

is not uncommon to hear many such boasting of how much success they gained without education, as if they were really better without it. It remains, then, for educated men to banish such intolerant notions from society. Further, the obligation is upon them to support educational institutions, and to increase their efficiency. Our country may well be proud of the position she holds in intellectual development, but still her institutions are far from perfection. The advantages we enjoy to-day are, however, greatly in advance of those enjoyed by the preceding generations, and this advancement came by sacrifice and labor on the part of those who lived before us; and so it becomes the present generations to pay for the use of these advantages by sending them on to the future with added strength.

We would not by any means confine the term educational institutions to the higher institutions of learning, or even to all the established schools of the country. There is a large proportion of the population of the country that will never receive higher education, and so great interest should centre in the common school work—education of the masses. And then the press and all the other educational influences should receive full sympathy and support. These institutions, and especially the latter, may be influenced by men in all positions of life, and all may be affected by them. It is a matter for regret that more literary work is not done by our educated men. With the agency of the press, men actively engaged in all the other pursuits might become reformers and educators.

Among those who are watching the interests of state in the Dominion of Canada, the desire is for increased immigration and a great population to develop the resources of the country. If knowledge is power, and it is, why not multiply the strength of the population by increasing its intelligence? Education is the surest means of reform, and the most certain guarantee of industry and advancement. When reformers and legislators and all the educated men of the country have discharged their obligations to the cause of education, then will their hopes and desires for reform and progress have been pretty fully realized.

## SOCRATES VERSUS SULLIVAN.

"It is excellent to have a giant's strength." The world appears to be growing cramped for common people. There are plenty of them, and they don't seem to be especially needed. A great man, on the other hand, commands attention, and wins admiration anywhere, and seemingly at any time. It has ever been thus, and will probably always continue. Witness Socrates and Sullivan. The former was a wise man (in some respects) and made his mark in ages past; the latter was a mighty man and makes his mark in ages present. These marks to be sure, are somewhat different, but the results virtually the same. Socrates drank the hemlock cup; Sullivan swills brandy. This shows how much more refined we are getting. Socrates taught immortality; Sullivan is exceedingly suggestive of mortality—short, sharp, and decisive—say three rounds. Socrates sought opportunities for teaching and preaching his doctrines without a thought of personal gain; Sullivan lets people seek him, is chary of his art, and keeps a sharp eye to the finances. This circumstance is valuable as showing how far Sullivan is superior to Socrates as a business man, and may be taken as an example of the better and more systematic ideas concerning business principles, which are prevalent at this happy stage of the world's history. Socrates had enemies among all classes, high and low, but especially among the former. Sullivan, notwithstanding he has a few enemies among a certain mediocre class, is patronized by royalty, by dukes, peers of the realm, and noble lords, is entertained, feasted, patted on the shoulder, and looked up to generally. Here again is seen how vastly more appreciative people have become, especially those, who, by virtue of their many privileges for culture, their æsthetic habits and associations, their enlightenment and high, social, and political standing, which admirably qualify them to rule over and guide the masses, can enter into and sympathize with the feelings, hopes and aspirations of the noble and exalted of all nations. Socrates was so extremely rude as to appear bare-footed on the streets and public places upon all occasions. Sullivan, with that delicate high-breeding and training, so characteristic of him, will not so much as appear in public with even his hands ungloved, preferring rather to wear gloves of even the very heaviest material if needs be. Notice, if you please, the striking difference between these two men. The one, though, rather suggests the other. Socrates was born in Athens, of Greece. Sullivan was born in the Athens of America. Socrates had a flat nose; Sullivan can soon flatten one. Socrates was the wisest teacher of his time; Sullivan is the finest slugger of his time. Socrates is looked back to as the father of philosophy; Sullivan is looked forward to as the papa of scientific sluggerism. The world