

of very great importance he fails to mention—that this represents the amount expended on the education of nine million pupils, which, by simple division, gives, in round numbers, a cost of nine dollars per pupil per year, an amount which cannot certainly be considered either costly or excessive; and yet with this amount Mr. Galt is dissatisfied because of the lack of 'production of scholars and great men.'

If our system affected only a small number of pupils it would be bad enough, producing no first-class samples, and destroying the intellectual progress of the bulk. Mr. Jenkins fails to see that the more the number is increased the more objectionable the system becomes. That out of nine million pupils we cannot produce a single scholar is about the most humiliating result imaginable.

It will not do to tell us that we are paying only nine dollars per head, for even if that be so, we are wasting about eight dollars per head.

The High School pupils cost four times as much as Mr. Jenkins estimates.

But he enquires: "Will Mr. Galt declare that the people of Ontario are in any way inferior to any other people in their ability to initiate and carry through reforms, or in their management of their commercial and legislative affairs?"

Most certainly I will not.

On the contrary, I have the very highest opinion of the natural ability of my fellow-countrymen, and that is the reason I am raising my voice against a system of education which is taxing the community beyond all reason, and which hinders rather than helps their intellectual advancement.

I did not suppose that Mr. Jenkins or anybody else could have understood me to object to newspapers or light literature.

What I did say, and what Mr. Jenkins does not pretend to deny, was that the vast majority of us read nothing but newspapers.

And how long do we take to teach our children this accomplishment? Children may enter the kindergarten when they are four years old, and need not leave the High School before they are eighteen. According to my critic seven years would seem sufficient. Is it worth while discussing the question further, even from Mr. Jenkins' basis?

A. C. GALT.

OUR EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM.

SIR,—The position taken by your correspondent, Mr. A. C. Galt, is no doubt on the right lines when he speaks of the failure of "our educational system." It has produced, as you say, Mr. Editor, nothing but newspaper readers. It has banished thoroughness. However Mr. Galt's plan of taking from the high and public schools to give to the universities is manifestly unjust. The schools are the people's universities. Mr. Galt's plan is not a good one so far as I can see.

Peterborough.

HAMPDEN BURNHAM.

THE MONTREAL WITNESS' REPRESENTATIVE APPLAUDS THE COLD-BLOODED MURDER OF THREE HUNDRED AND SIXTEEN MOSLEMS.—PART I.

SIR,—I contend that it is utterly unchristianlike to try to obtain political reforms by crime. That is what the Huntchagist Society (the Armenian Revolutionary Committee) has done; with the result that vast numbers of innocent persons have either been injured, or have lost their lives. But the saddle ought to be put upon the right horse. Those who outrage in a burning city ought to be sternly punished, but they who with "malice aforethought" set it on fire are far more guilty.

To assist your readers to understand the facts, I quote an incidental reference to Asiatic Christians, from p. 290 of the North American Review for last March: "The Christians of the East at this day are notoriously untruthful." The following fact is quoted from a leading American magazine: Some years ago a party of Americans were travelling in Asiatic Turkey and wishing for information they, through their Greek interpreter asked some questions of a poor, way-side Turk, but they doubted the truth of his answers.

Whereupon their Greek guide sardonically observed, "You can believe what he says, for his religion don't allow him to tell lies."

The Rev. Mr. Hamlin—at one time a leading missionary in Asiatic Turkey—the founder of Robert College, Constantinople, writing in the Boston Congregationalist (1894) reported the plans of the Huntchagists (Armenian Revolutionary Committee) as explained to him by a member. Briefly they were to commit outrages on the Moslems, in the hope that as in Bulgaria, they would make dreadful reprisals and thus induce horrified Europe to interfere. When he denounced the plan as "infernal" he was coolly told that it had succeeded in Bulgaria in 1876, and would also succeed in Armenia. Mr. Hamlin also complained that the Revolutionary Committee tried to embitter the Turks against the Protestants. He added "all the troubles at Marsova originated in their movements. They are cunning, unprincipled, and cruel. They terrorise their own people."

We must distinguish between the Revolutionary Committee who hire ruffians to start excesses, and the innocent multitude who suffer for their crimes—the former ought to be hanged; the latter deserve our pity. What should we say to an organization which hired ruffians to set fire to our towns?

In the Montreal Weekly Witness for December 24th, there is a letter from the Rev. Mr. Macullan, a missionary at Marash, thirty miles from Zeitown. He states: "If the Armenians had not rebelled most of this trouble would have been prevented. That miserable Huntchagist Society (the Armenian Revolutionary Committee) is at the bottom of it and must bear the responsibility. The Government has taken good care of us and our property so far." He thus corroborates the Rev. Mr. Hamlin. He estimated the number killed at Marash at thirty. The Revolutionary Committee published in all the papers that 8,000 were slain, thus multiplying the real number by 300. Only those who have carefully studied the news supplied by that organization to the European journals are aware of the wholesale lying of these Oriental Munchausens. Macaulay, when reviewing the memoirs of Barere, the Terrorist, stated that no man knew what lying was until he had read Barere's biography; but his observation applies far more forcibly to the officials' reports of the Armenian Revolutionary Committee. Thus there were most circumstantial accounts that at Sassun (1894) the Moslems wantonly murdered 20,000 men, women, and children; but according to the official report of the European delegates the total loss during the twelve days' fighting was 262. Thus the deaths were multiplied by 80. The Times correspondent, who understood the language and the country, visited the place, and made a full report of the Sassun affair. (See Times, March 29th, 1895.) He only heard one side, but was informed by the Armenians themselves, that they began the fighting by attacking the Kurds; and that when, according to the custom of inter-tribal feuds, compensation was demanded for the families of the slain Kurds—amounting to ninety dollars of our currency—they would not pay. Had they paid this trifling sum there would have been no Sassun affair. The Times' correspondent stated: "After diligent inquiry (at Sassun) I cannot find that in those ten days of skirmishing (with the Kurds prior to the coming up of the regulars) the Kurds did any harm to women and children." There had been most minute and circumstantial accounts of the horrors committed there by the Kurds, but these according to Armenians on the spot, were inventions. But he alleged that when the regular troops came up they committed horrible excesses. On the other hand a Catholic Armenian merchant, of Trebisond, "a man of education and considerable wealth," informed the Daily Telegraph correspondent (strongly anti-Turkish) that his fellow countrymen began the fighting, and mutilated captured Kurds—"committed horrible excesses on such Kurds as fell alive into their hands." He added that the English little knew how they had been deceived anent Sassun. "Ah! if the noble-minded English people only knew how grossly they are being imposed upon by a band of cut-throats." He stated that the regulars behaved well, but that when the Moslems got the upper hand the Kurds, in some cases, retaliated; that includes some of the 262 lives lost. We may accept this as truth. He offered to show the Daily Telegraph representative letters from his correspondents residing there verifying his statements. A lawyer would call that reliable evidence.

FAIRPLAY RADICAL.