THE WEEK:

AN INDEPENDENT JOURNAL OF POLITICS LITERATURE SCIENCE AND ARTS.

TERMS:—One year, \$3.00; eight months, \$2.00; four months, \$1.00 Subscriptions payable in advance.

ADVERTISEMENTS, unexceptionable in character and limited in number, will be taken at \$4.00 per line per annum; \$2.50 per line for six months; \$1.50 per line for three months; 20 cents per line per insertic; for a shorter period.

Subscribers in Great Britain and Ireland supplied, postage prepaid, on terms following;—One year, 12s. stg.; half-year, 6s. stg. Remittances by P. O. order or draft should be made payable and addressed to the Publisher.

No advertisements charged less than five lines. Address — T. R. CLOUGHER, Business Manager, 5 Jordan Street, Toronto.

C. BLACKETT ROBINSON, Publisher.

CONTENTS OF CURRENT NUMBER.

TOPIOS—	PAGE
Toronto University and Principal Grant	. 227 . 227 . 227
Increase of Judges' Salaries Professor Schurman on Canada's Destiny	. 227 . 227
Senator Macdonald on Canadian Commerce Prison Reform The Canadian Pacific Reilway Bill	228 228 228
Senator Gowan on the Grand Jury An Overlooked Defect President Harrison's Cabinet.	228
Abdication of King Milan	228
THE ANTI-JEBUIT AGITATION	. 229
WHITHER? M. A.	229
PROBATION (Poem)	. 230
CHAPTERS FROM OUR NATIONAL HOUSEKEEPING III Rambler.	. 230
MONTREAL LETTER Ville Marie	. 230
PHYLLIS (Poem) Helen Fairbairn	. 231
PARIS LETTER M. A. B.	. 231
LOUIS LLOYD'S LETTER Louis Lloyd	. 232
THE THINGS OF THE PAST (Poem) Ethelman Wetherald	. 232
IMPERIAL FEDERATIONII	. 232
THE PROGRESS OF CANADA.—II I Castell Hopkins	. 233
SHELLEY (Poem)	• 994
THE SLAVE TRADE IN CENTRAL AFRICA	234
READINGS FROM CURRENT LITERATURE	235
THE ECONOMIC INTERPRETATION OF HISTORY (Review)	236
HISTORY OF THE BANK OF ENGLAND (Review)	. 236
MUSIC AND THE DRAMA	0.96
LIBRARY TABLE	297
LITERARY AND PERSONAL GOSSIP	237
CHESS	. 238

All articles, contributions, and letters on matters pertaining to the editorial department should be addressed to the Editor, and not to any other person who may be supposed to be connected with the paper.

WE are much surprised that the Senate of the University of Toronto have taken no notice of the serious charge brought against them by Principal Grant, of Queen's University. We forebore harsh comment on the Principal's manifesto, at least until we should hear what the University of Toronto had to say in reply. But the interests of the higher education are paramount, and we wait anxiously for the expected defence before we draw further attention to the subject.

THE debate raised the other day in the Ontario Legislature by Mr. Craig's motion asking for information in regard to the use of other languages than English in the work of teaching in the public schools of the Province was interesting, by reason of the importance of the subject, as well as the ability of the speakers. As is unhappily so often the case, the importation of party jealousy interfered with the discussion of the question on its merits. The statements of the Minister of Education were so far satisfactory as showing that the number of schools in which the English language is not taught has been reduced from twenty-seven to zero within the last two years. On one point, however, the Minister's reply seemed rather evasive. Mr. Craig's question related to the use of French in the work of teaching. Mr. Ross dwelt mainly on the languages as subjects to be taught. The difference is obvious. But it is equally obvious, as the Minister indicated by reference to a German section, that the attempt to use English exclusively in teaching in a section in which the great majority of the pupils know only French or German, would be not only unjust but absurd. On the other hand, the existence of public schools in this English-speaking Province, in which the English language was neither spoken nor taught, was an anomaly which was not done away with too soon. In announcing that English is now taught in every public school in the Province, the Minister would have done well to have been more definite. Is it taught to all the children in the schools, or only to a few who may

choose to take it? It goes without saying that French and German should also be taught in those districts in which people of those nationalities largely predominate. The most rational and feasible plan would seem to be that in such localities English and French, or English and German, as the case might be, should be taught, pari passu, just as English and Latin used to be taught in English schools.

A NOTHER important question involved in the recent educational debate in the Legislature is that of textbooks. A fair inference from the admissions of the Minister would seem to be that while in the Public Schools teachers and trustees are tied down by rigid and inflexible rules to the exclusive use of prescribed books, the managers of the Separate Schools have the matter largely, if not absolutely, in their own hands. Mr. Ross, it is true, stated that the particular book referred to by Mr. Craig was used only in the hours set apart for religious instruction. But he made it clear enough that there is no such enforcement of regulations in regard to text-books in the Separate as in the Public Schools. We have always thought, and still think, that the text-book method of the Department is a bad one in two respects. By its narrowness it restricts the freedom of teachers and reduces the school system to the rigidity of a machine. This may be to some extent unavoidable, but it certainly is crushing to the individuality of teachers, and must render it impossible for those of the better class to do their best work. But less defensible and vastly more mischievous is the plan by which the books are prepared or chosen. The idea of having text-books made to order under the Minister's supervision, and copyrighted by the Department, is one that has been scouted by the foremost educationists elsewhere. It, indeed, carries its own condemnation on its face, for it renders competition in the production of text-books impossible, gives those who should be the most capable judges no voice in the selection, and is utterly discouraging to native talent and enterprise. But whatever considerations lead the Department to exercise this rigid supervision and control in the Public Schools should surely apply with at least equal force to the Separate Schools. It is too bad that the latter should be allowed a measure of liberty, whether beneficial or pernicious, which is denied to the former.

CLOSELY connected with the choice and prescription of text-books is the peculiar, if not unique, method adopted by the Department for their publication. It is exceedingly questionable whether a Government Department is justifiable, under any ordinary circumstances, in entering into the business of manufacture, either directly, or by way of securing permanent monopolies to certain firms. What would be said of the Dominion Minister of Militia, for instance, if he should undertake to oversee the manufacture of clothing for the volunteers, and should guarantee to certain firms perpetual monopolies of specific articles at fixed prices? Yet this would be not unlike the policy pursued by the Minister of Education. In the case of school books the extent and certainty of the sales make the monopoly especially valuable. How the system works is well illustrated in the case of the much discussed drawing books. Here is a set of books the sale of which is assured to the number of some hundreds of thousands annually. Half a million copies would probably be a low estimate of the numbers of copies of all grades sold in a year. The price is fixed at ten cents per copy. It is evident that a net profit of one cent per copy would make a snug fortune for a publisher in a few years And yet the Minister was compelled in the course of a recent trial to admit virtually that the books could be published at five cents a copy. Rival publishers have asserted in the press that they would pay handsomely at a much smaller figure. But the hands of the Minister are so tied by his own arrangement that he cannot prevent this great wrong to the parents of the school children of Ontario. Surely he must himself be now convinced that his arbitrary interference with the business of book-publishing was a blunder and an economical crime.

THE proposal of the Minister of Justice to increase the salaries of the Superior Court Judges by \$1,000 each will be heartly approved by most of those who have given

any thought to the subject. It would, as we have before pointed out, be idle to institute comparisons between the fixed salaries of those who have been raised to the bench and the large but fluctuating incomes derived by the leading members of the profession from their practice, as affording any basis for determining the remuneration of the former. There are many other considerations to be taken into the account besides the pecuniary one. The comparative regularity of the work, its comparative freedom from anxiety and worry, the dignity of the position, the sense of public duty, all have their place and influence. Even if the lawyers who command the largest incomes should be in some cases deterred from accepting positions on the bench by pecuniary considerations, it is not selfevident that public justice would suffer. The money-earning ability of an advocate is not necessarily a gauge or a guarantee of his superior fitness for a judgeship. But, on the other hand, all will admit that the salary of a judge should be sufficiently liberal, not only to free him from care in that regard, but to comport with the dignity and responsibility of his high office. Tried by such standards no one can say that \$5,000 to \$7,000 per annum is too much for a judge of the Superior Court in the wealthy Province of Ontario. It is rather a shame that they should have been so long permitted to content themselves with

THE American magazines are certainly doing their part to make Canada better known to the citizens of the Great Republic. Following close upon Mr. Wiman's article in the North American Review, and Charles Dudley Warner's, in Harper's, comes "The Manifest Destiny of Canada," by Professor J. G. Schurman, in The Forum. The least that can be said in praise of the last-named article is that its merits are such as to make Canadians proud of the advocate who presents their case; its defects such as can easily be pardoned as the optimism of a loyal and sanguine Canadian. In his description of the territory, resources, financial condition, population and political organization of the Dominion, the lines followed by Dr. Schurman necessarily fall to a considerable extent in the same direction as those which have been taken by the writers above-named, though without any evidence of imitation, and very possibly without a previous acquaintance with either. The resultant picture of the present state of Canada in respect to each of the five great essentials of nationality above enumerated must be admitted, by any but a most jaundiced critic, to justify abundantly the writer's manly declaration that "The destiny of Canada will be settled by the people of Canada. For them there is no manifest destiny but what they themselves decree." That the facts and figures adduced amply support this conclusion will be heartily admitted, even by those critics of less sanguine temperament, in whose eyes the realism of the picture may seem to be somewhat marred by the use of a little too much rose-colour, and by the throwing of its less hopeful features, geographical, financial and racial, too far into the background. The essay as a whole is certainly, as we have intimated, the production of an optimist, rather than of a dispassionate observer and critic.

MO criticise the weak points, or those which strike us as such, in so patriotic an article as that of Dr. Schurman would be an ungracious and ungrateful task. One remark seems to us to be demanded in the interests of historical justice. It is, of course, when he enters upon a description of the political parties of Canada, and an estimate of their respective shares in the still unfinished work of nationbuilding that Dr. Schurman steps on dangerous ground. Whether he holds the balance even we shall not undertake to decide. Opinions on that point will vary according to the party affiliations and prejudices of the reader. We refer to the matter only to call in question, on historical grounds, a statement which has often been made, but which has always seemed to us inconsistent with easily ascertained fact. When Dr. Schurman says that "Sir John Macdonald has been the real ruler of the Dominion since its formation, excepting only the few years of Mr. Mackenzie's Administration," the statement contains so much of truth that we need not stay to call it in question, though many of Sir John's most ardent admirers will regard it as doing scant justice to two or three very able men who have been