

that the ordinary training of the schools and colleges, leaving out of view what little may be done in some of them in the department of science, usually addresses itself so exclusively to the intellectual faculties that the powers of perception and observation are left quite undeveloped. Thus it often happens that a student may have taken high honours in classics, mathematics or metaphysics, and yet go forth into the world one of the least observing of mortals. Who has not known college graduates who have won distinction at their examinations, whose ignorance of, and consequent lack of interest in surrounding objects, whether products of nature or of human art and skill, was positively painful? They could not, perhaps, give the names or characteristics of half-a-dozen field flowers or forest trees, though they might move amongst them every day. Having eyes, they saw not, beyond the pages of their books. It can hardly be denied that, considering men in their relations to the world in which they are to live and act, such an education is deplorably one-sided. The bearing of the manual-training upon the trades and technic pursuits generally presents a more difficult problem. There is, unquestionably, some ground for the fears of the trade-organizations that the tendency may be to fill the trades with half-trained workmen to the detriment of skilled mechanics and their work. Yet, as it is pretty clear that the old system of apprenticeship is gone beyond recall, it is surely better that the journeymen workers of the future should have some scientific knowledge of the principles underlying their handicrafts, than that they should have nothing beyond a mere expertness, acquired by practice, in the use of one or two tools or bits of machinery. This much may at least be said, that the claims of manual-training to take its place as an integral part of every complete course of education, are worth more attention than they have hitherto received. The place and value of hand-work as a factor in education have yet to be determined.

TWELVE hundred millions of pounds sterling, or six thousands of millions of dollars, is a sum of money large enough to tax the powers of definite conception of most persons who are not born financiers, and who have not been trained in the Treasury Department of some large nation to think in millions. Yet these are the figures which, it is computed on the basis of the statistics compiled a few months since by Sir Rawson W. Rawson under the auspices of the Imperial Federation League, represent in round numbers the trade of the British Empire for the year 1888. This enormous aggregate is nearly equal, as the *Canadian Gazette* points out, to the combined trade of Austria, France, Germany, Russia and the United States. A fact of great interest in connection with the matter is that the British possessions contributed no less than one-third of the total amount, or about £400,000. Commenting on this fact, the *London Times* says that these figures "form one of the most powerful arguments for the unity of the Empire within practicable limits." With this conclusion few Canadians or other Colonists will be disposed to quarrel, though the force of the argument when more closely examined may not be so great as might at first appear. It may, for instance, be queried in the first place whether the United Kingdom would be likely to consent to any arrangement which might diminish or jeopardize the two-thirds for the sake of securing the one-third. Closely connected with this would come the companion query whether any closer union is necessary to retain that one-third—seeing that the trade is already so secure that it is difficult to see how any political change could affect it. Even Colonial independence, provided it did not culminate in actual hostilities, could not materially affect a traffic which is the outgrowth of commercial, racial and linguistic conditions which cannot be changed. If it were a question either of gaining or retaining a volume of trade so considerable, the commercial argument would have undeniably great force. Can it be reasonably claimed that such a question is, to any great extent, involved? Another consideration of great moment is that in the four hundred millions are included the trade of India which, of itself, amounts in the aggregate to nearly as much as that of all the other colonies combined, and of numerous other dependencies, which no one thinks of including in the proposed federation. All these must clearly be left out of the logical account.

COMING nearer home and looking at Sir Rawson Rawson's figures from a Canadian standpoint, we are still less impressed with their argumentative force. The distribution of the twelve hundred millions representing

the trade of 1888 is not given, but going back, as no doubt compelled by the lack of later statistics, to 1885, the trade of 1000 millions, in that year, is distributed as follows:—

United Kingdom	61.4 p.c.	Victoria.....	3.2 p.c.
India	16 "	New Zealand.....	1.3 "
Canada	3.8 "	Queensland	1.1 "
New South Wales.....	3.8 "	The Cape.....	1.1 "
Straits Settlements...	3.4 "	South Australia.....	1 "

All the other possessions contributed considerably less than one per cent. each. It can hardly be supposed that Canada's contribution of less than four per cent. to the total would operate as a consideration of very great weight in inducing the Mother Country to modify seriously either her political or her commercial system for the sake of the sentimental gratification of being able to continue to reckon our trade as a fractional part of the trade of the Empire. The weakness of the financial argument becomes still more apparent from another statistical table, which shows the contributions of the respective colonies to the trade of the United Kingdom apart from the rest of the Empire. The total of the colonial trade with the kingdom proper is given as a little over 26 per cent. of the whole. Of this India contributes 9 per cent.; Australasia, 8; British North America, 2.9; the Cape and Natal, 1.3; Straits Settlements, 1.1; the West Indies, 1; and all the rest less than one per cent. each. We are really reluctant to pour cold water upon so glowing an appeal as this formidable array of figures at first seems to furnish, but are quite unable to persuade ourselves that, for the sake of making more secure, or even slightly enlarging, a trade of less than three per cent. of her total business with the world, Great Britain is likely either to give us a voice in the management of Imperial affairs, or to impose a fine upon the rest of her customers all over the world for our especial behoof. The argument just now is, of course, from figures, and so of the most utilitarian kind. Hence, for the moment, all sentimental considerations are eschewed, and the question regarded on the cold practical side.

THOUGHTFUL Canadians will watch with profound interest the growing agitation amongst their neighbours in the Great Republic of the great economic and industrial questions which are now forcing themselves upon their attention. Nature has placed us in such geographical relations to the United States that no great change in the conditions of commerce and industry can take place in that country without most sensibly affecting the same interests amongst us. We may take, for instance, the very significant demand which seems to be gathering force in American manufacturing circles for the reduction or abolition of the tariffs on what are to the manufacturers in question the raw material of their respective industries. Two illustrations will make our meaning clear. The manufacturers of woollen goods are waxing emphatic in their demand for the free admission of wool. Experience has, it is claimed, proved the fallacy of the arguments that for a time prevailed, to the effect that the tax on wool, while of great value for the protection of wool-growers, would not injure the manufacturers so long as the latter were protected in their turn by a sufficiently high tax. It is now urged in effect that this argument would hold good only on two conditions, both of which are, in the present case, non-existent. Those conditions are that the home wool-growers shall be able, with adequate protection, to supply the demand of the manufacturers for the raw material, in respect to qualities as well as quantities, and that the home market, in its turn, shall prove able to absorb the finished products of the factories. It is evident, of course, that when the manufacturers are obliged in the first place to pay the high tariff on large quantities of wools of a quality which their country cannot produce, the increased cost of producing their fabrics must render it impossible to compete with free-trade England in the markets of the outside world, when, as is now the case, they have overtaken and surpassed the demand in their own country. With certain obvious modifications the same general plea is being vigorously urged on behalf of the iron manufacturers of New England. Governor Ames, as a mouth-piece of the malcontents, declares that the "natural advantages of competitors plus the duty mean death to New England's iron industry," that "through the compulsion of circumstances they (the manufacturers) have been systematically engaged in the degradation of American labour in New England," and so on. A great struggle for tariff reduction is thus imminent in the United States. The struggle will almost surely be successful, sooner or later, so far as what are called raw materials are concerned. But it is evident that the opening of the American market to these products, on the one hand, and the cheapening of

the American manufactured products, on the other, would very seriously affect the conditions under which the corresponding industries are carried on in Canada, necessitating either more protection or much keener competition for manufacturers.

BISHOP FOWLER, of San Francisco, recently created some sensation by predicting that China will sooner or later retaliate upon the countries that have shut out her people from their territories. Following upon this prophecy, which is said to be based upon personal observation, comes a New York *Herald* telegram, purporting to be from Shanghai, to the effect that the Emperor and his Cabinet at Peking are even now deliberating upon a memorial demanding the expulsion from China of all Americans in Chinese employ. The rumour does not seem intrinsically improbable. The wonder is rather that China has hitherto taken so meekly the insulting and injurious treatment of her citizens by the United States, in contempt of treaty stipulations, especially as the presence of large numbers of American citizens in her own dominions affords so ready a means of retaliation. It was possible, of course, that the Emperor and his Government were wise enough to see that their own country would be the greatest loser by the driving out of American capital and enterprise. But anger does not usually stop to take counsel with prudence, and there is no reason to suppose that the passion for revenge is not at least as strong in the Chinese as in the European or Anglo-Saxon breast. Certainly no one could, save on the grounds of a very lofty morality, blame the Chinese, should they insist on the unceremonious departure of every American citizen from their country. It is the nature of revenge that the retaliatory act usually goes beyond that which calls it forth. Herein lies the chief source of danger. The United States could scarcely, with any show of reason, resent the exclusion of her citizens from China. But the movement for expulsion, should it really be made, will hardly be restrained within legitimate bounds. It would be strange if, in the enforcement of such an edict, deeds of repine or violence should not occur, such as would arouse in the United States an irresistible clamour for strong measures. It may be, of course, that the rumours in question are wholly unfounded and all these dangers imaginary, but, unless the Chinese Government is anxious to keep all its people at home, and is rather glad when they are maltreated abroad, it is hard to believe that the Oriental rulers have not laid to heart the worse than discourteous conduct of the Americans, and are not waiting, with Oriental patience, for an opportunity to strike back.

THE more Mr. Balfour's proposal to endow a Roman Catholic University in Ireland is discussed the smaller is seen to be the likeliness of its meeting with general acceptance, either from Liberal-Unionists or from Irish malcontents. If the hint was thrown out merely as a "feeler," it is scarcely probable that anything more will be heard of the matter. The recent conference between Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Parnell goes to show, if we may place any reliance upon the report, that while these two leaders might not pursue the same policy in regard to this particular proposition, the difference would not be at all likely to bring about any rupture of the Home Rule Alliance. On the other hand, the wedge of division would almost surely be driven home between the Salisbury Conservatives and the Liberal-Unionists. It would be, too, a sorry reward for the zeal of Irish Protestantism, spurred on as it has been by the dread of Catholic ascendancy, to see a great Catholic University established with the money of the nation. It would make the case worse rather than better, from their point of view, should the funds set aside for the purpose be drawn wholly from Irish sources. On the other hand, a policy which would give to Mr. Gladstone so grand an opportunity to rally Nonconformists and Radicals in solid phalanx for his support, by taking his stand in opposition to the principle of denominational endowment in any form, would surely be the incarnation of political unwisdom on the part of the Government. As matters just now stand, we fancy that the bitterest opponents of Lord Salisbury's administration could hardly wish for anything better than that Mr. Balfour should go on with his scheme for the endowment of a Catholic University for Ireland. (Since the above was written we learn that Mr. Balfour has written a letter to the Protestant Alliance, denying that the Government has any intention of endowing the proposed Catholic University from national funds, and requesting that the Government's proposal should not be criticised until it is made known. But the fact has been made known, and as to details it is