

with it almost as many disadvantages, as advantages, as the comptroller of the college would probably admit readily. And, although the desiderata for a principal involve capacity of the highest degree, lofty ideals are not what is sought primarily by those making the choice.

The rest of the list consists largely of doctors, containing also three lawyers, turned politicians, the best about whom, it may be said, was they they stood out from a body of politicians, acknowledged by all to be singularly lacking in that high sense of public morality, so necessary to the modern state. Doctors, however distinguished, are notorious for their aloofness from public administration, and their greatness, as with that of the scientists, is of a peculiar kind, having little immediate bearing upon the national life, though of vast indirect consequence.

Thus one may at least speculate upon the value of such a list. But the chief feature of the McGill graduates' alleged great part in public affairs, is claimed to be derived from its high ideals of non-political, non-sectarian tolerance, and here is where one can lay the gravest charge at the present administration of the College. Here is the point, where one is forced to doubt the bona fides of McGill's claims to strict impartiality. A university -- and this is the point, which particularly needs rubbing in -- should be the leader of the intellectual life of the country in which it is placed. Reforms of all kinds should have been foreseen and advocated, at the universities of a country, long before their adoption by the rest of the community, by definition less philosophically inclined, and naturally more conservative.

But in a day, when the intellectuals of all nations are questioning the ideals in which one was brought up, and the people at large, even in this country, are beginning to see the patent