

longer boys, and the self-assertion to be held as men does not always take a wise form. There are times when coercion must be direct and vigorous. But ordinarily the exercise of authority must be that of suasion, based upon the respect and esteem obtainable by those who enforce it. The discipline must be firm, but it must be maintained with gentleness. Teachers of equitation will tell you that a tight rein and a light hand form the beauty of a rider. We all have heard the remark of Louis Philippe that the government of France was to be conducted by an iron hand in velvet glove, "*La main de fer dans un gant de velours.*" While Sir Daniel, like us all, was subjected to his share of criticism, he obtained great moral influence with all classes; his opinions always exacted respect, and his personal character in any crisis was one to make itself felt. With all his gentleness he did not falter on what he held to be the onward path he should follow. He acted as if guided by the advice given by the Cumæan Sybil to Æneas, "*contra audentior ito.*"

At the time of Sir Daniel's death it was said that the destruction of Toronto University by fire on the 14th of February, 1890, was one of its remote causes. There is no ground for the statement; it is simply a rhetorical assertion coined by some writer desirous of giving interest to his narrative, and it was never accepted as truth. Sir Daniel undoubtedly felt the great loss experienced on that occasion; but his was not a nature to be subdued by calamity, it was essentially one to rise superior to a reverse. His career showed that while he was the most gentle of men, and was never known to originate an altercation, he did not hesitate when the interests he represented were assailed to come forward boldly in their defence. He was not aggressive, but he never shrank from what he held to be the discharge of his duty, whatever the personal claim upon himself. The interests of the university on many occasions were assailed; Sir Daniel was always foremost in their defence, acting vigorously and unhesitatingly. He was not one to succumb to grief; in place of yielding to misfortune his strength of character led him to strive energetically to overcome it, whatever form it might assume.

What, however, may be said is, that in my humble judgment his continuous unrelaxed efforts to re-establish the university, and it is not a stilted phrase, as a "phoenix from its ashes," did repair his health. His labours for the last three years were remarkable. Their success can be read in the achievement of his attempt. No line of his epitaph should be placed in greater prominence than the record of his devotion in reintegrating the institution with which he had been so long and so worthily identified, of which he was then the head. That he morally rose equal to the occasion is as indisputable as it is undisputed, and that he so acted at the expense of his health is equally true.

He had arrived at a time of life when he required ease; his circumstances were such that he could readily have attained it. He could have retired from the university with a liberal acknowledgment of his service. His tastes would have suggested an occupation both congenial to him, and which could have been leisurely followed. He could have wandered through the ancient cities of Italy, and in many a spot have identified the locality of the renowned events of the previous centuries. While creating for himself an agreeable study he would have added to our national literature. He had the *entrée* into a society, the intercourse with which in his circumstances would have been a continual charm, where he would have found those who possessed his tastes, to interchange opinions, such as Cicero has recorded in his tract to *Atticus* "*De Senectute*" and to *Lælius* "*De Amicitia*." He rejected this temptation, and I cannot doubt that in moments of weariness and depres-