

ness so vast and so far-reaching in their effect upon the future of that great country, and of the whole Dominion, that, if at all feasible, no time should be lost in settling the question to the satisfaction of all concerned, and for all time to come.

"We have ventured, on occasion, to express very serious doubts in respect to the desirability of shaping the imaginations and ambitions of our boys after military ideals, by the practice, which is, we fear, growing, of introducing military drill into the schools. If the thing is good for both the health and the morals of the boys, as its advocates claim, we do not know why it should not be used in connection with churches and Sunday-schools, as well as with the public schools. But we fancy that most of our readers will be somewhat shocked to learn to what extent the practice is being carried in connection with the latter in some parts of the United States. In his August number, Mr. B. O. Flower, editor of the *Arena*, deals with the subject in a very strong article. To show the extent to which militarism is being yoked with the religion which has generally been supposed to breathe a spirit the very antithesis of that inspired by military drills and pageants, he quotes the following from the *Corner Stone*, of Michigan:

"Detroit has twenty-seven church military organizations, containing 651 men and 43 officers. The largest is the Baptist Cadets, with sixty-six men and three officers. Then comes the Maybury Cadets, an Episcopal organization, with sixty men, the First Congregational Cadets, with fifty-three; the first and last being armed with rifles. The Episcopalians have six companies, the Catholics eight, the Presbyterians seven, Baptists three, Congregationalists two, and Lutherans one. Thirteen of the companies are armed with rifles and one with swords. These, it must be remembered, are all church military companies, and have no connection with the civil societies of the state militia."

To show how the thing is being done in New York, Mr. Flower quotes extracts from the *New York Recorder*, describing the equipment and some of the evolutions of a corps of cadets under the protection and support of a wealthy Fifth Avenue church. The boys of this company objected strongly, it appears, to "make-believe" wooden guns, and have, therefore, been equipped with "very suitable weapons," purchased from a United States Arsenal. These are Burnside carbines, to which "no small degree of charm is added" by the fact that "they were once used in real fighting." At a recent drill of this company, amongst other movements was a sham battle. "During this action the instructor called out the numbers of the boys at intervals, and as each was designated he fell over as though shot, and was carried off by the ambulance corps, while the remaining boys

manned the cannon." It can readily be believed that "this feature proved especially interesting to the spectators." How spiritually edifying, too, it must have been!

We are not aware that any of our Canadian churches have as yet become so progressive as to prove themselves churches "militant" after this fashion. But as we do not remember to have heard any protests from our clergymen against this same kind of thing in the schools, it would be interesting to know to what extent it is really approved by them, or how many of them have even given careful attention and thought to the matter. The real effects and tendencies of the movement are surely worthy of the most careful study and investigation. Especially does the question of moral effect deserve anxious inquiry by parents, as well as by preachers, and by all who desire the very best training for their children. If our memory is not at fault, we quoted not long since from a high authority, an opinion distinctly unfavorable to the military drill as a means of physical culture, on which ground it is often particularly advocated. Mr. Flower adduces the authority of Dr. D. A. Sargent, of Harvard University, in opposition to its physical utility; that of the Head Master of the Dudley School, of Roxbury, Boston, that "it is a bad thing for the boys;" and that the "public street parades are especially evil things;" that of Dr. Sargent against the common belief that the military drill gives grace and suppleness to the boys; and that of Lieut. Col. Edmonds, of the Boston Cadets, to the effect that, from the military point of view, the school injures rather than benefits the militia service. The modern drill regulations, he maintains, "are by no means adapted for work in schools, under any circumstances. They need a man's brains and muscles." Is not the question worthy of a little more thought and discussion before we go any further in this direction in Canada?

#### THE INTERCOLONIAL CONFERENCE.

The official report of the Intercolonial Conference has at length been given to the press. It is, of course, voluminous, and coming as a whole at so late a date, will hardly elicit the same attention and comment which it would have received had it appeared from day to day, while the Conference was in session. Yet the discussions and resolutions are too important to be received in silence.

The interest of the Conference centred about two particular proposals and to these the discussions were mainly limited. These were, of course, preferential trade between the colonies, or within the Empire, and the Pacific cable. The discussion of the first question was carried on in connection with

a resolution moved by Sir Henry Wrixon (Victoria) and seconded by Hon. Mr. Suttor (New South Wales) which, as finally carried after some verbal changes, is as follows:

"That provision should be made by Imperial Legislation, enabling the dependencies of the Empire to enter into arrangements of commercial reciprocity, including power of making differential tariff with Great Britain, or with one another."

A fact of some importance in its bearing upon the policy of the Mother Country in the matter was brought out by Sir Henry Wrixon, in the course of his speech, viz., that since 1873 the Australian colonies have been permitted, by Imperial Legislation, to enter into commercial treaties with one another, and to support these treaties, if they wish, by differential tariffs, which are of course available to no other country. This permission applies solely to the Australian colonies and their relations to each other. It does not even cover their relations to Great Britain, so that the colonies are not permitted to extend the treaties or the discriminations even to the Mother Country herself. A similar permission has been granted to Cape Colony. As Sir Henry de Villiers (Cape Colony) explained, the right in her case is limited by two restrictions: First, such a customs union can be made only with another State or colony in South Africa. Second, it can apply only to goods imported overland, and not to goods imported by sea.

The fact that Great Britain has guarded so closely the discretionary powers thus granted to these colonies suggests the possibility that difficulty may arise in regard to extending the principle, as requested in the resolution, so as to make it applicable to all colonies of the Empire in their relations to each other. No doubt the Mother Country, in harmony with the wisely liberal policy she has long pursued in all her dealings with her colonies, will readily make the desired concession, provided it can be done without seriously disturbing or endangering her treaty relations with other nations. We do not imagine that the fact that, in carrying out the purpose which has given rise to the request, the colonies will almost surely discriminate against herself, will be permitted to influence her decision. Reference was made to the treaty with France which has just been ratified by the Canadian Parliament, as if it involved the principle in question, but, as Mr. Foster pointed out, there is really no new departure involved in that treaty, save that of allowing a representative of Canada to take the largest share in the negotiations. The treaty is still, in form and substance, a British treaty, pure and simple, negotiated and sanctioned by Great Britain on behalf of one of her colonies.

One other point is worthy of note. Though the power of making a differential tariff arrangement with Great Britain is in-