

Founded 1866

HOME JOURNAL

A Department for the Family

People and Things the World Over

The Grand Jury at the Toronto assizes recommended, among other things, that the lash should be part of the punishment meted out to wife-beaters. It seems rational that the penalty should bear some relation to the crime, and fine or imprisonment makes no impression on men who treat women with violence.

Because they objected to the method of teaching used by a professor, thirty-two students of the junior class of engineering in the University of Minnesota walked out from the class room in a body. They complained that the instructor used kindergarten methods. The gentleman seems to have sized up his class pretty well and decided to employ the most appropriate methods.

The school district of Belmont, 12 miles out of Morden, has a most enterprising young lady teacher, and one who is capable of adapting herself to conditions as she finds them. The teacher has secured the caboose from a threshing outfit and has it located near the school house. This she has fitted up until it is a very comfortable home in which she lives happily. She has several of the smaller children of the school boarding with her during the school days of the week. Their parents bring them in on Monday morning and come for them on Friday night.

A Domestic Relations Court is under discussion in New York. As now arranged, domestic troubles are brought before the city magistrates, whose calendars are always overcrowded. The environment there, it is argued, is unfit for many of those appearing in domestic trouble cases. These magistrates, though best-intentioned, cannot do justice to the cases, and, besides, many of the cases can be amicably adjusted if the proper facilities for consideration and inquiry are at hand.

Mr. Byron E. Walker, president of the Bank of Commerce, at a banquet in New York the other day, gave a fine presentation of Canada's ideals as a nation.

"We are a contented people," he told his American hosts, "with a fine birth-rate, with hardly any illiteracy, loving law and order, and insisting on it in every mining camp and on the wildest frontier line. We hope to build up a nation as free as any in the world with our own peculiar institutions, with a share of some kind in the British Empire, with relations with your great country, which should, through the coming ages, be of benefit to both nations materially and intellectually."

Year by year it appears that women novelists are gaining on the men. According to the reports of sales over the United States summarized in the *Bookman* the most popular novels of the year 1907 were written by 25 men and 7 women. In 1908 there were 22 men and 16 women among the successful authors. This is one of the few fields where women can compete with men without being handicapped by their sex. It is no longer necessary for them to assume a masculine pen-name, and there is no reason on the other hand to suppose that a woman's name adds to the popularity of a novel. It cannot be claimed that the men's novels are essentially different in character from the women's. The most conceited publisher would hardly claim that he could tell the difference between them with his eyes shut. What we want to know is how many other

things there are that a woman can do as well as a man when she has a chance.—*Independent*.

* * *

One man who has solved the question of keeping the boys on the farm is Charles Kirtland, six or seven miles from Salina, Kan. He isn't wealthy; he's just wise, this man. Mr. Kirtland owns 250 acres. Fred, his oldest son, is nearly 16 years old, and John nearly 14. Chester is nearly 6 years old. There are three girls. In the winter this family lives in town, Salina, and Mr. Kirtland says that the snow hardly has gone before the whole outfit is begging to go to the farm. Ever since they've been old enough to be interested in anything Mr. Kirtland's children have had some share, however small, in the farm, something they might call their own. He never fooled them. If they had \$8 worth of something and weren't old enough to be trusted with that much money, it was put to their credit in the books. Fred and John, 16 and 14 years, rented the adjoining forty acres last winter, and with their father's teams cultivated it and sowed it in wheat. They bought the seed out of their savings and paid for their threshing. The two boys put away a net profit of \$450 on this harvest. Next year they'll do better. They cared for this little farm of theirs without neglecting their own home or their schooling, and there are no happier boys in Kansas.—*Salina (Kan.) Capital*.

A Letter Coming to its Own

The reform and simplification of the very complex spelling of our language has received a sudden check in Ontario, and all the newspapers in the Dominion are devoting space to it, some of them growing quite excited over this backward step in a matter where it seems important to go forward.

The Ontario educational authorities have decided to restore the letter "u" in such words as "honor," "labor," "harbor," "parlor," wherever used in the new Ontario public school readers. This is one of the results that has followed the visit of Canadian pedagogues to Britain last year, and the announcement has stirred up a cloud of words. The idea of the authorities is that in speech and language Canadians are leaning too much to the American type and are turning their backs on the good old English standard. No doubt that is true and "slipshod" is the adjective that describes the average Canadian vocabulary, but one would think that there are other more important ways in which we could revert to the true type than in re-introducing a complication of spelling to harass the innocent school child. Beside, to get back to first principles in the spelling of some of these words, the original Latin did not contain the "u" and the addition of that letter was a French device. As far as phonetic pronunciation is concerned the "u" should have been retained and the "o" dropped, for in all the disputed words the sound in ordinary speech is that of the fifth vowel. In regard to "honor," one paper made a comment worth repeating. It suggested that in all the other words in the list the "u" was a superfluity, but advanced the theory that in going back from "honor" to "honour" perhaps it would be possible to go back to the old standard of the quality itself, when a man's word was his bond and neighbor dealt honestly with neighbor. Which brings up the question of whether in the good old times "honour" was more generally prevalent among men than now, or whether conditions were much the same and only publicity of dishonorable dealings has increased.

However that may be, the present renovation will not affect many Canadians except the very youthful generation in Ontario. The rest of us are not compelled to follow the ruling, and will doubtless go on using or neglecting the "u" as it has been our custom to do in the past.

The Things Jesus Would Not Do

It is significant of the marvellous vitality of the life of Jesus that His ideal persists age after age as the one supreme and absolute standard of conduct. It is significant of the unquenched divinity of human nature that, despite everything, the hearts of men everywhere, having once felt His touch, turn with wistfulness, if not with surrender, to the Man of Galilee, and in the rarest crises of life, when choices must be made, face themselves with the query, "Would Jesus do it?" His example is the world's ideal. Even though they may outwardly refuse it and pretend to ignore it, the life of Jesus haunts men as a Presence that will not be put by. It is the spark that disturbs the clod.

An instance is seen in the Press of the United States to-day. Nearly every great daily newspaper on the continent has published reports of the resolution of 1,500 young people of Cleveland to "live as they think Jesus would" during the current fortnight. And the experiment is watched and discussed as eagerly as any incident of the week. A despatch to *The Chicago Tribune* of Thursday gives the experience of one young lady, a stenographer in a large wholesale house. Here is her verdict:—

"You can't live as Jesus would and be an employee of a large Cleveland business house. It can't be done by an employee. The employer himself might carry the morality of Jesus into his business if he chose. The case is not hopeless. But the employer—at least my employer—doesn't. And it is suicidal for the employee to attempt it. Christ's morality and business tact clash. An employee insisting upon rigid honesty would be discharged instantly. I don't mean to say my firm is dishonest. Along broad lines it isn't. But the department managers resort to many evasions of truth in order that they escape unpleasant consequences."

For instance, a retail store is writing or wiring in for an explanation of why a certain order has not been sent. The reply is that it is the fault of the manufacturer, though such is not the case. Of course, that isn't serious lying. It's a white lie. But it is a lie just the same. No doubt it is necessary in business to tell that kind of lie, but Jesus wouldn't. And when I type the letter I must tell the lie, too. Jesus wouldn't be implicated in the lie. He would refuse to write it. If I did that, I should lose my position."

And what does it all mean? It means that Jesus was not only honest and truthful, but manly and brave. He had the courage to be a man. The department manager with his lie, even his white lie, is a coward. The man who lies and trains his employees to lie to his customers is not only a weakling but a fool. He must pay the price for his folly, not only in his honeycombed moral character, but also in his business. His employee who lies for him to-day will lie to him to-morrow. Jesus was right, even by the soundest maxims of the counting room and the business house, when He so lived and taught that at this day a Cleveland stenographer who understands His life can say confidently: "Jesus wouldn't be implicated in a lie." Slowly but surely it is being proved that Jesus is right. Individual men have proved it true, and some day society, the business world, the political party, will learn that no life is quite worth living that is "implicated in a lie."—*Globe*.

* * *

Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan has purchased and presented to the British Museum the collection of pre-historic weapons which was made by Canon Greenwell, of Durham, illustrating for the most part the bronze age in Great Britain. Some of the weapons were secured on the continent and in the east.

| | | |
|-----|-----|-----|
| 37½ | 37½ | 37½ |
| 36½ | 36½ | 36½ |
| 36½ | 36½ | 36½ |
| 35½ | 35½ | 35½ |

| | | |
|-----|-----|-----|
| 47 | 47 | 47 |
| 44½ | 45 | 45 |
| 41½ | 40½ | 40½ |

| | | |
|-----|-----|------|
| 122 | 123 | 122½ |
| 120 | 121 | 120½ |

KET.

ia, the shipment of a crop thus far moving, offerings from the Ar-s none too secure in ors to the future mar-ere was little change, pite bullish news from the condition of the yet being known of the American wheat crop has been fair. Prices range day by day were

| High | Low | Close |
|------|------|-------|
| 101½ | 101½ | 101½ |
| 102½ | 102½ | 102½ |

| | | |
|------|------|------|
| 99½ | 99½ | 99½ |
| 101½ | 101½ | 101½ |
| 102½ | 102½ | 102½ |

| | | |
|------|------|------|
| 100½ | 100 | 100½ |
| 102 | 101½ | 102 |
| 103 | 103 | 103½ |

| | | |
|------|------|------|
| 100½ | 100½ | 100½ |
| 102½ | 101½ | 101½ |
| 103½ | 103 | 103 |

| | | |
|-----|------|-----|
| 99½ | 99½ | 99½ |
| 102 | 101½ | 102 |
| 103 | 103 | 103 |

| | | |
|------|------|------|
| 99½ | 99½ | 99½ |
| 102½ | 101½ | 101½ |
| 103½ | 102½ | 102½ |

MILL FEED

t Winnipeg:

on) \$18.00

20.00

24.00

22.00

26.00

\$6.00 @ \$7.00

9.00 @ 10.00

4.00 @ 5.00

AND EGGS

35 @ 27

24 @ 26

21 @ 23

29 @ 32

29 @ 30

27 @ 27½

36

18 @ 20

wn and 17 @ 18

15 @ 16

12½

15

14

55 @ 65

1.00

1.00

75

40 @ 50

75 @ 1.00

1.50 @ 1.75

1.50

OCK

erings are quoted at the

light.

\$3.75; lambs, \$6.00 to

75; heavy hogs, \$4.75.

TO

50; bulls, \$4.00 to \$4.60;

to \$5.15, good, \$4.60 to

0; lambs, \$5.75, \$6.60;