

is but one argument in the whole thesis, and it lies in the query: Is dram drinking a good or an evil? Is the manufacture of whiskey a curse or a moral benefit to the community? Dr. Grant says that drinking a glass of wine is not a sin. But this has nothing to do with the question of prohibition. Prohibition is not meant to prevent the drinking of a glass of wine: it is intended to subdue the liquor traffic to such an extent as to produce the ease and comfort and respectability of living that is to be found in a community where no strong drink can be had, in a community where it is difficult to be had, or even in a community where the traffic has fallen into the hands of shebeen-keepers and such like. Under even the extreme circumstances, in the last case, there is surely a gain in morality, and if Dr. Grant continues to say no, he has only to travel through any Scott Act County, or any Dunkin Act town to see for himself. If there be then a gain in morality, even if it be not the great gain Dr. Grant, or any other reformer would like to see, there comes upon every one obligation to labor for rather than against prohibition, seeing there is avowedly no hardship to befall any honest man should it become the law of the land to-morrow. Besides that, there is a physical and moral gain in abstinence all our school text-books try to make plain to the rising generation. And this is why we have referred to the controversy at all. What is Dr. Grant going to do with these text books? What is he going to do with the rising generation? What *has* he done for them through this controversy? He is honest in his advocacy, no one disputes that. But in the child's way of judging, either Dr. Grant is wrong or the text-book, as the child will say, is a great hypocrite. Even the teacher who teaches total abstinence from the text-

book will pit himself against the great controversialist every time the drinking of alcohol comes up for discussion, at least so the pupil who has heard of the controversy will be apt to think. Dr. Grant has not taken sides with the alcohol manufacturer, seller or buyer, but he certainly has become an authority amongst them, and will be used as such, no doubt much against the principal's wish, as long as the prohibition contest remains with us. Even if the thesis can not be reduced to the gain in morality, the well-wisher of an improved morality will hardly get further than the verdict of *cui bono* when all has been said and done.

Some people, even as far away as Queensland, have something to say on the subject of those teachers who are always running away from the true function of the school, in his efforts to make a name for himself and his institution among the unthinking. At a teachers' meeting out there Mr. Bennet read a paper on "Charlatans," and this is what he says of the competitive examination:

"A greater charlatan than all, and one whose power grows daily, and for whose comfort *quasi* deiences are made, is the competitive examination fiend. This man imagines he benefits a child (or his school enrolment) by overdriving him for the sake of a scholarship which is often worthless from a monetary point of view. The point which, I fear, prompts most parents of bright boys. When I see neurotic, high-strung boys, who are the favorite subjects of the crammer, doing nine hours' mental work daily for a doubtful benefit, my mouth is 'filled with cursing and bitterness.' These children are of all the most sensitive and susceptible; and for them the world, with its blighted hopes, its lost ideals, its meannesses