

body, or by ancient endowments, or by the benefactions of living men, than you describe a man when you mention where his salary comes from. Yet there are petty creatures who think they know enough about a university, if they simply label it, especially if they stick on an offensive label, such as "godless" or "sectarian," "political" or "denominational." Associations of alumni represent truly pious feelings toward the mother that has watched over our intellectual growth, and aided in our enfranchisement from the idols of the mind. This association includes all who are willing to aid in extending Queen's. In forming it we have the satisfaction of knowing that we are following the example of the great Scottish University on which Queen's has been modelled from the beginning.

When, in response to a special invitation, we asked the Chancellor to represent us at the Tercentenary of Edinburgh University, we had no conception that his visit would be so fruitful. He brought back with him many things, among them the idea of an association of all our graduates and real friends that would be a permanent source of strength to the university. In his address at Convocation which he has sent, I think, to all of you, he explained that thirty years ago some adventurous gentlemen who had never done anything for the Scottish Universities proposed that they should be rolled into one. Scotchmen are supposed to be pretty Radical, but their Radicalism is ballasted by strong common sense. The various universities were native of the soil. Each had deep local roots, and a history that could not be ignored. Besides, the means were not provided for carrying out the magnificent scheme, and it fell still-born. However, one result was the starting of an association for strength-

ening Edinburgh, and the success which has attended it made the Chancellor think that we could better the example. Since that proposal was made, the smallest of the four Scottish Universities was vaguely threatened in a Parliamentary bill; but so lively was the feeling of resentment evoked that the objectionable clause was struck out, and now the Baxters have given nearly a million of dollars to start a college at Dundee that will probably develop into a fifth Scottish University.

We have recently had a similar experience. A proposal to concentrate in Toronto the four principal universities of Ontario was submitted to our constituents, and was unanimously rejected, last April. How is this unanimity to be explained, when, as I stated in my last inaugural, we were not unanimous before? How came it to pass that the proposed federation united against it the constituency of Queen's as one man? Because the proposal lacked the essential elements that an honest proposal would have contained. We have heard of the mountain in labour bringing forth a mouse, but in this case there was not even a mouse. There was no suggestion as to where the means were to come from to enable us to move, much less a word as to new sources of revenue to take the place of those that would be lost. Suppose that the conclusion had been come to that Kingston was the best centre for the University of Ontario, and that thereupon we had addressed an invitation to the Toronto University authorities to move to Kingston without a word as to how they were to get quarters to do as much work as they are now doing, would the invitation have been accepted? And when declined by them, would we be warranted in representing them as opposed to confederation? Equally preposterous is it to throw upon us the responsibility