historical culture would think of condemning a nation merely for the possession of an imperial heritage transmitted from an age in which aggrandizement was nowhere deemed immoral. If England is mistress of India, it is not because she was more unscrupulous than France, but because the arms and hearts which seconded the enterprise of Clive and Hastings, were stronger than those which seconded the enterprise of Dupleix and Lally. Mr. Morse's ancestors in New England followed with beating hearts and glistening eyes the conquering career of Chatham.

England could not now annex India; not a few Englishmen regard the Indian Empire as a curse, and would gladly retire if it were possible, without giving up the country to anarchy and blood; but it is certain that no such attempt has ever been made to render conquest, what unhappily it cannot be, the instrument of civilization. No government is purer, or in intention more philanthropic, than that of British India; the growth of population beneath its peaceful rule has been rapid, and is partly the source of its embarrassments; it has established a system of education, and improved the laws; it is now covering the country with railroads; and though there has been a mutiny, and one of which no humane Englishman can ever think without horror, among his troops, it has never provoked a rising of the people. The relations of the conqueror to the conquered never can be happy, but let that of the British conqueror to the Hindoo be compared with that of the Romans, Spaniards, French, or Dutch, not to speak of Turks or Moguls, to any subject race. Some years ago India was visited by Dr. Prime, an American, apparently not wanting in moral sense. He emphatically condemns the crimes of the conquest, but adds, that the purpose of government is now changed; and he testifies strongly, not only to the conscientiousness and intelligence of the administration, but to "the promising aspect of the country in all respects, national, educational, social and religious." Though we may not all share his hopes, what he says as to the disposition and objects of the government is the simple truth, and it would not be easy to find such testimony paid by a foreigner, and one from a not very friendly country, to the administration of any other conquerors. American writers may possibly be justified in assuming, as they habitually do, the enormous inferiority of Englishmen to themselves in morality as well as in dignity and amiability of character; but the English naturally ask for proofs. Insolence, unscrupulousness, inhumanity, are too surely begotten by conquest, yet not by conquest alone. Mr. Morse himself has occasion to refer to the "irregular proceedings" of General Jackson in Florida. "Turned loose in the regions of Florida, checked only by an uncertain and disputed boundary line, running through half explored forests, confronted by a hated foe whose strength he could well afford to despise, General Jackson, in a war properly waged against Indians, ran a wide and lawless, but very vigorous and effective career in Spanish possessions. He hung a couple of British subjects with as scant a trial and meagre shrift, as if he had been a medieval free lance; he marched upon Spanish towns and peremptorily forced the blue-blooded commanders to capitulate in the most humiliating manner; afterwards when the Spanish territory had become American, in his civil capacity as governor, he flung the Spanish commander into jail." All these outrages, committed as the writer avows, against the defenceless, were as dastardly as they were atrocious; and among them were two most foul murders. Yet Mr. Morse plainly intimates that the American people liked them, and his tone indicates that he does not greatly dislike them himself. "The country, right or wrong," was a maxim, not coined we believe in insolent and buccaneering England. It may have been the maxim only of a section of Americans; but let it be remembered also that the Rottenborough Parliament was not the English people.

It surely ill beseems a nation which has risen to unquestioned greatness, to be for ever feeding its soul on a malignant and slanderous hatred of the Mother Country of its race. If England, and her annals are what American stump-orators and stump-historians paint them, the blood of the American people must be deeply tainted, the origin of their institutions and of their religion must be vile, their intellectual life must have flowed, and must still be flowing from a polluted spring, and the English pedigrees which they are so fond of tracing, must be genealogies of dishonour. It is not possible that they can regard an ancient quarrel with George III. and his ministers as an adequate cause for an interminable feud with the British nation. There is something servile in the composition of the feeling: no Englishman, when the conduct of his nation is arraigned, thinks of screening it under American example, but Americans seem often