

it by acknowledging the protests made by McGill as worthy of consideration, appears to exist in official life. The Minister of Education in Ontario is seemingly ready to compare notes with Principal Peterson, with the object, we suppose, of ascertaining how far McGill actually meets the requirements in Arts now in force in Ontario, and, consequently, to what extent a modification of our present curriculum is necessary in order to satisfy doubters and give the University the standing it justifiably demands. In view of the reconstruction of the curriculum in Arts only five years ago, searching changes are hardly entertainable now, nor, indeed, would they be warranted by the end that is sought. Whatever conditions Ontario might advance, McGill could meet, but any system that McGill has found to be vital to its academic effectiveness must remain essentially unimpaired. And it may not be irrelevant to add, quite quietly, as a fact and not as a vaunt, that the *personnel* of the McGill Faculty of Arts is not excelled in quality by that of any university in the Dominion.

It is a matter of every-day note how easily grounds of debate are shifted, either unintentionally or wilfully. With the University of Toronto, McGill has, in this question, no concern. The University of Toronto is occasionally brought into the discussion, as if the chief object of the disputants was to pit rival universities against each other, and then, after making calculations tinged by bias and prejudice, point to the impossibility of doing anything to get rid of a state of affairs that is felt to be damaging to true educational interests. Sensible persons belonging to both universities are ready to confess that above them both stands the educational welfare not of provinces regarded as such, but of the country as a whole. It is, indeed, preposterous to suppose that the function of universities can be rightly discharged unless they minister to the needs of the country without let or hindrance. Nor, we repeat, should the fear be entertained that inefficiency would cause disaster if educational barriers were altogether removed. That feeling is sometimes harped on by way of thwarting efforts to rise to higher academic conceptions. But in the educational as in the natural world things sink quickly to their destined levels, and an inefficient university soon finds it impossible to keep on the surface. It is obvious that educational vigour is increased by promoting healthy academic rivalry, and equally obvious that no step could be better taken to excite it than the step which removes the obstacles provincialism has erected.