

in which we live, which all regard as valuable, how much more valuable is that special and direct cultivation gained by a liberal education?

But the most frequent questioning is that of results. The skeptic tells us that the great men of our country are not college men. This question is not new; it used to be discussed at Rome in Cicero's time. In the oration for Archias, Cicero tells us that he has known learned fools who have been to school, and great men who have not; but when a man with brains is educated then the best results follow. In the older countries of Europe we find that, as a rule, the great men have been college bred; and if, in our young country, the opposite principle seems to hold, we may fall back on the experience of history for our great principle, and may meet objectors with Cicero's dictum. Abraham Lincoln was a great man; would he have been less great if he had had a liberal training? I use the word great as it is generally used in such a connection,

in the sense of political greatness. This kind of greatness depends most largely on executive ability which is inborn. It is not fair to blame the colleges for not turning out great administrators; nor is it just to claim that liberal culture and administrative ability are incompatible. The best exponents of culture in the Roman world were Cicero and Cæsar; the former was moderately successful in executive work, and the latter remarkably so. The colleges cannot create, they can only develop what comes to them; and if a literary man is a failure in political life, it should be no more astonishing than the failure of a machinist to do carpenter's work. We must reiterate the principle that the task of the college is to develop the whole man, and not a part of him; and therefore adverse criticism must be directed against the result as a whole, not against the least of some particular natural endowment of the man, or failure in some technical specialization in the work of the world.—*Education.*

CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES.

THE Canadian Dominion and the American Commonwealths trace most of the political institutions they possess to the great English mother of all governments. In the course of many years, diversities have naturally grown up in the working out of those institutions. It is generally taken for granted in the United States, that in these diversities the advantages are altogether on the side of the States. This, however, I take to be a mistaken view. I think Canadians may fairly claim that they possess institutions worthy of the study and imitation of their neighbours.

I acknowledge that in the constitution of the Upper Houses, in the existence of the political veto, in the

financial dependence of the provinces to a large extent on the Dominion exchequer, there is room for doubt whether the constitution of Canada does not exhibit elements of weakness. The Senate of the United States is a body of great power and varied ability, to which the people may refer with pride and gratulation. The reference to the courts of all cases involving points of constitutional interpretation has also worked to the advantage of the commonwealths. On the other hand, Canadians call attention to the following features of their system as worthy of the serious consideration of their co-workers in the cause of good and efficient government;

An executive, working in unison