

evidence of the Minister's estimate of his actions, that it is well understood that, so long as the professor continues a book-builder and book-pedlar, Mr. Crooks would give him no place on the Committee.

2. That there should be a Rotation of Examiners.

This, after a coy delay, Mr. Crooks has also accepted.

3. That there was grave reason to suspect Mr. Kirkland and Dr. McLellan of collusion in the matter of Examinations.

It is known that Mr. Crooks himself admits the propriety of the conduct of those who brought the matter before the public. But the reconstruction of the Committee would itself be a sufficient proof of the correctness of the stand taken by the opponents of these parties.

4. That there was also grave reason to believe that there had been collusion between a publishing firm and certain members of the Committee.

No sane man now doubts the truth of this assertion. The whole course of events since the charge was made indicates this most unmistakably. It is true that Dr. McLellan was "whitewashed" at the Investigation; but he was subsequently left off the University Senate by an intelligent constituency, in a contest in which this was the question at issue. Further, the advisory functions of the Central Committee have ceased, and when authorization is to be considered, the Minister consults outsiders or his own sweet will. All the preceding facts are known to the public; but there are others besides connected therewith, which are peculiarly gratifying to the authors of the movement against Mr. Crooks's maladministration, and which convince them that their course has had the approval of honest and honourable men. We unhesitatingly assert that Education owes a debt of gratitude to the opponents of the Committee as at first constituted. Their efforts have produced results of inestimable value to the profession at large, and they have reason to be proud of the stand they took against recklessness and incompetence.

But what are we to infer from Mr. Crooks's

attitude on the question of the appointment? If, as his course of late has shown, he practically admits the propriety of their conduct, is he justified in offering these gentlemen an uncalled-for insult, especially when none of them was an applicant for the vacancy? Is it to be understood henceforth that one of the qualifications for office under Mr. Crooks is indifference to the interests of Education, or abject subservience to Departmental caprice? We hold, first, that, admitting the correctness of the Minister's attitude, he has acted unadvisedly in publishing his reasons. Garrulousness is as much a misfortune as ineptitude. Secondly, that the official revival of the Scandal will provoke more ill-will and stir up bitterer feelings than anything that has since occurred. The responsibility of the resurrection of this foul-smelling episode in his career will now rest on the Minister, and he cannot blame in others what he has sanctioned by his own conduct.

So far, however, as Mr. Hodgson is concerned, no blame can attach to him; and it would be iniquitous to visit on the servant the sins of the master. He has our best wishes for his success, and may securely count on the support of the conductors and owners of this journal, so long as he discharges his duties as Inspector with the ability and zeal that have characterized him as a Master. Many, no doubt, will feel chagrined that their claims have been ignored; that long experience and marked success under trying circumstances have not weighed with the Minister. They must, however, remember that matters might have been far worse; and that the judgment of Mr. Crooks as to their respective claims will be regarded with respect only by those who have forgotten the matter of the University appointments.

THE LATE DEAN GRASSETT.

"The blind, indiscriminate hand of common death" has once more, in our midst, shown us its relentless work. One by one the men of valour and truth who have served the Province from its infancy are passing away. So long meeting together at the