

be governed according to its own statutes, and it would not be necessary either to abolish or to degrade degrees in Divinity.

But what are the objections to it?

The author of the pamphlet, so often referred to, offers the following, which shall be considered in the order in which they have been advanced.

First, "The enormous pecuniary cost," which would warrant the charge of "approximation to impossibility."

Before considering the validity of this objection, it is necessary to state that the necessity for expenditure (whether small or great) is produced by the existence of the Colleges at Kingston and Cobourg. It is not King's College, but they, which require assistance. The Act, whereby King's College was divested of distinctive religious character, had been passed, before those Universities were established—and yet instead of proposing or endeavouring to carry out a scheme for a joint University, the Presbyterians and Methodists preferred having exclusive institutions for themselves. That was the time for considering "the enormous pecuniary cost" of separate Universities. It is now too late—when the Charters have been obtained and the Institutions are in operation—to urge the expense of such establishments as the ground for incorporation with a University from which they had voluntarily separated themselves.

It is plainly unjust that King's College should suffer for the errors of others. If other Universities, which have been established since she obtained her Charter, cannot continue to exist as they were established, without "enormous pecuniary cost," it is unfair to throw the blame, which attaches to those who were instrumental in founding and conducting them, on others who neither advised nor desired their existence as separate institutions.

But, however, the enquiry relates to circumstances as they at present exist.

There are three Universities, and they must be either consolidated or maintained as they are. If the choice then lies