

MEN, IN SUCH TOTAL DARKNESS

about the first elements of the case as to talk thus, write to the papers and undertake to guide public opinion. In tones indicating grief for our hardness of heart, they—sometimes piteously, sometimes angrily,—ask “why not come to Toronto?” It would almost seem that they believe that Queen's is only a Divinity Hall like Knox, McMaster and Wycliffe, or that there is something so sacred about University College that the walls of its class rooms will expand indefinitely to receive any number of students, and that Professors can do twice as much there as elsewhere. One writer frankly acknowledges the difficulty, but replies that there is plenty of room in the Queen's Park for more class-rooms. That implies another staff of Professors, or a duplicate of University College at once. And why not, when Oxford and Cambridge have between twenty and thirty colleges each? Why not? It only means that if we go to Toronto, the state will pay for our Professors and provide for our students; but that

IF WE STAY IN KINGSTON

the State will do nothing for us. What else can it mean? Remember, I have no wish to arouse local feeling, but I desire clearness of thought. Any one who considers for a moment, will see that it would be just as impossible for University College to abolish Queen's as it would be for Queen's to absorb University College. When Victoria and Trinity are added to the sum, the impossibility is doubled. And the grant now asked for University College will not contribute an iota to the solution of the problem. Besides, we must think of the future. For, as our secondary education improves, more young men will demand a University Education. In the course of the next ten years, the number of students in our Colleges will probably be doubled, notwithstanding any fence in the shape of increased fees that may be put up.

There are then in Ontario more than twice as many students in Arts as University College can accommodate and the number is sure to increase. This shows the absurdity of calling University College the keystone of our educational system. The keystone does not consist of any one building. Just as the second story is, in the main, Upper Canada College and 106 high schools and collegiate institutes, so the third story or keystone consists of the colleges that receive matriculants from those. The men who are studying for the degree of B. A., and their Professors are the keystone of our system. Does not the very constitution of Toronto University imply that there are to be a number of colleges in the Province? I need hardly say that by colleges, divinity halls are not meant, and it is surely implied also that if several colleges are required no undue leverage shall be given to one. When football clubs from the different colleges compete, one would scorn to accept any favoritism that would give it an undue advantage over the other. Should it not be with mind as with muscle?

THREE SOLUTIONS PROPOSED.

I have stated what the problem is that a statesman has to face, if he touches it at all. Three solutions have been proposed:

1. Mr. Mulock says, let the Legislature give money to enable us to add three or four Professors to University College. Now, doubtless, each new Professor adds to the efficiency of a College. Apparently, too, no halt can be called in this path till University College has as many Professors as Berlin. And can we halt then? The University at Cairo has, I believe, three thousand Professors. And could Toronto allow itself to have fewer than a Mohammedan University? I do not wonder that the friends of University College applaud this scheme. If it

was proposed to give Queen's three or four more Professors in arts or science, our friends would applaud. But may not a true man take higher ground than applaud a proposal to increase the efficiency of his own College? May he not say, “I desire to see all the Colleges that the country really needs made more efficient, and I desire to see them all parts of an organic whole.” That would not mean uniformity. Unity is higher than uniformity.

2. The course usually taken in the United States is to give to the rich men of the country the privilege of extending, and even of establishing colleges. And the rich are proving worthy of the trust. Harvard, Yale, Johns Hopkins, Columbia, Cornell, Princeton, Wesleyan, Brown, and many others have received millions, and they are sure to receive ten times as much more before very long.

3. The system in England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, India, the Cape and other colonies is to give grants in aid to chartered institutions, according to carefully prepared regulations. But, in our case, would not that mean grants to denominational Colleges? Here we must distinguish. Grants of public money to denominations are a violation of the modern principle of the separation of Church and State, though we submit to the violation in the establishment of Separate schools, and in grants to denominational hospitals, almshouses and houses of industry, where the State has not a shadow of control. But the modern principle is not violated when a well equipped college is aided to do strictly scientific work. When the State is satisfied that the work is required, that it is the complement of the public school system, that it is unsectarian, that it is in the public interest, that it can be inspected and tested, and that there is adequate control so far as its money is concerned, then the State acts wisely if it gets its work done economically by utilizing and stimulating the voluntary liberality of the people. The State gives nothing to Theology in the Scottish Colleges. It finds no difficulty in giving to the Arts Faculties, and it does give with the hearty approval of all dissenters. Well, in the same way, there is not a tinge of Presbyterianism about our Classics, Mathematics, English and Modern Languages, our Physics, Astronomy, Chemistry, Oriental Languages, Natural History, Mental Philosophy and Political Economy. Our students are as representative of the various denominations as the students of University College. And, for all practical purposes, our Faculty of Arts is as distinct from the Faculty of Theology as University College is from Knox or Wycliffe.

ONLY POSITION ACCEPTABLE.

I have stated the three courses that have been suggested. We cannot submit to the first. It outrages our sense of justice. If carried it would be a fatal gift to University College, for no institution can benefit by injustice. It would only accentuate the present lack of harmony in our system of higher education and breed discords and complications little dreamed of now. The second course represents in the main the wisdom of America, and the third the wisdom of Great Britain. We are prepared for either, or for a full and frank consideration of the whole subject. The better organization and the full development of our Higher Education should be not a call to war, but a call to all the matured intellects of the country to devise what is best in the interests not of this or that college, but of all our colleges. We are reluctant to organize for war, for when war begins the voice of reason is apt to be hushed. I invoke the sense of moderation that characterizes the people of Ontario, and no matter what the attacks made on me, attacks unworthy of the writers and the institution they represent, I shall endeavour to continue to speak with moderation.