

of the work done by their predecessors a generation ago. While we should certainly be among the most earnest in opposing any scheme which might threaten to impair in the slightest degree the unsectarian and thoroughly national character of any of the provincial schools, from the University downwards, we cannot fail to recognize a degree of force in the contention that the other Universities of the Province, also holding their charters from the Provincial Legislature, and more or less responsible to it for the character of their work, are entitled to some voice and influence in regard to the standards of matriculation and the courses of the secondary schools which prepare for it. Nor can we quite forget that, however clear and sharp the distinction between the people and the denominations, it is still in the main true that the members and adherents of the denominations are the people, and that apart from the denominations the Provincial University would have few students or supporters.

EDUCATIONAL questions are rife this week. In the midst of all the discussions about matriculation standards, Separate Schools, French Schools, and so forth, comes the discovery that the Board of School Trustees in the great and good city of Toronto are actually requiring, as a *sine qua non* of the admission of a child to a Public School, that the parent or guardian shall certify, amongst other things, that he is a Protestant! But a dim light is thrown upon the matter by the explanation that some official or officials have taken it upon themselves to substitute "Protestant" for "supporter of the Public Schools." It is clear that some one has blundered; whether wilfully or not remains to be seen. The two terms are, happily, by no means synonymous. While it is but just that the taxes of those whose children attend the Public Schools should go for the support of those schools, it is obviously desirable, in the interests of the whole community, that every honourable inducement should be held out to Catholic parents to patronize the Public rather than the Separate Schools, instead of obstacles being placed in the way of their so doing. We feel sure that a healthful public opinion will quickly compel the removal of the odious clause from the certificate required, no matter by whom or for what purpose it may have been inserted.

NOW that these inconsistencies in the School laws of the Province have been set in so clear a light, it becomes the plain duty of the Government and Legislature to reconcile or remove them at the earliest opportunity. Nor is there room for any serious doubt as to the direction the necessary change should take. The present confusion has evidently arisen from the attempt made in the last amendment to meet the demand of the Catholic hierarchy that all members of their communion should be assumed to be supporters of the Separate schools, just as all Protestants are assumed to be supporters of the Public schools. On the surface this is somewhat plausible. Having entered into a solemn constitutional compact to maintain in perpetuity the Separate School System for the minority, the majority are bound in good faith to suffer no unnecessary obstacle to be placed in the way of its successful working. But on closer examination it will be found that the reasoning on which the claim in question is based is defective in two particulars. In the first place it rests on the false assumption that members of the Roman Catholic Church necessarily or with practical uniformity wish to support the Separate Schools, whereas, as a matter of fact, large numbers of them are known to prefer the Public Schools. In the second place, there is involved the equally fallacious assumption that the Separate Schools, because constitutionally permitted, stand to the Government and the people in precisely the same relation as the Public Schools, that they are the public schools for Catholics, just as the others are the public schools for Protestants. This, we conceive, was never intended. The so-called Public Schools are the schools of the Province. The Separate Schools are the schools of a class. The one are normal, the other exceptional. The one are for the people, the other for those who specially claim them under the constitutional provision. The case is not such that Catholicism makes one a Separate School supporter, and non-Catholicism a Public School supporter, but rather that citizenship makes every man *prima facie* a Public School supporter, unless and until he claims the special exemption which permits him to be classed as a Separate School supporter. Such, at least, unless we greatly err, will be found to be the meaning of the law and the constitution. Such surely ought to be their meaning.

THE Dominion Government has, it is pretty clear, attempted a compromise in regard to the export duty on logs. An Order-in-Council has been passed providing that all logs found to measure, inside the bark, eleven inches or less diameter at the butt end thereof, irrespective of length, when exported for piling purposes or as piling, be not subject to the export duty of \$1 per 1,000 feet board measure. Whether this will meet the usual fate of such compromises remains to be seen. There seems reason to doubt whether it will suffice to allay either the animosity of the American lumbermen who are demanding retaliatory legislation, or the fears of Canadian lumbermen dreading such legislation. Half measures are seldom very successful. If the Government made a mistake in putting the heavy export duty on logs, either through ignorance of the fact that Canada imports more logs from the United States than she exports to that country, or otherwise, it would be better to frankly admit the error in judgment by promptly repealing the Order-in-Council, than to incur danger of being compelled to do so by hostile legislation.

THE Convention which is about to meet in this city, on the call of the Citizens' Committee on the Jesuits Estates Act, will no doubt be large and enthusiastic. Our time for going to press will not admit of any comment in this issue. We may express the hope, however, that the proceedings will throw light upon a question which is now perplexing to a good many minds. We are well aware that it would be unreasonable to expect that those who enter upon a great movement of this kind should be able to see clearly the end from the beginning. That is not the way in which great reforms or great revolutions have been brought about. One clear step at a time has ordinarily and rightly been deemed sufficient. But this one step should be plainly in an onward and upward direction; not in the arc of a circle which leads one no farther from the central difficulty. The immediate end proposed in this agitation is the disallowance of the Jesuits' Estates Act. Suppose this end gained by one or other of the three methods proposed. Suppose even that the previous Act incorporating the Jesuits be also invalidated. The prospects of success in either respect seem exceedingly poor, but that does not matter. Suppose these immediate ends reached, what real advance will have been made at all commensurate with the tremendous efforts put forth? The hierarchy will still be supreme in Quebec. The Jesuits will remain in the land and go on with their work at some disadvantage, perhaps. The tithe system will continue to drain the resources of the *habitant*. The Roman Catholic Bishops will still erect and reconstruct municipal parishes at pleasure. The Separate Schools of Ontario will still flourish, and the so-called Public Schools of Quebec will remain to all intents and purposes, as they have been and are, recruiting and training schools for the Church. The reign of ignorance and superstition will continue. In a word the virus of Ultramontaniam will still remain in the country and in the constitution. Is the game, then, worth the candle? Is it worth while to organize and carry on a great crusade for the sake of spiking one or two guns of a powerful battery? Does it pay to build a huge scaffold in order to cut off one or two branches from the wide-spreading tree of race and religious sectionalism? Would not a more comprehensive and thorough movement have been both more logical and more inspiring?

IT is gratifying to learn that the loss of life in the Conemaugh Valley catastrophe was at first probably greatly over-estimated. But the sudden destruction of even five or six thousand people, should the figures be happily brought so low, is a calamity sufficiently dreadful to demand the strictest investigation. Pending such inquest it is but fair to suspend judgment as to the guilt of individuals, but it now seems only too probable that the result will be found to have been due to the astounding carelessness or parsimony of the Club to which the artificial lake belonged, and for whose pleasure it was made and maintained. The *Philadelphia Record* says that one prominent resident of Johnstown, who now mourns the loss of wife and daughter, was so convinced of the danger threatened by the reservoir that he had even tried legal measures to compel its removal, and had been laughed at as a "crank" for his pains; that an experienced engineer had, after careful examination, reported in unmistakable language that the dam was in an unsafe condition; and that one of the Club's watchmen had continued to warn the officers of the Club of the danger, until silenced by threats of dismissal. If these statements, in which names and particu-

lars are given, can be substantiated, the officers of the South Fork Club will have to render a stern account to the laws of the State and to the bereaved survivors, and a still sterner one, it must be supposed, to their own consciences. The horrors of the event seem multiplied; one can almost fancy it a mocking representation in miniature of the great tragedy of human life, when it is remembered that, whether due to culpable negligence or not, the danger was created and the catastrophe brought about, through the agency and for the gratification of a few pleasure seekers.

WE have on previous occasions discussed the startling inequality in the sentences pronounced by the courts in Great Britain, and sometimes in Canada, for criminal offences. These inequalities are of two kinds. They appear in the great differences in length of terms of imprisonment imposed in cases where the offences are similar, and in the still more astonishing disproportion often observable between the degree of heinousness of the offence and the penalty inflicted. Such occurrences as the imprisonment of mere boys for years for petty pilfering, while hardened culprits are let off with briefer terms for the most brutal assaults, especially upon wives or children, are astonishingly frequent, especially in the Old Country. The marked tendency of many judges there, and a few here, to be much more severe in punishing crimes against property than those against the person is no doubt to be explained as the outcome of an aristocratic state of society, in which the laws were originally made and administered by privileged and property-owning classes against masses whose condition was little if at all better than one of serfdom, and whose lives were regarded as of much less consequence than their masters' possessions. Akin to this feeling, and the outgrowth of a similar state of society, is the tendency to ascribe to the husband and father a kind of absolute lordship over the persons of wives and children. But whatever the origin, the fact of glaring inequalities in the awarding of sentences is undeniable, and the wonder is that such cases awaken so little resentment or remorse in the public mind. Attention has, however, at last been drawn to the subject in the British House of Commons. A motion for a Royal Commission to inquire into the matter and propose a remedy was voted down; but the suggestion of a Court of Criminal Appeal for the reviewing of evidence and revising of sentences met with considerable favour. Sooner or later some remedial legislation will no doubt be had. Meanwhile the mere drawing of attention in this way to the matter will have its effect upon courts and people. Far too much is now left, evidently, to the discretion of individual judges and magistrates. It is not easy to see why the laws may not be made more explicit in proportioning the punishment to the offence. It may even be doubtful whether any sentence beyond a few months' imprisonment should be, in any case, determined by a single individual.

IT is, on the whole, a good omen that the members of the Senate Committee of the United States on relations with Canada seem to be making an honest and patient effort to acquaint themselves with the facts of the case, so far at least as commercial relations in the West are concerned. In proportion as knowledge increases prejudice usually dies out. It cannot be doubted that the lack of accurate information has had much to do with the unreasonableness that has so often been displayed by United States Senators when matters affecting Canada came up for discussion. The members of this committee have now visited many important points along the frontier and on the Western coast, and Senator Hoar, the Chairman, is reported as saying that everywhere along the route they have been met with the expressed desire for closer trade relations. The Committee has also had an opportunity of seeing how complicated and mutually dependent the railway systems of the two countries have become, while, happily, the great centres of trade, both in the West and in the East, have expressed in no doubtful terms their resolve that their commerce should not be left at the mercy of the great railway monopolies of their own country by the adoption of any such summary legislation in respect to Canadian roads as has been urged in the interests of those monopolists. Senator Hoar is also credited with the statement that legislation of some sort on the Fisheries question must take place next session. If Congress has at last resolved, as we may begin to hope, to put national prejudice and the fear of the Irish vote aside, and set about studying international questions on their merits, the day of a friendly and fair settlement of all matters in dispute