

upon. But more than that, his presence among the clergy was a never-failing healthy stimulus to advancement in every right direction, but especially in learning, and both by private advice and in the periodical meetings of the clergy for conference and study Dr. Carry's counsels and his discriminating recommendations of books were of the greatest value.

To the general public Dr. Carry was best known by his letters in the public press. His letters were upon all sorts of subjects—literary, educational, social, ethical as well as religious. Their masculine vigour, originality and outspoken boldness, as well as the charm of their style, made them very captivating. Anything like a complete account of his letters is, of course, impossible. Among the most important were those on the controversy with Rome, and which won for Dr. Carry the title of the Littledale of the Canadian Church.

But that which formed the crown and glory of his life were the twelve letters printed simultaneously a few months ago in four or more of the leading secular newspapers of Canada, upon the reunion of the separated bodies of English-speaking Christians. They were his glory and crown, not because of their great ability and profound learning; not only for the marvellous way in which he marshalled and disposed of the difficulties of the problem, showing the reunion to be practicable even from a High Churchman's point of view, without sacrifice of principle on any side, but more because of the beautiful spirit which everywhere pervades them—their moderation, their conciliatory tone and temper, their generous consideration towards others.

There remains one more side of Dr. Carry's life to be touched upon, without which this sketch would be incomplete—his table talk. His power as a conversationalist was one of his most excellent gifts. The flow of his talk in the social circle was simply delightful, and though full of variety in its subject matter, playful and jocose, always instructive.

Mention has been made of Dr. Carry's learning. In the writer's judgment he was the most exactly learned divine on the continent. In every department of sacred learning his knowledge was exact. He had a sound acquaintance with the Hebrew and Syriac languages; and besides his familiarity with the Greek and Latin classics, which he kept up to the end ("I am reading an ode of Horace every day," he wrote some months back), he had an intimate acquaintance with the ecclesiastical Greek and Latin writers. His knowledge of Biblical exegesis and criticism was extensive and exact. But not only sacred learning, in all literature he was extensively read. His especial delight, however, was in poetry, indeed his mind was essentially poetical, and he was himself a verse-writer of no mean order.

In estimating Dr. Carry's character, everyone at all intimately acquainted with him would put first the transparent honesty of his nature. One could thoroughly trust him. And next, his fearlessness, or rather, his courage. But what especially bound his friends to him was the affectionateness of his nature, his unusually warm and loving heart. His greatest craving was for affection and sympathy, and where it was offered he returned it with interest a hundred fold. The highest quality of all was the depth and power of his personal religion. His personal faith in the Incarnate Saviour was simple and entire. There lies before the writer a MS volume of his prayers, mainly intercessory, extending over more than thirty years. If one did not otherwise know it, an hour spent over this sacred relic would convince anyone that Dr. Carry was essentially a man of prayer.

His health had been much broken for several years, and he knew that he was liable at any moment to be summoned away, and often spoke of it. His death, instantaneous from heart failure, as he was on his way to give the Blessed Sacrament to a sick parishioner, was a veritable *euthanasia*. Port Perry, from which he will always be called *Johannes a Portu* (as he once called himself in a flash of wit), holds his mortal remains. But, take him for all in all, shall we ever look upon his like again?

PROGRESS AND POVERTY.

THE first public lecture of this year's series was a criticism of Henry George's theories of the causes of poverty and the remedy for its removal, by Principal Grant, of Queen's University. The lecturer was introduced by the Dean, who reminded the audience of the lecture which Principal Grant had delivered from the same platform some years ago on Robert Burns. After remarking on the contrast his present comparatively dry—though most important—subject presented with a sketch of the Scottish poet—the lecturer plunged into his criticism. We ought to criticize with great sympathy, he said, those who try to alleviate social evils. A man who has once believed in a theory is its best critic. He had been "almost persuaded" when he first read Henry George's book. He knew nothing of the subject, and the book captivated him and set him thinking and reading other works. After a time he found Henry George wrong, first on one point, then on another, though he lost none of his respect for the zeal and earnestness of the man. His followers say his book has never been answered, and if you attempt to do so, they cry out that you own land. The lecturer remarked that he did not own an inch. In his own language, he "was not such a fool." In such a case they put you down as a bond-slave of the ruling classes. So easy is it to believe, so hard to examine justly any question or answer. People like a simple remedy; Morrison's pills are well known as an example of this. We are told that the simplicity of Mr. George's remedy is a sign of its truth. But the more complicated society is, the more difficult will it be to heal it by any one simple remedy.

Let us then examine Henry George's thesis, his starting point. The proposition which he sets out from is that in the present state of society, material progress actually produces greater poverty. With our present state of things there can be no cure for poverty. Where the machinery is most perfect and wealth most abundant, there is found the greatest pauperism. Now the first question one naturally asks is—has Mr. George proved the fundamental assertion from which he starts? Now when we examine the facts, we see that everywhere the very reverse of his primary thesis is the case. He uses the argument, *post hoc, ergo propter hoc*. The case is similar to the fact that when railways are spread over a new country, the tramp comes after them. But the tramp was not created by the locomotive; he came to steal a ride on it, it attracted him. So where population is densest, and riches are most abundant, there the tramp or pauper can get most support with least work, can beg more, and so he swarms thither. The deepest poverty is not found in civilized nations, but in barbarous communities, as we may see by comparing Canada as it is now with what it was in the time of Champlain, or by looking at "Darkest Africa," where the land is as rich and fertile as possible. The life of the poor in civilized countries, bare existence as it is called, would be thought the height of luxury among barbarians. Figures prove the contrary of Mr. George's theory, showing that poverty is not as rife as formerly, and that by the distribution of