

educational and political estrangement than such an exhibition of narrowness or distrust in their educational systems. But what does Mr. Ross propose to do about it? Is he prepared to take the initiative in bringing about a better understanding? If not, why not? As the official Head of the Educational Department in the largest Province of the Dominion, he is evidently in the most favourable position to initiate a better system. He can hardly doubt the readiness of the other Provinces to reciprocate. A free interchange of teachers between the Provinces would be one of the most effective means of which we can conceive for promoting the national as distinct from the Provincial feeling in the schools. But the inter-Provincial movement, in order to be truly effective, should not stop with the mutual recognition of certificates. There should be also a common text-book system, so far at least as to admit of the use of the same text-books all over the Dominion? Why not, if we are going to be national rather than Provincial in education? If in order to this it should be found necessary to reform the present machine methods in the production and authorization of text-books in this Province, "so much the better," many of our best educators would say. But this opens up a large question, and it is unfortunately now a political question in this Province. And this reminds us of one ambiguous utterance in Mr. Ross' speech, if it is correctly reported, which is adapted to awaken curiosity. Complimenting Hon. Gideon Ouimet, the Superintendent of Education in Quebec, on his success in pleasing men of all parties and creeds, Mr. Ross is said to have added that he (the speaker) had not perhaps been quite able to do this, but that, if the methods of his Province were altered, there might yet be a chief superintendent in Ontario as happy in his work as his friend in Quebec. Is this prophetic?

PERHAPS the most practical action taken at the Educational Convention with a view to the promotion of national sentiment in and through the schools was in a matter in regard to which there is need of the greatest caution. We refer to the arrangements which were made or attempted to be made—at the time of writing we are not sure whether the measures proposed to accomplish the end aimed at were actually perfected or not—with a view to the production of a text-book of Canadian History, for use in all the Provinces. There may be and probably is need of a better outline of the history of the different Provinces which now constitute the Dominion than has yet been produced. If so, the Dominion Association could scarcely better prove its usefulness than by securing the production of such a work, by proper means. But thoughtful educators are justly suspicious of text-books manufactured to order, under any kind of official supervision. There is double ground for suspicion when the book in question is a history and when one of the avowed objects in its production is the teaching of patriotism. It would be a mere truism to say that the aim of a genuine history must be to ascertain and record facts. To set any other leading motive before a writer is to offer insult to the historical spirit. Some one suggested that the projected work should teach the history of Canada as a whole rather than the history of its several Provinces. But what is to be done when the truth is against such a plan, as it happens to be in this case up to the year 1867? For our own part, we should be sorry to see our Canadian educators fall into the error which has made and is making many of the schools across the border ridiculous, by inculcating narrow national prejudices and a species of flag-worship, unworthy of an educated and what should be a broad-minded people. To such text-books and such teaching in the schools is due very much of what is narrowest and most disagreeable in the American national character. The genius of history is utterly averse to everything in the nature of colouring for a purpose. The muse is sure to take alarm the moment she is invoked for a so-called patriotic production. The truest patriotism in teaching is that which tends to inspire the most ardent love of truth and right, and to produce the broad-minded, large-hearted men who alone can make a state or a nation worthy of a true man's devotion.

A GOOD deal of indignation was expended by Sir Richard Cartwright and other Opposition leaders the other day, over the course pursued by the Government, or its Finance Minister, in proposing certain changes in the tariff on the very eve of prorogation. True, the changes made in this particular instance are not of great importance in themselves. Several of them, being reductions

or removals of duty, would probably commend themselves rather than otherwise to the Opposition. Viewed in the abstract, no sufficient cause is apparent why the Government should not be at liberty to propose measures which it deems to be in the public interest at any time during the session. Parliament is not limited to any particular date in respect to closing. It would be quite in order to maintain that the people's chosen and by no means reluctant representatives may fairly be assumed to be present and paying attention to their legislative duties up to the last moment of the Parliamentary session, be that longer or shorter, and prepared to give all the time that may be necessary to the discharge of their public duties. Still, custom often acquires almost the force of moral obligation as well as of law, and seeing that it has become so customary for a large number of the members to leave for their homes a week or two before the expected close, it would have been, perhaps, fairer as well as more courteous had Mr. Foster at least given some intimation that he was about to make the innovation. Whatever abuse the precedent might give countenance to on some future occasion, it could hardly be seriously maintained that there was anything in Mr. Foster's proposals in this instance to warrant the suspicion that they were kept back till the last moment from any sinister motive. On general principles the question whether it is either good policy or good morals to compel Canadian citizens in certain localities to pay five cents a dozen more for their eggs for the real or fancied benefit of certain other Canadian citizens, is broad enough to cover the whole ground in dispute between free trade and protection. But under the established system, whether the basal principle of that system is protection pure and simple, or merely reciprocity of tariffs, the imposition of the duty on eggs is so natural a pendant of the existing tariff that it would have been puerile to make it the pretext for a party struggle.

WHAT is to be the future trade policy of Canada? This is the question of the hour. Parliament is prorogued. The Government is sustained by a very large majority of the people's representatives. It is strong enough to take an independent and fearless stand in favour of any change which the circumstances of the country may seem to demand. It goes without saying that the present situation is sufficiently serious to make the most careful consideration an imperative duty. What is that situation? Some of the journals which support the Government and the National Policy persist in assuring their readers that the country is prosperous, the people contented, and everything satisfactory. It is true, we dare say, that there are considerable classes of the people who are content with things as they are. These are the individuals who are themselves comfortable or prosperous. Merchants who are favourably situated, manufacturers who enjoy the advantages of the monopolies created by the restriction of trade, bankers and holders of bank stock, Government officials, professional men in assured positions, in short all those who are so favoured by circumstances, often it may be as the result of their own successful endeavours in the past, that they now scarcely feel the struggle for existence which is going on around them, and which is steadily forcing thousands of those less favourably situated out of the country—these will be found to be, as a rule, the classes who are now contented with the prospects of the Dominion and ready to denounce as traitors or "blue-ruin" pessimists, those who conscientiously believe and declare that the country is in a more unsatisfactory condition than it has been at any time within the last forty years. But let these prosperous classes step out from the narrow precincts of their own little paradises; let them go among the people who are in the thick of the fight, those whose stalwart sons are leaving the country as fast as they come to years of maturity, not of choice, but because they can find no opportunity for making a comfortable living with reasonable prospects for future betterment, in their own land, and see if they will not find reason to modify their optimistic conclusions. It is not for the pleasure of it that a Canadian journal chooses such a theme. But surely it is the part of true patriotism to look unpleasant facts fairly in the face and see whether there may not be some way in which they can be effectually met and transformed.

HOWEVER private individuals of sanguine temperament may succeed in persuading themselves that those things which they do not wish to see do not exist, we cannot believe that the leading members of the Canadian Government are blind to the real state of affairs.

They must know, what some of their ablest supporters freely admit, that the National Policy, whatever may have been its effects in the past, is no longer equal to the demands of the situation. They must know, too, that the policy of preferential trade with the Empire, to which many have been looking as the future hope of the country, is no longer within the horizon of practical politics, or of reasonable expectation. Recoiling as they do, in common with thousands even of their political opponents from the suggestion of reciprocity with the United States on the only terms on which it is attainable—discrimination against the Mother Country—it is surely time that they were setting themselves in downright earnest to the task of finding the way out. They can hardly fail to perceive that the "inglorious policy of drift" is already inaugurated and whither it threatens to carry us. The greater the difficulties to be overcome, the grander the opportunity for a display of the higher qualities of statesmanship. As one of the signs of the times, journals which have in the past ardently supported the National Policy are now casting about for substitutes. Imperial free trade and absolute free trade are among the schemes mooted, but the former would involve discrimination against other nations, to which Great Britain would be forced to object, and both would involve great loss of revenue and, as a consequence, direct taxation, which would be specially obnoxious to a people accustomed to indirect methods of taxation. But what does the Government propose? If the question is already decided, the sooner some authoritative intimation is given to the country the better. If, as we strongly suspect, it is still undecided, then surely it is one of the first and highest duties of our national rulers to deliberate wisely, announce clearly, and act promptly in the interests of British connection, or of Canadian nationality.

AS we write, the fate of parties in the Mother Country is still undecided. Enough is known, however, to warrant the conclusion that Mr. Gladstone will, as the *Standard* puts it, be returned to office whether he be returned to power or not. The probabilities are that he will be dependent for his majority upon the Irish Nationalists, which will place him in a very unenviable position. Sustained by such a majority he will be forced to introduce at the earliest moment, and carry through the Commons, if possible, a Home Rule Bill. But it is evident that so long as he is dependent upon the Irish for his majority he will not have either the political or the moral strength necessary to force the Bill through the House of Lords, as he might have done had he been returned with the sweeping majority from Great Britain alone which was so confidently expected. His situation will evidently be most embarrassing. Suppose him to decline to introduce his Home Rule measure, on the ground that he is not strong enough to carry it through the two Houses. His majority would at once be alienated and his Administration liable to overthrow at any moment. Suppose, on the other hand, his Home Rule Bill to be introduced, carried through the Commons and thrown out by the Upper House, which would almost certainly be the alternative programme. Under ordinary circumstances the usual course would be to pass on to other legislation, determining to re-introduce the Bill the next session, and trusting to the pressure of public opinion in the meantime to bring their lordships to a better frame of mind. Should they prove persistently obstinate, there would be the ultimate alternatives of a dissolution with the rejected Bill as the main issue, or the more heroic measure of creating new peers in sufficient number to give the necessary majority. But there is small reason to suppose that the impatience of the Home Rulers would brook these long delays, especially in view of the extreme improbability that Mr. Gladstone, upon whom their hopes are so largely dependent, could at his advanced age retain his strength through such a series of campaigns. What course Mr. Gladstone will choose should the contingencies which now seem so probable take place, it is of course impossible to say, but in view of all the circumstances it seems pretty safe to predict another general election within a very short Parliamentary period.

NEW YORK had a visitation last week, the like of which, it is said, the great metropolis with all its experience of popular gatherings never before knew. We refer to the advent of the thirty thousand young men and women who swooped down upon it, swarming, as one of its dailies observed with complimentary suggestiveness, in every place but the saloons. It is but a score or two of