

of pupils between fifteen and twenty years of age, whose first ambition is to enter the ranks of school teachers at the earliest possible moment. In many cases these succeed in passing the requisite third-class examinations, spend a few weeks at a model school, secure an engagement at salaries of from \$200 to \$300 a year, and enter upon the duties of what should be one of the most learned and honourable professions. Many of these have no intention of continuing to teach more than a few years. The business is merely a stepping-stone to some other profession or occupation. Even those who might have been willing to make teaching a life-work find it impossible to do so by reason of the low rates of remuneration. They have gained entrance only by underbidding and crowding out older and more experienced teachers who could not live on the pittance they were so willing to accept, and they in their turn will soon be crowded out by a repetition of the same process. That such a state of affairs must be fatal to true educational efficiency, no one can doubt. As it has its origin in the very natural, sometimes perhaps necessary, effort to keep school rates down to the very lowest figure, it is not easy to apply a remedy. The remedy indicated is clearly reduction of the number of competitors by raising the standard of age and other qualifications. This would mean a good deal of unpopularity for the Minister, and possibly in some cases hardship to the people. But surely it is high time that something were done.

THE verdict in the now famous Cronin case, in Chicago, is a curious comment on the judicial system which empowers the jury not only to pronounce upon questions of evidence, but also to determine the sentences of convicts. The acquittal of one of the accused, and the comparatively light punishment fixed for another, we may assume to be probably justified by the lack of proof in the one case, and by mitigating circumstances in the other, but to find the remaining three defendants guilty of murder, "as charged in the indictment," and then to let them off with anything short of the sternest penalty prescribed by law for the crime of murder, seems illogical in the extreme. It is hard to conceive of a crime comprising in itself all the worst features of murder most foul, and without palliating circumstances, than that charged in the indictment. The whole plot seems to have been conceived in the most hellish malice, and carried out with the most pitiless cruelty. If ever a crime merited the extreme penalty this surely was such a crime. It is hard to resist the conclusion that the sentence of life-imprisonment must be the outcome of a conviction on the part of some or all of the jury that the death penalty is not justifiable in any case. Such a view, no doubt, exists widely, and is probably spreading, not only in the United States, but in other countries. Into its merits we do not now enter. We are seeking to explain to ourselves the action of the jury in the case in question, in order that we may the better understand the working of this particular part of the judicial system in use amongst our neighbours. The question resolves itself, we suppose, into the more general one—Which is the more likely to pronounce a capricious sentence, one man of high character and culture, learned in the law, and skilled in weighing evidence and judging motives, or twelve men of average, or less than average education and capacity, destitute of such special training? The answer might seem easy were it not for the strange inequalities and eccentricities which sometimes confront us in the sentences pronounced by more or less distinguished British and Canadian justices. The memory of some of these constrains us to suspend the judgment we might otherwise feel ready to pronounce. On general principles, moreover, it might be difficult to give any good reason for believing that whatever arguments are valid in favour of a jury of one's peers to determine the question of fact may not be equally valid in favour of a similar jury to determine the degree of punishment. Reasoning thus, and recalling the old adage about glass houses, we are constrained to lay aside the stone we might otherwise have been disposed to fling at the jury in question, or the law which clothed it with such authority.

THE death of Robert Browning, while it has taken away one who will evermore stand, as he is worthy to stand, in the foremost rank of Britain's long line of illustrious poets, dead and living, has naturally enough revived to some extent the old controversy, as to the cause and character of the undeniable obscurity which marks and perhaps mars many of his productions. We say "undeniable," because we deem it no longer possible to deny the fact—however complimentary or otherwise may be its explanation. The very existence of numerous "Browning Clubs,"

many of them very likely mere imitative shams, but others composed of groups of thoughtful men and women intensely delving for the poet's deeper thoughts and meanings, is in itself a most practical evidence that Browning wrote not after the manner of other great poets; but in a kind and style peculiar to himself. The charges of being "wilfully obscure, unconscientiously careless, or perversely harsh," will, indeed, be no longer urged against him, seeing that he himself long since took pains to disclaim it, and assure his readers that he had "done his utmost in the art to which his life was a devotion." While Robert Browning will almost surely be always assigned a place, as we have said, among the most renowned of British bards, his exact niche in the temple will probably be long a matter of dispute. The final decision will, it is very likely, have to be left to a future generation, though it is possible that the profound and enthusiastic study of his new book, which by a pathetic coincidence, came into this world just as he was leaving it, may do much towards settling this question. Those who have rashly assigned him the very first place, will, we dare say, have no light task to defend their opinion. The admirers of Tennyson, who, at his best, has so well shown how possible it is for a great genius to be profound, without becoming obscure, and to clothe the subtlest thought, and the most entrancing imagery in monosyllabic Anglo-Saxon, will not soon admit any other living or departed, to a place beside their prince of poets. But we forget ourselves. The columns of a journal, and the limits of a paragraph, would afford little apology for the presumption that would broach in them a question so high and delicate. Let us hasten, as much better becomes us, to lay our homely wreath upon the tomb of departed genius, as we drop a tear in memory of one, who, whatever the merits or defects of the food he provided for our "deeper musings," knew well how to furnish exquisite amusement and instruction for the lighter hours of every genuine lover of poetry.

THE ANGLICAN CATHEDRAL.

OUR opinion of the expediency of establishing a Cathedral, with all its accompaniments, will depend upon the view which we take of the Anglican system itself. If we accept that system, even theoretically, in its essential features, we shall take one view. If we assume that we are at liberty not merely to adapt the system to present requirements, but even to reconstruct it, we shall take another. At the time of the "Great Rebellion," the Puritans not only did away with bishops, they also put down all the offices connected with the Cathedral—deans, canons, and all the rest of it. No one needs to be told that, in thus acting, they were thoroughly consistent. They could not have done otherwise without stultifying themselves. But it was equally inevitable that when, at the restoration of the monarchy, the Episcopal system was reinstated, the Cathedral system should also be reconstituted.

Now, we have no mind in this place to discuss the advantages or the rightness of the different kinds of Church government which are adopted by the different Christian communions now in existence. Experience proves that any one of those systems, if faithfully and earnestly worked, will have a good deal of success; and further, that the more consistently the principles of any particular community are carried out, the more successful it will be. We do not mean to say that one body may not learn something from another, nor that the time may not come when a larger scheme shall be adopted on the basis of which a union of the Reformed Churches may be realized. But we mean that no community is likely to have success which is not true to its own principles, and to those principles as they have been illustrated in its history.

It is a very general opinion among thoughtful observers, both here and in England, that the English parochial system is becoming increasingly congregational. And this in two ways. In the first place, different types of service are found in different churches to a far greater extent than has ever been before. And, in the second place, the people do not keep to their parish church as they used to do, especially in towns, but go to the church which they like best, some for the sake of the preacher, some because of the ritual. There can be no doubt that this change has been beneficial to some extent, more especially in abating the rather extreme stiffness and rigidity of old Anglicanism; but it is equally clear that it has its dangers. Among these the chief seems to be the tendency to decentralization, the likelihood of congregations thinking chiefly of themselves and of their own interests and not very much of the needs of the community at large.

Now the Cathedral system, rightly understood and vigorously worked, has a tendency to counteract this particularism and to stimulate the whole diocese. It has been said by some persons, here and in the United States, that the Cathedral is neither needed nor likely to be useful in this new world. If these persons meant to argue that Episcopacy is unnecessary, we could understand them. No doubt, the arguments for a Presbyterian form or even for Congregationalism are so strong that they commend themselves to many learned and devout theologians. But this is not the present question. Given the Episcopal system, and the experience of Roman Catholics, Anglicans, and Episcopal Methodists would seem to prove that it is as workable as any other—given this system, is it wise to abandon an organization which has always, in some form or other, been a part of it?

It is indeed urged with a good deal of force that Cathedral establishments in England have too often been mere incumbrances in the dioceses, dead weights which have pressed heavily upon the life, vigour, and action of the Church, which should therefore be removed as soon as possible. But those who argue in this manner from the past can scarcely know the present state of matters in regard to the influence of Cathedral bodies in the old country. It is not merely that they have so woke up that they are becoming centres of life in almost every English diocese; but this revival has come about in great measure from there having been a fresh recognition of the intention and significance of the Cathedral system. Even a pronounced Liberal like Professor Freeman has again and again pointed out that so far are the original ideas of the Cathedral system from being unsuited to modern needs, that our failures have resulted from our having forgotten the true meaning of their constitution; and that we may expect them to be living and influential institutions when we go back to the ideas from which they originated and study the rules of their founders.

Whilst, however, it would seem in the last degree unwise to dismiss a part of the Episcopal system which is so identified with its history, it does by no means follow that a newly founded Cathedral should be a mere copy of an old one. There is no reason in the world why the founders of the new should not work freely on the lines of the old, making such modifications and adaptations as our own circumstances may require. The present Archbishop of Canterbury, when Bishop of Truro, is thought to have accomplished this task with great ability and success in the constitution of the Cathedral body for the new Cornish diocese. The Bishop of New York is commencing something on the same lines, but apparently with greater magnificence, in the great city on the Hudson. That two men of such practical sagacity as Bishop Benson and Bishop Potter should undertake such a work, involving heavy expenses, immense labours, and a large amount of anxious thought, might suggest a doubt to those who assert the uselessness of such institutions.

As regards the Toronto scheme, it is not quite easy to form a judgment. It was a somewhat deplorable necessity which constrained the respected Bishop of the diocese to leave the throne of Bishops Strachan and Bethune in St. James' Cathedral. We understand that the ruling powers at St. James' are now as fully aware of the evil as others have been for a long time; and that they are willing to meet the Bishop's wishes to almost any extent. It has been remarked that the removal of the Cathedral to Seaton Village is very much the same kind of thing as though the Bishop of London should remove his throne from St. Paul's to Sydenham. We fear it is too late to reconsider this part of the scheme.

As regards the constitution of the Chapter, to speak frankly, we are not sure that we understand it, either as an application of the older systems or as a scheme created to meet present circumstances and needs. As, however, it does not seem to be fully matured, a change having been made in the designation of its members, it may be useful to offer a few remarks on the scheme as a whole.

In the first place, the body is evidently too large. So many, however, of the nominees to offices have declined, that the number has been greatly curtailed. In the second place, there is a want of reality about the scheme. It appears to be a conglomerate hastily formed from the suggestions of a number of persons thinking and acting independently. It was a strange notion of bestowing honour upon some of the leading clergy in the city, to call them Minor Canons; since, according to all English usage, the Minor Canon is simply the Stipendiary Curate of a Cathedral. This mistake is supposed to be mended by calling them Prebendaries; but how the occupants of