

his time. If anything can be made of imperial federation, it is about time that its admirers presented the country with a scheme of federation that at least pretended to be practical. For our own part, we do not think this impossible. It is possible. But that those who now have the scheme in charge will formulate such a scheme we think exceedingly improbable. Almost every federation speech that we have read deals with the glories of England and the beauties of loyalty. All this is pretty, very pretty—from the English stand-point. And if there were only the English standpoint to be considered, it would be enough.

\* \* \*

Fortunately, however, or unfortunately—as one chooses to look at it—there is another side from which the promoters of this scheme will have to look at this question—and that is, the Canadian. The glories of England are all very well; as the product of the work of our ancestors we take pride in them. But what we look at is not the past glories of England so much as the present and future glory of Canada. Loyalty is a beautiful theme—for the tenth class politician or the first class poet. But loyalty in this country and for us means *devotion to Canada*. This trifling fact is conveniently overlooked by many of our imperial federation friends. They style themselves patriots, and they fill our ears with a tale of our obligations to England. This would have done very well—excellently well—a couple of hundred years ago. But the French revolution and American revolution have happened since then. And men in our day recognize the fact that loyalty and patriotism are words bounded by the limits of the country in which they dwell.

\* \* \*

No man has a right to the title of patriot in this country who places the interests of any other country whatsoever before the interests of Canada. And this is what many of the imperial federationists are doing. The air is full of England—but it is only a chance time that we hear anything of Canada—and when we do it is usually a description of the debt she owes the mother country. As a matter of fact what she owes England is very much less than what England owes her. If any man hopes to see imperial federation *un fait accompli*, he will have to learn to base his hope, so far as Canada is concerned, on the benefits which such a step will confer upon us. We do not deny the existence of such possible benefits—we want to hear of them—that is all.

\* \* \*

This is, however, a digression from the pamphlet of which we spoke—and yet it is no digression. The name of Haliburton, to those who know him, is—like the name of Joseph Howe to all who know him—a synonym for patriotism—it is intimately and lastingly connected with the bone and sinew of our national life. All that concerns the nation concerns this name—conversely, all that concerns the name concerns our country. For this reason, we hope that Mr. Crofton's work will be largely and

widely read. It deserves to be. And, if the Haliburton will allow us to make a suggestion, we would advise that a fitting subject for the second number of their series would be "Joseph Howe, his life and speeches." We hope that every student of Queen's and every graduate whom the JOURNAL reaches will enclose half a dollar to King's college, Windsor, Nova Scotia, and procure "Haliburton, the man and the writer," by F. Blake Crofton.

\* \* \*

Everyone, we fancy, will sympathize with the Senate in its splendid attempt to raise the standard of work done in the different classes by its new curriculum. The enlargement of Junior Mathematics, Philosophy, etc., into two compulsory classes, the junior and the senior, cannot be regarded as anything but a decided advance in the line of educational reform. It will undoubtedly result in better and cleaner work in both classes. It is beyond contradiction that a single year in Philosophy is insufficient at once for the student and for the professor. The work has been divided hitherto into two great parts, the one treating of the history of Philosophy and the other dealing with its general principles. The kind of work required in the two departments is essentially different, the first part being mastered largely by a good use of the memory and the latter demanding original thought. The time hitherto given the student to get into trim for the second and more difficult half of the work, viz: Three or four months, is far too little. The change from memorizing to reflection was too pronounced and as a result the benefit to the student was reduced nearly to a minimum. He was graduated from the class just as his eyes were beginning to be opened to the character of the work he had on hand.

\* \* \*

By the new curriculum all this is changed. For the whole of the first year he will deal with the history of Philosophy, with a few side lights thrown in by the professor in the way of original work. These will be, as we have said, few; but they will have enough of suggestiveness about them to give him a fair conception of the work which he will enter in the next session. He will then have the six months vacation in which to develop into the work of the second year. So that, when he begins the senior class, he will do so with his eyes wide open and prepared to make a fit and proper use of the lectures which he will then receive. That this will at the same time make the work much lighter for the lecturer, and prove of very considerable service to the student is, we think, beyond question.

\* \* \*

The same thing holds good and in much the same way with the course in Mathematics. But while this will improve the character of the work done in these two departments, it will at the same time make it very much easier for those who desire to pursue a course foreign to them. For example, to those who take honors in litera-