

sary responsible element into the Council. The respectable working men are just as anxious to be well-governed as the ablest banker or the richest capitalist. The trouble is they have been and are the tools of demagogues. Show them by example what is right and they will be only too glad to throw over their ward bosses whom they really dislike as much as any Rothschild could. The party press dare not speak out. The evening papers rather like the sensation of publishing the accounts of public meetings. So the abuse continues. How long is it to last?

Canadian Poets.

WHETHER our Canadian poets are deriving any material benefit from their productions is, we fear, a little doubtful; but at any rate they are attracting notice from others besides Canadians. One of the magazines published in New York recently published a careful estimate of our principal singers, English reviews treat them with respectful recognition, and it is to be hoped that, before long, Canadian ladies and gentlemen may be induced, in a larger measure, to recognize their importance by placing their volumes on the same shelves with their favourite English and American authors.

We have before us at the present moment an excellent and well considered article in the Catholic World, published in New York, on "Canadian Poets and Poetry," written by Thomas O'Hagan, M.A., Ph.D., himself a Canadian poet of no mean powers. To this article we gladly draw attention, because it is not only the result of a good deal of careful study on the part of the writer, but is written with perfect candour and freedom from the jealousy by which poets are sometimes supposed to be infected. Dr. O'Hagan declares of Canadian poets generally that "their songs are racy of the soil, charged with the very life-blood of the people. Canadian poetry is full-blooded, hearty, healthful and hopeful in its tune."

Among the pioneers of Canadian poetry he places Alexander McLachlan, "who is justly called the Burns of Canada." Pierre Chauveau, "universally recognized as the *doyen* of French-Canadian literature, Charles Sanger, the Canadian Wordsworth in his love and reverence of nature," Charles Heavysege, the author of the tragedy of "Saul," considered by Longfellow the best since the days of Shakespeare—rather a hard saying! To these he adds Louisa Murray, whose poem, "Merlin's Cave," is "characterized by great beauty of thought and diction."

The performances of the Canadian singer of to-day, Dr. O'Hagan remarks, are marked by "scholarship, refinement, a keen appreciation of the artistic with a certain boldness of wing"; and he rightly observes that his contemporaries show more of the influence of Keats, Tennyson and Swinburne, than of Scott, Wordsworth and Burns.

Mr. Charles Roberts is placed at the head of the band, and the place will not be contested, even although others of the company may appeal more strongly to individual tastes. "Roberts is a virile writer, and possesses in an eminent degree that even wedding of thought and language so essential to the production of a first-rate poem."

Mr. Wilfrid Campbell is declared to be one of the most original and bold among the younger Canadian poets. He is said to have "a keen sense of colour and form," and "has, at times, a great deal of strength and resources of melody which might well be matched against the best music of Shelley and Swinburne." We may hope that this ungrudging testimony will be pleasing to Mr. Campbell's friends who thought him slighted in a recent article. It might be well also if Mr. Campbell himself would meditate the kindly criticism of Mr. O'Hagan, which, however, need not be quoted here.

To Mr. Lampman and Mr. Duncan Campbell Scott, we are happy to see, Dr. O'Hagan does justice ungrudgingly and cordially. Mr. Lampman's charming volume, "Among the Millet," secured for the author "a pre-eminence among the younger poets of Canada. Lampman is an artist in every sense of the word." Mr. Scott, he says, "has a delicate and refined touch and a quaintness of fancy all his own. He never beats out the ore of his thought too fine, but links jewel to jewel with an artistic skill gives surety of the high-

est form of workmanship." Of another poet of the same name, the Rev. F. G. Scott, he says, he is "a poet of great spirituality, much earnestness, sinewy strength, and a certain boldness of conception which borders at times on the sublime." The London Speaker, he tells us, has pronounced Mr. Scott's poem, "Samson," to be the best American poem that has been published for years; and Dr. O'Hagan quotes the poem entire.

Of Mr. Bliss Carman, he says that he is by many regarded as the strongest of our Canadian poets; and he certainly has a note and a very charming note of his own. Justice is also done to Mr. Bengough, whose charming volume, recently noticed in these columns, is said to place him "at the very head of Canadian poets as a writer of tender and graceful elegies." We are happy to add that some verses of Mr. Bengough's, published since "Motley" appeared, testify that there is no failing of his poetical powers.

Several other contemporary poets are mentioned in the article. Among the French, Dr. Frechette and others; among the English, Miss Machar, Miss Pauline Johnson, Mrs. Harrison and others. Does Dr. O'Hagan know Prof. George Murray's "Verses and Versions?" They contain real poetry of a high order. The Rev. Duncan Anderson should also be mentioned as having caught the spirit of Burns and Tamsill in a very high degree.

We have drawn attention to this excellent article, not merely because we agree, for the most part, with its contents, but because we wish Canadians to know better than they do now the wealth of poetic genius which they possess.

WILLIAM CLARK.

Can the State Afford to Support a Purely Secular Education?

THE satirical commendation of Gallio contained in the Reverend G. Low's recent article in THE WEEK might almost have deceived an unwary reader into imagining that the worthy satirist really admired the type of character of which Gallio stands out as a representative. We know, of course, that the reverend gentleman really is far from admiring the worldly, indifferent Proconsul, to whom, no doubt, a Roman banquet, with its lampreys and peacocks' tongues and Falernian wine, was of vastly greater importance than an unintelligible dispute between despised Jews concerning "the Resurrection and the Life," and who was not likely to show himself as susceptible to the eloquence of Paul as were even the Procurator Felix or King Agrippa. Doubtless, too, Mr. Low wished to hint that we are never without our Gallios, plenty of them, with less excuse than the original one, and also perhaps a trifle less logical. We hear from a good many of them in the present discussion on the vexed question of religion in our public schools, and they invariably confuse religion with doctrinal theology.

But was Mr. Low still satirical when he defined the object of the State in educating its children as that of making "intelligent citizens." If not, he must have used the word "intelligent" in a larger sense than the usual one. For surely, if the State undertakes the education of the people at all, her object and aim should not be less than that of making useful citizens, or good citizens, in the sense in which that expression is generally understood. And it is becoming increasingly clear that the cultivation of the "intelligence" alone will not necessarily make a "good citizen." It may, in fact, simply turn out an accomplished villain, all the better fitted to pursue a career of cunning wickedness, of the possibility of which we have lately had certain striking examples, calculated to make us consider this matter somewhat seriously.

Moreover, recent writers on "Social Evolution" and "Industrial Evolution" have forcibly pointed out that the intellect alone cannot be morally regulative, since it cannot supply any rational basis for that self-control and self-denial necessary for man to practice, in order to maintain the very existence and well-being of social life. To this end there must be moral training, enforced by "supernatural," that is, religious sanctions. This, many of us believe to be emphatically true, and, therefore, we cannot accept what we regard as the dangerous fallacy that a public school education which has for its *raison d'être* the training of good and useful