

what surprising. To what additional eminence he might have attained, had his earlier efforts been addressed to a more critical circle, must remain a matter of conjecture. But it is not unlikely that he might have taken rank among the very greatest literary names of the century; had he had higher educational advantages and a more stimulating literary environment at the outset of his career. As it was, Haliburton generally wrote forcibly, and often smoothly and classically while in detached passages he could be terse and even brilliant. But the attractions of his style are not sustained, and he is sometimes a little slipshod or diffuse. He is accordingly still more to be admired as a humorist than as a writer, and more than either, perhaps, as a thorough student and acute judge of human nature. He noted with almost equal keenness and accuracy the idiosyncrasies of individuals, classes and nations. He intuitively recognised the tendencies of the age; he observed the currents of public opinion, and gauged their volume and their force with approximate correctness. He foretold some important events that have happened already and others that seem extremely probable to-day.

I have only touched lightly and incidentally on what strike me as being his faults—his self-complacency, his discursiveness, his repetitions, the inconsistencies in his characters, the lack of thoroughness in his historical researches, his occasional stooping to indelicacy. I felt that they bear but a small ratio to the merits of this greatest of Canadian writers. And if some too industrious hands—some other hands than