

perhaps deprive itself of the 5 per cent. on the bequest of private individuals which the State grants, and, further, of the revenues from the lands with which the State has dowered the institution. We question very much whether the University would be able to do its work fully without the help thus afforded by the State, and we are compelled not only to question the probability of the Senate's self-abnegation but to venture the opinion that the country would not allow that body to cripple the resources of the highest educational institution in the colony, even if it were so ill-advised as to wish to do so. As to the relations between the Council and the Senate, it is of course true there is no deadlock. Such a consummation is impossible when the one body is fully executive and the other purely consultative. The Senate says that such and such a thing is wrong; the Council sees fit to hold that it is right. Supreme power resting in the hands of the Council, the Senate can protest and move until its lungs and its arguments are exhausted—with no further result than would follow upon the pricking of an elephant with a pin. The Council can do whatever it chooses, and, as it were, it simply presents its impenetrable surface to the assaults of its powerless foe. The elephant is not stopped in its course by pins; if he happened to step on one it would only irritate him and goad him more furiously on. Thus the differences between the Council and the Senate can never under present circumstances cause a deadlock; they can at best result in a disagreement uncomfortable to both parties, and prejudicial to the best interests of the institution which both are concerned to advance. Such a disagreement now exists. It is devoutly to be desired that by force of mutual concessions it will soon vanish.

As tending to this end we notice with pleasure that Dr. Smith's motion did not contemplate the restriction of candidates for seats in the Council to members of the Senate. What it did contemplate was the introduction of a modification of the proxy system, whereby graduates in the country should be enabled to express their opinions on the merits of candidates for seats in the Council. Leaving out of consideration the strong objections that may be urged against the principle of proxy voting, this proposition is worthy of consideration, if only on the ground that it would take away from the University the reproach which is sometimes cast upon it that it is a city institution. No fraud would be possible, for the double reason that every constituent is known and his signature capable of verification. Then the term "member of the University" should be held to imply undergraduates as well as graduates. Dr. Smith does not go so far as this, but probably he would be prepared to accept the larger definition of the term. A proposal to increase the influence of the Senate is conspicuous by its absence, but perhaps it is thought that as constituents of the Council members of the Senate have already great power. It is doubtful whether this position will be always occupied by the Senate, and we confess we should like to see some provision introduced into the Act, whereby the repeated opposition of the constituency to a change proposed, in educational matters at least, by the Council should

have the effect of delay'ing the carrying into practice of the innovation. As we pointed out yesterday, this would be a desirable thing in every respect—it would not weaken though it would regulate the executive power of the Council, and it would allow that body the benefit as well of the advice of the graduates as of a seasonable space for the reconsideration of changes. Besides this, it would do away with the possibility of the suspicion that in adopting new regulations in particular cases the Council was animated by an unworthy prejudice against an individual concerned. Thus, if the new arrangements for the tenure of professorships were not to come into action until a vacancy had arisen through death, resignation, or by reason of evident incompetence, the strong impression prevalent that one of the present Professors has been hardly dealt with would be untenable. However, the Senate, without deigning to enlighten the public as to its reasons for adopting that course, has refused to appoint a committee of its members to bring before it proposals for the amendment of the existing Act. Whether it is satisfied with the Act in its present shape, or whether it considers it beyond its functions to make suggestions to the Legislature, are questions that remain unanswered. By the emphatic and brusque rejection of the motion placed before it on Wednesday it virtually disclaims all interest in the matter.

---