

ents, with courtesy. Matters have come to a hard pass when either trade jealousy or personal disappointment can drive a professed educationist into setting other journalists so pernicious an example.

The reference to the SCHOOL JOURNAL in the same article is of a piece with dozens of references of the same kind. This journal is not the "trade organ" of the publishers and we have no hesitation in appealing to our editorial and news columns for confirmation of this assertion. The publishers of the *School Journal*, except when compelled in self-defence to violate this rule, have studiously refrained from making use of any but its advertising columns in which to make their business announcements, and these columns are as open to other publishers wishing to advertise as they are to the publishers of the *Journal*.

So much cannot with truth be said of the *Educational Monthly* which has been persistently made the "trade organ" of its publishers, and especially of the Campbells' publishing establishments, in one of which the editor of the *Monthly* is at present an employee. By its highly commendatory notices of books published by that part of the trade for which it speaks, and its ludicrously unjust criticisms of all others of the same class it proclaims that it has no other function than that of a "trade organ" except the one already referred to of political hack. Any apparent exceptions to its ordinary practice are easily seen to have been prompted by a sinister purpose. For instance in its July-August number the *Monthly* gave a favorable notice of Macoun and Spotton's "Botany," a work which has been before the public for three years. They could afford to do this from the trade point of view since none of the publishers interested in the *Monthly* have, or are likely to have, any rival to that admirable manual, and by this cheap praise the conductors put themselves in a position to say that they do not invariably condemn books not published by themselves. The *Monthly's* editorial puffs of its own editor—a man whose sole qualification for his present position is that he has proved a failure at everything else—are beneath contempt.

UPPER CANADA COLLEGE.

At a recent meeting of the Senate of the University of Toronto a communication was received from the Minister of Education enclosing a report by Principal Buchan of Upper Canada College. In that report he recommended that the services of two of his colleagues, Messrs. Wedd and Brown, should be dispensed with, assigning as a reason that they were not able to maintain sufficiently good order in the class-room. Mr. Buchan must have known, when he was contemplating such action as this, that he would raise a storm if he ventured to do as he has done. That he persisted in what he conceived to be his duty in the premises speaks volumes for his moral courage, whatever the merits of the case as between him and the other members of the staff may be.

Attempts have been made in certain quarters to make it appear that Mr. Buchan has been actuated by other than honorable

motives in what he has done, and that it is not his colleagues but himself who lacks the capacity to maintain a high state of discipline amongst the pupils. We venture to say that this is a point on which those who talk so glibly are quite incapable of forming any intelligent opinion. It is inconceivable that a new Principal should be anxious to get rid of veteran assistants without a strong conviction that their presence had become a source of weakness to the institution. Who is to judge between him and them? Is any opinion on the matter entitled to a moment's consideration which is not based on weeks or months of close observation? And why should the professed friends of the institution seek to injure it by weakening the hands of the Principal at a most critical period of its history?

We fully agree with the suggestion that the dismissed teachers—if they have really been dismissed—should not be sent out without adequate pecuniary provision for the future. They are dismissed with the brand of incapacity stamped upon them and this at a time of life when age alone would have formed a serious obstacle to a change of occupation. It is evident now that either Mr. Buchan or his two assistants must go, and in such a crisis the Minister of Education must stand by the Principal. To decline to act upon his recommendation would be tantamount to dismissing him, and this the authorities could do only after satisfying themselves that his management had proved a failure.

Mr. Buchan has been condemned for consenting to take the Principalship after having some years ago participated in a crusade against the very existence of Upper Canada College. This kind of criticism is utterly absurd. By assuming his present position he does not necessarily declare that he has changed his opinions about the expediency of maintaining the College, and it must be permitted to him to alter his views as the result of experience. For some years past, as high school inspector, he has occupied the position of a salaried servant of the whole Province, and when, on the occurrence of a vacancy in the Principalship he was asked to undertake its duties a belief in the inexpediency of maintaining the institution would have been no reason for refusing. His duty is to make it a success if he can, and those who know Mr. Buchan best will most readily and implicitly believe that when he undertook the task imposed on him he did it in perfect good faith.

SCHOOL READERS.

The Minister of Education has intimated to the various publishers who are engaged in the preparation of school readers; that he expects to have all the competing series before him by the 15th of September. At furthest, then, it cannot be more than a very few weeks till he is in a position to announce to the public which series he intends to authorize. Those who are engaged in the sale of the old readers should govern themselves by this intimation and take care that when the change goes into effect they are caught with as small a stock as possible.