

THE WEEK.

Sixth Year.
Vol. VI. No. 45.

TORONTO, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 11th, 1889.

\$3.00 per Annum
Single Copies, 10 Cents.

THE WEEK :

AN INDEPENDENT JOURNAL OF POLITICS LITERATURE SCIENCE AND ARTS

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
Principal Caven on Jesuit Endowment	707
The Action of the Montreal Presbytery	707
Professional Study of Mental Diseases	707
Voluntaryism in Higher Education	707
Recent Events in Manitoba	708
New Short Line to the Seaboard	708
The Ontario Law School	708
The Moral Influence of the Revolver	708
The Proposed Monastic Order	708
The New American States	708
The French Republic	709
China Building Railroads	709
The Ethical Element in Fiction	709
WALLACE'S DARWINISM	709
LONDON LETTER	711
MONTREAL LETTER	711
YEA, OR NAY (A POEM)	712
A FEW WORDS MORE ABOUT MR. HOWELLS	712
PARIS LETTER	712
LIFE'S DITHYRAMB (POEM)	713
THE MONTREAL SEMINARIES	713
AN ARTIST'S LETTERS FROM THE ROCKIES—V	713
SONNETS	714
EDUCATION IN ANCIENT EGYPT	714
CORRESPONDENCE—	
The French Revolution.—I	Fairplay Radical, 715
TRUE TALE	716
ART NOTES	Templar, 716
MUSIC AND THE DRAMA	716
OUR LIBRARY TABLE	717
LITERARY AND PERSONAL GOSSIP	717
READINGS FROM CURRENT LITERATURE	717
CHESS	718

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.

PRINCIPAL CAVEN'S recent address before the Alumni Association of Knox College may be regarded, we suppose, as being, in part at least, the answer of one of the most highly respected and influential leaders of the "Equal Rights" movement to the arguments brought forward by the Hon. Mr. Laurier in his Pavilion speech. Principal Caven's deductions from the premise from which he sets out seem to us sound and unanswerable. We do not see how any reasonable man can doubt that a measure which should give \$400,000 or any other sum of money from public funds to a religious body in Canada as an endowment would be a measure "not to be approved of by the people of this country," or that in a mixed community like ours "you have an end to peace and harmony if you are to bestow public money on the denominations." That has been understood to be the settled policy of Ontario at least, ever since the secularization of the Clergy Reserves. It is a policy that was strongly re-affirmed in Ontario soon after the passage of the British North America Act gave her the complete control, which she had not before had, of her own local policy and resources. It is undoubtedly approved, not only as a policy but as a principle, by the great majority of the people of the Province, and by none more heartily than by most of the religious bodies themselves. We do not suppose the same can be said of Quebec, so far as the principle is concerned. The fact that the majority of her people belong to a denomination which enjoys many of the privileges of a State Church, and which approves of the support of that particular church by the State, is irreconcilable with the belief that the majority hold any such view, as a matter of principle or right. But as a matter of policy Quebec no doubt clearly recognizes the wisdom and necessity of adhering to the rule laid down by Principal Caven. It is inconceivable that the Protestant Churches of Quebec could for a moment acquiesce in any Act of the Legislature involving the appropriation of public funds for purposes of religious endowment. It is equally inconceivable that the Catholic majority could fail to see how utterly and dangerously impolitic it would be to attempt to make any such disposition of the Provincial funds, foreseeing, as they must,

that any such measure would be bitterly opposed by the minority, would put an end to all peace and harmony, and would, in the end, imperil the existence of the Catholic Church as the privileged body it now is. So far, we have no doubt, Mr. Laurier and the whole one hundred and eighty-eight members of Parliament who voted against Col. O'Brien's resolution would be in complete agreement with Principal Caven. Where then is the flaw in Principal Caven's argument? "In the faulty minor premise," Mr. Laurier would no doubt reply. "That premise assumes that the \$400,000 in question is given as an endowment, and the conclusion rests wholly on that assumption, whereas the Act makes it clear that it is given for no such purpose, but in settlement of a claim, which, rightly or wrongly, is to some extent recognized." We do not now express any opinion upon the justice of that claim or the wisdom of recognizing it. We only point out that, as a matter of logic, it seems to us the argument, to be convincing, should be directed against the Act as it is on its face and in its ostensible purport. By the simple process of assuming that the intention of an Act is something quite different from that declared in the Act itself, one could demonstrate the iniquity of any bill ever passed by any Legislature.

WE have said that it is inconceivable that the Protestant Churches of Quebec could acquiesce in any Act of the Legislature which they regarded as involving the principle of a denominational subsidy or endowment. The recent action of the Montreal Presbytery, representing the Presbyterian Church of the Province, strongly confirms this view. It cannot be denied that the setting apart of \$60,000 for the use of Protestants in their educational work was a most illogical procedure on the part of the framers of the Jesuits' Estates Act, and that the acquiescence of the Protestant minority in the Legislature was both inconsistent and impolitic. Either the moral claim of which the award of the \$400,000 was ostensibly a recognition was founded in justice or it was not. If it was, in the opinion of the minority, so founded, the award should have been cheerfully agreed to without any consideration or equivalent. If it was not it should have been resisted to the last. As the matter stands nothing can free the Protestants who voted for the Act from the imputation of having accepted, on the behalf of the constituencies they represent, a pecuniary consideration for consenting to an act of justice. The only ground, so far as we are able to see, on which their action could be defended, would be that they regarded the giving of the \$400,000, not as a business settlement of a moral claim, but as Principal Caven regards it, as the endowment of a religious body. On this assumption the \$60,000 for Protestants takes the shape of a concurrent endowment. But this alternative lays the Protestant legislators under the imputation of having legislated on false pretences, and this horn of the dilemma could hardly be less painful to men sensitive on points of honour than the other. The same remarks would apply to the Protestant Committee of the Council of Public Instruction were they to be regarded as in any real sense the representatives of the Protestants of the Province. To what extent the plea that they are merely the servants of the Government may excuse their conditional acceptance of the grant we need not stay to determine. What we wish to point out is that the reasoning of Principal MacVicar in his speech before the Presbytery is irresistible, and the action of the Presbytery in protesting against the acceptance of the \$60,000, the only consistent action, if the Presbyterians of Quebec wish to repudiate the policy of the endowment of denominations by the Province. Says Principal MacVicar, "The only claim of the Jesuits is an alleged moral claim. That claim has not been and cannot be alleged on behalf of the Protestants of this Province. The Jesuits contend that they were robbed by the King of England and have a moral claim for compensation. If the Protestants could allege any share in the original estates, they would then have some show of reason in sharing in the compensation. On what grounds, in the name of common sense, can Protestants base a claim? It is simply hush money." The language is strong, but we do not see how any one can deny that the argument is sound and the conclusion logical.

WHATEVER room there may be for difference of opinion as to the abstract desirability of making a faculty of medicine "part and parcel of the educational system of the country," or as to the abstract propriety of committing the State to the work of purely professional training of any kind, there can be none whatever, we should suppose, in regard to the great importance of making the study of mental diseases a part of every course of medical instruction. The fact incidentally brought out in Dr. Daniel Clark's address at the recent Convocation of Toronto University, that that institution was the first on the continent to put this branch of medicine upon its curriculum, and that but a few others have as yet done so, will be, we dare say, as astonishing to the general public, as it must be, in one of its aspects, gratifying to the friends of the Provincial University. The other facts of which Dr. Clark reminds us, viz., that there are in the Dominion no less than 9000 persons afflicted with diseases of this class, and that physicians are constantly being called upon to give certificates condemning individuals to the asylum, or determining their competency to perform such acts as the disposal of property, set in a very striking light the necessity that the members of a profession upon which rests such responsibilities should have the best facilities for the thorough study of the causes and symptoms of insanity. Dr. Clark might, no doubt, have gone much further. Mental diseases are simply, we suppose, brain diseases, in so far, at least, as they come within the range of medical treatment. When we consider to how large an extent the prevailing ailments have their origin, or their outcome, whichever it may be, in affections of the nervous system, it is difficult to see how any course of medical study can be at all complete, which is not largely occupied with the functions and disorders of the nerve centres of which the brain is chief. Insanity in its various forms is, we assume, from the physiological point of view, but one of the various manifestations of these disorders, and is certainly not the least worthy of special attention, and clinical as well as class-room investigation. The faculty of medicine of the University is to be congratulated, not only in having made this branch of medical study compulsory on its students, but on having secured for its chair of instruction a professor so well qualified in every respect as Dr. Clark.

IN his interesting address at the recent Convocation of the University over which he presides, Sir Daniel Wilson referred, with characteristic felicity of speech, on the one hand to the various improvements in the institution which recent windfalls have enabled its authorities to make, and on the other to the need of additional contributions on a very liberal scale, if the University is to keep pace with its wealthy competitors on the other side of the line, and with the ever-growing requirements of modern scientific research. The President informed the public of the fact, of which many were probably not previously aware, that the recent extension of the buildings for scientific purposes has involved the destruction of the College gymnasium. He also suggested that "no act could more gracefully mark the sympathy of the large body of graduates, and their loyalty to their *alma mater*, than the gift of a gymnasium for the healthful recreation of their successors in the old halls." It is to be hoped that the *alumni* of the University, amongst whom are many possessed of ample means, will not fail to act promptly upon the hint so neatly given. Sir Daniel's references to the munificent benefactions that have within the last year been bestowed upon so many of the universities of Great Britain and the United States, and to the great need of similar liberality here, suggests a variety of thoughts and queries. Among the latter is the question why an institution which stands so high in the estimation of its own graduates and of the public generally, should have hitherto failed to attract to itself the liberal gifts of wealthy friends of higher education. May it not be possible that the President's own address suggests this explanation? It is worthy of note that the magnificent endowments of other institutions to which he refers are in the main, if not exclusively, the gifts of private benefactors. The very fact that the projectors and managers of universities find themselves now obliged to compute their wants