

suggested the force of law, or even entertain the propriety of so doing, and, as Mr. Blake observed, the discussion of the question is simply adjourned for eight or ten months.

There was, however, a very interesting and animated debate on the subject, in the course of which we notice that several members, supporters of the government, distinctly declared that they did not hold themselves committed to the discontinuance of the grants, and from the tone of which we judge the prospect of permanent assistance to the colleges to be more hopeful than was the obtaining of the present grants four months ago. Our own estimate of the character and tendency of the debate is very fully expressed in the following paragraphs from a contemporary, evidently well informed on the subject:—

In respect of the continuance of the grants a very strong case was made out. The present system of allotment was very generally and justly found fault with, but the claims of the Colleges to some recognition by the State were urgently pressed. As usual in deliberative assemblies, there were those who kept to the point and there were those who wandered away from it to indulge in vague generalities. Of the former class we cannot but think that the friends of the Colleges had the best of it. The reports in our opinion unmistakably show that they had the weight of statistics, facts, and arguments on their side. In respect of both the amount of work done and the economical rate at which it is done, the institution of Toronto University to which the government proposes to confine its patronage, and to patronize so fully that it shall continue to be entirely independent of private liberality—not the most healthy condition—was shown to be a long distance behind. Speakers on both sides of the question confined their attention too much to numbers. By long lists of graduates and students one may prove much or little, a good case or a bad one, according to circumstances. Perhaps the mistake is pardonable for once, but when the question comes up again, we hope members will give some consideration to the regulations, and practices at different institutions with respect to attendance, work and examinations.

Again, it is exceedingly important to notice that the discussion was not circumscribed or dwarfed by an exclusive attention to the pecuniary aspect of the questions but that it extended also to the educational features of it. The desire for a common curriculum and a single standard of examination for degrees was very generally expressed. The existence of so many degree-granting institutions as we have in this Province was loudly complained of. Some speakers hoped that the Colleges would come to an agreement, whereby the present nominal affiliation to Toronto University would become a reality: others advocated the institution of a University of Ontario to be entirely independent of every teaching corporation and to be the

only fountain of literary honour and professional distinction, while Mr. Clarke of South Grenville sketched, almost to perfection, the desideratum necessary to complete, in all its grades, the existing system of public instruction.

With regard to the first of these suggestions, it is a consummation most devoutly to be wished. With regard to second and third, it is useless to invite the other Universities to surrender their privileges to the Toronto University, so long as it has a close and local connection with University College, and so long as its members, against their own interests we believe, show no disposition to accommodate the sister institutions on fair and reasonable terms. With regard to the fourth, it is fundamentally essential to a settlement of the question. With a University of Ontario, knowing no single College more than another, but having all the Colleges as teaching Corporations affiliated to it, and conferring degrees upon the students, educated at these Colleges, after an impartial examination of their attainments, most of the existing anomalies and difficulties would disappear.

Our idea is this—let us have the University of Ontario; let its membership consist of men who shall have, or at least the majority of whom shall have, no connection with any of the teaching Colleges; let them have the power of issuing examination papers and appointing examiners for the various Colleges affiliated to it, on the same principle as the University of London does its work, for its thirty or forty Colleges throughout England, and let this body alone determine, according to the value of the papers received, what students may be entitled to obtain degrees. Let the terms of affiliation binding the Colleges to the Provincial University be arranged on principles so liberal as that none of them shall have any good reason for keeping aloof; and whatever the terms be, let conformity to them be a condition of State aid. We see no insuperable obstacles to a scheme like this, and, once in operation, the good Province of Ontario will take its place, in respect to its facilities for education, with any country in the world.

We support the continuance of the present system only in the hope that it is a temporary expedient. Better this than nothing. It is manifestly unjust to longstanding institutions which are doing the bulk of the work connected with an important public service, that they should be utterly proscribed so far as regards government assistance. But we hope that a better system will soon be inaugurated, and we have yet to learn that the subsidized colleges are opposed to the introduction of such a system. Those which, during the discussion at Toronto, were most frequently and applaudingly referred to, years ago committed themselves to an affiliation scheme."

The conviction appears to be gaining ground in the Canada Presbyterian Church, that the right of using musical instruments in public worship, must be conceded to congregations desirous of employing their aid. So far as we have seen the debates reported lately, the ground now taken appears to be