

agreement from buying on the same terms is a distinct interference with Commercial Freedom." I admit this, and under the present condition of affairs justify it. Restraint on commerce is as common as the air we breathe. Both our Customs' Tariff and Inland Revenue directly interfere with commercial freedom. The ordinary citizen cannot buy certain drugs without giving assurance that the interests of those to be affected will be properly guarded. The common huckster cannot offer his wares for sale without a special permit. The sale of certain classes of literature is absolutely prohibited. There is scarcely any branch of trade without some restraining conditions. The feature of the case in point is, that it is exceptional—of a nature not yet recognized by custom; certainly not so objectionable as some even of those mentioned, inasmuch as while it restrains a man's freedom it opens up a way for a personal benefit to the parties so restrained. Even were this not so, the old maxim comes in of the "Greatest good to the greatest number," before which every other consideration of an ordinary character at least must give way. Expediency is a potent element in all the concerns of life, and while I would by no means give it a position of undue prominence, it is alike a necessary factor in the management or government of nations, communities or households, and if it be found expedient that individual merchants should abide by a reasonable rule in the general interests of the trade, then his or their commercial freedom must be curtailed to this extent for the common good. Strictly speaking it is not necessary to enter in writing into our sugar agreement. One wholesale grocer is not a signing party to the agreement; at least he is not a member of the guild. It is, however, known that he sells at the same fixed prices as the guild and nothing more is required. Again, a merchant can sell for less and still be supplied by the refiner, at, however, a slight advance, just sufficient to say to the retail merchant, "These prices are less than they cost the seller, beware of extortionate profits on other goods." He then chooses between this system, and buying from others on an honest basis. There is, as far as I can see, no boycott in such an arrangement.

You ask, "Why not trust to the same principles and the same forces for the correction of the evils which it is claimed the combinations are formed to cure?" I answer in general terms that you do not trust to the same means to obtain exactly opposite results; besides, the "forces that make for righteousness" are never really powerful except by association. Individual action combined with associated effort are the forces which alone can permanently establish the principles of right. Your example given of the "Labourers' Union" is a rather happy one for me, because the organization is used for exactly the purpose you mention, viz., to get a "fair return for their labour" and "elevate the standard of fair dealing between man and man, and correct the evils resulting from dishonest purchasing of labour at starvation prices" except, of course, they do not use the weapons referred to in their endeavours to obtain such results.

I hope I have been able to clear up these points of difference, and beg to thank you for the expressions of confidence towards the trade and myself; and assure you if you can show me that injustice is being done I will at once withdraw from all such agreements. Yours very truly,

H. BLAIN.

Toronto, March 27th, 1889.

OUR EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM.

To the Editor of THE WEEK:

SIR,—An editorial note in your issue of the 22nd inst. suggests the expression of some ideas that have been floating about in education circles for years. The charge recently brought by Principal Grant against Toronto University of maintaining a low standard for University Matriculation, the discussion in the Provincial Legislature as to the duty of the State with respect to education of a higher character than that given in our Public Schools, and the conflicting opinions held as to the limits of Public and High School work, induce me to outline briefly what appears to be a rational and sound scheme of arranging the relative positions of the various classes of educational institutions in the Province.

1. It is the experience of the High School Teacher that a great many pupils leave the Public School to attend the High School or Collegiate Institute without receiving any appreciable advantage from the change. The time they spend in the High School is too limited to allow any marked advantage to be gained by beginning the study of French, German, Classics, Algebra and Euclid. On the contrary, the smattering of knowledge gained in these subjects fails to compensate them for the loss they sustain by not confining their attention to fifth form course of study of a good Public School. If the attention which is now given for a year or two in our High Schools to the elements of Classics and Modern Languages were given to English (including Composition, History, Geography, Bookkeeping and Arithmetic) the practical benefit would be much greater, and the educational results equally good. I would not advocate the exclusion from our High Schools of any candidate capable of passing the entrance examination, but I certainly would advocate that, wherever possible, a fifth form should be established in our Public Schools. Were such a provision made for continuing the work of the Public Schools beyond its present limit, there can be but little doubt that thousands of students, now filling to overflow the lower forms of our High Schools,

would remain in the Public School until their education was completed.

2. The effect of such a policy on our High School attendance would no doubt be very considerable. Not so many High Schools and Collegiate Institutes would be required; the country would have, instead of a number of poorly-equipped, small High Schools, better Public Schools at a much less expense. The attendance at many of the larger High Schools and Collegiate Institutes would also diminish. That, however, would not be an unmixed evil. Just now the attendance is much too large for the good of either pupil or teacher. A smaller attendance would ensure more thorough work, more careful and individual teaching, more rapid progress and a higher standard of attainments and efficiency. This now leads me to another point.

3. The complaint of the low standard of our Matriculation Examination may be taken to be well founded. The blame is thrown on different shoulders by different writers according to the various standpoints from which they write. Admitting that a high standard is desirable how can it be attained? The answer is by placing the work of the first year of our Universities in the hands of the Collegiate Institutes. This is a perfectly feasible plan, and the advantages which would result from it are very numerous. It would raise the average standard of our Collegiate Institutes, and would be a distinct line of demarcation between High Schools and Collegiate Institutes. It would materially relieve the Universities—particularly Toronto University—from a portion of their present work and leave them free to undertake the more advanced studies which are the work proper of a University. We lament that our young men must go abroad to pursue their past graduate studies. Can we be surprised at this when it is taken into consideration that Toronto University is engaged in doing (badly) the work that should be left to the High Schools and Collegiate Institutes. If the present First Year Examination were made the Matriculation Examination, the attendance at the Universities might be somewhat lessened, but the energies of the University and College professors would be expended on subjects worthy of their supposed abilities. We might then have a University where genuine University teaching would be given. I pass by the financial benefit of this arrangement to note very briefly the objections raised to such a change.

4. The objections are from totally different quarters—from the smaller High Schools and Collegiate Institutes, and from the University. The objections of the smaller Collegiate Institutes and some of the High Schools are that to teach the work of the present first year would impose too heavy a task on our teachers, and would be a financial burden on the ratepayers. Others, I am afraid, object because such a step would tend to elevate a few of our Collegiate Institutes at the expense of the others. On the other hand, University authorities pretend to be afraid that the Collegiate Institutes are not competent to undertake the task of teaching *thoroughly* the work of the first year. This objection has been urged very often—what its grounds are it is difficult to understand. It is a fact that for years some of our Collegiate Institutes have been teaching the pass and honour work of the first year, and their fitness for the task is shown by the results of the University examinations. In the majority of cases where students trained by the Collegiate Institute come into competition with those of University College, the results have been in favour of the Collegiate Institutes. This is a test that cannot be ignored; besides, it is well known that the personal attention given in a good Collegiate Institute to pupils of the higher forms is utterly impossible in a College so crowded as University College admittedly is. We contend that the teaching in our High Schools and Collegiate Institutes is infinitely superior to that given in the first year by the Universities, and that instead of suffering from the transfer, students would greatly profit if their present first year was taken at some good Collegiate Institute. Nor would it be a burden to these Institutes to do the work efficiently. It would be as easy and economical to teach a class of twenty-five as a class of ten, and not more than an average of twenty-five would attend a Collegiate Institute.

As to the increased financial burden it would not be very great, and might be entirely removed by a small grant from the Education Department. Ten thousand dollars a year of additional expenditure would serve for some time to come, and this would be a much more economical expenditure in the interests of University education than a large increase in University endowment.

In conclusion, I may say, that these thoughts have been very hurriedly thrown together, and that anything in the way of elaborate argument has not been attempted. The thoughts are not new, but it appears to me that they are worthy of serious consideration.

W. J. ROBERTSON.

St. Catharines, March 23rd, 1889.

THE JESUITS' ESTATES ACT.

To the Editor of THE WEEK:

SIR,—Mr. Edward Douglas Armour closes his rejoinder to Professor Wells' reply to his article in THE WEEK in these words: "Therefore, whether it be alleged that Great Britain's title to the estates was imperfect by escheat, or 'confiscation,' if you will, or whether it be alleged that in making a money compensation for the loss of the estates the Legislature was obliged to procure rati-

fication from the Pope himself before its Act would be binding, in either case the sovereignty of the Pope has been unfaithfully set up over Her Majesty the Queen and the laws of the Province. Those who would uphold the Act may sit on whichever horn of the dilemma they find least uncomfortable." Has Mr. Armour established his dilemma?

1. As by the Act in question the Quebec Legislature expressly asserts that the Crown's title to the estates in question is perfect by escheat, and deals with the matter upon that basis the Act cannot be said to be unconstitutional as impugning that title and the first horn of the supposed dilemma does not exist.

2. As the Quebec Legislature has not expressly or by implication admitted that it "was obliged to procure ratification from the Pope himself before its Act would be binding" (Mr. Armour's words), the second horn of the supposed dilemma seems equally imaginary.

Had not the Quebec Legislature full constitutional power to make a gift or subsidy out of its own moneys to any person or body in the Province without imposing any condition whatever? If it had such power had it not a right to make its gift conditional upon the happening of any event whatever? And has that Legislature by the Act in question done more than this? Does that Legislature by this Act more than say: "These estates are the absolute legal property of the Crown. This Legislature has the constitutional power to deal with them and with the public moneys of the Province as it thinks fit, by sale or by gift, conditional or unconditional. In exercise of that power we deal with these estates and moneys in a certain manner in favour of a certain body upon condition that that body through its agent (the Pope) accepts that dealing in full settlement of certain moral (not legal) claims, which we are not legally bound to recognize, but which we think proper to recognize to this extent for the sake of peace. This Act is to have no effect, i.e., we will not deal with the matter in this way unless that condition be fulfilled. All the power is in our hands and we refuse to (not 'we cannot') exercise it unless the Roman Catholic Church in Quebec, through its agent the Pope, binds itself by ratification of this proposed settlement of these moral claims to accept it as satisfactory?"

Mr. Armour's other objection that the Act does not provide for a finality does not seem to touch the question of constitutionality but seems rather to be a matter to be dealt with by the Quebec Legislature.

Yours truly,

Winnipeg, March 25, 1889.

F. B. ROBERTSON.

WE AND OUR NEIGHBOURS.

To the Editor of THE WEEK:

SIR,—I am greatly surprised that any advocate of "Imperial Federation" should deem it necessary to use such arguments as Mr. Granville Cunningham does in your issue of March 29. I for one absolutely refuse to accept his dictum that Canadian independence is the least desirable of the three futures, to which, according to him, we are shut up—the other two being Imperial Federation and Annexation to the United States. I firmly believe that an independent Canadian nation is quite possible and practicable if only all Canadians, or the great majority of them, want to have one. The men who are just now doing the most to make such a future impossible are Mr. Cunningham and his Imperial Federation associates, and they are, therefore, the real traitors in the Canadian camp.

Mr. Cunningham and those who think with him may as well understand that if the advocates of Canadian independence are defeated in their wish many of them will prefer annexation to Imperial Federation as a political future for this country. I myself will, without hesitation, and for what seem to me good, sufficient, and patriotic reasons. He may as well learn also that no such bugbears as fear of the military power of the United States and dislike of the social characteristics of the people of that country will prevent annexation. Nobody except our worthy police magistrate believes that the people of the United States are thirsting for our blood, and no one takes Col. Denison seriously. In the matter of administration of justice, the old slave-holding states have not yet come up to our standard, but justice is as well administered in New England, the Middle, the Northern, and the South-Western States as it is in Ontario. The Biddulph lynching was worse than anything that has happened in New York for fifty years, and the lynchings are still unpunished.

Moreover, Ontario would, after annexation, have in her own hands even more completely than she now has it, control of the administration of justice. We could have our judges appointed then quite as well as now. We could observe the Sabbath then just as we please. We could make divorce lax or difficult to suit ourselves. In short, in every imaginable particular we would be more than we are to-day in this Province masters of our own political condition. If Mr. Cunningham does not know this he should inform himself before writing as he does. If he is trying to mislead he is an unworthy advocate of a cause which has many honest, if visionary, supporters.

Toronto, March 30, 1889.

KANUCK.

PHILOSOPHY triumphs easily over the past and over future evils, but present evils triumph over philosophy.—*Rocheffoucauld.*