

ment and no mean place in Canada's great sports. We have associations "by the people, for the people," and some far off wooing of the *still, small voice* of Art. Better than all, we have men for our masters, men of attainments, of culture, of breadth, of character. What we wish to emphasize is this: We, at this seat of learning, in common with our fellows at other colleges, have many special privileges, and our aim should be to present to our country as a return for the opportunities she gives us, the gift of a growing manhood. This is her reasonable demand—men of action, of executive ability, of affairs, men of letters, of science, of religion, men who can follow and men who can lead; but in all and through all, men, "able men, such as fear God, men of truth, hating covetousness."

* * *

Recent events, in both America and Europe, have given striking illustrations of the truth that democratic institutions do not necessarily make a people free. If it is true that the free man is the one who is master of himself, and who, therefore, is free to do only the right, to fulfil the true end of his existence, the same may be said of nations. Such nation is free in the truest sense which is making progress toward the realization of a high national ideal. Such a nation cannot be satisfied with a merely material prosperity. It must seek especially the moral and spiritual upbuilding of its citizens and must, therefore, be interested, not only in its own welfare, but also in the advancement of civilization the world over; it will recognize the spirit of freedom in whatever continent or under whatever government it is found.

Applying such a test, what nations have most right to be called free? We fear it is not those which have talked most loudly about liberty. Of late we have seen the great republic to the south, which is so proud of its free institutions, assuming a hostile attitude towards Great Britain over a question of little importance, while acknowledging that it was aware that if Britain were involved in war on this side of the Atlantic, Russia would attack her on the other. At the same time we behold France, the ancient champion of liberty, more ready to enter into alliance with Russia than with either Germany or Britain. What does all this mean? This much at least; that the United States is more deeply interested in the forms of government than in the advancement of civilization, and that France cares more for revenge than for liberty.

In spite of all the wrong-doings of Britain, no intelligent man can doubt the influences for good which the British nation has exerted during the past century. It has fought out the battles of civilization in every quarter of the globe, and while giving

its own citizens full political freedom under a limited monarchy, it has been ready to recognize the spirit of freedom, under whatever form of government manifested.

To an American, war with Britain must, of course, mean the defeat of Britain; and this would necessarily involve submission to Russia's terms in the East. Can it be that, under such circumstances, any large number of American citizens would welcome war with Britain? We are glad to believe that the best citizens in every part of the States would not, and we believe their influence will always prevail. But we are forced to acknowledge that while the most influential class would oppose war, the majority would welcome a war with Britain on almost any pretext. Such a state of affairs should cause thoughtful men to ask what the explanation is, and we believe that at least a partial explanation will be found in the fact that our neighbors have worshipped the form to the neglect of the spirit. They have imagined that, with a republican government and free institutions, the people must be free and that where this form of government was wanting there could be no freedom. We admit that this is only a partial explanation. The other side is to be found in a certain class of immigrants that has poured into the United States from all parts; but probably the fact that the form of freedom was given greater prominence than the spirit has done much to attract this class of immigrants.

Be that as it may, it is time for every nation to learn that government by the people does not necessarily make a people free in the highest sense. Nothing short of a high moral and intellectual standard among the electors can make a people free, and this is a lesson which Canada, as well as her neighbor, needs to learn. It is still true that "righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people," whether they be a republic or a monarchy.

* * *

Good fellowship has always been a prominent feature in college life, and in the nature of the case must continue so. Young men, with three-quarters of life drawn from a common fund, the other quarter affording just variety enough for friendly differences, and with boundless life in all, must let their spirits run out in social channels. Nowhere do they find such vent as round a jovial board where "good digestion waits on appetite" and the richer feast of wit and wisdom revives the higher man. Why such intellectual creatures insist on the material part is a question for the physiologist or gastronomist, but this is a fact that must be reckoned with—even students' tongues move more freely at a well-laden table. Hence the desire for a college residence;