THE WEEK:

AN INDEPENDENT JOURNAL OF POLITICS LITERATURE SCIENCE AND ARTS

TERMS:—One year, \$3.00; eight months, \$2.00; four months, \$1.00 Subscriptions payable in advanoc.

ADVERTISEMENTS, unexceptionable in character and limited in num ber, will be taken at \$4.00 per line per annum; \$2.50 per line for six months; \$1.50 per line for three months; 20 cents per line per insertion for a shorter period.

Subscribers in Great Britain and Ireland supplied, postage prepaid, on terms following;—One year, 12s. stg.; half-year, 6s. stg. Remittances by P. O. order or draft should be made payable and addressed to the Publisher.

No advertisements charged less than five lines. Address — T. R. CLOUGHER, Business Manager, 5 Jordan Street, Toronto.

C. BLACKETT ROBINSON, Publisher.

CONTENTS OF CURRENT NUMBER.

Maria de la compania	
	AGE.
Can It Be the Fact?	
The Postal Delivery Question	467
Increased Prison Accommodation	467
Is There Virtue in the Lash?	
University Honours Well Bestowed	467
Toronto and the C. P. R.	467
The Weldon Extradition Act	468
The Future of Democracy	468
The Prospects of Political Reform	468
President Harrison's Removals	468
The Cronin Murder	468
Radicalism of a Royal Commission	468
English Statesmen and Imperial Federation	468
The Two-Fold Impracticability of the Project	468
RAILWAYS IN CHINA	469
MORE PROSE WANTED Erol Gervase.	469
LITTLE MAY (Poem)	470
LONDON LETTER Walter Powell.	470
ACADIAN LEGENDS AND LYRICS	471
MONTREAL LETTERVille Marie.	471
BETTY'S CHOICE	471
PROFIT-SHARING A SOLVENT FOR THE LABOUR PROBLEM,	
G. Mercer Adam.	472
FLEMING-IN APRIL (Poem)Seranus.	473
ART NOTESTemplar.	473
"FORGIVE, FORGET" (Poem) M. E. Michall.	474
OUR LIBRARY TABLE	474
LITERARY AND PERSONAL GOSSIP	474
MUSIC AND THE DRAMAB Natural.	474
READINGS FROM CURRENT LITERATURE	475
CHESS	478
The state of the s	_

All articles, contributions, and letters on matters pertaining to the editorial department should be addressed to the Editor, and not to any other person who may be supposed to be connected with the paper.

INSPECTOR HUGHES has explained that the word "Protestant," in the certificate to be signed by parents on making application for the admission of their children to the Public Schools, was inserted solely for the purpose of separating all applicants for admission into two classes, viz.: Those who can and those who cannot support Separate Schools. The reason for making this classification is that the children of Protestants are admitted without a certificate from the City Clerk, while the children of Roman Catholics require a certificate from that officer stating that their parents or guardians are rated as Public School supporters. This explanation suggests two observations. In the first place, some ill-feeling might have been saved had the other officers concerned understood more clearly the real reason for this part of the certificate being required and given it promptly when the matter was first mooted. The other and far more important point is that raised by Inspector Hughes's answer to the question why the appearance of presenting a creed test might not be avoided by simply asking whether the parent was a supporter of Public Schools. To this the Inspector makes the following remarkable reply: "This form might fairly be used if no Roman Catholic would be (were?) made a supporter of Separate Schools without his knowledge and consent. Unfortunately, however, many Roman Catholics are rated as Separate School supporters entirely without their knowledge of the fact; and, therefore, they cannot give a satisfactory certificate themselves." It is difficult to believe that this is not the prejudiced assertion of the political partisan, rather than the judicial statement of the responsible official. If many Roman Catholics are actually rated as Separate School supporters without their knowledge and consent it is an astonishing fact, and one that goes far to justify much of the indignation which has been aroused against the Local Government in the matter. Surely the Government or the Minister of Education is bound either to disprove the allegation thus directly and officially made, or to promise prompt amendment of the law which leads to such a result. Justification of it is, we conceive, out of the question.

THE doubling of the rate of postage on drop letters for delivery in cities is said to be reducing instead of increasing the income of the Post Office Department from this source. This is a result which was easily foreseen and which we ventured to predict. Bills and circulars are now finding their way to the hands of citizens unadorned with the familiar, or rather, so far as the two-cent stamp is concerned, unfamiliar postage stamp, showing that other distributing agencies are being called into requisition. In view of this fact, the Post Office Department is, it appears, bringing test actions against certain of these agencies, with a view to compelling business men and others to send all such documents through the post office. It is highly probable that the letter of the law is in favour of the monopoly claimed on behalf of the Government. That the law relied on is a copy of an Act passed in Great Britain many years ago, before the development or even conception of the penny-postage reform, is significant. It would not, we fancy, be an easy matter to-day to induce any Parliament or Legislature to pass an Act compelling a citizen to pay the Government of the day more for the performance of a certain business service than the price at which voluntary agencies would be ready to undertake the service. If, as seems to be implied in the action begun against the Northwest Telegraph Company's District Messenger Service in Hamilton, the Post Office Department is prepared to go to the length of preventing the prompt delivery of letters and messages in cases in which the slow routine of the Post Office would be useless for the purpose of the sender, it is as well that the question is up for decision. On the principle that the best way to secure the repeal of a bad law is to enforce it, the action of the Department will eventually result either in cheap postage or in unhampered freedom of private delivery. The pushing business men of to-day are not likely to submit quietly to have their correspondence handled in the expensive and deliberate fashion that was in vogue in the days of the Georges.

WE are glad to see indications that the good seed so industriously sown by "The Prisoners' Aid Association of Canada," is bearing fruit in an aroused and enlightened public opinion. The case is, no doubt, one of those in which there is more need of the arousing than of the enlightenment. Of the eleven principles of prison reform advocated by the Association, there is scarcely one which will not, on consideration, commend itself to the judgment of every thoughtful and patriotic, not to say philanthropic, citizen. In this, as in many other cases where there is urgent need of reform, the vis inertia is the great opposing force. In a recent circular the Association presents an encouraging consensus of opinion from the Canadian secular and religious press, from county judges, sheriffs, gaolers, etc., and from students of penology at home and abroad, whose conclusions are entitled to special attention. All heartily endorse the leading principles of the reform proposed. Surely the Government will no longer hesitate to take action, especially in the direction recommended years ago by Mr. J. W. Langmuir, the late Inspector of Prisons for Ontario, viz., to provide "a central prison in the east and a central prison in the w -both on the Elmira reformatory principle, and large enough to completely relieve the gaols of all prisoners under sentence." Greatly enlarged accommodation whether by means of two or a larger number of prisons. giving ample room for proper classification, and for the use of true reformatory methods, is clearly the first and great desideratum. It would make all the rest possible. The best public opinion of the Province will support the Government in making a liberal appropriation for this purpose, and the Government will do itself honour by courageous action.

TOUCHING the necessity of improved methods of dealing with certain classes of criminals, and especially with juvenile culprits, we note indications of a growing sentiment in favour of some form of corporal punishment. Individuals and newspapers advocate the use of the lash

as if they believed it endowed with some inherent reformative virtue. Even the Grand Jury at Brockville, while strongly deprecating the practice of confining young persons in common jails, where they almost inevitably consort with confirmed criminals, and most wisely affirming that the society of depraved men and women should be rendered impossible for such, goes on to submit that "in the case of very young offenders, corporal punishment by a proper officer of justice would be a much greater deterrent from crime than imprisonment." This may be true, when the imprisonment is of the kind described. It is possible, too, that there may be cases in which any improvement of character on the part of the depraved criminal is so utterly beyond hope, that the State is justified in choosing the punishment solely with reference to its probable effect as a deterrent. But we hold that in the case of young culprits such as those referred to by the Brockville Grand Jury, and, in fact, in all cases in which there is any reasonable hope of reform, it would be both cruel and unphilosophical for society or the State to act on the theory which regards alone or chiefly the deterrent effects of punishment. In nine cases out of ten society is to blame for the production of the criminals. He is simply the product of the surroundings in which he has been permitted to grow up. The first duty the State owes both to the culprit and to itself is to do its utmost to effect a permanent reformation. But no one can seriously believe in the reformatory power of a flogging in such a case. Criminal tendencies are the product of habit, and time is an indispensable element in the formation of habit. Reform, in like manner, is possible only through habit, and time is equally indispensable to the formation of a new or reformed habit.

UNIVERSITIES of high standing do well to be chary in the distribution of the distinctions which they hold in their gift, yet they are sometimes able to bestow them so well that no less honour is done to the giver than to the receiver. Even those who may be disposed to regret that the University of Toronto should have departed from its safe conservatism in order to confer several honorary degrees at its late convocation, must still acknowledge that neither the University, nor the title of LL.D., can lose in dignity from being written after such names as Sir John A. Macdonald, Edward Blake, Oliver Mowat, etc. One's sense of the fitness of things is still more strongly appealed to by the announcement that the Board of Governors of McGill University have unanimously elected Sir Donald A. Smith Chancellor of that Institution and President of its Board. Sir Donald had already received the degree of LL.D. from the University of Cambridge. His election to the highest position in the gift of McGill is a most fitting recognition of his liberal and wise contributions in aid of the higher education of women, in connection with that institution. Sir Donald's name will go down in history as that of the man who had the high honour of being the first founder of a University Annex for women in Canada.

IT would be useless, just now, to discuss at length the very important questions that have arisen between the city of Toronto and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, in connection with the attempt being made by the latter to expropriate certain lands along the Don and the city water front. The pending interview with the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, the result of which is not known at the time of this writing, will probably determine the question or the future course of the respective parties. There are, however, certain general principles in connection with the affair which seem so obvious that it is incredible that they can be seriously called in question. It is, for instance, clearly in the interest of all concerned that the railway should have all reasonable and necessary facilities for entering the city and providing for carrying on the greatly enlarged business which it may confidently expect in the future. It is no less obvious that no such exclusive rights should be granted to this or any other railway as might be used in the future to prevent or obstruct the entry of any other road on, so far as possible, equally favourable conditions. It is, in the third place, almost axiomatic that to permit any railway company to gain a position that would enable them to control the city water