

THE TRUE WITNESS

IS PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY
The Post Printing & Publishing Co.
AT THREE OFFICES:
761 CRAIG ST., Montreal, Canada.

Subscription, per annum \$1.50
It paid strictly in advance.

TO ADVERTISERS.
A limited number of advertisements of approved character will be inserted in "THE TRUE WITNESS" at the rate of 10c per line (single) first insertion, 10c per line each subsequent insertion. Special Notices 50c per line. Special rates for contracts on application. Advertisements for Teachers, Information Wanted, &c., 50c per line (not to exceed 10 lines). Ordinary notices of Births, Deaths and Marriages 50c each insertion. The large and increasing circulation of "THE TRUE WITNESS" makes it the very best advertising medium in Canada.

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS.
Subscribers in this country should always give the name of their Post Office. Those who remove should give the name of the old as well as the new Post Office. Remittances can be safely made by Registered Letter from Office Order. All remittances will be acknowledged by changing the date on the address label attached to paper. Subscribers will see by date on the label when their subscription expires. Sample copies sent free on application. Parties wishing to become subscribers can do so through any responsible news agent, when there is one of our local agents in their locality. Address all communications to

The Post Printing & Publishing Co.
MONTREAL, CANADA.

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 29, 1884

TO SUBSCRIBERS IN ARREARS.

All those indebted for subscriptions, and who have already received accounts, are specially requested to send their remittances without delay. The amount thus outstanding is so large that we are under the necessity of pressing all to an immediate settlement.

CATHOLIC CALENDAR.

OCTOBER.
THURSDAY, 30.—Office of the Blessed Sacrament. Cons. Bps. Loughlin, Brooklyn, and De Goebsbrunn, Burlington, 1853.
FRIDAY, 31.—Vigil of All Saints. Fast.
NOVEMBER.
SATURDAY, 1.—All Saints. Holyday of obligation. Less. Apoc. vii. 2-12; Gosp. Matt. v. 1-12. Cons. Bps. Feehan, Chicago, 1865. Cons. Bp. O'Farrell, Trenton, 1881.
SUNDAY, 2.—Twenty-second Sunday after Pentecost. Epist. Phil. i. 6-11; Gosp. Matt. xiii. 15-21.
MONDAY, 3.—All Souls (Nov. 2).
TUESDAY, 4.—St. Charles Borromeo, Bishop and Confessor. SS. Vitalis and Agricola, Martyrs.
WEDNESDAY, 5.—Of the Octave of All Saints.

The Local Government has at last been induced to take measures for the relief of the starving fishermen on the barren coasts of Labrador, Gaspe and Magdalen Islands. A cargo of flour has been despatched to the scene of the distress, and the Hon. Mr. Flynn, who has taken special interest in the destitute condition of these poor people, has the distribution of the provisions under his control.

HON. MR. ROBERTSON, Provincial Treasurer, says the Government is not responsible for the loss by the recent explosions at Quebec. No responsibility for the safety of the buildings can attach to the Government until they are completed and delivered over, except it can be proved that the outrage was committed by enemies of the State. In that case there will be very little likelihood of a call being made on the public funds to make good the loss. Enemies of the State ordinarily do not waste powder or dynamite in blowing up unfinished and empty buildings.

The galleries of the British House of Commons were packed on Friday night, when it was expected that the Irish party would open fire on the Government against the Maamtrasna murder scandals. It is considered a significant fact that among the most conspicuous of the spectators, who took an anxious and painful interest in the proceedings, were the notorious Clifford Lloyd of backshot fame; Director Jenkinson, of the Irish Criminal Investigation Department, and Mr. Peter O'Brien, who was crown prosecutor in the murder trial.

A PRIVATE detective of this city is said to have succeeded in discovering a clue to the recent explosions which wrecked the new parliamentary buildings at Quebec. The detective states he has already obtained sufficient information to warrant the conclusion that the outrage was perpetrated by local men for local interests. He ridicules the idea that any foreign dynamiters had anything to do with the explosions. If this surprising information regarding the miscreants, the authorities should take immediate steps to have it laid before them. It won't do to let the scoundrels go unpunished for want of energy or determination to ferret them out.

RECENT STATISTICS as to the various employments of women in England reveal an unexpected number engaged in pursuits which are commonly supposed to be monopolized by the sterner sex. There are 347 female blacksmiths who actually swing heavy hammers, and 9,138 women employed in nail making, who make nails for horsehoes. Coming down to less violent manual labor, 10,592 women bind books and 2,302 assist in proofing them. In intellectual occupations women also fill an important place, the number of teachers being 123,995; of missionaries and preachers, 7,162; of clerks in the civil service, 2,283; of painters, 1,180; of students, 1,000, and of engravers, 1,604. There are 37,010 women engaged in medical and surgical work, nursing, &c., 452 busy themselves in editing, compiling, and writing books; 1,309 are employed in the various departments of photography.

The Canadian Immigration returns for September show that 14,590 persons landed in the country during the month, as compared with 16,432 for the corresponding period of last year. Of these total arrivals only 9,091 settled in Canada, and the remainder, 5,499, passed over to the States. Last year for the same month the settlers numbered 9,452, and 6,980 went across the lines. The total immigration for the nine months, from January 1st to October 1st of the present year, was 127,102, out of which Canada has retained 73,326 as settlers and lost 53,776, who preferred the United States for a home. These figures do not compare favorably with the totals of 1883. Last year there was a total immigration of 151,209, of which 89,463 elected to remain in Canada.

ONE of the most notable features of the Presidential campaign is the warm and cordial reception accorded to Mr. Blaine by the female portion of the inhabitants. In his triumphal tour through some of the Northern States, the ladies, in many instances, form the larger and more enthusiastic portion of the crowds that assemble to greet and welcome the Republican candidate. They cheer him, they wave their hand-painted fans and delicate umbrellas, and some go so far as to kiss him before the assembled multitudes. And he is said, that Mr. Blaine's gallantry is equal to the occasion, as he meets them half way in these manifestations of affection and devotion. These feminine ovations are participated in not by the low and vulgar, but by the best girls in the villages, towns and cities. What, then, is the reason of this unusual outburst of sentiment in favor of Mr. Blaine? Do they mean it as a protest against the social record of the Democratic candidate, or do they mean it as a vindication of the character of Mrs. Blaine, who was so foully attacked and slandered in her matrimonial relations and in her position of a virtuous mother? Or, perhaps, the ladies prefer that married life and not exclusive bachelorship should be given the highest honor in the gift of the nation. There must be some solid reason besides vague sentiment at the bottom of this overwhelming preference of the women for Mr. Blaine. What is it?

THE liquor traffic in the United States has increased enormously during the past ten years. In 1874 the nation's drink bill was estimated at \$600,000,000, or about twelve dollars per head of the population. Last year it had increased to \$1,040,000,000, or about twenty dollars for each man, woman and child in the Union. These figures only represent the direct cost of the liquor; but the indirect cost, resulting from loss of wages and profits, from depreciated physical and mental capacity to labor, and from destruction of property must be fully as great. From 1840 to 1883 the annual consumption of beer increased from 23,000,000 gallons to 651,000,000, and distilled liquors from 43,000,000 to 78,000,000; wines, five millions to twenty-five millions increase; beer drinking has not decreased whiskey drinking, as often contended. During the last five years whilst beer drinking increased 60.2 per cent., whiskey increased 44.5, whilst the population has trebled since 1840. The consumption of liquor is nearly ten times as great. In 1840 it was little over four gallons per man; in 1883 over 12. This unlimited liquor traffic is a curse and a fruitful source of tribulation to the people. It is to be found the cause of a large part of all the crime, poverty, insanity, suicides and diseases that make life a misery and a shame. It interferes with the public peace, destroys domestic happiness, and renders life and property insecure. This is the only equivalent returned by the unbridled use of liquor.

REV. MR. FYLES AND THE IMMIGRATION SCANDALS.

Serious charges of misconduct were brought against the management of the "Christian" branch of the Immigration Department at Point Levis. The scandal was so extraordinary that it would have been a crime against the public interest to have allowed it to extend its demoralizing effects in silence. In calling the attention of the Government to the unwholesome condition of things, we imagined ourselves as rendering good service to a public institution; but it appears it was only a delusion, for the indicted parties say that THE POST has done a grievous wrong. If such were the case, we would be very sorry, as it is against our principles to do injustice to either male or female. In the present instance, however, we must withhold an expression of regret until the charges are satisfactorily and adequately refuted by the accused. When they appear in their white robes of innocence, then THE POST will put on sackcloth and ashes and perform all due penance. We have received from the minor figure in the scandal a letter purporting to be a refutation of the charges, and which the reverend writer dignifies with the title of "rebuttal." The document is by no means as strong and to the point as it is indignant and cunning. It reads:—

To the Editor of THE POST and TRUE WITNESS.
SIR.—The attack made upon Miss Richardson in L'Electeur was simply brutal. The writer of it had forgotten, (perhaps he had never been conscious) that he was a man. A rehearsal of that letter you thought befitting food for your readers; you and they are to be pitied.

The silly letter you have published in your Wednesday's issue affords me an opportunity of still further exposing the mendacity of the writer. Miss Richardson has on no occasion whatever addressed to me an offensive epithet. I have never once held a public service with the immigrants. I have never had place, time, nor opportunity for such a service, however desirable it might have been. No word has ever passed between Miss Richardson and myself concerning the religious instruction

of servant girls. I have never obtained the signatures of any two servant girls for any purpose whatever. Mr. Stafford has never once been the means of communication between Miss Richardson and myself. In short, you have been misled, by religious and political bias, to publish a tissue of falsehoods from anonymous slanderers.

We will see if you have sufficient honesty to publish this rebuttal.
Yours, &c.,
THOMAS W. FYLES.
South Quebec, Oct. 23, 1884.

This letter is more remarkable for what it omits than for what it contains, and even then the major portion of its contents deals with "fabricated" points, as we shall conclusively show later on. In the first place, the attack made upon Miss Richardson, the matron of the Immigrant Home for girls, may have been "brutal," but the question to solve and what we were interested in ascertaining was, not the quality of the attack, but whether or not it was justified and founded on facts. As far as we could see, and as far as the evidence went, the attack was made none too soon and none too strong. The matron's extravagance and high living, her intoxication in the privacy of the Home and in public places, her corruption and perversion of immigrant girls by immoral literature and other means, her insolence and contempt towards those whom she could not influence, her strained relations with the Rev. Mr. Fyles himself, all described in the most circumstantial manner; actual occurrences, figures, time and place and other data connected with the scandals were fully given; and reliable witnesses were called to testify to the sad truth of the charges. What have we, on the other hand, from Miss Richardson? Nothing but hysterical denials. There is no attempt at a refutation, except her run to Ottawa to get her gracious patron, the Minister of Agriculture, to have her brutal accusers silenced. The imported matron is on the wrong side of the ocean for that kind of official interference. There the charges stand, with an interested denial but with no sign of a refutation.

Now, as to the denials of the Rev. T. W. Fyles. He deals with the letter of a correspondent who wrote us from the scene of war to confirm the truth of the position we had assumed. The rev. gentleman starts out by denying that Miss Richardson ever addressed to him an offensive epithet; perhaps he does not consider "cad," and the like, offensive epithets, but in good society such names are generally considered so. How is it that Mr. Fyles takes good care not to deny that unseemly squabbles and quarrels with the matron have taken place? He next says: "I have never once held a public service with the immigrants." There was no call for this denial, for no one ever said he did. He forgot to add, because the matron would not allow the immigrants to go to his service. Mr. Fyles proceeds: "No word has ever passed between Miss Richardson and myself concerning the religious instruction of 'servant girls.'"

We don't know about "servant girls," but responsible parties aver that there was considerable altercation between the two concerning the religious instruction of immigrant girls. He next says: "I have never obtained the signatures of any two servant girls for any purpose whatever." No body ever said he did. What was stated was that he went all the way to St. John, N.B., to have the evidence of two immigrant girls taken down, to send to Ottawa for the purpose of proving his charges against the matron of the Home. Why does he not deny the other statement, that he drew up a statement for the guardians and officials upon the wharf to sign, for the purpose of sending it to Ottawa, to prove that the lady was an untruthful person? The reverend gentleman winds up by accusing us of having published a tissue of falsehoods from anonymous slanderers, through religious and political bias. He is also mistaken on this score. Our informant is a responsible and reliable person, who is perhaps too well acquainted with the facts for Mr. Fyles' convenience and comfort. He is not an anonymous slanderer, as his name and address were forwarded with his correspondence. In the publication of the letter he used a *nom de plume*, which was his right. On the whole, we think the reverend gentleman has made out a bad case, both for himself and for the matron, and that his production has only gone to confirm the truth of the grave charges which have been brought against the "Christian" branch of the Immigration Department at Point Levis. Denials are easily made; what we want to see is a satisfactory refutation or substantiation of the charges.

"BULLDOZING" A JURY.

The Boutel murder case, which has occupied the attention of the Quebec Criminal Court for some time, was marked, in the closing scene of the trial, by a singular exhibition of temper and impatience on the part of the presiding judge, Hon. Justice Ramsay.

We have nothing to say as to the merits of the case, whether the woman Boutel is guilty or not of the charge of poisoning; but it is decidedly a matter of public concern as to how juries, in the discharge of the most solemn duty, should be treated by judges on the Bench. A jury deliberating on the question whether a prisoner should be condemned or not to death, ought not to be "bulldozed," coerced, or frightened into rendering a verdict one way or the other. The jury in this Boutel case could not come to any decision regarding the guilt of the prisoner, and after long deliberation they reported the fact to the Court. This announcement caused His Honor Judge Ramsay much displeasure, who at once set about to abuse the jury and to deliver a most violent harangue from the Bench. His remarks are reported as follows:—He said that "there had never been a clearer case of murder; that if the jury persisted in disagreeing, it was evident that they did not respect their oaths

and had been tampered with before entering the box." There had "virtually been no defense at all open to the prisoner," and if there could possibly be any ground for doubt they should come into court and state what their doubts were. "If ever there was a case in which a court was justified in insisting on a verdict it was the present." He told them plainly he would accept from them no such statement as that they could not agree upon a verdict. They must retire and come to an agreement one way or the other, and so far as he had power he would compel them to do so, even to the extent of keeping them shut up until the end of the present term.

His Honor, moreover, consulted his own convenience, and gave it to be generally understood that he had made arrangements to leave for Montreal by the evening train, and if the jury did not arrive at a decision prior to his departure they should be obliged to wait until they were ready to return a verdict, when he could be telegraphed for, and would come back to Quebec to receive it. Now, if this is not walking over a jury with a vengeance, we don't know what is. The threats, however, had the desired effect, for the jury shortly afterwards re-entered the court with a verdict of guilty, although a few minutes before they swore they were unable to agree. The principle of allowing a judge to thus threaten and bulldoze a jury is, bad and should not be tolerated. It may happen that a judge, by means of such pressure, may force a righteous verdict from a jury; but it may also happen that the judge, through mistaken zeal, may compel a jury to render a wrong verdict. This is the rock which must be avoided.

A verdict should be the unsought result of free, conscientious, and untrammelled deliberation. No element of coercion on the part of the judge no more than a breath of corruption on the part of the jury, should be allowed to exercise any influence in the jury-room.

THE REASSEMBLING OF PARLIAMENT.

The British Parliament reassembled for business yesterday. The Ministers and the Opposition had issued the usual mandate for prompt attendance on the part of their supporters, urging the necessity of putting in a strong appearance on the first day of the session. The party whips were well responded to, and the House from the start presented an animated scene. There is every indication of a fierce fight on the franchise question. The talk of compromise between Lords and Commons has vanished into thin air. In the speech from the throne there is not the slightest allusion to redistribution, to which the Upper House has committed itself. Mr. Gladstone makes the Queen say that she brings Parliament together to enable it to further consider the great subject of the representation of the people; all other subjects are only of minor importance. In face of this determination of the Government, Lord Salisbury showed no signs of receding from the position he has taken up, and insisted that the franchise measure should be blocked by the Lords unless it was coupled with a redistribution act. To this Mr. Labouchere, M.P., returned the answer that he hoped the Upper House would persist in rejecting the franchise bill and thus hasten the abolition of that body. Mr. Gladstone, in the course of his opening speech, expressed the hope that the Opposition had seen that the country wanted the franchise bill passed. In a menacing tone the Premier warned them that while insisting that their labors should include the redistribution scheme, they should not include another question the issue of which he was unable to foresee. The Premier, having thus formally outlined his policy, it cannot be expected that he will recede from it to please the Lords. He will only proceed with redistribution when the process of enfranchisement shall have been completed.

Before resuming any further the progress of popular privilege, the House of Lords would do well to take breath in its headlong policy of exclusiveness and consider the prudence of giving patriotism precedence of partisanship, and of yielding gracefully to the demands of the nation; otherwise the result will inevitably be that as a legislative power in the empire the Upper House must go. If it won't be mended, it must be ended. The attitude of the Lords, however, does not constitute the whole gravity of the political situation. A keener thorn in the side of the Government is the Irish National party. The difference between the Lords and the Irish is that the former fight against popular rights, while the latter fight for them, and therein lies the secret of the strength and indestructibility of the Irish National party. It is accordingly no matter for surprise to see Mr. Harrington, M.P., giving notice of an amendment to the address, declaring that the administration of the law in Ireland was unsatisfactory, and that inquiry into the Maamtrasna murder trial would lead to greater contentment among the people. This subject cannot fail to elicit lively and prolonged discussion in the House, which will show to the world what a farce and shame is the administration of justice in a central portion of the British Empire. Then there is another element in the political situation, which cannot but prove extremely troublesome to the government—the Egyptian question. The great European powers are almost unanimously arrayed against the Gladstone financial policy for Egypt. General Gordon's position in Khartoum and the late occurrences in the Transvaal are also matters for serious and weighty consideration, and which may turn out to be most disquieting events for the United Kingdom.

In any aspect that the situation is viewed, there are exciting and troublesome times ahead, the outcome of which no one can anticipate with any degree of certainty.

NARROWING THE PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN.

WHEN Grover Cleveland received the Democratic nomination for the Presidency it was emphatically stated that he would rip open the bond that kept the Northern States tight and solid; in the Republican ranks there was to be no head for the Democratic party to trouble itself about the doubtful States, such as New York, Connecticut, and the others; Cleveland would have them without the asking. With a little energy such staunch Republican States as Ohio, Wisconsin, Iowa, and the entire Pacific range were looked upon as legitimate and easy prey. Their capture and conversion to the Democratic party, all on account of Grover, was only a matter of time. The picture of the Democratic tidal wave submerging the Union was indeed rose-colored and the outlook was encouraging at the start; but time has taken the glitter from the picture, and the outlook has been replaced by hard facts. Cleveland's magnetic power was over-estimated. His name and record, instead of bringing victory nearer to the party that adopted and put him to the front, have been the most dismal and discouraging features in the campaign. It is now universally, although not officially, admitted that with Bayard, Butler, Thurman, or any of its well known, tried, and able leaders, the Democratic party would have swung into the White House on the highest wave of popular favor that ever rolled from the ballot box. As things now stand, Cleveland's supporters lose their hope of success on the slender chance of carrying New York State. They have given up all idea of trying to bring over any of the old-time Republican States which they promised to do at the commencement. Then, as to the doubtful States, they dare not expect more than a bare majority of the electoral votes.

The Democrats are conceded 153 electoral votes in the solid South, which are distributed as follows:—

Alabama	10
Arkansas	7
Delaware	3
Florida	4
Georgia	12
Kentucky	13
Louisiana	8
Maryland	8
Mississippi	9
Missouri	16
North Carolina	11
South Carolina	9
Tennessee	12
Texas	13
Virginia	12
West Virginia	6

Total 153

The electoral votes, amounting to 165 in the following States, are, on the other hand, conceded to the Republicans:—

Illinois	22
Iowa	13
Kansas	9
Maine	6
Massachusetts	14
Michigan	13
Minnesota	7
Nebraska	5
New Hampshire	4
Ohio	23
Pennsylvania	30
Rhode Island	4
Vermont	4
Wisconsin	11

Total 165

Besides these States, there are eight more which are generally considered to be doubtful, that is, liable to go Republican or Democratic on the impulse of the moment. These eight States command 53 electoral votes, distributed as follows:—

New York	36
Connecticut	6
New Jersey	6
Indiana	15
California	8
Colorado	3
Oregon	3
Nevada	3

Total 83

Assuming that Cleveland will secure the 153 electoral votes of the South, as conceded by his opponents, he will still require 48 more to be elected. If he cannot carry New York he will be unable to obtain the requisite 48, as all the other doubtful States put together only furnish 47 votes. It is consequently as clear as day that without the 36 votes of New York State the Democratic ticket must remain under Blaine, on the other hand, can be elected with or without the aid of the Empire State. He requires, outside of the 165 votes conceded, 36 to win. New York furnishes the exact number, or if this State fails to support him he may secure the majority by the vote of Indiana, New Jersey, Connecticut and California, leaving the other doubtful States to the Democrats. It is plain from these calculations that the Democrats, have much up-hill work to encounter, and that to win they must spread themselves out over an immense territory, while their opponents can afford to concentrate their efforts and their money in the one corner of New York.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN AND THE "DRONES."

The bitterness of the political agitation in England is indicated not so much by the violent and furious attacks of Liberal mobs on Conservative meetings, by the destruction of private and public property, and by the stoning of Lord Salisbury and other Tory leaders, as by the studied and deliberate pronouncements of responsible Ministers of the Crown, and by the utterances of a large portion of the British press. Many of Mr. Gladstone's parliamentary supporters, and the Liberal party in many centres throughout the country, have slipped beyond the Premier's control since the defeat of the Franchise Bill roused the popular wrath against the House of Lords. The cry in such places is, "Don't mind them, but end them." Prominent among those who seek to effect radical changes in the antiquated constitution are Messrs. Bright and Chamberlain. The latter gentleman, who is a pillar of the Gladstone Government, has risen to the foremost position in the agitation against the standing order of things. Speaking to the National Liberal Federation, Mr. Chamberlain bluntly told the people of England that if they wanted to enjoy the common rights of citizenship, they must wring them from the fears of the ruling caste. This is what he said: "If the people of this country (Great Britain) desire self-government—and what nation is there so base as not to cherish that ambition—if they desire self-government they must obtain it for themselves. They may extort it from the fears of their opponents. They never will obtain it from their good will or their generosity." Mr. Chamberlain is decidedly plain and unequivocal in his political directions to the masses; but it must be remembered that he is not threatened with a plank-bed and hard labor for an indefinite period in some isolated bastille, as would undoubtedly be the case with an Irish speaker who would dare to make such appeals. But the manner in which the cabinet minister pays his respects to the House of Lords is singularly virile and to the point. The following remarkable extract will sufficiently speak for itself: "Lord Carnarvon told his hearers on one occasion," said Mr. Chamberlain, "the old fable of the bees, and he compared the House of Lords to a hive with which it would be dangerous to meddle—that the community of bees in a hive have three estates, like the British Constitution. First, there is the queen, who is honored and respected by all her subjects; then there are the drones (laughter), and there are also the working bees. The drones lead an idle life—they toil not, neither do they spin (laughter.) They feed upon the produce and labor of others (hear, hear), and I have no doubt they think themselves the best and the wisest and the most patriotic of insects (laughter.) But there is a tragic ending to this pleasant dream. About this time of the year the working-bees prepare for winter. They become impatient of these dozy parasites (cheers), and with swift and implacable resolution they stop the supplies (laughter and renewed cheers). They drive the drones from the hive (continued cheering), and these perish miserably from the violent pressure of their indignant fellow-subjects (cheers). Now, I think I may commend the future study of entomology to Lord Carnarvon. I may leave him to make the application (hear, hear)."

If Mr. Chamberlain is honest and sincere in his appeals to the workers of England to "drive the drones from the hive," he should see that the voice of the drones, who are his colleagues in the Cabinet, is not all-powerful in the national councils, and that, when brought face to face with them on the floor of the House or in the Council Chamber, he does not yield and submit to their dictation.

CO-EDUCATION IN ONTARIO.

The Government of Ontario has not acted wisely in forcing the faculty of University College to admit young girls and women to the classes and allow them to seek the advantages of higher education, jointly with young boys and men. Co-education of the sexes has never given satisfaction. It is, besides, a system which does not meet with the approval of those who have the moral welfare of the young at heart. It has been condemned by competent and experienced authorities for the evil effects it produces. The Government, we understand, was impelled to adopt this plan of opening the path of higher education to women by considerations of economy. This is much to be regretted, for it shows that the authorities took no cognizance of the gravity of the issues involved in the settlement of the question. The subject of co-education is one of too weighty importance in its bearings on the moral character and social life of the province and of the country at large to be finally disposed of on mere grounds of economy. Dr. Wilson, the President of University College, is strongly opposed to the plan and fearlessly says so. His belief is that a great mistake has been made, and he declines to share the responsibility, which he places entirely on the shoulders of the Government. Dr. Wilson hopes that the whole question will be reconsidered, and that it is not yet vain to look among Canadian statesmen for men "too fond of the right to prefer the expedient." In his address, delivered at the opening of the University, the worthy President, deriding the idea that co-education should be adopted because of its cheapness, says that "while the little Anglo-Canadian minority in the Province of Quebec, who borrowed from our Toronto movement for the higher education of women the plan which they have successfully prosecuted till now, are furnishing to McGill College by private liberality the means for an efficient system of academic training specially adapted for its lady students, the wealthy Province of Ontario, which has hitherto prided itself on its thoroughly organized school system, adopts a plan confessedly inferior, because it is cheap. In strict fulfillment of my duty as President of this College, I have laid before the Minister of Education, and through him, before the Government, my reasons for objecting to the arrangements proposed. I have done it in the interests of University College. But I have done it still more in what I believe to be the true interests of women. We shall, indeed, under the present system, have lady students, and I most cordially wish them success in their honorable struggle for intellectual training, but I do not believe that co-education will meet the demands of the future. Nay, I feel assured that the President of Michigan University, speaking with all his ample experience of co-education, is right when he frankly says that after all this has been done to throw open our halls to the masses of the majority of young women seeking higher education, will do so at colleges specially designed for women."