

phrenologists call "Causality" and "Comparison," with none too much "Conscientiousness."

But I am not disposed to unduly find fault with the knight. I am only pointing out the weakness, so that the people may not heed him on the school question. Sir William is just as Nature and the schools have made him; and, unless Nature has been generous, the schools are as apt as not to spoil a man, so far as all liberal and independent thought is concerned. Thus, it may be that history will put Sir William Dawson down as a brilliant scholar and *litterateur*, an ingenious (but not overly ingenuous) exegetist, a good geologist, and doubtless an exemplary and pious private citizen; but, at the same time, a lame philosopher and a limping publicist—a reactionist quite incapable of broad development and of keeping up with modern thought and progress.

That is my diagnosis—a fair and just one, I think, without prejudice—and hence, I submit that Sir William Dawson is not a proper guide for the voters or legislators of Canada on this intricate educational question, which can never be fairly solved or settled on any narrow or sectarian grounds, or from any standpoint but a broad, just and liberal one. But how few, comparatively, can or will take the broad view! Each has his own preconceived notions on the subject—his own sectional or sectarian view—his own constitutional limitations. He looks at the matter through the colored glasses of education, religion, environment, party, prejudice, personal idiosyncrasy, etc.; and is either confused by the problem confronting him, or has his own way of settling it off-hand, which, of course, would suit himself but not other people. I speak here of the citizen, not of the politicians and legislators, who, many of them, have no principles whatever in the premises, but only a policy, and that policy to do anything on the school question, or any other question, that will be most likely to keep them in *power* and in *pay*.

Principal Dawson has been, I believe, a long time in the Province of Quebec, and hence cannot be ignorant of the character of the common schools in that province and the resultant general illiteracy. He must also know that in every country where the Roman Catholic hierarchy have control of education the same illiteracy prevails. Taking a half dozen or so of such countries and comparing them with a like number where the church has no control of education, we find that the number of illiterates is about 60 per cent. in the former, while it is only a little over 4 per cent. in the latter. Statistical proof of this will be forthcoming if required. As to his own province, some 90 per cent. of the teachers put into the schools by the church in Quebec are uneducated and incompetent, many members of the Boards of Examiners being scarcely able to read and write. These humiliating facts, which are indisputable, came before the public last August, at a Convention of School Inspectors at St. Hyacinthe, presided over by the Superintendent of Education, the Hon. B. De la Bruéfe. The inspectors, one after another, reluctantly bore testimony to these startling facts. Principal Dawson must be fully

cogniza  
Manito  
some  
factur  
foster r  
in the c  
is taught  
and ab  
who pr  
in a bo  
the Sep  
used in  
page 35

"Q. H  
Zuingliu

"A. In  
at all, it v  
great libe  
goods of  
Gospel;  
you believ  
zerland an  
source of  
those who

Sir W  
knight  
and of E  
ary," an

And n  
consisten  
teaching  
to the att  
West, jus  
for a you  
of Canad  
think in  
conclusio  
institutio  
and perh

It woul  
these to p  
I think it

"If a se  
establishing  
Republic .