

ministry. At the conclusion of their studies all returned to their native land. One served his Master, unknown save to his native county, in a quiet parish on the East River of Pictou, and went years ago to his reward; two returned to Britain to occupy honourable positions in the Church of Scotland; the fourth was George Monro Grant, and what his British training did for him, and what he did for Canada, students of Queen's do not need to be told. Of three friends, who in the early sixties had rooms in common in Edinburgh, one was D. J. Macdonnell, another D. M. Gordon. Thus even when the prospects of Canada were far poorer than they are to-day, our Canadian lads came back; our precious ointment was not poured out in vain. Greatly as she has gained, the church is beginning to find that she has lost somewhat in relying entirely upon a home-trained ministry. If the Rhodes' Scholarships can give us some such men as these, we shall not too closely count the cost. These men were trained in Scottish Universities, but the influence of Glasgow or Edinburgh and Oxford on the best minds is not dissimilar. Inferior in apparatus for, and methods of, research to Germany, making little attempt to compete in Applied Science with Cornell or McGill, they have on the best minds a stimulative influence which may be called dynamic, awakening a sane and many-sided zeal for culture which cannot be over-valued. Certain defects there are even in the literary training of Oxford; a tendency to produce *doctrinaires*, to implant an intellectual arrogance which scorns the work-a-day world of compromise and make-shift and second-

best, a contempt for 'the dirty facts' which has spoiled much of the work of the greatest living master of English prose style, Goldwin Smith. Against this tendency we may count native Canadian common sense to be a sufficient prophylactic. Our danger lies rather in the opposite direction, in an inability to see anything but our present material surroundings, in a rampant Philistinism, ignorant of the past and oblivious of the future. To such a spirit an Oxford training is the best possible antidote.

Other objections may be more briefly dismissed. There are pessimists in Canada who never moved twenty miles from their native village; the man Oxford spoils would probably have been a grumbler wherever trained. And have I not been unjust to those who do not return in saying that they are lost to us? Britain needs to learn of us as well as we from her; just as those who return will gradually render less offensive our narrow provincialism, so those who remain will do much to break down the still more crass insularity of the Briton. To share our best with the Mother-land, to promote the spirit of inter-Imperial knowledge and charity, is not to impoverish ourselves but to enrich both. Is Lord Strathcona lost to Canada, or Sir Gilbert Parker, or Charles Roberts? Of the three Edinburgh friends whom I mentioned, the third was the Rev. C. M. Grant of Dundee, and many a Scot in Canada, giving to her service the glory of his manhood, finding on our broad prairies the scope for his Scottish enthusiasm which was denied him at home, knows whence came the kindly word which spurred him on, and the more material help which made his journey possible.