

all events, it is clear that if there is to be blame for what took place fifty years ago, the Province alone is responsible.

As to the second epoch, Sir Daniel tells us that by the Act of 1853 the heads of the other institutions "were invited to share in the government of the Provincial University, as a step towards the establishment of more intimate relations between them under one degree-conferring board. Queen's and Victoria Universities, along with other Colleges, so far responded to the invitation as to bear a part for a time in the deliberations of the Senate; but the only result was a determined effort to accomplish a division of the endowment among certain denominational colleges. That scheme was accordingly superseded by the Act of 1873." Principal Leach and President Nelles would have given a somewhat different picture of the working of that Act of 1853. I have heard both describe graphically the worse than Barmecide feast to which it invited them. But it is not necessary that I should vindicate those great men. Neither is it in the general interest to revive dead issues. One question, however, may be pardoned, for it will show that Sir Daniel and I agree in the main with regard to what is taught us by the second as well as the first epoch. If the result of the Federation of 1853 was only a quarrel between the contracting parties and if as a result the universities were driven farther apart, ought we not to be slow in trying another Federation, unless the basis promises a better ending to the experiment?

That question brings us to the Conferences called by the Minister of Education in 1884, and to the present Federation Act, with regard to which Sir Daniel sums up as follows: "As to the universities that have been organized on this continent under denominational or other control, we would fain hope that it is not impossible to revive among them something of the Cosmopolitan fellowship of the mediæval universities. But whatever be the result in that ampler field, we think we have a right either to ask of our own Canadian colleges to accept of the co-operation offered them on liberal terms, or to enter on a fair and friendly rivalry, etc." This makes it necessary for me to explain why and in what way Queen's came to its decision to decline the "liberal terms" offered by the Federation Act, and at the same time to say that we have always been, and now are, solicitous for "fellowship," for "co-operation," and for "fair and friendly rivalry."

When the proposed federation was submitted to the University Council, a body that includes the trustees, the senate, and forty elected representatives of the graduates, it did not get a single vote. Not that there were no friends of union in the Council. Quite the contrary. But it was seen at a glance that the proposal did not attempt to deal with existing facts. It was simply a scheme that circumstances made apparently convenient for Victoria and Toronto. It is not necessary to explain why it went no farther in reality; but as a distinguished member of the Senate of Toronto said subsequently, "Queen's was out of the question from the outset." Notwithstanding this, the Council sent the proposal to all our alumni and graduates and asked their opinions before publicly pronouncing its own. Not a man voted in its

favor. It was sent also to our benefactors. Out of more than a thousand of these only two voted yea, and they would promise nothing for the new buildings required. They have since contributed to the Jubilee fund! Will one man who reads this say, over his own name, that Queen's should, in these circumstances, have accepted the "liberal terms" offered? These terms meant her annihilation, as they would have meant the annihilation of Toronto, had it been invited to Kingston on the same terms. A high authority seems to think that we were influenced by "local and denominational sentiment." How could that be? Our friends in Montreal, Toronto and Manitoba were on the same side as the people of Kingston. Our graduates are everywhere and are of all denominations. Where did the localism and denominationalism come in? The fact is that our Council, at its annual meeting in April, 1884, in anticipation of the conferences which it was understood were to be held, considered the question and decided that a university system similar to that of Scotland and New England was best adapted to our history and condition. Events have vindicated their views. Not a single university in Ontario has accepted the Federation scheme. The legislature, by giving a charter to McMaster, has increased, while professing to be in favor of lessening, the number of our universities. The trend of events elsewhere is the same. Though Massachusetts has five good universities, one man is giving millions to found another at Worcester. It looks as if John Knox's ideal, "a university in every principal city," would be realized before long.

In June, 1885, the chancellor communicated our decision to the Minister of Education. In the following October I asked for five additional chairs in Arts and an additional building, in the following language: "Professor Ferguson will give his whole time to history whenever we can get a chair of English language and literature. A chair of modern languages is also one of our first necessities. The chairs of ancient classics and of mental and moral philosophy should be divided." All that has been done. The building is also secured. *Laus Deo!* I said further: "In the present condition of natural science, to ask the same man to teach botany, geology and zoology, is almost an absurdity." We are still guilty of that almost absurdity. Who will come to our deliverance and save the life of Mr. Fowler?

Queen's, then, is here to stay, and that by unanimous consent. But in what way does this make it impossible for us to co-operate with Toronto, or with the department of education? Take matriculation, for instance. Dr. Wilson points out that it is wrong to reject a student on the ground of his inability to cope with puzzles. He has condemned with righteous warmth some of the papers that have been set. Now that is a matter in which all are equally interested. The candidates for Queen's, Victoria and Trinity come from as many high schools as the candidates for Toronto. We are willing to co-operate in making this examination, to which the whole high school course leads up, as rational and elevated as possible. Who stops the way? If the papers of Toronto are more difficult than ours, we are not afraid of them. Only give us a chance to point out mistakes beforehand, in language half as vigorous as that used by Dr. Wilson in the