

QUEEN'S COLLEGE * JOURNAL.

VOL. XVIII.

KINGSTON, CANADA, MARCH 7TH, 1891.

No. 9.

Queen's College Journal

Published by the ALMA MATER SOCIETY of Queen's University in TWELVE FORTNIGHTLY NUMBERS during the Academic year.

JAMES BINNIE, M.A.,	-	-	Editor-in-Chief.
J. W. MUIRHEAD,	-	-	Managing Editor.
A. E. LAVELL,	-	-	Business Manager.

The annual subscription is \$1.00, payable before the end of January.

All literary contributions should be addressed to the Editor, Drawer 1104, Kingston, Ont.

All communications of a business nature should be addressed to the Business Manager.

IN this issue we present the portrait of Prof. Goodwin. Since his connection with Queen's the chemistry department has made rapid advancement, and the science course of which it forms a part is now one of the most popular in the University. The increased demand for science masters in Ontario at the present time makes it important that still further advances be made. The opening of the new Science Hall next session will give a fresh impetus to the work and provide excellent advantages for both students and professors. Prof. Goodwin is deservedly popular not only among his own students but among all who have the privilege of his acquaintance. A brief sketch of his life is given in another column.

* * *

The religious papers have recently been calling attention to what is variously termed "New Theology," "Higher Criticism" or "New Apologetic." With regard to the points in dispute we express no opinion; but we think the criticism might be more temperately written. If those who hold what are considered heterodox opinions are sincerely seeking the truth, they should receive warm sympathy and encouragement. If they are not sincere, nothing will please them so much as to be savagely denounced by professedly orthodox writers.

In any case, the sarcasm, the denunciation, and the calling of names which has been indulged in by some who have taken the position of champions of orthodoxy is wholly out of place. Such a procedure has a strong tendency to make all fair-minded people distrust the candour of those in it, and to question whether he who "argues!" in such a manner is confident of the truth of his own position. A still more serious result is likely to

follow such action. For when ordinary people hear an advocate abuse the plaintiff's attorney, they are almost certain to conclude that he himself has no case. Hence they are led to doubt the truth of a view which has to be defended by such improper means.

We have much pleasure in publishing, in another column, a criticism of our criticism of Father Huntington's lecture in Journal No. 7. While we cannot quite agree with the conclusions of our critic, we think many who discuss social and political questions might learn a lesson of moderation and brotherly kindness from the spirit pervading the article. As this is a subject of great importance a few points may be referred to.

"Fidelis" considers it a half truth to say that the institutions of a country represent the convictions of its citizens, and that the only way to get better institutions is to make the citizens better. We still regard it a whole truth in the connection in which we used it. No doubt a good law or a good institution reacts upon the citizens who passed the law or established the institutions and so helps them to a more complete social life. But we are unable to see how, under representative government, a law could be passed or an institution established unless the majority of the community were convinced that the law or the institution was a good one. Our critic is a sufficiently keen observer to note that all the evils in society spring from selfishness. Will the Single Tax system, or Free Trade, or Reciprocity, or Imperial Federation or any thing of that kind take away that selfishness? We think not. When a majority of the citizens are convinced that a certain course of action is wrong, they will pass a law to make it more difficult for the minority to continue in such a course; that is all a law can do. But until the selfishness of men is to some extent overcome, they certainly will not pass a law which opposes that selfishness, and that is what we meant when we said "When men are better we shall have better social and political institutions, but not before."

Again, "Fidelis" says the Single Tax theory is not put forward as a *panacea* for all social disorders, but simply as a measure tending to alleviate some of those disorders. Regarding this point, we wish to say that we were not discussing the Single Tax theory and did not deny that it *might* give some relief. What we were criticising was Father Huntington's lecture, and we understood him to mean (and both our city papers reported him as saying substantially) that the theory in question would right almost all social wrongs. To hold this opinion of any such theory is to consider it a *panacea*. In such a connection