

a great work to do for Canada, a reluctance to let her subside into the humble position of a federated college in a novel and apparently one-sided confederation, and a modest confidence in their own power and will to aid in her future development. Some looked no farther than the benefits conferred on Kingston by the University, and in the spirit of ordinary hucksters counted up the number of dollars that the professors and students spent annually in the place. Others, of a far different spirit, looked at the scheme from a church point of view, and, longing for a strong theological college like Union, saw in it an opportunity of realizing their ideal, but like true patriots the general good weighed down in their estimation the special good that it promised their Church. Not a few, also occupying the Presbyterian standpoint, opposed the scheme because they believed that the life of the Church would be fuller and richer by the preservation in their entirety of its distinctive theological schools. These men appreciate Queen's because of the spirit of its students. They do not estimate a school of thought by the number of its professors or the number of its students, or its money power. For Divinity students, they would rather have one man like Dr. Cook than a dozen ordinary teachers, and they believe that if a professor does his duty to twenty, thirty, or forty students, he is not eating the bread of idleness. Some of our best University men were at the outset in favour of a greater concentration of our scanty educational resources, and with these, in my moments of despondency, I sympathized; but they demanded as prime conditions of their assent to any change full compensation for the losses that would be incurred in removal, and also that no invidious distinctions should be made between the component parts of the new University. When there was any hesitation in granting these conditions they suspected the honesty of those who talked confederation, and when they found that the scheme lacked both, they rejected it with more vehemence than anybody else. To these men the provision by which the arts curriculum was to be partly theological for as many candidates as chose, condemned the whole scheme. Such a provision was contrary to all their ideas of what the B. A. degree should represent. Others were from the outset opposed on principle to both the teaching and examining concentration sought for. They pointed out that wherever and whenever the intellectual life of a country is vigorous it has manifested itself in the establishment of colleges and Universities of different types at every important centre; that we have no example in history of the best results flowing from a monopolizing of all higher educational work by one institution; and that here in particular the results would simply be a great consumption of red tape and hopeless stagnation in University matters. Whatever the views of this or that section of our friends, they all came to the same conclusion, and last June the Chancellor informed the Minister of Education accordingly.