

THE WEEK.

Seventh Year.
Vol. VII. No. 15.

TORONTO, FRIDAY, MARCH 14th, 1890.

\$3.00 per Annum
Single Copies, 10 Cents.

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.

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.

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.

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
The City vs. The Railroads.....	227
The Educational Question in Manitoba.....	227
The Power of the Purse.....	227
The Creed Wrangle in Education.....	227
Secularization the Only Logical System.....	228
Public Places Association Meeting.....	228
Health Preservation.....	228
The Educational Report.....	228
The Irish Question.....	228
The Discovery of Coal in Kent, England.....	229
American Political Methods.....	229
AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS: RECIPROCITY CONSIDERED. R. H. Lawder.....	229
QUATRAINS.....	230
IMPERIAL INDIA—III..... J. Castell Hopkins.....	230
MONTREAL LETTER..... Ville Marie.....	231
NOTES ON THE COALS OF WESTERN CANADA.....	231
THREE PICTURES..... Archibald MacMechan.....	232
THE ELIXIR OF LIFE (Poem)..... William McGill.....	232
PARIS LETTER..... Z.....	232
THE RAMBLER.....	233
SELF-ACCUSED..... Coyote.....	233
WEDDED LOVE (Poem)..... Annie Rothwell.....	234
CORRESPONDENCE—	
Whose is "The Fallacy?"..... E. J. Hemming.....	234
SPARKS FROM THE ANVIL..... The Blacksmith.....	234
ART NOTES..... Templar.....	235
MUSIC AND THE DRAMA.....	235
OUR LIBRARY TABLE.....	235
LITERARY AND PERSONAL GOSSIP.....	235
READINGS FROM CURRENT LITERATURE.....	235
ONTARIO PUBLIC PLACES ASSOCIATION MEETING.....	236
CHESS.....	239

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

It is greatly to be regretted that the representatives of the city and those of the two great railroads should have failed to come even within sight of a basis of agreement in reference to the Esplanade matter. Much trouble might have been spared had the citizens awakened some years earlier to their duty to themselves and to those who are to come after them, but it is useless now to consider what might have been. The issue seems to be fairly joined between the two hundred thousand citizens whom the city will have within its limits before the business is settled and two powerful railway companies. The interests of the latter are purely pecuniary, touching the property and dividends of stock and bondholders. Those of the former relate rather to the rights, convenience, and safety of the whole present and future populations of the city. It seems clear that the last-named considerations ought to prevail, and must prevail to an extent limited only by the obligations of good faith and fair dealing. That the city cannot and should not be bound, to the hurt of all its present and future inhabitants, by any unratified agreements injudiciously entered into on its behalf by officials, who were at the most but delegates, and in no sense plenipotentiaries, goes without saying. If the managers of a railway took the confirmation of any such agreement for granted, and made large outlays on the strength of it, it can only be said that they displayed less than the usual prudence of such managers, and acquired at the most not a legal but a moral claim to such compensation as an impartial tribunal might deem just under all the circumstances. Certainly they can thereby have obtained neither legal nor moral right to control the city's water front, and determine the manner and extent to which the citizens shall have access to it, for all time to come. On one point the minds of the citizens are now, it may be hoped, thoroughly made up. They must have full, free, and safe access to the bay all along the city front. To this end there must be no closing of streets, no climbing of elevated bridges, and no hazardous crossing of a gridiron of railway tracks. These requirements, surely reasonable in themselves, are the prime conditions of the problem. Its solution, so far as appears, involves as a *sine qua non* the elevation of the railway

tracks. This cannot be an impossible, or even an impracticable, task. To say nothing of the reports of competent engineers, no one who has used his eyes in railway traveling, or who has any knowledge of what is being every year accomplished in railway construction, will readily believe that the proposed viaduct can either involve any extraordinary feat of engineering skill, or be so enormously costly, as to put it beyond the reach of the combined resources of the city and the railways interested. The same general principle of the paramount rights of citizens applies with equal force against giving to any railway exclusive use or control of any part of the property created by the improvements on the Don. It is to be devoutly hoped that the managers of the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific Railways may, on further reflection, see the righteousness of the main positions taken by the committee of the Citizens' Association, and betake themselves to a friendly discussion of details. It would be a fine thing, in some respects, if these two great rival corporations should be made friends to each other, provided the reconciliation should not, as there seems some reason to fear, be based on the sacrifice of the rights of the people of Toronto.

THE Education Bill now under discussion in the Manitoba Legislature is in many respects an excellent one. In its establishment of a Board of Education, which will no doubt be composed of educational experts, its fuller recognition of the principle of local option in regard to religious exercises, and probably in some other respects, it is an improvement, we think, upon the Ontario system. As we write, however, without a copy of the Bill, or full information in regard to details before us, these opinions are expressed under reserve. In regard to the soundness and fairness of the broad principle on which it is founded we can speak with less hesitation. The speech of Mr. Prendergast, as reported in the dailies, presents, no doubt, the best arguments available on behalf of the Separate School system, which the Bill is designed to supersede. When it is asked if it is not a great right of the Catholics that they should be permitted to educate their children in the tenets of their church, the reply is, "Yes, but not at the expense or partial expense of the public, or under State control, which is the corollary of State aid." When reference is had to the Protestant Separate Schools of Quebec, the argument is specious, but, on examination, the parallelism fails. The right of the Protestants of Quebec to Separate Schools arises wholly from the fact that the Public School system of Quebec is not unsectarian, but very positively the opposite. It is idle to argue that the Public Schools of Manitoba will be Protestant in the same sense in which those of Quebec are Catholic. The allegation is simply not true. If the schools of Manitoba are fairly secularized there will be no good reason why in localities in which Catholic citizens predominate the teachers may not be Catholic. In that case the atmosphere of the school will be Catholic, in the same sense in which the atmosphere of a school in a district in which Protestants predominate will be Protestant. This cannot be helped. The main object is to secure a single, efficient system, and in order to this, no sectarian teaching of any kind must be permitted.

THE control of public expenditure is the safeguard of popular liberty, under any form of representative government. The power of withholding supplies as soon as they have lost confidence in the integrity or administrative capacity of the Government is the palladium of people's rights. Under the party system it usually falls to the Opposition to do most of the work of scrutinizing the Government's management of the public funds and challenging such outlays as they may deem extravagant or otherwise improper. This is natural enough, seeing that, by the conditions of the respective cases, the members of the Government are under constant temptation to use the public funds in the manner best calculated to strengthen their own position, by rewarding friends, and conciliating opponents. It is, therefore, not surprising that much of the time, in both the local and the Dominion Legislatures, is spent in criticising the public accounts. We have, on a former occasion, pointed out that the chief question at issue in the Ontario Legislature is largely one of book-keeping. Whatever room for differences of opinion there

may be in regard to certain large outlays, such as that on the new Parliament buildings, extravagance in smaller matters is certainly not one of the faults of the Ontario Government. In fact, in the opinion of many, Mr. Mowat's administration seems quite as liable to err on the side of a too strait-laced economy as on that of undue liberality in the use of the public funds. At Ottawa the case is undeniably different. That the tendency there is towards distributing the funds with a free hand is clear from the large and constant increase in the public expenditure. Hence it is not to be wondered at that much time is being spent in the discussion of financial questions. That charges of corruption should abound in both Provincial and Dominion Legislatures is, of course, inevitable. It is one of the fruits of the party system. To what extent any of these charges are sustained is a matter on which the people should decide impartially, after examining the evidence, nor should they shrink from the duty of investigating the evidence. A growing expenditure does not necessarily prove an abuse of trust. It may be an evidence of wise statesmanship. In the case of nations as of individuals there is that scattereth and yet increaseth, and there is that withholdeth more than is meet and it tendeth to poverty. At the same time it cannot be denied that the expenses of Government in Canada, including Dominion and Provincial outlays, are enormous. This is largely due to the fact that we, as a people, are greatly overgoverned. But, apart from keeping up so much unnecessary local machinery in the smaller provinces, it cannot be denied that there is much in the rapid growth of Dominion expenses to cause anxiety, if not alarm, as to the future. In addition to the large questions of public polity thus raised there are many items in the accounts which demand the closest scrutiny. Conspicuous amongst such are the Rideau Hall expenditures, and those connected with the Public Works and Civil Service Departments, and with the working of the doubtful Superannuation policy. It is very easy, and may appear magnanimous, to sneer at "cheese-paring" criticisms, but sound economy and correct business methods are a public as well as a private duty. There is no good reason why the system of book-keeping should not be as perfect, and the demand for vouchers as rigid in the Government Departments as in the best managed private establishment. It is in the interests of the public morality no less than of national solvency that every department of the Government should be required to account rigidly and accurately for the use it makes of the people's money.

THE Toronto *Globe* of a recent date has an elaborate and, for a Liberal newspaper, somewhat curious article on the question of religious teaching in the Public Schools. While believing that the co-education of Catholic and Protestant children in the Public Schools would have the happy effect of mollifying creed prejudices in after life, it goes on to argue that the creed-wrangle is alike inevitable whether under a sectarian or secular system of public education. One would suppose that a logical deduction from the fact that the co-education spoken of would operate as above described would be that school systems should be arranged with a view to securing this result. Granting that the secularizing of the schools would have the effect, which the *Globe* does not seem to dispute, of promoting co-education to some extent, it surely follows that, however it may fail of at once producing the desired peace, it must at least tend toward the production of such peace in the future. The *Globe* says Sir Charles Dilke's "Problems of Greater Britain" sets forth a multitude of facts which go to show "(1) that the abolition of Roman Catholic Schools would not produce, to so great an extent as is commonly supposed, the co-education which is desirable; (2) that the creed-wrangle is often fiercer in English countries where all State-aided schools are secularized or unsectarian, than in our own Province." The experience of Massachusetts, and of several of the Australian Colonies, is referred to in support of these statements. But the *Globe* might surely have found facts pointing to a different conclusion without going so far afield. The case of New Brunswick, for instance, in our own Dominion, has often been quoted by those familiar with the facts, as showing how possible it is, when a purely secular system has once been firmly