

Toronto University I may be permitted to suggest that while its graduates have already a share in its management I see good reasons, not for handing it over entirely to the graduates, but for freeing it altogether from party or political control. Indeed, it will be a good day for the country when the whole department of education is made independent of party. Still, the important question is not, who shall manage University College, but whether it is well managed.

If well managed, its friends may be asked to do something for its extension. If not well managed, I do not see why I should be taxed for its luxuries. Our graduates are satisfied with a voice in the management of Queen's. They do not govern it; but that does not stop the steady flow of their liberality. One word as to our finances, for this question has been imported into the discussion. A critic gravely informs us that while University College cannot get contributions, Queen's "has been able to get all the money it needed." This will be pleasant news to some of its friends, who perhaps are getting just a little tired—such is the weakness of the flesh—of giving without ceasing. I am sorry to dispel so pleasing an illusion. Had my critic read my address, he would have learned that we had just appointed two Professors without having secured an endowment for the chairs, and in previous addresses I pointed out that we need now, and need very badly, at least a quarter of a million of dollars. In a few years after we get that, we shall need another quarter of a million. All that I can promise is that the money shall be well spent. University College and Queen's may well sympathise with each other, for both are in need, but our need is the greater. But I believe that both of us shall get all that we really require, if we only go the right way about it, and exercise a little patience. And when the money is given willingly, it will be twice blessed.

### 3. ON DEC. 8TH.—TO RESIDENT MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL.

On University day I took the liberty of warning the friends of University College that if the question of direct aid to colleges from the public purse was opened it could not be settled in the one-sided way they proposed. Last month I referred again to the subject, endeavoring to look at it from my critics' point of view, answering their arguments and stating our position. I propose now to review briefly what has been written since, and to state the three courses of collegiate policy that have been suggested, that the public may judge which of the three is most in accordance with right reason, and, therefore, promises most for the best development of the people as a whole.

As to the personalities that have been imported into the controversy I put them aside as—in the literal sense of the word—impertinences. Anonymous writers are doubly bound to avoid those, but when they violate the unwritten code of honor it would be a mistake to answer them according to their folly. To that style of writing there is no end, and endless columns of it contribute nothing to the settlement of the question. Suppose, with Mr. Biggar, that my addresses are "garlands of rhetoric," or, with an anonymous ally of his, that they are "Chinese stink-pots"; suppose that Dr. Williamson is "rude," and that Professor Burwash and Dr. Nelles, men to whom the country owes a debt of gratitude for life long services of the noblest kind, are worthy only of taunts and sneers; suppose that the Rev. D. J. Macdonnell—one of the clearest intellects in Canada—is quite incapable of judging whether a paragraph in one address is or is not inconsistent with a paragraph in another, what then? What has been proved?

Does it follow that University College should have 225 Professors in Arts because Berlin has 225 in arts, science, law, medicine, theology, dancing, and fencing? And that University College should have them all salaried at the public cost because the great majority of the Berlin Professors are paid wholly by fees? It seems, too, that we are enemies to the public school system; that we seek to cripple University College; that we are acting the part of the dog in the manger; that we are un-