

his Cabinet, above Sir John himself, or gives the most commonplace M.P. precedence over the Premier of a Provincial Cabinet. But these apparent anomalies are the outcome of a rule that is easily understood and that probably serves the purpose well enough on the whole. Nor do we suppose that Sir John, or any other person similarly situated takes the indignity greatly to heart. That which is really anomalous and indefensible in the matter is that, in a Dominion which has no established church, any place, in the order of precedence, should be assigned to clergymen of any denomination. In England, of course, church dignitaries are State officers and must be treated accordingly. In Canada they are private citizens, and to single out those of one or two denominations for official distinction is clearly illogical and may be regarded by other denominations of equal or greater strength and influence as unjust or offensive, if, indeed, they care at all about the matter, which spiritually-minded men perhaps should not do. If it be said that Quebec has its State church, and that the prelates of that church are, therefore, entitled to official distinction, the reply is that even so it is contrary to the general principle observed, according to which Dominion officials in all other cases rank above those whose title to honour is merely Provincial, that the archbishop of a Provincial church should take precedence of the members of the Dominion Cabinet and Parliament. Moreover, this explanation has no force in reference to the dignitaries of the English Church. Evidently the order is illogical in these respects and should be amended.

A VALUED contributor, Mr. W. D. LeSueur, has recently favoured the readers of THE WEEK with two articles, either of which deserves more than a passing notice, by reason both of its keen, logical incisiveness, and of the unusual conclusions it seeks to establish. The first, which appeared in the issue of May 23rd, dealt with the subject of "Spiritual Influence." In opposition to a principle long since embodied in Canadian law, Mr. LeSueur maintains that the State cannot, without infringing upon the natural rights of the citizen in the domains of both conscience and intellect, make an ecclesiastic amenable to the law if he brings spiritual penalties or terrors to bear in order to influence an elector in the exercise of his franchise. As is well-known the laws of the Dominion do not now permit the use of such penalties or terrors. Mr. LeSueur's arguments, based upon such grounds as that the Church claiming to have to do with unseen realities pertaining to another sphere of existence and the State conceding the claim, the latter cannot properly interfere with the operation of the former within her own exclusive sphere, are, as we have intimated, put with all the clearness and force of the skilled logician. On reading his article we were reminded of the famous demonstration that was one of the puzzles of our school days, in which it was shown that the hare, given a start of a certain number of yards, and running at a certain rate of speed, could never be overtaken by the hound, running at a faster pace, inasmuch as while the hound is crossing any interval, however small, remaining between him and the hare, the hare will have passed over a certain additional space and so will be still ahead. It will be remembered that even a great logician at one time pronounced this a perfectly logical demonstration of a conclusion which was both absurd in itself and capable of being disproved by fact as often as anyone chose to try the experiment. We do not assert that Mr. LeSueur's demonstration is of this kind, save in so far as the conclusion reached, or at least involved, seems to imply a possibility of consequences so startling as to verge on the absurd. We fancy, indeed, that it would not be very difficult to apply the *reductio ad absurdum* absolutely, by supposing possible cases in which rigid adherence to the principle involved would be suicidal on the part of the State, rendering it unable to punish what to the ordinary mind would be gross crime, but to the doer, acting under ecclesiastically-inspired conviction or terror, would be sacred duty. Our present purpose is not, however, to attempt to lay bare the fallacy in Mr. LeSueur's reasoning, or to indicate the direction in which it may seem to us to be lurking, or even to maintain that such fallacy positively must exist, but merely to direct our readers' attention again to the article, if, perchance, some of them may be able to shew cause why our contributor's view should not prevail, and lead fair-minded men to demand repeal of whatever in our legislation touching this matter may be an infringement upon the rights of intellect and conscience. We may just add, that reference should be had to Mr. LeSueur's own argument and not to our necessarily imperfect presentation of it.

THE other article alluded to is that on "The Failure of Education," in the last number of THE WEEK. We are inclined to think that the picture Mr. LeSueur gives us may be a little overdrawn, and to query whether the "induced stupidity" is not to a considerable extent a thing of the past more truly than of the present. We are glad to believe, at any rate, that here and there throughout Canada are to be found even State schools, in which the operation of mind-training is tolerably well understood and carried on with a good degree of success, though under limitations which make the highest success impossible. It is to be feared, however, that such cases are exceptional. Possibly, the exceptions are so rare that they scarcely do more than establish the rule. Be that as it may, we are sure that Mr. LeSueur has called attention to one of the most important matters to which attention can be directed. We have long been convinced, not without some opportunities for observation, that the State can never give us the system of education Mr. LeSueur describes, and for the reason, amongst others, which he gives, that its system must be to so large an extent uniform and machine-like in its operations. But we need not repeat the views to which we desire to direct special attention. We merely wish to point out that the rational system, with the living scientific teacher to give it effect, can be had, with some approach at least to the ideal, whenever and wherever a sufficient number of parents are willing and able to pay the price. Let the demand for such schools, using the best educational methods even in the most elementary stages, be created, and the supply will soon be forthcoming. Let it become matter of practical recognition that teaching, even the teaching of young children, is a profession, requiring special aptitude and the highest educational preparation; that its emoluments and honours must therefore be put on a level with those of the other learned professions; and that, still further, mental training is a process which can be successfully performed only upon the individual and not upon the mass—which means, of course, that the teacher's attention must be concentrated upon a small number of pupils—and the solution will be found. It is, we confess, a solution which, though within the reach of the many, could not easily be brought within the reach of all. The public school, State-supported, would still be a necessity, though it could not fail to profit greatly by the new departure.

WE have received a copy of The Protest of New York Importers and Merchants against the McKinley Tariff Bill. It is a formidable document and cannot fail to have a powerful effect upon the minds of any of the United States Senators who may be, in any measure, open to conviction. Emanating from business men, it is, as was to be expected, thoroughly practical and business-like in its mode of dealing with the subject. The main portion of the large eighty-page pamphlet is made up of the reports of sub-committees, to each of which was committed the task of examining carefully the effect of the proposed Bill upon the special business with which the members of that committee were identified. The result is a series of reports, not of theorists of any school, but of experienced business men, concerning the actual practical effect of the proposed tariff law on the various branches of trade in which they are engaged. One fact brought out very clearly and strongly insisted on, in most of these reports, is that the proposed tariff is so constructed as to bear with special severity, if not with positively prohibitive weight, against the cheaper grades of the various classes of goods, thus pressing with special rigour upon the poorer classes of the population. The arraignment of the tariff is in many respects very severe. Some declare that its effect will be actually prohibitive of the lines of business in which they are engaged, and will compel the closing up of their establishments, throwing large numbers of employes on the streets, many of whom will be able to find no other employment. The committee on cutlery declare that the tariff is so framed that it will drive every honest man out of the trade and put it into the hands of rogues. In fine, this protest, addressed by about four hundred and fifty of the leading New York firms, to the Senate and House of Representatives, declares that the McKinley bill is "wholly unnecessary," that it does not accomplish its purpose, that it is unjust, and that it handicaps American trade, and retards the progress of the nation. A more formidable memorial is not often, we fancy, presented to Congress. Its effect remains to be seen.

HARVARD COLLEGE has under consideration a change in its method of bestowing degrees, which seems likely to be the beginning of a revolution, at least in American Colleges. It is proposed to substitute, in lieu of four

years' study involving eighteen and a half courses, successful examination in sixteen courses, entirely irrespective of the length of time spent in the preparation. It is estimated that the average industrious student will be able to accomplish the work in three years and a half, and the exceptionally clever one in three years. One result, and it certainly is one which will have its disadvantages, will be the complete breaking up of class organizations. The object of the change is to save time for the industrious and clever student, enabling him to enter on his professional course a year or half-year earlier than at present. The plan has been already approved by the Faculty, the Academic Council, and the Corporation, and awaits only the concurrence of the Board of Overseers. Whether this particular plan is commendable or not—and we question the propriety of reducing the requirements for a B. A. degree as it evidently does to some extent—it seems to us to have in it a suggestion of great practical utility. We have never been able to see why the regular College course for the first degree should be made four years, or their equivalent. Might it not be of great public utility if Universities should, in addition to their four years' courses, arrange complete and symmetrical courses requiring respectively three years, and two years, and even one year's study, and give diplomas of graded values, distinctly setting forth the character and extent of the course pursued in each case? For instance a course of one year or two years, devoted almost exclusively to the reading of the best English authors, might be made an invaluable preparation for life, available for thousands who would shrink from entering upon a four years' course.

THE *Spectator* thinks that nothing is more painful than to read in immediate succession a speech of Mr. Gladstone's, not only denying all obstruction on the part of the Opposition in the British Commons during the current session, but even claiming that it has shown conspicuous magnanimity in supporting, as far as it conscientiously could, Government measures, and a speech of any one of the leading members of the Government, or any one of the Liberal Unionist leaders, imputing to the Opposition the most unscrupulous use of obstructive tactics. The *Spectator* does not, indeed, go to the length of assuming that there must be deliberate mis-statement on the one side or the other. Its conclusion is that "political passion runs so high as to render anything approaching to candour and impartiality almost unattainable in the party life of the present day." That conclusion is, no doubt, what our cousins over the border would call the "bottom fact" in the case. It by no means follows, however, that party passion is carried to a higher pitch, or results in more absolute intellectual and moral blindness at the present day than at many former periods in the history of the British Parliament. The evil is undeniably, to a large extent, the outgrowth of the party system itself. Perhaps we shall but expand rather than supplement the *Spectator's* diagnosis when we add that the contradictory assertions grow very largely out of the totally different views entertained on the opposite sides of the House as to what really is culpable obstruction. If to obstruct is to interpose insincere speeches and motions simply for the purpose of embarrassing the Government and injuring its reputation for efficiency by delaying its measures, Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Morley and others of the Opposition leaders would strenuously deny with perfect sincerity, though very likely not with perfect accuracy, that their methods are the outcome of any such purpose. They will declare that they feel bound to give the most determined resistance to such measures as certain clauses of the Land Purchase Bill, the Local Taxation Bill, and the licensing clauses of the Customs Bill, because they deem the principles involved in these measures utterly wrong and mischievous. The broad question thus emerges whether it is the duty of an Opposition, after having once or twice urged their objections to proposed legislation which they believe to be pernicious, to yield gracefully to the inevitable majority vote, or to oppose such legislation at every stage, and by every constitutional means, so as to cast the whole odium of forcing it through the House upon the Government. The *Times* admits that no compromise is possible on certain of the points referred to. "The question is simply whether on a well-defined issue the Government or the Opposition are to have their way. As the Government have a majority, every one knows that their way must be ultimately followed, and the Opposition seek for nothing but the waste of time which might otherwise be utilized for business." Does this necessity follow? Of course, if the Government is sincere and has faith in its measures it has no alternative but to force them through with reasonable celerity. But,