

China and Japan. Two points in connection with most of these speeches invite criticism. One is the undertone of assumption in most of them, that the American tariff is conceived in a spirit of hostility to Canada and Britain. The *London Times* even goes so far as to pronounce it a distinctly unfriendly measure, to be resented as such. But the speeches of the influential leaders of the high tariff movement contain no indication of any such purpose. There is, in fact, every reason to believe that the Bill is conceived in pure selfishness, the selfishness of the great monopolies which control the policy of the Republican party, and are able to move Congress almost at will. We admire the spirit of our Government and people, in determining to seek out new markets for Canadian goods. From the point of view of Sir John A. Macdonald and his supporters, who claim that every effort has been made consistent with Canadian dignity and self-respect to obtain reciprocity, there is nothing else to be done. But it seems little better than an electioneering device—and this is the second point to which we refer—to assume, as Sir John and his supporters constantly do, that reciprocity in its unrestricted form is synonymous with annexation. The simple fact is, as every intelligent Canadian knows well, that there is no sufficient reason for believing that there is any idea of annexation in the minds of those who would favour, more than of those who would oppose unrestricted reciprocity. There is no question of annexation at all in Canada, and if there were, the argument of those who say that free trade with the United States would be the most effectual means of killing any such movement, by taking away the only inducement to political union, is, so far as appears, just as valid as that of those who take the opposite view. The question of unrestricted reciprocity, if it should become a living one—and it is certain that reciprocity in no other form will become possible for long years to come—should be argued on its merits. It is a fairly debatable one. Why should it be thought necessary to prejudice the discussion by identifying unrestricted trade with political union, as if the one involved the other?

SOME of the leading capitalists of New York have been giving their opinions in regard to the effects of the McKinley tariff. Those opinions are in a certain way favourable to the new policy. Messrs. Jay Gould and Russell Sage are, it is very likely, right in predicting that the operation of the tariff will not seriously interrupt the prosperity of the country. They have great faith in the ability of the people to accommodate themselves to changed conditions. If their prognostications prove correct, as they no doubt may, the result will, we venture to say, be due much more to the vast extent and variety of the country's resources, than to the peculiar causes assigned by these capitalists. The fact is that the nation is so unique in the extent of its territory and the vastness and variety of its productions, that it is a world in itself. So long as South and North, East and West and Centre have the freest possible intercourse with each other, they can be fairly prosperous even if the rest of the world were utterly shut out. Hence the experience of such a country is no proper test of the effects of extreme protection, nor will the fact of its continued prosperity suffice to prove that it would not be much more healthfully and happily prosperous under a more liberal and far-sighted trade policy. Some of the reasonings of these wealthy monopolists are nevertheless worthy of study as curiosities in political economy, if for no other reason. Mr. Gould, for instance, says apparently in the most jaunty manner: "If it (the tariff) increases the cost of some articles people will simply use less of them. Take wool, for instance. If the tariff on wool makes clothing cost more, a person will get along with one suit, where he would otherwise have two." There's philosophy for you! "Job's comforter!" we can fancy the poor man exclaiming, conscious that he would vastly prefer two suits to one, and unable to understand why the men he helps elect to Congress should conspire to deprive him of the second. Mr. Gould says further: "The products of the country have to find a market, and if they cannot find it at high prices they must find it at lower prices," forgetting apparently that the tariff is imposed for the very purpose of bringing the high prices. Mr. Russell Sage is, perhaps, less frank, but no less unsatisfactory. Let us put two or three detached sentences side by side: "The new tariff will lessen importations, and thereby save outlays for duties;" "The tariff will give additional employment to labour, for the reason that under it home manufactures may be stimulated;" "The tendency

of all articles has been toward lower prices on account of competition and over-production;" "The tariff unmistakably improves the situation as far as labour is concerned, for it will decrease foreign competition;" "Home competition will reduce the prices of all products as low as they ought to be;" "In accomplishing the reduction (in price) which I have named, this country employed its own labour and kept its gold at home, instead of sending it away to pay the labour of other countries." Here are some of the links. Let the curious student of political economy weld them into a logical chain, showing, how, if the tendency has been to over-production and lowering of prices, the stimulation of that over-production can result in advantage to labour; why the country might not send its over-productions instead of its gold to pay for imports, and thus increase rather than diminish the stimulus to home manufacture by enlarging indefinitely the market for its products, and so forth. The fact seems to be that the United States in a decade of infatuation has fairly embarked on a trade policy very similar to that which prevailed in England during the first half of the present century. Though the discussion and experimentation will probably run their course much more quickly than was the case in the Mother Country, there can be little doubt that they will end in the one case as they did in the other.

THE recent census-taking in the United States affords a striking object-lesson on the wastefulness and folly of partyism in the civil service. The census, even the ultra-Republican *Tribune* being witness, has proved a monumental failure. This result can be attributed to but one root-cause, the appointment of incompetent officials on partisan grounds. It is admitted on all hands that the statistics gathered are utterly unreliable. New York is now making a re-count of its own inhabitants, and expects to prove that the figures set down by the census-takers are incorrect to the extent of at least 100,000 citizens. The increase of population made out for the whole Union, after deducting that part of it which can be shown by indisputable records to be due to immigration, leaves the natural increment so absurdly small that its correctness is out of the question. This complete and disgraceful break-down of the civil service system involves more than the mere waste of the millions of money expended. It introduces an element of uncertainty and confusion into every argument and induction and business calculation based upon these returns, or rather reduces them all to comparative worthlessness. It is not unlikely that the result is due, in part at least, to the error in judgment of the officer at the head of the department in trying to find out too much, and so asking questions to which large numbers of the people would not give a correct answer. Be that as it may, the spoils system of appointment has proved an egregious failure and the whole nation is disgusted. What can be done about it remains to be seen.

#### UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS AS TEACHERS.

THE active and intelligent interest that is taken in seeking out and adopting the highest ideal of public education, and the best methods of attaining to it, is perhaps one of the most satisfactory and hopeful signs of the times. The old-time conservatism and apathy in educational matters which bred a Dotheboy's Hall and Salem House has given place to a spirit of activity and radicalism at times nearly revolutionary. There is no curriculum in school or college, no matter how it has been honoured by the public instructors of the past, but is subjected to the most careful scrutiny, and applauded or condemned on its merits. Accordingly we find that a large measure of attention is being bestowed upon the important practical question of university reform, in this and other countries, by those who are in a position to observe the results of university training upon society, and capable of measuring its defects.

It is felt that though economic considerations may put a course in arts beyond the reach of the masses, yet there are deeper and more serious reasons why the baccalaureate degree is not competed for by a larger percentage of those who pass through our high schools. The complaint that the arts courses in our universities do not fit men and women for the very serious tasks of life, or at least that the benefit obtainable from such courses is not adequate to the time and energy expended, is heard on all sides. Though murmurs of this kind may be, and indeed often are, out of all proportion to the actual defect, it will be found that the question is worthy of the most thoughtful consideration.

Without attempting a discussion of what ought to be the actual objects of study in the universities, it may not be without profit to direct attention to a matter of scarcely less importance, namely the need of more down-right teaching ability in our professorial chairs.

Canadian universities do not suffer so much from lack of scholarship in their professors as from those qualities which fit men to impart instruction in a clear and methodical manner. There is ground for the opinion that in the selection of a professor greater anxiety is often displayed in securing a "double first" or a senior wrangler, than one who though of less brilliant parts may from his habits of thought and general bent of mind far outstrip his more brilliant rival so far as a power to train the minds of students, or create a thirst for knowledge is concerned. Since all men have not the same gifts, it may be impossible to arrange any university course so that it would be impossible for a man to take the highest honours, and yet possess few of those qualities of mind which are requisite to teach with effect. Nothing however is more plain, from the teaching of experience, than that many profound scholars are lamentably helpless when they undertake to expound a principle or elaborate a theory before a class. Many a graduate, no doubt, will call to mind instances to illustrate this statement.

Some professors fail to employ their abilities to the best advantage by being too abstruse and in general talking above the heads of their students. Others waste time by dwelling upon unimportant points. A third class of men fail to reach the high standard of an excellent professor from their utter want of order, or method. The writer has in mind a man who may be taken as a type of those professors who unintentionally waste much of the valuable time of students. This gentleman is a "double first" of a European university and has since won for himself a name in science. He is of middle age, vigorous and enthusiastic. His reading does not end with the particular department of which he makes a specialty, and he may well be termed an "all round man." In the class-room, however, he cuts a sorry figure. Possessed of an exceedingly active brain, he appears to try to carry on two or three trains of thought at once, and having but one set of vocal organs his expression cannot keep pace with his mind. The result is that he succeeds in mystifying his students, to say nothing of himself. The pernicious effect of such an eccentric mind upon the minds of young men whose habits of thought are being formed cannot be estimated. The end-in-chief of an arts course is surely not so much to *know* as to develop the *power* to know, and the power of knowing depends in no small measure upon clearness and precision of thought. To cultivate an ear for music and an eye for art we must listen to the artistic efforts of the best musicians and contemplate the master pieces of the great painters. It is no less true that clearness and precision of thought is best developed by accustoming this young mind to the proceedings of those master intellects, whose every turn of thought counts for something.

This is an age of conferences, assemblies and convocations, where the great questions which stir the minds of mankind are freely discussed. Is it not just possible that there is room for a professorial convocation in this country where the question *how to teach* might not be an unworthy subject for the thoughtful consideration of the venerable occupants of our university chairs?

ANGLICANUS.

#### LONDON LETTER.

FANNY BURNEY'S *Earlier Diaries*, edited the other day by Mrs. Raine Ellis, sent me to the house in narrow St. Martin's Street, off Leicester Fields, to see for myself the little play-room up two pairs of stairs, where "Evelina" was written, to see if in the library or eating-parlour the ghosts of Garrick and of Johnson sometimes took the air. I found no ghosts. Though the clock struck twelve as I wandered in the cool old rooms I found no ghosts, for it was twelve at noon, with the sun scorching bright outside, and I think not even a member of the Physiological Society has met a Spirit on a summer morning.

There was the decorated fireplace, by which lounged the Barney patron, Mr. Greville, at that dull assembly where everyone was bored, and there the long three-windowed library, scene of that family group (fit subject for one of Hogarth's conversation pieces) which Mme. D'Arblay has sketched in her "Father's Memoirs." The shallow wide staircase is as it was when Dr. Burney was wont to lead the way with pride, up, up, to the little wooden observatory in the roof from whence Newton used to watch the stars. But a hundred years have fled since the fine company came thronging in to the sound of Hester's harpsichord and Pacchierotti's charming voice, and the atmosphere of the place has altered, for there are lodgers in all the upper floors, and a club smokes its leisurely pipe in the reception rooms.

You would say, if by chance you turned into the street and looked up at the fine old house (which you have never done when I have been at the windows: there are no loiterers in the alley) that it had a history—it had known better days. Probably you would not care to turn the handle of the great door and come up to the panelled parlours. And yet I think you would be repaid, for here is the stage where many delightful comedies were played what time George III. was king.

One likes Fanny Burney infinitely better in consequence of the publication of these *Earlier Diaries*. You meet her at home and *en déshabille* and find her an honest little creature, devoted to her own people, well-bred, quiet and modest. In these books she is at her best and is excellent company. Occasionally, notably in the Rishton and Maria Allen escapade, the pages