

TRINITY UNIVERSITY REVIEW.

VOL. IV.

TRINITY UNIVERSITY, TORONTO, JUNE-JULY, 1891.

No. 6-7.

Trinity University Review.

A Journal of Literature, University Thought,
and Events.

Published in twelve monthly issues by Convocation and the Undergraduates in Arts and Medicine of Trinity University.
Subscription: One Dollar per annum, payable in advance. Single numbers, ten cents. Copies may be obtained from Messrs. Rowsell & Hutchison, 76 King St. East, and Messrs. Vannevar & Co., 440 Yonge St.
Rates for advertising can be obtained on application to the Manager.
All subscriptions, remittances and business communications to be addressed to

J. G. CARTER TROOP, Manager,
Trinity University, Toronto.

Literary contributions or items of personal interest are solicited from the students, alumni, and friends of the University, to be addressed to Mr. Troop, Trinity University, or to the Editors Trinity Medical College, according to their department. The names of the writers must be appended to their communications, but not necessarily for publication.

BOARD OF EDITORS:

Convocation:

F. BARLOW CUMBERLAND, M.A. REV. PROF. SYMONDS, M.A.

Arts:

Medicine:

REV. E. C. CAYLEY, M.A.
H. H. BEDFORD-JONES, M.A.
G. F. HIBBARD, B.A.
J. G. CARTER TROOP, Editor-in-Chief.
C. W. HEDLEY.

D. JOHNSON.
D. BEATTIE.
H. C. PARSONS.
J. R. BINGHAM.
W. MATHESON.

Editorial Topics.

THE NATIONAL LOSS.

THE memory of a great name, and the inheritance of a great example,—this is the legacy left to the Canadian people by the Statesman whose impressive personality and remarkable career have so lately formed the chief topic of discussion throughout the empire. Sir John Macdonald had large and liberal ideas in the management of great affairs. He looked at the whole of our complicated interests in one connected view. He did not take things by bits and scraps, some at one time and one pretence, and some at another, just as they pressed, without any sort of regard to their relations or dependencies. That gives the measure of the man and determines the quality of his influence. Undoubtedly the late Premier of Canada was a Statesman of the first rank. With a masculine understanding and a stout and resolute heart he had an application undissipated and unwearied. By a thorough knowledge of constitutional law and a perfect practice in all the business of Parliament he early obtained that commanding influence in the Councils of the nation which was never afterwards lost. His great knowledge of men and extensive comprehension of things were alike remarkable. In fact, few men knew human nature better, or how to decide between conflicting assertions. If Sir John Macdonald was ambitious his ambition was of a noble and generous strain. He is to be judged by the way he used his power, and none can deny

that he was ever actuated by a serious desire to promote the best interests of the State. How dear was Sir John to the people whom he so faithfully and brilliantly served is seen in the deep sorrow which found expression in every quarter of the Dominion when it became known that the great leader was dead. The little party differences were forgotten in the common grief, and the Liberal was as ready as the Conservative to bear witness to the eminence of the Premier and the goodness of his heart. Nothing more clearly proves the unification of the Dominion—the chief object of Sir John Macdonald's life—than the universality of the grief at his death. Nor was the mourning confined to this country: in all parts of the Empire, and especially in England, was the sad news sorrowfully received. It was felt and readily acknowledged that whatever measures Sir John might introduce in Canada were meant "to make the continuity of the Empire more and not less stable." In the Memorial Service held in Westminster Abbey the English nation paid to the memory of the dead Statesman the highest honour in its power. A yet further tribute to his splendid achievements is the elevation of his noble wife to the Peerage.

WE have received a letter from a recent graduate of the University, containing a number of suggestions for the improvement of its position, influence and work, upon which we would offer some remarks.

In the first place, the letter is of too great length for publication, unless we were assured of the necessity, or at least advisableness of its being made public. We fear, however, that its contents put forth without correction or comment might be injurious rather than beneficial, and we think it better to take up the points brought forward by our correspondent and express our own opinion upon them. These comments must, however, extend over more than one issue of THE REVIEW. The writer begins by drawing attention to the special advantages possessed by our University in the fact of so large a proportion of the students being resident within the walls. Certainly we have here what we may call the *Differentia* of Trinity. If it should turn out that such a system does not produce an excellent and superior type of scholarly and social life and character, then it will have to be abandoned. Very few persons who are familiar with the state of education in Great Britain will raise any question on this subject. It may, of course, turn out that a system more resembling that of the Scotch University, a system like that of the University of Toronto, may be better adopted to the circumstances of Canada. If that should be so, our own will naturally be abandoned. But we think that experience will lead us to hesitate before we give up methods so well tried and verified by experience. It appears, from the letter in question, that some among us regard our methods as "too English." This is slightly indefinite. We suppose, there is no one who advocates the mere imitation of everything which is done in England. But undoubtedly, the type of education generally adopted in our University is the English type, rather than the Scotch or the German. We want our men to be not merely well-educated, but disciplined and cultivated, in other words, we want to turn out gentlemen as well as scholars, and our general type of gentleman is the English. We know of none more human or more universal. We also