

THE WEEK.

TORONTO, FRIDAY, APRIL 3rd, 1891.

\$3.00 per Annum.
Single Copies 10 Cents.

Eighth Year.
Vol. VIII., No. 18.

THE WEEK:

AN INDEPENDENT JOURNAL OF POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE AND ART

TERMS:—One year, \$3.00; eight months, \$2.00; four months, \$1.00. Subscriptions payable in advance. Subscribers in Great Britain and Ireland supplied, postage prepaid, on terms following:—One year, 12s. 6d.; half-year, 6s. 6d. Remittances by P.O. order or draft should be made payable and addressed to the Publisher. ADVERTISEMENTS, unexceptionable in character and limited in number, will be taken at \$4.00 per line per annum; \$2.50 per line for six months; \$1.50 per line for three months; 20 cents per line per insertion for a shorter period. No advertisements charged less than five lines. Address—T. R. CLOUGHER, Business Manager, 5 Jordan Street, Toronto. C. BLACKETT ROBINSON, Publisher.

CONTENTS OF CURRENT NUMBER.

TOPICS—	PAGE
Educational Statistics	279
Dr. McLellan's Report	279
A Position Re-stated	279
That Dilemma Again	279
Some General Observations	280
Canadian Copyright	280
Professional Monopolies	280
The Hurontario Ship Railway	280
Lord Salisbury on the Labour Commission	281
Bradstreet's Record of Failures	281
The European Situation	281
THE LATE REV. K. L. JONES.	<i>Fidelis.</i> 281
CLAUDE WILMOT: A STORY OF THE WAR OF 1812.	<i>The Late Rev. K. L. Jones.</i> 281
REQUIESCAT IN PACE. (POEM)	<i>Fidelis.</i> 283
PARIS LETTER	Z. 283
THE RAMBLER	283
CORRESPONDENCE—	
Our Commercial Relations with the Empire	<i>J. Castell Hopkins.</i> 284
Congregationalism in Canada—Another view	<i>W. Henry Warriner.</i> 285
DEATH. (POEM)	<i>Constance Fairbanks.</i> 285
THE LAND OF WATERWAYS	<i>Watson Griffin.</i> 285
THE DYING CHRISTIAN. (FROM THE FRENCH OF LAMARTINE)	<i>C. L. Johnstone.</i> 286
MR. JAMESON'S STORY	286
CANADA AND IMPERIAL FEDERATION	286
ART NOTES	288
MUSIC AND THE DRAMA	288
OUR LIBRARY TABLE	289
LITERARY AND PERSONAL GOSSIP	289
PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED	289
READINGS FROM CURRENT LITERATURE	290
CHESS	261

All articles, contributions, and letters on matters pertaining to the editorial department should be addressed to the Editor, and not to any person who may be supposed to be connected with the paper.

THE Report of the Ontario Minister of Education for the year 1890 is, as usual, a voluminous document. The statistical and other information it supplies is interesting and valuable to all who desire to study the educational status and progress of the Province. The total school population in 1889 is set down as 616,028. In 1877 it was 494,804, an apparent increase of a little less than 25 per cent. in thirteen years. All this, however, is not actual increase, as the period of "school age" was in 1884 enlarged from 5-16 to 5-21. In 1885, the first year in which the school population was reckoned on the new basis, the total was 583,147, showing an increase of a little more than 5 per cent. in four years. If this is not very satisfactory for a young country, it is still more discouraging to find that the total increase during the year 1889, the last year for which figures are given, was but 675. Attention was directed a year ago to the fact that the powers conferred upon Trustees by the School Act to compel the attendance at school of children between seven and thirteen years of age, were not exercised. The improvement in attendance for 1889 was very slight. The number of children within those age-limits who attended less than one hundred days in the year during 1888 was 87,874; in 1889, 86,515. The case is, therefore, very strong in favour of the adoption of legislation for securing the enforcement of the clauses providing for compulsory attendance. The Bill which it is supposed the Minister of Education will introduce for this purpose should receive the most favourable consideration on both sides of the House. But while attendance at school is one indispensable condition of raising the average of intelligence in the country to the level which is absolutely necessary for the well-being of a self-governing people, it is not the only such condition. A supply of teachers, adequate both in numbers and in educational and other qualifications, is equally indispensable. The number of public school teachers employed during 1889 was 7,967, of whom 2,774 were males and 5,193 females. In 1877 the total number was 6,468, of whom 3,020 were males and 3,448 females. Computing on the basis of average attendance we find that the ratio of teachers to pupils has increased in thirteen years only from one to thirty-four to one to thirty-two. This means, evidently, that many teachers in

the Province must still have forty, fifty and possibly a still larger number of pupils to deal with, thus literally realizing Sir Walter Scott's description of the village teacher as "one against a host." It requires but little reflection to convince anyone who knows anything of educational processes that efficient individual teaching—the only real and effectual teaching—is out of the question under such circumstances. Turning our attention to the evidences of educational competency, or the reverse, we find that of the 7,967 teachers employed in 1889 only 258 ranked as first-class, 2,829 holding second-class, and 4,019—more than half of the whole number—third-class certificates. When we remember how low the grade of attainments requisite for a third-class certificate really is, we cannot but realize that this showing is far from satisfactory. If the salary commanded may be taken as an index of scholarly acquirements the situation from this point of view is equally unpromising. The average salary of male teachers for the Province was \$421; for female teachers, \$296. Comment is needless. The impossibility of securing the talent and culture which should be deemed a *sine qua non* in this most important profession, for such beggarly pittance is obvious. In thus calling attention to some of the defects that lie on the surface of our educational system we hope we shall not be deemed blind to its many comparative excellencies. We may take another opportunity of referring to some of these.

A VALUABLE portion of the Educational Report is the elaborate paper by Dr. McLellan, Inspector of Normal Schools, with which it concludes. This paper appears as a special report on the Normal School "Problem." As that problem has lately been under discussion in our columns, our readers may be interested in learning some of the views of so competent a critic. Though the criticisms are naturally and justly too, we do not doubt, favourable in the main, serving to bring out the best features of the system, the Inspector does not hesitate to hold up to the light some of the defects in the practical working of the scheme, and to point out their causes. The following will be seen to be quite in line with some of our own observations with reference to the new scheme for engrafting Training-school departments into some of the best of the Collegiate Institutes. Referring to the Model School, considered as a training school for teachers, Dr. McLellan, after an appreciative description of its constitution and methods, points out that its chief defect "is due to the lack of the scientific element in its methods." This means that the teachers generally "are not in a position to explain and justify their methods from a thorough knowledge of mental science, and of the history and criticism of educational systems." Hence their "criticism of the practice-teaching cannot have the depth and value of scientific criticism," and "empiric criticism is often superficial and sometimes decidedly pernicious." The force of these remarks is undeniable. Their applicability, not only to the proposed arrangement in the Collegiate Institutes, but to the whole "Model School" system, now in operation, is obvious. In another part of his paper, and the only one to which we can now refer, Dr. McLellan classifies, very justly as it seems to us, some of the causes which prevent the existing Normal Schools from attaining the highest excellence, as follows: "The candidate for a teaching certificate is required—or allowed—to go over too many subjects in a given time." "The candidate, in his non-professional course, is taught and learns for examination, not for power and culture." "Too little time is taken for academic training." These are very serious obstacles to true progress. "Both teacher and taught take no thought for the morrow of culture, but only for the morrow of examination." Hence, "the right spirit, the scholarly spirit, and the spirit of high ideals" is not developed. It is, of course, much easier to put the finger upon defects than to suggest practicable modes of removing them. But the correct diagnosis is the first and indispensable step in the healing process.

WE are, we confess, somewhat chagrined that in our notes in answer to the questions put to us by Mr. J. Castell Hopkins last week, we should have expressed ourselves so obscurely as we must have done if we may

judge from Mr. Hopkins' summary of our criticisms in his letter this week. If we can succeed in re-stating with greater clearness the points we attempted to make in those paragraphs, we venture to think there will be found in them by anticipation an answer to most of the statements in Mr. Hopkins' reply. Our first position had regard, not to "the impossibility of such a policy being even considered in Britain"—it is in a certain sense even now being considered—but to the impossibility of its becoming at any early day a question of practical politics. Mr. Hopkins quotes from Mr. Gladstone, from Lord Salisbury, and from a Cobden club pamphlet, certain utterances admitting the obvious fact that the free-trade policy is not making progress among the nations, admitting even that protection is gaining ground. But surely he does not mean to convey the impression that either of the authorities named has ever said a word that could be construed into distinct or implied approval of a differential protective tariff as a condition of Imperial Federation. Surely he cannot doubt that Lord Salisbury's words quoted and referred to in our first paragraph last week, make his position unmistakably clear, or assert that Mr. Gladstone has ever even hinted approval of the project, or the Cobden club endorsed it, or that any leading English statesman, with possibly one or two doubtful exceptions, has ever expressed distinct approval of the Commercial Union feature of the Federation project. Some of them may have admitted the possibility of Britain's being driven to adopt moderate retaliatory tariffs, but we venture to affirm that, viewed in the light of the context, and of other fuller expressions of opinion, the words of no one of those quoted can be shown to amount even to an admission of the feasibility of such a customs union. If for no other reason their clear, practical minds must see the utter inadequacy of the colonies to afford a market for more than a fraction of the overplus of British manufactured goods.

OUR second main point was made in the shape of a dilemma which Mr. Hopkins has not done us the honour to consider, while the "general dissertation upon the advantages of Free Trade to the Mother Country" we fail to find and certainly did not mean to attempt. If our correspondent will do us the the favour to look into our paragraph a little more closely, he will find, we think, that the observations he has so misconstrued were simply intended to show, from the British Free Trader's point of view, the utter insufficiency of the differential tariff proposed to afford a remedy. The dilemma seems to us sufficiently troublesome to be worth re-stating. It is, in brief, as follows: Either the differential tariff proposed will, or it will not, increase the cost of food to the British artisan and of raw material to the British manufacturer. If it does so, it must either virtually reduce the wages of the workmen, already low enough in all conscience, or increase the cost of production, and so render it still more difficult to compete in the world's markets, thus aggravating the evil effects of foreign protective tariffs. Mr. Hopkins now argues and quotes statistics, which we need not stay to examine, to prove that Imperial Commercial Union would not increase the price of food products. Where, then, we ask again, will be the gain to the British agriculturist? As he has now an ample market at current prices for all his products, there is no question, as in Canada, of securing a home market. Where, too, will be the gain to the colonial producer, who has already a free and ample market at prices which are, by hypothesis, not to be increased, for all his products? It must not be forgotten that the case for the colonist is radically different from what it would be had Britain a tariff wall to be taken down.

TWO or three general observations may make our position clearer. The greater part of Mr. Hopkins' article is made up of facts and statistics designed to show the injurious effects of foreign protective tariffs upon British manufacturers. This needed no proof. We should not think for a moment of denying it, though one or two of the alleged facts might perhaps be successfully challenged. It is, of course, impossible for Mr. Hopkins to know that France is preparing to establish practically prohibitory duties upon British goods. A sufficient rea-