

draw their proceedings from public observation, and even from academic opinion; they have never taken into their confidence the people, or even the University graduates; and they have maintained an unbroken silence as to their educational policy. On one deplorable occasion they were ranged in direct hostility to the people and to their representatives in Parliament. In the struggle for religious equality the University actually became the champion for the party of intolerance. The natural result followed. The Charter of 1828, under which the University had made itself obnoxious, was snuffed out after much sputtering, and only a brief, feeble, sooty illumination; and the Chair of Divinity was kicked over in the dark. Now, even before the days of the Charter, a scheme was adopted by which the graduates should largely control the policy of the projected University; and, under the Representation Act of 1820 (Statutes of Canada, 60 George III., cap. 2), they were, by anticipation, actually assigned a special member in Parliament who would explain and defend their views. When assembled in convocation, the graduates were to enjoy all the powers of the Convocation of Oxford University (Charter, 1828). The convocation scheme runs through George the Fourth's charter, through the first University Act (1837), and through the Baldwin Act (1849 and 1850-1). There is an obvious necessity for a Convocation in such a University system as ours. All experience has shewn that the general tendency of University corporations is towards lifeless routine; or, when reforms are urged, towards reactionary intrigue. Men as they grow old naturally resent such advances of knowledge as jostle their traditions, or depreciate their scholastic wares. They have no relish for undertaking the newer studies themselves; they keenly contest any

educational movement that displaces their own pet subjects or pet views from their former "coigne of vantage." A familiar illustration is supplied in the extreme acrimony excited by the first introduction of Greek into English schools. The representative of educational reaction now resists even the partial displacement of Greek by Modern Languages or Natural Science, with the same earnestness and heat as his lineal ancestor, three centuries and a half ago, abused Erasmus for introducing Greek. In our University system the frank and open discussion of academical questions by the graduates was designed to prepare the way for progressive enactments in the Senate. But in spite of the plainest provisions of law, this design has hitherto been completely frustrated by a party of reaction within the governing body who have always succeeded by the simple process of withdrawing their proceedings from every opportunity of public observation or criticism. Throughout the various phases of the legislation designed to counteract this result, University management has always, by this simple secrecy of proceedings, been gradually worked back into the hands of a small local coterie. The Hincks University Act of 1853, as we have seen, expressly demanded of the Senate an annual exposition of its policy, and its proposed academical measures. This obligation is still in full force. During the twenty-five years that have passed, how many such reports has the senate presented to Parliament? Has it presented one? If so, will some one obligingly tell us where it is to be found?

Mr. Crooks' Act of 1873 was evidently drawn with extreme care, and the highest expectations were naturally raised by the representative character given to the reorganized senate. Under this Act the present composition is as follows:—Chancellor (elected by convocation), 1; Vice-Chancellor (elected