

save our political system from total corruption? One thing seems clear. The public conscience in large sections of the Dominion is sadly in need of education, and it is doubtful if anything else would so effectively educate it as a provision for the criminal prosecution of both the giver and receiver of a bribe by public prosecutors appointed for the purpose, a term of imprisonment to follow conviction in every case.

WHATEVER may be the result of the struggle for the Presidency, in the United States, it cannot be denied that in two very important respects the great Republic has wonderfully redeemed its reputation during this campaign. The familiar objection, which has always hitherto been abundantly justified, that a Presidential election meant a very serious disturbance of business for at least a year preceding the contest, is without force in this instance. So, too, the old and true reproach that the electoral struggle was a campaign of personal slander and abuse has happily little or no applicability to this particular contest. These improvements are no doubt partly due to the personal self-respect and good reputations of the candidates. But may it not be hoped, for the honour of a great nation and of republican institutions, that with the increase of age and influence is coming an increase of dignity and decorum? How much ground there may be for such hope can be determined only by the future. Certainly the absence of outrageous methods of conducting the campaign has not been due to the want of a wide issue. It is difficult to conceive of any intelligent citizen who does not realize that it must make an immense difference to the future of the Union whether Harrison and McKinleyism or Cleveland and tariff revenue carry the day. Of course no one fears any sudden or violent overturning of the existing system in any event. But the Republican Party is not more distinctly pledged to a protective policy than the Democratic Party to one of tariff for revenue. The result will be known, we suppose, before these words are read, but what the probabilities are with regard to that result is just as unknown to-day as it was at the outset of the campaign. We are, therefore, quite unable to put ourselves into a position to say, "We told you so." We prefer, in this case, to be wise after the event.

"YOU built schools antagonistic to the faith of these new comers (the Irish immigrants), and you taxed them for the erection and maintenance of these schools." This is the view which Bernard O'Reilly, Prothonotary Apostolic, urges against the public school system of the United States, in an article in the November number of the *North American Review*. The first part of the article, the argument of which is summed up in the above words, is but a forcible re-presentation of a course of reasoning with which we are all familiar. It is so specious that we cannot wonder that to many who may not take the trouble to go below the surface and dig out what is involved in it, it appears sound and irrefutable. The question is the same in Canada, at the present moment in Manitoba, as in the United States. The fallacy, in the form in which Mgr. O'Reilly has put it, is wrapped up in the word "antagonistic." It is the fallacy of "begging the question." It takes for granted in the premise the very thing which it affirms as proved in the conclusion. The public school system simply omits religion as something which the State has no mandate from the citizens to teach, and which it is by its very nature incompetent to teach. How can the absence of religious teaching, a mere negative thing, be said to be antagonistic to anybody's faith? "Oh!" say Mgr. O'Reilly and his co-religionists, "it is the very absence of it of which we complain, because religious instruction and all the living light and warmth which religion can impart to the work of the teacher, should not be separated in the school from the imparting of secular knowledge and professional training." The particular faith then, which is antagonized by the public school system, is not the belief of a religious creed, but the belief that the teaching of a religious creed is a necessary part of the work of school instruction. Grant that this is properly the faith or part of the faith of the Roman Catholic Church and the thing is done, the point is proved. But on the same principle any other opinion held by any body of Christians, or non-Christians, may be called their faith and that faith shown to be antagonized by any school system which is not constructed in accordance with that view. For instance, Mgr. O'Reilly and his fellow-prelates

might say "The faith of the Roman Catholic Church is that Mary, the Mother of Jesus, should be worshipped and that this dogma should be taught in the schools. Your public school system makes no provision for the teaching of this dogma. It, therefore, antagonizes our faith. And yet you tax us for the support of these schools!"

"SINCE, in a community divided into numerous religious denominations, denominational schools are a practical necessity, let the State bestow with impartial justice the moneys of the school fund derived from taxation, on the schools which do their work thoroughly; and let every school receive such further encouragement as the State shall judge fit in proportion to the way the work of instruction is performed." This is Mgr. O'Reilly's solution of the problem. It sounds well and seems simple. Why not adopt it and settle the question once for all, in Canada as well as in the United States? We cannot fail to note the beautiful provision for any amount of party favouritism and corruption which inheres in such a system, especially in the feature outlined in the last sentence. Those who have had any experience or knowledge of American and Canadian politics will not need to be told of the immense advantage to be had, under such a system, by the denomination in which the clergy, who would naturally become the virtual managers of the schools which are thus constructed on denominational lines, have the most absolute control over the politics as well as the creed of their adherents and can on occasion ensure their voting virtually in solid phalanx. But let that pass. The first question touching the principle of the scheme is, what is to be done with the large class of parents who belong to no denomination in particular, whose "faith" it is that no religious dogmas should be taught in the schools, or who object to all religious teaching? Would not the faith of all these classes be antagonized by such a system? And, then, what about the faith of the minorities, of some description or other, who would be found in almost every community, too few and feeble to have a school of their own and consequently forced, if education were compulsory, to send their children to schools where their faith would be "antagonized," and if it were not compulsory, to choose between such schools and no schools? One fatal flaw in Mgr. O'Reilly's reasoning, and that of many others who advocate substantially the same system, is in the assumption that "Catholic" and "Protestant" are co-ordinate terms, and that they are together practically exhaustive, whereas, as everyone knows on a moment's reflection, the latter word is but a general and not very accurate term used to denote a great variety of sects or denominations, each holding its own peculiar tenets. Even were the usage which thus separates religionists into two instead of a score or a hundred of denominations practically correct, it would still follow that the denominational plan of schools would mean the necessity in thousands of cases for two schools in communities where it would tax all the resources of the residents to maintain one in any tolerable efficiency. How utterly impracticable such a system would become in communities divided into half-a-dozen or half-a-score of denominations, is obvious to a moment's reflection. We have left ourselves no space for dwelling upon the crowning absurdity involved in the denominational or sectarian system. The State may very well say through its Government: "We are unable to apply any infallible test to enable us to recognize the true religion, or to distinguish between it and its counterfeits. We shall, therefore, take a position of strict neutrality and leave those whose vocation it is to propagate their own views as best they may. We are, in fact, bound to do this because we recognize that we have no right to attempt to direct or control anyone's freedom of thought and action in matters of conscience." But what more absurd than for it to reason from the same premises to the conclusion: "Therefore we will recognize all forms of so-called religion as equally true, by giving to the adherents of each free course and virtual control in a number of schools proportioned to their strength in the commonwealth. Thus we will 'encourage and assist'—these are Mgr. O'Reilly's words—in one school the teaching of the dogma of the Pope's infallibility and absolute authority as God's vicegerent upon earth, and in another, perhaps ten rods distant, the dogma that the Pope is the Antichrist of Scripture and the Romish Church the wanton woman sitting on the scarlet-coloured beast, so graphically described in the same Scriptures?"

THE ravages of cholera in the districts where this dread disease has claimed so many victims during the past few months is now, it may be hoped, effectually checked for the winter. But there is great reason to fear that the return of the warm season may bring fresh outbreaks, not only in those places which have already been so terribly afflicted, and in other parts of Europe, but in Great Britain and America as well. It is, therefore, but the dictate of the commonest prudence that every precaution which sanitary science can devise to guard against the danger should be used without stint. Whatever differences of opinion may exist—and their name is legion—in regard to the best method of treatment for the cure of the disease, and even in regard to the most effective agents for disinfecting and prophylactic purposes, on one point there is, we may affirm without fear of contradiction, absolute unanimity among medical authorities. We refer to the virtue of cleanliness. It is, we suppose, as certain as anything depending upon accuracy of human observation can be, that if absolute cleanliness of person and environment could be secured throughout any community of sufficient extent, the residents of that community would be safe from the inroads of cholera, diphtheria, typhus, and the whole tribe of zymotic diseases which now so persistently claim their annual hecatombs from all our cities, towns and villages. If this be so, it follows that the nearer approach we make to those conditions of safety, the better will be our chances of escape from such visitations, and the lighter and more easily overcome will be the attacks when they do fall upon us. The inference is obvious. Whatever may or may not be done in the way of observation and experimentation for the discovery of remedies, the one incontestable duty resting upon every community, and upon every individual in the community, is to observe and enforce the laws of cleanliness in every particular. This is an obligation which is binding on everyone not only as he would promote his own personal safety and that of his family, but as he would fulfil his duty to his neighbour. It is a serious charge to make, but there can, we suppose, be no shadow of doubt that dozens, nay, hundreds, of human lives are destroyed every year in a city like Toronto through the uncleanly and unsanitary habits of neighbours. If men and women are to be held strictly responsible for the consequences of their neglect and wrong-doing, there must be in every city hosts of murderers upon whom the law has no hold, and who are, through sheer want of thought, not themselves conscious of their guilt. If all this be so, the burden of responsibility resting upon those to whom the people have entrusted the management of all civic affairs becomes especially heavy. Never was it heavier than it will be during the coming winter and spring. To cut the matter short and come home directly to our own city of Toronto, and to apply the general principle to a particular case, there is probably no qualified physician, and scarcely an intelligent, disinterested citizen, who doubts that the privy pits which still abound even in some of the most densely populated parts of the city, are a constant source of danger and death, not only to those who are responsible for their continuance in defiance of all the laws of sanitation, but to all the residents of the districts in which they exist. Now, if our City Councillors, who as intelligent men must know the true state of the case, in view of the diphtheria and fevers which are hardly ever wholly absent from the localities referred to, and of the dire peril from the threatened cholera, fail to take or sanction vigorous and effective measures for removing this source of danger before the coming of another warm season, how can they escape moral responsibility for all the sickness and death which will certainly ensue from this cause?

WHILE remarking on the presence of a danger to life and health which is obvious to the common sense and even to the sense organs of everyone, we are reminded by some law of association of a real though less tangible danger to which we are in these days subject, arising from a very different quarter. While we are not, we hope, insensible to or ungrateful for the many useful discoveries of inestimable value in the preservation of life and health, for which we are indebted to the mingled enthusiasm and patience of modern explorers in the domain of biological science, we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that there are new and distinct dangers arising from this very enthusiasm. Mankind is always credulous. The credulity which in earlier ages took on the form of what we call superstition, is tending in these days in the direction of an equally ready credence of hasty assumptions and