

calm and self-possessed." The memory of this great man needs not our vindication. Friends and opponents alike in his own land and the leading papers in this country unite just now in praising him. But we have no quarrel about adverse opinion of the man's character. What we most object to is the bad taste, the indecent haste and the condensed disrespect shown by *The Week* in the above quotation. One of the members of our staff, a Bostonian, and one who knows more of the late orator's reputation at home than perhaps the writer of the above extracts, naturally feels aggrieved at this disrespect and has embodied his thoughts in some stanzas which will be found in our poetry department.

SIR ISAAC NEWTON was one day sitting before the fire, in his study, when the heat became rather uncomfortable. Calling his servant he said, "William, I think you had better move that stove back some distance. It's very warm." William suggested to the great philosopher that the same result might be attained by moving his chair back a few feet. The anecdote shows that it does not always require an equal to point out an error to a great man. Having said this we want to comment on a speech lately delivered by the Chancellor of Toronto University—The Hon. Edward Blake. There is one method obtaining among orators which is almost sure of success. Begin by laying down some broad principles or grand truths; dilate at length upon these, laying stress upon certain propositions which every body believes and flatters himself he understands. Then any position to which you are favorable may be laid down and it will be accepted at once. Your hearers argue that the man who can lay down such just premises cannot surely be wrong in his conclusions.

To the greater part of the Hon. Mr. Blake's speech we subscribe. It was the grand theme—The necessity and glory of a national

system of education; the symmetrical and harmonic development necessary for its beauty and true usefulness—presented with an eloquence such as only that honorable gentleman can use. The one point of error seems to us to be in the application where he confuses a national system of University education with University education in Toronto. The old error. Toronto University may be Gog but it is not Gog and Magog and all the rest rolled together. Let us take an illustration which has done service before. Our educational system is a building of three stories. The first is the system of Common School education. This system does not mean a certain log school house on this concession line and another one on that cross road together with brick buildings scattered throughout the country, but it means Common School work wherever done thoroughly and as the people want it. Again the second story—our High School system—means High School work wherever done efficiently and as the people wish it. So the third story—our system of University education does not alone mean a certain magnificent stone pile situated, lying and being in the City of Toronto, but it means University education wherever done efficiently and as the nation requires.

IN connection with the Federation phase of the University question so popular in some quarters at present, there are many difficulties that 'Bystander' is inclined to think can be cantered over easily, but which seem to be worthy of the gravest consideration. As long as we have two or three vigorous and efficient Universities there cannot be stagnation. One will stimulate another. But let all the colleges be federated in one "University of Ontario," and who shall guarantee a governing body quick to discern the signs of the times and resolute to lead the van from generation to generation. The resistance that Toronto University has made to