would bear no comparison in point of value with the advantages that would result from absolute freedom to negotiate solely in her own interests. Canada certainly wants the full management of her own affairs, but it would be hard to give any good reason why she should want a fair share or any share in the management of the affairs of the Empire in Europe, Asia, Africa, Australia, and all over the world.

THE foregoing remarks relate mainly to material and selfish considerations. The advocates of Imperial Federation rightly attach great value to sentiment. But so do the friends of Independence, and they certainly are entitled to ask whether the vision of an independent Canada with unlimited possibilities of development before it, is not adapted to arouse a higher ambition and a more ardent patriotism than any dream of playing an insignificant part as a fractional appendage to a world-wide Empire could possibly beget. Principal Grant is, inadvertently we are sure, a little unfair when he speaks of Independence as "secession from the Empire." History has given to that word "secession" some disagreeable connotations which do not properly belong to the notion of Canadian Independence. If independent nationality involved any violent tearing away from the parent stock, any abrupt breaking off of old and cherished relationships, or even of friendly intercourse; if it must necessarily leave behind a heritage of bitter enmity, or a burning sense of injustice, ingratitude and wrong, then, indeed, the argument from sentiment would carry overpowering weight. But when it means nothing more than the severance by mutual consent of the very slack and slender apron-string by which the well-grown youth is now kept under the tutelage of the mother, instead of being thrown upon his own resources; when it is simply the last stage in the process of an evolution, the natural culmination of which is an energetic, self-reliant manhood, the painful images suggested by the word "secession" are surely out of place. When Principal Grant asks in reply to the fear that Canada would be without influence in the proposed federation, "Is Canada going to give way to the argument of timidity?" the friends of Independence may well thank him for giving them that word. Is not the argument of timidity the argument which he himself and others like-minded most strenuously urge against the advocates of Canadian nationality? Our aim being friendly and useful discussion, not controversy, we shall not dwell upon other points which suggest themselves, such as the difference of opinion between Dr. Grant, whose view is also that of Lord Salisbury, on the one hand, and Sir Charles Tupper on the other, as to whether England or Canada should take the initiative; or the fact that the idea of a discriminating tariff in favour of Colonial wheat, which was put forward by Colonel Denison, and which if attainable, would be the strongest and most tangible inducement that the project could offer to Canada, seems now to have been finally disposed of by the collapse of the Fair Trade movement in England.

THE resignation of Mr. Prendergast, Provincial Secretary, from the Manitoba Cabinet is accepted as showing that the abolition of Separate Schools and the discontinuance of the official use of the French language are a part of the fixed policy of the Administration. It is now stated that Mr. Prendergast's resignation was handed in in June last, which seems to show that the determination of the Government has not been come to suddenly or without due deliberation. Mr. Prendergast is said to have stated that he does not intend to withdraw his support from the Government, save in regard to these specific matters. This may perhaps indicate that the success of the Government measures is foreseen, and that the Opposition will content itself with a protest. Did Mr. Prendergast regard the proposed action as a terrible injustice, or a gross violation of good faith, it is inconceivable that he could think of continuing to give a friendly support to the Government and the party capable of committing themselves to it.

TWO distinct questions are involved in such a discussion as that which is likely to be raised by the action of the Manitoba Government—the one touching the abstract justice of the principles underlying the proposed reform, the other, its fairness or otherwise in view of existing constitutional obligations. The latter concerns more the Dominion Government and Legislature than those of the Province, inasmuch as the framing of the Constitution was the work of the former rather than of the latter. On this point it may be said generally that the right of a Province to make such reforms in its institutions and modes of working as are dictated by experience, helpful to progress, and approved by a large majority of citizens seems to be a corollary of its autonomy. Denied such powers, a Province could no longer be considered self-governing or free. Apart from constitutional and historical limitations no sufficient reason could be now urged for the publication of the official documents of Manitoba in the French language. When that requirement was embodied in the Manitoba Act, it was in the expectation, no doubt, of a large migration from Quebec into the North-West. It seemed, in fact, not improbable that the French might be the preponderating element in the population of the new Province. That expectation has not been fulfilled. Were the Constitution now being drawn up, in view of the smallness of the French-speaking minority such a proposal would be regarded as an absurdity and would hardly be considered for a moment. Why then should the Province be handicapped for all time to come by an obligation involving great trouble and expense, which was imposed to meet a condition which is practically non-existent? In view of the fact that this clause of the Constitution has been already suffered to fall into partial disuse, apparently without protest, it may be hoped that no serious objection will be raised to the proposed change, so far as the language is concerned.

THERE is, undoubtedly, a certain amount of force in the main argument used on behalf of Catholic Separate Schools. The gist of that argument is, if we understand it, about as follows: Roman Catholics cannot conscientiously send their children to the public schools, therefore it is unjust that they should be taxed for the support of such schools, as they can derive no benefit from them. This sounds plausible. If these objections on conscientious grounds had a positive basis, if they were urged as against any system of faith or morals actually taught in public schools, they might be hard to answer. But when it appears, on closer scrutiny, that the exception is taken not to what is taught but to what is not taught in the public schools, the argument loses its force, or at least the reply is easy. The Province is willing and careful either to eliminate from the public school all teaching to which Catholics can reasonably object, or to so arrange the programme that no child of Catholic parentage shall be required to be present at any such exercise. Clearly, then, the grievance no longer exists. The contention at once assumes a different character. The demand for Separate Schools now implies that the Catholic clergy and laity demand that money derived from the taxation of Protestants and Catholics alike be appropriated to aid them in teaching tenets and observances which are distinctly Catholic in character. This is not the object of a public school system, and it involves injustice to the non-Catholic population. This answer is, so far as we can see, sufficient and conclusive. But may not the Government go much further and say that to give public money for the support of Separate Schools is not simply to use unfairly the public funds. It means much more than this. It is to give public money in aid of the propagation of doctrines which are distinctly subversive of the supremacy of the civil authority which governments represent. It will not be denied that it is a doctrine of the Catholic Church, taught by all her authorities and unequivocally enforced by more than one famous Papal syllabus, that the ecclesiastical is superior to the civil authority, that it has the right to limit and overrule the decrees of the latter, that the ideas of civil and religious liberty which are the basis of all our modern free institutions, are wrong and bring those holding them under the anathemas of the Church. To give public money in aid of distinctively Catholic schools is, therefore, not only wrong in principle and unjust to all non-Catholics, but is suicidal in policy, as tending to the subversion of civil authority and individual liberty. In saying this we are not blaming Catholics for holding or teaching what they may honestly believe. Our aim is merely to show how illogical and unreasonable they are in claiming that the State should aid them in disseminating such views.

THE meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, which takes place in Toronto during the week beginning 28th instant, promises to be of unusual interest. On two previous occasions has the Association crossed the border—its meetings in 1857 and 1882 were held in Montreal. A great many eminent names are already mentioned as among the scientists who will honour the Toronto meeting with their presence. Major Powell, Chief of the United States Geological Survey, is the retiring president this year; and Professor Mendenhall, the new Superintendent of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, is president-elect. Among the vice-presidents are Professor G. L. Goodale, for some years assistant to Professor Asa Gray and his successor in the chair of botany at Harvard; Professor C. A. White, of Washington, the eminent paleontologist; and General Garrick Mallery, of the United States Bureau of Ethnology, who has cast a flood of light on the origin of written speech by his studies of the pictography and sign-languages of the North American Indians. Forestry preservation is to be discussed by Professor B. E. Fernow, Chief of the United States Forestry Bureau; the silver question by Hon. Messrs. Dana S. Horton and W. L. Treholm; scientific cookery by Edward Atkinson, Esq., of Boston, the eminent statistician, and Dr. W. O. Atwater, a chemist, who has made food his specialty; trade channels, by Captain H. C. Taylor, Vice-president Nicaragua Canal Company; and indeed not make too long a list there is promise that in every one of its eight sections, masterly papers will be presented on all the lines on which science is to-day most rapidly advancing.

THE proposal that trial by jury in civil cases should be abolished in Manitoba has given rise to considerable discussion, both in the Province immediately concerned and elsewhere. The jury system as at present conducted undoubtedly proves in many cases a very defective instrument for securing justice. No one who is in the least degree familiar with the practice of the Courts can doubt that in many cases the verdict of the jury is more in the nature of a "toss-up" than of the result of a careful weighing of evidence; that the advocates on one side or the other often succeed in "packing" the jury box to the small extent necessary to defeat the ends of justice; that the jurors chosen are often of a class quite unfitted by education and mental habit for casting aside the prejudice of sect, party, caste, locality, and so forth, and giving a true verdict according to the evidence. There is undeniable truth in the statement of the Winnipeg *Sun* that "as a rule the suitor who is confident his case is a righteous one is anxious to bring it before a judge, but if it is rather 'off colour,' he seeks adjudication before a jury." It would not be easy to overestimate the significance of such a fact. But while it is not hard to find serious defects in the time-honoured system of "trial by jury," it is by no means so easy to find a substitute which may not lead to other and greater wrongs and abuses. Trial by judge without option is not, in our opinion, such a substitute. It may at once be admitted that, by virtue of his peculiar training and ingrained sense of responsibility, the average judge of to-day is far more likely to be free from bias, as well as far more capable of discerning between right and wrong in an intricate case, than the average juryman. How much more likely is he then to judge righteously than the least informed, least intelligent, and least just of twelve average jurymen? And, so long as any one of the twelve may render a right verdict impossible, this is really the proper form of the comparison. But is it not pretty clear, on the other hand, that to abandon the jury system and return to one of judicial absolutism would really be to turn back, and a long way back, the hands on the dial of social progress? Trial by a jury of one's peers, even in a civil suit, is a palladium of popular liberty. It has been one of the emancipating agencies which have brought it about that a Gardiner or a Jeffrey on a modern bench of justice is an impossibility. Like other popular functions pertaining to the exercise of self-government, which might perhaps be better performed by proxy, it represents an educative force of great value to the common people, and one which, if they are wise, they will not vote themselves unfit to retain in their hands.

THE fact that no one would think of proposing the abolition of juries in criminal cases is very suggestive. Nor should it be forgotten that in regard to the question of fact, which is the only question upon which the jury has to pronounce in either civil or criminal trials, it is admitted by high judicial authorities that the juryman is quite as likely to determine correctly as the judge, while in many matters pertaining to ordinary industrial pursuits he is even more likely to do so. In view of all these considerations would it not be wiser, admitting that the jury system is unsatisfactory in many respects, to seek some better alternative than its abolition. It will appear, we think, on careful consideration that it is not the jury system itself, but the condition which demands a unanim-