

THE WEEK.

Ninth Year.
Vol. IX., No. 22.

TORONTO, FRIDAY, APRIL 29th, 1892.

\$3.00 per Annum.
Single Copies, 10 Cents.

THE WEEK:

AN INDEPENDENT JOURNAL OF POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE AND ART

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

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

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 insertion for a shorter period.

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

European Agents—SMITH, AINSLIE & CO., 25 Newcastle Street, Strand, London.

C. BLACKETT ROBINSON, Publisher.

CONTENTS OF CURRENT NUMBER.

TOPICS—	PAGE
University College Alumni Association	339
The State and Education	339
Two Other Points	339
Redistribution	339
Did Mr. Mowat Gerrymander?	339
Prisoners' Testimony	340
Shall Prisoners be Compelled to Testify?	340
Mr. Mercier Prosecuted	340
The "Most Favoured Nation" Clause	340
Canada's Commercial Freedom	340
What Does it Mean?	341
OTTAWA LETTER	T. C. L. K. 341
ORPHEUS. (Poem)	Sarepta. 342
TWO KNAPSACKS: A NOVEL OF CANADIAN SUMMER LIFE. J. Cawdor Bell.	342
A PARSON'S PONDERINGS CONCERNING THEOSOPHY. Rev. Geo. J. Low.	345
PARIS LETTER	Z. 345
THE LIBERAL PARTY	F. W. F. 346
CORRESPONDENCE—	
The Manitoba School Question	John S. Ewart, Q.C. 347
A LOSS TO CANADIAN SCHOLARSHIP	Principal Grant. 347
KINGSFORD'S HISTORY OF CANADA	347
ART NOTES	347
MUSIC AND THE DRAMA	348
OUR LIBRARY TABLE	348
LITERARY AND PERSONAL GOSSIP	349
PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED	349
CHESS	351

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

THE recent formation of an University College Alumni Association in connection with the University of Toronto is a movement which may have no inconsiderable effect upon the future of the University. In moving the resolution affirming the desirability of forming such an association, Mr. William Dale, M.A., dwelt on three useful purposes which, if properly managed, it should serve: (1) Such an association would be a centre of union for the graduates of the college. (2) It would form an effective means of defending the college endowment, which recent events had shown needed such defence. (3) It would be a means of bringing about a harmonious development of the various departments of study of the arts faculty in the college." The first and third of these objects the Association now formed will have in common with most similar alumni organizations. These objects alone would no doubt afford an ample reason for being and a large sphere of usefulness for the society. The second of the purposes named, upon which Mr. Dale dwelt for a moment or two, suggests, probably, the more immediate and pressing motive for the organization of the Association at this particular juncture. Two of the matters alluded to by Mr. Dale in this connection are of special interest, as showing the attitude likely to be taken by most graduates of the University in regard to certain transactions which have been touched upon, from time to time, in these columns. These were the recent transfer "under cover of the word equipments, by an order in Council, of over \$100,000 of University funds, to Upper Canada College—funds which should have been devoted to strengthening the teaching staff of the Arts Faculty." The other point referred to, Mr. Dale touched upon as follows: "Assistance (in the Arts work) was demanded from the authorities, but at first refused on the ground of straitened finances, though it was discovered that at the same time in the space of two years a sum of about \$100,000 was being expended on the Biological department, which to a large extent is in reality a medical college—an expenditure of money on purposes foreign to the original objects for which the endowment was intended. But this was not all. It had been stated, on what he believed to be

good authority, that a valuable portion of land available for the maintenance of the college had been appropriated to the funds of the medical hospital, which he believed was practically a part of the same medical college." These expressions are interesting and may be regarded as significant of the attitude which the graduates are likely to take with reference to the future policy of the institution. It is pretty clear to all who have given thought to such matters, that it is a great mistake for a university with a limited endowment to economize at the expense of the strength and efficiency of its Arts department, which must always be its chief department, in order to expend freely in the development of any professional department, the aim of which is necessarily to fit the student for a "bread-and-butter" occupation, rather than to implant a love of learning and literature for their own sakes.

WHILE we are glad to find ourselves at one with our correspondent, Mr. Ewart, on several points in regard to the school question we have been discussing, we are sorry to find that, in order to guard against being supposed to give consent, by silence, to propositions from which we emphatically dissent, and which seem to us to involve educational and political principles of the very first importance, we are obliged to recur to the subject. In so doing we shall merely point out, as briefly as we may be able, the points of difference which we deem of fundamental importance. To Mr. Ewart's first six propositions we take no exception. The assumed "parity of reasoning" in the seventh, we are quite unable to concede. The things compared—religious "doctrines" and "secular education"—are utterly disparate, for the purposes of this argument. With the one, as we have shown, the State has no right to interfere in any way whatever; the other, as a matter of self-protection and national well-being it must of necessity include within its domain. Hence, "while nothing could be more unjust than for it to use the taxes paid by the Catholics to aid in the propagation of the doctrines which the good Catholic detests," the same element of injustice is not at all present, so far as we can see, when the State uses those taxes for the purpose of imparting the "purely secular education" which we are agreed it is the province and the duty of the State to secure amongst all classes of its citizens. As this secular education is a necessary part of education, it seems a little absurd to speak of the Catholic as detesting it. If it be said that the emphasis is on the "purely," the reply is easy. The education need not be purely secular, because the good Catholic parent is at liberty to mix as much religion with it as he pleases. Hence, when we have eliminated the fallacy that lurks in the word "purely," the alleged injustice which would certainly be present if the State school prevented the Catholic parent, or guardian, or priest, from infusing as much religion as he chooses into the educational process, as it goes on from day to day, vanishes. We may just observe, further, that the mere fact that a Catholic, or any other citizen, detests a certain thing, does not of itself prove that the thing is wrong or unjust. That must be demonstrated on other grounds. Many citizens, both Catholic and Protestant, it is to be feared, detest paying their fair share of the necessary taxes, but that does not make it unjust for the State to collect those taxes.

TWO points more and we have done with the Manitoba School question for the present. From Mr. Ewart's eighth proposition we are forced to dissent squarely. First, there is a broad and fundamental difference between our admission that corporate powers may be conferred upon Catholic (or any other) citizens to enable them to unite and organize for voluntary educational work, and the proposition with which our correspondent asks us to agree. The parenthetical clause which he has introduced, "united and organized by the State for the purposes of education," introduces the very principle against which we have been protesting from the first. The State has, we hold, nothing to do with uniting and organizing Catholics or Protestants for educational or any other purposes. The State has to do only with citizens as citizens. To organize one particular sect for educational purposes, and to pledge

all its resources and all the machinery of organized society for the carrying out of those purposes, a principal part of which is the teaching of the doctrines and ritual of that denomination, would be to violate some of the most fundamental principles of politics. In the second place, to so organize the members of a religious sect, with the understanding which the proposition in question implies, that the members of that sect are to be exempt from the payment of the taxes necessary for the maintenance of the public schools, which are admitted to be necessary for the safety and well-being of the State, would be to add wrong to wrong. It will not do to say that the State may proceed in the same way with all other denominations, for the result would still be that a large residuum of the future citizens would be unprovided for, and these of the very classes whose presence in every community makes the State educational system a necessity.

THE Redistribution Bill promised by Sir John Thompson, on behalf of the Dominion Government, will probably be in the hands of our readers by the time that this number of THE WEEK is received. Whatever the character of the measure, the cry of "Gerrymander!" is pretty certain to be raised by the Opposition. For this reason, as well as for better ones, it is, we think, greatly to be regretted that the Government have not followed the precedent set by the Gladstonian administration in England, and put the business of redistribution into the hands of a mixed, or non-partisan, commission. They could have lost little by so doing, save on the assumption that they really wish to take an unfair advantage of their political opponents, which we are loath to suspect. It would be superfluous to say that a redistribution should be made with the most complete disregard of every partisan consideration. On the other hand, it is obvious that not only is the temptation to a dishonest Government to make it a means of party gain very great, but that the conditions are such that even the most conscientious one would find it very difficult to perform the task with perfect impartiality. It would be too much to expect even from such an administration that it should forget its own interests at the risk of giving its opponents perhaps two or three or more additional members in the House. Moreover, it is well known that the Liberal party in Ontario has been, ever since the redistribution of 1882, and still is, smarting under a bitter sense of injustice and trickery. To the shame of the Government that was responsible for that rearrangement be it said—and it is, we believe, hardly possible for their best friends to deny the impeachment, though we may hope for the sake of the honoured dead that the boast of a purpose "to hive the Grits," which has so often been ascribed to the Premier of that Administration, was either a pure fabrication, or a wicked perversion of a harmless jest. Be that as it may, and be the guilt whose it may, the fact is, as we have said, almost beyond dispute. The writer of these remarks has occasion to remember, it having been his task at one time to prepare a chart of the constituencies of the Province, as they are arranged for Dominion purposes, for use in engraving a map of the Province. The result made certainly a striking picture, as any one may see who will try the experiment. As a mere stroke of policy, to put it on no higher ground, it may well be doubted whether Mr. Abbott could better have signalized the new order of administration which he claimed to wish to inaugurate, than by bringing down an unobjectionable redistribution bill, unless, indeed, he had been fair and wise enough to have adopted the non-partisan course spoken of at the commencement of this paragraph.

THE imminence of an election in Toronto, to fill the vacancy caused by the lamented death of the late Mr. Clarke, reminds us that, if the testimony of an Opposition may be relied on, the Dominion Government has not a monopoly of the badly won advantage to be derived from a successful "gerrymander." The much-praised Liberal Administration of Ontario is said to have disgraced itself by using the same expedient—certainly one of the most cowardly and mean to which it is possible for any Government to resort. So far as the general outlines of the con-