

*RECENT ARTICLES in the "GLOBE" AND "LEADER".*

On the fifth day of November,—rather an ill-omened day for conspirators against the welfare of the state!—articles on the U. C. College Question, simultaneously appeared in the *Globe* and *Leader*. The *Leader* especially deals in "villainous saltpetre," and evidently, in the present conspiracy, divides with the *Telegraph* the exalted honor of carrying the dark lantern.

The article in the *Leader* of the 5th of November, is chiefly amusing as being the exact contradiction of an article on the same subject which appeared in the same journal, on Oct. 31. Under these circumstances I am content to wait until the *Leader* shall have settled this U. C. College question with his own troubled conscience, and given the world the benefit of his matured convictions. It would not be a profitable occupation of my time to reply to an article to which the *Leader* may itself, in all probability, on the morrow, supply the most ample and the most satisfactory confutation.

The *Globe* expresses its unqualified abhorrence of all such antiquarian researches as the U. C. College Pamphlet enters upon. And yet not many years ago the Constitutional Act of 1791, and the Clergy Reserves possessed inexhaustible attractions for our journalist. But when as in this instance the question concerns not the Clergy Reserves but the Grammar School Reserves—Ah! my friend, that is a different, because a Toronto, matter! It was not always so. If I were that unkind person that the *Globe* so feelingly portrays to its readers, I might wake once more to life the echoes of former years,—echoes of manly utterances that have long since died away among the dusty volumes of that journal—I might astonish the Province with the ringing periods in which the *Globe* declaimed against this present monopoly. But all that is past, and the *Globe* loveth not antiquarian researches!

J. H. H.