

the country to encroach on the liberties of the old settlers, and that on the banks of the Red River as well as on the banks of the St. Lawrence the people would be at liberty to use their mother tongue, to practise their religion, and to have their children brought up according to their views. Such statements are of force only as they imply that the liberties of the old settlers have been encroached on, and that they are not at liberty to use their mother tongue, to practise their religion, and to have their children brought up according to their views. We need not stay to point out that the old settlers and the French-speaking inhabitants generally have precisely the same rights and liberties still, in these and all other respects, as other citizens. But the Archbishop's main argument rests upon the statement that in the negotiations between Dominion Ministers and the delegates sent to Ottawa at the time of the first Riel Rebellion, two of the points agreed upon were that French should be an official language and that there should be separate schools. This is a serious statement, and, though it may not affect the judgment of the Court, which must, we suppose, be based upon the Constitutional Act, deserves careful consideration by all who desire that justice should be done at all costs. Several questions of fact are involved. First, did the delegates referred to, we mean the delegates appointed by the Half-breeds, really make any stipulation touching schools or language? We have no official record before us, but our recollection is that their grievances related wholly to matters quite different in character, such as those of land, etc. Second, did those delegates really represent the people of Manitoba as it then existed, in such a sense that any agreement made with them was of the nature of a treaty and is morally binding upon the Dominion? Upon the answer to these two questions depends, it seems to us, the validity of the Archbishop's argument. We have no doubt that the priests and prelates concerned were anxious to secure the separate schools and the official use of the French language; but we shall be surprised if it can be shown that the popular delegates knew or cared anything about such questions, or made any stipulations in regard to them.

TWO delegations last week waited upon Lord Salisbury in connection with matters of deep interest to Canadians. The first was composed of representatives of the Imperial Federation League, whose special object was to request that the Government should summon a council of colonial representatives to discuss the question of Imperial Federation. Lord Salisbury, while declaring himself to be in full sympathy with the purpose of the League, replied in effect that the Government could not call such a council until a definite scheme of federation should have been agreed upon. This reply may, no doubt, be accepted as final, so far as the action of the British Government is concerned. But the formulation of a scheme such as may be expected to receive the assent of all concerned is, of course, the crucial difficulty. If the framing of such a scheme is possible, it is pretty clear that it can be reached only as the result of a conference of representatives of the Mother Country and of all the colonies interested. The holding of such a conference is a matter of great difficulty and expense. The responsibility is thrown by Lord Salisbury's action upon the colonies themselves, or rather upon the advocates and promoters of the movement in the colonies and the Mother Country. A little reflection will satisfy most persons that Lord Salisbury's condition is a reasonable one, that he could, in fact, scarcely have given any other answer. It is very doubtful whether the Imperial Government would be within its constitutional right in committing the Government and the nation to the promotion of a project which is virtually nothing less than a complete reconstruction of the Empire and its present governmental system, without not only proposing a definite scheme, but securing a mandate from the nation in favour of the general principle involved. As Lord Salisbury said to the other deputation referred to below, Englishmen would never consent to legislation of a vague or indefinite kind, in a matter affecting their dearest interests. The friends of Imperial Federation are showing a good deal of zeal and perseverance in their advocacy of their great scheme. Can they now succeed in bringing together, as the result of voluntary action on the part of its promoters, such a council as that which the Prime Minister declines to call until such time as the principal purpose for which it is needed shall have been accomplished? They could hardly have a more favourable opportunity than the present. The confederation movement now going on in Australia, the uncertainty and unrest concerning the coming fiscal

policy of Canada, and the tendency of the nations of Europe, with which the Mother Country trades largely, to embarrass her manufacturers with still higher protectionist duties, all seem to combine in saying to those who propose a radically new departure: "Now or never!" It would perhaps be well for all concerned if the Imperial Federation League and its colonial branches could devise means for assembling a council or conference of representatives from all parts of the Empire for the purpose of framing a definite policy. Should such a council succeed, a great step in advance would have been taken. On the other hand, should it be found impossible to agree upon a compromise policy satisfactory to all the various interest involved, Imperial Federation would have received its quietus for some time to come.

REPLYING, a day or two later, to an address presented by a delegation representing the United Empire League, Lord Salisbury made certain statements which, as reported in the brief cablegram, are so nearly contradictory that it is very difficult to reconcile them with each other. Probably the reporters are at fault. He is represented as regretting those provisions in the treaties of 1862 and 1865 which prevent the colonies from giving preference to English trade, but at the same time pointing out that it is impossible to denounce those treaties in bits, rejecting what does not suit the Empire, and retaining that which does; and declaring that England would take the earliest opportunity to seek deliverance from these unfortunate engagements, but could not do so at the cost of losing very valuable provisions contained in those treaties. Lord Salisbury did not leave it to the delegation to determine how much encouragement could be extracted from a hope whose only basis was the assumption that the other nations concerned might be willing to forego the provisions of the treaties which secured their interests, and abide by those which are of value to Great Britain. He went on to say, if correctly reported, that it "was impossible for England to give preferential treatment to the colonies at the expense of the rest of the world," though he is represented as having coupled with this the advice, seemingly either inconsistent or ironical, that the members of the League "must work hard to convert their countrymen to the League's way of thinking." They must first ascertain how far the country would support the policy of which "a prominent feature is a preferential tax on grain, wool and meat." A later cablegram informs us that "the United Empire Trade League is satisfied with Lord Salisbury's reply to the League delegates, and will organize a fair trade campaign throughout the country." We see no reason to suppose that Lord Salisbury has modified the opinion he has more than once expressed, and seems indeed to have reiterated on this occasion, to the effect that a scheme of imperial union based on free admission of colonial products and a protective tariff against the rest of the world is impossible, that it would, indeed, bring about a state of things "scarcely distinguishable from civil war." Yet some Canadian advocates of the scheme seem ready to enter upon the campaign with light hearts, and grow enthusiastic in showing how England, under the proposed tariff, might procure her wheat, her wool, her sugar, her tobacco, her cotton and her meat from the colonies and India; thus virtually ceasing to trade with the rest of the world. To say nothing of the danger of civil war at home, no great prescience is required to foresee that this policy would soon bring about a state of affairs scarcely if at all distinguishable from war, not civil, with the foreign nations, which, being no longer able to sell in British markets, would of course no longer buy British goods. Who, remembering all that international trade has done to promote peace and good-will among the nations, could desire to see a return to a state of commercial non-intercourse? It is, however, hardly worth while to speculate upon the possible consequences either in England or abroad, for, as we have seen on former occasions, the only way in which the proposed British discriminatory tariff could help the colonies would be by enhancing the price of their products to British consumers, and to that Englishmen will never consent. On this point, the London *Economist*, a high authority on such questions, takes precisely the same line of argument which was followed a few weeks since in these columns. Discussing the proposal to tax wheat, frozen meat and a number of other products which form the raw material for manufacturers, it says:—

Nothing, however, is more certain than that if we do this the colonial producers will take advantage of the opportunity and raise the price of their supplies to the extent of

the duty we impose. It will be no advantage to them to have a privileged market accorded to them unless they take advantage of the privilege. If the foreign producers beat them just now it is because they can sell cheaper, and if the foreign products are made artificially dearer the colonists will not fail to raise their prices in somewhat the same proportion. But if the cost of the raw material, say of the woollen industries, is enhanced, there must also be an advance in the price of the finished goods. Not only, therefore, will we have to pay more for all of these goods that we ourselves consume, but our manufacturers, who already find it difficult enough to maintain their ground in foreign markets, would have a new disability imposed upon them. Thus to gain a trade of a few millions with Australasia, we are counselled to impose a heavy tax upon home consumers, and to imperil a great trade with foreign countries.

A RESOLUTION has been adopted by the Public School Board of this city recommending that the courses of study in the schools be so changed "that more time may be devoted to the study of those branches of education which are of general utility in everyday life, and less to those which, although interesting, are of little practical use unless pursued further than can well be done in the Public Schools." We have not before us the report of the discussion, which, we presume, preceded the passing of this resolution, else we should probably have clearer notions as to what are the branches of education referred to as being of little practical use unless pursued further than can well be done in the Public Schools. As a matter of fact, every study which makes proper demands upon the mental faculties of the pupils, thereby strengthening and developing those faculties, is of "practical use" in the best sense of the words. At the same time, it is very likely that there may be sound wisdom underlying the resolution of the Board. If, for instance, it is possible to pursue the study of arithmetic in such a manner as to cultivate the faculties of mind which are called into exercise in dealing scientifically with numbers, but at the same time to confine the attention to the solution of problems such as are seldom or never met with in ordinary business life, the result cannot fail to be of practical as well as of educational value, by reason of the increase of power it enables the pupil to carry with him to any pursuit in which he may be afterwards engaged. But if it is found that, in the hands of a skilful teacher, educational results of at least equal value can be gained by keeping the pupil employed largely with exercises of quite another kind, and closely related to the affairs of everyday life, no one could hesitate to say that the latter course is that dictated by reason and common sense. Nor is the hypothesis a mere suppositional one. We have all, no doubt, seen clever pupils, whose proficiency in arithmetic may have been the pride of the school, who yet would be utterly at sea when brought face to face with some question of discount or computation familiar to all men of business. Few competent teachers any longer doubt that the intensely practical phases of the subject may be used with even better effect for purely disciplinary purposes, and for the induction of underlying principles, than those of a less practical kind. The same fact, it is now being discovered, holds good in respect to all other branches of study. No competent modern teacher now thinks of requiring his pupils to set out after the fashion of forty or fifty years ago, with conning by rote the rules of grammar or the definitions in geography, as found in the old text-books, nor does he begin British History from the date of the Roman invasion, or geometry with the memorizing of a string of axioms. It is one of the best educational discoveries of the age that the most effective mode of study in any or all these branches is that which is most thoroughly practical. Direct study of the living language is banishing the dry bones of the old text books in grammar. The study of geography is commenced from the spot in which the pupil actually stands and lives. History teaching sets out from the standpoint of the now and the here. Philosophy puts on the garb of inductive science, and follows the lines of actual personal observation; and so forth. We had thought that all our teaching was thus becoming unmistakably and sensibly practical. There may, however, still be ample justification for the censure implied in the Board's resolution. Every parent and every other citizen is interested in the question. We should like to see the implied criticisms of the Board put into the shape of tangible facts, in order to full and intelligent discussion.

WHILE moralists are deploring, not without good reason, the extent to which money-getting and pleasure-seeking are in these days being made the great