

for the rejection of a scheme that had the name of confederation but that lacked every essential element that belongs to the federal principle. The discussion, however, has served one good purpose. It has united those in Queen's who were in favour of concentration with those who always preferred the distributive system of colleges. The former are now convinced that the men who talked fluently about concentration did not know what they were talking about; had not thought the matter out, or lacked the courage of their convictions. They feel, too, that it is impossible to waste any more time considering vague generalities and ghost-like schemes, and in the spirit of Nehemiah they say: "Let us rise up and build." Sufficient time has been spent in discussion, and we must now give ourselves to work.

Let me say here that we have cause for congratulation, not only that the question has been settled on the old lines, and in my opinion the old are the best, but that it has been settled without any feelings of bitterness or hostility between the different universities. Whoever has been responsible for these feelings in the past, a new era may be inaugurated. I think that we may be assured that no Government will open the subject, unless it is prepared with a comprehensive measure that will be adequate to the proved necessities of the whole country, and will recognize the claims of every institution that is well equipped and is doing genuine university work. Being assured of this, we can all unite heartily in seeking the common good, and in cultivating feelings of the warmest kind for sister institutions. My own convictions are that the common good will be best promoted when we have that element of generous rivalry, without paltry feelings of jealousy, which is secured by the existence of two or three autonomous

universities; and when these look for extension not so much to the action of this or that politician as to the liberality of those who appreciate education. Certainly the history of our race in the Old and the New Worlds proves that although growth may be slow when dependence is on private individuals rather than upon the State, it is sure, and in the end likely to be on a scale far transcending what could be expected from the most liberal State or Province. Can you conceive of a Provincial Government voting one million for university education? But one man in California has given three or four millions, and another in the same State is about to give twenty. Besides these, Johns Hopkins, Ezra Cornell, Vanderbilt, the Stewarts, Lennoxes, Peabody and others have given on a scale that no State or Provincial Government would venture to imitate, unless in the way of giving wild lands that nobody felt took anything out of his pocket. So has it been and so is it in the Mother Country. Oxford and Cambridge have revenues greater than some States. Where did they come from? Not one penny from the Consolidated Fund or votes of the House of Commons. The Scottish Universities would have been equally well-endowed had it not been for the greedy barons who stole the church lands that pious founders had intended to be permanently applied to the twin sacred cause of religion and learning. The British Parliament, therefore, votes some \$200,000 a year in aid of the Scottish Universities; but it never dreams of giving the whole amount to one, and it gives in a way to stimulate local and individual effort. Looking at what has been done for Queen's in the past, I am quite willing to wait until our friends find that they can do more than they have already done. We are advancing every year since we