

school, while in Saskatchewan a minority in any school district—a minority which may be either Roman Catholic or Protestant—is allowed that right. The public school of the district will naturally be the school of the majority. The school arrangements may take some color from the religious faith of that majority, perhaps in the election of trustees or the choice of teachers. If the majority are Protestant, and the school arrangements are not satisfactory to the Roman Catholic minority, the latter can have a separate school. They have exercised this right in a number of districts. In like manner, if the majority are Roman Catholics, their school becomes the public school of the district. The Protestant minority in that case can claim a separate school, and in a number of instances they have done so. It should be explained, however, that apart from the allowance of a certain time for religious exercises in separate schools, all the schools must be conducted according to a common standard, under the general regulations of the Government's Education Departments.

School questions with small beginnings have the unpleasant habit of growing into importance. They have also, unfortunately, the faculty of stirring up religious strife, in the course of which it not infrequently happens that much religious zeal is manifested by people who have not at other times been conspicuous for their activities in religious movements. It is much to be desired that this Saskatchewan question be calmly discussed and dealt with in such a manner as to avoid a repetition of past conflicts. The trouble has not yet taken any party form. The leaders of the movement against the present Saskatchewan law are supporters of the Scott Government, by whom the law was placed on the statute book. They urge that the law was a mistake, one that defeats the intention of the Autonomy Act, and that therefore it should be repealed. Much, perhaps, will depend upon an authoritative determination, if such can be obtained, of the question, whether the Saskatchewan laws, as they stood before the passing of the Act of 1913, allowed such an option to the minority taxpayer as is now alleged by the opponents of the new Act.

Canadian Government Railways

CANADA is apparently growing up! At any rate she has rid herself of the last trace of the old Colonial connection—a name which offended many who believed that Canada was already a nation. According to an edict issued by the Railway Department at Ottawa the Intercolonial Railway will no longer be known as such, but as part of a system to be known as the Canadian Government Railways. It appears that there is an Illinois Central Railway and the I. C. R. of Canada, and the I. C. R. across the line got their ears mixed up and caused endless worry to our over-worked railway officials. Then the naughty Yankees used to steal our ears, and would only send them back when we threatened to send the sheriff or the Interstate Commerce Commission after them.

Rather than embroil President Wilson in any more international complications and note writing, our pacifists at Ottawa decided to abandon forever the letters I. C. R., and leave the Illinois Central in undisturbed possession. It meant nothing to them that for two generations these magic letters had upset governments, had (so some people said) provided

election funds for parties and subjects of debate in Parliament and out of it. The Intercolonial is no more! The Colonial part gave offence during recent years to many who believed we had passed from the Colonial stage to the status of a nation. The new name does not suggest that we are a dependency, but rather a people who have launched out on the uncertain sea of Government ownership. It denotes expansion, proprietorship and progress. No longer can we shrug our shoulders and ask Shakespearean-like, "What's in a name?"

Dumping

AMERICAN journals, in their discussion of the trade problems likely to arise after the war, are giving considerable attention to the question of devising methods for preventing what is called "dumping"—the selling of foreign goods at sacrifice prices, as a means of attacking the home industry. Referring to the efforts of Canada and Australia in that line, the New Republic says:

"Since 1906 Australia, and since 1907 Canada, have had anti-dumping clauses in their tariff laws. We have dumped freely in Canada since, nevertheless, and probably in Australia too. How can a customs service determine with accuracy whether the foreign producer is offering goods at lower prices than he charges in his home market?"

Our contemporary, we think, is not well informed as to the experience of Canada. The Canadian dumping law was the first measure of the kind adopted anywhere. There are always some difficulties in the application of new principles. Some little time was required to set the new machinery in efficient operation. But the difficulties were overcome. The Canadian Customs authorities, we believe, will not confirm the statement of the American journal. They have found ways and means of determining, with substantial accuracy, whether the invoiced price of an article is the usual price in the country of production, or a special price fixed for the illegitimate purpose of controlling the Canadian market. In most cases the American trade journals send circulars accessible to the Canadian authorities which furnish the desired information. In exceptional cases closer inquiry is needed, and then Canadian officials seek the facts at the headquarters of the American industry concerned, and, if necessary, make an examination of the books of the establishment. Of course Canadian officials have no power to make such investigations at an American office if the proprietors object. At one stage, we believe, some American shippers were inclined to stand for their legal right in this respect, refusing to allow the proposed examination. These, however, soon learned that if they desired to do business with Canada it would be necessary to conform to the requirements of Canadian Customs laws. The dumping clauses of the Canadian Customs Tariff have, we believe, proved more effective for their purpose than the New Republic supposes. Occasionally somebody complains that the law is a failure, but inquiry will usually lead to the discovery that the adverse opinion comes from some interest which had desired the protection of the law to be extended to transactions that were not really dumping. A manufacturer in Canada who finds keen competition from the United States may easily come to the conclusion that it is caused by the dumping of the American goods. He fails to

distinguish between dumping and legitimate low prices. Wherever the importer can show that the price at which he is buying is the ordinary price of the article in the country of production, he has a right to import at the valuation stated, no matter how low that price may be. But in any case in which it can be shown that the price is a special one, designed to undersell the Canadian producer of a similar article, the dumping law is available to check the practice, and the Canadian Customs officials will find no difficulty in enforcing it.

Alarming Proposals

MILITARY systems, based for the most part on old-time conditions, must occasionally, in these days of disturbance, come into conflict with the democratic spirit of the age, especially the democratic spirit of the Western continent. The considerable measure of intercourse established in England and at the front between the officers, non-commissioned officers and privates of Canadian regiments has been surprising to the military men of the old school. Probably in the case of these regiments there has been a little unofficial relaxation of the ordinary military rules. But something more in this direction is claimed by the Chronicle, of Halifax, a city which now has some thousands of volunteers training for overseas service. "Away with the Frills" is the caption of the article. The first "frill" for which abolition is demanded, is the salute now required from soldiers to officers, whether on duty or not. The saluting business, the writer claims, is much overdone. It is quite right, he admits, that salutes be required while the men are on duty; this is necessary for the maintenance of proper discipline. But why, he asks, should volunteers, many of whom have occupied influential positions in the community, be required, when they walk the streets, to salute every youth who happens to hold a commission?

The assignment of privates to do menial duties as officers' servants is another "frill" that the writer thinks may be justified in service in the field, to enable the officer to give his time to his important work, but such service should not be required at other times.

An incident just reported from Toronto discloses another "frill" which the Halifax writer would probably include in his list. Two officers of a Canadian regiment, we are told, declined to remain in a hotel in that city because a private soldier was allowed to be a guest at the same hotel.

To the military authorities of the old world, accustomed to see lines sharply drawn between the various ranks of the army, suggestions like these will seem startling. But there will be many people in Canada who will find themselves sympathizing largely with the Halifax writer's views. If experience shows that the practices complained of are essential features of an efficient military system—a question upon which we shall probably have to accept the judgment of military men of long service—Canada must be content to have them, for military efficiency is one of the things to which at this time all must bow. But how far they are really essential may be open to question.

Germany's far-reaching plans for extension of her commercial and industrial power, and the bearing of the present conflict upon them, are very clearly set forth in Professor Swanson's article in this issue.