

object of jealousy and suspicion. An impartial authority, trusted by the whole community, can alone put an end to this educational war. And now it seems there is another danger to which the political regulation of text-books is giving rise. The Minister is being pressed, and we fear in his weakness he is consenting, to allow the books to be made the vehicle of Party propagandism. The Scott Act people, we are informed, are demanding that their special tenets shall be taught in schools. Be Prohibition good or bad, practicable or impracticable, it is clearly the policy of a section and it has not yet received the assent of a fourth part of the constituency of Ontario. To make the public text-books its propaganda is clearly most unjust. What right has the Minister of Education to tell the child of every man in this community who uses wine or beer that its father is intemperate and immoral? What, we may add, will be the condition of the child's own mind when it reads in the authorized text-book that to drink wine is a sin, and in the Gospel that Christ and his disciples practised that sin, while Christ himself performed a miracle to furnish others with the means of sinning? Nor is the improvidence of the proceeding less manifest than the injustice, and if the character of Christ is really divine, the impiety. No false teaching can, in the end, be wholesome. The child is made to repeat an exaggerated and untenable doctrine which it believes only so long as it is a child. Going out into the world it finds that the beverage which in the text-book is called a deadly poison, and described as the drink of the vicious alone, is in fact not poison at all, and is used by all civilized nations and by many of the most virtuous of mankind. It then tramples on the false precept, and perhaps tramples on it with a vengeance.

PRESIDENT BAYLES, of the American Institute of Mining Engineers, at the late meeting at Halifax, N. S., drew an alarming picture of the condition and prospects of American labour. He thinks the wage-earner has cause for dissatisfaction with the existing distribution of the products of industry; but, as he does not give the grounds of his belief, no special value can attach to his opinion. If the worker cannot now learn a complete trade, he performs in the greatest degree of perfection the limited task which the minute subdivision of labour assigns to him. It is no longer necessary for him to learn a complete trade; in any case he could only do so by a sacrifice of the perfection of the finished product which division of labour attains. It would be a waste of sympathy to regret the supposed loss of independence enjoyed by the hand-loom weaver of other days. If he was not a mere spoke in the wheel of a complicated machine, if his individuality was little trenched upon, his poverty was deeper than that of the average worker in the great hives of modern industry. Mr. Bayles sees in the discontent and unrest of the working-class a Vesuvius which may at any time overwhelm the Pompeii of modern society. When it is said that the average worker has no chance of rising to responsible positions of management, and no tangible goal for his ambition, it is necessary to remember that we cannot all be captains of industry; and if one in five hundred could rise to the highest position attainable by an employé under the actual organization of labour, five times ninety-nine must remain in the ranks. If it be true that "the hopelessness of the average wage-earner consists in his ignorance"; if between his acquired knowledge and the elementary works on technology there is a gulf which he is unable to pass; if he cannot compete for the highest positions in the hierarchy of industry against graduates from West Point, it does not follow that he is therefore condemned to perpetual misery. It is something to know, though Mr. Bayles does not tell us, that the worker is better housed and better fed than formerly, and the general amelioration of his condition must be accepted as a gain. There never was a time when the worker did not see others in possession of wealth in which he had no share; and the logic which necessarily sees in the fact proof that there is something radically wrong in the distribution of wealth is the logic of the Commune. Occasionally great gains of an objectionable character come to the surface; but they accrue to the manipulators of stocks and bonds, not to the great captains of industry, and happily they form the exception to the rule of accumulation. A few days ago the son-in-law of a great railway king testified that he had "earned" three millions of dollars by a railway shuffle which he had been engaged to make. The three millions of securities for which he gave only a few days or weeks' labour must tend to raise the rates of freight. If "earnings" of this kind were common, society—not wage-earners merely—would have to protect itself against the abuse. But the rule is that wealth is fairly and honestly acquired; and its existence, far from being an injury to the worker, sets labour in motion and creates a demand for the products of his industry. If all were as poor as he is himself, his condition would become worse from want of capital to set his labour in motion and of consumers to buy the products of his toil. If the present system of employment has its defects, is it possible to graft upon

it a participation of profits? In this direction future progress may possibly be found. But the way is not clear of difficulties. Profits are not continuous; and labour could not afford to bear a participation in losses when they occur. Besides the profits of production are now often reduced by competition to the lowest point; so low as to leave no available fund for supplementary division among the wage-earners. But there is perhaps room, as Mr. Bayles suggests, for "a more conspicuous recognition of individual worth and capacity." Trades Unionism, whatever labour may owe to it in other respects, tends to reduce all the workers, whose aptitudes and capacities vary as much as their faces, to a common level of remuneration. To rectify the injustice of Trades Unionism in this particular is a worthy object, and one to which the enlightened self-interest of employers might prompt them to resort, were it not that the only result of the effort might be to create suspicion and distrust among those for whom the benefit was intended.

THE trouble which is always brewing between the Ritualistic and Protestant parties in the Anglican Church has come to a head in Iowa. The immediate cause of dispute is the introduction of candles on the communion-table. Canon Kellogg, the author of the innovation, explains that the two candles are only intended to symbolize the light of Christ's double nature which, it seems, is better represented by the rays of a candle than by those of the sun. But the congregation rightly surmise that the real object is to turn the communion-table into an altar, to instil belief in the performance of the eucharistic miracle by the priest, and to pave the way for the adoration of the host. A sensible Christian will put up with a great deal in the way of ceremonial and ornament, however novel and however uncongenial to his own taste it may be, rather than create a schism; nor can it be denied that Ritualism is, to a great extent, a natural reaction from the coldness and dulness of the ordinary service. But when a man is asked to express his belief, or to take part in a service which implies belief, in the performance of a miracle which in his conscience he regards as a figment, and in the supernatural authority of a priesthood which he holds to be no priesthood at all, he must pause unless he is content that his religion should be entirely divorced from his sense of truth. Nor can his acquiescence lead to anything but general hollowness in worship and the treatment of the Church as a Sunday theatre. It is unquestionably the aim of the Ritualist leaders to restore the religion of the Catholic Middle Ages and the power of the mediæval priesthood. Dr. Pusey's "Irenicon" also placed it beyond a doubt that, at the end of the vista, lay reunion with the Church of Rome. It does not follow that the Ritualist leaders are in the wrong, much less that they are dishonest, though they have sometimes compromised their honesty by the stealthiness of their advance. But it does follow that between them and the heirs of the Reformation the difference is fundamental; nor can they wonder if the Protestant laity watch with jealousy the furtive progress of neo-Catholicism and object to ceremonial changes which, though indifferent and, perhaps, even puerile in themselves, are intended, as everybody well knows, to introduce doctrinal innovations.

IS CONFEDERATION A SUCCESS?

It is now a little over eighteen years since the various settled Provinces in British North America were united into what is called the Dominion of Canada. Since then Prince Edward Island has joined the Confederacy, and British Columbia, and the whole vast Territories in the North-West have been incorporated into the Dominion, so that now Canada embraces all British North America. Has that union been a success or a failure? That is a grave question to propound, but one which no one ought to have the least hesitancy in discussing thoroughly and candidly. All that can be said is that the public man who ventures to challenge enquiry ought to be able to make a pretty clear case against it, because, if the Union is a good thing and has been a success, it is almost a crime to make a question about it at all.

In order that there shall be no misunderstanding a few preliminary considerations should be disposed of. It must be admitted at the outset that, *prima facie*, the idea of Union is sound. It is better to have a united British America than a number of separate Provinces. If we are to continue to exist as a dependency of Great Britain, then it is unquestionably better that we should be united and work together with common aims and interests. If we are to create a nationality in North America separate from the rest of the Continent, then, indeed, it is absolutely necessary that there should be political unity. In this light we may view with approval the aims of those who created the Confederation in 1867. Their motive was, no doubt, good. They sought to found a Canadian Nationality having a destiny quite distinct from the rest of the continent,