

probability, they are not remunerative to the C. P. R. It was not expected that they would be at the outset. One of the arguments in favour of a liberal land grant was that the traffic would not pay while the country was sparsely settled. Though the people murmur, and not without reason, the dividends of the Syndicate are probably small, and will be so until the population becomes much more dense than it is at present.

It will perhaps be said that the Government can redress this grievance by limiting the tariff charges of the railway, but its hands are tied by the terms of the contract. Not until the Syndicate can be shown to be receiving a ten per cent. dividend, can a check be put upon its demands. There is little probability of this point being reached during the whole term of the monopoly, and the settlers in the North-West are clamorous for immediate relief. Can this clamour be appeased by anything short of radical measures? It is very doubtful if it either can or will. The settlers have the example of Illinois, where railway extortion became intolerable, and there was an uprising of farmers in such downright earnest that the legislature was compelled to take the matter in hand, and redress the grievances of the people. As the result of the Illinois railway rebellion, for such it was, Iowa, Wisconsin and Minnesota have laws regulating and limiting railway charges. These north-western States of the American Union are Manitoba's near neighbours, and the lessons they have learned in the school of experience have found students across the border who are not ignorant of the motto "what man has done, man can do." What has been achieved in Illinois, is not impossible in Manitoba.

It is of no use to pooh-pooh the Manitoba uprising. The settlers are made of sturdy material, and they mean business. They see plainly that the wolf is at their door, and they are going to drive it away, by hook or by crook. Here and there a few who have no particular stake or tie may quit the country and go to Dakota, but the majority are there to stay, and to obtain their rights. The cries of secession and annexation are faint and feeble. In most cases, they are started in the interest of United States wire-pullers and speculators. Manitoba cannot stand alone, nor can she join the American Union without the consent of the rest of the Dominion, and of Great Britain, and that most assuredly will not be given. The just claims of the North-West will have to be conceded, one and all, sooner or later. Sir John Macdonald never spoke a truer word than when he said, "We cannot check Manitoba." The country will grow in spite of all obstacles. Like a young Samson, which it is, it will burst all the ropes and withes with which its limbs may be bound, and unlike the ancient hero, will never submit to have its locks shorn and shaven. Our future as a Dominion is too closely bound up with the prosperity of the North-West to permit its interests to be trifled with. Plainly the people have endured all the tension they can bear. Reaction has now set in, and it will go on with resistless force. It will be well if politicians and partymongers make a note of this, and govern themselves accordingly.

W. F. C.

### OPEN LETTERS.

#### "A BYSTANDER" ON STATE AID TO COLLEGES.

To the Editor of The Week:

SIR,—In the few words which he has written on the question of Legislative aid to Toronto University, "A Bystander" has shown a strange misapprehension of the real point at issue. Starting from the fact that the authorities of Queen's and Victoria are opposed to State aid for University College, he has built up in his own mind an interpretation of their opposition which, to those who have followed the discussion, must appear as the wildest romance. There is not the least evidence that the opposition rests upon religious grounds, and yet Dr. Grant and Dr. Nelles are represented as a pair of Zealots, quaking for the future of Christianity, bent on keeping the intelligent youth of the Province in the safety of a "pusillanimous and impotent seclusion," and clamouring against a godless University! A doubt seems for a moment to have entered the writer's mind that his *a priori* view of the case was not in keeping with the known liberality of those gentlemen, but the suggestion seems to have been promptly suppressed. It is a prostitution of the critic's function to draw damaging inferences from premises of his own creation.

The actual facts of the case are these: There are in Ontario four colleges—University, Victoria, Queen's and Trinity—which are admittedly doing the work of higher education for the Province, and doing it as well as their limited means will allow. That none of them is as fully equipped as we should desire is a fact that goes without saying. It has been asserted that University College, and it alone, should be aided by the Legislature. To this, the answer is, that such a solution of the problem is inadequate and unjust; inadequate, because it does not grapple with the whole prob-

lem of higher education in Ontario, and unjust, because it discriminates in favour of a single institution. No appeal has been made to Sectarian prejudice, nor has it been even hinted that a purely secular college is hostile to the interests of Christianity. All that has been done is to claim for the other colleges the same degree of consideration as for University College. An entirely irrelevant issue has been forced into prominence by those who have taunted the other colleges with being "denominational." Denominational they are not, in any sense which should prevent them from receiving such assistance from the Legislature as may enable them to do their work more efficiently. It is true that, as in the Scottish Universities, there is in each a Theological faculty, but the connection between it and the Arts faculty is for all practical purposes no closer than that between Knox College and University College. A broad view of the whole question, therefore, demands that the Legislature should aid all the colleges which are struggling manfully to do their work under many discouragements and difficulties, or if that is at present impracticable that it should in justice refrain from helping one institution at the expense of all the rest. To say that any of the colleges is "afraid of the best literary and scientific teaching," or is actuated by "religious antipathy to a common university" is a charge as pointless as it is unfair. The authorities of Queen's and Victoria have not refused to consider any scheme for University consolidation which may come from an authoritative source. Certainly their action has in no way been determined by fear for the future of Christianity. "A Bystander" assumes that they must have a "religious antipathy to a common university." By a "common university" is meant, we presume, one after the model of Oxford or Cambridge, and having a number of colleges gather together in one locality, the students of which all submit to the same test of efficiency. If there is any "antipathy" to such a university, its source is not "religious" but educational or financial. Suppose that the ideal which has for so long floated before the vision of "A Bystander" could be reduced to fact—and some of us have a wistful longing to see it realized if only that were possible—would opposition to the singling out of University College for exclusive State aid then cease? Surely not. Is it not self-evident that it would rather be intensified? How could the friends of the other colleges tamely submit to be handicapped? Would they not demand to be treated, not as step-children but as the present favoured child of the State? It is, therefore, incomprehensible how "A Bystander" should infer that opposition to exclusive aid being given to University College can only be a disguised form of "religious antipathy to a common university." The objections to a university with various colleges grouped in one centre are mainly of a practical character, not the least being that an expenditure by the Legislature of something like a million dollars would at once be required; and until "A Bystander" gives more evidence than he has yet done of having faced the practical difficulties lying in the way, our Legislators may be pardoned for not taking any steps towards the realization of his fascinating ideal.

JOHN WATSON.

Queen's College, 15th Dec., 1883.

To the Editor of The Week:

SIR,—"Bystander" either did or did not read my three brief addresses on the subject of State aid to colleges. If he did, he must have seen that my attitude was totally different from what he has chosen to represent it; if he did not, he must have constructed my position out of his own consciousness. Such a style of criticism is doubly vicious when made the basis of a personal attack. No man is more sensitive than he to misrepresentation; yet he has misrepresented, with the tone of an oracle, men whom he must have known are quite as incapable as himself of "religious antipathy to a common university," or of "the avowal that timid counsels are Christian wisdom." Alongside of such imputation of unworthy motives, it is a small thing that he has disfranchised us with the top-lofty declaration that we "can have no right to be heard against the improvement of a national or provincial institution," that is, I suppose, that we have no right to discuss the policy of the nation or the Province with regard to higher education!

Yours, etc.,

G. M. GRANT.

University of Queen's College, Kingston, 15th Dec., 1883.

[Dr. Grant appears to have taken the words of "Bystander," "It is hardly from Dr. Nelles or Dr. Grant that we should expect the avowal that timid counsels are Christian wisdom," in a different sense from that in which we took them ourselves. To us they appeared to be an appeal to the well-known liberality of Dr. Nelles and Dr. Grant.—THE EDITOR.]

A REVIEW in the last number of *The Literary World* speaks of "the aspiration of Mrs. Browning's poem, 'May I reach that purest heaven.'" The poem quoted from is by George Eliot.