

situation. They think possibly that their patience and virtue will be rewarded at some distant day. Hitherto their complaints have been low murmurs; if they would growl a little they would suffer no harm, as it is tolerably certain that the public would support them.

To particularize. Is it not a fact that all the later appointments to Chairs in McGill University have been filled by other than Canadians? Is it possible that these Chairs could not have been properly filled in this country? If not, where have we been in educational matters all these years? Where are all the sons of McGill? Are none of them fit to teach as they have been taught? Have none of them kept sufficiently in line with the age? To answer in the negative is to make a woful confession. Of course we admit this much, viz., that in a young country there are few so far removed above the struggle for existence, and the "eternal lack of pence," as to be able to devote themselves to advanced study; and we admit that in such cases the young country can without wrong (indeed, anything else would be folly) avail herself of the foreign talent that foreign wealth has trained. But Canada has surely got beyond this period. McGill was founded in 1821. Her graduates are numbered by hundreds, and many of them are men of real scholarly ability, whose highest pleasure it would have been to have devoted themselves to the service of their *Alma Mater* and their country had the least encouragement been extended to them; but when it began to be understood that the fat berths were for cousins across the sea, and that the most a Canadian could look for was an assistant lectureship or janitorship, with a starving pittance, then young Canada turned away sadly from academic shades, and looked for pastures new. Greatly do we desire, therefore, that McGill will make her name still more illustrious by showing on every occasion possible that she is not ashamed of her sons.

The higher the institution of learning and the greater the capacity of the student, the more do we expect from the instructor. If then our universities are justified in going abroad for teaching talent, there is scarcely the same need for our high schools adopting the same course. Still less excuse is there for our high schools, if experience has proved such a course far from satisfactory. Now it is a fact that the Protestant Board of School Commissioners have displayed a curious *penchant* in favour of the graduates of old Oxford. Like many other institutions, Oxford has sent forth some men of a very excellent kind, and some that are not, at least so far as teaching ability is concerned. The last two appointments in the High School were received by Oxford graduates, for no other reason that we could find, than that they were Oxford graduates, and in each case, I am given to understand, the results were far from satisfactory. I am also informed that the Oxford men were appointed in spite of the fact, that the Board had in its employ graduates of McGill, who were quite able to fill the vacant positions. The claims of these, however, were quite disregarded, and the folly of the course pursued by the Board was demonstrated by the most unsatisfactory of results. All of this shows that not only has the Board ignored the principle of promotion according to merit, but has exhibited a pitiable lack of discernment, and introduced incapacity into an institution where the very best of talent alone should be found. Now these are serious facts, if true, and of their truth I have assured myself. They are not of less importance than the Ontario appointments, and should create amongst us quite as much interest. They *would* create as much interest if educational matters were as well ventilated as they should be. But there is too much star-chamber secrecy about our scholastic institutions. Appointments are made, money received and expended, and buildings erected in a marvellously quiet way. The public learn nothing of these things until they are *faits accomplis*. It is all very well to publish a statement annually of receipts and expenditures, and throw that in the face of the public when questions are asked. Such a course would be about as justifiable for the House of Commons to adopt as an excuse for secret proceedings.

Of course it is much more comfortable for a Board of Commissioners, or a corporation of any kind, to make its arrangements without the intervention of public criticism, and it is quite natural that in course of time that such a Board, untroubled by public inspection, should acquire an unconscious feeling that it has a Divine right to administer, and then begin to regard criticism from outside as a most troublesome and inconvenient thing in the first place, as deserving of contempt in the second place, and the Board itself as most shamefully abused in the third and last place. After giving up so much of its valuable time to the public, without remuneration of any kind, it is most ungrateful, inconsiderate, etc., etc., etc.

But this kind of directorate is too far behind the age to be silently permitted. The searching light of public criticism—criticism not necessarily hostile in motive—should examine each and all of our public institutions, and of these none should be regarded of superior importance to those that are educational. And if these are to flourish, they can only do so aided by the stimulus of an intelligent public interest. The interest that a few feel should be extended to the many. And when this is done we shall witness, among other desirable things, the utter extinction of the class prejudice, ridiculously out of place in Canada, that leads many in England to ask of one, not "Is he well educated," but "Has he been at Eton or Oxford?"

Nihil Verius.

WOMEN'S INFLUENCE.

What shall be said of woman as an organiser in *domestic* life? Have we not all friends whose housekeeping is a terror to us, alike from its cleanliness and the want of it—whose table makes us either abstemious or hungry? Is not every house the microcosm of the world, and is not every woman at its head a miniature sovereign? But as the generic resemblance and the specific difference in woman's work in this department are matters for private interpretation, rather than for statement of facts, it is sufficient merely to assert that if she is not in this field also an organiser she ought to be. From the organisation of a home the transit is slight to the *educational* department of life. At once the organisation of a schoolroom rises before us, and we proudly assert that three-fourths of the two hundred and fifty thousand teachers in the United States are women; that is, organisers of the present for the future. The large educational institutions for women have never been the result of her organising power alone, though many of their arrangements are due to her. On the other hand, societies and clubs have sprung from her inventive faculty. Women's clubs have become so familiar a sound that their terrific and strong-minded aspect has disappeared, till they are now generally welcomed even by men as refreshment of mind and heart to the wife and sister. These clubs are carrying out for women the work begun by the Sanitary Commission. They are teaching them to think consecutively, and showing them their power and shortcomings relatively to each other. Through them they are being prepared for more important committee work, which is surely devolving upon them as they hold places in schools and State charity boards. That clubs have taught women to work with one another alone justifies their existence. The Women's Education Association in Boston has organised the Harvard Examinations for Women, diet kitchens, nurses' training and cooking schools, and botanical lectures, its committees on education, industry, and æsthetics, and is merely one of similar organisations in many cities. To it is also due the Chemical Laboratory for Women in connection with the Massachusetts Technological Institute, where its pupils can become practical chemists, dyers, assayers. In regard to art there is little concerted action among women. They rent studios together, and form classes for mutual criticism and admiration. The school for carving and modelling in clay, plaster, and wood in Boston is unique. A girl can graduate there as plasterer, stone-cutter, designer, or carver. She knows every step of the process, from the manipulation of clay, the casting in plaster or gelatine moulds, to the final cutting in stone or wood. She draws her designs as a flat copy, or moulds it in high or low relief. The Philadelphia School of Design ranks high, but it is not especially a woman's school; whilst that in Cincinnati is an instance of the organised result of woman's power to keep at a thing.—*Atlantic Monthly*.

SAXON AND ERIN.

In the last number of the CANADIAN SPECTATOR, over the signature of a writer who calls himself "Erin," appear what are supposed to be intended for criticisms on an article under the head of "Lords and Land" in a previous issue of the same publication, and in which, according to "Erin," there are several discrepancies. First, it appears we have imagined that satire is argument, and have forgotten that describing measures of reform as immoral designs is not proof that they are so. We bow! our acknowledgments and return the information with thanks.

That satire is not reason; that assertion is not proof; and that Queen Ann has ceased to exist, are facts with which we have long been familiar and never forget; but that opinion could be mistaken for either argument or proof, except by a mere surface observer, is our latest discovery. Like most of the community we have our convictions, some of which occasionally find their way into print. One of them being that the Irish Disturbance Bill was immoral in its conception and meaning was simply so stated; but that it could be held to assume a logical character, and as such become "somewhat amusing," is a good deal more than we had ever imagined. We are further informed, and candidly admit, that reform is usually considered wholesome: the words "wholesome measures of reform," however, having been quoted from the editor of this excellent periodical, our critic has apparently overlooked the meaning of commas inverted; but the process by which he has reached the conclusion that we regard reform and immoral designs as synonymous is, to us, the most perfect of puzzles. In the article alluded to, immoral designs are said to have been presented *in the guise* of wholesome measures of reform. Presenting a thing in the shape or semblance of another thing from which it is essentially different cannot really assimilate the two things; the synonym, therefore, appears to be purely supposititious.

The land question, as we understand it, having formed no part of our writing of October the second, our view of it can hardly be described as "superficial," and in connection therewith we venture to observe that progress in the science of political economy is not usually measured by attainments in music or dancing. It is to be regretted that when "Erin" deemed our writing worthy of his attention he did not read us a little more carefully. Had he