

character and conduct, but all truth is precious. We are not sure that it could not be successfully maintained that all truth is related more or less intimately to character and conduct. If, then, it might be argued, it is the province of the responsible managers of a denominational or theological school to determine beforehand just what shall be taught as truth in regard to disputed questions of religious doctrine or interpretation, it must be no less their duty and that of the managers of every school and college to determine in like manner what shall be taught as truth in all questions in dispute in science and philosophy.

WE do not present the above as a conclusive *reductio ad absurdum*, by any means. There is clearly another side to the question. If there is an element of absurdity in the idea that it is the duty of a board of managers, whose members may or may not be scholarly men, but the majority of whom cannot, as a rule, be supposed to have kept up their studies to such a degree as would qualify them to speak dogmatically upon such questions as that at issue in the case of Dr. Workman, to pronounce *ex cathedra* upon the subject matter of his teaching, it is none the less absurd to suppose that the managers of a denominational college, established and supported by those who regard certain views of religious truth as of the first importance in their relations to the highest well-being of those who embrace or reject them, have not a moral as well as legal right to control the teaching of the institution, so far at least as to prevent the inculcation of opinions which they regard as vitally inconsistent therewith. Here, then, are two apparently contradictory absurdities. How can we escape from the mutually destructive negations to which they seem to shut us up? There is, it is true, a third position, or what appears at first thought to be such. It may be urged with much force and plausibility that it is a radical misconception of the functions of the teacher to suppose that it is any part of his duty to maintain the truth or falsity of any one disputed theory in science or theology as against all others. It is, of course, impossible to deny the tremendous influence which an able teacher brings to bear, whether he will or no, upon the minds of those who are placed for months or years under his instruction, during the most susceptible stages of their intellectual growth. A student of more than ordinary independence of mind may now and then dissent from the conclusions of a professor of the stamp indicated, but the chances are ten to one in favour of his not only adopting the views of his admired teacher, but continuing to hold them during life, or a large part of life. But what those views may be in regard to any specific point is, so far as the student himself is concerned, usually determined for him by circumstances over which he has no control. Reasoning along such lines many might reach the conclusion that it is no part of the teacher's business to indicate to the student what his own personal opinions are, in regard to disputed points or conflicting theories,—that his duty is rather to put before him, with all the impartiality of a judge on the Bench, the *pros* and *cons* touching each moot matter and leave him to mature his own conclusions at his leisure. Every capable teacher no doubt finds it advisable to do this from time to time in respect to what he may regard as minor questions. But the difficulties in the way of such a course in matters which are deemed of radical importance are many and formidable, and too obvious to need particular mention. Especially is this the case in matters theological. After a good deal of pondering we confess ourselves unable to see more than a single clue, and that not a wholly satisfactory one, to lead us out of the labyrinth in which our cogitations bid fair to leave us. The whole question must, we fear, be relegated to that large class which, by their very nature, do not admit of a general and categorical answer. It belongs to the moral plane in which mathematical demonstrations and universal canons are alike inadmissible. The truth, or if not the absolute truth, the practical and practicable solution, lies between the extremes. That is to say, each case will have to be decided by itself on its merits. Responsible managers will have to act on their own responsibility with reference to the individual case, being amenable, first, to their own judgment and conscience, secondly, to those whose representatives they are in the discharge of their trust, and, thirdly, at the bar of public opinion. As a humble unit in the great mass which constitutes the latter, we venture to doubt whether, even assuming the erroneousness of Dr. Workman's personal opinions on the point in dispute, and admitting a certain degree of injudiciousness in his mode of propagating those opinions, greater

injury to the cause of truth is not likely to result from the sympathy sure to be aroused by his arbitrary dismissal and the consequent suspicion that the orthodox view in the case cannot be trusted to free discussion, than could possibly have resulted from the Professor's continued championship of an error which the ablest writers and logicians in the church were free to discuss and expose.

IT is encouraging to those who are looking forward to a time when hearty good-will between employer and employed shall be the rule rather than the exception, to observe a tendency on the part of thinkers and professional men to pay more attention to industrial problems. There is still far too much ground for the regret expressed by Professor Ashley in his lecture on Saturday afternoon at the University of Toronto, that these problems are so much neglected by the well-to-do and professional classes. We are glad that such men as Mr. Houston and Professor Ashley are doing what they can to arouse interest in them. They are more closely related than almost any others to the welfare of society, as expressed in the formula "the greatest good of the greatest number." A considerable part of Prof. Ashley's lecture was very profitably devoted to explanation and commendation of the "Boards of Conciliation," which are now playing so important a part in preserving peace in several very important industries in the Mother Country. These boards of conciliation stand in pretty much the same relations to the two parties concerned, in times of peace, in which boards of arbitration stand in times of industrial war. The lecturer was hearty in his commendation of the latter boards as a means of settling disputes after those disputes have culminated in strikes or lock-outs. He expressed surprise and regret that they were not oftener resorted to in this country, but explained the fact on the ground—no doubt partially correct—that industrial development has been later in this country, and that we are but now arrived at the stage of progress in respect to such questions which was reached in Great Britain twenty-five years ago. But as an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure, Prof. Ashley rightly exalted the board of conciliation above the board of arbitration, as a means of preventing the great losses in money, time and temper on both sides, which are the result of strikes. Indeed, with capable and qualified representatives of both parties on such boards, it would be very difficult for a strike to be brought about. It is interesting to note, too, that Prof. Ashley, in common with nearly all the political economists of the time, admits the usefulness and even the necessity of labour unions as the only means whereby the workingmen can enforce their rights, and denies that the forces of supply and demand can be relied on to secure them their just wage. Such admissions really mark a great step forward in the direction of industrial peace based on the only sure foundation of righteousness. Prof. Ashley, as reported, was emphatic in his condemnation of "that extraordinary hybrid of extreme individualism and extreme socialism which is known as land nationalization," and expressed also the opinion that profit-sharing, as a means of overcoming the dangers incident to the wage system, suffers from several fatal defects; the first and most formidable of which is that it does not even profess to meet the essential difficulty—the determination of the ordinary wage. Without undertaking the defence of the land nationalization theory, we may query whether it may not have a basis in natural justice which can hardly be swept away by a combination of epithets? As to the profit-sharing, we should like to suggest whether the first fatal defect above-mentioned may not rest upon an assumption in reference to its sphere which its thoughtful advocates would not admit. We were under the impression, moreover, that the last returns laid before the British Parliament indicated, not indeed satisfactory progress, but a measure of success such as to render the outlook for its future much more hopeful than Prof. Ashley's words would indicate.

SEEING that Rossendale has long been known as a strong Liberal constituency it would be easy to overrate the significance of the triumph of the Gladstonian candidate, in itself. The mere fact of the victory would have surprised no one who was acquainted with the character of the electorate. It is, we believe, an open secret that Lord Hartington's return after his secession to the camp of the Unionists would have been impossible but for an act of grace by Mr. Gladstone himself, who naturally did not care to see his old and valued colleague defeated. It is, therefore, only when we consider the

largeness of the majority in the present case, indicating as it does a change of side on the part of more than 1,300 voters, and when we remember that this is but the latest of an almost uninterrupted series of Gladstonian triumphs in the bye elections of the last two or more years, that we are forced to regard it as what it is claimed to be by the victors, an almost sure presage of the result of the approaching general election. Assuming the reliability of this prognostication, one can well understand that the breath of an old-fashioned English Conservative must almost be taken away as he takes in the full meaning of the coming changes. We say "changes," for though Home Rule for Ireland has front rank, it is far from being the only radical measure to which such representatives as the newly elected Mr. Maden stand pledged. Rossendale is largely a Nonconformist constituency, and Mr. Maden is committed even more distinctly, if possible, to Disestablishment in Scotland and Wales, than to Irish Home Rule. The same thing is no doubt true of nearly all the other candidates who have been elected on the Gladstonian ticket. But disestablishment in Wales and Scotland will be but the prelude to disestablishment in England, as is easily foreseen. If one did not shrink from becoming a prophet of what many would regard as an accumulation of deplorable ills, he might go on to say that home-rule for Ireland means home-rule for England and Scotland also, at no very distant day. It is quite possible that many of our readers may live to see each one of these great changes a fact accomplished. When we remember how many other changes almost equally radical in character have taken place in the United Kingdom within the last half-century, without having brought in their train the destructive evils foreboded by those who feared and fought against them, we may perhaps be justified in adding that those who see these changes will also, probably, see the British constitution still stable and the British Empire still flourishing in more than its pristine glory.

A PAINFUL fact in connection with the horrors of the Russian famine is the tardiness and comparative feebleness of the efforts put forth in other and more prosperous countries to succour the perishing. This is particularly noticeable in those English-speaking countries like Great Britain and the United States, and, let us not forget to add, Canada, which have always been found ready heretofore to contribute liberally for the relief of distress, wherever found. Of course the reason of this comparative indifference to the awful sufferings of the starving millions of Russia is not far to seek. It is to be found in the peculiarities of the Russian Governmental system and its administration. Not only has no official intimation been given to friendly Governments that the demands of the occasion were likely to overtax the resources of the nation and that help would be gratefully accepted to save the lives of the wretched inhabitants of the famine-stricken districts, but it has, up to within a few weeks, been apparently doubtful whether contributions in aid of the sufferers would be permitted to enter the country. So far as we are aware no satisfactory assurance has even yet been given by the Russian authorities that aid in money or food would be distributed as speedily and as judiciously as possible. Still further the notoriously inefficient and corrupt character assigned by almost universal consent to the Russian officials made it extremely doubtful whether the bounty of pitying foreigners would ever reach its destination, if entrusted to official hands for distribution. It was also for a time doubtful whether private philanthropists would be permitted to carry on relief operations on their own account. Now, however it, is understood that no obstacle will be thrown in the way of Count Tolstoi and his family and others who are striving so nobly to mitigate the horrors of the situation in the famine-stricken districts. There is, therefore, no longer any reason why those in every land who have means to bestow and hearts to feel for the miseries of their fellow-beings, should not do their best to send food to the famishing. This is being done to some extent in England and the United States. But so far as we are aware, no organized or systematic means of collecting and forwarding the offerings of the charitably disposed has been provided in Canada. This is a reproach to our humanity that should not be permitted longer to exist. If only some well-known person or society, whose name would be accepted as a guarantee for the right and prompt disposal of gifts placed in their hands for this noble purpose, would volunteer to receive and forward contributions and have this fact made widely known through the newspapers and otherwise, we cannot