

in intellect and in morals. We say in morals, for it is a mistaken notion that Carlyle's doctrine of "Might is Right" did not have regard to the moral consequences of the acts of those he would fain make the "Real Rulers." On any other view, how could he consistently cry, as he ever and sincerely did, that God's will in all things should be supreme? Might, he saw, was endowed with courage and with purpose; its correlative in his eyes was wholly ignoble. In Carlyle's opinion, as Froude remarks, no remedy lay in political liberty: anarchy alone lay there, and wretchedness and ruin. "The battle," he adds, "is no longer even to the strong, who have at least the one virtue of courage; the battle is to the cunning, in whom there is no virtue at all." Hence Carlyle's apotheosis of Might, for in Might was wisdom, according to his conception of its essence and being. The wisest and the ablest he always associated together. His theory, properly understood, was that Right inherently was mighty, and that Right was the one thing the world wanted, and whether it wanted it or not, Right would prevail. This view is set forth in the 33rd Chapter of the 2nd Volume of Froude's Biography of Carlyle, which we commend to the perusal of all who have any difficulty in regard to Carlyle's political gospel that "Might is Right." Says Mr. Froude:

Carlyle was often taunted—once, I think, by Mr. Lecky—with believing in nothing but the divine right of strength. To me, as I read him, he seems to say, on the contrary, that, as this universe is constructed, it is "Right" only that is strong. He says himself:

"With respect to that poor heresy of Might being the symbol of Right 'to a certain great and venerable author,' I shall have to tell Lecky one day that quite the converse or reverse is the great and venerable author's real opinion, namely, that Right is the eternal symbol of Might: as I hope he, one day, descending miles and leagues beyond

his present philosophy, will, with amazement and real gratification, discover; and that, in fact, he probably never met with a son of Adam more contemptuous of Might except where it rests on the above origin."

ART EDUCATION.

THE Report of the Minister of Education on Art Schools would be satisfactory reading and valuable for reference were it not such a diffuse mass of compilations with some omissions. It naively states that "Art in this country has long been considered as an amusement or a luxury." Educators and others, whose opinions are of weight and value, have thought otherwise, maintaining that an art instruction was the necessary complement of a polite education. It might just as well be said that in this country it has long been considered that a University Education was an amusement or a luxury. The Report immediately affirms that "Art is not the privilege of a class, but is individual and universal, and that there is no department of science, or art, or industry where it is not called into requisition," p. 233. A list of industries benefited by Art Education is given, but its applicability to many of them is not apparent. For instance, screw factories would be benefited by a knowledge of drawing and colour on the part of the employes who run the machinery for turning out screws. The same could have been said of barbers and wig-makers, but these industries have unfortunately been overlooked. A computation is also given that over 150,000 persons are employed in the Dominion to whom drawing and painting and modelling would be highly beneficial. It would have been better to have given the statistics for Ontario.

It is briefly stated that "the Ontario Society of Artists, which formerly had charge of the Ontario School of Art,