

tive statements and that it was hardly fair to condemn it as heretical because it fell short of a complete portraiture of the Christ.

The author of the "Expansion of England" has earned the gratitude of all friends of the Anglo-Saxon race. Competent authority pronounces this work to be the key to a true understanding of European history during the eighteenth century. And its author may deservedly be called the father of the idea of Imperial Federation. At the end of his lectures on the "Expansion of England," Prof. Seeley thus sums up his view of the relation existing between England and her Colonies:—

"I hope that our long course of meditation upon the expansion of England may have led you to feel that there is something fantastic in all those notions of abandoning the Colonies or abandoning India, which are so freely broached amongst us. Have we really so much power over the march of events as we suppose? Can we cancel the growth of centuries for a whim, or because, when we throw a hasty glance at it, it does not suit our fancies? The lapse of time and the force of life 'which working strongly binds,' limit our freedom more than we know, and even when we are not conscious of it at all. It is true that we in England have never accustomed our imaginations to the thought of Greater Britain. Our politicians, our historians still think of England not of Greater Britain as their country; they still think only that England *has* Colonies, and they allow themselves to talk as if she could easily whistle them off, and become again with perfect comfort to herself the old solitary Island of Queen Elizabeth's time, 'in a great pool a swan's nest.' But the fancy is but a chimera produced by inattention, one of those monsters, for such monsters they are, which are created not by imagination but by the want of imagination!"

In addition to works already mentioned, Prof. Seeley is the author of "Lectures and Essays" and "A Sketch of Napoleon" which first appeared in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. This short study is a good example of Prof. Seeley's power of weighing evidence. It is an admirable summary of Napoleon's strong and weak points, and seems to show that where Napoleon was the child of his age he succeeded, where he was *himself* he failed. Prof. Seeley also wrote some papers on Goethe which were originally published in the *Contemporary Review*. These short, pithy essays give a very clear account of Goethe's development. Comparing Goethe's work with Shakespeare's, Prof. Seeley maintains that only a very small part of it is at all worthy to be compared with Shakespeare's average work. Goethe's best work being "Faust," part I., and one or two other pieces, which were all done during his short "classical period." We cannot recommend any better introduction to the study of Goethe than these appreciative studies.

One of Lord Rosebery's first acts was to bestow upon Prof. Seeley the order of K.C.M.G. No doubt this signified the appreciation with which, as Foreign Secretary, Lord Rosebery had viewed the author of "Expansion of England." In Professor Seeley England has lost a strong Unionist, the Colonies a friend, and the world of letters a brilliant historical writer. Cambridge is not so rich as Oxford in men who can fill the Regius Professorship of History. But we hope that she will not have to go again to Oxford, as was the case when the present Bishop of Peterborough was called to a chair at Cambridge. It is impossible with any certainty to forecast the appointment to the vacant chair, Mr. Oscar Browning is not likely to succeed, Mr. J. B. Mullinger might, but Mr. G. W. Prothers is the most probable appointment. Whoever it may be, we only hope that he may have something of those gifts of sympathy in understanding the past disinterestedness in weighing evidence and skill in

the use of the English language which have made Prof. Seeley so popular whether as a writer on literary, theological or historical subjects.

### \* \* \*

## The University of Toronto Makes a Mistake.

AMONG the recollections of our college days few incidents stand out to view more prominently, after more than a quarter of a century, than one which had in some respects the character of a struggle between a large majority of the students and the university authorities. The students had organized and were giving at their own expense, to all who chose to attend, a series of lectures on various subjects of public interest, by the ablest lecturers whose services they were able to command. They had been, up to a certain point, aided in this somewhat disinterested work by being permitted to use the College Hall for the purpose, free of charge. The occasion of the trouble was the choice as lecturer for a certain evening of one of the ablest and most eloquent statesmen whom Canada has ever produced. Unfortunately, however his politics, and probably his personality, were at that time particularly obnoxious to the ruling powers of the university. Imagine the astonishment and chagrin of the students on receiving formal notification from said authorities that the use of the Hall could not be granted for the proposed lecture. This, too, though the subject announced for the lecture was of a purely literary character. The indignant students rose to the occasion. Though there was not another hall suitable for the purpose to be had in the locality, they were resolved not to be thwarted in the exercise of what they considered to be their rights as free citizens *in esse* or *in futuro*. They accordingly proceeded to rent for the evening, at an expense which was for them appalling, one flat of a large furniture factory, the proprietor agreeing to remove his furniture for the evening, and the students concerned turning out in a body during recreation hours, procuring lumber, and extemporizing seats for a much larger audience than even the College Hall could have accommodated. The result was that the facts became noised abroad, public sympathy was in a large measure with the students, and on the appointed evening their orator was greeted with a very large and enthusiastic audience, who cheerfully paid an admission fee sufficient to lift the burden of the expense off the weak shoulders which had assumed it. Not a few of those students are now staid professors in colleges. One at least is at the head of a university, one is on the bench, a number occupy prominent positions at the bar and in the medical and other professions; but if any of them has ever seen cause to think himself wrong in that assertion of mental independence we have yet to learn the fact.

We beg our readers' pardon for the introduction of a personal reminiscence. The occurrence has been brought prominently to mind by a recent incident in connection with the Provincial University. We refer, of course, to the action of the authorities of the University of Toronto in refusing to permit the Political Science Association to listen to addresses on subjects intimately related to the objects of the Association, from Mr. Alfred Jury and Mr. Phillips Thompson. The position of the University as a State institution gives the press the right to criticize its action. We confess that we find it difficult to credit the alleged fact, as stated in the newspapers. We should have thought it a commendable and student-like feeling, and one to be encouraged rather than deprecated by the Faculty, which would prompt the members of the Association to wish to study the views in question, however unorthodox, as they presented themselves to men of sound common sense and acute intellects, who, without the