

tised hand shown in the recent modification of the curriculum of the University of Toronto in this particular, as well as the exceeding anxiety of its anonymous supporters in the press to get full credit for the change and all its consequences, whilst the ink of the new statute is yet scarcely dry. The somewhat startling way in which the principle of "theological options" is applied, looks more like a sop to the theological colleges than a real attempt to Christianize the general curriculum. Longer experience may, however, be expected to give further light for the guidance of the Senate in such unknown regions, and, meanwhile, with all sincerity, we may congratulate the Provincial University upon the abandonment of its traditional policy of ignoring the Christian Revelation as unworthy of a place amongst the subjects of a liberal education, and the adoption of at least the principle for which Trinity has so long contended.

(2) The principle of "confederation" as opposed to "absorption" must be frankly and sincerely adopted. Any attempt to bring about ultimate absorption under the guise of confederation, by placing University College in a position of unfair pre-eminence in the new University will be absolutely fatal to the scheme. The *addenda* of the Corporation upon this head, not only, as the *Week* remarks, "in no way conflict with the principle of the scheme," but embody the only way in which this "principle" can be practically and fairly carried out. Of course the questions which arise in regard to the relation of the several confederating Colleges are full of delicacy and difficulty, and it could not be expected that the Conference would in its memorandum deal finally or fully with them all, but it is important in this connection to note that in no case do the conditions of Trinity embody a demand which had been rejected at the Conference. The simple fact that the governing bodies of Trinity and Victoria have independently arrived at conditions, which, although differing widely in form, are practically almost coincident, corroborates strongly the conclusion almost universally expressed by impartial onlookers, that no University in Ontario could, with any self-respect, confederate upon other terms. It must be very galling to the authorities of a University which is never tired of boasting about the widening and liberalizing influence of its system; to notice the petty narrowness of view which marks the productions of the anonymous defenders of the University of Toronto in the press. One learned "organ" seeks to allure us with the prospect of becoming the leading theological boarding-house in the Queen's Park, and in the same breath exhorts us to emulate the greatness of Oxford by so doing. Surely the distinction between a "College" and a "boarding-house" is not too recondite for our contemporary to grasp, or does it imagine Oxford to consist of theological boarding-houses grouped round a central Arts College? A correspondent, who rejoices in the dignity

of "Curator," whilst denouncing the chief features of the new scheme in strong terms, as an "absurdity," "a dangerous experiment," etc., yet finds counterbalancing "advantages from a public point of view" in the "increase of the state-teaching body," the number of professors being raised to "about twenty-five." Has it ever occurred to "Curator" that we have already in the several Universities of Ontario a staff of at least thirty professors of as much eminence as any we can hope to get in the new University. True, some of these gentlemen must plead guilty to the fatal indictment of not belonging to the state faculty, i. e., they do not cost the country a dollar for the educational work they do, but after all it is possible that this may not appear so capital an offence from "a public point of view," as it does to "Curator." It is clear that the aspirations of "Curator" and his friends are summed up in keeping Toronto University as nearly as possible just as it is, and drawing indefinitely upon the public purse to give to the "state teaching faculty" the monopoly of supplying University education at the lowest possible price. Such a programme is intelligible, although it hardly possesses the merit of novelty, but it is far as the poles asunder from the aspirations of "Bystander," for the founding of a new Oxford upon Canadian soil. Clearly, at this rate of progress, we need be in no great haste, as it will take men of the stamp of "Curator" years to understand the first elements of the scheme they criticize.

(3) The State must prove itself ready to provide the necessary funds for starting and equipping the new University in a thoroughly liberal way. We quite endorse Principal Grant's view, but if the country is to gain another Oxford by the readiness of the other confederating Universities to incur considerable risk and make large sacrifices to this end, it is altogether unworthy to "haggle about the bill." In good sooth, if the State will not bear the necessary large initial expenditure connected with the removal of the various college buildings, etc., no college would be insane enough to waste its own trust funds for such a purpose; in fact any college that did so would have the satisfaction of presenting University College with more than it has ever asked for, whilst itself losing the greater part of the funds it possessed.

Fortunately the common sense and justice of the community has been strong enough to prevent any would-be opponents of "compensation" from making themselves heard, and the claim of the Corporation on this head has received nothing but support even from unexpected quarters. Care should also be taken to secure that the endowment of the new University should be made over in a capital sum, and not be dependent upon an annual Parliamentary vote, liable at any moment to be ruthlessly cut down for the purposes of a political cry.

We trust that our graduates and benefactors throughout the Province will give to the action of the Corpora-