

Senator to rise and explain that Mr. Morgan's remarks are purely Pickwickian. But if the other Senators back Mr. Morgan up, the world could hardly be surprised if Great Britain were to insist upon a very decided answer to the question propounded by the Saturday Review. It looks rather as if the British lion was commencing to growl because his tail is being twisted a little more energetically than usual. The patience even of that patient animal has its limits.

Joseph
Howe.

Canadians will hear, with feelings of patriotic satisfaction, that Nova Scotians at last are alive to the claims of their great statesman, Joseph Howe, on their gratitude and respect. A movement is now on foot to raise a monument worthy of the man, whose public services were set forth so forcibly by Dr. Bourinot in an elaborate paper quite recently printed by THE WEEK. In these initial stages of our national life no more important work can be accomplished than the encouragement of a love of country. In no better way can this be done than by pointing our young men and women to the stories of courage and devotion of which the annals of French and English Canada tell so eloquently. Laying aside all national and sectarian prejudice, let us study the pages of French-Canadian history and only remember that they give us many evidences of some of the highest attributes of humanity. Laying aside all political prejudice and bitterness let Tory, Conservative, and Liberal unite in bearing testimony to the services of those eminent Canadian statesmen, who, despite any mistakes they may have made from time to time in the opinion of some of us, were, on the whole, animated by honest and patriotic impulses. Among such statesmen the figure of Joseph Howe, printer, poet, statesman, governor, the father of responsible government, must always stand out most prominent; for he, at least, was ever unselfish, true to the best interests of his country and a loyal subject of the British crown.

Religious
Education.

It is satisfactory to find that the question of religious teaching in our elementary schools is not forgotten, even if there does not seem to be as yet a general agreement as to the best method of providing it. An interesting communication recently made to the Globe newspaper, by a writer subscribing himself A.B.C., pleads earnestly for voluntary schools as auxiliary to the board or state schools already in existence. Many persons are strongly of opinion that voluntary schools are preferable to those established by the rating system; and, abstractly, there is a great deal to be said for them. But we fear it is too late. If, even in England, where these schools were in possession, there is now almost a life and death struggle for existence, how should it be possible to establish them in circumstances so much less favourable? It may be possible, after a time, to set up voluntary schools in places with a large population, and even to obtain grants from the Government or from the school rates for their support. But it will require a process of education in the public mind, and in the meantime something practicable should be attempted.

What can be
done?

Can anything, then, be done, or suggested, which would be practicable under the actual conditions of this country? One method recently commended by a writer in THE WEEK was that the ministers or other members of the different Christian denominations should give instruction in religion to the children belonging to their several churches. This system

may be available in some places, but it will hardly meet the want which is universally felt; and, therefore, however this or other plans may be adopted in special localities, it is necessary to think of some method which shall be universally applicable. What shall this be? In the first place there must be some space of time—half an hour, say—appropriated for religious instruction *within the school hours*. In the second place, all the children (except those whose parents or guardians may object) should be taught to read appointed portions of scripture, and to commit certain parts to memory—as the Lord's Prayer, the Beatitudes, certain of the Parables, and so forth. Further, the children who are excused attendance at religious instruction should be instructed in subjects of a moral character. These are points on which it is believed there would be a very general agreement throughout this Province, and with these at least a beginning might be made. If more should afterwards be found possible, well and good. This would be something.

Liberalism.

AND everyone that was in distress, and everyone that "was in debt, and everyone that was discontented" "gathered themselves unto him." These were the people who in the time of Saul were the nucleus of the opposition under David, at least so we are told by the chronicle, in the First Book of Samuel, otherwise known as the First Book of the Kings. The allusion was brought into prominence in England by Lowe and the Cave of Adullam and Adullamites are now recognized terms in the English language for all politicians who are desolate and oppressed. From the nature of things and the constitution of men's minds it must always be that there will be too great opposing types. There are those who wish to keep matters as they are and there are those who desire a change. The motives of these latter may not be the same, but they agree on the main point of wanting to get existing arrangements altered. Their opponents represent vested rights. They attack privilege and prerogative. In England and all countries which have been under organized government for a long time Reformers generally have a serious purpose and a reasonable reason for their union against authority. In new countries like Canada abuses are more abuses committed by personal ignorance or tyranny than abuses of a system. Reformers have, therefore, not so much to attack on principle as on opportunity. In short, they are opportunists more than reformers. It is fair to assume and possible to conceive that the motives of both of the great classes of opponents on political questions are equally proper and sincere. What then are the elements which lead to the division between them? The Conservatives, those who wish things to remain as they are, are chiefly composed of men who have an interest in landed or business interests which will be affected by a change. They are generally wealthy or, at all events, independent. They are supported by the moderate, timid or nervous element of the community who dread a change without knowing why. Then they have the strenuous backing of all who hold office and can control patronage. The motives of the latter element are, on the whole, less sincere than those which operate on the two former. The opposing body, or Reformers, are much less homogeneous than the Conservatives. They include the very same people who joined the rebel David. Every man who has strong opinions about any particular hobby, when he finds he cannot get the average member of society to agree with him, goes into opposition. Each such man has his own particular fancy. One man nurses Prohibition, another Free Trade, another Annexation, another Sabbath Observance, another the Reformation of Social