

plainly, Latin against Teuton; *habitant* against Saxon; Protestantism against Ultramontanism. And who would thus disintegrate our fair Dominion or complacently view a cloud upon the political horizon, though not bigger than a man's hand that shadowed a storm burst after the fashion of Europe's Thirty Years' War?

What then is to be done? Patience. Time works wonders if we use its intervals in allowing judgment to enthrone itself as against passion, and sympathetic reason to overcome prejudice. Delays are not always dangerous; the Fabian policy saved Rome; better spend fifty years in honest endeavour after unity and peace, than hastily rush in on a position from which our children will vainly strive for deliverance. The Maine boundary, the Newfoundland coast difficulty, with the constant experience we suffer therefrom in being handicapped, ought to make us hesitate ere we leave a heritage of strife for those who come after us. Discount the politician, and encourage the statesman, and let patience have her perfect work.

The position is sometimes assumed that with such antagonistic elements as Protestantism and Roman Catholicism, there can be no permanent political peace; oil and water will not mingle. It should be remembered, however, that a little alkali will from those discordant elements produce an article without which our domestic economy would prove sorry indeed. We are slowly, let us trust surely, developing a Canadian spirit. Allow that to become sufficiently strong to overcome these racial differences, and to unite the excellences of both in a coming race. It is to be hoped that neither side will precipitate a final issue. Few events are more to be feared than the appeal to the electorate at this present moment on an issue as yet in its consequences little realized. Such a step would let loose the rage of fanaticism and fan the flames of sectarian strife to such an extent that the present generation would find it impossible to repair. Keep the question free from party issues; think well ere the leap be taken.

This leads me to notice an illustration of the counsel for the Roman Catholic minority given before the Privy Council to show the utter impossibility of harmonizing the two interests in common school education. "Protestants say to Catholics, we both like porridge, we can eat together; the Catholic says, not without salt; the Protestant replies, you can have your salt on Sunday." I can understand such an *ad captandum* argument made on the hustings, or before a jury of bushrangers, but not as calmly given before a Privy Council or for an intelligent public. Education is the directing and encouraging of growth, not a process of gulping down ready made mixtures. A much more apt illustration—not for the learned counsel's object 'tis true, but for the general weal—could be drawn from a nursery where the cultivator plants seeds to produce the stock on which afterwards the gardener grafts the special fruit or flour he desires to produce. There are stock truths common to all forms of Christian teaching; elementary education can recognize them, the grafting may be done elsewhere.

To sum up these desultory fragments on a momentous subject: We are at the parting of the ways. Shall we force upon an unwilling Province in perpetuity a dual system of public education, thus absolutely preventing political integrity; or can we so endeavour to rise above the strife of partyism as to set ourselves earnestly to work by each side, entering patriotically into the convictions of the other until a common basis may be found on which permanently to rest our Canadian nationality and elementary education?

Gravenhurst, April 1st, 1895. JOHN BURTON.

Letters to the Editor.

THE COPYRIGHT QUESTION.

To the Editor of The Week:

Sir,—Is it not possible that the Copyright Question may be practically settled without the adoption of a law which, especially if American interlopers take advantage of it, seems almost certain to lead to injustice and to trouble?

The main object of the advocates of the Act, as I believe I am informed on the best authority, is to obtain the liberty of reproducing works of fiction on reasonable terms. Could not this be attained by the formation of a syndicate to negotiate with English authors? The syndicate would

be able to guarantee to authors the payment of their royalty, and it might fairly look for reasonable terms, because it would be the means of introducing the authors to a public to which otherwise they might remain comparatively unknown.

Yours faithfully,

GOLDWIN SMITH.

Toronto, April 29th, 1895.

POLITICS AND BUSINESS PRINCIPLES.—NO. V.

To the Editor of The Week:

Sir,—If the generally accepted axiom, that gold and real property securities always flow towards the country in which the rate of interest is lowest, be true, then there is nothing that will preserve a favourable economic condition but a rigid observance of those principles upon which a low rate of interest depends. The economic condition of Canada is unfavourable to her prosperity and advancement, because she has become depleted, to such an alarming extent, of her active capital; and thus her invested capital has become impaired. An inflow of money would rectify this adverse condition, but how can we hope for a change so contrary to natural law? Up till the present time in the history of Canada the flow of money and securities has been outwards in strict conformity to the accepted axiom. If we cannot induce money to flow contrary to the accepted axiom then it is quite evident that we must bring such action to bear on our finances that will give us as low a rate of interest as the country enjoying the most favoured economic condition, or else we need not expect an influx of money and therefore the power to compete in foreign markets, which is the only level by which we can attain to anything like material prosperity.

Gold is the only international money, because it is the standard of value of the largest creditor country. The standard of the largest creditor country is the dominant power by which all market values of the world are measured, irrespective of the standards of all debtor countries. Debtor countries might far better conform to Great Britain's standard than be taught the lesson through ignominious defeat and ruin to their trade and industries, that high interest countries cannot, with any advantage to themselves, establish standards of their own different to that of the largest creditor. It is only under one condition that they could establish a standard of value different to that of the largest creditor country with advantage to themselves, and that condition would depend upon the rate of interest being as low as it was in the largest creditor country; then, I say, a debtor country might establish its own standard of value of some different metal to that of the largest creditor country, because the flow of money would be towards such country, and therefore the country could take its payments in whatever metal it wished.

By the adoption merely by us of the standard of value of the largest creditor country, our economic condition is not by any means assured, there is something of far greater importance required.

CRITIC.

THE DESPERATE TORIES AND THE WILY GRITS.

To the Editor of The Week:

Sir,—The people of this country are being afforded an interesting but not altogether edifying spectacle by the attitude of the two political parties on the Manitoba Question. Both parties in the House seem to be playing with this question—the one a desperate game, and the other a wily game. This may be all very well for the Parties, but it is disastrous for the country. People are beginning to wonder why the example set by Sir John Macdonald and Mr. Blake in regard to the Jesuit Estates Question is not followed by Sir Mackenzie Bowell and Mr. Laurier to-day in regard to the Manitoba School Question. The firm and consistent stand of the *Globe* and the conciliatory attitude of the *Mail* look in that direction; but what about the leaders? Mr. Laurier has as good as committed himself to oppose any interference with Manitoba as long as her public schools are not "Protestant" schools; and as the Privy Council distinctly stated that the schools are not Protestant but "entirely unsectarian," by the very statute that created them, Mr. Laurier may surely be relied upon. He has moreover assured us that he has no desire to make political capital out of this question. Is it Sir Mac-