

for excellence, to which the same degree conferred by an isolated institution could scarce hope to attain. The difficulties of the union, if any there be, are such as liberality of views and mutual allowances would readily obviate. The internal economy and system of management, peculiar to each of the Colleges, need in no way enter into consideration; at least not until the day comes, if ever, that will afford some prospect of collecting all these institutions of learning into one University town,—a theory that is at the present, as our essayist in last issue properly terms it, purely Utopian.

But there is one question that intrudes itself, but one whose importance objectors greatly magnify: In what light should the degrees conferred previous to consolidation be viewed? We would answer the question with another: Would there be any more difficulty in recognizing these degrees than those conferred by old Kings' College? There is no reason why they should not be incorporated with those subsequently to be conferred, especially since, as we have shown already, no College bears any responsibility for, or is in any way compromised by, the degrees obtained by the matriculants of another.

We are pleased to notice that this question is being taken out of the speculative and placed in the practical sphere, by the action of the High School masters, determined by them in convention. We understand by a letter in *The Mail* from CORTEZ FESSENDEN, a Trinity graduate, that measures are being taken to sound the sentiment of the different Colleges, with a view to the appointment by them of representative committees, to confer with the Minister of Education on a scheme of union, that in due time the matter may be brought before the Legislature, and the red tape of organization proceeded with.

The following considerations, as a groundwork for the proposed consolidation, were submitted to the Corporation of Trinity, and were favourably received:

1. That the power to confer degrees in Arts should be exercised by only one University in the Province.
2. That this University should be equally independent of all the Colleges, denominational and provincial.
3. That a portion of the public money should be distributed among the different Colleges from year to year, in proportion to the number of successful candidates for degrees.

Trinity, then, has already declared her readiness to accede to the scheme on fair and equitable terms. If the other Universities, to whom these considerations are to be submitted, entertain the notion with equal liberality, University consolidation may, as *The Mail's* correspondent declares, soon be a fact. There is another matter that renders this union easier: University College being a Government institution, the High School course is in preparation for it, and so self-interest has induced the sectarian Colleges to adopt its subjects for matriculation.

*Apropos* of this, we were not a little amused to notice the kind advice, recently given to Trinity by a newspaper correspondent, that she should adopt this course, betraying that utter ignorance with regard to the subject, that has always characterized these irresponsible scribblers in their remarks concerning us. The advice was doubtless good, but it came somewhat more than a year too late,—a year after the recommended change had been made. This action of the High School Masters, and the increased interest taken in the subject on all sides, augur well for the project; and a united effort, on the part of the present Corporations, is alone necessary to produce a University that would bid fair to rival the best.

## REPRESENTATION.

We think it proper time—a duty to our University—to make some comments on the subject of responsible government in her affairs in view of the fact that some official steps have been lately taken in that direction.

At the outset we must consider what the present system of management is, what the proposed change amounts to, and how far it may be efficient; next, how from these small beginnings the University executive may be made truly representative, as appears to those who have a life interest at stake.

We may be guilty in the following considerations of some inaccuracies, but the nature of our administrative body, who are themselves to blame if the Church public does not comprehend their constitutional anomalies, must supply the cause.

A University must speak to the public through some medium—in our case through the corporation in council. The history, and consequently the present composition of our sole executive body, is somewhat on this wise. The Church in Canada raised funds,

some thirty years ago, for the establishment and equipment of a University, which might leaven a liberal education by theological training and religious exercises. The promoters of the scheme naturally resolved themselves into a committee of a provisional and administrative character. They had no other course. Years went by, and death or indifference caused occasional vacancies—indifference, we say advisedly, delegates from Eastern Ontario, for example, having recently lost their seats from continuous absence. The question to be considered then was, how such vacancies were to be filled. Being, at that early stage, necessarily a close corporation, an election was practicable only by the members constituting themselves the electors, or by their vesting the power of appointment anew in their president.

A fusion of both systems seems to have been adopted: the Bishop of Toronto nominating a certain proportion of the members from his Diocese, while the Council elected the residue when vacancies occurred. The Bishops of the remaining sub-divisions of the old See of Toronto appear to have had the exclusive power of appointment of the delegates from their respective Dioceses. This, then, is the system at present in operation. Originally, the Corporation was the official Committee of the Church in the Diocese of Toronto. They were, as such, the deliberative and executive officers of the University, whether subsequent additions to their number were analogously elected or no. But it must not be forgotten that any such directing Committee was, from the nature of the circumstance attending its formation, of a purely provisional character. Bishop STRACHAN'S obvious intention—an intention otherwise apparent in our internal economy as a whole—was to follow out in detail the English University system. A *University* was to be established—a University, and not a College. Our Founder's Committee was a necessity, but it was formed for a purpose—to act as Trinity's guardian and overseer till she attained maturity; to train and educate churchmen, who might make her hereafter "a seat of learning, the resort of the learned;" to knit closely to her by association, and more substantial benefits, those who would foster her well-being; to create a University kinship, that Trinity's graduates might in the future find in her a true *Alma Mater*, and themselves be her *Alumni* in more than name. A generation has since passed; her sons' sons are now numbered