

and I am free to speak on the relations of the universities of Ontario, as I promised on University Day. The address delivered last month to the Convocation of the University of Toronto by its distinguished President called attention to this subject, and courtesy demands some notice of it on our part. In the course of his address, he pointed out that the Federation Act has come into operation and that it offers not only to the Theological Colleges of the various churches, but to every University in the province, a share in the government of the University of Toronto. As it would be scarcely respectful to decline the challenge thus given to take our offered share, we must define our position. I am all the more willing to do so, because of the warm personal friendship that everyone who knows Sir Daniel Wilson must entertain for him, and because he and I are on common ground in our views of what a university should be, and our conviction that the "Arts course should be essentially educational and not professional." All of us are also on common ground with him in the reasons assigned for desiring a rational matriculation examination. "Our incomes are in no degree affected by the increase of numbers;" and here, as in Toronto, a low standard "must prove a source of burdensome drudgery to the professor, an impediment to the work of the class-room, and a discredit to the university."

Discussion with such a man is likely to be pleasant and profitable. We may see things from different points of view, but in the end we are sure to agree, or, if not, each will be convinced that the other desires not only the good of his own university, but the common good.

It may be said, at the outset, that between sister universities even discussion is somewhat unseemly; that all our strength should be given to our work; and that there is room in Ontario for Toronto, Queen's, and every well equipped university. Precisely. Those feelings animated me from the day of my arrival in Kingston. In my inaugural address, I took the ground that it was well that Ontario should have devoted the whole endowment accruing from public lands to one College, because the existence of one well equipped was a guarantee that others would be also well endowed, and that educational interests would not be sacrificed to the clamours of sects or localities. The regard I had for Toronto then I have still. But I think more of the Province than of any institution. History has decided that there shall be more than one university in Ontario, and it is vain to kick against the goads. Let the facts of the case be recognized, and let there be co-operation, since there cannot be absorption. Duty now demands a forgetting of old feuds and a cordial understanding between the different universities. In a word, I submit that history, as sketched by Dr. Wilson, indicates that we should be cordial allies, instead of enemies each fancying the other to be hindering it from attaining some cherished ideal.

Three epochs of which two are gone from us, are noted by him. With regard to the first he says: "Had King's College from the first been established on a liberal basis, accessible and acceptable to all, we should not now be struggling to bring about a hearty united action for the establishment of a uniform standard of higher education accredited by the imprimatur of a national University."

Perfectly agreeing with him, I take the liberty of asking, on whom must the responsibility be laid for the illiberality? Not on those who after struggling in vain for years to liberalise the Provincial University, were at last driven to institute one of their own, and who made that at any rate "open on equal terms to all the youth of the country." Admittedly the province was to blame. Think what the efforts of the founders of Queen's meant? Long continued self-sacrifice on the part of thousands of people then very poor, but who responded heroically to the call to lay the foundations of an independent University on the Scottish model. When the question of higher education is discussed, let it never be forgotten that there is no blame, that there is nothing but praise for them. If ever an institution deserved to be treated with justice by this province, that institution is Queen's.

Our founders builded better than they knew. They were forced to act as they did, but it is now a subject for consideration whether it was not better that a distributive rather than a centralized system was established in this great province which already counts a population of two or three millions. Monopoly is a good thing only when something better is not to be had. When the monopoly touches our most sacred interests and is controlled by a party machine it wears its worst aspect. The establishment of competing universities led to the enfranchisement of Toronto. Ever since the same cause has forced it to take steps in advance that otherwise would not have been taken. A glance at very recent history is enough to prove this. What led to the admission of women to Toronto? The fact that they were passing it, to come to Queen's. I need not ask what university first made provision for the medical education of the women of Canada. For other instances, take the case of extra-mural students, and post-graduate study. On both questions we have strong convictions. We believe that it is best for students to attend the classes, and so strongly did we hold this that our rule admitted of no exception, though in Toronto I understand that attendance for only one year out of four was compulsory. But, when the Senate became convinced that here, as in England, there are exceptional men, unable to attend, but entitled to a degree, we opened our examinations to them, and established a scheme to ensure as much benefit as possible for them, without handicapping it by requiring a year's attendance. If a man is able to get up three years' work at home he is able to prepare the fourth year also. So with post-graduate students. It is best for them to go to Europe, but there are Canadians who cannot go to Europe or even to Baltimore. Are they to have no opportunity of continuing their studies under the direction of sympathetic professors? Must they seek the very indifferent guidance that is offered from the other side of the boundary line? Besides, should not Canada have sufficient self-reliance to make a beginning in this department of work? Our calendar shows that we think so. In it we offer thirteen courses of post-graduate work to those who know that when they have attained a degree, even with honors, they have only "learned to handle the tools of a student." I make these references simply to point out that it may have been in the general interest that our founders had to act independently. At