

study, proportioned to their intrinsic worth. And thus the proud pre-eminence of the ancient classics has come to be threatened. The spirit of this intensely practical age has invaded the sacred abodes of learning, and demands that the instruction given shall be such as is capable of immediate application to the affairs of life. The present is a vastly different age from that which witnessed the adjournment of the British House of Commons to ascertain the quantity of a Latin verb.

Students are no longer willing to waste a large part of their best years in the profitless task of acquiring a superficial knowledge of dead languages. English men are becoming cognizant of the fact that at their own door, enshrined in their mother tongue lies a literature inferior to that of no nation, ancient or modern. The student, whose object is the acquisition of useful information, will not long hesitate between the dry husks of antiquity and the teeming riches of modern literature and science. If a general culture and the formation of correct literary taste be sought, we think the study of the classics of our day will be as fruitful of result as an obstinate devotion to those of Greece and Rome. Indeed it has been pointed out that a study of the ancient languages, especially Latin, tends to develop a florid, ornate style at the cost of that purity which is the strength of the best English writers. It will be noted also, that later speakers and writers do not abound in quotations from the ancient classics, as did those of an earlier period. This may, and probably does, arise from lack of an intimate acquaintance with the literature of antiquity. But from whatever cause springing, the fact must be patent to every student that the writers and speakers of this day draw their illustrations, not from the literary remains of Greece and Rome, but from the classics of modern times. An example of

this is found in the brilliant history of Justin McCarty, recently published, which in the absence of classic reference presents a striking contrast to the writings of Macaulay and his contemporaries.

THE question of the re-organization of the University system of Ontario has assumed a new phase. Hitherto nothing has been said or done that seemed to call for any response from the Colleges which are taunted with being "denominational," because they happen to be under the guidance of men who are members of a Presbyterian or a Methodist Church. Mr. Goldwin Smith's beautiful vision of a New Oxford deserves to be treated with the respect due to our foremost man of letters, but the vision must be stripped of its poetical garb before it can begin to be realised in fact. Now, however, that there seems to be a disposition on the part of the Provincial Legislature to deal with the matter, it is worth asking what form the proposed substitute for the University of Toronto ought to take. The authorities of Victoria and Queen's, so far as we are aware, have never set their faces against University consolidation as such. They have certainly refused, and will no doubt still refuse, to migrate to Toronto, or to efface themselves that University College might abound the more; but their resoluteness in these points can hardly be called more than a natural measure of self-defence. Reform in our University system must be determined solely by a regard for the interests of higher education; local interests and jealousies must be put entirely aside. It is contended, and perhaps with reason, that a number of Colleges all serving as feeders for a single University, would be spurred on to stronger efforts and would accomplish better results, were the examination for degrees entrusted to a central Board, or at least that under such a system the public would have a perfect guarantee