

viewer had put into his mouth an attack on certain land speculators in the North-West of whom he had never heard, with a quotation from a document which he had never seen. This is mere fraud and forgery. People are told that the safe course is to insist on having the questions written down and writing your replies: but how can this or any other safeguard avail to secure you against unscrupulous fabrication? Even the sanctity of private intercourse and of the social board is not always respected, and a man to whose utterances any interest attaches has to be very careful how he talks unless he is sure that no one connected with the press is present. When the Prince of Wales was here, one of his *suite* was drawn into conversation at a ball by a very gentlemanly man whom he did not know, but whom he afterwards discovered to be the reporter of a New York journal. The consequence was that the Prince one morning came down to breakfast and laughingly handed to the member of his *suite* who had been interviewed a copy of the journal with the report, in which a comparison not flattering to his Royal Highness was drawn between his intellectual endowments and those of his brother. The Prince's good nature is well known to be unfailing, but the confusion of his unlucky friend may be imagined. The friend had been imprudent no doubt; but he came from a country where, in those days at all events, nobody would have been in danger of seeing reproduced in the newspapers anything that he had said at a ball.

We expect too much in these days of our great men. The result is that our great men, our political leaders more particularly, in their endeavour to accomplish all that is required of them, break down in health, and are either temporarily or permanently incapacitated for further duties. Mr. Gladstone only recently, the *Times* says, has been able to "resume his tree-felling occupation." Lord Salisbury has been obliged to take a rest. Sir Leonard Tilley has found it necessary to resign, and reports are circulated to the effect that Mr. Blake is about to give up the leadership of the Opposition. Mr. Chapleau complains of overwork; for the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie the exigencies of party strife have been too severe, and to this list many names may be added. True, some constitutions seem to be able to withstand an enormous amount of political turmoil. Sir Richard Cartwright is as yet hale; so also are Messrs. Hardy and Pardee—all hard workers. But nevertheless the general proposition is true that we expect too much of our public men. It is a consequence of the times. The possibility of making a speech at one place to-day, and at another five hundred miles distant to-morrow is too tempting to be withstood. The mistake is in expecting our leaders to take a share—or, at all events, so great a share—in electioneering. Electoral campaigns should be left to the command of political lieutenants, not undertaken by political leaders. The latter have already too much to occupy their thoughts. For leading statesmen to think and act ought to be accounted enough. Stump-speeches may be left to their subordinates. And a few years ago this was the case. Lord Palmerston or Sir Robert Peel would have been simply amazed if asked to address their electors as do nowadays our statesmen. Her Majesty would as soon have thought of mounting the hustings. A speech at the Mansion House, or at a more than ordinarily important political banquet, was all that was expected of them and of their predecessors. But to day our great statesmen speak several times a week; answer all manner of letters; attempt to state publicly their policy on minute points of foreign or home questions; or, oftener perhaps, attempt to satisfy the public on such points without definitely stating their policy, a task which must entail no little mental fatigue. From a social point of view, too, our public men live differently from their predecessors. They entertain more and are more entertained. This seems to be expected of them, at least, in England and also in Canada. In France it is otherwise. There it is taken for granted that a political leader has other and more important duties to attend to. If he writes, inspires, or gives suggestions for an article in his official journal, he is usually considered to be doing all that is requisite. There are but two alternatives: either the public will continue to demand from their leaders more than these can accomplish, with the result that they must sooner or later breakdown; or it must be acknowledged that the cares of state are enough for statesmen without adding to them those of stump-speeches and public banquets.

THE President of University College alluded, in his speech on Convocation Day, to one of the most burning topics of the hour—secular education. It was a fitting occasion on which to touch on it; and the speaker was one well competent to express an opinion on this variously-viewed subject. There is little doubt that the tendency of the day is toward the secularization of all education. But the advance has been slow. Religion, in the form of a system of religious doctrines, has been so intimately connected with all educational institutions that to their sepa-

ration there are serious obstacles. Within the recollection of many of us is the fact that an Oxford or Cambridge Fellowship was tenable only by one in Holy Orders. And to-day, upon this continent, a continent priding itself on its freedom from tradition, the proper line of demarcation between religious and secular instruction has by no means been clearly marked out. Everyone is familiar with the never-ending disputes upon the Bible in Schools; a Separate School System; the relative privileges of Denominational and Undenominational Colleges; and kindred questions. But of the fact that the community, as a whole, is gradually coming to take a clearer view of such problems, there are unmistakable evidences. Upon the subject of religious instruction, Lord Salisbury made, the other day, an admirable remark. "Believe me," he said, "the essence of true religious teaching is that the teacher should believe that which he teaches and should be delivering, as he believes it, the whole message of truth. Unless there is that sympathetic, that magnetic feeling established between children and teachers, that the teacher is dealing honestly with them, the public will believe that the religious teaching is a sham." If we grant this, then it necessarily follows that religious instruction must be left to the parent, the pastor and the denominational college. For no public or state educational institution can be relied upon for such religious instruction as that for which Lord Salisbury contends. The alternative—that religious bodies should possess schools and colleges of their own, supported by Government funds—is the thin edge of a wedge, which if driven in to its logical extent, would necessitate Government aid to every religious and, indeed, irreligious body, from the Ritualists to the Agnostics. The chief difficulty to a proper understanding of the respective spheres of religious and secular education seems to be that to the word "religious" has been given a meaning which belongs properly to the word "moral." The secular teacher has ethical functions to discharge as well as purely pedagogic functions. He will teach his pupils the value of right and wrong, and point out to them the true principles of conduct generally. But this he must do by example and precept, not by doctrine or dogma. What we want in our secular colleges is masters and professors of high moral character. Creeds may be left to the care of denominational colleges. To those who think that morality is the outcome of creed these latter are open. They cannot look to the State to inculcate their peculiar religious tenets. The State will do all in its power to foster morality. The fostering of various bases of morality is outside its province.

THE MOUND-BUILDERS.

AN article which recently appeared in the *Mail* suggesting that the Government should aid scientists in investigating the ancient mounds found in Southern Manitoba and throughout the North-West should be given attention at Ottawa. The Government of the United States has devoted money to such purposes, and so have several of the colleges as well as the Smithsonian Institute at Washington, with the result of throwing much light upon an obscure subject, yet not enough to permit us to distinguish with any degree of certainty when or by whom the mounds were built. So eager are scientists in the pursuit of data relating to the mound-builders, and their supposed contemporaries the cliff-dwellers, that some years ago Mr. Frank Cushing, a young American collegian, was commissioned by several scientific associations to give his entire time and energies to investigating the cliff-dwellers' relics and the pueblos of Arizona and New Mexico. In order to equip himself the better for the task, he became a resident member of the Zuni tribe of Indians and studied their language and customs so that he might prosecute his researches with more diligence; he has become a chief of the tribe, and at the meeting of the British Association in Montreal last year he reported most satisfactory progress. The late Charles Darwin pointed out that the region which cradled the human race can never be satisfactorily identified. This has not decreased the ardour of the tireless gropers into antiquity who day by day are demolishing Ussher's Chronology, and dragging to light from the dimness of the ages astonishing facts regarding civilizations long since swept away. Theorists have pointed to the great plateau of Afghanistan as the region whence sprung the races which populated the earth. Others have pointed to Yucatan, Central America, India, Egypt, the legendary continent of Atlantis; while a more recent writer advances the polar regions, ere the earth lost her equilibrium and when her atmosphere was that of perpetual summer, as the cradle of mankind. These theories, however, take us far away from the mound-builders. Their work is recent, when we consider the immense period of time which must have elapsed since Adam was driven from his domain to labour and since Cain first taught covetous man the use of weights and measures, and conducted the first barter of land. There are no monuments which carry us back to that past; but the mound-builders have left remains which