

the other papers was receiving their active support. Undue importance is too often attached to newspaper articles. A newspaper known to speak the sentiments of a Government is watched and read with interest, because it is the mouth-piece of the administration. For example, suppose the *Globe* now propounded a new land or timber policy for Ontario, it would at once be assumed that it was speaking on behalf of the Government, and therefore importance attached to it, which otherwise would be puerile. But no such weight or importance can or should be attached to the sayings of an independent paper, who may simply be airing the views of its editor; and these often very shallow and worthless.

Suppose that I admit for argument sake, what as a fact I most distinctly deny, that Mr. Brown and the *Globe* were in the past what they are represented to be by his worst enemies, what would that prove against the Reform party? I answer unhesitatingly nothing—absolutely nothing. Surely a party, numbering its followers by hundreds of thousands, is not going to be judged by the acts of one man or by the writings in one newspaper. In physics what would be thought of a philosopher who sought to establish a general law of nature from one phenomenon or from one set of phenomena. Why his theorizing would be scouted as absurd and dangerous speculations, even though, like Kepler, his genius unaided could for an instant penetrate the vast abyss that divides finite knowledge from infinity. Such laws are founded on carefully recorded series of observations under every variety of circumstances and extending over considerable periods of time; and when promulgated as great natural truths they are subjected to the most severe, rigid and critical analysis by all the world of science: every credential is closely inspected before being admitted to the temple of truth. Take the astronomer in the simplest of his operations—the finding of his latitude. Though possessed of the most perfect instruments that scientific skill can bring to his aid, will he determine it by a single observation? Far from it. Day after day he will make a series of observations, take a mean of each day's; and by a mean of *all his means* he fixes his position. In judging a party we must take ground exactly similar to the philosopher, we must not draw conclusions from single or isolated facts. We must try it by the views of all its leading men, by the authorized exposition of its doctrines, by the principles it inculcates and by the whole press which circulates them. We must not specially seize on periods in its history of exasperation and disturbance. Who would think his character fairly portrayed by a delineator who seized on his moments of weakness from ill-humour or excitement? We must take a comprehensive view, gather together all its acts, and judge it intelligently and critically by the sum total of these acts. Would it be just or