

THE WEEK.

Ninth Year.
Vol. IX., No. 35.

TORONTO, FRIDAY, JULY 29th, 1892.

\$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.

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.

European Agents—SMITH, AINSLIE & Co., 25 Newcastle Street,
Strand London.

C. BLACKETT ROBINSON, Publisher.

CONTENTS OF CURRENT NUMBER.

TOPICS—	PAGE
Those Examinations	547
What is Canadian Loyalty?	547
The Reason Why	547
Why are They There?	547
The Manitoba Elections	548
The Plebiscite in Canada	548
After Irish Home Rule?	548
What of Other Reforms?	548
The Threatened Itelation	548
What is to be Done?	548
THE ARCHIC MAN—VL. Nicholas Flood Davin, M.P.	549
A CENTENARY ODE: 1792—16th JULY—1892	S. A. C. 550
TWO KNAPSACKS: A NOVEL OF CAROLIAN SUMMER LIFE. J. Cawdor Bell.	550
AFTER SUNSET. (POEM)	Emily A. Sykes. 552
BRITISH COLUMBIA	B. 552
THE CRITIC	553
LA SOTTISE. (POEM)	J. A. T. L. 553
PARIS LETTER	Z. 553
CORRESPONDENCE—	
Canadian Loyalty	J. Castell Hopkins. 554
The Dominion Electorate	Civis Canadensis. 554
PLAISIRS DE FROISSART. (POEM—After Charles d'Orleans)	J. Ross-Wetherman. 554
THE DIALOGUES OF PLATO	John Watson. 554
ART NOTES	555
MUSIC AND THE DRAMA	556
OUR LIBRARY TABLE	556
LITERARY AND PERSONAL GOSSIP	557
SCIENTIFIC AND SANITARY	558
CHESS	559

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.

ONCE more the annual examinations in connection with
the Education Department have been held, and once
more the daily papers are filled with indignant protests
against the alleged unfair character of some of the exam-
ination questions. So far as memory enables us to compare,
our impression is that never before were the complaints
so many and emphatic, and never before did they relate to
so many of the subjects of examination. It is noteworthy,
too, that the length as well as the character of the question
papers is bitterly complained of. This ought not so to be.
Is it hardly conceivable that the papers could have called
forth such a chorus of condemnation without good cause.
But the experience of past years should, one might sup-
pose, have enabled skilled examiners, especially if they are,
as they ought to be in every case, themselves actual and
experienced teachers, to judge with a good deal of accuracy
what may be expected of the average student who has
faithfully gone over the prescribed ground. In the absence
of personal knowledge we shall not attempt to decide
whether the fault is with examiners, students, or schools,
much less to search for or suggest more remote causes of
the dissatisfaction. But one inference we will venture to
draw, in confirmation of an opinion which we have, if we
mistake not, more than once expressed in these columns.
That opinion is that the examination by writing, excellent
as it is as an instrument of education in the hands of the
teacher himself, is unreliable as the sole test of the results of
a prolonged course of study, or of the mental acquirements
of a given student. We say "as the sole test," for as a
partial test, in connection with other methods, it may
serve an excellent purpose. But we hold, and we venture
to appeal to the experience of thoughtful educators of
every grade, if the view is not a correct one, that in every
case in which the fitness of a student to enter a certain
grade, or to receive a certain certificate of culture or pro-
ficiency, is concerned, the opinions of the masters under
whom he has last studied for some length of time, and who
have kept a record of the manner in which the daily work
of the class-room has been done, is a much fairer and more
reliable criterion than the results of the most rigid examina-
tion. There is not, for instance, a competent High
School master in Ontario whose certificate of the fitness of

a student who has passed through the forms in his school,
for a given non-professional teacher's certificate, or for
entrance into the first-year classes of a university, is not
more reliable than the result of any written examination
that can be held. If this be so, the inference is obvious,
and the methods of the Education Department and the
universities should be modified accordingly.

WHAT is Canadian loyalty? A very simple and, as
most persons would suppose, correct answer would
be, "loyalty to Canada." If this definition be accepted,
then the first question for a loyal Canadian to ask and
answer in every emergency will be, What do the true
interests of Canada, its highest and best interests, demand?
It is a fact admitted and deplored by almost every one
who has given attention to the subject that the feeling of
Canadian loyalty as thus understood is by no means so
deep-rooted and vigorous in the breasts of Canadian
citizens as a whole as it ought to be and must be if we are
ever to have a true Canadian sentiment, corresponding in
kind and degree to that which, for instance, almost every
American citizen feels for the Republic to which he
belongs. Thousands of Nova-Scotians, for example, though
Nova Scotia has been for a quarter of a century in the
Confederation, will scarcely permit themselves to be
called "Canadians." Thousands in other parts of the
Dominion may formally recognize themselves as such, but
in their bosoms the word awakens no responsive thrill of
the kind to which we have referred as the spontaneous
outcome of the genuine patriotic passion. We are dealing,
be it remembered, with facts. We wish simply to look
them fairly in the face, in order to discover how they may
be changed for the better. A respected correspondent,
Mr. J. Castell Hopkins, assures us that "there really
should be no distinction, and to the true loyalist there is
none, between Canada and the Empire of which she forms
a part." We know that there are in Canada very many
citizens whose loyalty will stand the test of that dictum.
But we are sure that there are very many others who
would not yield even to him in their affection for Canada,
the land of their birth, the land in which they hope to
live and die, who would be ruled out by Mr. Hopkins'
criterion. Are they, then, not loyal Canadians? We are
sure that there are in Canada other thousands of citizens,
some of them of Canadian, some of foreign, birth, who
maintain that it is simply impossible for them to cherish any
such patriotic impulses in regard to Canada as they would
spontaneously and heartily feel were she a nation, instead
of a colony. Does not our correspondent meet with many
such? Perhaps the very fact that the Queen's representa-
tive here is an Englishman and successor in that position
to a Scotchman and an Irishman, which he gives as an
incentive to loyalty, as he conceives it, may be with many
of these a reason why they feel themselves unable to
cherish what they regard as a true Canadian loyalty.
They are accustomed to think of loyalty as an attribute of
nationality and incompatible with the status of a proconsul-
late. We are much mistaken if a close analysis would not
detect a good deal of this kind of sentiment lurking in
the bosoms of many British born residents in Canada,
whose loyalty to the Empire is unquestionable and intense.
It is not pleasant to say such things, and we know how
liable we are to be misunderstood in saying them, but to
us who have lived all our years in Canada, and in different
sections of it, they seem to be simple facts. True, a genu-
ine Imperial Federation, were such practicable, would go
far to meet the difficulty, but no one has yet shown that
such a thing is within the range of sober, practical poli-
tics. Why would not an Independent Canada, in alliance
more or less close with the Mother Country, be at once a
more feasible and a simpler solution of the problem? Of
course Mr. Hopkins knows that his categorical statements
in regard to the commercial, financial and political welfare
of Canada, however clearly demonstrable they may seem
to his own mind, will not be accepted by many, even of
those who are in hearty accord with his views of loyalty.

A GOOD deal of dissatisfaction was caused by the very
unusual course taken by Mr. Foster, the Minister of
Finance, in proposing certain changes in the tariff within

three or four days of the close of the session, when the
absence of a large number of the members from both sides
of the House prevented full consideration and discussion.
The Government gave no satisfactory reason for the inno-
vation. That omission has now been supplied by the
Canadian Manufacturer, in a remarkable article. Its
explanation amounts to this. The changes made were but
two or three out of a large number of similar modifications
of the tariff which the manufacturers, whose right to
direct the Government in such matters is set forth in terms
which must make the Ministers wince, had urged upon
their attention during the session. For prudential reasons
the Government did not see its way clear to complying
with the bulk of these requests, and did not wish to open
up discussion with regard to them, lest the manufacturers
in question and their friends in the House should prove
troublesome. Hence, they adopted the not very valiant
course of delaying the announcement of intended changes
until the last hours of the session. From the protection-
ist point of view the *Manufacturer* makes out a very good
case in favour of most of the changes denied as well as
those granted by the Government. They were all, or
nearly all, of the nature of reduction or removal of duties
upon raw material not produced in the country and enter-
ing into the manufacture of products of consumption or
export. These duties, it is claimed, seriously handicap the
producers of such products and lessen their ability to com-
pete in foreign markets. Why the Government should
have declined to comply with the requests of their masters
in the matter it is not easy to conceive, taking the cases
as represented by the organ in the number now before us.

WRITERS on Political Economy have sometimes
discussed with much learning and acumen the ques-
tion of the proper relation of the people's representative in
a parliament or legislative assembly to his constituents.
Among the various views which have been from time to
time presented the one which has perhaps found least
favour is that which regards the representative as a dele-
gate having no discretionary power, but bound to speak
and vote just as he may be directed by his constituents,
or such of them as may be specially interested in any
matter that may be under consideration. It is generally
felt that such a view of the duties of a representative,
reducing him as it does to the capacity of a mere agent of
the lowest class, who has only to do just what he is told
to do, is to degrade the business of statesmanship far
below the level of other professions. In law or medicine,
for instance, such a view of the relation of the agent to
the principal for whom he acts would be scouted, and the
person who should insist upon that kind of service would
soon find himself shut up to the employment of those at
the very bottom of the profession, if indeed he could
succeed in finding any one willing to set so low an estimate
upon his own professional knowledge and skill. Those who
think that the profession of the national legislator should
not be placed on a lower basis will deprecate any attempt to
degrade the business of law-making to a vote-as-you-are-told
level. These remarks are suggested by a series of articles
in the *Canadian Manufacturer* of the 15th inst., in which
what we may call the mechanical view of the position of
both Government and members is presented with refresh-
ing bluntness. A few sentences culled from these articles
will convey some idea of the trend of the argument, so
far as the relation of certain members to the manufactu-
rers who claim to have elected them is concerned. We
may add that in one or more articles preceding those from
which the quotations are taken the members of the Gov-
ernment are told their duty to the manufacturers who put
them in power with equal frankness, and are given clearly
to understand that they, too, are upon their good behaviour
to that section of the population. What would be the
consequences to both Government and members, if at any
time the views and interests of some other equally power-
ful section of their constituents, say the consumers, should
conflict with those of the manufacturers, must be left to
conjecture. Evidently the poor legislators would be
between Scylla and Charybdis with a vengeance. Fol-
lowing are a few detached quotations. The italics are
ours:—