

cannot be far distant. Should that settlement be followed by a lowering of some of the barriers to profitable trade which now exist on both sides the line, it would be a sensible and profitable arrangement for both parties.

COMMENTING on the tendency of growth by the cities at the expense of the rural districts which has marked the progress of the last forty years in the United States, the *National Economist*, which is published in Washington and is the thoughtful and well conducted organ of the Farmers' Alliance and other agricultural unions, sets out to seek for the cause. It finds it in "the simple fact that the laws of the country and the regulations of society and business have made the various lines of business conducted in the cities more successful and prosperous than agricultural pursuits." "This," says the *Economist*, "is a very simple reason, but it is a good one, and is sufficient to produce the result seen. The people may always be depended upon to find and follow such lines of business as are the most profitable, and if the conditions of the country are such that effort will secure a greater reward when expended in the city than like effort expended in the country, the tendency will always be toward city occupation, in spite of the most specious arguments to the contrary. Self-interest rules the masses, and it should rule them. Any reform worthy the name should be of such a nature that it will conform to this fact before it deserves success." It may be readily admitted that the legislation referred to is one of the potent causes of the phenomenon. Confirmation of that view is afforded in the fact that the same tendency did not become marked in Canada until after the adoption of her "national policy," at a much later period. But it may well be doubted if the one cause is the only one or adequate to the whole effect. Others have combined with it. One of the most potent is, no doubt, the wonderful improvements in labour-saving machinery, and as a consequence of its growing complexity and expensiveness, the failure of the small rural and village factories, and the tendency to manufacturing on an immense scale, such as is only possible in great commercial centres. But the point to which we meant to call attention is the evidence afforded by such an organ and such writing—for the *Economist* goes on to point out the changes in legislation which must be demanded in the interests of the agricultural communities—that the farmers in the United States are becoming organized and powerful, and are bringing to bear upon legislative questions an intelligent influence which must hereafter be reckoned with, and will not fail to leave its mark upon the legislation of the future.

VICE-CHANCELLOR MULOCK AND PRINCIPAL GRANT.

AT last Principal Grant has received some sort of attention from the University of Toronto. On a very great occasion the Vice-Chancellor of the University took the opportunity of pouring out the vials of his wrath upon the Reverend Principal of Queen's, and now the battle has begun in real earnest. If the Vice-Chancellor had been a little less angry, he might have seen that he had hardly touched the points of Dr. Grant's contention. Let it be remembered that what Dr. Grant insisted upon was not more numerous or more difficult subjects of examination, but that the work should be better done; also, that there was need of concert between the Universities, that some kind of unity of action might be secured; and finally, Dr. Grant complained that no notice had been taken by the University of Toronto of the appeal of Queen's University.

As far as we have remarked Mr. Mulock takes no notice of the imputation of rudeness on the part of his University or its Senate. We are, therefore, bound to believe that, in this count, he pleads guilty, or perhaps it may be that he regards rudeness on the part of a great institution like the University of Toronto to a weaker one like Queen's to be no act of impropriety, but something, under the circumstances, quite legitimate, or even meritorious. If so, the theory can be defended neither on Christian ground, nor on the principles of ordinary good behaviour which are accepted by men of the world. However, we may let this pass. It belongs to the accidents, not to the substance, of the matter in hand.

The Vice-Chancellor finds fault with Dr. Grant in two respects. In the first place, he complains that the Principal has proposed two different ways of meeting the actual difficulty, or rather that he proposed one and immediately afterwards abandoned it in favour of another which was proposed by Professor Dupuis of Queen's. Surely this is the strangest complaint. Principal Grant made it quite

plain that he was not at all desirous of reaching his end by any particular method, but only of reaching it. If there were difficulties about his first proposal, he was quite willing that something simpler or better should be devised. Only let us get quit of our present evils, and any lawful method of accomplishing this deliverance may be accepted. It is rather hard upon Dr. Grant that this readiness of his to give up his own proposal should be imputed to him as an offence.

The Vice-Chancellor complains that the original suggestion of Principal Grant, that the Universities should combine to devise some common scheme which they might together carry out, would be, in effect, to place a large portion of the education of the country "under denominational control;" and the most terrible results might be expected to ensue; for that control might be extended "until the whole system should have passed beyond the reach of the people's responsible representatives, and have become an element of discord among our people to the destruction of the whole system." We are a little sorry to draw attention to these remarks, because they show temper on the part of the speaker; and indeed the whole speech was evidently prepared and delivered under a feeling of irritation. It is really nothing less than absurd to draw such inferences from the very natural suggestion of the Principal. There was not the least necessary connection between his proposal and the denominational usurpation of power which the Vice-Chancellor seems to have anticipated. But at any rate, the proposal seems now to be abandoned, so that there was no necessity for dwelling upon its dangerous character, except for the purpose of having a fling at an adversary.

With regard to the proposition of Professor Dupuis, we will only say here that it seemed to us, on the whole, a scheme that might be worked quite easily and most usefully. In some of its details it might be modified; but, in its general design, it would certainly have the good effect of putting an end to all these unseemly squabbles as to the comparative standards of the different Universities. It does not seem of much use, for the present at least, to discuss it further, as the University of Toronto appears to have retired upon its papal *Non possumus*. The Vice-Chancellor is good enough, however, to wind up this part of his philippic with the asseverance: "Far from this University opposing the adoption of a general scheme founded on sound principles, I may say that it would heartily co-operate in order to the attainment of so desirable a result." It is impossible to say how much or how little these words may signify. We are quite sure that if the University of Toronto will honestly act in the spirit of them, Dr. Grant will cheerfully endure the rough handling to which he has been subjected at the hands of Mr. Mulock.

In the second part of his address the Vice-Chancellor proceeds to carry the war into the camp of the enemy; and to prove that it is the Queen's standard and not the University which is the lower. There is a great appearance of sincerity and *bona fides* about this part of the Vice-Chancellor's oration; and yet the fallacy involved in his argument is transparent. He first attaches his own meaning to Principal Grant's complaints, and then he proceeds to demolish that meaning. Let this point be made clear. Dr. Grant did not complain, as we understand him, either that the subjects of examination were not numerous enough, or that the papers were too easy. He complained that the standard of examination and passing was too low, that candidates were accepted who did only one-fourth of of the paper.

It will be easy to illustrate this point by what the Vice-Chancellor says of the examination in Latin for matriculation. It appears, from his speech, that the only persons who objected to the present standard were persons connected with Queen's University. Now, at first blush, this would seem to put the Queen's people out of court. We have no communication on the subject with those whom Mr. Mulock indicts; and therefore they are in no way responsible for any remarks which we may make on the subject. Now, simply reading what was spoken by Principal Grant on the one hand and by Vice-Chancellor Mulock on the other, we find no difficulty in understanding the perfect consistency of those who at once want the demands upon the candidates to be somewhat lowered, and yet the standard of examination to be raised. What they really want is, less pretension of scholarship and more reality, less work to be done, but what is done to be better done. Has Mr. Mulock ever seen the papers of those unfortunate young men (and women) who matriculate in classics at our Canadian Universities? Does he know that a good many

of them are very imperfectly acquainted with their Latin Grammar? Is he aware that a great number of them are unable to write simple Latin prose? And these unfortunates are required to bring up, we know not how much of Latin and Greek authors, and are supposed to be able to translate and parse them all before they can matriculate!

It is well that the Vice-Chancellor should have brought forward this particular instance, because, instead of its overthrowing Dr. Grant's contention, it does in reality confirm it. We do not want cram and pretence. We want good, solid work, a foundation upon which the structure of education can be soundly built; and we are not getting this at present, but we are getting the other, as many of the teachers in our High Schools are abundantly testifying. It cannot be otherwise. We are trying to cover too large an area, and we can do so only in such a manner as to have unsatisfactory results.

The Vice-Chancellor has apparently got up his case with great care and industry. He passes on to the examination papers of the different Universities, criticizing the comparative difficulty of those set in English Grammar and Mathematics. But here again he is only illustrating the point which we have been urging. We have taken the trouble to examine the English Grammar paper set for the University of Toronto last year, and nothing could better illustrate Sir Daniel Wilson's remarks on such examinations in the March number of the *Canada Educational Monthly*. The learned President said that he was sometimes unable even to understand some of the questions set in those papers, much less to answer them! And this from a gentleman who was, for many years, Professor of English in University College.

We did not wish to make these remarks in any way personal, we forget even the name of the examiner; but we have been required to look at the papers; and we deliberately affirm that some of them were, at least one of them was, absurd and ridiculous. There are many highly educated English scholars who would be puzzled to answer several of the questions, and a good many of them could be answered by persons not knowing English at all. If the Vice-Chancellor knew that youths who spell very badly are crammed to answer technical questions in philology, he would be less proud of these methods. Yet such is the case; and it is against this kind of thing, as seriously imperilling our whole educational system, that Dr. Grant and others who agree with him are contending.

It is probable that, before these lines come under the public eye, the controversy will have gone beyond the point at which we now find it. Let it be remarked, therefore, that Dr. Grant is responsible for nothing which is here written. We take the statements of both sides simply as they are before us and make our own comment upon them. Whether the authorities of Queen's will accept our position is a matter of comparative indifference. What we are contending for, and what we believe they are contending for, is soundness, reality, common sense in our educational methods, instead of pretence, imposture, and rottenness. This is the main thing.

MONTREAL LETTER.

THE Victoria Rifles Armoury was the scene of an incident unusually suggestive in our economic life a few evenings ago, when the Rev. Dr. Edward McGlynn lectured on "How to Abolish Poverty." The reverend gentleman, of New York fame, told his audience that he stood before them to talk to them of worldly matters, not in spite of his priestly ministry, but because of it. The Church regards it as her duty to nourish poverty, he looked upon it as his to abolish it. He drew a distinct line between abolishing poverty and abolishing charity. Charity should live for ever. Poverty is a disgrace for ever. He came before them as a priest, not as an ex-priest. He took his stand on a secular platform to prevent men from being estranged from God because they believe there is a lack of sympathy among the clergy about the needs and rights of humanity. The Church is like an army thinking only of nursing the sick and coddling the weak, with neither time nor thought for the brave and the strong in the battles they are fighting. Poverty is degrading. Carlyle had called it the Englishman's hell. The Church had exalted it, and would like us to believe it a school for the development of the heroic virtues. He had no hesitation in pronouncing it an unmitigated source of vice and crime. With an increase of wealth, the march of civilization seems to bring in its train an inevitable increase of want. Hood wrote his "Song of the Shirt" in London, under the shadow of the metropolis of the world, and in the noontide blaze of the prosperity of the nineteenth century.

The remedy Dr. McGlynn believes to be in "the land for the people." God had given it to the people, and not to a favoured few, and all improvements should go to the good of the people and not for the special over-enjoyment