nothing which affects the well-being of humanity foreign to my sympathies." One can easily contrast with such an ideal as this the kind of men whom we might expect as the product of such institutions as Dr. Harper has in mind. "Save me from the man of one book!" exclaimed a certain philosopher. May we not all with equal fervour exclaim, Save us from the man of one science, be it politics, biology, electricity, or whatever you please.

"But what are we to do?" we can fancy the perplexed educator crying out, almost in despair. Time was when the motto "something of everything and everything of something" might have served tolerably well as a guide to effort. But with the multiplication of the sciences and of the range of possible acquirements in a thousand directions, the youth who is kept at a general course until he knows something of everything will be in danger of becoming grey-headed before he is ready to commence the herculean task which remains. We quite agree with those who maintain that there is often a sad waste of time at our schools and colleges. Dr. Harper's statement is strong and probably extravagant when he says that as many men have been injured by college training as have been helped, but we do not doubt that a good deal of positive injury often results from wrong or defective methods at college, to say nothing of enormous waste of time in barren work. But we are persuaded that a good deal of the contempt showered by Dr. Harper and other representatives of the great universities upon the tenth-rate colleges is misdirected. To our thinking, based upon some observation, the opinion of another is much nearer the mark, who says that the "small colleges often do better work for the boy than the more pretentious university." But we often find ourselves disposed to question seriously whether the college is not made altogether too much of an educational fetich in these days, with the rigidity of their courses and the multiplicity of their professors. The idea that there can be no liberal education apart from college and university is itself a mistaken and mischievous one. It may be questioned, too, whether the specialist is not taking the place of the educator, to a most injurious degree, for it is notorious that the specialist is often the man least fitted by mental structure and habit for the work of education proper.

All such questions, interesting and pertinent as they are, would carry us far beyond our assigned limits. Within those limits we can only hint at what seems to us to be the direction in which the answer to the practical problem we raised a moment ago is to be found. Specialized colleges and courses in universities, as many and as thorough as possible, for the trained student in the pursuit of a special science or other study, but not for general liberal education. For the latter, which should always be preliminary to the former, it should not, after all, be difficult to select a certain list of what are in their nature pre-eminently adapted to be used as culture studies, and the more interesting and practical these are the better. But, above all, for English students the English language and literature, the language incidentally studied as necessary to the literature, will afford material and scope for an almost ideal culture. The English literature happily covers the whole field of science and philosophy in itself. Happily, too, college tutors and professors, though very helpful when of the right stamp, are by no means indispensable to the acquisition of this culture. The only thing really necessary is to read the literature, to read it intelligently and to read it widely. The two processes which will thus be carried on *pari passu*, of thinking great men's thoughts after them, and thinking one's own thoughts beside theirs, are the really essential educational processes, and whoever will may use them.

RECIPROCITY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA.—II.

PRODUCE OF THE FARM.—It is in connection with this branch of the commerce between the two countries that special interest is displayed, and many different opinions are held as to the probable effects and balance of advantage likely to result to either country from a new reciprocity treaty.

Agricultural products (exclusive of animals and their products). During the last year of the former treaty, 1865-66, the value of farm produce exported from Canada to the United States was $13,298,008; consisting of wheat and flour, $6,718,272; barley and rye, $4,618,868; oats, $908,158; peas, $328,670, and other lesser articles. During the year 1866-67, although the treaty had expired, and customs duties had been imposed by the United States on almost all kinds of farm products, the exports of these commodities amounted to $11,185,227, or nearly as much as during last year of the treaty. These exports consisted of wheat and flour, $5,897,287; barley and rye, $3,780,788; oats, $492,175; peas, $512,528, and other articles.

Wheat and flour. The large exports during these two years were attributable partly to effects of the war, and partly to deficient wheat crops in the United States, owing to which that country imported from Canada more wheat and flour than it exported to Europe. Conditions have completely changed, the productions of wheat in the United States having increased so enormously that, during the years 1891-92 and 1892-3, it has exported in wheat and flour equal to about 400 million bushels, and is carrying over into next season an unprecedentedly large surplus of old wheat. The quantity of Canadian wheat taken for consumption in the United States in 1890-91 was only 5,404 bushels, and in 1891-92, 9,308 bushels; of flour in 1890-91, 623 barrels; in 1891-92, 527 barrels. During the six years, 1886-87 to 1891-92, Canada has imported from the United States for home consumption, 452,231 bushels wheat, and collected duties thereon, $67,837; flour, 742,341 barrels, collecting duty thereon $398,220.

Reciprocity or free trade in wheat and flour could not possibly now produce such sales by either country to the other, as would affect prices in either market. It might possibly create a larger interchange, especially of wheat, as millers in either country might find it advantageous to import special qualities for the purpose of blending with their own wheats. In this respect free trade would be advantageous to both countries. At present the millers of Ontario and Upper Provinces have almost the exclusive supply of flour for Quebec and Maritime Provinces. Under free trade they would be exposed to keen competition from Western States millers and from the flour dealers in United States seaboard cities. It is very doubtful whether they would obtain from free access to American markets for their flour an equivalent compensation for the competition in trade with the Lower Provinces. A decided advantage resulting in free trade in grain and flour, would be in the release of exporters and millers from the vexatious delays and petty expenses now incurred in their shipments in bond to Europe.

Barley and Rye. During the years of reciprocity, and even for some time afterwards, the trade in barley in Canada was not considered of sufficient importance to require special entry in the customs returns, and it was combined with rye. There is a great deal of erroneous impression among the farmers of Canada with respect to the barley trade. The large crops and high prices are generally supposed to belong to the reciprocity years. On the contrary the first barley crop of much importance, as to extent and value, was that of 1865, which both as to yield and quality it far surpassed that of any previous year, and owing to partial failure in crop of United States, it brought good prices. Even then, the total quantity of barley and rye exported during 1865-66 was only 6,355,191 bushels, average value per Trade and Navigation Returns, 73 cents per bushel. In the following year, 1866-67, the crop in Canada was again large as to yield, but of poor quality. The exports of barley and rye were 6,882,776 bushels; value, 59 cents. The exports to United States were not all available there, and from one-fourth to one-third of this quantity was exported to England for feed. The seasons for the highest prices for barley in Canada were 1868-69, 1873-74, 1874-75 and 1878-79, during all of which the United States duty was 15 cents per bushel. Owing to the generally favourable returns for the barley crop, its production in Canada rapidly increased until, in 1889-90, the United States imports from Canada had risen to 11,827,000 bushels barley and 213,135 bushels malt. Simultaneously with the increase in production in Canada there had been also a large increase in acreage in the United States. The production had began to exceed consumption; prices declined; and the exports in 1889-90 only averaged 50 cents per bushel. In the spring of 1890, Canadian farmers very generally reduced the barley acreage, so that the imports into the United States during 1890-91 only reached 5,076,471 bushels. The McKinley Bill went into operation in October, 1890, and caused another reduction in Canada's barley acreage, so that the imports into the United States again fell off, being for the year 1891-92, 3,144,918 bushels, price averaging about 60 cents per bushel (of which only 2,384,000 bushels were taken for consumption), the balance being exported to Europe. In