

peded by the lack of funds. Canadian Drexels, Caldwells and Hills, in generosity, we have none, but in wealth they are found in every province from Vancouver to the sea. To their disgrace be it said that the higher interests of their co-religionists and of themselves have been wholly forgotten in their unreasoning thirst for gold. Not metaphorically, but literally, is the widow's mite greater than the contribution from their riches; and not metaphorically, but literally, must we read and apply the condemnation of their action. If our schools and colleges and charities and churches are at all what they should be, they owe it to the firm faith and constant charity of the poor; if they lack in aught, the fault must be laid at the door of the rich, who hold that they are masters of what they have, and forget that they are but the treasurers and dispensers of God Almighty.

READING.

This subject may be hackneyed. What we shall say on it may be trite. But its indisputable importance must be our excuse for offering thereon a very practical suggestion. Setting aside observation and experience, reading is the medium through which we must obtain nearly all the knowledge that we acquire on this side of the grave. It is from reading that we derive our best thoughts and our noblest inspirations. This it is that inspires the lawyer with legitimate ambition, the physician with a lofty sense of his responsibility, or the priest with purity of intention and holy zeal.

The student who does not acquire a taste for reading during his collegiate course will probably never acquire it. Though he succeed in his examinations, he will not be well read; and, we venture to say, he will never rise higher than the routine work of his calling in after life. On the other hand, the indiscriminate

reader will find it extremely difficult to study anything seriously, thus losing the two most important results of a course of studies—the training of the intellect and the exercise of the will.

Emerson lays down the rule, "Never read but what you like," and James Freeman Clarke, "Read what interests you." We have, however, only to point to the half-crazed reader of sensational trash, to show that these rules are not absolute. We have but to look at the lax morals and accommodating creeds of too many of those who read "what they like," to be convinced of the necessity of some guidance in the matter, at least, until a correct taste is formed. During college life this guidance is easily obtained. The professor of history, for example, would willingly direct the attention of his class to different standard authors, and indicate the parts bearing on the question under discussion. Anti-Catholic writers could be safely read in conjunction with passages of the works wherein the Catholic side of the question is most ably presented. The student who thus reads history will with comparatively little study, become familiar with the masterly style of Hume, the "extensive, various and profound" knowledge of Hallam, and the "gigantic merit" of the impartial Lingard. Chapters of Guizot and Buckle, compared with corresponding chapters of Balmes, would go far towards giving one a just idea of the real influences which have been at work in European civilization; and go far also, towards making one familiar with many of the prejudices and sophistries which he would otherwise meet under less favorable circumstances. The class work will enable him to read, intelligently, isolated parts of authors; and the study, thus conducted, will be productive of benefits which could be obtained otherwise only by an extended course of reading.

What is true of history is equally true