

sity College, Toronto. Had such counsels as these had any weight we fear the future prospects of Queen's would have been far from bright. It must be admitted that Canada has not had the means for giving a finished training in all departments, and a man with a purely Canadian training must be at a disadvantage as compared with one who has had the privileges of a European education. Again, however defective the training at University College may be, it does not follow that any one who has taken his ordinary college course there has been mentally crippled for life, or that he may not in other centres of learning and culture become thoroughly qualified for the occupation of a professorial chair. The selections made show that the trustees were not partial to Canadians, but also that they were not opposed to them; further, that they were not partial to the graduates of any Canadian university, but also that they had no narrow prejudice against the graduates of any of them.

WE would call attention to Professor Watson's address on "The Future of Our Universities," delivered on university day. The address contains important suggestions which the friends of higher education cannot afford to overlook. It is the very natural but no less wrong idea of most people in a new country like ours that the higher education and culture of the citizens is but a side issue or after-thought. Too often it is regarded as a mere luxury which may be sought after or not according as people have or have not a turn for that sort of life. Should culture become a fashionable pursuit then, indeed, we may find a great many philistines trying to acquire at least the manner and language of cultured people. But as the object sought is purely external so also is the culture. Of this we have an instance in much of the reputed culture of

Boston. Even this condition, however, poor as it is, is preferable to a dull apathy to all the things of the mind.

A nation's life no less than that of the individual does not consist in the abundance of things which it possesses. The higher or human life of the nation, as of the individual, is a spiritual one; and according to the development of its spiritual life so is the true greatness of the nation to be estimated. Doubtless *being* is to be secured in order to the attainment of *well-being*. But to make the conditions of mere *being* an end, instead of a means is to miss the essentials of our high vocation as men possessed of a spiritual nature. It is to spend our lives in merely preparing to live. Now, as Dr. Watson has pointed out, referring back to the experience of older countries, it is to our universities that we must look for the larger share of that influence which makes for culture. There if anywhere may the youth of the country be stirred up to take a nobler, more spiritual view of life than can be obtained from the ordinary work-a-day world. As Matthew Arnold puts it in his "Culture and Anarchy": "Culture begets a dissatisfaction which is of the highest possible value in stemming the common tide of men's thoughts in a wealthy and industrial community, and which saves the future, as one may hope, from being vulgarised, even if it cannot save the present." Now it is not pretended that this higher life is confined altogether to those who have had a university training. The universities simply are, or should be, the highest centres of culture, but with an influence which pervades the whole community, though often through channels more or less indirect. The question to be answered by those who recognize the importance of higher education in the determination of national greatness is simply, shall our universities be thoroughly fitted for the work required to be done?