

and State in answer such may be taken schools who different local need? Does profess myself abstinence in- at it should never been more hay to outside? Is erosity to his State College, port a State ends of the gislature to State College was that as State support ons compose are now told een's. Very chmen. Do rians to pay were forced 's is doing a ould not pos- es." I have r patriotism,

charges, let ture deals e subject and s reasonably luty and its y years, per- in Ontario s for the de- tly educated to have one or university also reason- ovincial sys- together of a breadth of eality or any en, as I have rifices their ernity by the

The fittest he State that the develop- ognize facts. and is surely e treasury by colleges, the r in Toronto in Ottawa in with the posi- as University led. Accord-

ing to the *Globe*, University College has this year 270 undergraduates. Its class room and staff are taxed to the utmost. Certainly, we have been told so again and again. Queen's, has exactly half that number of undergraduates, and we could accommodate nearly as many more. Of course I am speaking now not of our divinity students nor of the medicals from our two affiliated colleges who attend classes in science, but simply of the students in arts. Now this statement of facts shows what the problem really is. And what is the solution? "Bring all your students to Toronto." it is airily proposed. "Is not Knox College in Toronto, and Wycliffe College and McMaster Hall? Why not Queen's also?" Gentlemen, it is a fact that men are in such total darkness about the first elements of the case as to talk thus, write to the papers and undertake to guide public opinion. In tones indicating grief for our hardness of heart they, sometimes piteously, sometimes angrily, ask, why not come to Toronto? It would almost seem that Queen's is only a Divinity Hall like Knox, McMaster and Wycliffe; or that there is something so sacred in Toronto air that the walls of University College class-rooms will expand indefinitely to receive any number of students, and that Professors can do twice as much there as elsewhere. One writer frankly acknowledges the difficulty, but replies that there is plenty of room in the Queen's Park for more class-rooms. This implies another staff of Professors, or a duplicate of University College at once. And why not, when Oxford and Cambridge have between twenty and thirty colleges each? Why not? It only means that if we go to Toronto the State will pay our Professors and provide for our students, but that if we stay in Kingston the State will do nothing for us. What else can it mean? Remember, I have no wish to arouse local feeling, but I desire clearness of thought. Any one who considers for a moment must see that it would be just as impossible for University College to absorb Queen's as it would be for Queen's to absorb University College. When Victoria and Trinity are added to the sum, the impossibility is doubled. And the grant now asked for University College will not contribute an iota to the solution of the problem. Besides, we must think of the future. For, as our secondary education improves, more young men will demand a University education. In the course of the next ten years the number of students in our colleges will probably be doubled, notwithstanding any fence in the shape of increased fees that may be put up, and to mass them all together under one Professorial staff, even if it were possible, would be a mistake.

There are then in Ontario more than twice as many students in Arts as University College can accommodate, and the number is sure to increase. This shows the absurdity of calling University College the keystone of our educational system. The keystone does not consist of any one building. Just as the second storey is, in the main, Upper Canada College and 106 High Schools and Collegiate Institutes, so the third storey or keystone consists of the Colleges that receive matriculants from these. The men who are studying for the degree of B.A. and their Professors are the keystone of our system. Does not the very constitution of Toronto University imply that there are to be a number of Colleges in the Province? I need hardly say that by Colleges divinity halls are not meant, and it is surely implied also that if several Colleges are required, no undue leverage shall be given to one. When football clubs from the different Colleges compete, one would scorn to accept any favoritism that would give it undue advantage over the other. Should it not be with mind as with muscle?

I have stated what the problem is that a statesman has to face, if he touches it at all. Three solutions have been proposed:

1. Mr. Mulock says, let the Legislature give money to enable us to add three or four Professors to University College. Now, doubtless, each new Professor adds to the efficiency of a College. Apparently, too, no halt can be called in this path till University College has as many Professors as Berlin. And can we halt then? The University at Cairo has, I be-