

IT is not necessarily dispraise of Sir Richard Cartwright as an orator or a statesman to say that the burden of one of his public addresses can generally be predicted with tolerable certainty, and that its prevailing note will be pessimistic. These oratorical characteristics are, we suppose, meritorious or otherwise just in proportion to the truth or falsity of the premises from which the speaker reasons. If the Dominion has been and is being so sadly misgoverned as Sir Richard affirms and essays to prove; if its politics have been corrupted, its resources squandered, its population driven away, its present blighted and its future mortgaged to anything like the extent he maintains, his jeremiads are but the measure of his honesty and his patriotism. Leaving the hearers and the readers of his Saturday's speech to settle those questions for themselves in the light of the formidable array of figures and alleged facts laid before them, we turn to another paragraph of his speech which more particularly invites comment just now. We refer to his manly defence of his vote and that of his fellow Liberals on the motion for the disallowance of the Jesuits' Estates Act. When he puts it to all honest men throughout the country, How could men of the Liberal party, one of the main planks of whose platform has been that the rights of every Province should be respected, that each Province should be supreme in the sphere which the Constitution had assigned to it, have turned back in their own course, and been false to their own record? he puts a question which has always seemed to us simply unanswerable. It has, no doubt, been a wonder to many that leading members of Sir Richard's party have hitherto been so slow to accept the popular challenge and come forward in defence of their action in this matter. Perhaps now that Sir Richard has broken the ice others will pluck up courage and follow the lead.

THE matter of chief interest in Sir Richard's speech, at the present juncture, is his attempt to formulate a principle, or rule, to guide Dominion Ministries in the right use of the veto power. Opinions on this difficult point have hitherto oscillated between two inadmissible extremes. The theory that the power of disallowance vested in the central Government is virtually unconditional and absolute, and the antithetical theory that it is valid in regard only to measures which are unconstitutional or *ultra vires*, vorge equally on the absurd. The one view would do away with provincial autonomy and place the provinces under an Ottawa despotism to which they would never submit. The other would make the veto power a farce, as being both meaningless and useless for any practical purpose. But if the truth lies between the extremes how and where shall it be located and defined? Sir Richard's speech presents the latest attempt to answer this question, and coming from so high an authority, the answer is at least worthy of respectful consideration. Here it is in his own words: "The veto power of the Dominion Government may be exercised as a right in just such a way and on just such terms as the veto committed by the Constitution to the British Government may be exercised with respect to the Acts of the Federal Parliament. You will not find the British Government interfering with the Acts of the Federal Parliament in any matter whatever which comes fairly within its jurisdiction, and precisely the same language, precisely the same words, identically the same terms are used in the Constitutional Act defining the right of interference by the Dominion Government as are used with respect to the right of interference by the British Government with Federal Acts. I know right well how a Canadian Parliament and how the Canadian people would resent any interference from Downing Street with Acts formally passed by their Legislature. And I say that if our Constitution is to be worked at all you must extend to the Local Legislatures the rights and privileges which you yourselves have claimed and maintained, and which you are prepared to maintain against the British Government should it unfairly interfere with you." This is, so far as we are aware, a new view of the case. The argument certainly has considerable logical cogency. But if this were accepted as the standard of interpretation, we fear it would not settle the difficulty, since the same kind of reasoning which now avails to persuade hundreds of intelligent men that the Federal Government is in duty bound to veto the Jesuits' Estates' Act of Quebec, would be equally cogent to convince them that, *mutatis mutandis*, the British Government would not hesitate, in a parallel case, to veto similar legislation by the Canadian Parliament.

THE elaborate explanation of the working of the Public and Separate Schools Acts, given by the Minister of Education in his speech at the Liberal picnic, on Saturday, fails to remove the inconsistencies in the provisions of those Acts to which we have before adverted. The Minister's statement is in one important respect satisfactory. It commits the Government for whom he speaks to the distinct declaration that the law "presumes every ratepayer to be a Public School supporter," and of course to a distinct denial of the position that the law, as it now stands, presumes every Catholic ratepayer to be a Separate School supporter. This is as it should be, and having laid down this principle it follows, as a matter of course, that the Government will promptly remove or amend any clause of the Acts which seems to be at variance with it. Such a clause is, surely, that which requires the assessor to accept the statement made in behalf of any ratepayer that he is a Roman Catholic as sufficient *prima facie* evidence that he is a Separate School supporter. The merest tyro cannot fail to see that this clause runs counter to the legal presumption above mentioned. And every one who knows anything of the working of such statutes, must know that these *prima facie* assumptions are of very great practical importance. The Minister of Education points out, no doubt with perfect accuracy, that "if any ratepayer goes before the Court of Revision and asks for proof that any Catholic desires to become a Separate School supporter and the proof is not forthcoming in the form of a notice from the Catholic himself or his agent, then such Catholic cannot be assessed as a Separate School supporter." But it makes an immense difference in such cases upon whom the burden of taking the initiative is made to rest. If, as the foregoing statement implies, it rests upon some second party not directly interested, the presumption is that in nine cases out of ten no action will be taken and the proof required will not be demanded. But on the principle laid down by Mr. Ross himself that every ratepayer is legally presumed to be a Public School supporter, nothing can be clearer than that the Catholic ratepayer who wishes to be rated as a Separate School supporter should, in every case, be required to take the initiatory step. The law should be so amended as to leave no doubt or confusion in regard to this matter.

WITH the Government's programme, as laid down by Mr. Ross, for dealing with the schools in the French sections of the Province, no fairminded Canadian can find much fault. There is, indeed, some speciousness in the Minister's careful bracketing of "French" with "German" in all his remarks, on the assumption that every objection that applies to the one applies also to the other. Seeing that the main objections are based on national considerations, and that no one suspects the Germans in Canada of cherishing any distinctive national or race ambitions, or any determined hostility to ultimate assimilation, the essential difference in the two cases is not very hard to discover. But as a defence of his own administration the Minister's historical and political sketch was effective, while his policy in regard to the future, if honestly carried out, should, we think, satisfy any Canadian who has any facility in putting himself in his neighbour's place. To press steadily, prudently and reasonably for the same proficiency in English in the schools of Ontario in which French and German are taught; as in the Public Schools where only English is taught; to carry out at the earliest opportunity measures for training the teachers of French schools in correct methods of teaching English; to see with all convenient and reasonable speed that none but authorized text books are used in these schools in any subject; to refuse permits or new certificates to all teachers unable to teach English, and to do all this in the spirit in which one should deal with fellow citizens, not with aliens, will be, perhaps, to go about as far and as fast in the direction of reform as either a true patriotism or a sound statesmanship would warrant. In one particular, if the *Globe's* report be accepted as accurate, the Minister seems to leave himself open to a charge of using the arts of the politician by paltering with his hearers in a double sense. He states distinctly and with ample arguments that the Government will not prohibit absolutely the study of French or German in any school where the local wants of the population render a knowledge of these languages desirable or necessary, but whether the Government will concede or refuse the demand that English only be made the language of instruction in all state-aided schools, deponent, so far as we are able to discover, saith not, unless, indeed, the affirmative is implied in the promise with regard to the use of none but authorized text books. If by this is meant text-books in English only, we venture to predict

that the "convenient and reasonable speed" will prove a veritable snail's pace. As we have before suggested, the natural solution of the difficulty will, it seems to us, be found only in a bi-lingual series of text-books.

PRINCIPAL GRANT'S rejoinder to Vice-Chancellor Mulock has been published, and both sides of the question are now before the public and the Government. To many the question will seem, after all, to be not a very large one, yet it is educationally important. Principal Grant has done wisely in seeking to put aside all irrelevant matter and fix attention directly upon the point at issue. That point is whether the matriculation standards in Ontario are what they ought to be, and, if not, how shall they be improved. If we are not mistaken most of those who have some claim to be reckoned among our educational authorities, including many of the alumni and other warm friends of Toronto University, are agreed that the standards need to be raised and improved so far as the subjects chosen and the amount of work indicated are concerned. Very many, too, will, we believe, agree in the opinion that the choice of examiners by the University Senate is not always of the wisest character, and, especially, that no man, young or old, no matter what his literary attainments, can be qualified to perform the delicate functions of such an office, so long as he has no practical acquaintance with the science and art of teaching. From this point of view it can hardly be doubted that an Examining Board, representing the combined wisdom and experience of all the Universities, should meet the conditions of the problem better than any other arrangement. Would putting the formation of Matriculation standards and the application of Matriculation tests into the hands of such a Board, be equivalent to bringing the secondary education of the country under denominational control, or involve the slightest departure from the present purely secular system? If we thought it would, we should be among the first to object and oppose. Any change involving this effect would be inimical to the best interests of both the Provincial and the voluntary Universities. Dr. Grant ridicules the idea that anything of the kind would be involved, and we confess that with our present light his argument, drawn in part from the fact that at present the Senate of Toronto has on it representatives, not only of denominational institutions but of purely theological colleges, appears conclusive on the point. What is wanted is not a departure from the sound educational principles now established, but a more effective application of these principles, wherever possible. Whatever promises to raise the average of preparation for and of educational training in the Universities, both Provincial and denominational, will tend in this direction, and deserves attentive consideration.

NOT only the graduates and undergraduates of Toronto University, but many other friends and admirers of the late Professor Young, will, we are sure, require no urging to induce them to respond promptly and heartily to the appeal of the large and influential body of gentlemen constituting the "Young Memorial Committee." With regard to the propriety and desirability of establishing some fitting and lasting memorial of the deceased there can be no two opinions: Those especially—and we believe they are many—who are conscious of having received from him such impulse and inspiration as will be helpful to them through all their future lives, will not willingly let the memory of their benefactor perish, but will rather desire to do all in their power to make the good that he has done live after him, in other lives as well as their own. The committee have, after deliberation, thought it best to indicate \$10,000 as the sum to be asked for. They also request contributors to state whether they would prefer that the memorial should take the form of a work of art or a scholarship. Some have suggested both, but the amount named would clearly be inadequate for the two objects. The committee, no doubt acting wisely and on the best information attainable, have decided on what they deem practicable. Were it otherwise, we could have wished that they might have seen their way clear to set their financial mark very much higher and aim at the establishment of a new Chair in some branch of study akin to that to which the lamented professor was so enthusiastically devoted. But assuming that this fittest and most unobjectionable form of memorial is out of the question, we can only hope that the response made to the committee's circular will be such as to enable them to proceed at once to the accomplishment of one or the other of the objects proposed.