

MCGILL UNIVERSITY GAZETTE

Friday, May 9th, 1884.



CONTENTS:

	PAGE.		PAGE.
THE UNRECORDED VOTE	1	CORRESPONDENCE	6
EDITORIALS	1-3	COLLEGE WORLD	6-15
STUDENTS' PARTING SONG	3	BETWEEN THE LECTURES	15
CONTRIBUTIONS	3-6		

TRENHOLME, TAYLOR & DICKSON,
Advocates, Attorneys, &c.

18 HOSPITAL STREET,
MONTREAL.

R. W. TRENHOLME, M.A., B.C.L. A. D. TAYLOR, B.A., B.C.L. W. E. DICKSON, B.C.L.

WM. B. S. REDDY, B.C.L.

Notary Public,

Commissioner for the Provinces of Quebec, Ontario & Manitoba,

118 ST. JAMES STREET.

MAGMASTER, HUTCHINSON & WEIR,

→*ADVOCATES*←

Barristers, Solicitors, &c.

162 ST. JAMES STREET,
MONTREAL.

DONALD MAGMASTER, Q.C. M. HUTCHINSON, B.C.L. R. S. WEIR, B.C.L.

GREENSHIELDS, MCGORKILL & GUERIN,
ADVOCATES,

Barristers, Attorneys, Solicitors, &c.

CHAMBERS: EXCHANGE BANK BUILDING,

109 St. Francois Xavier St.,

MONTREAL.

J. N. GREENSHIELDS. J. C. MCCORKILL. EDMUND GUERIN.

CHARLES CUSHING, B.C.L.

HERBERT S. HUNTER, B.C.L.

Notaries, Commissioners, Conveyancers, &c.

→*MARRIAGE LICENSES ISSUED*←

No. 110 ST. JAMES STREET.

→*A. PEZARD*←

Law Bookseller,

IMPORTER AND BINDER,

71 ST. JAMES ST., between Place d'Armes and
St. Lambert Hill, MONTREAL.

SPECIAL TERMS TO STUDENTS.

JOHN HENDERSON & CO.
Hatters and Furriers

283 NOTRE DAME ST.

Fur Coats, Caps & Gauntlets

Extra Quality Goods at Lowest Cash Prices.

The "McGILL" Ribbon for sale.

→*WM. HILL*←

Practical Hair Dresser.

→*ROOMS AT*←

No. 1828 St. Catherine Street,
St. Lawrence Hall, St. James St.,

—AND—

Exchange Hotel, Point St. Charles.

Shaving Tickets at Reduced Rates, good at any of above places.

WM. FARQUHARSON,

Merchant Tailor,

NO. 185 ST. PETER STREET,

BETWEEN ST. JAMES AND CRAIG STREETS,

MONTREAL.

MILITARY UNIFORMS A SPECIALTY.

SURGICAL INSTRUMENTS

A FULL STOCK CONSTANTLY ON HAND

IMPORTED DIRECT

— FROM THE —

LEADING MANUFACTURERS of the WORLD.

→*AN INSPECTION INVITED,*←

LYMAN SONS & CO.

384 ST. PAUL STREET.

UNIVERSITY GAZETTE

Vol. VII.]

McGILL COLLEGE, MONTREAL, MAY 9TH, 1884.

[No. 10.]

McGILL UNIVERSITY GAZETTE.

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE:

Consulting Editor—E. LAFLEUR, B.A.

J. R. MURRAY, B.A., '86, Law. H. S. McLENNAN, '85, Arts.
W. H. TURNER, '84, Arts. W. W. WHITE, B.A., '86, Med.
J. W. MOFFAT, '84, Ap. Sc. S. FORTIER, '85, Ap. Sc.
F. McLENNAN, B.A., '84, Law. WYATT G. JOHNSTON, '84, Med.

THE UNIVERSITY GAZETTE is published fortnightly during the College Session.

Rejected Communications will not be returned, to which rule no exception can be made. The name of the writer must always accompany a communication.

THE UNRECORDED VOTE.

At the gate where gentlemen make the laws,
She stopped one wintry night;
And she wrapped her cloak close—how it tears, how it gnaws,
That hunger, with cruel spite!
And marvelled why the gay beam flashed from the tower's stately height.
O'er the distant streets, o'er the lanes and squares,
The great eye circled round;
And she thought, as she gazed, if the eye of God stares,
So far, far above the ground,
So cold, so clear; not half way up and the cry of woe is drowned.
And the people surged in the entry there,
For party was at stake;
And the whips were worn out with the worry and care,
And all for the party's sake:
Men said the Ministry was doomed, when the Opposition spake.
Yet again the cheers ringing sharp and shrill,
From gasping throats upsent!
And the loudest of all for the member whose Bill
Was startling the Parliament:
Her feeble cheer—she knew not why—with the multitude's was blent.
In the land the poor shall for ever be,
The Christ said that of old;
But they ought to abide where the rich cannot see,
Away from the marts of gold,
Away from Senate's lordly pomp, where the nation's fame is scrooled.
With affairs of state famous "statesmen" dealt,
The crisis met its hour;
And the Whig fought the Tory, and Saxon fought Celt,
With boast, in the pride of power:
The hearts of yore were beating still; thei great England ne'er should cover.
'Twas a grand debate, and the House was thronged,
With Commoner and Peer;
And they swore that the flag of their country was wronged,
Away in the southern sphere:
The woman crawled and huddled down by the bridge's pathway near.
And the night crept on, and the votes were cast—
The old regime was dead;
And the beam flashing round lit her face as it passed—
The soul from its pangs had fled;
And silent rose to God's white throne where the deeds of state are said.
Montreal. CHAS. E. MOTSE.

Editorials.

Following the custom of all editors at the close of our labours we turn and look back upon the course of events since we were entrusted with the management of the GAZETTE in September last. In this retrospective view nothing seems to us to call for special notice, for the session just closed may shortly be described as prosperous and uneventful.

During the year all must have felt the absence of our respected and renowned Principal. Dr. Dawson could not but be missed by the Governors and Professors, as well as by the Undergraduates of the University, and all, we are sure, will be glad to welcome him back amongst us. We have taken great pleasure during the winter in following his movements in Europe, and although the College was deprived of his teaching and his counsel, yet we were glad to know that his health was being recruited and that he was enjoying a well deserved holiday amongst pleasing scenes in the Old World. He was especially fortunate in being able to be present at the great meeting recently held in Edinburgh—the greatest meeting, perhaps, of representative men in all departments of knowledge ever held in Britain.

But it must have been particularly gratifying to Dr. Dawson in his absence to know that everything was moving smoothly and on the whole very satisfactorily under the management of those who were called upon to fill his place. In fact, we can think of nothing which should be more gratifying both to him and to these gentlemen themselves.

The number of students entered in the several faculties during the past year was greater than at any previous time in the history of the University. In round numbers we may say that five hundred Undergraduates were in attendance. An increase took place in each of the faculties, except that of Law, in which there was a considerable diminution, but in this faculty, too, there is the significant fact to be noted that 80 per cent. of the Undergraduates were Graduates in Arts. Next session we look forward to a very considerable increase in this faculty as well as in the others, so that from this point of view the outlook is entirely encouraging.

Our losses by death were very serious. Dr. Leach referred to these in his Convocation address in such touching terms that we would fain leave what he has said without addition.

The faculty of Applied Science has made remarkable advances since last year. The number of Undergraduates was about seventy, a number not so very much short of that in the faculty of Arts. It is evident to everyone that very soon greater accommodation must be provided for this increasing body. A new building is absolutely necessary and must be provided very soon. Our readers will remember that a rumour reached us during the session to the effect that one of our wealthy citizens was soon to erect a building for the accommodation of this faculty to correspond with the Peter Redpath Museum. We hope that before we again assemble this rumour will prove to have been well founded. The number of Professors, also, in this faculty is too small, and additions will have to be made as soon as sufficient funds are forthcoming for the purpose.

As to the faculty of Medicine it may be said never to have been in a more flourishing condition. The number of students was larger than ever before, while the teaching staff received several additions and underwent several changes which rendered it even more efficient than before.

In the sporting world, too, a fair amount of success has fallen to our lot. Although our football team was not as successful in the earlier part of the season as we could have wished, still towards the close some fine playing was done by our men. Training and hard practice can alone make up for the disadvantages under which we lie in football matters, and this fact, we hope, will be remembered by the players next year. Our hockey club was also very successful, although the team did not succeed in winning the carnival cup. Next winter, however, we hope to see the cup once more in the hands of old McGill. The completion of the track round the football field is a matter for congratulation, and those who originated and carried out the idea deserve general thanks for their efforts. Unfortunately the Inter-University athletic sports did not come off last fall as was expected, but we understand that steps have been taken towards the organization of such a meeting in October next. Another matter in which we took a great deal of interest was the formation of a University Athletic Association, but no action, we are sorry to say, was taken by the Undergraduates for the furtherance of the scheme during the session. We are glad to know, however, that the sports committee intend to have this association formed early next year. The Lawn Tennis club, too, we understand to have had a very successful season.

As to ourselves, we have partaken largely of the general prosperity. Our financial position is better even than last year, and the number of our subscribers greater, whilst we have not once had a lack of matter for our columns. We have to thank many friends for kind assistance during the year, not a few of whom were people unconnected with the University. Indeed, it has been a matter of regret to us that while the Professors and many outside friends have contributed largely, but very few of the Undergraduates themselves have written for us. This is the only thing we have to complain of, and we can only hope that our successors will not have even this fault to find when they come to lay down the pen. How far we have represented the opinions of the students and advanced the interests of the paper, is a question which we shall not attempt to answer. We shall be content if we shall be found to have improved the paper in some slight degree and to have extended its influence. The Graduates, we are glad to be able to state, have this year evinced much greater interest in our welfare than heretofore, and we have several times discussed questions in our columns of especial interest to them. Amongst these was the proposal made by us for the formation of a University club, a proposal which met with very warm approval, and which we hope soon to see carried out by the committee of the Graduates' Society. At the annual meeting of this Society held a few weeks ago, the desirability of forming a joint-stock company to take over the management of the *Gazette* was discussed, and a committee appointed to enquire into the question. What the decision of this committee and of the students upon this matter will be we do not know, but in any case we ask the present subscribers to the UNIVERSITY GAZETTE to continue their interest in the paper in the future.

It has been a matter of very general remark and of general congratulation also that during the past session our Medical School has been amply provided with subjects, and this without the enactment of revolting scenes hitherto very common in this city. For this grateful change we have to thank the Provincial

Anatomy Act passed about a year ago, and amendments to which are at present under consideration at Quebec. For the first time in the history of this province grave-robbing has been entirely unknown, and the army of resurrectionists has died out because the circumstances which before made the desecration of graves necessary, have now ceased to exist. Nothing, in short, could be better than the results of the wise legislation of last year. But we are very sorry to say that there are not wanting a few individuals of quasi-philanthropic tendencies who are attempting to get up a war-cry against this Act which has already done so much for public decency. Some of our daily papers, notably the *Herald*, have lent themselves to this most unreasonable agitation. In its deceitful old age the *Herald* has taken to raving, and when not occupied with the Grand Trunk or the Court House, the Anatomy Act forms the subject of its hysterical editorials. Two things it admits, first, that it is absolutely necessary that subjects for anatomical dissection be provided for our medical students; second, that "body-snatching" is an abomination. But very illogically it goes on to attack the Act which provides subjects and prevents desecration. The Act must be done away with because the aged inmates of our charitable institutions, receiving Government aid, are tortured by the thought of what will become of their poor bodies after death. This is all, of course, a matter of sentiment, but the *Herald* is a great believer in sentiment. It confesses that what it says "is nothing but sentiment, and sentiment is the largest and best part of human life." But by sentiment the *Herald* understands "right feeling based upon good sense," a rather remarkable definition. But after all this screeching what does this defender of the *heart* as against the *head* demand or suggest? The editor expresses a fear that the students are too prone to be lavish or wasteful with their material, and suggests the propriety of substituting a wooden model for flesh and bones. At all events he thinks one subject should suffice to meet the requirements of a complete anatomical education! One is rather surprised, after such suggestions as the above, that the amendment to the Act demanded by our sentimental friend, should be so very mild as they are. After all his thunderings he only asks that the permanent inmates of our charitable institutions be excluded from the practical operation of the law, and that the time allowed for the claiming of bodies be somewhat extended. Not very much opposition, we imagine, will be made to these amendments. The harm which some good people do with the very best of intentions is very great indeed, and amongst such good people we must class those who are worrying themselves over the imaginary ills resulting from our Anatomy Act. The harm done, however, is by no means lessened by the action of these people being defended on sentimental grounds, even though the sentiment be supposed to be based on good sense.

At the recent meeting of Convocation several most important addresses were delivered. The subject treated by Dr. Johnson is one which is at present engaging the attention of all educationalists, and it cannot be denied that the experience of our Professors affords evidence of a very material character upon the point at issue. We were glad to see that the address referred to was published in full in one of our daily papers. The address of the Venerable Archdeacon Leach we ourselves give in this number. It will be read with pleasure, not alone because of the importance of its subject matter and the gracefulness of its expression, but also on account of the deep regard in which

our cultured Vice-Principal is held by every person connected with the University.

We congratulate Principal Dawson and the University at large upon his reception of the honorary degree of LL.D. from Edinburgh University. At the recent tercentenary celebration the *Senatus Academicus* chose over one hundred savants for distinction in this way, amongst the number being James Russell Lowell, Dr. J. S. Billings, Asst. Surgeon-General, U.S.A., Prof. W. A. Green, of Princeton, and Dr. Forlyce Barker, of New York. All must be sensible that, through Dr. Dawson, a great honour has been conferred upon our University.

We are glad to see that the Sports Committee has at last taken some action in the matter of a University Athletic Association. We understand that the draught of a constitution has been drawn up, modelled on the constitutions of similar Associations at Harvard and elsewhere, and that it is to be submitted to the Undergraduates in September next. We sincerely hope that the efforts of the Committee will be successful, and that the existence of the Association will be inaugurated with an entirely successful Inter-University meeting.

We must once more raise our voice against the way in which our College grounds are neglected. No sooner had the snow disappeared from the surface than the noble array of nurses invested the north side of the campus, and their small, but indefatigable, charges proceeded to kill the young grass by playing cricket while the ground was still quite wet. But we have come to look upon this part of the grounds as belonging not to the University but to the Montreal nurses, and we hitherto consoled ourselves with thinking that the other side, at all events, might be used by us without our being warned off by some ticket holder. But this year we are informed that the whole position must be given up to the enemy. The Montreal Football Club began to practice before the ground had recovered from the effects of the snow and water, but the damage which they did was infinitesimal compared with the mischief and annoyance caused by about a hundred small boys who have formed a juvenile football club, and call themselves the "Young McGills." We are informed that the Registrar has apportioned a large space to this band, and refuses to allow them to be dislodged as they all pay fifty cents or so per annum for their privileges, and the impetuosity of the authorities will not allow this fruitful source of revenue to be cut off. So much does this bring in that half of one porter's salary, we believe, was once realized in an unusually prosperous season. Notwithstanding all this we have the temerity to express our opinion that this bonanza should be foregone, and all nurses and small boys confined to one side of the field if allowed in at all.

STUDENTS' PARTING SONG.

Tune:—*Vive la Compagnie.*

Come, all jolly students of any real worth,
Vive la compagnie!
 And roll our glad chorus right heartily forth.
Vive la compagnie!
 Chorus:—*Vive la, de.*

The spring calls to us with witching looks,
 "There's something far better than grubbing 'mong books,"
 The Muses—fine ladies!—from far we admire,
 But give us the girls that set hearts on fire.

The Greeks and the Romans were men we revere,
 But we've had quite enough of them now for a year.

For Logic—we rather would reason like fools,
 Than learn any more syllogistical rules.

Of phosphorus, sulphur, and that sort of stuff,
 Pfu! long ago, surely, we've had *quantum stuff*.

O'er the field of geometry no more we'll roam,
 But work out the problem to make tracks for home.

Contributions.

THE MORALITY OF SHAKESPEARE.

[Portions of a paper read before the Shakespeare Club of Montreal, February 4th, 1884.]

"Love's Labour's Lost" betrays many an evidence of youth. It contains that minuteness of detail, particularly in regard to quip and pun, which the immature mind displays in lieu of comprehensive and manly thought. In so far as it indulges in these, it follows the distinctive bent of the age in which it was produced. It comes down to us, too, as the most Euphuistic of Shakespeare's plays. But this does not prevent it from being serious, nor from concealing behind abstruse grotesqueness a moral that is equably sustained. The nature of that moral has already been glanced at: The folly of taking things as they ought not to be taken, of making empty unrealities do duty for sober fact. Words are presented to us instead of deeds; shadow instead of substance.

In order to relieve the weariness of a life that is essentially unnatural, in order to vary the monotony of study—and it will be observed that study forms the staple of the new régime both in *Love's Labour's Lost* and in the *Princess*, though from different causes and with different motives in either case—there shall be laughter for king and lords. Fashionable mirth shall alternate with gravity. A man of words fantastical,

"A man in all the world's new fashion painted,
 That hath a mint of phrases in his brain"—

the Spaniard Armado, is to relate stories of romance. A most imposing person, that Armado! Yet is he weak in exact proportion to his imposingness. His intellectual food is wretched stuff—mere mental milk and water of the poorest quality. He is attended by a satellite, Moth (*i.e.* motie) who has to supply brains to his master. Notice the dialogue in Act I. sc. ii., where Armado and Moth appear for the first time: "Boy, what sign is it, when a man of great spirit grows melancholy?"—"Comfort mo, boy. What great men have been in love?"—"Is there not a ballad, boy, of the King and the Beggar?" Armado feels that Moth is "quick in answers" and Shakespeare feels that both of them are instruments for showing the inner purpose of which he never loses sight. In the spectacle of the *Nine Worthies*, the little page takes the part of Hercules—disproportion here between show and substance. The Spanish Grandee with his fine exterior and his affected mannerism is little better than a bird of gaudy plumage, after all. There is unreality and disproportion even in *clothes*:

ARM.—By the north pole, I do challenge thee.
 COSTARD.—I will not fight with a pole, like a northern man; I'll slash 'till do it by the sword. I pray you, let me borrow my arms again.
 DEMAIN.—Room for the incensed Worthies!
 COST.—I'll do it in my shirt.
 DUM.—Most resolute Pompey!
 ARM.—Gentlemen and soldiers, pardon me; I will not combat in my shirt.
 DUM.—You may not deny it: Pompey hath made the challenge.
 ARM.—Sweet bloods, I both may and will.
 BIRON.—What reason have you for't?
 ARM.—The naked trunk of it is, I have no shirt; I go woolward for penance.

The ladies, with practicalness and unconventionality that throw them into marked contrast to the men, help to display the reverse side of matters and to reveal the weakness of the other sex. There is much wordy talk of the show sort between the King and Lords about their love. Their wooing shall have an element of unreality, if possible; they will press their suits in disguise, as Muscovites. But the wood are forewarned, and

are quite equal to the occasion. They change favours and produce rare confusion. The scheme of the Lords is upset from the beginning, and even little Moth, their herald, falls a victim to contradictory fact.

MOTH.—“All hail, the richest beauties on the earth!”

BOYET.—“Beauties no richer than rich ladies.”

MOTH.—“A holy parcel of the fairest dames.”

[The Ladies turn their backs to him.]

That ever turn'd their backs to mortal views!”

BIRON.—“Their eyes,” villain, “their eyes.”

MOTH.—“That ever turn'd their eyes to mortal views!”

“Out!”

BOYET.—“True; ‘out,’ indeed.”

MOTH.—“Out of your favours, heavenly spirits vouchsafe

Not to behold!”

BIRON.—“Once to behold,” rogue.

MOTH.—“Once to behold with your sun-beamed eyes, with your sun-beamed eyes!”

BOYET.—They will not answer to that epithet;

You were best call it daughter-beamed eyes.

MOTH.—They do not mark me, and that puns out.

At the end of the play, penance. The men are for wedding straightway. But that would never do, so they are commanded to face reality without further hesitation. The King is sent off to a hermitage; to some spot where he can examine his intent wisely, and where no theoretical plans or distractions of the Armado type can militate against the soundness of his conclusions. The others are sent into the world itself, and all for a twelve-month. As for Biron, the scornful, half-cynical element in him is to be corrected by an acquaintance with the sorrows and nauseousness of a Hospital, for Elizabethan Hospitals seem to have been “terrible places to work in.” Such then is the conclusion, and although we may say that the women are light enough, and cannot for a moment be compared with the immortal creations that stand in the Dramatist's later work, yet light as they are, they will at least marry sense, and not monastic-Italianate sentiment. And the Don? How does he fare? “I am a votary. I have vowed to Jaquenetta to hold the plough for her sweet love three years.” For three years! And for Jaquenetta, of all people! And the plough! Perhaps we had better leave Love's Labour's Lost with Don Adriano de Armado at the plough-handle.

[I am indebted to the lectures of Prof. Henry Morley for some of the ideas regarding Love's Labour's Lost. What was said concerning a Midsummer Night's Dream need not be repeated, as it would mainly be a résumé of matter already in print.]

CHAS. E. MOYSE.

A PLEA FOR THE CLASSICS.

It has become the habit recently of many who idolize the practical to sneer at classical studies. Most of those who do so, however, have not had the advantage of a thorough training and sound drill in them. They are, for the most part, men who have been shrewdly successful in “getting on” in the money-making sense of that phrase, and who, taking full credit for their sagacity, exclaim against any education which does not directly aim at being effectively useful in promoting what they denominate “the main chance.” This is a false way of judging of the matter. As a man who has been blind from his birth would be but a bad authority on the use of eyes, and not a very good adviser upon optical contrivances, so a man who has not been subjected to the academic discipline of classical study cannot rightly adjudicate on the question. The converse argument, which may be hinted, will not, however, hold; for as a man who is blessed with eyesight can easily experiment upon the evils of blindness, by the simple process of shutting his eyes, so can the person who has diligently studied the classics dismiss, *pro tempore*, the associations he has acquired through them, and ask himself what his condition would have been if he had been deprived of all those sources of joy which classical studies have supplied him with? It would perhaps seem as ungenerous as the twitting of a blind man with his sightlessness, were we to attempt to enumerate the various elements of benefit which arise from the prosecution of a diligent perusal of the works of the chief writers of Greece and Rome, and from that special kind of attentive thoughtfulness which is cultured in man by

acquiring a knowledge of the syntax and construing of the ancient languages. We might enlarge at some length on the improvement in one own's language attainable by endeavouring to fix in the mind the various fine gradations of meaning implied in the accurate translation of exquisite productions of the authors usually read in schools and at college; on the power of comparison elicited by the constant need of dismissing the ordinary associations of our life from our minds, and living, in idea, the life of the times of other far-distant years, that we may get at the standing place for a good view of the meaning of an author; and on the minute and sedulous care which requires to be habitually expended on the authors studied, to acquire a mastery of their meaning and peculiarities. But we shall not venture on these topics. Nor shall we ourselves venture on an estimate of the worth of the literature of the old ages. As an unexceptionable witness on the advantage of Greek culture, we might cite Milton, who in his “Paradise Regained” has left us an eloquent tribute to the excellence of the language of Greece; similar evidence might be adduced as to the value of Roman literature. We need not, however, do more than advert to the names of Horace and Virgil, Cicero and Caesar, Sallust and Livy, to show that there are noble associations connected with and derived from the classics of Rome. Classical literature possesses a real worth and an intrinsic value. This renders it specially fitted for being used as a storehouse of the materials for imparting to our youth the mental wealth of knowledge. As classical study effects this, we assert that it finds its fit place in our course of education.

The proper place of classical instruction is to be the basis and ground work of a thorough disciplinary training of the youthful intellect in the use of language as an expression of thought, as a drill in the various methods of written style and thoughtful speech, and in the artistic shaping of ideas, so as to accomplish their purposes. The classics contain a complete round of developed thought connected with a past civilization, in which the capabilities and graces of language have been treasured up for our learning, for the refinement of our taste, and the culture of our style. To these works a vast mass of historical, geographical, and philosophical matter accrete, and they form the foundation and ground-plan on, and according to, which the young may be trained to clearness of apprehension, force and neatness of expression, and the attentive pursuit of thought through all the devious mazes of artistic language. Classics form the model studies of our youths; they are employed to form the centre of a whole net-work of associations, and for training the mind to the up-building of an idea of a whole framework of life, in which the entire development has gone from the earth. The evoking of such a power of mind, and of such methods of exercising it, cannot fail to be useful; while no one can readily doubt the advantage of possessing a full knowledge of

“All the glory that was Greece, all the grandeur that was Rome.”

In reply to those who speak in derogatory terms of classical learning, we may point to the fact, that all our most distinguished thinkers and writers have been educated through the classics, and hence their whole course of thought is tinged with the results of these studies. Often, therefore, to understand them a knowledge of classical literature is required. Almost every man who has risen to any eminence through his own exertions has lamented his deficiency in regard to classical learning. They see the advantage in clearness and consecution of reasoning which those have acquired who have been made companions of the great intellects of Rome and Greece; and they have confessed that experience has not granted to them a power of insight equal to that implied in classical training.

The poet, the warrior, the statesman and the moralist may alike find in Greek and Roman literature whatsoever is good for food or pleasant to the eye. “Lives there a man with soul so dead?” who cannot appreciate the poetic effusions of Mæonides, or of the companions and convivial guests of Mæcenas, the sad elegiacs of Ovid “to lonely Tomi banished,” or the sublimity and majesty of Sophocles, rivalled only by the tender and pathetic style of Euripides! Let the warrior admire the valour and strategy of Hannibal and Cæsar, Achilles, Agamemnon and

Hector, even though the military tactics of the soldiers of the present day be wide as the poles asunder from those of these heroes of old. Does the statesman turn away as finding nothing of service to him in steering the ship of Government? Is Solon, with his just and equal laws, to be despised? Does the construction of the Roman Republic afford him no insight into the principle of sound government? Is the experience of some of the greatest geniuses the world ever produced to be cast aside as a thing of no moment? Let the orator listen to the orations of Cicero, and as he listens admire the fiery eloquence tempered with the sound philosophy of the Roman orator; and whether it be in the public capacity of senator, or in his private disputations with his own familiar friends, he, too, will find his time amply repaid. Nor need the moralist shun the classic groves of ancient lore, as finding there nothing worthy of his special attention; to him, as to others—poet, warrior, statesman, orator and philosopher—will it be given to distil nectar from these mellifluous bowers. Say not the languages of Greece and Rome are dead; if they are they yet speak, and “as the thoughts of men are widened with the process of the suns,” we need not fear any material decay in the intelligent pursuit of languages, replete with whatever is pleasing to the taste or instructive to the mind.

“Let them be translated,” say the opponents of culture, by means of classical literature. In an objective point of view this may be tolerable, but even in that it is open to objection. Every one who has given any attention to classical studies must have felt the satisfaction to himself, as well as the superior light thrown upon the meaning of a passage after a careful perusal of the original, as compared with the tame, however faithful, English translation. But to insist on the fact of the loss sustained by the translation of an author were an unnecessary task, as it is too palpable to admit of dispute. Still let us look at this farther, in a subjective light. Suppose a perfect translation of every classic author of note were made into the English language; would not one of the principal aims of a classical education be lost? Granted that the youth has to spend many a laborious day over the acquirement of a knowledge of them (an objection, by the way, which might be urged against any branch of science), has he been acquiring nothing during all that period except the knowledge of the languages themselves? Has not his mind gone through a course of discipline the most healthy to further development? Has he not been taught to regard with precision every particle that has crossed his path? Has he not obtained a power of expression as well as been educated in the process of thinking in a manner unattainable by any other process? Have not his powers of discernment and discrimination been exercised in the highest possible degree? Have not his tastes been refined, and his whole mind moulded and fashioned in a manner fitting him at once for the prosecution of the pursuits of the merchant, the lawyer, the statesman, or the theologian?

The study of modern literature is suggested as a substitute for that of classics. Man's life is said to be too short to admit of a profitable study even of the works of men now living; how absurd, then, to spend the seventh part of a lifetime, and that the most useful for the attainment of knowledge, in the search after the truths embodied in the volumes of the ancients, when the very study of these precludes the possibility of getting acquainted with the language of our own land! “Let us take a living language,” say the utilitarians, “such as German, would not that serve the end?” Not as do the ancient classics. Go to the fountain-head at once if you want to drink the pure waters, and benefit by the health-giving influences of soul-cultivating truth; and where is this to be found in unsullied purity but in the mother languages? Besides, the very fact of there being dead languages tends all the more to the cultivation of the intellect. Memory not needing to clog herself with unnecessary burdens after the acquirements of the “beggarly elements.” The opponents of the classics argue, further, as if these languages were studied to the total exclusion of even the reading of English literature, which is contrary to fact, for are not our own classics introduced and studied *pari passu* with Homer and Virgil? But even if the schoolboy were prevented by his classical studies

from reading the English classics, the very time of his leaving school is that which may prove the most opportune for the commencement of that campaign where a solid substratum has been laid, and habits of thought formed, which should add in an infinite degree to his intelligent and beneficial pursuit of the study of the literature of his own country.

It is not to be supposed that we make classics everything, far less that we wish to exclude other useful branches of education from our schools; but we strenuously maintain that for the power of culture which they possess, and for the key they afford to other stores of knowledge—not to speak of the pleasures resulting from the study of them—no popular clamor or false insinuations as to their causing the total neglect of other studies, or the sordid desire of becoming wealthy, should in any wise incline us to reduce the standard in education of the products of the minds of men who, living in ages of heathenism, nevertheless earned codes of morality surpassed only by that revealed in the unclouded light of Christianity.

M.

“THE EVER-LIVING LIFE.”

Chance has thrown in our way a copy of a brand-new poem, privately printed for the author. It is a lucky thing for the world that at this juncture, when Alfred Tennyson is shelved with a peerage, that the author of “The Ever-Living Life” should arise to fill the gap. In many respects it is unique, and we freely confess that we never met anything like it before; and further, in many parts it is entirely incomprehensible.

We shall endeavour to cull a few specimens, in hopes that our readers will better understand the author's aim and objects than we have been able to do. The opening of the poem is lofty enough:—

“Poets! Ye, who in these regions, through these glimpses of the stars,
Whereabout this round Earth rolling with an atmosphere debars
From the sight of flesh-eyed creatures glories that supremely stay,
Where the lighted constellations up amid the ethers sway:—

Ye, who through these human regions, voices beautifully raise,
Captive of the feelings all throughout the human ways;

Ye are they who should be bearers of the topmost flowers of thought
Into human hearts, receptive ever of true beauties brought.”

Then the author falls to scolding the poets of the present day for having fallen from the “mettle of their pasture,” as

“What are these your teachings lately, through these centuries a few?
How have you forgotten grossly what the pristine poets knew?”

Ah! the tunes are not now potent with right paladins of song;
Ye, who are the poets, truly, have not made our measures strong.”

and after rating them soundly, and speaking of the later poetical productions as little more than

“Cadences on vowels tripping, smoothly consonanted all;
Rhymes of perfect termination, charming with their witted fall;”

We are told how the author has discovered a theme worthy of a great poet, and he breaks forth thus—

“Lo! I see the mighty sunbeams wielding planets in their plight,
With a mighty, long pulsation, and the daily draught of light;

And I see a theme most worthy, placeless now in human song,
Though in days of old the singers struck the *f y*-note brief and strong.”

And so our poet determines to sing the “Ever-Living Life,” and he certainly does it in a very lofty style, and he tells other poets

“Open now your eyes and see, ye that would be strong of song:
Ye that would with animation lofty lift the world along!
Open now your eyes and see, with the optics of the mind,
That within the mind you may, God, your maker, visibly find.”

He sings of Heaven,

“Where the topmost mind of all,—
Topmost mind of all that can be, wraps the universal ball
In a phosporic raiment, round and round, and round and round,
Round and round, and round and round, with the glorious raiment wound.”

No wonder that the writer becomes giddy. Again, when he talks about:

“A levitative essence in a spirit strong,”
surely can he mean “gin cocktail?”

We had marked some other passages for quotation, but out of consideration for our readers we forbear. The author tells us that

“Politics and economics are but vagaries of the brain,
Dealing with overwhelming problems, frail and visionary, vain!”

and we conclude that he has undertaken an overwhelming problem; in one couplet he tells us that
 "Simple truth alone can say it, and must briefly speak it too,
 Or the verbiage will surely mystify the blinded view."
 and simple truth compels us to say briefly that the book is the worst farrago of nonsense it has ever been our misfortune to have inflicted upon us.

Correspondence.

OUR IRISH LETTER

DUBLIN, March, 1884.

We are now half way through what is called the "Dublin Season." The Viceroy has held two levees which, though not so largely attended as last year, were quite up to the average, the military and legal professions being most conspicuous. A Fancy Ball, in aid of a Dublin hospital, has proved a great success. It was attended by more than twelve hundred people, and has brought in a substantial sum to the funds of the hospital. The question regarding the amalgamation of the two branches of the legal profession is the chief topic of conversation at the law courts. None but Barristers are permitted to plead in the Superior Courts, and a Barrister must be instructed by a Solicitor, but if there was an amalgamation the one man could be instructed by the client, and also advocate his cause, which of course would greatly lessen the expense; but cheapness has its disadvantages, and men of great experience in both branches despise amalgamation very strongly.

The Centenary of the Royal College of Surgeons, Ireland, has just been celebrated. The President (Surgeon W. J. Wheeler) entertained the Viceroy and a distinguished company at a banquet in the College.

Trinity College, Dublin, cannot boast of any magazine of general college news. The only paper issuing from it is a monthly one, containing papers written by the Fellows and Professors on classical and scientific subjects.

Ireland sustained two defeats in football this year, one from England (by one goal) and the other from Scotland. The match against England was played in Dublin, and that against Scotland in Edinburgh.

YOUR CORRESPONDENT.

College World.

MCGILL.

The meeting of Convocation for the conferring of degrees in the Faculties of Arts and Applied Science took place in the Molson Hall, on Wednesday, 30th April. The attendance of students and ladies was very large, the former being unusually noisy. The proceedings, which were very protracted, were of an interesting nature. The Valedictorians were Messrs. J. W. Pedley, B.A., and Graham, B. Ap. Sc. Addresses were delivered by Profs. Leach, Johnson and Chandler. The Hon. Judge Torrance, Member of Corporation, presided. The address of the Venerable Archdeacon Leach, D.C.L., LL.D., was as follows:—

The business of this Session has been brought to a successful conclusion, and the representative bodies—the Governors, Principal and Fellows of the University, and all the Professors—after their hard service, may be happy to interchange congratulations on that account. The Annual Official Report, with those of the Committees on that account. The Annual Peter Redpath Museum, have been published and put in the Library and the all most likely to take an interest in the University, and therefore it is only the present occasion. However pleasant it may be to dwell upon the gains some of the losses we have sustained. We are informed by men of science encouraging to believe that in the other, in whatever term or terms you may distinctively designate it, no good work ever perishes, and no good man's life is ever lived in vain. It has not been our custom to have set fame is so natural, and with the young especially so vigorous and useful, and as it is closely related to the moral consciousness, it may not be, after all, an infirmity, even in the noblest minds; and hence it is our duty, in some form, to take care that the names and good endeavours of the benefactors of our race, and among these we reckon the benefactors

of this College, shall not be hidden, so far as we can prevent it, "from the children of the generati- on to come." And I may add that for this view of unto you, wherever this Gospel shall be preached in the whole world, that also which this woman hath done, shall be spoken of for a memorial of her."

The decease of the Chancellor, Mr. Justice Day, has been spoken of twice before in this Hall—once by His Excellency the Governor-General, in graceful and appropriate language, gave us a faithful representation of his character and public services, and again by Mr Justice Mackay, with similar effect, in his formal address at the last meeting of Convocation. We are all well aware of the magnitude of our loss. Let us hope it may not be too long before we see his like again.

There is another loss to which reference must needs be made—that occasioned by the death of Dr. Scott; for there are many here who mark the absence of the erect and manly countenance, not soon to be forgotten, and whenever remembered to be associated with respect and kindly regard for the man who, for many years, endeavoured by his labours and counsel to make the Medical Faculty the eminently useful member of the University to which it is. And yet another loss in one who, for many years, was sent up a representative Fellow from the Medical Faculty. It is difficult to mention the name of Dr. Reddy without emotion. No one could have any acquaintance with him without being more than pleased with the benevolence which so full and noble mind, and the sweet fragrance of the virtue memory that recalls him.

It appears from the Official Annual Report that the number of students in the Faculty of Applied Science is nearly seventy. This expansion, during the lapse of a few years, is very significant of the progress of Physical science, and, considering with respect to the staff of Professors and the cost of the apparatus required for the work of this Faculty, we cannot sufficiently value the generosity of those who multiplied it possible for them to prosecute their work. The cost, multiplied a thousand times over that of the national wealth through the labours and science of the men from this College, along with others, of course, who have been employed in un- been supplied to the contentment of all; I allude to the element of success has Museum, which, in respect of extent and the completeness of its scientific arrangement, is an informed by a most competent authority, Dr. Egleston of New York, ranks third on the continent of America. Much, however, is still needed to complete the apparatus, and the machine for testing the strength of materials, and additional accommodation is imperative if more students are to be admitted.

This University is fortunate in another respect, for which it is indebted, Dawson. There stand affiliated to it several Theological Colleges, and these of the principal Protestant Churches in the city; and this in regard as one of the most promising events that have occurred in the history of this part of the Dominion. While it was inevitable that each should build on the like old foundations, and use the same old kind of bricks that were used by the old master builder, in the same old kind of bricks that were of their edifices, some of which, not much the worse from age, still stand — be that the same forms, and these, I suppose, with all their contents, con- petual element, the original reason of their existence at all, and that truth the per- level at the same object—the salvation of sinful men—why may not they say "Ye are brethren." Why not believe it and act upon it as far as possible? necessary to have far more about the *univitas in cetero*, that only renders it the more that the Principals, Doctors and Professors of those Colleges here meet to- gether to deliberate in common on subjects deeply interesting to all alike, part of their studies, are an indication that they together to alter a material made some progress, and gives reasonable ground to hope that it may of all rational and God-fearing men.

In this relation that too so happily subsists, we find how we have a guaranty that the physical sciences will not monopolize the activity and might of the University. The study of all kinds of learning and some sciences older than any which the Faculty of Applied Science claims as its own, must needs hold their place through all the fierce pell-mell of its own, gross, Philosophy and learning, in each successive century from the early times of Christianity, have found in the Church their hereditary seat. They are a charge entailed upon her and all her several churches which are, in a manner, incorporated with this University, have clearly shown their de- termination to assume the charge.

The Greek and Latin languages must always form a necessary part of the curriculum of students of Divinity, and we may rest nearly certain that there will always be some among them who will make these languages, and the literature which they comprehend, their special study.

For the same reason I anticipate for the chair of Mental and Moral Philosophy, I need not say additional security, for under any circumstances it peculiar interest in the subject for which it is established, the Church can- not fail to shield and maintain it; she requires its teaching both for defence and nourishment. Whatever the solidity of the rock that is her support historically, all are not equally influenced by the same representations, and speak from experience, I should say that it is the moral and spiri- tual element in Christianity—the indwelling divine spirit—that mainly per- suades and captivates the heart to believe in Christ and His obedience to His Law, no subject of study is more imperative than ethics. We need course. There seems to be a very strong belief that part of our philosophical have their origin in human invention—that that moral laws or rules arbitrarily—that any ecclesiastical council, order or synod, may make them sense, any society, company or club or clique whatsoever, may fashion them for their own convenience, and that they need no better sanction than

their own authority. Many years ago, in Toronto, a man tampering with the loyalty of a soldier of the 83rd Regiment, urged that his occupation as a soldier was "contrary to the will of God." "O no," replied the soldier's Highlander, "but ye ken the military is governed by a law of its ain." The soldier, I know, did not express all his better belief, but he found the case rather a hard one; he was no casuist, yet his words, literally taken, denoted the sin and error of prevaricating the God-given laws whence are formed derivative the conceptions and beliefs that ought universally to regulate the conduct of rational human beings. "Let us all be governed by a law of our ain" is the lowest reach of impiety or moral idicy.

The affiliation of the Theological Colleges sooner or later, if the friendly spirit adverted to prevail, may lead to some great improvement in the educational system of the province. However admirable, as compared with many others, like them, it is defective in one respect by no means immaterial. Is it not desirable that the youth of the land during their years at school should be instructed with all possible care, among the first things needful for their life on earth, in their duties to God and man? You cannot leave this to the parents; fathers are too much occupied with their business, mothers are careful and troubled about many things; the Sunday Schools are worthy of all praise, and never can be too much encouraged nor too much attention paid to the character and gifts of the teachers, and yet it will be hardly denied that it is from other schools and the academies that the determining influences come, which chiefly form the character of pupils, so far as it can be affected by external conditions. We hear it often insisted upon that some of the subjects introduced into the schools are so efficacious as intellectual training, called by a fallacious mental training, as if the former were the whole of man. In moral and religious instruction not a good kind of training? Among so many arts taught, why exclude the art of righteousness? Why refuse them the tribute that fall from the Master's table? Except on the plea of necessity, nothing can justify the exclusion of the whole of man. In moral and religious history are not very encouraging to one's best hopes, yet it does seem incredible that this necessity should be perpetual, and that so many of the kind of men connected with the several colleges and schools, all so deeply interested in the subject, many of them of much experience and devoted to the cause of public instruction, should not be able to devise some plan offensive to no man's conscience that has light in it, to supply this want—stop up this avaral gap that lies between the stage to which the present system has advanced, and the fulfilment of its end.

In the course of the summer we hope to have the honour of receiving in to the halls of the College a great number of the members of the British Association for the Advancement of Science. This expectation appears to inspire all classes with unfeigned satisfaction. I have heard no voice out of harmony with the general feeling. Many books have been lately published with the professed object of reconciling religion and science or science and religion, as if this were demanded by some peculiar necessity of the times; and apprehension of this kind seems to have existed from the beginning. St. Paul pronounces the emphatic warning—"Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit." Hence, many young persons especially may be disposed to take to some prejudice against Philosophy and Science, for they are not always distinguished, as if they were naturally antagonistic to true religion. As to St. Paul's warning, he cannot mean all Philosophy, for, in that case, what is to be said of his own. His warning is correctly given in the New Version—"Take heed lest there shall be any case that maketh spoil of you through his philosophy and vain deceit." Many of the best masters of philosophy and science and of other kinds of learning hold truth too much in honour, and love the well-being of men too well to justify the hasty conclusion that they are necessarily "against us," as some of them we are certain are decidedly "for us." So upon the whole it seems a warrantable persuasion that Philosophy and Learning will, as ever before, do good service in the Kingdom of God, and prove able auxiliaries in support of the Crown of Christ. In the meantime Cicero's advice in reference to the disputations of the Academicians and Stoics of his day, may be thought worthy of some consideration—"Let it be understood that there be between them, as it were, a neutral ground, such as the Laws of the Twelve Tables ordain shall subsist between the parties of different landlords."

There is another point which I beg leave to suggest for deliberation to the Faculties concerned. It has been proposed that those of the Faculty of Medicine and Law would greatly benefit and elevate their professions if the regular course in Arts were made imperative. If this should be judged to be impracticable, the full course in mental and moral philosophy might not occupy the time of the student detrimentally. It is a species of knowledge requisite with all well-bred and well-educated persons, and has the physician while he endeavours to remove "the perilous stuff that weighs upon the heart" physically, to take into consideration the state of the mind, and in the case of Law it is essential, supposing it to be necessary to study with any care the original principles from which all Law, except physical laws, are derived, and necessary it is, if a succession of fit and able persons is to be found to occupy the high places of the field, the statesmen of the land, and the judges, many such as we hitherto have had and have here still on the Bench, men accomplished in their special science, in all its extent, and other things, comparable to the best of any other age. So long as we have such as these there is some hope for us whatever races of men fill the future Canada.

The Graduating Classes in Arts and Applied Science were entertained at dinner by the Undergraduates in the two Faculties, at the Windsor Hotel, on the evening of the 30th, Mr. C. W. Trenholme, B.A., occupying the chair. It is unnecessary to say that a most enjoyable and a most noisy time was spent by those present. The classes graduating this year have been noted not only for their intellectual prowess, but for their fine social qualities as well. "*Oratus multa prece, nitere porro, Vale, Vale.*"

UNIVERSITY LITERARY SOCIETY.

On the evening of the 28th April the Ladies' Ordinary at the Windsor was crowded to its utmost capacity by a large audience who had been invited by the Society to attend their twenty-first public meeting where they would be entertained by, as the card of invitation stated, an

"Adres buy the President, Mr. Charles J. Doherty, B.C.L., "Dibbit: Shtad Fonetik Speling by yuzud tuu repprzent the wordz ov uwr Ingglish langwage?"

Afirmativ: { J. Ralph Murray, B.A.,
Albert J. Brown, B.A.,
Negativ: { Raleigh J. Elliot,
John F. Mackie, B.A."

So large a number did this bring together that seats were at a premium long before the business of the evening began, and many persons were content to take advantage of a seat in the corridor or a convenient wall, rather than miss the "dibbit."

The address by the President has already been published by one of our daily papers, which makes it unnecessary for us to give it here.

MR. MURRAY opened the debate as follows:—

MR. PRESIDENT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,—The subject chosen for our consideration this evening (one which at first sight may appear to many of you to be of an unpractical and uninteresting character. Those of you who have already studied and reflected upon this question of phonetic spelling, and who have carefully examined the pretensions of those who take the view of the case which it is our honour to uphold this evening, will look upon this subject with no contemptuous regard, and I feel very confident indeed that when, later on, the vote comes to be taken your decision will be instinctively given in support of a reform which you cannot fail to have recognized as reasonable and very necessary. But when I come to consider the little attention which has been paid to this question in Canada, when I remember the comparative ignorance in which many of us have lived a to the strides which the agitation for reform is making, and the proportion which it is assuming in the mother country at the present day, it is but natural for me to suppose that there are many amongst those whom I am now addressing who have hitherto looked upon this scheme of phonetic spelling as about the most impracticable which it has ever been proposed, and as one to be advocated, that the idea was entertained chiefly by cranks, or at the best was useful only as affording amusement of a literary nature to the most visionary scholars. To those who have thought thus, if any there be here, I wish to say that no more erroneous idea was ever entertained by them; and I feel sure that before this debate has come to an end they will be ready to acknowledge such to be the case. I have never been much inclined to advocate reforms as we generally understand them, simply because they went by the name of reforms; indeed, by nature and association I am opposed to all radical changes, and yet as I stand up this evening to advocate this change in our mode of spelling, I feel that the reform is no ordinary one, I feel that as it is one of the vastest social and literary importance, embracing millions upon millions of people in its effects, so, too, it is one into which I can enter with the greatest enthusiasm of which I am capable, one which I confess honour upon me to be allowed to support. Most vivid is my consciousness at the present moment of the enormous importance of this grand, this far-reaching reform, but almost as deep is the regret which is present with me that the advocacy of such a bold cause should, in such a propitious occasion as the present, be entrusted to the hands of those so little capable of doing justice to it.

As the time allotted to me is not very long, I shall content myself with giving a very general idea of the scheme of phonetic spelling as it is sought to be introduced into the English language. If I shall draw, as it were, a rough outline of the plan which we are advocating, leaving the intricacies and omissions to be filled in by my learned friend who is to support me. It would be impossible, and I think wholly undesirable for me to attempt to enter into the minute details of the technical part of this subject; nor do I desire to do so, but I think it would be well to give some idea of the full understanding of the desirability of spelling reform. Glancing at the meaning of language in general, and at the development of written language from spoken, I shall go on to refer briefly to those points in which the English language falls to come up to the ideal of a perfect written language, to those respects in which it falls short of what it ought to be. Then by drawing your attention to the disastrous results flowing from these imperfections I shall show you that reform is necessary and possible; I shall show you that if this system which we propose be adopted, the only remedy for the most important objections which may be raised to it, as a consequence of this, do a monumental service to millions of our race in this and succeeding ages. But it is not to be supposed that such a drastic improvement as this can be carried out without its encountering the sharpest criticism and the most determined opposition. We shall glance, therefore, at some of the most important objections which have been raised to the scheme, and I shall attempt to show you how these objections are almost entirely groundless, and certainly not of sufficient weight to stay the progress of this inevitable amelioration. I have not the slightest doubt that my friends on the opposition, when they come to reply will refer to some of these slim objections from their point of view, and will lay a great deal of stress upon them, but I have no fear of their imposing upon you.

Finally, I shall mention the names of a few of those who are supporting this movement in the United States, in order that you may understand that this is no mere visionary proposal which is made, but one that emanates from persons of the greatest renown, and from those possessing the greatest experience in educational matters.

ways, each of which can be supported by examples of analogous spellings, thus:—S is represented in 17 ways; short I in 36; Z in 17; E in 33; R in 10; Z in 17, and these multiplied together,

$$17 \times 36 \times 17 \times 33 \times 10 \times 17 = 58,366,440.$$

So that in this particular case the chance that a person who had only heard this word would spell it incorrectly are about 58 millions to one.

What is the practical meaning of all this? It means the loss of three or four years of precious time to every child who learns to read by the present means; it means days and months and years of useless drudgery for both teacher and pupil; it means that years which might, if the Phonetic System were introduced, be employed by our children in acquiring useful knowledge, are now squandered in unprofitable and unnecessary work, and breaking their hearts; it means that 90 per cent. of the pupils in the schools of England go out into life unable to read a paragraph from a newspaper intelligently; it means that 15 millions of dollars are annually thrown away in England alone; it means that the English national education is a failure; it means that ignorance prevails through the land. Here is our great argument for phonetic spelling, which no objection from our friends opposite can shake. They will tell you, no doubt, in the most eloquent terms, as they are well able to do, that we want to destroy the etymological and historical value of our language, and a great many more things of the same kind. A weighty thing indeed to counterpoise against the blessings of the phonetic system! Forsooth, our children are to be compelled to waste from four to seven years of their short lives because some people have an idea that the new system would destroy our etymology. I appeal to you, especially to those of you who are engaged in the noble profession of teaching, and a very noble profession it is, I appeal to you if it would not be an inestimable blessing to the race if boys and girls, old men and women, could learn to read and write within the short space of six or twelve months. If there are any sisters here who have helped to teach their younger brothers to read, if there are any elder brothers who have helped their sisters as they toiled day after day over those miserable pothooks and hangers, if there are any such here, and I am sure there are, I appeal to them to give their vote this evening in favour of the system which will bring emancipation, power and happiness with it.

But besides the utter waste of time involved in learning to read, a great mischief is done to the minds of the children by subjecting them to such unscientific teaching. Hear what Max Muller, probably the greatest living philologist, says upon this point:

"What, however, is even more serious than all this, is not the great waste of time in learning to read, and the almost complete failure in national education, but the actual mischief done by subjecting young minds to the illogical and tedious drudgery of learning to read English as spelt at present. Every child who learns to read in this manner, and whose spelling is irrational: one rule contradicts the other, and each statement has to be accepted simply on authority, and with a complete disregard of all those rational instincts which lie dormant in the child, and ought to be awakened by every kind of scientific experiment."

"I know there are persons who will defend anything, and who hold that it is due to this very discipline that the English character is what it is: that it retains respect for authority; that it does not require a reason for everything; and that it does not admit that what is inconceivable is therefore impossible. Even English history has been grounded back to this hidden source, because a child accustomed to believe that *though is though*, and that *through is through*, would afterwards believe anything. It may be so; still I doubt whether even such objects would justify such means."

"But with all that, the problem remains unsolved. What are people to do when language and pronunciation change, while their spelling is declared to be unchangeable? It is, I believe, hardly necessary that I should prove how corrupt, effete, and utterly irrational the present system of spelling is, for no one seems inclined to deny all that. I shall only quote, therefore, the judgment of one man, the late Bishop Thirlwall, a man who never used exaggerated language. 'I look,' he says, 'upon the established system, if an accidental custom may be so called, as a mass of anomalies, the growth of ignorance and chance, equally repugnant to good taste and to common sense.' But I am sure that the public mind is becoming more and more tenacious proportioned to their absurdity, and are jealous of all encroachment on ground consecrated by prescription to the free play of blind caprice."

After considering these things who will assert that Reform is not necessary?

Again, the ignorance of so many grown up people at the present day may be traced to the same source. In England alone there are about five million grown-up people who cannot read. Why is this? Because, in the words of Maria Edgeworth, among the most famous, "the labour and disgust of learning to read render it the most difficult of all human attainments." This, however, can all be changed by the introduction of the phonetic system, which is so simple that it does not necessarily require the addition of a new letter to our present alphabet, but only that the present letters be used in a different way, though it would be more satisfactory for each simple elementary sound to have a single sign. Our present spelling we must consider not only a scientific failure, but also a moral failure, because it deprives a large proportion of our population of the enjoyment of one of the most indispensable blessings of civilized life—the power to read.

Many other evil results attend upon our present mode of spelling occur to my mind, but time will not permit me to dwell upon them. My learned friend who is to follow me on the same side will, I daresay, refer to some of these points. Amongst other things our present spelling occasions great difficulties to those who endeavour to reduce unwritten languages to writing; it obscures the names of persons and places, and it disables us from ascertaining the real condition of our spoken language, even a few hundred years back.

Amongst the incidental advantages of phoneticism I may mention that the system will cause a diffusion of correct pronunciation over the whole Empire, and will tend to do away with provincial dialects; that it will diminish the number of letters with which it is necessary to write a word, and reduce the bulk and therefore the expense of our books by about one-tenth.

Summing up, then, the advantages of phonetic spelling, we see that—

- (1.) It will render reading easy.
- (2.) It will render spelling easy.
- (3.) It enables, as soon as he has learned the phonetic alphabet, to spell any word with the same accuracy that he can pronounce it.
- (4.) It renders the task of learning to read delightful to teacher and learner.
- (5.) It will consequently tend to remove the present ignorance of the poorer classes.
- (6.) It will render the language less difficult for foreigners.
- (7.) It will render the business of reducing unwritten languages to a writing system more easy.
- (8.) It will show the exact state of the language at a given time.
- (9.) It will tend to do away with barbarisms in pronunciation.
- (10.) It will reduce the bulk and therefore the cost of our books.

Now let me turn to some of the objections chronically urged against phoneticism.

The most important objection is that which maintains that the system would tend to obscure etymology, and produce confusion. We answer to this, first of all, that phonetic spelling, so far from being a hindrance to etymology, is a sure and safe guide, for the science of etymology is built upon the science of phonetics. In the second place we may ask our opponents if the change which we propose will destroy the etymology, how is it that the etymology has not already been destroyed? We know that in Queen Anne's time our orthography was not the same as at present. We know that since that time the orthography was different from that of Queen Anne's time, and if we go back to Chaucer we find that English is almost like another language. The truth is that etymologies at present are very uncertain, and we do not look to them for the present meanings of the words. If, to take a celebrated example, I should call my friend opposite a *fovere* and a *villain*, he would hardly be satisfied with my telling him that one of the words originally signified only a lad or servant, and the other a ploughman. But even if the etymological value of our words was somewhat impaired by phonetic spelling, I ask should the latter on that account be rejected? Ask yourselves carefully how often do you look to the etymology of words in your every day life. I imagine that the occasions are very few and far between. It would only be the scholar who would lose and he would still possess the records of our present books. I shall give you the opinion of the greatest living etymologist upon this point—

"Language is not made for scholars and etymologists; and if the whole race of English etymologists were really to be swept away by the introduction of spelling reform, I hope they would be the first to rejoice in sacrificing themselves in so good a cause. But it is really the case that the big game of etymology is being lost in the language by the adoption of phonetic spelling, and the profession of the etymologist would not be long, I say, No, most emphatically, to both propositions. The real answer, however, is that no one could honestly call the present system of spelling a purely historical or etymological; and I believe that, taken as a whole, the loss occasioned by consistent phonetic spelling would hardly be greater than the gain."

Hear also the distinguished Dr. J. A. H. Murray, the lexicographer, upon this objection:

"I hardly need all to my dictionary experience has already shown me that the ordinary appeals to etymology against spelling reform utterly break down upon examination. The etymological information supposed to be enshrined in the current spelling is sapped at its very foundation by the fact that it is, in so far as it is, often wrong from right, that it is often the fancy of pedants or snobs of the Renaissance, or monkish etymologists of still earlier times, that are thus preserved, than the truth which alone is etymology. From the fourteenth century onward, a fashion swept over French and English of refashioning the spelling of words after the Latin ones, with which rightly or wrongly they were supposed to be connected; and to such an extent has this gone that it is, in nine cases out of ten, now impossible, without actual investigation, to form any opinion upon the history of these words—the very thing the current spelling is supposed to tell us. The real history is recovered only by marshalling the phonetic spellings, and comparing them with the Latin ones, as they are available everyone to do, piercing through the mendacious spellings of later times to the phonetic facts which they conceal or falsify, and thus reaching a genuine etymology. The traditional and pseudo-etymological spellings of the last few centuries are the direct foes with which genuine etymology has to contend; they are the very enemies of the etymologist who seeks the thorns and thistles which everywhere choke the golden grains of truth, and afford satisfaction only to the braying asses which think them as good as wheat."

Also, Ladies and Gentlemen, is the great objection with which our opponents arm themselves, this is the broken reed upon which they so confidently rely.

The next objection is that while in the new spelling we are unable to distinguish words pronounced alike but now spelled differently, such words are distinguished in the old spelling. My answer to this is, that if at present in the hurry of conversation there is hardly ever a doubt which word is meant, surely there would be much less danger in the slow process of reading a continuous sentence where the context would remove any possibility of doubt. That this objection is a most flimsy one will be seen from the fact that there are already in written English about 600 words with different meanings which, on the reasoning of our opponents, should be provided with separate spellings. For instance the word *box* would require eight spellings, for it might not mean, different meanings. The objection is really an objection to the English language, and not to phonetic spelling.

The only other objection deserving of our consideration is that there would be no uniform method of spelling—that each one would spell as she or he thought fit. This objection has, in reality, no basis, and primarily arose from an erroneous idea that phonetic spelling was advocated only by teetotalers, vegetarians and uneducated people. True, people could spell as they liked, just as they can spell now as they like, for we cannot prevent utterly ignorant people, in the phonetic system, or in the present system, or in any system, from spelling as they please. But the danger of this would be an infinitely greater likelihood of their spelling correctly

under the phonetic system. We should have just as strong authority for our spelling as we have at present. At present we follow the principally Dr. Johnson, modified, however, by the lexicographers, who Ogilvie is perhaps the best. We have no Act of Parliament to guide us, and, indeed, the present spelling varies a good deal. We should have just as sure and authoritative guides under the new system.

Finally, I said I would read to you the names of those who are doing up, supporting this agitation in order to show you the names of some of those who scheme. Amongst the number I see the names of John Hall Gladstone, Ph. D., F.R.S., Head Master of the School Board for London; Rev. E. A. Abbott, D.D., Head Master of the City of London School; Rev. Joseph Angus, D.D., President of the Hegen's Park College; and Member of the Society of Arts, Messrs. Alexander Bain, LL.D., Headmaster of the Ladies, Cheltenham; Miss Frances Reale, Principal of the College for London Collegiate School for Girls; Leonard H. Courney, M.P., Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies; Sir John Lubbock, Bart., F.R.S., Professor of the University of London; Rev. J. P. Mahaffy, M.A., F.R.S., Prof. A. J. Mundella, M.P., Vice-President of the University of Dublin; the Right Hon. Education. Rev. Archibald Henry Sayce, M.A., Deputy Professor of Council on Comparative Philology in the University of Oxford; Rev. G. Brodric count Sherbrooke; Rev. W. Westinaster, The Right Hon. Vis. in the University of Cambridge; Alfred Tenison, C.I., F.R.S., Poet Laureate. But the greatest of all is Alexander J. Ellis, F.R.S., Poet

That this is not an impossible reform may be gathered from the fact that the Spaniards in the last century and the Dutch in this, adopted similar and Hungarian alphabets are all modern and constructed on phonetic principles.

I must now bring my rambling remarks to a close and leave the subject over, before sitting down to repeat what I said, rising to speak that the human race. Believe me, your decision to-night will not be without favour of what will enfranchise more people than the greatest bill which knowledge throughout the length and breadth of the land than any invention since the time when the first printer, trembling with excitement and joy, scanned the first printed page.

Mr. Elliot in opening for the Negative said:—

MR. PRESIDENT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN.—When the actions and contents of this nineteenth century shall have been submitted to the investigation and criticism of posterity, I venture to say that the period will stand out as one of *change and of great activity of thought*. In the centuries before us we see wide-spread and even violent changes, no doubt, but the most important in well defined localities and upon well defined subjects, but now it has per the pulp of the world, among all classes of people, from the shop to the pulpit; the national labour in common with the professor is discussing theories and estimating probabilities; the spirit has swollen from an security to a mighty and turbulent ocean, which threatens to sweep away upon its swelling and inconstant billows even the very landmarks of our ancestry and to overturn the foundations of our social system.

There was a time when reform had need of encouragement and sustenance; a time when the noble decision of an intellectual giant, coupled with an heroic courage and unflinching perseverance could alone cope with the torpor of custom and prejudice, and give a progressive movement to show us the dimensions of the "room for improvement." But it is equally true that in these days we need, instead of the glowing pictures and ardent fancies of the adherents of advanced opinions, the healthy courage and cautious action of more conservative minds; men who will not shrink from so-called reformers—first, for the good that is in them; secondly, for the poor who are asked to exchange them for.

We are asked by the gentleman who has just resumed his seat to exchange our present system of spelling for one which he and I must confess I can bring to bear upon the subject that gentleman has proposed to the defects of the old, the advantages of the new. Whatever may be said of his contentions there can I think be but one opinion as to the clearness and ability with which the learned gentleman has pleaded for a change. The lucidity of his sentences has, I must own at once, entirely changed my opinions. I am now forced to believe, what up to the present time I found very difficult, that our opponents' advocacy of this change arises from a hearty belief in it, and, though in error, they certainly have the courage of their convictions. Were it not that I feel assured to confess to it to the aid which we undertake to-night needs but little support as to the contentions and attention of our audience, I should scarcely venture to attack the arguments of my opponent, not indeed because of their intrinsic worth, but because they deserve a cultured reply.

Our opponents' advocacy of this change, however, shows them to have been unwittingly carried off upon one of the breakers of change in the great ocean of thought and not upon a deep and natural current of reform.

Let me say at the outset that they do not oppose a change merely because it is such. I know it has become the fashion in these days to consider those who give opposition to such undertakings as the ones who are to be despised or to be laughed at as the difference between the two is not a matter of degree. This is as often false as true; it is often as to mistake prejudice for reason. It is this—that while they have falling in lower in our opponents and us they arrive in the ardour of their affection to substitute for the old and really valuable instrument we, on the other hand, with a lively remem-

brance of the debt we owe to the old for its mines of knowledge, its wells of consolation and its streams of music, maintain our right to stand cautiously in regard to the foundations of this old system, and will not discard it until we are assured that its usefulness is gone and that a better has succeeded it.

Our opponents are greatly exercised lest we should consider them "cranks" and hasten to assure the learned gentleman that, on the contrary, I have always admitted logical habits of thought, but I must confess to entertain deep pity for that poor man upon whom he placed such a glowing eulogy, who, at the age of seventy years, was engaged in so purely a glacial pursuit.

It is evident, Mr. President, that our opponents are bound from the very nature of the subject to establish, first, that the present system is defective; second, that the proposed is a vastly superior one. Whether in either of these two tasks we have been to any extent successful in his arguments nor any criticism offered upon his views, but without entering upon a detailed reply I propose to place the arguments of the learned gentleman as belonging to a class much in vogue among ardent reformers, and consisting in the creation of *imaginary maladies* for which they invent corresponding cures. I shall endeavour in reply to these arguments to show two things,—first, that our opponents enormously exaggerate the defects and inconveniences of the old system of spelling; second, that it is far more easy to defend than to attack, giving strong evidences of being not an improvement, but a positive injury.

First, then, that the defects of the old system are calamity. I am aware that this very statement may be seized upon by our opponents as an admission that the defects of the present system are a perfect one. I admit that it has defects in the same way that any system which is an answer for agricultural pursuits are defective, that our system of education is defective, that our governmental machinery is defective; they are defective because in wisdom we have been endowed with aspirations for an ideal which is perfect.

It is assumed quietly by our opponents that the written word should correspond to and be an exact reflex of the spoken. Now, at the outset, demands proof. Why should it? Dr. Trench has well observed that, every word has two existences, as a spoken word and a written, and you have every right to sacrifice one of these or even subordinate it wholly to the other. The spoken word gives us information through the sense of hearing; the written word through the sense of vision. Written words naturally are stable; spoken words are naturally changeable.

The answer of our opponents to this obvious truth is—yes, but in the spoken word, as well as in the written, and spoken words are intimately connected, and unless we have a regular and systematic alphabet to represent the sounds employed in uttering spoken words, and unless we have the most possible of acquisition, or at any rate necessitate, the expenditure of a great deal of money, and thus presents an appalling obstacle to the education of the people; and in this answer we have in brief the *raison d'être* of the discussion.

In reply to this, I say, it is only true to a very limited extent, so limited indeed, that instead of assuming it to be sufficient cause for so radical a change, it should be closely examined whether it is a charge sufficiently important to deserve the attention of education by which we are to be benefited. The eye and the memory are all the important means by which we learn to memory retains the name of the thing, the picture to the mind and the spelling is the rule, no doubt, the task upon the memory is somewhat less, for an act of memory need then only be exercised over a class instead of over each individual word, but at the same time it must be remembered that in such a language words must necessarily lose many of their distinctive marks; hence, the eye is more likely to err, and moreover the system of reasoning power. It may, I think, very reasonably require a certain amount of reliance can be placed upon this power in the first stages of education, especially in the case of very young children I am of opinion it would render the primary steps even more difficult than they now are, for teachers would be very apt to expect from the infantile mind powers which naturally belong only to older children.

I find it is a favourite method among our opponents of showing this encroaching to read and spell a phonetic language with the necessity to acquire the English, and I have been astonished at the apparently thoughtless manner in which these gentlemen have jumped at conclusions; I can only account for it by the intensity of their passion for their captivating hobby, reminding you of the adage, "love is blind."

In examining this question I wish to attach to it all the importance to which it is entitled in the discussion, it would be an easy task to pose the exact relation of some of the calculations of those advocates of the change who are merely forcibly reminded of Mark Twain's reflection after having proved the river Mississippi to have been 1,300,000 miles long at one time, and there is something fascinating about science. One gets such calculations of Mr. J. H. Gladstone as those of a friend and brother reformer. I think I may say that he has views strongly and places his argument in ment to you, ladies and gentlemen, as a bribe to an fair in presenting his argument of all like arguments of our opponents. It is a specimen brief upon which you may gather the difference between the two, but I must leave these gentlemen to make for themselves a pretty correct idea of the sort of *proofs* upon which they are so ready to make for themselves a pretty correct idea of the sort of *proofs* upon which

Mr. Gladstone, who was a member of the London School Board, in 1878, entered upon his calculations with this practical object in view, to

improve, if possible, the educational advantages of the working classes in the great City of London; he, therefore, conducted his investigations, one would suppose, in a practical business-like manner. He tells us that the spelling of the Italian language is the most perfect in Europe, being almost strictly phonetic. After carefully examining the amount of time devoted to reading and spelling in Italian and also in English schools, he comes to the astonishing result that 1375 hours more are devoted to these subjects in the school year in the English school than in the Italian! (I suppose he takes into account the amount of time spent in a system of spelling which thus wastes the time and youth of our people, if his calculations were correct and thorough, but they are not, they are erroneous because very superficial, and as I say may be taken as a specimen brick of all like arguments.)

I need scarcely remind you, Mr. President, that there are two methods of teaching, with a text-book and orally. Now, if a child commit to memory a rule of arithmetic from a text-book he is actually studying reading and spelling rather than arithmetic; if he learn facts of history and geography from a text-book, he is having the equally good practice in reading and spelling. Now, in English schools we know that these subjects are, as a rule, taught to a great extent orally, while I am inclined to believe that the system adopted in Italy is the opposite, but whether this be true or not, Mr. Gladstone's 1375 hours are utterly valueless as an argument in favour of phonetic spelling until he proves to us that these two systems of teaching are not respectively in vogue in the two countries to which I have referred.

But the utter absurdity of these calculations may be well exposed in another way. It is notorious that a century ago only a very small percentage of Italians could read and write, but of those who could, probably eighty or ninety per cent. could understand their own great poets and philosophers. Now every one learns to read, at least, but of those who can pass a very tolerable standard not one per cent. can make head or tail of Dante. Now what does this prove? Simply this, that Italians are taught to read and spell a vocabulary which will prepare them to read their newspapers and write business letters. But what is the aim of an English school? To teach the entire vocabulary of the language; consult our spelling-books, bristling with words that a fairly well-educated man does not employ a dozen times a year; look through our reading books, supposed to be adapted for boys of ten years of age, and you have extracts from "Disraeli's speech on the death of Wellington"; the scene in the tower, from King John," and Dr. Dawson's relation of the Earl's "and yet the time necessary to acquire this vocabulary is compared with that necessary for the former. The quantity of the words, not the method of spelling, is what consumes the time and produces unsatisfactory results; and here let me say, that it appears to me a mistake well taken in the case of the Italian book. I think it an entire waste of energy and a positive cruelty to spend the time of the children of the working classes, those who go to school to learn to read and write and nothing more, in either reading or spelling words which they will never have occasion to use. "Teach children multiplication but not the reasons for it," is a maxim which, if they ought to be able to spell *dog* must they of necessity spell *protoplasm*?

Now, Mr. President, I have endeavoured to show that our opponents are able to prove, neither by abstract reasoning, nor yet by comparison with other countries, that a system of spelling is such a burden upon the education of the people as they regard it. One other method of proof I resorted to, ingenious but equally fallacious. It is said children of our own country have actually been taught to read and spell by the phonetic system, and they have learned in a much shorter period of time; with regard to the latter accomplishment they would probably be able to read and write at their time as Artemus Ward considered Mr. Chaucer behind it; when he said "he had brains, but, unfortunately, could not spell!" But in answer to this argument I would say, what guarantee have I that you are not comparing the work of exceedingly good teachers and exceptionally bright children with that of careless teachers and ordinary children; but even granted that the children and teachers were of equal ability, this much remains to be said, that the teacher of the phonetic system has entered upon his work with the zeal and the care he should have, and has, therefore, the immense advantage that such a condition gives him.

It only remains to be said in this connection, Mr. President, that if the charge against the present system of waste of time has been shown to be false, the charge of waste of money falls to the ground, for it is, in fact, only the measure of the former. When our opponents do formulate a plan to procure actual calamities brought about by the old system, argument fails and defence is useless. The leader of the affirmative has wittily, and I must say to my mind unfeelingly, charged our present system of spelling with *killing a Frenchman in every census*. It is not necessary after my sympathy to the bereaved family who, in their youthful gambol, are with one fell swoop, deprived of a fond father and their matrin bowl of milk!

My second task, Mr. Chairman, is to endeavour to show why I consider the proposed method would be not only not an improvement but a positive injury to the language. In order to do this I shall make some comparisons difficult as it is to compare the seen with the unseen, the known with the unknown, and, in defence to the opinions of our opponents, I shall try to free myself of the knowledge that this new system has but a name, and forget, for the time being, that the practical man dependent upon the learned leader of the affirmative was powerless to call it out of the ghostly region of erudite thought, and give it a habitation and a form.

First of all, then, Mr. President, I claim that we can make no comparison between this new proposed system of spelling and the old as regards the cost of printing or writing. In order to do this I shall make some comparisons difficult as it is to compare the seen with the unseen, the known with the unknown, and, in defence to the opinions of our opponents, I shall try to free myself of the knowledge that this new system has but a name, and forget, for the time being, that the practical man dependent upon the learned leader of the affirmative was powerless to call it out of the ghostly region of erudite thought, and give it a habitation and a form.

My second objection is, we have in English a large number of words, of very different meaning, yet all pronounced alike; everybody will admit

this to be a disadvantage, but our opponents ask us to extend this blemish to the written language as well, to spell, as well as pronounce them alike! In spoken language this may lead to error; in written language, from the very nature of things, it would; and so great would the inconvenience and annoyance be that it would be worth overhauling the phonetic rules and interposing signs to catch the eye and distinguish the word.

Again, it is contended that phonetic spelling would indicate pronunciation and reduce dialects. Now, I contend that, for the great mass of the people, it would indicate pronunciation, indeed, but it would also indicate dialects; it would perpetuate them. Spoken language is decidedly dialectal and very tenacious. We have no authority of final resort for pronunciation in English; the spirit of the people will not brook such a thing; with a phonetic alphabet, and true to phonetic principles, the people would make the written word correspond with their idea of the spoken, as it is our written words are a standing protest against such mutilation; sweep away our etymological spelling and our written language will become a confused jargon. Italy has a phonetic alphabet, but she has also a number of very distinct dialects, and in our case, Mr. President, imagine us furnished with a phonetic alphabet, used under phonetic rules, and I ask you how much similarity would there be among the same words written by the inhabitants of the different sections of the British Isles themselves and of the Continent also. I wish to point you to the fallacy of the argument that people would not require to learn to spell, say after the two first years of school life. The argument, of course, is, if our words were spelled by fixed rule and not with arbitrary letters, people would naturally spell correctly. Now, if this be true, how comes it that incorrect spellings are so common? I have myself seen a number of long letters irregularly spelled in three different ways by the same individual. The system is invented as a boon for uneducated and partially educated people. Dr. Trench gives us a forcible example of people spelling by sound, and hence an idea of what we may expect when the system advocated by our opponents is introduced. He says "the postmaster of the town of Woburn has noted 244 different methods of spelling that name among the uneducated class, for whose benefit this system is mainly composed.

There is still another objection to the system, so important and so far-reaching, that it is no wonder our opponents have always summoned the biggest guns to this point of attack. I refer to the irreparable loss which phonetic spelling implies in the etymology of our language. At first those who favoured phonetic spelling were dumb in reply to this objection, but through time they have gathered together a number of specious arguments, which have become worth; of notice only because some philologists and highly educated men have taken them under their special care. Our charge is, that this system will obliterate everything that *visibly* connects our language with the past, and will make it a dead, mechanical contrivance, instead of what it is, the expression of the human mind, the growth of the thought and progress and dignity of the race. The leader of the affirmative has given us a long array of scholarly names who deny this statement. I cannot dissect at any length the answer made to this charge, but they will not, I wish to say, with simply shewing that when carefully examined they should have little weight to sustain their position. The noted philologist, Prof. Müller, whose opinions usually are entitled to close attention, makes reply to our charge by propounding this question: "If a man know the origin of a word is he any less likely to recognise it in a phonetic dress?" and he answers, "Yes." But this is evading the question. If a man do not know the origin of a word, will he ever be likely to find it in a phonetic dress? The learned man, the ignorant man will never try, but there are thousands of fairly well-educated men and women to whom the study of the origin of words, the inspiring thought, and opening up vistas of beauty undreamed of, whose knowledge is too limited to surmount the difficulty, and yet too extensive to rest satisfied wanting their solution.

In reply to the argument that the proposed system would substitute a healthy mental training for a vicious one, I cannot do better than remind you of the fact that thousands of English men and women have surmounted the difficulties of the language, and are not, as we can see, any the worse for it either mentally or morally. The learned leader of the affirmative is an eloquent man; for the occasion he has composed a number of words which will follow me on the affirmative will unconsciously give emphasis to the position. As regards their morality I am equally certain on that point, unless, indeed, they claim that the system has engendered that ingratitude which they are so anxious to bring the beneficent, mother of their purest and most cherished enjoyments.

I am painfully aware, Mr. President, how impossibly I have pleaded a good cause. From the course pursued by my friend who opened the discussion I have been obliged to anticipate argument, but I have endeavoured at the same time to reply to his position. I am sure that you will understand you that our opponents are bound to show, first of all, good cause for doing away with the old; secondly, equally strong reasons for introducing the new, these reasons built upon natural conclusions arising out of a description of it; and after they have done all this they are bound to say how much of a gap they will allow between the spoken and the written word; in other words, how often they will introduce changes into written words to have them keep pace with the spoken, which are constantly changing and forever changing. I will take a suggestion from the adverse camp, I should like to advise them to institute at once a Board of Investigation into the old and set down the new before a knowledge-thirsty and grateful people at each decennial census!

And then when all this is done they may set to work with ear-tickling fancy and wit to reduce and propose to induce such audiences as the one before us to-night, Mr. President, to obliterate the proudest boast of our race, to give place to a pure plebeian upstart, whose sole claim to existence rests upon money and expediency.

Will you have an apparent and imaginary gain, destroy and obliterate this inexhaustible treasure-house of word-lore?

Will you, for an utilitarian and gross demand, wipe out the sentiment and poetry wrapped up in our words, and thus transmitted to us in our language by the nobles of our race.

Will you have those numberless guides which our language supplies us, to the ancient custom, the beliefs of long past centuries, the conquests of heroes, and the creeds of all, for a soulless form suited to a spiritless people.

by other nations, such as the Italians and Spaniards, during the past two centuries, we have every reason to think it would be practicable in ours, and even achieve greater results, for these other nations were not so unfortunate at the outset as were we. English, nor had they any great inducements to bring about the change, for we have to-day on our shoulders the responsibility of improving and bringing into harmony the written and spoken elements of the greatest and grandest language the world has ever known. Of course we have to work against a great system of tradition, and I feel that this evening I am speaking to an audience which fully appreciates the fact that a change in our system of spelling must be made, and that at an early date.

When the idea of introducing and substituting the Arabic system of numerals for the old Roman system was first broached, I believe that popular opinion was as strongly against it as it is to-day against the introduction of the phonetic system. Yet what a triumph followed. Who of you now would be willing to keep a set of books in Roman numerals? Who would wish to run up a single column in such a ledger? and great as has been the benefit derived from such a change, I hope to see a still greater one, which is far more far-reaching, conferred on our people through the introduction of a phonetic system of spelling, for it is not every one who has to make use of figures, while every one should know how to read and spell his own language.

Before closing I would like to say a few words about what seems to be the most efficient means of introducing the system. This, of course, could only be done by degrees. First it would have to be introduced in the public schools, where life would be made much more pleasant to both teacher and scholar. In this way, in a short time, the system would become finally established, while it might be placed within the reach of those of maturer years by causing pamphlets and books to be issued for a while in both systems.

Those who oppose the reform tell us that it would necessitate the loss of all the books which our libraries now contain; this, however, is an unreasonable assumption, for readers of the present generation would keep their old editions, while those of the next would prefer the new, and in the course of time new editions of all the books worth reprinting would come out anyway, and might be issued on the new system and without great public expense, for it would no doubt be made to a great extent a private enterprise, while the less valuable books which these libraries contain would be done away with and not be much loss; besides, if these books were not republished they would be consulted only by students who would probably be able to read both systems, and if they were unable to do so, it has been found that the student requires less time to learn to read and spell in the old system by first pursuing a course of study in the new, than to read and spell in the present system only, so that in either case time and labour would be saved.

All eminent philologists join in saying that if it were possible for our method of spelling and antiquated orthography that universality of the English language would be secured beyond a doubt, and other nations may find cause to flatter themselves at the fact that the English nation has not sooner found this out.

Show us, ladies and gentlemen, by your votes this evening that you are willing to unite with us in putting down that system of which the well-known writer, Lord Lytton, found cause to speak in the following terms: "A more yivng, round-about, puzzle-headed delusion than that by which we continue the clear instincts of truth in our accustomed system of spelling was never concocted by the father of falsehood. How can a system of education flourish that begins by so monstrous a falsehood, which the sense of hearing suffices to contradict," and, ladies and gentlemen, you will show your willingness to assist in conferring on future generations one of the greatest blessings the world has ever known.

In conclusion, I thank you for your kind attention.

MR. MACIE IN SUMMING UP for the Negative said:

MR. PRESIDENT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN.—Whenever any reform or so-called reform is being agitated in a community, we never fail to find a class of men ready and willing, and who in reality do devote the whole of their lives and energies to the accomplishing of the reform, and who in their wild zeal do not scruple to almost overlook the fact that their apparently whole-souled interest is due not so much to a conviction of the benefits to be obtained by the introduction of what they propose as to an unnatural desire for the introduction of a change. In many cases they do not know what, but which they, the restless, love change for their own dear sake, would have us resort to. The advocacy of the reform in spelling which certain individuals are trying to force upon us in the place and stead of our present tried and effective method of spelling the English language does not prove an exception to the general rule. For we find its advocates speaking and writing with all the energy and fanaticism (sometimes spelled phoneticism) which is to such an eminent degree a characteristic of change.

It seems to me to be a sad waste of time, of money and of undoubted talent for men with the intellectual standing of many of the supporters of the new system to throw away their short lives in support of a scheme which cannot be held as desirable and which, even if it were, so totally impracticable as to leave no room for a second system. I have been quoted by one, excepting the few whose evidently superficial arguments have been quoted by the gentlemen upon the affirmative to-night. I have asked several prominent literary men in this city how it is that more has not been written against the proposed scheme and in support of our present system, and the answer has invariably been that these energies and our workers for phonotypy are engaged in a thankless task, and are expending their time and money in advocating a system which it is impossible can ever sensibly affect the stability and character of the English language as it is spelt and pronounced. Our present system of spelling and orthography is looked upon more with ridicule than with any fear as to what its possible effects might be; people seem convinced that it will never be universally introduced.

A person reading any of the phonetic publications, written, of course, after the style of the new orthography is at first struck with what appears to him to be an extremely ludicrous play upon certain words, and feels

more as if he were reading an extract from Josh Billings or some other of the writers whose works under the proposed system would be considered as representative specimens of English literature, instead of a choice selection from some one of our own great poets or *literateurs*, and one is almost forced in admiring many of the meanings of the words, to proceed scheme to make the same remark as was made by Artemus Ward on attempting to read Chaucer, that "Mr. C. had talent, but he couldn't spell." Now, Mr. President, is this the feeling that forebodes a very glorious future for the new system? I think not. Most of us must say that I am of opinion that it shows clearly and conclusively that the change is not desired by the people, and that they are so in love with their present language and manner of spelling the same, as not to tolerate such an innovation as the introduction of the new system would be.

But there are difficulties in the way of any one who attempts to defend what we have, and who advances a few facts tending to show the bad effects arising from a change. These difficulties have been intensified and made so rather harder to overcome by the very ingenious and clever manner in which the gentlemen upon the affirmative have laid their views before you to-night, and by the utmost confidence with which these gentlemen have advanced certain plausible statements which one, at first sight, might construe into arguments, and which require some little examination before the illogical reasoning of some of them is brought to light. If each one of you would but give the question a little care and study, we are satisfied, and we have no reason for dreading the result.

In listening to the discussion to-night you must have been struck by the very confidence with which the gentlemen opposite have handled their arguments, and by the utter absence of any such hesitations in their speeches throughout, and I am confident that an audience, such as we are addressing to-night, will not accept their view of the matter, when such an issue as the revolutionizing and destroying our language and literature is at stake. They speak to our sympathies, to our generation, who are so forced, they say, in the struggle for an education to spend a great part of their early life and energy in learning our barbarous orthography of to-day, and they are completely carried away with joyful anticipations of the time when reformed, and it should be in our power, and when the emancipated youth of our land would, almost without any effort, master the intricacies of language, and dive into the depths of literature and letters, which they say will be preserved to us, as we have it now, in all its entirety and beauty.

For this, and we may say for this only, we are asked to exchange the stable framework of our language, which has risen from lower things to become the greatest and grandest structure of the kind in the universe, for a system which has nothing to recommend it to the practical student of literature and language, and which gives us, in the way of a reward, or as a reward, accomplish what it claims. We say it will not and cannot be done; that it is totally impracticable, and, even if possible, that it is not desirable, for the losses consequent on its introduction would be very great, and the gains unequal and small.

Spelling, it is urged, would no longer need to be learned at all, for every sign being represented by a sign would almost involuntarily bring the proper pronunciation of a word to a person's mind, the sound and sign being in perfect contact with each other. The truth of this rests upon two assumptions, which are erroneous, but are very often made for granted by the gentlemen opposite. The first of these is that all men pronounce all words alike, and in spelling a word they will exactly agree as to what the sound is expressed in letters. The falsity of this is evidenced by the difference in the spelling of the same word by different persons, and in some instances even by the same person. Select a word of average difficulty and submit it to a class; some of these will, no doubt, spell the word properly, but a number will misspell it, and the majority will misspell it in an entirely different manner from the others. Those who cannot spell it correctly are obliged to fall back upon what they think the sounds contained in the word are. What then is the reason that these several persons do not fall into the same error as to what the sounds are, and how they are to be represented? Simply because there is this difference of pronunciation which always has existed, and will continue to exist in spite of all the phonetic system can do to prevent it, and which pronunciation is continually varying under the treatment it receives at the hands of different individuals, so that whose ideas are slightly at variance with the others. But this difference is attributed to the confusion of the spoken English spelling. Is this true? It decidedly is not, for the differences in pronunciation are greatest among people who cannot read or write at all, and whose ancestors for generations before them were in the same lamentable state. They cannot read or write, and yet manage to guide their children in the way of their fathers with such an infallible and never-failing standard that it is strange to me that they do not have a better method to guide their children in the way of their fathers in their pronunciation than there should be such a very large number of dialects and differently pronounced words among the uneducated class.

Another assumption is that one written representation of a sound from which it is never necessary to guide the learner in the way of his pronunciation is not the fault of the old system, nor would it be remedied by the new. Take for example the sounds of the vowel *o* as pronounced in the words *wrong* and *wrong* according to some of the proposed schemes this vowel does duty for these two words. Now, the learner, at the first sight of the word, asks the question, "how am I pronounce this sign?" Am I to say *wrong*, or is pronounced in the last syllable of *fusion*, or *fusion* as it is sounded in *wrong*? and this fact forces itself upon us, that which ever way you decide and in whatever manner you decide upon your pronunciation, your neighbour will be quite as strong a position, and can defend it equally as well and as exactly the same arguments, when he decides the other way. This difference is unavoidable; people cannot help it, and before one year had passed the vocabulary of words differing completely from the present would be produced, and which would produce a confusion infinitely greater than that which it is claimed exists in the present spelling of the English language. The Italian method has been mentioned by the gentlemen as the Phonetic spelling, which they advocate, and which is the same Italian language that I wish you to notice as a proof of what I have just said. There is probably no one of our modern languages that is so broken up by dialects and different systems of pronunciation, and so multiplied by the same name as this same language, and these are the direct results of the language being so nearly the same as the phonetic scheme, and the su-

priority of the Italian method as regards the ease with which young children learn to read and spell, is detracted from by the fact that there is no uniformity of speech by which the people can be guided in their pronunciation. Italy still furnishes us with further examples of the evils consequent on the introduction of phonotypy in this, that the inhabitants of that unfortunate country are able to read the daily papers and write a few commonplace letters, but little more. Were we to adopt the new speech and writing, our highest ambition would be to be able to read the Phonetic Journal, and mechanically spell and write the symbols, which we at our literature, which has made our country what it is, would be cast aside, and benign influence, would degenerate into a state of semi-barbarity, and the phonetic system would be in its proper sphere, where it would have influence in building up a literature and ameliorating the language of a who love their language, containing, as it does, so many connecting links between what they once were and what they are now as they love their life, is a sufficient guarantee that such an occurrence can and will never take place.

The second assumption which these gentlemen help themselves to in such a gratuitous manner and which is quite as erroneous as the first is this: That just as soon as everyone is ready for a reform they will instantly accept the phonetic system. But the difficulty that arises here is, what is the phonetic system? upon what standard of pronunciation are we to found a uniform system of speech? are we to accept Pitman, with only our allegiance to Jones? or the nearly half the words in our vocabulary have advocated different methods of so-called phonetic spelling, by which they profess to overcome the disadvantages of the present spelling, but opinion and variety of construction than the gentlemen opposite have ever claimed exist in our present system.

Probably no two men have given this question more laborious study than Mr. Ellis and Dr. Murray, and what does their evidence show? Simply this: they are acknowledged that the objects sought to be attained by each of them were precisely the same, but they were forced to admit that entirely different, and each was of the opinion that what the other was doing only tended to put obstacles in the way of the change ever becoming a permanent success.

In looking through an article a few days ago, professingly supporting the reform, I found a table containing six different proposed schemes with the spelling of one hundred words in each, and I was rather surprised to find certain words spelled in the number of a different manner in each of the proposed methods. In the word pronunciation as it is in the word these words were and how they were to be represented. But I am answered have to conform to it, and that this would be the uniform method of the gentlemen, our opponents, and where then would be the boasted ease of the learning to read and spell. If I believe in one method and another that were not spelt according to my pronunciation, the same reasoning is applicable in any other of the many schemes which would be proposed, and the amount of laborious study required in this would be infinitely greater than any work required in learning to spell the English vocabulary to-day.

If letters were invented to-day we should have a sign for every sound in the language; we would limit each sign to the expression of one sound and we should spell our written words exactly as they were spoken. We very few persons who would be able to agree upon the number and nature of the sounds in the language and upon the signs by which they were to be represented. As a familiar example let any one of you compare the different pronouncing dictionaries and note the elaborate schemes and plans for the eye, and you cannot fail to see how futile is the attempt to make the written language correspond to and agree with the spoken, and understand effect more than the letters done or ever can do.

The general idea concerning the acquisition of the wisdom and study of past ages, is that these stores of knowledge which have accumulated alone, that in these written works only are contained the ideas of great men who have lived in times gone by, and that in the same are bound up the whole nation's history; but it is not in books that this knowledge is stored up, but to a very great extent in individual words. From has been a continual change in our language; as the nation progressed there became occasion for the creation of new words to meet the requirements of an advanced understanding; others were called from the language to take their place; still, however, leaving traces of the old in what reality whose ideas instead of being merely a mechanical combination of symbols to represent some particular thing, and these ideas are much often were written out in full; and oftentimes we learn more of the wisdom and campaign. Now, following this up we can easily see that the history of a tom though it may, as these gentlemen claim, present some difficulty to the beginner, yet is of the greatest value in revealing to us the etymological connection and derivation of words, thus creating a connecting link between the literature and language of ancient and modern times. If our words would be mere mechanical representations, without anything of interest whatever attaching thereto, and through which learning would suffer

an impassable loss. The existing system is continually calling our attention to the roots and derivations of many words, but in the new there is nothing that would even lead us to enquire. Words have a descent exclusively their own, and the casting aside the history of the word (for its history is included in its etymology) would destroy one of the most pleasing features in the study of our language, and it is very slightly detrimental to the literature in this respect are those belonging to the small class of language which is the derivation of a word that no one else need care whether they are acquainted with are favoured with a superior education, but between the two extremes, those who there is a multitude of persons neither accomplished who have not at all, without the knowledge of language, except their own, and it is not to be doubted for a moment that these should have helped, enabling them to words they are nearly allied, and what is their proper use, to what ing. This argument could not be urged with as much force at the time now with one half the force it will be a few years hence, for all our schools as much time as any other branch, and our spelling books take up almost arguments of lessons in the derivation of our English vocabulary. Many of the classics in a liberal education might be brought with much weight in favor of our etymological consideration of this question.

The English language resembles what is called a Gothic building, crowded with apparently incongruous detail, much present that can only depending for effect not on the interest attaching to history; but above all complexity of structure. Infinite labyrinthian intricacies, rather on internal corners, each feature half hidden by its neighbour, a strange mixture of inviting attention to its general outline or plan, which is indeed almost incomprehensible; yet to those who understand such language, in no wise injured by anomalous accessories."

Emerson has somewhere characterized language as "fossil poetry," meaning that in some fossils we find beautiful shapes of vegetable and animal life, which have been hidden in their rocky beds for thousands of years, so in words are beautiful thoughts and feelings, the imagination preserved and made safe for ever. And what is more calculated to inspire a feeling of respect and love, and opposition to any change than to know from which the rich and expressive words contained in it are derived, the is lacking in which it is superior to other languages, the points in it tend to expand into further improvements of the mind, and to ready an ancestry; they may be classified into families and tribes, and just as one who has attached to him the name of a noble knight, and derive instruction from tracing his lineage back to the knights of old, and tongue the many expressive and comprehensive words that we are using every day; but this change would reduce the mass of words that we are using to a baron's herd, to which little sense and no interest whatever could be ing to cast away everything of interest, and which we hold most dear in connection with the true life of the nation, whose literature, whose institutions, whose very religion and laws are represented in multitudes of words that are continually using. I think it is not for the love of his language take possession of every Englishman from this it is but the characteristic love of tion expressed in one particular direction. If the noble cause of the nation to which we belong are precious to us, if we feel ourselves made greater by the glorious deeds of our ancestors and by the greatness of our the true nobility of Englishmen who are now dead and gone, but who have bequeathed to us a name which by us must not be made less, in what way can we be assured that their native land and ours has fulfilled a glorious past, and that they should have acquired for themselves and us a clear a strong, an harmonious, a noble language, which, on its very face, speaks of those who have strengthened and fashioned it, and the utterance of their inmost life and being, and the English people, filled with such sense of whose origin is not the origin of themselves; and each one of us must consider the care of such a language as sacred trust, and should make it the object of his unceasing concern to preserve it pure and entire, and to speak it as far as in his power doth lie in all its purity and perfection. A nation whose language ever becomes so rude and barbarous as the phonetic system would make ours, must be on the very brink of barbarism, and if we testify to-night to our willingness to accept the new system, we are at the same time to-night to our intellectual power, and even to cease to exist as a literary and intelligent people.

Mr. Murray having made a forcible reply, for which we have no space, the question was put to the meeting and decided in favour of the Negative by a narrow majority.

The following is an experiment in Phonetic spelling:—

DHE SOLJER'Z FYUNERA L,
Dhe mufed drum rold on dhe air,
Wariz'z drah steitli step woz dheir;
On evori arm woz dhe blak kreip buwnd,
Evori karbuin woz tærnd tuw dhe grund;
Solem dhe suwnd ov dheir mezhard tred,

Az suilent and slo dhey folod dhe ded.
 Dhe ruidieries hors woz led in dhe ryr,
 Dher wur hwuit plumz weiving ovar dhe byr,
 Helmet and sord wår leid on dhe pal,
 For it woz a soljår'z fyumeral.

Dhat soljår had stud on dhe batel plein,
 Hweir eværi step woz ovar dhe slein :
 But dhe brand and dhe bal had past him buy,
 And hy keim tu hiz neitiv land—tu duy !
 Twoz hard tu kum tu dhat neitiv land,
 And not klasp wun familior hand !
 Twoz hard tu by numbård with dhe ded,
 Or e'er hy kud hjr hiz welkum sed !
 But twoz sumthing tu sqj iz klifs wuns mor,
 And tu ley hiz bonz on hiz on luvd shor ;
 Tu think dhat dhe frendz ov hiz yuth muit wjp
 O'r dhe gryn gras tarf ov dhe soljår'z slpp.

Dhe byugelz syst dhe weiling suwnd
 Az dhe kofin woz lœrd intu dhe gruwnd ;
 A voli woz fuird, a blessing sed,
 Wun moment's paz—and dhey left dhe ded !—

Aː	Eːə	Yːy	Oːa	Oːo	UU	Uːu
alms	earn-urn	ye	all	old	woo	put
amz	ærn	yj	al	old	wuu	put
	ui or uy	ei or ey		uw	yui	
	bie, buy	ale, they		out	use	
	buit, buy	eil, dhey		uwt	yuz	

A font ov tuips must by yuzd in hwich inværted
 letårz Δ egzaktili on dhe seim luin az upruit.

NOTICE.

1. The Publication Committee of the McGill University Song Book give notice that two prizes of the sum of ten dollars and five dollars respectively will be given for the first and second best new original McGill College songs, with or without chorus.

2. All communications, with the *nom-de-plume* of the writer attached, are to be sent in to the Secretary of this Committee, not later than August 15th, 1884.

3. Communications are to be accompanied by a sealed envelope, bearing the *nom-de-plume*, and containing the name and address of the writer.

4. This competition is open only to graduates and undergraduates of McGill University.

5. The Judges will be members of the Competition Committee.

All students are specially requested to send in to the undersigned any songs which they would like to see published.

C. W. WILSON (Med. '86),

Secretary.

The annual report of the Reading Room Committee, for the session just closed, shows, as these annual reports usually do, a very prosperous condition of affairs. The surplus remaining after the paying of all expenses is something over \$30, about double of that of last year.

The Committee of Athletic Sports have also a flourishing report to make. The surplus remaining in their hands is over \$100, not including a small amount standing to the credit of the Track Committee. The Sports Committee have, we understand, prepared the draught of a constitution for a University Athletic Association, to be submitted to the undergraduates next autumn, and have also taken some steps for the holding of Inter-University Sports. We hope that in both of these projects their efforts will be successful.

Between the Lectures.

PARENTAL MUSINGS.

There's my fourth son, young and gay,
 Who has reached that time of day
 In his life, when poets say

Is just the age
 Where the brook and river meet,
 (The expression's rather neat),
 When to him the world effete
 Is but a stage.

At the age when one goes o'er
 The good old days he's spent of yore ;
 When he votes the sex a bore,
 And somewhat mean,
 Lovely woman's but a toy
 To be bought with base alloy :—
 Is he man or is he boy
 At eighteen ?

He's in that open-hearted time
 Of life, that draws no rigid line
 Between what's strictly, mine and thine
 In way of clothes.

And so his manly breast he covers
 With neckties probably his brother's,
 And when they re'orn he'll seek for others
 I suppose.

His elder brothers are pedantic ;
 His little sisters too romantic,
 So he throws in jest and antic,
 Wild and strange,

To relieve the pompous bearing
 Of his brothers, who are wearing
 Out their lives to keep from swearing
 At the change.

Tho' he hates the very sight
 Of the early morning light,
 Yet he's out each blessed night
 Of the week ;

So I think I'll put a stopper
 On these ramblings, so improper,
 Or, I fear, he'll come a cropper,
 So to speak.

But perhaps my better course is
 To invent some forcing process,
 Something like metempsychosis
 For the lad,

By means of which he'll slumber through
 From eighteen—say to twenty-two—
 And thus he'll spare much trouble to
 His anxious dad.

A BALLAD.

(AFTER MR. SWINBURNE.)

I hid my hat in some Otto of Rosses,
 Out of the num's way, safe for a while.
 'Twas blacker of hue than the old black crow is ;
 In Otto of Rosses I hid my tile.

Why did it smell so ? Why they smile ?
 When I don that hat they say it's absurd,
 For the Otto of Rosses, by the gray god's guile,
 Has been soured by the song of a secret bird.

"Smell not," I cried, for the scent discolors
 Wherever I am, so that what I am at
 Is speedily known—though the governor dozes
 And all might be well—but that cursed hat,
 Like some spying sneak, with a wom in heart,
 And red ripe lips, like a woman unheard
 Screams out (so to speak) "there's a rummy start,
 This hat is mixed up with a secret bird."

I'd baste that hat with goary old Moses,
 (He's one of my uncles, a soapy old file,)
 But I know what that Patriarch's knowing old nose is,
 And how it would turn up at scent of the "ile,"
 And the Jewish remarks he would make all the while,
 And how the hot blood in his heart would be stirred,
 When he'd say with his happy avuncular smile,
 " 'Trape you'll shell me de song of your secret bird."

Envoi.

No—I'll stick to my roses and stick to my hat,
 Though Philistines smile and say it's absurd ;
 But a crutch and a tooth-pick are worse than that—
 And I love the song of my secret bird.

PHILIP HAY.

Box Mor.—A learned professor the other evening was explaining to a company the theory of Psychophysics. A lady who was present, hearing the imposing phraseology about the intensity of sensations increasing in arithmetical ratio, while their physical stimuli increase in a geometrical ratio, exclaimed, "it certainly does make one feel sick of physics."

NEW
HOUSE-FURNISHING GOODS!

At S. CARSLY'S
TAPESTRY CARPETS, all new designs, new colors,
At S. CARSLY'S.
TAPESTRY CARPETS, splendid value, superior qualities,
At S. CARSLY'S.

BUSSELS CARPETS.

Our stock of these goods from the most renowned
manufacturers,
At S. CARSLY'S.

BUSSELS CARPETS.

Private patterns, designs and colors adapted to the vari-
ous rooms of any residence,
At S. CARSLY'S.

BUSSELS CARPETS.

Manufactured from the finest wools, guaranteed free from
jute, and of the highest standard of quality, and will be
found superior to those generally produced for colonial
trade. Call and see them
At S. CARSLY'S.

TOURNAY VELVET CARPETS.

Some nice specimens of these beautiful goods
At S. CARSLY'S.

MOQUET CARPETS.

The handsomest Drawing-room Carpet ever produced at
the price.
S. CARSLY'S.

SAXONY STAIR CARPETS.

Cannot be equalled for wear and superiority of appear-
ance, to be had
At S. CARSLY'S.

S. CARSLY'S,

1765, 1767, 1769, 1771, 1773, 1775 and 1777 NOTRE DAME ST.

DAYLIGHT DISCOUNTED?**PHOTOGRAPHS BY ELECTRIC LIGHT**

PHOTOGRAPHS MADE EVERY EVENING AT

Artless' New Gallery,
251 ST. JAMES STREET.

NEXT DOOR TO H. MORGAN & CO.

**A LIBERAL DISCOUNT GIVEN TO STUDENTS.
OPEN EVENING FROM 7 TO 11.**

PLEASE CALL AND SEE SPECIMENS.

P.S.—The only place in the Province where Pictures are taken by Electric
Light.

C. ASHFORD'S**New Book and Stationery Shop**

(ONE DOOR WEST OF HIS OLD STAND)

Medical Books,
Students' Note Books,
Dissecting Cases and Scalpels,
(BY WEISS & SON.)
CHEAP FOR CASH.

Books procured to order from England and the United States.

678½ AND 680 DORCHESTER ST.

MONTREAL.

UNIVERSITY OF
BISHOP'S COLLEGE
MONTREAL.

FACULTY OF MEDICINE

SESSION OF 1884-85.



THE FOURTEENTH WINTER SESSION of this Faculty will open
on the first Tuesday in October, 1884. The Faculty of
Medicine of Bishop's College bases its claim for public
support upon the thoroughly practical character of its in-
struction, and the fact that the means at its disposal for this
purpose are not excelled by any medical school in Canada.

Its Diploma is recognized by the Royal College of Physicians,
Edinburgh; the Royal College of Surgeons, England; and the Royal
College of Physicians, London. Students have the option of attending
the practice of either the Montreal General Hospital (200 beds), or of
the Hotel Dieu Hospital (200 beds), both of which institutions have a staff
who regularly and systematically visit them. At the Montreal General
Hospital excellent facilities are afforded for the study of Practical Pathology,
under the direction of the Pathologist of the Hospital. The practice of the
Montreal Dispensary—where splendid opportunity is afforded to learn Dis-
pensing—is open to the Students of Bishop's College.

THE WOMAN'S DEPARTMENT OF THE WESTERN HOSPITAL, under the
supervision of this Faculty, is divided into two departments—Obstetrical
and Gynecological. The Obstetrical Department is under the control of
the Professor of Midwifery, and affords to Students a field unequalled in
the Dominion—in fact this Department has made Bishop's College the
Midwifery School of Canada. The Gynecological Department is attended
by the Professors of Bishop's College, and is the only Hospital of its kind in
this important Department of Surgery.

TWO GOLD MEDALS ("The Wood" and the "Robert Nelson" Gold
Medals) and the "Dr. David" Scholarship are competed for annually.

FEES, about the same as at the other Medical Schools in Canada, but a
Student who pays the cost of the entire course on the commencement of his
studies is able to effect considerable reduction.

FACULTY:

- F. W. CAMPBELL, M.A., M.D., L.R.C.P. Lond., Dean, Professor of Principles and
Practice of Medicine, consulting Physician Montreal Dispensary, Physician to
Western Hospital.
J. BAKER EDWARDS, Ph. D., D.C.L., Emeritus Professor of Practical Chemistry.
K. A. KENNEDY, M.A., M.D., C.M., Professor of Obstetrics and Diseases of Children,
Consulting Physician Montreal Dispensary, Physician to and Superintendent of the
Obstetrical Department of the Western Hospital.
J. PERRIGO, A.M., M.D., C.M., M.R.C.S. Eng., Professor of Surgery, Physician to and
Medical Secretary Western Hospital.
J. E. McCONNELL, M.A., M.D., C.M., Professor of Materia Medica, Physician Western
Hospital and Montreal Dispensary.
CASEY A. WOOD, C.M., M.D., Professor of Pathology, Physician Western Hospital.
GEORGE E. ARMSTRONG, M.D., Professor of Pathology, Physician Western Hospital.
JAMES C. CAMERON, M.D., C.M., M.R.C.P.I., Registrar, Professor of Medical Juri-
sprudence, Physician to Montreal General Hospital and Western Hospital.
THOMAS SIMPSON, M.D., Professor Hygiene, Physician to Montreal General Hos-
pital, Consulting Physician Western Hospital.
E. H. TRENHOLME, M.D., C.M., B.C.L., Professor of Gynecology, Consulting Phy-
sician Montreal Dispensary, Physician Western Hospital.
WM. YOUNG, C.M., M.D., Professor of Chemistry,
J. LESLIE FOLEY, C.M., M.D., L.R.C.P. Lond., Professor of Anatomy, Physician
Montreal Dispensary.
H. L. REDDY, B.A., M.D., L.R.C.S.E., L.R.C.P.I., Professor of Therapeutics.
A. LAPHORN SMITH, B.A., M.D., M.R.C.S. Eng., Professor of Botany, Physician
Montreal Dispensary.

LECTURERS IN SPECIAL DEPARTMENTS.

- JOSEPH REMOISE, F.C.S., Lecturer on Practical Chemistry.
ALEXANDER PROTFPOOT, M.D., C.M., Lecturer on Diseases of the Eye, Ear and
Throat, Oculist to Montreal Dispensary and Western Hospital.
D. D. GAHERTY, C.M., M.D., Demonstrator of Anatomy.
ANTHONY KERRY, C.M., M.D., Curator of Museum.

For Circulars giving every requisite information apply to the Dean
or to

JAMES C. CAMERON, M.D., C.M., M.R.C.P.I.,

MONTREAL, December, 1883.

Registrar, Montreal.

L. ROBINSON,
 LATE OF
 LONDON, ENGLAND,
 Fashionable Tailor
 31 BEAVER HALL.

Martin

PHOTOGRAPHER

141—ST. PETER STREET—141

All the latest improvements adopted, including the INSTANTANEOUS PROCESS, &c., &c.
 COMPOSITION GROUPS executed with intelligent regard to established rules of art.

☛ Cabinet Photographs of HERBERT SPENCER, taken on his recent visit to this city, for sale. Price 50 cents.

—☛ TELEPHONE COMMUNICATION ☛—



PATENT
 SPECTACLE
 INDICATOR.

Will indicate the exact focus required for each eye.
 Pat. July 31, 1877.

HENRY GRANT & SON,
 26 Beaver Hall Terrace.

Students' Eye Shades,
 CLINICAL THERMOMETERS,
 MICROSCOPES,
 BAROMETERS, &c.

GRANT'S PATENT SPECTACLE INDICATOR **JEWELLERS.**
 WATCH-MAKERS,
 OPTICIANS,

HEADQUARTERS

— FOR —

School and College Text Books!

❖ **DRYSDALE'S** ❖

232 St. James Street.

Medical Works, *Books used in Art Course,*
Science Text Books,
The various Theological Text Books.

Full assortment in stock and sold at Rock Bottom Prices.

STUDENTS' NOTE BOOKS,

SCRIBBLING BOOKS, &c., &c.,

BEST VALUE IN TOWN.

Stylographic Pens, Anti-Stylo Pens and Students' Supplies a Specialty.

W. DRYSDALE & CO.

232 St. James Street,

— ALSO —

BRANCH STORE: 1423 ST. CATHERINE ST.



H. SANDERS,

OPTICIAN,

186 St. James Street,

MONTREAL.

Importer and Manufacturer
OF
MICROSCOPES,

SURVEYING,

MATHEMATICAL

AND
SCIENTIFIC INSTRUMENTS.

WM. NOTMAN & SON,

PHOTOGRAPHERS to the QUEEN

17 and 19 BLEURY STREET,

MONTREAL.

❖WILLIAM SAMUEL❖

367 Notre Dame Street,

— IMPORTER OF —



From the Best English Makers,

— AND —

MANUFACTURER OF FINE FURS.

Highest Award for FINE FURS, Dominion Exhibition, 1880.
Fourteen First Prizes and Gold Medal, Provincial Exhibition, 1881.

367 Notre Dame Street, Montreal.

SUMMERHAYES & WALFORD

❖PHOTOGRAPHERS❖

No. 1 BLEURY STREET,

MONTREAL.

❖Special Rates for Students.❖

C. HILL,
Circulating Library

10 PHILLIPS SQUARE,

Bookseller and Stationer.

English and American Periodicals

And Illustrated Works.

All Kinds of Stationery.

Cards Engraved—Orders for England, for Town and Country, or the United States, promptly attended to. Postage Stamps.

RICHELIEU HOTEL

J. B. DUROCHER, Proprietor.

JACQUES CARTIER SQUARE, opp. COURT HOUSE and CITY HALL

MONTREAL.

The above Hotel is the best in the city for McGill College Dinners.

❖GEO. BROWN & SONS❖

Merchant & Tailors,

SHIRT & COLLAR MANUFACTURERS

21 BLEURY STREET,

NEXT DOOR TO NOTMAN'S.

A SPECIAL DISCOUNT TO STUDENTS.

DAWSON BROTHERS.

BOOKSELLERS AND STATIONERS,

HAVE REMOVED TO

NO. 238 ST. JAMES STREET.

SIGN OF THE GOLDEN OWL

ALL TEXT BOOKS

ALL KINDS

IN USE

OF

IN THE COLLEGES

NOTE BOOKS

AND

OF

COLLEGE

CANADA.

REQUISITES.



SIGN OF THE GOLDEN OWL

NO. 238 ST. JAMES STREET,

NEAR VICTORIA SQUARE.

DAWSON BROTHERS.

BOOKSELLERS AND STATIONERS