

in such transactions. It would seem to be but fair that the capital invested by the State should at least rank with any other capital in the distribution of profits. We do not see why the people should be called on to share the risks involved without deriving a right to a corresponding share in the rewards. This objection seems to us to lie with even increased weight against the bonus system, as applied to such enterprises as that under consideration. The Dominion Government already offers a cash bonus of two dollars per ton for pig iron manufactured in Canada. Let the Provincial Government add a similar amount; assume that the furnace when erected puts out the minimum amount of the manufactured article, viz., 100 tons per day, for 300 days in the year. The result is that the taxpayers of Canada will be called on to pay no less than \$120,000 a year into the coffers of a private company, which, unless the advantages of the industry are greatly over-estimated, could hardly fail of itself to provide a profitable investment to its owners. The public advantage is, we shall be told, to be looked for in the employment that would be afforded by such an industry to a large number of labourers. We have seen no calculation as to the number of men whom a furnace of the capacity indicated would require to carry on its operations, but from the foregoing it appears that the sum to be given as bonuses by the two Governments would pay the wages of 300 employees, at an average wage of \$8 per week. May it not well be questioned whether a manufacture which cannot live without so much extraneous support is really worth the outlay? Is there not, too, a serious discrepancy between the conditions as described, providing the tests proposed should show satisfactory results, and the amount of bonusing asked for? This leads to the further enquiry whether there are not other important conditions indispensable to success, which are not dwelt upon sufficiently in the petition. We do not profess to speak from any special knowledge of the iron industry, but it seems to us that conditions no less essential than those of the quality and abundance of the ores, and the existence of other facilities for manufacture, is that of a sufficient market accessible within such distance as would make it feasible to transport to it so heavy a product, in competition with other sources of supply. We are strongly inclined to doubt the soundness of the bonusing system under any circumstances, but we feel certain that in this case the public will need to be satisfied that the absence of a sufficient open market is not at least one of the chief causes of the unwillingness of capitalists to invest without such Government aid as would go far to counterbalance any advantage to be derived by the people generally from the establishment of the industry, before they will consent to tax themselves so freely in aid of a private company undertaking it.

SO far as at present appears, the recommendation of the Committee on Works that Charles M. Rust be appointed City Engineer, at a salary of \$3,000 per annum, with power to call in Mr. Jennings as Consulting Engineer, affords a satisfactory solution of the existing problem. Mr. Rust, though comparatively a young man, is undoubtedly possessed in large measure of the qualifications necessary to the efficient discharge of the duties of the office. He is a man of high personal character, of fine engineering ability, and of large experience in the service of the city. He is an enthusiast in his profession, a fact which in itself is, if not a pledge of success, at least a very important factor in producing it. He possesses also, we are informed, in good degree another very valuable qualification for such a position, viz., tact in the management of those under his direction, and the ability to combine kindness with firmness in proper proportions. Some of the most important works which must occupy the attention of the City Engineer for some years to come will be those connected with the improvement and extension of its sewer system, and this is, we understand, the department of engineering to which Mr. Rust has given special attention and in regard to which he is specially well informed. The salary proposed is moderate and would afford a considerable margin for the employment of such assistance as might be thought advisable in the case of any specially great or difficult undertaking, though it is not clear that it would be either necessary or wise to leave it entirely to his option to call in Mr. Jennings whenever he might deem it desirable to do so. It might, perhaps, be as well to retain both the choice of an adviser and the responsibility for consulting him in the hands of the civic authorities. We are the more inclined to hope that the recom-

mendation of the Committee may prevail because the promotion of tried and faithful men, whenever expedient, is the soundest principle in the making of such appointments.

IT is satisfactory to learn that the arrangements for the Ontario exhibit at the World's Fair, to be held next year in Chicago, are progressing hopefully. Mr. N. Awrey, the Commissioner for the Province, issued, a few weeks since, an invitation to producers, stock-breeders, agriculturists, manufacturers, fruit-growers and others, to send in their applications for space in the Ontario section of the great fair. The appeal was so well responded to that at last accounts Mr. Awrey was making arrangements for a large increase of space in Chicago. There can be no doubt that it is from every point of view, and in the highest degree, desirable that the products, resources, and capabilities of the Province, and indeed of every Province in the Dominion, should be set forth conspicuously at the great fair. No such opportunity for advertising our country and its resources throughout the world is likely to occur again for a decade. In order to accomplish this result in the best possible manner so far as Ontario is concerned, Mr. Awrey needs and invites the hearty co-operation of the citizens of the Province at large. The case is one in which the interests of the Province as a whole and the interests of the individual producers of all classes so closely coincide that there is every reason to hope that Mr. Awrey and his coadjutors will not fail in their laudable ambition to make the Ontario exhibit on this occasion far surpass the very creditable display made at the Centennial in 1876.

GREAT credit is due to the Quebec Government for its heroic resolve to resort to direct taxation for the delivery of the Province from the financial straits in which the recklessness and extravagance of successive administrations have placed it. It may indeed be said that their courage is but the courage of necessity, or of despair, but none the less will they deserve well of their fellow citizens, and of their fellow countrymen all over the Dominion—for the interests of the Provinces are so bound up one with each other that the calamity or disgrace of one must bring calamity and disgrace to all—if they succeed by brave, straightforward measures in saving the Province from the threatened crisis. It is not easy to conceive of a much worse financial showing than that of a corporation whose main reliance is upon a fixed income, when the charges over which it has no control have been brought up to a point at which they exceed that income. Hitherto it has been the custom for Quebec to rely upon securing an increase of subsidy for deliverance from her straits. It is indeed pretty certain that matters would never have been allowed to reach the present pass but for the confidence felt by the Provincial rulers that, as a last resort, they would again be able to force such an increase from the exigencies of rival parties. It is no small point gained that the Provincial Government and Legislature now realize clearly that it is hopeless to look again for help from this source. The people of Quebec are no doubt poor, but the probability is that if their repugnance to the system, or rather, as *La Presse* suggests, to the name, of direct taxation, can be so far overcome as to allow of this method being fairly tried, they may find it quite possible to raise even the large sum required to make ends meet, without suffering any such terrible distress in consequence as their imaginations may at first picture. *La Presse* is probably not far wrong in saying that "if political parties had not in the past used the expression 'direct taxation' as a scarecrow for the elections, the people would have long ere now demanded this manner of raising revenue in preference to all others." Owing, however, to the deep-seated prejudice which has been engendered by the means indicated, there can be no doubt that any measure of direct taxation sufficiently severe to meet the requirements of the situation will be received with great aversion, and the administration which is forced to resort to it will have to run the gauntlet of a formidable popular outcry when it next comes before the electorate for a new lease of power.

THE proceedings of the Presbyterian General Assembly of the United States, which has been in session during the last two or three weeks, has revived the public interest in the famous Briggs controversy. Two distinct points seem to be involved in this discussion. There is, first, the question of heresy or orthodoxy. This touches Dr. Briggs' relation to the Church and its theological courts. But notwithstanding all the breadth and warmth

of the controversy which his teachings have evoked, it appears that no distinct charge of heresy has hitherto been formulated against him, in any of the ecclesiastical courts of the denomination. A Committee of the New York Presbytery was appointed to consider his case and report. It reported in effect that there was no cause of action. The report was accepted and the Committee discharged. Some members of the Presbytery, however, were dissatisfied with this result and appealed directly to the Assembly, instead of to the Synod, the next higher court of jurisdiction. After prolonged and most animated discussion, this appeal was sustained by the Assembly and the New York Presbytery instructed to try the case. This decision has the effect, as we understand it, of postponing any direct action by the Assembly on the question of Dr. Briggs' alleged heterodoxy until another session, after the Presbytery shall have had an opportunity to try the case and report. Meanwhile the recent publication of a volume containing some of the principal lectures and papers of the accused, which have given rise to the discussion, will give every one who has sufficient interest in the controversy an opportunity to study his views and arguments in the only fair way, that is, in his own words. A peculiarity in the writings and addresses of the accused professor is that instead of posing as a theological reformer, or claiming to have received some new light on the points under discussion, he generally maintains that his are the accepted doctrines of the Church, or its leading divines, through the ages, while those doctrines and dogmas which his opponents quote against him, and by which they seek to condemn him, have really no historical existence older than the Puritan theology.

A DISTINCT source of the trouble in which Dr. Briggs is involved arises out of the relations of the General Assembly to the Union Theological Seminary, in which he is a professor. This seminary exists, it appears, on an independent foundation, and is not in any sense the property of the Presbyterian Church, or under its control. The right of the Assembly to interfere in the matter of its teachings is derived from an agreement made in 1850 in virtue of which the Seminary, in order to possess itself of the advantages derived from a quasi organic union with the Presbyterian Church, agreed to give the General Assembly a power of veto over the appointment of professors. Pleading its right under this agreement, the Assembly a year ago vetoed the appointment of Professor Briggs to the chair which he now fills in the Seminary. The Seminary has refused to recognize the veto, claiming that the agreement referred only to the appointment of new and additional professors, and did not affect the position of those already on the staff, and that as Dr. Briggs was already a member of the faculty and was merely transferred from one chair to another, the Assembly's veto power does not apply in this case. The directors of the Seminary also memorialize the Assembly, asking to have the agreement of 1850 annulled. The Assembly insists on its veto, refuses to permit the Seminary to withdraw from its compact, and offers to submit the question of the relations of the Seminary to the Assembly to arbitration. Thus the case stands at present. The *Christian Union*, which strongly champions the accused professor, intimates that the Seminary will take no notice of the action of the Assembly, but will retain Dr. Briggs on the staff, and assert its former independence, at the loss of whatever advantages may accrue from connection with the great Church which this Assembly represents. It even intimates that it is doubtful whether, under the trust, the giving to the Assembly or any other outside body a voice in the management of the institution is not illegal. The further progress of this remarkable controversy will be followed with interest by people of all denominations, and with sympathies varying according to their individual views of the freedom which should be accorded to theological students and teachers in their philosophical and biblical researches.

#### UNIVERSITY MATRICULATION IN ONTARIO.

MR. SEATH, Inspector of High Schools, has done well to publish in pamphlet form the important and valuable paper on University Matriculation in Ontario, which he read before the Ontario Educational Association, at its recent meeting in this city. The educational reforms advocated in this paper may be said, with sufficient accuracy for our present purpose, to be two: first, the unif-