is the judicious granting of credit. If our able and respected contemporary, the Draper's Record, will take up the matter of reforming the terms of credit given by the British textile trade as energetically as it urges new bankruptcy legislation for Canada we have no doubt a great good will be accomplished.

PAY UP YOUR NOTES.

A subscriber in the county of Essex, who has long been a careful reader of THE MONETARY TIMES, sends to the Editor a lengthy letter which he says is not intended to be published. But we take the liberty of extracting a sentence or two which refers to a matter of marked importance to merchants. After referring to some other subjects, he say: "Now bear with me while I express myself respecting the foolish system of credit that is kept forever going round and round in this Canada of ours like a treadmill or a windmill. I look ahead and try to see what is going to come of the system of renewing paper in the banks that the retailers give and that is renewed half-paid, renewed one-fourth paid, or renewed and nothing paid. I dare not estimate the proportion that is paid in full at its maturity. Trouble must come of this excessive credit. I think, meanwhile, *somebody* is paying the shave the banks get. When will our importers and manufacturers insist on being paid notes in full when due? I remember an article in THE MONETARY TIMES some half dozen years ago entitled 'Pay or Burst,' in which you took strong ground on this very subject. I wish you would reprint it or else write another like it."

Upon turning up the article in question we find it was written in March, 1890, and it may do some good if we reprint part of it as suggested by our correspondent:

"PAY OR BURST."

"I hear you have made a change in your business'" said a bank director in an Eastern city to a wholesale merchant the other day.

"Yes, that is true," answered the merchant, "we do not date ahead like the rest of the trade."

"But that is not what I mean," continued the bank director, "they tell me you have refused to renew for your credit customers—is that so?"

The merchant replied, "Yes, that is even so; we have stopped renewing."

"And do you stick to it?"

"Yes, we stick to it."

After musing a few moments, the bank director said, "Well, I daresay you are right. Pay or burst, that's about the size of it. If a man cannot pay at due date the notes for what he has deliberately bought, he is likely to prove an undesirable or unsafe mark. I admire your pluck, and I think you are on the right track."

Is anybody shocked at this conversation? There certainly are people of the opinion that it is cruel to refuse renewals, and that it is mean to "shut down on," traders who are doing their best to pay, and such abruptness may seem harsh. But it is business. Have the people who take so humanitarian a view of commerce ever been in the position of holding tens of thousands in customers' promises to pay? If they have been, and had already given value for such paper, we venture to say they did not excuse the laxity of those signers who asked renewal. When certain folk talk of forbearance in such circumstances, one is reminded of the motto of the Bankers' Magazine; "No expectation of forbearance or indulgence should be encouraged. Favor and benevolence are not the attributes of good banking. Strict justice and the rigid performance of contracts are its proper foundation." Every word of which applies to a merchant's business. No man has a right to abuse another because he does not choose to renew notes deliberately given for merchandise purchased. There has been far too much renewing. Too much dating forward, too much credit generally. And any firm that puts down its foot resolutely and says: "We must be paid at due date; we will not renew our customers' paper," deserves the thanks of its competitors and the praise of the community. It is not easy to see anything shocking or deserving of opprobrium in the policy summed up by the bank director as meaning "You must pay or burst."

BOOK-KEEPING, ETC., IN THE COMMON SCHOOLS.

During the last fortnight we have received several communications on the subject of, or connected with, the matter to which we devoted a brief article on April 21st, namely, "Business Handwriting." They are mostly commendatory of our contention that good handwriting is a qualification of great value in commerce. A prominent manufacturer says: "You do quite right to make a protest against slipshod handwriting or slipshod anything else in these days when young folks seem to despise the old-fashioned essentials." A leading banker writes with regard to the same issue: "The article is excellent and most timely." Some of the communications received are disposed to place the blame on the common schools of th country, and one reminds us of what Mr. Walker said at the bankers' meeting in October last about "boys being turned out with a High School education yet unable to spell." A well-known business man of Toronto says: "The matter of penmanship, while faulty, is not so serious in my experience as the bad spelling." This, too, he adds, among nice-mannered lads and young men.

A gentleman writes to us condemning in strong terms the length of time devoted, in some of the city schools, to subjects which are more appropriate for a business school, and the short time devoted to penmanship and spelling. He sends us a table exhibiting the time devoted to each of sixteen subjects in the Highest Fifth form at one of the public schools of Toronto in September, 1897. From this we gather that 60 minutes per week was given to reading, but 70 minutes to Euclid; 15 minutes to spelling, but 115 minutes to algebra; only 30 minutes to drill, but 90 minutes to physics and botany. And, while the subject of penmanship does not appear at all in this table of subjects occupying the scholars' attention, 170 minutes, which is nearly two hours and three-quarters per week, is given to book-keeping! This gentleman's letter says:

"You will observe that on Tuesdays and Wednesdays from 2.30 o'clock till 4 was given to book-keeping. That is, the subject was considered of sufficient importance to warrant detaining the scholars an extra half hour, from 3.30 to 4 o'clock. There are only two subjects in the whole list, viz., grammar and arithmetic, to which more time per week was given than to book-keeping, and this stands a long way ahead of the next subject, i.e., geography. Not a minute is given to penmanship, except indirectly, the exercises in composition giving 55 minutes per week. Not approving this sort of thing, what I propose to do is to have my children drop a subject like book-keeping, which only crams, confuses and bewilders children's minds to no purpose, and by so much unfits them to grapple with subjects which are of value. If there must be home lessons, I do not intend that the study of book-keeping shall be one. Think of the contrast: Three hours a week at school trying to learn book-keeping, against one quarter of an hour learning how to spell; and as against two hours spent at geography. Verily, our children will become expert (?) book-keepers, before they able to spell the articles of merchandise which they have to enter in the books, and before they know where they come from, or are to go to.

Now, the attempted forcing into children's minds of such a variety