

Three cheers marked the conclusion of the address, after which Chancellor Fleming addressed the new doctor, expressing pleasure at welcoming her into the University, and saying that he was about to impose a high duty upon her, that of taking to Her Majesty the Queen the address of loyalty to the Queen from the University of which she was now a member. Chancellor Fleming then read the handsomely engrossed address, all standing as he did so and applauding at the conclusion.

Lord Aberdeen Speaks.

At the request of the Chancellor, Lord Aberdeen addressed the assemblage, commanding perfect attention and speaking with force and clearness. He spoke as follows:—

Mr. Chancellor, Principal, Ladies and Gentlemen,—For a reason which need not be specified, I do not feel that the present moment is favorable for a speech from me or for indulgent attention from you. However, we are in academical circumstances, and one foremost feature of the academical system is, as I have no doubt my friends in the gallery will testify, the maintenance of discipline. (Applause and laughter.) Discipline must be preserved, and therefore without demur I respond to the summons of the Chancellor to say a few words. My allusion to academical surroundings suggests that the atmosphere thereof should not merely hover about the actual university, but be wafted like a healthy fragrance on a breeze far and wide, and among the influences thus diffused we may surely expect those which may cause our University to be regarded as temples of peace, but peace with honor—(applause)—that leads you at once to patriotism, but patriotism with breadth, with magnanimity, with humanity—(hear, hear)—that excludes jingoism; we need not stop to define jingoism.

The name like the thing itself is not elegant. It came about by accident during an epidemic of the disease, and it came to stay. May we then look to our Universities to foster, ay, to propagate, the principles of peace and friendliness? We may. We do. I refer not only to our own land. What about the Universities of our big neighbor? Not long ago somebody sent me—for my own good, of course—an American magazine which I had not previously seen. I am not going to give it a free advertisement by mentioning the title, but it attracted my attention because it implied that the magazine was, or rather claimed to be, an academical organ. But when I find leisure—which to most of us seems to mean never—I shall inform the sender of this publication that so far as concerns the particular article to which attention was directed it is sailing under false colors. I will explain. Its purpose was to deal with an article in *The Spectator*, full of re-

spectful good-will towards the United States, mingled with expressions of regret at the tokens of an opposite disposition towards England, and suggesting at the same time as an explanation of that phenomenon that it might be due to the ideas that are instilled into the minds of American boys and girls by the method in which the history text-books depict the events which led to the formation of the United States—the separation from the parent country. Well, the reply to this courteous utterance of *The Spectator* was a vehement and rather splenetic rejection of advances, with a scornful inquiry as to whether *The Spectator* would propose that the American schools should adopt the pages of Blackwood and certain other British publications as their text-books. And then followed various quotations from Blackwood and nine other periodicals, quotations of a character which would undoubtedly give offence in the United States, especially in the northern States. But when did these utterances appear? All, or almost all, thirty years ago. That is to say, the writer had to go back thirty years ago to the period of excitement caused by the civil war, when inevitably some papers supported one side and some the other, in order to obtain material for the attack.

And this is the point on which I wish to lay stress, that for many a year the British press has uniformly adopted a tone of good-will towards the United States. Is it not time that we should allow by-gones to be by-gones? It is said that on one occasion an American citizen who had just paid a visit to Rome was asked by a friend what he thought of it. "Fine city," he said, "fine buildings, fine post office." "Oh, yes," said the other, "but about the antiquities?" "Oh, well," said the traveller, "as to that I always think we should let by-gones be by-gones." (Applause and laughter.) So far as the Presidents or Principals of the leading colleges of the Union may be regarded as the spokesmen for the institutions over which they preside, I venture to declare that having the pleasure and advantage of some acquaintance with the Presidents of the Universities of Harvard, of Chicago, of Yale, of Princeton, I do not believe that any of those notable men would endorse or approve of utterances of unfriendliness or suspicion towards Britain, and I, of course, use the word in its proper and comprehensive sense. But their attitude is not merely passive. I refer to these matters, Mr. Chancellor, because I think it is well that we should keep in view what may counterbalance or form an antidote to the impressions created by indications of an opposite sort. We should do our part in promoting the only rational, the only tolerable condition of things between the different branches of the English-speak-