

the work of a College) but examination; not for imparting an Educational training or communicating information on literary and scientific subjects but for testing the results of this training. The Examiners, whom it appoints, examine such students as may be sent up by the College or Colleges affiliated to it; and to such candidates, as have reached the prescribed standard and have thus been found qualified, the University awards a certificate of qualification in the form of a Degree.

A University may have affiliated to it one College or several Colleges. These may exist in one locality, or in places widely remote. The University of Oxford has 20 affiliated Colleges, all within the town of Oxford. The University of London has affiliated Colleges scattered throughout England and some of the Colonies. While the University of Edinburgh (prescribed in the Royal Charter of Queen's as its model) has only one College. *Practically* the last named form exists in Ontario. The University of Toronto has University College; Victoria University has Victoria College; Queen's University has Queen's College.

The writer is an advocate for more than one University in the Province. Not that he approves of the present condition of University Education in Ontario. Without doubt too many charters have been granted. They were accorded with a fatal facility to all and sundry who applied for them in the closing days of the *regime* which preceded Confederation. But Queen's is not responsible for this state of things. It is the *oldest* in operation. We wish then to be regarded as advocates of the *use*, not the *abuse*. The attitude of Queen's to the Higher Education of the country is that alone with which we have to do.

Who will say that England has not been the better of possessing Cambridge as well as Oxford? And these were founded centuries ago, when population was sparse. Look at Germany where higher learning flourishes more vigorously than in any other country. How many Universities has she, and we have yet to learn that injurious results have accrued from the multiplicity and variety of these—that any agitation has ever been set on foot for the concentration of them. Would any one in his sober senses propose to destroy the University of Edinburgh or Glasgow or Aberdeen or St. Andrew's, and these were all in full vigour when the population of Scotland was not larger than that of Ontario at the present day. To propose such a thing would be deemed a retrograde step. We believe that the educational interests of the country can best be advanced by having a variety of institutions, each characterized by some distinctive feature. Thus Oxford is regarded as the special home, as the chief patron of the Classics and Philosophy; Cambridge of Mathematics; London of the Natural Sciences. Life and uniformity are very far from being synonymous. Hear Professor Seeley, the accomplished Professor of Latin in University College, London, one of the foremost educationists of the day (*vide* *Essays on a Liberal Education*, pp. 146): "Education, in fact, in England is what the Universities choose to make it. This seems to me too great a power to be possessed by two corporations, however venerable and illustrious, especially since we know them to have grown up under very peculiar circumstances, and to be fortified by endowments against all modern influences, good or bad. I wish we had several more Universities; I mean teaching as well as examining Universities. I hope that the scheme, which was announced some time ago, of creating a University for Manchester will not be allowed to sleep. I should like to see similar schemes started in three or four more centres of population and industry. Could any investment of money in philanthropy be less questionable at this time? Is there anything more undeniable than that our material progress has outrun our intellectual,—that

we want more cultivation, more of the higher education, more ideas?"

The only country in the world which, so far as I am aware, has adopted the one-University idea is France. Arrayed against this is the practice of England, Scotland, Ireland, Germany, Belgium, Switzerland, &c., in the old world, and that of the United States in the new. The case stands France vs. the rest of the educated world. Canada! which is to be your model? University Education is one of those things on which very varied opinions are held, and there should be no cast-iron rule for each and all—one mould into which to force our Institutions, else symmetry and uniformity may be gained at the expense of life, or at least of a healthy condition. Some look to *information* merely, and would confer a degree on any one who was able to pass a prescribed examination, though that might be the result of cramming and he had not attended college for a session. Others lay stress upon educational training and the advantages to be derived from going through a regular curriculum at a fully equipped Institution. Some esteem of highest value the ancient—others modern studies. One University favours the English—another the Scottish type of education. And as there are varying tastes and opinion, so there should be a choice of Universities. Monopoly is the worst foe of healthy education as of healthy trade. Competition stimulates and prevents stagnation. No true reformer should advocate a system that would crush wholesome rivalry and spirited emulation.

Pray, what gain to the country, what benefit to Queen's would accrue from the surrender of her charter and her agreeing to go into a scheme of Ontario affiliation? A degree from Queen's has now as high a value, say at the University of Edinburgh, as would a degree conferred by a University of Ontario, were such instituted. For upwards of 20 years a succession of alumni from Queen's College have gone to finish their studies, or, after finishing them, take an additional session at the Universities of Scotland or Germany; and almost invariably they have earned high distinction. And these were not always men who occupied the highest position in the Canadian classes. Let us confine ourselves to the last six years.* One carried off the degree of B.D. with distinguished honour. A second bore away with eclat the degree of Doctor of Science. And within the past three months a young gentleman, who came out No. 2 in the Prize List of Queen's won one of the chief prizes in the gift of the University of Edinburgh, his competitor being a First-class Honour Graduate of the University of London.

Now that the several British Provinces in the northern half of this continent have been united in Confederation, why do not the admirers of the one-University idea advocate the establishment of one University for the Dominion, to be called the University of Canada? The leading argument in support of their favourite idea, which these advance, is that Canadian Degrees would have a higher value—would receive more wide-spread recognition in the educational world, if there was only one fountain for Academic distinction, a uniform standard by which to test the qualifications of aspirants to these honours. Looking at the *questio vocata* from their point of view, if this end would be more likely to be gained by an Ontario University than by the present system, *a fortiori* it would be secured in a still higher degree by a Dominion University. Moreover, the adoption of such a scheme, would, we conceive, be attended with fewer practical difficulties than the one proposed of having a single Degree granting Board for the Province of Ontario. Such a scheme, we should suppose, the authorities of Queen's College might

* This was written in 1871.