

UNIVERSITY REPRESENTATION IN PARLIAMENT.

As time passes the necessity of granting to our great educational institutions a voice in Parliament becomes more and more manifest. Indeed, looking back over the history of the past, one almost wonders why this useful reform should have been so long delayed. Amid the mania at certain periods, shown by our legislators for extending the franchise, in that desire, laudable in itself, that no class should be found in the Dominion whose sentiments should not be represented as far as possible on the floor of Parliament, whence comes it that such great centres of intelligence and mental activity as our Universities should have been overlooked? Surely amid the turmoil of democratic institutions, the making and unmaking of cabinets, the rise and ruin of public fallacies, amid abuse, misrepresentation and personal slander, there is room for that calm judgment and cultivated reason, characteristic of Universities, to exert a marked and beneficial influence. It has been the aim of every law, defining the right of voting, for a century or more to secure as far as possible the full representation of the intelligence and good sense of the country in the halls of our legislatures. At one time we heard much of the great mental endowments of householders, at another of farmers' sons, and of the evident injustice of depriving these mainstays of the Constitution of the right to cast an honest ballot. The ballot has been cast, and how far it has been honest let time and the election courts decide.

But is it not somewhat strange, that amid the keen earnestness with which law-makers have sought out the intelligence of the Dominion, they should have forgotten to look for it in these very institutions to which they have paid thousands of dollars for fostering that particular endowment, and whose success in doing so they are eager at all times to proclaim to the world. True, it is urged that our graduates do find their way into Parliament, and that in them the feelings and sentiments of the Universities find a fitting utterance. But, in the first place, it may be seriously questioned whether any member, elected on certain well-defined promises, who is supposed to consider before all others the interests of his constituents, can be said in any way to be an exponent of the wishes and aspirations of that *Alma Mater* that sent him forth into the world to uphold her name and battle for her rights. But if he is, if after all our Universities really are represented, why not remove the strain? Why not make them in name what they are in reality? If their opinions and their influence exert a good influence in the country, exercised indirectly, what reason is there for believing it would not be still more powerful and still more beneficial when exercised directly. Why should they be denied publicly that honor which privately all feel is their due? The graduates of the English Universities, too, find their way into Parliament. Scarcely an illustrious name is enrolled to day in the annals of Britain's glory which some of her Universities do not triumphantly claim as its own. Does that obviate there the necessity and justice of giving these centres of learning direct representation? Cambridge, with its roll of honor

clating far back in the centuries, looks down with complacency on the long list of those who in every station of political life have made her influence felt and her wisdom a safeguard to the nation. From the halls of Oxford have gone forth voices whose influence for good, honest government the nation has often felt and blessed.

And why are the reasons for direct representation in force there, not equally potent here? Are our people calmer than theirs? Are we less in need of learning and experience—that calm weighing of facts, and that moderation in debate, which it is the peculiar province of education to give, and which we might expect would be conspicuous in representatives directly elected by its highest institutions? Are their people less deliberate, less honest, less impulsive, less intelligent than ours? Verily, he who has been behind the scenes in any of our election contests would peril his reputation for truth by answering in the affirmative.

But I fear this article is already too long. Else it might be urged that now, when this subject of education in our own province has been thought sufficiently weighty to be placed under the direct control of a responsible minister of the crown, that minister should have at hand some representative to make known the hopes and wishes of so large and so influential a number of those affected—and keenly affected—by the slightest change in the regulations of that department over which he presides.

G. W. FIELD.

LECTURES IN LAW.

In a recent number of *THE WHITE AND BLUE* I noticed a communication from a graduate, pointing out the need there is for a chair in political economy in University College. With it I agree; but I would like to see something else besides: I would like to see at least one professor in law appointed, and the nucleus of a faculty in law thereby created.

For the degree of bachelor of laws, candidates are required to take the first two years in arts, and then three years in law. I think, perhaps, that this course could be recast and replaced by one of four years. If that were the case, and if there was a professor of political economy and one of law, with the lectures now given in history in the arts course, a fair beginning would be made toward imparting a university education in law—a thing hitherto unknown in Ontario. In Montreal it is different, there being a faculty of law in connection with McGill College. Once the experiment were tried, I venture to say it would not be long before we should have a comparatively strong law school in Ontario.

To put it in another form, my idea is to strengthen the faculty of arts by the addition of a chair in political economy, and then utilize the lectures in history and political economy of the arts faculty, in connection with a course of lectures on law. There is no want of accommodation in the building for such an addition.

Though there must be at least two hundred students in law in Toronto, but very few of them are taking the university degree of bachelor of laws. One reason no doubt of this is that there are no

lectures in law given. Formerly there were lectures in this branch of study given at Osgoode Hall, but for some reason or other that has been done away with. Both in arts and in medicine there are teaching facilities and large graduating classes; in law no instruction is given, and the number proceeding to the degree of L. L. B. is small. This very fact was regretted the other day by one of the oldest judges of the province, and he further remarked that there were so many candidates for the profession that those controlling it could well insist on a university education, both in law and in arts, from those wishing to enter it. He hoped, he said, to see some steps taken toward lectures both in law and medicine being given at University College.

It might be that a beginning could be made without appointing a regular professor of law; some of the many legal gentlemen in Toronto could be secured to deliver a course of lectures, and this be so arranged that it would not interfere with their practice. I would like to hear from some others on this question.

LEX.

COLLEGE STUDENTS AS WAITERS.

An idea is prevalent in the adjoining republic that a large number of the students of its various colleges put in their vacation as hotel waiters at summer resorts. The funny man of the American newspaper is probably himself the origin of a great many of the accounts which we read of Yale and Harvard men acting in this capacity. But there must be some foundation for the belief, for the *Roanoke (Va.) Collegian* thus refers to the matter:

"The position in which the students of some of our higher institutions place themselves by enlisting as hotel waiters at our fashionable summer resorts, would seem to call for some sort of an explanation on the part of the young men who are pleased to so indulge themselves. From the standpoint of necessity they can not defend themselves;—there are positions certainly of more dignity than that of the hotel waiter open to any moderately qualified young man, and to say that necessity compels them, is only to admit their utter want of qualification for a higher sphere. If this is so, by all means let them engage permanently in the position, and no longer play the role of educated civilians, when they can make brighter lights in the broad field of white-aproned gentry.

"We can not admire the hotel waiter as such, neither can we admire the student who is so extensive in his capacity for usefulness that the dignified surroundings of classic halls and the odoriferous pantries of the fashionable hotel have equal attractions for his soaring genius.

"Especially do we lament the fact that theological students are being led into the mania of spending their vacation in the rather incongruous occupation of dispensing creams, ices and what not, to a dusty, hungry and impatient public. We think a practical exegesis of Acts vi. 2, would be beneficial in this connection.

"We never heard of a Canadian student having to fall back on such an occupation.

Some of our readers probably do not know that at Windsor, Nova Scotia, there exists an educational institution known as King's College. Yet listen to the sublime check of one of the students there in a recent issue of his paper: "King's College, for so many years the foremost University in the Dominion. But our blue-nosed brothers by the sea always had a good opinion of their institutions,