

That there has been much honest conviction exhibited, on both hands, we may cheerfully admit, but there also appears to have been a turbid under-current, full of sedimentary matter of the baser sort, in a saturated solution, and ready to be deposited. The subject has perhaps been debated *ad nauseam*, and it is only proposed here to give a few brief comments upon its general features. It should be mentioned, to begin with, that we must trace this wordy warfare to the rivalry of two schools of medicine, contending for the pre-eminence. It has passed into a proverb that, when doctors disagree, there is an end of controversy and a decision is hopeless. It may be so; but curiosity naturally leads one to ask when doctors did anything but disagree, especially if they form in squads or coteries? The unseemly rivalry between these institutions has been the chief cause of the virulence with which the discussion has been conducted, and had the further effect of narrowing, as well as of obscuring, the question at issue. To each of them the aspect of the subject it was thought desirable to present to the public with much embellishment and rhetorical flourish, was something altogether apart from the esoteric motives of which both possessed a hidden and inward consciousness. Upon these concealed springs of action it is not needful to enlarge, and they are merely hinted at to disabuse the public mind of the glamour which interested parties have managed to throw about the question. For our own part, so long as the governing power of the University is free to act in the matter of affiliation, unshackled by any obligation to admit to the privilege any or every institution without exception, and without conditions or stipulations precedent, we see no reason to fear that the special legislation of this year can do much harm. At the same time, it is, to say the least, anomalous, that a medical school which now virtually possesses University powers of its own, since the members of its faculty are the medical examiners of a chartered University, should clamour for a share in the endowment or a voice in the management of our great Provincial seat of learning. In spite of the laboured attempts recently made to draw a parallel between Canadian and British Universities, where none really exists, it is certain that such a claim was never put forth in the mother

country. Moreover, the attempted analogy fails in another respect. The admission of students is one thing, and the double or triple affiliation of schools quite another, and totally distinct one. The first is defensible enough; the second only on the purely selfish ground that it is desirable to give schools or colleges two or three strings to their bows, simply for advertising purposes. In the struggle for existence amongst these rival institutions, the inevitable result must be that every school will demand the right which has been invidiously granted to one, and that, in consequence, an undignified scramble for students, of which we have already had a foretaste, will be the rule instead of the exception. If this is to prove the normal state of things, the medical profession will inevitably be degraded, and it is certainly too much to expect the University of Toronto to be any party to that degradation.

Much has been said about liberating the University, and, strange to say, it seems never to have occurred to those who employ the phrase so glibly, that the word 'liberation,' in connection with an established institution, whether church or university, bears a suspicious relation to disendowment, which is, in fact, its ultimate meaning. No one supposes that any large number of those who have taken part in the recent movement desire to injure the Provincial Institution; still there are knowing ones amongst them who can scarcely conceal the ulterior object of it. It appears—though, strange to say, no report of the remark appeared in the morning papers—that Mr. Lauder proclaimed, as an undoubted fact, that the University of Toronto had lost the confidence of the country, and that the work of superior education was carried on almost entirely by the denominational institutions. It is not necessary to indicate the path upon which the hon. member for East Grey has entered. Obviously his idea of education is clearly that which involves levelling and confiscation. Every true friend of the Provincial University is desirous that its basis should be as broad as its endowment will admit of its being; but he also desires that any scheme to 'liberalize' it should be made in the interest of the people and in the cause of superior education, not to bolster up other academic institutions, no matter how intrinsically deserving they may be.