

the University work went on with its usual regularity and good order; and also by the hearty rejoicing with which his return was recently greeted by all connected with the institution. A torchlight procession and a large and enthusiastic reception in Convocation Hall celebrated his arrival in fully restored health and strength, and in his speech on that occasion he declared very plainly that the motto of the University under his guidance is still to be, "Onward and upward."

It is clear, indeed, that Queen's University is now in no danger from any lack of progressive spirit, yet, in common with our other educational institutions, it is exposed to other and peculiar perils. In its early days it suffered from the generally low level of education in the country, while its course was too simple and elementary to be complete. *Now*, with the great multiplication of subjects and professors, honour courses and special prizes, along with a more ambitious standard of University education, the danger lies in quite the opposite direction. High pressure and undue specialization of the undergraduate course are now the perils that beset our Universities, and against them the best minds of our time have begun to protest. For the ideal of a "liberal education" is to lay a broad foundation of general knowledge on which the more special superstructure is afterwards to be built. The student, at the close of his undergraduate course, should have gained some adequate idea of the relations and proportions of different kinds of knowledge—some intelligent grasp of the great outlines of the different provinces of the kingdom of thought. Any attempt to secure special scholarship in any department during the undergraduate years, necessarily narrows the scope of the education, often to an almost injurious degree. As a matter of fact, "honour" graduates often

leave our Universities densely ignorant of almost everything save their special "honour" courses. And if we find such an one suffering from haziness as to the simplest elements of English literature or English history, it were scarcely a balm to our wounded sense of fitness to know that he could perhaps calculate an eclipse with the accuracy of a Leverrier. Not, conversely, will an intimate acquaintance with Anglo-Saxon or Greek roots, or Pythagorean Philosophy, atone for ignorance of the spirit of ancient literature, or of the simplest facts of Natural history. But this evil is inevitable so long as each professor thinks only of his own subject, with the modern ambition of making his course as "stiff" and his examination as severe as possible. Undue specialization of undergraduate study acts injuriously both on the man who is to be a specialist in that direction and on the one who is not. In the first case, the student misses an opportunity that may never recur, of having his mental vision enlarged and his whole being developed. In the second, he is sure to find that he has wasted much valuable time in the acquirement of knowledge which he is likely never to need and soon to forget. To combine the largest possible degree of general culture with the invaluable requisites of accuracy and thoroughness, in the undergraduate years, is a matter requiring careful study, comprehensive grasp and thoughtful arrangement.

There is a second great evil connected with excessive special study. As each professor wishes to bring his own subject up to as high a standard as possible, the consequence is that each is apt to give as much work as—to do it justice—would occupy the whole time of an average student. If, as usually happens, the student is taking two or three courses at once, the only alternatives are *killing* or