

*pro re nata* meeting of Convocation was called—the one to which I referred in the opening sentences of my first paper—and in spite of the strong protests of the minority, a resolution was passed requesting the Senate not to recommend for affiliation any medical college already affiliated to any other university. The line of argument used against this resolution—namely, that the University of Toronto, as the only State-endowed University in the Province, should treat all teaching institutions on their merits, and never recognize in any way whatsoever their university powers—was so effectively urged in the Legislative Assembly, that even the request of the Minister of Education, to have the words “or universities” expunged from the Trinity School Bill, was refused, and the Act passed in its present form. But once more the Legislature showed itself more liberal than the University Senate. The latter body soon afterwards formulated its policy on the question of multiple affiliation in a series of resolutions, of which the following are the portions bearing directly on the subject of this paper:

That no medical school or college should be admitted to or continued in affiliation which is or becomes connected with another university, either as its medical faculty, or by its professors or lecturers being examiners for the degrees, honors, scholarships or standing of another university, or its holding out in any way that its examination will be accepted by another university as entitling to degrees, honors, scholarships or standing. Provided that this shall not preclude any one or more individual professors or lecturers, *bond fide*, becoming examiners in another university, the intent being that the faculty of any affiliated college, or any part thereof, shall not be permitted substantially to conduct the examinations of their own students for degrees, honors, scholarships or standing in another university. Any school applying to be affiliated shall be informed of this regulation, and shall be required to enter into an undertaking to observe it, subject to the express condition that upon breach of such undertaking the statute shall be repealed and affiliation cancelled.

That students shall be admitted to the ordinary examinations necessary for obtaining a degree in medicine in this university from all medical schools of good standing, giving such courses of instruction as the Senate shall from time to time determine, whether belonging to or not belonging to the Province, and even if falling within the classes to which it is in the last paragraph resolved that affiliation shall not be extended, and even if such candidates are, at the same time, undergraduates in another university.

That, in the opinion of the Senate, the examination for honors, scholarships and medals, while extended in the fullest and most liberal manner to students coming from any medical school of good standing whether or not affiliated to this university, and whether or not affiliated to any other university, should not be open to those who are at the same time undergraduates in medicine in another university.

A careful perusal of these resolutions shows that while the Senate found it inexpedient either to pronounce against the principle of multiple affiliations, or to refuse to admit as candidates for examination the students from colleges affiliated at the same time to this and to other universities, they took refuge under a resolution against allowing men who are undergraduates or graduates of another university to compete for honors, scholarships or medals in the University of Toronto. This was so “lame and impotent a conclusion” to a prolonged and heated discussion, that it would have been much better for those opposed to multiple affiliation to allow the matter to drop altogether, more especially as the Legislature unmistakably intended that candidates should have an opportunity of obtaining degrees in medicine and surgery without being compelled to attend any lectures at all.

In my next and last paper on affiliation I shall refer briefly to the Western University Act, and conclude with some remarks on what I regard as the true policy to be followed by Toronto University in relation to other institutions of learning, whether they are merely teaching colleges or can also boast the possession of university powers.

WM. HOUSTON.

It has been decided to produce Sophokles' *Antigone* in Convocation Hall next March. Why it must necessarily be produced within the College walls is not yet apparent to us, except for the reason that a majority of the College Council have so decided. Why this decision should have been arrived at is still more inconceivable. There are

alarmists in College Councils as in any other body; but it does not follow that too much weight should be attached to their fire-bell notions. If the susceptible proclivities of the students can be entrusted with the representation of a moral Greek play, what possible difference can it make whether these students represent it in an opera house or in a college? It may be, and we believe it has been seriously argued, that the intimate association with painted scenery and footlights, and the inhaling of the inspiring atmosphere of an opera house, might engender theatre-going ideas in the flighty mind of the likely-to-be stage-struck undergraduate; while others say that what might be termed theatricals in a forbidden abode would spread the impression abroad that, with the sanction of the College Council, the students were rushing headlong to perdition. Many people would have gone to hear Morley Punshon lecture at the Grand Opera House who had never been there before, and we maintain that they are as harmlessly free to be there to see a Greek play. Making use of Convocation Hall will necessitate a repetition of the play, and will, by curtailing the possible receipts, prevent many perfections that might otherwise have been attained. It would seem that this play is going to clash with the *conversazione*. That the students were tired of these band-concert chemical-experiment entertainments was evinced by their not holding one in 1879, and ever since it has been by a narrow majority of a poorly attended meeting that it has been resolved to resume them. The opportunity now offers itself for departing from this conservative custom and taking a long step onwards, for a Greek play is clearly a long way in advance of the ubiquitous *conversazione*, and in all fairness it should be unanimously supported. The large expense, though this has been nearly all provided for, and the greater demand upon undergraduate time in the one event are reasons for uniting if possible all sympathies.

A WRITER in an unpublished query, asks a definition of “the duties of a chairman” in deciding the issue of a debated subject, implying that this officer, at the last meeting of the Debating Society, had overstepped his province in summing up the arguments. In our estimation his discussion should turn upon the merits of the arguments presented and not upon his own personal views of the question. It is not fair to lend to either side the additional weight of his own argument, while it is incumbent on him to express his opinion as to the weight of the various arguments presented, and on this to base his decision.

THAT University College, being exclusively an arts institution, can confer a degree in medicine is too ridiculous to even state, but for the question of “Innominatum” on another page. The mistake brought to notice in this communication arises no doubt from the so common want of discrimination between University College and the University of Toronto. The fact that *University College* is one of the colleges of the University, may be a reason for confounding the two institutions, which have quite separate functions, as pointed out in a recent issue.

AMONG the many interesting facts published by the *Globe* in connection with the recent hazing affair, was one, setting forth that a large number of Mr. Holmes' old schoolmates at St. Mary's, had held a meeting at which it was unanimously resolved to send a letter of condolence to him, for the shameful manner in which he had been treated at the hands of the students of University College. A student of the St. Mary's Collegiate Institute, writing to the *Journal* of that place the following letter, shows how wide of the mark the *Globe* hit, in this instance as in many others. He writes: “There appeared some time ago in the *Journal* a statement to the effect that a meeting of the students of the Collegiate Institute was held here to express sympathy with one of the Freshmen concerned in the recent doings at University College. That statement has placed the students of the Institute in a false position, and demands explanation. No meeting was ever called with the above named object. In a discussion of the University affair by three or four students, some one suggested, as a practical joke, to send a letter of “condolence” to one of the Freshmen, a former student here. The whole thing was simply a farce; the letter itself was merely a piece of irony and sarcasm. Very few of the students knew anything about it until they saw the notice in the *Journal* and *Globe*. Indeed, so far from feeling sympathy for the freshman, they *entirely approved* of the action of the seniors. These, so far as I can learn, are the facts of the case. As to the charge of ‘cheek’ which has been preferred against it by many who are ignorant of the truth of the matter, we repudiate it most emphatically. The evil did once prevail to a slight extent in our midst, and it was more than once proposed to exorcise it. However, as we knew the work could be done more effectually at the University, we allowed it to pass. We have all along been expecting the event which just happened at Toronto.”