

THE MENACE OF UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS

J. F. SNELL

Professor of Chemistry, Macdonald College.

UNIVERSITIES exist for the threefold purpose of discovering new knowledge, disseminating and applying current knowledge, and developing in their members such traits of character as shall conduce to the further development of knowledge. The efforts towards the dissemination of knowledge and the development of character are naturally most effectively directed towards the young, and in this department of its work the college or university but continues the work begun in the home and continued in the primary and secondary school. Distinctive features of the university as compared with the secondary and primary school are, accordingly: first, the more advanced stage of development of the pupils, and second, the unique function of creating or evolving new knowledge.

A natural consequence of the more advanced state of the pupils is that the knowledge imparted is more or less recondite, all of it beyond the ordinary possession of the average man, much of it beyond the possible grasp of the average adult comprehension. So vast has become the sum of knowledge of the race that at present not even the greatest mind can compass it all, and practical considerations render it necessary for the university teacher to confine his efforts to a comparatively narrow field, while the investigator must necessarily specialize still more closely. Consequently, the university staff is a body of diverse attainments and interests. In spite of this fact, its members have much in common with one another, both in knowledge and in experience, which the bulk of their fellowmen do not share with them. In other words, they understand one another, and they understand their own environment more fully than it is possible for outsiders to understand them and their university world. In the same way, members of other professions—lawyers, physicians, engineers, clergymen, military men—understand one another and the things of their respective professions to an extent that is impossible to outsiders. And, after all, it is questionable whether the diversity of interests amongst

the university staff is any greater than that amongst members of those other professions in which specialization is most fully developed—for instance, amongst medical men.

The fundamental aim of university administration ought obviously to be the maintenance of high standards in its Faculties—high standards as regards scholarship, integrity, diligence, enthusiasm, sympathy, co-operation, numbers in relation to the work to be done, facilities for work and facilities for self-development. That system of administration is best which attracts to the institution and advances to its highest positions of influence men of sound scholarship, strong personality and natural aptitude for either investigation or teaching, or—best of all—for both. To attract, to hold and to develop men of the best type, it is essential that the positions to which they are appointed or those to which they may reasonably aspire should carry the dignity of authority, responsibility and adequate remuneration. In order that the supply of competent men for these higher positions may be maintained it is also important that a certain measure of authority and responsibility should be imposed upon the junior members of the staff, and some even upon the undergraduates.

There can be little doubt that the reason why the type of institution to which the term “university” was first applied did not survive but was eventually replaced—even in the place of its origin—by a second type, which originated almost simultaneously, is that the former *abased*, while the latter *exalted* the Faculty. Doubtless many a Canadian graduate is unaware of the fact, well known to all who have taken the trouble to look into the history of the development of universities in the Middle Ages, that the first academic institutions to which the Roman law name for a corporation (*universitas*) was applied were guilds of students in Bologna, which were self-governing, and which lorded it over the professors in a way that would bring joy to the heart of a modern sophomore, fining them for falling behind in a schedule of work set by the student corporation, requiring them to deposit security for their return from journeys out of town, and so on. Of this type of institution modern universities retain only the most rudimentary remains, the most notable, perhaps, being the election of the authoritative head of the Scottish universities by the students, this official preserving the name (“Rector”) originally applied to the head of the Bologna guild. Fraternities and modern systems of student self-government in America are to be regarded, not as survivals, but rather as revivals of some of the more desirable features of the old guilds.

The second type of *universitas*, that of the masters’ guild, though

not unknown in Bologna, was more influential and authoritative in the University of Paris. This is the type which in time displaced the former one almost entirely, and our contention is that its survival was due to inherent fitness. The teacher *must* command the respect of the taught. To deny him authority is to debase him, hence to drive all worthy men from the professorial profession, hence to destroy the university. University nomenclature is so varied that one must be guarded in the use of terms, but in the mediaeval Oxford and in many modern universities the *Chancellor* is the personal representative of the authority of the *teaching* or of the *graduate* members of the university, and he—not the undergraduates' representative—is the official head of the corporation.

In modern times the menace to the authority, and therefore indirectly to the efficiency of the professoriate, comes not from the student body, but from another source. Unlike the mediaeval university, which could so readily migrate that it was in position to dictate to the authorities of the town in which it was situated, the modern university is a wealthy property-owner. It must have a suitable site, appropriate buildings which are necessarily costly, an expensive equipment of scientific apparatus, museum collections which cost much to secure and to maintain, and an extensive library with suitable facilities for its use. To maintain its buildings, grounds and equipment the university requires an endowment, running in the case of all institutions of high rank into millions of dollars. The management of such wealth requires a kind of skill which is most readily found amongst men associated with great business undertakings. For the control of its funds and properties the university must either enlist the services of such men or develop a similar type of man for its purpose. Some sort of financial or business board every university must have. The crucial modern issues of university organization centre about this board. How shall it be composed—of members of the university or of outsiders? How shall its members be appointed? How extensive shall be its powers? What shall be its relation to the Faculty organizations, and how shall the functions of the two be co-ordinated?

At the one extreme we have the purely internal organization of Oxford and Cambridge, with Executive Councils chosen by members of the university, and Financial Boards subordinate to these; at the other extreme we have the type, too common in America, of a body of trustees appointed either by co-option or by some external authority, and entrusted with plenary powers in the control of property, appointments and promotions, and even of

educational policy. In the latter class of institution, the control of educational policy is usually delegated to the Faculties. This is done in some cases by constitutional or statutory provision, more commonly merely by grace, and because the trustees realize that they are not as competent as the Faculties to deal with such matters. Moreover, there is no clear, inclusive definition of the term "educational policy" and, except where the Faculty is legally protected in this right, arbitrary interference by the trustees may often occur.

Still more common than arbitrary interference of trustees in matters pertaining to the Faculties is the establishment of an autocracy under the protection of the trustees. A sense of their limitations in respect to knowledge of the internal affairs of the institution leads the trustees to depend for information and advice upon the official who serves as intermediary between them and the Faculties. Such an official in a university governed by an external Board is in a position to exert a most far-reaching influence upon the destinies of the institution, even though, as in the Australian universities, he occupies the nominally unimportant office of Registrar. But in America he is deliberately invested by the Board with a most autocratic power over the members of the teaching body. He is usually "the President", and his authority within his sphere is comparable with, and indeed in some respects more absolute than, that of the President of the United States.

Though usually selected from the professional personnel and denominated the Chairman of the Faculties, the President naturally recognizes his responsibility to those to whom he owes his appointment, and is constrained to adopt their views. Sometimes he is broad enough and strong enough to influence both Board and Faculty to the adoption of his own views. It may even happen that, although selected by the Board, he is just such a man as the Faculty itself would have chosen as its leader. In such cases all goes well. An intelligent and beneficent autocracy is an efficient form of government, and satisfactory to all who do not look ahead to the possibility of the succession of an autocrat who is stupid or cruel or selfishly ambitious. But, as an institution, autocracy is fundamentally bad and—as Mr. J. McKean Cattell remarks—the genial and efficient autocrat is the very worst kind, inasmuch as he tends to perpetuate an objectionable system of government. "The cruel and incompetent despot soon disappears."

In the United States, where the ills of this form of government are exemplified with amazing frequency and acuteness, the pro-

fessoriate has not failed to protest against both the prevalence of external control and the concentration of power in an autocratic head appointed by external authority. Mr. Cattell, himself the son of a successful College President, went so far as to propose the elimination of this—"the black beast of the academic jungle." Seeking the opinion of the leaders in the scientific world in the United States (of whom he had a list for another purpose) he found only 15 per cent of them favourably disposed to the prevailing system, 23 per cent favourable to a system in which the Faculties would have a greater share of control, and the remaining 62 per cent in favour of a still more radical change in the direction of representative democracy. In his volume on "University Control" he has not only given the results of his enquiry with copious quotations from the answers he received, but has also reprinted a number of strong essays by university professors and others in criticism of the system prevailing in his country.

Aside from their purpose, most of these essays are worth reading as examples of vigorous English prose. Limitations of space prohibit more than the most meagre quotation. The consensus of view is that the system of administration imposed upon the university is carried over from the business world, the President being regarded as a foreman, and the professors as the employees of the Board of Trustees, the result being a drift towards "high-priced imperious management and low-priced docile labour." The case against such a system is well summed up by one who had the rare experience of serving first as the Secretary of the Faculty and afterwards as a member of the Board of Trustees of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology:

We have here a conspicuous example of the current tendency towards one-man power, towards that concentration of authority which makes, of course, for ease, rapidity and sureness of administration, but which in politics undermines manhood, in industrialism destroys initiative, and in education tends to defeat the very object of teaching, which should be to develop and make the most of every man's individuality.

A distinguished son of maritime Canada who—though twenty-five years President of Cornell University—never lost sympathy with the Faculty's point of view, contrasts the true ideal of a university with the actual conditions imposed by outside control, as follows:

The university is an intellectual organization, composed essentially of devotees of knowledge—some investigating, some communicating, some acquiring—but all dedicated to the in-

tellectual life. To this essential fact the American professor wants the government of his university to conform, and he criticizes presidents and boards of trustees because under the existing plan of government they obstruct the realization of this ideal—nay worse, actually set up and maintain an alien ideal, the ideal of a business corporation engaging professors as employees, and controlling them by means of authority which is exercised either directly by “busybody trustees” or indirectly through delegation or usurpation by a “presidential boss.”

In a more recently published protest, Thorstein Veblen, who has been a member of half a dozen of the leading universities of the United States, attributes the prevalent dissipation of resources and youthful energy upon pageantry and semi-professional sport to the influence of the business men, exercising their craze for display and publicity in the management of the universities. This writer despairingly advocates the divorce of the investigating staff of the university, the body of men absorbed in the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake, from the teaching departments—a remedy which few thinking men would endorse.

In Canada, fortunately, none of these evils—trustee interference, presidential tyranny, semi-professional sport, craze for mere size and sensation—have run to such extremes as in our great neighbour country. Nevertheless our universities, growing up under similar social conditions, have tended to conform to the same type of organization as those in the original British American colonies and the United States into which those colonies have evolved. Here, as well as there, the earliest established universities owe their existence to religious denominations, and here as well as there some of these remain denominational, while others have evolved into independent institutions, depending for their support upon private endowments or upon private endowments supplemented by governmental grants. In both countries the evolution of the denominational into the independent university has been accelerated within the last quarter-century by the influence of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. In McGill and Dalhousie we have the university founded by the enterprise of a single donor and supported mainly by the revenues from investment of the original and subsequent donations. Our provincial universities correspond closely to the American State universities. Roman Catholic institutions play a part in the higher education of both countries, but in Canada this part is naturally of more relative importance, and French Canadian culture has developed its own peculiar type of Catholic university.

With regard to their sources of income and the means of its

control, the twenty-three existing Canadian universities may be classified as follows:

1. Six established and supported by provincial governments:—New Brunswick, Alberta, Toronto, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, British Columbia.

2. One jointly supported and governed by a city and a province:—Western University, London, Ontario.

3. Three privately endowed universities with self-perpetuating Boards and some provincial support:—McGill, Dalhousie, Queen's.

4. Six Roman Catholic universities:—Laval, Montreal, St. Francis Xavier, Ottawa, St. Joseph's, St. Dunstan's.

5. Four independent Protestant denominational institutions:—Bishop's College (Anglican), Acadia (Baptist), McMaster (Baptist), Mount Allison (Methodist).

6. Three Protestant denominational institutions federated with other universities: Victoria (Methodist), Trinity (Anglican), and King's College (Anglican) which has just federated with Dalhousie. (There are several other "affiliated" theological colleges, whose actual relationship to the universities differs but little from that of these formerly independent institutions.)

All of the six provincial governments maintaining universities delegate most of their authority over the institution to a small Board of Governors. (In New Brunswick this Board is called the "Senate." Some mischievous elf plays pranks in the nomenclature of university bodies and functionaries.) This Board varies in number from nine members (Manitoba) to twenty-four (Toronto). In Ontario, Manitoba, Alberta and British Columbia, all its members except one or two are appointed for a limited term of years by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. In New Brunswick nine (including the "Chancellor," who is in every essential the Principal) out of fourteen are appointed by the government, four are elected by the alumni, and one by the teachers of the province. In Saskatchewan the government appoints only three members on a Board of nine, five being elected by the Senate—a body of about thirty members, of whom twelve are elected by Convocation and eight by professional societies, the remainder being *ex-officio*. The ninth member of the Board is the President of the University, who is appointed by the Board itself. In Alberta, as in New Brunswick, the government reserves to itself the right of appointment of the President, and that without the proviso—holding in respect to the New Brunswick "Chancellor,"—that he must be selected from

amongst the staff of the university. In the other four universities the President is chosen by the Board of Governors. In all of the provincial universities this Board of Governors makes all appointments and promotions and fixes salaries on the recommendation of the President, though in Alberta appointments and promotions to positions carrying a salary of over \$3000 require the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. The Faculties are unrepresented, and members of the Faculties are explicitly excluded from appointment to the Board of Governors—which is no doubt well, considering that appointment is made by external authority.

The Board of Governors of the Western University is composed of twelve members, four being appointed by the City Council, four by the provincial government, and the remaining four being co-opted by these eight. The Board makes appointments on recommendation of the deans and heads of departments, and prepares and adopts the budget. Legislative functions are assigned to a group consisting of the Governors and Senate. The latter comprises five representatives of each Faculty, two representatives of alumni, two of affiliated colleges, and a number elected by bodies interested in the university. In this broadly representative Senate and in the co-ordinating committee of Senate and Governors, we have an unconscious parallel to the constitution of the British civic universities, the Senate corresponding to their Courts, and the co-ordinating committee to their Councils. This form of constitution is worthy of the study of any group of persons charged with or interested in the revision of university constitutions. It provides opportunity for the Faculties to bring their views before both those responsible for the finances of the institution and the graduate members and friends of the university, dwelling outside its precincts.

Dalhousie and McGill are private institutions which have never been under denominational control. They are not under control of the legislatures of their provinces nor of the municipal councils of their cities. Both have self-perpetuating Boards of Governors, the formal appointments being made by the Governor-General of Canada. The Dalhousie charter grants to any individual or group of individuals that endows a chair the right to nominate a Governor—a much more dangerous bid for gifts than the similar provision for benefactors' seats in the Courts of British universities, inasmuch as these Courts are much larger bodies. In both Dalhousie and McGill, pressure on the part of graduates for representation upon the Board of Governors has resulted in concessions on the part of the self-perpetuating Boards. In Dalhousie, the alumni and

alumnae are allowed to nominate four on a board of twenty-two, and all persons appointed are required to guarantee to resign after six years of service, being then eligible for re-appointment. In McGill the graduates are allowed to elect three representatives on a Board of twenty-five. In McGill contact between the Faculties and the Governors is provided for in the large body known as "Corporation" which includes the Principal, all the Governors, and forty-two "Fellows"—of whom six are appointed by the Governors, twelve are *ex-officio* (deans, etc.), eight are elected by the Faculties, and the remainder are "representative" of various Faculties, districts, affiliated colleges, etc. There is a considerable number of members of the Faculties on this "highest academic" body, and no doubt the proportion of these attending meetings would be larger than that of the Governors, who have so many outside duties and connections. But can anyone conceive of the Faculties ever daring to contest an issue with the Governors or the Principal? It would be quite out of the question. The advantage is all with the Governors.

Queen's has evolved from a denominational institution to a private one receiving some governmental support. It has a Board of thirty-four trustees, the majority of whom are co-opted by itself. The graduates, however, have five representatives and the University Council four. This Council, which appears to have but little power, is a composite body including all the trustees, the members of the Senate (an academic body), and a body of graduate representatives equal in number to the trustees and senators together. The Board of Trustees appoints all members of the staff and has charge of all matters not relating directly to instruction. In view of its representation upon the University Council, the graduate body there has more influence in the selection of trustees than in McGill or Dalhousie, but the professoriate is pretty effectually disfranchised.

In the Roman Catholic universities, ecclesiastical control is of course safeguarded, and such control extends more or less to finances and appointments. In these universities the Faculties possess in general considerably more authority than in the non-Catholic institutions. So at least it appears to an outsider. The four smaller institutions, St. Joseph's, St. Dunstan's, St. Francis Xavier's and Ottawa, appear to be but little subject to the control of business men. This may be due to the fact that, being small and conservative, they have less need of the services of those skilled in the management of property, or on the other hand to the special training of some ecclesiastics in the management of Church property. A comparison of lists in the announcement of the University of St.

Joseph's College shows that without exception the Governors are also members of the Faculty, the higher positions on the staff being held by priests and friars of the Congregation of Holy Cross. The Oblate Fathers of Mary Immaculate name the trustees of the University of Ottawa, and also a Council of Administration which makes all appointments. Of the twenty members of the governing board of the University of St. Francis Xavier's College, two are elected by the alumni, and members of the teaching staff are not excluded from appointment or election to the Board of Governors. However, an official of the university states that there is little organized control even of educational policy on the part of the Faculty.

In Laval University, one of the two larger and distinctively French Catholic institutions of higher education, the Seminary of Quebec has full control of finances, but almost all the rights and powers of the university are assigned to the University Council, which is composed of seven directors of the Seminary, the deans of the four Faculties, and three representatives of each of these Faculties. This Council, in which Faculty representation predominates, appoints the deans and professors and the nominations, before being definitely decided are submitted to the Faculties concerned for advice. Nominations to the Faculty of Theology, however, are made by the Bishop of Quebec in his capacity of Visitor of the university, and are presented by him to the University Council.

Montreal University, recently organized on the foundation of the Montreal branch of Laval, has a constitution unique amongst Canadian institutions. Like the University of Toronto, it is a colossal federation of institutions of varied history. This necessitates complexity, and apparently the essentiality of co-ordination amongst the various members of so great an organism was prominent in the minds of those who drafted its constitution. Its Administration Commission consists of thirty members, of whom three are *ex-officio*, two are delegates of the Academic Senate (the supreme appellate court of the university), nine are representatives of the boards of administration of the Faculties and schools merged into the university, one represents *Les Messieurs de St. Sulpice au Canada*, and the remaining fifteen are nominated by the Commission itself with the limitation that they must be representatives of various callings and must be chosen one from each diocese of the ecclesiastical province of Montreal. This body has charge of all university property, and fixes salaries and fees after consultation with the Faculties and schools involved. It forms a branch of a superior body to which its regulations have to be submitted for

approval. This superior body is known as the University Council, and is composed of the members of the Administration Commission and of the Commission on Studies sitting together. It is the President of this University Council who bears the title of President of the University of Montreal. The constitution provides that he shall be a layman. Besides this President, the Commission of Administration may have its own President, appointed by the University Council. There is also a Rector, who presides over the Commission on Studies, and a Vice-Rector. These are ecclesiastics chosen by the bishops of the ecclesiastical province. The Rector, or in his absence the Vice-Rector, holds a seat in the Administration Commission, and the President of the Administration Commission holds one in the Commission on Studies. The Secretary General is also a member of both Commissions. Subordinate to the Academic Senate and the two Commissions of the University Council there is an executive committee of nine, to which the President of the Administration Commission, the Rector or Vice-Rector and the Secretary-General belong, together with representatives of the three superior bodies. It is this committee's duty to prepare the general budget and yearly appropriations for the approval of the Administration Commission. Each Faculty has the privilege of choosing its own officers and appointing its own professors, subject to the approval of the Chancellor, the Archbishop of Montreal.

It will be recognized that, subject to the supreme authority of the Church, these two French-Canadian universities have constitutions which accord to the professoriate a considerable share of democratic control and responsibility.

In the universities controlled by Protestant Churches also there is in general less absolute control by business boards than in either the private or the State institutions. Two of the universities of this class, Trinity and Victoria, are federated with the University of Toronto, and King's College has now a similar status with respect to Dalhousie. Only the two Baptist universities, (Acadia and McMaster) one Methodist (Mount Allison) and one Anglican institution, (Bishop's College) will then remain as independent.

Bishop's College, (Lennoxville, Que.), at present the smallest of our Canadian universities, is governed by a Corporation consisting of the Bishops of Quebec and Montreal, sixteen trustees and nineteen members of the College Council. The latter are appointed by the said bishops. The Board of Governors is appointed by this Corporation, seven of its members being trustees and five members

of the College Council. The two bishops, the Chancellor and the Principal are *ex-officio* Governors. Formerly the graduates elected three representatives to a Corporation of thirty-five or thirty-six in which the trustees and the College Council were represented in equal numbers. The constitutional changes recently adopted appear to be in the direction of augmenting the authority of the bishops and the trustees, and diminishing that of the Faculties and graduates.

The two Baptist universities are headed by Boards of Governors elected by the Baptist Conventions. In Acadia, however, one-third of the membership is elected by the alumni, and in McMaster all appointments are made on recommendation of the Senate, a composite body to which the Faculty and graduates elect representatives.

In King's College, as constituted before federation with Dalhousie was decided upon, the alumni had a strong minority representation upon the Board of Governors, the majority being elected by ecclesiastical courts. In Mt. Allison the alumni elect eighteen of the forty-two Regents, the remainder being elected by the General Conference of the Methodist Church. In Victoria University the alumni and the General Conference each elect eight Regents, eight more are co-opted by these, and four officials of the Church are *ex-officio* members of the Board. Appointments, including that of the President, are made by the Board on the recommendation of an Executive Committee. In the matter of appointments the President of the College is looked to for guidance, but has no more technical authority than any other member of the Executive Committee. The regulations of the General Conference prohibit the election of any member of the teaching staff, other than the President, to the Board of Regents. Trinity University has a single trustee in a Corporation of over sixty members, some of whom are elected by the graduates, some by Synods, some are *ex-officio* and some are co-opted by Corporation itself. The Chancellor, Provost, Dean and Registrar constitute an Executive Committee of Corporation.

Reviewing the situation, one sees that in all the greater English Canadian Universities—Dalhousie, McGill, Queen's, and the provincial institutions—the subordination of the professor prevails to the same extent as in the United States. As regards rights and forms the subordination is also to the same *degree* here as there, and our only advantage consists in the fact that our Presidents and Boards of Governors rarely abuse the authority vested in them so flagrantly as to create a public scandal. The yoke is so easy that many of

us may be unconscious of its existence. The disease in our "corporations" occasions only a dull, steady pain, or rare spasms of acute suffering. So it is allowed to run on, and to prevent the profession of teaching and research attaining a vigorous, healthy development and attracting to itself men of the highest intellectual power and the greatest moral strength.

Stimulated by flagrant invasions of their rights, American university professors have combined to defend themselves. Since January, 1915, they have had an Association to study both the rights and the obligations of the profession, and to combat invasions of the former and evasions of the latter. In 1917 a committee of this Association, headed by a graduate of our Trinity University, Professor J. A. Leighton of the Ohio State University, prepared a report on the place and functions of Faculties in university government and administration, in which the main principles involved are set forth as follows:

Faculty power of initiative and right of consent in all matters of educational policy; Faculty participation in the nomination of its own members and officers; provision for frequent interchange of views between trustees and Faculty; openness of the Faculty to suggestions on educational policy from the trustees; but the responsibility for the use of moneys and the final election of administrative officers and members of the teaching staff to remain with the trustees, since they are the custodians of the public interest in the care and administration of the property and income provided for the conduct of higher education and research.

In regard to the practical application of these principles there was naturally not the same unanimity as in subscription to the principles themselves. The principle of self-perpetuation of Boards of trustees was unanimously condemned, and alumni representation on the Board was commended. A minority of the committee favoured direct representation of the Faculty upon the Board of Trustees, the plan advocated by ex-President Schurman of Cornell and favoured also, we understand, by his successor, President Farrand. The majority preferred the plan of joint conferences between trustees and Faculties or their committees. The President, who should be chosen for broad scholarship, insight into educational problems and power of leadership no less than for administrative skill, should be nominated by a joint committee of Faculty and trustees, the appointment to be confirmed by the Board of Trustees as a whole. Appointments of deans should be accomplished by concurrence of Faculty, President and trustees, though there was difference of opinion as to whether the initiative should lie with the President

or with the Faculty concerned. All the members of the committee but one favoured the participation of the Faculty in the preparation of the annual budget, a system which has been in operation in Oberlin University, Ohio, for many years and which the Faculty and trustees of that university agree to be satisfactory. The committee favoured Faculty participation (through appropriate committees) in the selection of full professors and executive officers of departments and in the appointment of Faculty standing committees, amongst which there should be a small judicial committee to which any member of the instructing staff threatened with dismissal should have the right to appeal and which should have power to estop dismissal—whether temporarily or absolutely is not clear.

The American Association of University Professors has not hesitated to investigate and publish reports upon cases of dismissal of Faculty members by trustees, and there can be no doubt that its influence is wholesome. Membership is open to Canadians, and some of our professors have joined the Association. To the present writer it would appear preferable to have an association of our own, perhaps affiliated with the American organization, but avoiding conceivable objections to the direct intervention of foreigners in our domestic quarrels. Such an organization could not only stand ready to defend the profession against invasion of its rights, but could also render a more positive service by arousing the profession to a more vivid realization and a more vigorous performance of its duties; for, as Professor Leighton well says:

The best way for a Faculty to show that it is worthy of a greater share of responsibility in the government of the university is to exercise vigorously and in concert the responsibilities and powers that it has. We should value our calling highly, and show by our words and deeds that we are asking for more power in order that we may better discharge our social responsibilities as preeminently the class of public servants to which is intrusted the high duty of preserving for, and propagating in, the coming generation an intelligent and balanced consciousness of the essential continuity of civilization; and, by our teaching and our productive work, make it clear to all who have eyes to see and ears to hear that there is nothing that moves in the modern world beyond the blind forces of nature that does not owe its origin and its power to the unremitting and persistent exercise of systematic thinking and investigation, and to that disciplined exercise of the creative imagination that comes only through hard thinking.