

UNIVERSITY QUESTION.

THE
STATEMENTS
OF
JOHN LANGTON, ESQ., M. A.,
VICE-CHANCELLOR OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO ;
AND
PROFESSOR DANIEL WILSON, LL.D.,
OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, TORONTO ;
WITH NOTES AND EXTRACTS
FROM THE EVIDENCE TAKEN BEFORE THE
COMMITTEE OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
ON THE UNIVERSITY.

TORONTO :
ROWSELL & ELLIS, PRINTERS, KING STREET.
1860.

UNIVERSITY QUESTION.

THE
STATEMENTS
OF
JOHN LANGTON, ESQ., M. A.,
VICE-CHANCELLOR OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO ;
AND
PROFESSOR DANIEL WILSON, LL.D.,
OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, TORONTO ;
WITH NOTES AND EXTRACTS
FROM THE EVIDENCE TAKEN BEFORE THE
COMMITTEE OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
ON THE UNIVERSITY.

TORONTO :
ROWSELL & ELLIS, PRINTERS, KING STREET.
1860.

STATEMENT

OF

JOHN LANGTON, M. A.,

VICE-CHANCELLOR OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.

The method of investigation adopted by the Committee has been, that each of the gentlemen appearing on behalf of those, who have prayed for an enquiry, has put in as evidence a written statement of the facts and arguments, by which he substantiates his objections to the present constitution and management of the University. In conformity with this arrangement, before answering such questions as may be put to me, I desire to submit a reply on behalf of the University of Toronto, with a reference to such documents as I believe will aid the Committee in coming to a correct judgment upon the questions before them. If my reply should be thought to extend to an unreasonable length, I hope the Committee will remember that each of these gentlemen has principally confined himself to one or two particular points, whilst I have to enter into them all; and that the complainants frequently make a general charge in a few words, the truth of which I can only enable the Committee to judge of by examining it in detail.

The subject naturally divides itself into three principal heads, the University, University College, and Upper Canada College, which must be judged of separately, although having many points of mutual connexion. Upper Canada College is supported by a distinct endowment, and is only so far connected with the University, that the general superintendence of the institution has been committed to the Senate. It is very proper that the subject should be enquired into, and I am prepared to go into the question of its management by the Senate; but whatever may be the conclusion of the Committee, whether the management be continued in the hands of the Senate, or be vested as formerly in a separate corporate body, or even if that College were to be altogether abolished, the main question of the constitution of the University would remain unaltered. With regard to University College, whilst on the one hand the connexion is closer, as it is supported out of the same endowment, and forms an essential portion of the Provincial University as contemplated by the Legislature, on the other hand its internal govern-

ment rests with a body entirely independent of the Senate, and the details of its organization and discipline are beyond our control. In this enquiry I only appear for the University, and it is not my intention to enter into questions relating to the College, apart from its connexion with the general scheme, unless in answer to questions which may be put to me by the Committee.

(1.) LEGALITY OF THE MANAGEMENT OF THE UNIVERSITY.

It is argued that the Collegiate Institutions supported by the different denominations, have, by the Act, an equitable, if not a legal right to an apportionment of the University endowment. Dr. Cook supports this view upon what he conceives to be the well known and easily proved policy of the framers of the University Amendment Act; Dr. Stinson, upon what he considers "the plain letter and obvious design" of the Act itself. I cannot agree with either of them. It would be very unsafe to judge of the meaning and intention of an Act from the recollection of conversations with leading politicians, or even from the individual wishes of members of the Government, several years ago; and still more so, from a clause in the Bill as originally introduced, which does not appear in the Act as finally passed. If any conclusion is to be drawn from this latter fact, it is rather a presumption that the Legislature did *not* sanction the principle of the suppressed clause; but that it having been originally proposed to make a specific grant to certain Institutions, it was judged by the framers of the Bill, and by the Legislature, wiser to leave the appropriation of any surplus which might arise, after the main objects of the Act had been accomplished, to future legislation. That the present 54th section cannot have been intended to carry out in other words the principle of the suppressed clause, is obvious from the fact, that the latter expresses, as a condition of the grant, the abandonment of their Charters by the Colleges; whereas the former in no way limits the apportionment which may be made by Parliament of any surplus.

Neither does the Act, as it stands, bear out the intention assigned to it by Dr. Stinson. To understand properly the meaning of the Preamble of the University Amendment Act, reference must be had to Mr. Baldwin's Act of 1849, which it repeals. The Preamble of the Act 12 Victoria, chapter 82, recites that "whereas the people of this Province consist of various denominations of Christians, to the members of each of which denominations it is desirable to extend the benefits of University Education," &c. The Act, therefore, goes on to purge King's College of its denominational aspect, and under another name to constitute one central Institution in Toronto, *both for teaching and examining*, intended to be entirely free from all denominational bias. The 43rd section provides that any existing College, upon surrendering its right to confer Degrees, except in Divinity, may become affiliated; but the only privilege they obtain thereby is the power of electing Members to the Senate. The only teaching Body, except in Theology, was to be the University of Toronto, and no Degree could be conferred except upon students who had gone through their regular course in Toronto. This being premised, the meaning of the Amendment Act is

obvious. It recites in the Preamble that no Colleges have affiliated ; that parents are deterred by the expense and other causes, from sending young men to Toronto, and that it is just and right to afford facilities to those who pursue their studies elsewhere, to obtain Degrees and other Academical honors in the Provincial University, according to the system pursued in the University of London. The Act therefore goes on to establish the University as a distinct Body ; to constitute University College out of the teaching staff of the former University, as a College supported by the State endowment ; and the 17th section enacts that all existing Colleges in Upper and Lower Canada, and such others as may afterwards be so declared, shall have all the rights of Affiliated Colleges, and students who have pursued in any of them the course of study prescribed by the University, shall be as eligible for Degrees and other distinctions, as those educated in University College. This, then, is the remedy provided for an acknowledged grievance under the old law, and not, as is contended by Dr. Stinson, that the Denominational Colleges should be supported from the State Endowment. That the present 54th section could not have been intended as any pledge that the Affiliated Colleges should receive pecuniary aid from the Endowment, is evident, if only from this fact, that no distinction is made in the affiliation between Colleges in Upper and in Lower Canada, and it will hardly be contended that there was any intention of supporting Lower Canada Colleges out of an exclusively Upper Canadian Fund.

Dr. Green is even more distinct in his assertion, that the Act of 1849 was repealed for the avowed and clearly expressed purpose of providing for an extension of the Fund to the Denominational Colleges. It must strike the Committee as somewhat singular, that this avowed purpose should have been entirely unnoticed in the Act, except by the power given to Parliament to deal hereafter with any surplus which might arise, for Academical education generally ; and that the Act should only have assigned an altogether different reason for the repeal of Baldwin's Act, viz : that instead of pursuing all their studies in Toronto, students might be allowed to pursue them any where, as in the University of London. Dr. Green, thinking only of the money, accuses the Government and the Legislature of holding out fallacious promises ; the Legislature, thinking only of the convenience of the students, provided for them every thing that it promised.

I entirely concur in the view stated by almost all the gentlemen who have appeared before the Committee, that the true policy is to have one Central Body for conferring Degrees, which judges of candidates only by their proficiency in the subjects of examination prescribed, without regard to the College in which they have pursued their studies, or indeed whether they have been students in any incorporated College at all, a point strongly insisted upon by the Oxford Commissioners, (p. 213, *et seq.*, Heywood's Ed.,) and sanctioned by the revised charter of the University of London. For such a system of University Education the Amendment Act makes provision, and the Statutes framed by the Senate are adapted to give it effect. That the Denominational Colleges, whilst, praising it in theory, have not thought fit to adopt it in practice, is much to be regretted ; but the University authorities are in no way to blame. It is not, as stated by Dr. Cook, that "the Government required, as a preliminary and necessary condition to affiliation, that Colleges having Univer-

sity powers, either from the Crown or by Provincial enactments, should surrender their powers," for no such provision is contained in the Act. It is not, as, in various forms, is asserted by the appellants, that exclusive privileges are given to University College; for, as will be shewn hereafter, no such action has been taken either by the Government or the Senate. One reason why the Denominational Colleges have not adopted the University course, has been stated to be that they are unable, from insufficient means, to teach all the subjects required. It certainly cannot be expected that each College should maintain a staff of Professors capable of efficiently teaching, in their higher branches, all the subjects embraced in the University course—a very strong argument in favour of maintaining one Provincial College that can; but by the system of options permitted, this would not debar their students from entering the University, and competing for honors in departments which their College can teach well. But there is a reason beyond this. It is not that any part of the machinery is wanting to establish in Canada a system similar to that which works so well in England, that has formed a bar to the full carrying out of the Act as yet; but it is the desire of Denominational Colleges to have them supported from Provincial Funds, a desire inconsistent with the well known feelings of the people of Upper Canada, and at variance with the principle upon which all our other National Educational Institutions have been established. As far as Academical studies and rewards are concerned, the Act proposed to itself the University of London as a model, but in relation to endowment it distinctly recognizes a difference; whereas in England no Government aid is given to any of the Affiliated Colleges as such, in Canada, as in Ireland, the Legislature founded and endowed one non-denominational College, which otherwise has no privileges over the others.

(2.) EQUAL RIGHTS OF ALL AFFILIATED COLLEGES.

It is contended that the intention of the Act has been frustrated by the action of Government, and of the University, which have pursued the policy of building up one College to the exclusion of all others. This charge is mostly expressed in general language, but there are some few cases where it is made in a tangible shape.

Dr. Cook instances "its (the College's) numerous scholarships," but he must be aware, or, before making the charge, should have informed himself, that the University Scholarships are as open to the students of Queen's as of University College. They are not even, as Professor Weir says he understands they are, practically confined to University College, for many of them are held by Students who have no connexion with that Institution.*

* *Ques. 466.* In your Statement in Chief you say that the scholarships of Toronto University are all open scholarships, unconnected with any College;—that a student of Queen's or Victoria may hold one if he can obtain it, and continue his studies at his own College: that, in fact, any young men who can come up to the requisite standard, whether they belong to a College or not, may hold scholarships of the University, and that many are so held. Can you state the whole number of scholarships awarded by the University since its commencement, and how many were taken by students not at the time students of the University?—There have been 213 scholarships awarded since 1854. Of

Again, Dr. Ryerson complains, that the annual examinations make it too burdensome for students educated out of Toronto to attend ; but as a member of the Senate, Dr. Ryerson should be aware, that no student in any Affiliated College is required to appear except at the examination for the second year, and at the final examination ; a certificate from the head of his College that he has satisfactorily passed in it the examinations required for matriculation, first year, and third year, being sufficient to admit him to his standing ; an arrangement adopted by the Senate with the special view of accommodating the Colleges which are not situated in Toronto.

All the parties who have appeared have complained of the appointment of three professors of University College upon the Senate. It must be remembered that the Senate as originally constituted, with the head of each educational institution as an *ex officio* member, had been in existence for three years before these appointments were made, and yet the denominational Colleges had not only taken no steps to take advantage of the Act, but one of them had even expressly declined to recognize its affiliation. It is therefore not surprising that the Government, in the absence of the assistance which might have been expected from them, should give the Senate the advantage of the practical experience of gentlemen of such acknowledged learning as Dr. Croft, Dr. Wilson, and Professor Cherriman.

There is one point connected with this charge which I cannot pass over, as it implies an imputation against these gentlemen. It is stated by Dr. Cook, and it was as broadly asserted by Dr. Ryerson, in his oral evidence, that the Professors form part of a body which fixes their own salaries, though, as it appears in print, the latter gentleman's charge is somewhat modified. I have reason to know that Dr. Cook stated this in ignorance of the facts, but Dr. Ryerson is certainly fully cognizant of them. The salaries of the Professors are determined by Order in Council, and not by the Senate. It has indeed twice occurred, that His Excellency has referred to the Senate for advice on this point, and that the Senate recommended an increase of salary ; but what share any of the gentlemen, whose salaries have in any way come before the Senate, had in determining their amounts, may be judged of from the following facts. When a memorial of Dr. McCaul's to His Excellency, praying that his emoluments might be raised to their former amount, was referred to the Senate, Dr. McCaul not only left the meeting, but objected that it was a matter with which the Senate had nothing to do. Upon this Dr. Ryerson himself moved and carried a resolution in favour of an increase, not only of Dr. McCaul's salary, but also of those of the other Professors, not one of whom had at that time a seat on the Senate. Upon the second occasion of a reference from Government, requesting the Senate to define their general recommendation of an increase to the Professors' salaries, the only professor present left the meeting, and Dr. Ryerson was also present and assenting to the progressive increase for length of service, but without any retrospective effect, as erroneously stated by Dr. Ryerson in his answer to Question 210.* The salary of the Vice-Chancellor

these, 100 were awarded to candidates who were not at the time students in University College. Many of them afterwards became students in the College, but many had no connexion with it in any part of their course.

* This is a plain statement of the facts as they occurred, which it was sought without success to invalidate by questions 435 to 475, suggested by the Rev. Mr. Poole. And

was fixed on the motion of Dr. Ryerson before the present holder of the office became resident in Toronto; the salary of the Principal of Upper Canada College was determined with the concurrence of Dr. Ryerson before the Principal had a seat on the Senate; and the only other member of the Senate receiving a salary from the University or Upper Canada College Funds, enjoys the same income as master in Upper Canada College, which had always been attached to his office for twenty years before he first made his appearance on the Senate as President of a School of Medicine, which was then the Medical Faculty of Victoria College.* It is obvious, therefore, that in no single instance is this imputation borne out by the facts.

It is objected by all the witnesses, and in the memorial of the Methodist Conferences, that the Professors of University College are always appointed Examiners. I agree with the memorialists that these appointments are objectionable, but there have been practical difficulties in the way, which have hitherto prevented the abandonment of the custom. Every person acquainted with examinations will acknowledge, as is stated by Dr. Cook in his cross-examination, that no Examiner can be efficient who has not had practical experience in teaching. An amateur, however great his attainments may be, will make a bad Examiner. I hold it essential that a good Examiner must be a good teacher. But good teachers are, unfortunately, not numerous in Canada; and from the length of time over which the examinations extend, the choice is necessarily almost limited to Toronto and its immediate vicinity. Persons engaged in teaching cannot spare the time from their duties, and to mention this year alone, a professor of Queen's College, and one of Victoria College, have for this reason declined the appointment. Besides this, if it is objectionable that the professors should examine their own Students in the later years, it is equally wrong that other teachers should examine matriculants, some of whom have probably been their own pupils. We always appoint a co-examiner with the professor, and the professor always takes the principal part in examining the matriculants, where he certainly is the best that can be selected, and throws a large part of the work of the later years upon his colleague. Still, I fully admit the present practice to be objectionable; and several of the professors have expressed to me

again, in questions 458 and 475, and 505, 6 and 7, the whole circumstances as above related were brought out in an examination of Dr. Ryerson himself, all the documents being placed in his hands--the minutes of the Senate, the memorial of Dr. McCaul with the reference to the Senate and its answer, the subsequent action of the Government thereon, and the second reference to the Senate for further explanation, with its reply. Yet, after all this investigation the Rev. Mr. Poole is represented in the published proceedings of the Kingston Conference (p. 9 and 10) to have said, "in which analysis there is conclusive evidence, that the resolution on the increase of salaries charged on Dr. Ryerson was moved by the Vice-Chancellor and seconded by the Hon. Mr. Patton; and that Dr. Ryerson had nothing to do with it."

* In a paragraph of Dr. Ryerson's reply, (p. 41 of C. P.) headed "Mr. Langton and Dr. Wilson's misrepresentations as to the representation of Victoria College on the Senate," Dr. Ryerson gives a history of the Toronto School of Medicine, and adds, "Yet, in presence of these facts Dr. Wilson and Mr. Langton represent him (Mr. Barrett) as holding his seat in the Senate as a representative of Victoria College." Dr. Wilson and Mr. Langton never said that he now represents Victoria College; but they said that he first took his seat and for some time sat there as the President of the School which was at that time the Medical Faculty of Victoria; thus giving three members in the interest of Victoria College at a time when there was only one representative of University College; of which no one complained, although such an outcry is now made because four persons are at present on the Senate connected with University College, and only two with Victoria College.

their desire to be relieved from this duty. I believe in former years the evil could hardly have been avoided ; but well educated young men are becoming more numerous in this country now, and I think it may ere long be made a general rule that no professor shall examine except for matriculation. I may mention, however, that it is the common practice in the Queen's University, Ireland, to select the Examiners in rotation from the several Colleges—a practice which I think open to serious objections, unless there be, as is the case with us, a second Examiner in each subject. It is also worthy of remark, that the first appointment of Examiners, when, as now, the names of all the professors appeared in the list, was made on the motion of Dr. Ryerson himself. In thus alluding to that gentleman's action, I do not wish to infer, if this decision was wrong in itself, that it was any excuse for the Senate that they followed an evil counsel. But the fact is important in this view, that Dr. Ryerson, who doubtless then held the same decided opinions upon the subject which he does now, nevertheless saw such practical difficulties in the way of making any other satisfactory appointments, that he adopted the present system as upon the whole the best that offered itself.

I believe I have now answered all the specific charges which have been brought of favouritism to one College, and have shewn how groundless they are, except the last be so considered. I may add, that I know of no action of the Government or of the Senate, apart from the fact that University College is endowed by the State, which places it in a different position from any other College, excepting in two instances, necessarily arising from a joint endowment. As we occupy the same buildings, it is provided that the President of University College shall be *ex-officio* a Member of the Committee on the grounds surrounding it, and that one other Member of that body shall be appointed if there be one on the Senate ; and as the Government have never acted upon the clause in the Statute giving them that power, by assigning the old Library for the use of either the College or the University, whilst to the Senate is entrusted the duty of making additions to it, a similar clause exists in the Statute respecting the Library Committee.

(3.) EXPENDITURE OF THE UNIVERSITY.

The next head of complaint which is made is the alleged extravagance of the expenditure upon the University and University College. It is argued that even if the denominational Colleges have no claim to any specific appropriation, and I deny that they have any, they may have at least a contingent interest in any surplus which may remain after the University and University College have been maintained in a state of efficiency, and which Parliament may devote annually to the support of Academical Education in Upper Canada, in any manner which it may judge to be most conducive to the interests of the country, instead of its being necessarily applied, as formerly, to the increase of the permanent fund. Whether there had been any such provision or not, I admit that any extravagance of expenditure which may exist should be enquired into and checked. It remains therefore to enquire, whether the expenditure has been upon a scale dispropor-

tionate to the wants of the Provincial Institutions, for directing and for practically carrying out the higher branches of Education. The principal points insisted on are the Buildings, the Library and Museum, the Professorial Staff, Examinations, and Scholarships. These I will reply to separately ; but before doing so, I must be allowed to allude to an implied charge against myself. Dr. Ryerson, in his evidence before the Committee, merely alluded in passing to the salaried Vice-Chancellor, who audited the expenditure which he had himself authorised ; but in the printed document put forth by the Conference in support of their memorial, intended to produce its effect in another sphere, the same point is more frequently insisted upon, and it is stated that some undue influence has been exerted to prevent the publication of the Accounts. As Provincial Auditor, it is certainly my duty to see that the Bursar makes no improper use of the public moneys, and produces vouchers for all his expenditure, and his accounts are accordingly examined in my office as all others are ; but as Auditor, I have no more power to interfere with the objects of the expenditure, than I have with Dr. Ryerson's distribution of the grants placed under his superintendence. As to the publication of the Accounts, the Bursar is required by law to lay them annually before Parliament ; and whether they are printed or not rests with the Printing Committee, and not with me.

Before going into details I must also explain a point, which the public would never gather from the evidence of the gentlemen at whose instance this investigation is made, viz. : that the endowment, consisting of lands in various parts of the Province, requires an extensive establishment to manage it, and is, in fact, a department of the Government, over which the University authorities have no control. Whether its arrangements may not be economised, is a question which the Committee may ascertain from the evidence of the Bursar ; but as far as the University authorities are concerned, it is the net revenue only which they have to deal with, and this is all which at present is available for academical education. The revenue in the preceding evidence is spoken of as \$60,000 or \$70,000 ; and by adding to it that of Upper Canada College, it is set down by Dr. Ryerson as \$80,000 ; but the highest amount which the net revenue ever reached was \$56,000, in 1856, when the run after land was at the highest, and the average net revenue since 1853, has only been \$48,000.* It will be for the Committee to decide, whether this amount is so much more than a Provincial University can require, as it has been argued, and whether it is sufficient to be divided amongst the numerous claimants, without destroying the object for which it was set apart.

* How much of this amount would be left for the University, if even the present demands of the denominational claimants were satisfied, may be judged from their evidence. Mr. Nelles (Q. 407) says he wants £2500 more than his present income, (leaving it doubtful whether this is in addition to what he already receives in the estimates.) If Queen's, Trinity, and Regiopolis, received as much, supposing there to be no other claimants, the whole fund would be exhausted, and whence are the University and University College to derive their income ? Dr. Ryerson contemplates with satisfaction ten separate Colleges with £1500 each, requiring \$60,000, without any provision for the University. Dr. Cook (Q. 18 and 44) proposes £6500 for the University and College, including Scholarships, of which £1250 is to be for the University. He also proposes that the Denominational Colleges shall each receive one-half of what is allowed to University College. To accomplish this would require an income of \$70,000 ; but it is idle to suppose that the four existing Colleges would be the only claimants.

Buildings.

It is objected generally to the expenditure on the buildings, that the Act which contemplates only additions to the present buildings, does not authorise new ones on a new site. Unfortunately, in the same session, when the University Amendment Act was passed, another Act* gave the Government authority to take possession of the property for Provincial purposes, and the University and College were ejected, and temporarily accommodated in the Parliament Buildings. When, in 1855, the Seat of Government returned to Toronto, the College was again moved, and temporary additions were made to the old Medical School, which rendered it available for a time ; but this had become perfectly inadequate to the accommodation of the College before the new buildings were ready ; and the frame additions were so temporary in their construction, that the Bursar has reported to me, now that it has returned into his possession, that it would be more economical to pull them down and sell the material, than to put them in effectual repair. The stone building, originally intended for the College, is still in the occupation of Government for another public object. If then the Act is to be interpreted in the literal sense given to it by Dr. Cook and others, there were no buildings to which to make the additions. This, however, is not the view to take of the question. The Act had established a central University and a College, endowed from the public funds, with a staff of efficient professors. It was necessary to provide a building for their occupation, and especially to provide the means of accommodating resident students, without which one of the great advantages of a University education would have been lost. Such an institution was not intended to be of an ephemeral character, to be moved about as convenience dictated, from one public building to another ; and as the endowment fortunately supplied the means, it has been provided with a durable home, worthy of the position it holds in the country, and of a still higher destiny which the rapidly increasing number of its students shows that it is destined to achieve. The Government of the day, therefore, wisely, as I think, exercised the undoubted power given by the Act, and authorised the Senate to expend £75,000 out of the Permanent Fund for this purpose.

Library and Museum.

The Government also authorized the expenditure, from the same source, of £20,000 upon a Library and Museum. It is objected that such an expenditure is foreign to the purposes for which the University was established ; but I can hardly think that the Committee and the Legislature will entertain that view. There is not a University or College in the world of any standing, which has not already acquired, or is not accumulating, a Library and Museum, as essential to the prosecution of the higher studies. Dr. Cook partially, it would seem, admits of a Library, but he would have it to belong to the College and not to the University, and would give out of the endowment a similar sum to all other Colleges for their Libraries. Now, it must be remembered, that

* This Act is 16 Vic., cap. 161. to which Dr. Ryerson (p. 34 C. P.) ridiculously says that Mr. Langton refers, as authorising the erection of University Buildings.

although the University and the College are distinct in their functions, the College, or teaching body, forms an essential part of the University scheme, as established by the Act, and whether the Library be supposed to belong to the one body or to the other, is immaterial, provided it be established. As the University, however, represents the whole country, as the heads of all educational institutions, and the representatives of all denominations find a place in it, I think it better that the management and control should be vested in the Senate than in the College. But to expend the money in forming five or six collections is utterly to ignore the great use of a public Library. The ordinary text books used in education, the classical authors in various languages, the books of reference in common use, are not so numerous as to be beyond the reach of any College, or even of many private individuals; but there is another class of books which you will not find there, consisting principally of books of reference of a more special character, not so often used it is true, but as essential when occasions for consulting them occur; and those numerous periodical publications issued by learned and scientific bodies in various parts of the world, in which almost all new views and discoveries first make their appearance, and without access to which a scholar or a man of science in this country would have to remain contented with his ignorance, till, years after all Europe had been turning their attention to something new, he gathered the information from some digest published in a more popular and accessible form. Such publications, often of a very costly kind from their limited circulation, can only be found in a public Library; and, until Canada possesses such a collection, she must be content to remain in a position of inferiority, ill adapted to her growing wealth and intelligence. Such a collection the Senate has been authorised to form and is now acquiring, and it has provided for giving the public the freest access to it.*

Professors in University College.

It is argued also that the professorial staff in University College is beyond the wants of the country, and the charge excessive. As to the rate of remuneration I may fortunately appeal to the appellants themselves. Dr. Cook admits that the salary of a Professor should be at least £500 a-year, and that he would rather see it £600, and none of the other gentlemen have appeared to dispute his views. It is true that in a later portion of his evidence, when driven to the necessity of keeping his proposed expenses within a sum to which he would limit the expenditure of the University and College, he has been compelled to confine himself to

* The expenditure upon the Library and Museum by the University of Toronto was specially excepted to by the petitioners, though both Dr. Cook and Mr. Nelles, when asked what they would do with an additional grant, naturally enough specify this as an important acquisition for their own Colleges; and though Dr. Ryerson, in the celebrated letter to Mr. Hincks, would make it imperative on his proposed University to expend at least £1000 a-year for this object. Now, however, he appears to look upon the question from a less exalted point of view, for he says, in his reply, (p. 35, C. P.,) "the law no more authorises the purchase of a Provincial Library and a Provincial Museum out of a fund designed for College education, than out of the funds designed for Grammar and Common School education." Does the Superintendent intend by this sentence modestly to confess, that, when the law authorised the expenditure of £200 a-year out of the Common School Fund for a Museum, it was not quite legal to expend thousands upon a Museum and Gallery of Pictures at the Normal School?

the lower amount; but I would rather accept his opinion on the abstract question, than when modified to suit a predetermined result. Now the amounts approved of by Dr. Cook are very nearly those at which the salaries of the Professors in University College are fixed by the present Order in Council, viz.: £500, rising with length of service to £650. It is therefore only against the number of Professors that there can be any cause of complaint, and Dr. Cook's proposition is to reduce them by striking off five, viz.: History and English Literature, Modern Languages, Agriculture, Meteorology and Oriental Languages, and by combining the present three Professorships in the Natural Sciences into two.* To a certain extent I agree with Dr. Cook, but on other points I differ from him entirely. I do not believe that the Professorships of Agriculture, which have been established either here or in any other University, have answered the expectations of those who founded them; and I do not think that it is in the nature of the subject that they should. Meteorology is also too limited a subject to form an exclusive chair, and all that is necessary of it might well be taught by the Professors of allied sciences. The history of the foundation of the chair may not be known to the Committee. The British Government having established, and for years maintained, the Meteorological Observatory, determined to abandon it. The Provincial Government, feeling that we had just cause to be proud of the results obtained there, gave an annual grant for its maintenance, and proposed to connect it with the University. When the proposition was submitted to the Senate, Dr. McCaul, the Vice-Chancellor, moved, seconded by Dr. Ryerson—"That the Senate will gladly co-operate with the Government in carrying out the plan for the organization of the Observatory, which has been approved by his Excellency the Governor-General, and will accordingly pass the necessary Statute for the establishment of Graduate Scholarships,—and thus, as proposed in the above-mentioned communication, contribute towards the expense of the establishment the amount of the stipends of the scholars, in addition to one-third of the salary of the Director of the Observatory and Professor of Meteorology, &c., &c." The idea of the Scholarships was dropped on further consideration, but the Professorship remains, and the subject has been introduced into the University course, but only as an optional one, not because it was considered an essential part of academical study, but because there was a Chair in the College, and it was thought some

* It is somewhat singular that, when Dr. Cook is proposing a scheme for University College, he should say, (Q. 26,) "There should be a Professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy *united*," but when asked for his disposition of any money he could obtain from the University Fund, for Queen's, (Q. 279), he should claim "a Professor of Mathematics *and another of Natural Philosophy*." So also he would class together, under one chair, at Toronto, Natural History and Chemistry, which have no connexion, but at Kingston he would separate Greek from Latin. He proposes, in short, to reduce the Professors in University College from ten to five, and to increase those at Queen's from five to seven.

Dr. Ryerson also, in the Hincks' letter, besides four Professors in the College, proposes to constitute University Professors in "Ancient and Modern Philosophy and Literature, General History, (not yet discovered to be unadapted to be taught by lectures,) Natural History, Astronomy, Political Economy, Civil Engineering, *Agriculture*, &c."

In the Queen's Colleges, Ireland, which being founded by Government within the last twenty years, may be taken as a fair test of the requirements of a modern college, there are twelve Professorships in the Faculty of Arts, besides Political Economy, which is included in the Faculty of Law, viz.: Greek, Latin, History and English Literature, Modern Languages, Celtic Languages, Mathematics, Natural Philosophy, Chemistry, Natural History, Logic and Metaphysics, Mineralogy and Geology, Agriculture.

Undergraduates might wish to pursue the study, especially those who were intending to teach Grammar Schools, in which a system of meteorological observations has been established. I think that it was a mistake to connect the Observatory with the College, but as long as Government maintains it, I see no objection to its continued connexion with the University, and the Director, if disconnected with the College, might very properly have a seat in the Senate.* I agree also with Dr. Cook that the study of Oriental Languages is not a necessary portion of a College education, and the Senate has made it optional throughout. It more properly belongs to the Faculty of Divinity.

On two other points I partially agree with Dr. Cook. If funds were insufficient, two professors in the Natural Sciences might be made to take the place of three, although I would adopt a different arrangement, viz., Geology and Natural History which are intimately allied, and Chemistry and Mineralogy, which latter can only be studied effectively in connexion with the former. But it is only rarely that you can obtain a man equally and thoroughly versed in those separate branches, and in almost all Universities separate chairs exist, and the subjects are even more subdivided than with us.

Again, a chair of Modern Languages, in the sense of teaching the languages themselves, and not the principles of comparative philology, appears to me very inadvisable. It could only be efficiently filled under very peculiar circumstances. But when Dr. Cook and other witnesses condemn the study of Modern Languages in a University, I differ from them *toto caelo*. I believe that there should be no single Professorship, but Lectureships in each separate language, or two or more combined in one lectureship, according to the individuals that can be procured to teach. French, in a country circumstanced like Canada, may well be considered essential, and now that Latin has ceased to be the common language of educated men, and three quarters of the learning and science of the world is published in French or German, no man should pass through a University who has not acquired at least one of them.

History and English Literature I also consider essential, and I cannot conceive that there is any thing in the study of these two subjects, which makes them less adapted to be taught by lectures, as argued by Dr. Ryerson, than in that of any other subject of education. I cannot indeed imagine that Dr. Ryerson himself perceives any such difference, for when the question is put to him (No. 13) he diverges into a disquisition upon German Universities, and admits that his remark applies to Lectures "in the German Sense" as distinguished from the usual meaning of the word. In the "University Sense," it seems, he does not think History a subject which cannot be taught by Lectures. Dr. Ryerson has triumphantly quoted the report of the Queen's University Commissioners, which recommends the abolition of the Chair of Agriculture, but he ought to have added that they do not recommend the abolition of those of Modern Languages and of English Literature and History, nor the compression of the three Chairs of the Natural Sciences into two.† As

* The only part of the expense of maintaining the Observatory, borne by the University, is one-third of the Director's salary; yet its staff is included amongst the forty-five "regular salaried officers" enumerated in that curious piece of statistics, in which Mr. Poole, and Dr. Ryerson on his authority, try to swell the real numbers, by including almost every body twice, and some three times under different titles.

† Mr. Langton might have met Dr. Ryerson's quotation from the Irish Commissioners by a reference to the report of the New Brunswick Commissioners, of whom Dr. Ryerson

to the importance of those subjects, I shall have occasion to return to them when I come to the subject of options. I would only now remark that the witnesses who have been heard in favour of the Latin and Greek, and Mathematics, being the proper Studies of a University, and most of the rest mere works of supererogation, run counter to the daily growing opinion of all the best authorities upon University Education in Europe, as I shall show from the published opinions of the Commissioners on the English Universities.

In thus stating my concurrence with some points of Dr. Cook's scheme, I wish to be understood as explaining what would be my recommendation, if called upon to organize a new college in circumstances similar to those of University College, and what should be kept in view for future arrangements, as opportunity offers. But I by no means wish to say that existing professors, who have accepted their offices on the faith of the Government, should be dismissed, and I feel convinced that neither would the Committee recommend, nor the Legislature sanction such injustice. It must also be borne in mind that the University, which is charged with extravagance, is in no way responsible for this organization, which was adopted before it had any existence. The Professor of Agriculture and the Lecturer on Oriental languages are amongst the oldest of those connected with the teaching staff, and all the other chairs which Dr. Cook would abolish, with the exception of that of Meteorology, formed the establishment which the Act provided should be supported out of the endowment. The University is not even responsible for by far the greater part of the increase which has been made to the rate of salaries, though I for one do not think it excessive. In the printed document put forth by the Conference in support of their memorial, the salaries of the Professors at the passing of the University Act are set down at £4497, including Librarian and servants. This does not give quite a correct view of the case, as the salaries of the four newly appointed Professors only appear for seven months in the accounts of that year; but Dr. Ryerson, desirous of shewing a still larger increase, goes back to 1850, before the addition of the staff which the act of 1853 provides for. He states that "it cannot be claimed that the Faculty of Arts is more efficient for the legitimate purposes of a University College than it was in 1850, yet, since then, its expenses have been increased from £3350 to £7670," leaving out of view the fact that in the meantime five new Professorships and a Tutorship have been created, some of which, even in Dr. Cook's view, are necessary; and giving the present cost, however arrived at, £1420 greater than the greatest amount paid to Professors in any one year. The true difference is this. The salaries of the Professors and Lecturer, as established in 1853, were £3930. From the 1st of January, 1854, the salaries of the newly appointed Professors were put upon the same footing as those of the old ones, making the amount £4430, and this was done, be it observed, before the Senate was constituted, and by the same Ministry who are represented to have made, six months before, such generous provision for the Denominational Colleges, which we, it is said, have rendered of none effect. The present salaries,* including the Classical

was one. It appears that not only did he recommend to Mr. Hincks, in 1852, Modern Literature, History and Agriculture, as proper subjects for lectures in a Canadian University, but as late as 1854, he included, in the scheme designed for New Brunswick, all those subjects.

* The next addition to the cost was the Order in Council of 1855, which added a percentage to all Government Salaries in the Province. The last addition, the only one recommended by the Senate, has only amounted to \$800.

Tutor and Professor of Meteorology, since added, are £6070, being an increase of 44 per cent. upon those of 1854, and 54 per cent. upon those of 1853. This is not more than the increase made in almost all salaries during the same period. In a somewhat allied branch of the Public Service, for instance, the salaries of the educational staffs, east and west, were £900 in 1853, and the same officers now receive £1775 and £1800, respectively, being an increase of 100 per cent., *without* reckoning the increased number of the staff.

Salaries in the University.

Besides the salaries of the Professors in the College, there are three connected with the University, the Vice-Chancellor's, the Librarian's, and the Registrar's, which Dr. Cook would abolish, or materially reduce. He admits that, if the Librarian gives his whole-time, he must have a sufficient salary; but it is suggested that some one of the students might be employed, and that he might also perform the duties of Registrar, whilst the salary of the Vice-Chancellor he would abolish altogether. It is true that, if the Library were made a mere college library, it might be locked up, as I have known to be the practice in small colleges, and a Librarian might be in attendance for half an hour a day to give out books, and a promising student might well have some small allowance for attending to this duty. But if it is to be open to the public, which I submit to be a much more proper application of public funds, it is clear that a competent person must be employed at a fair salary. To appoint a student would be to injure him for life, as interfering with his studies. The Registrar is an equally necessary officer, and he is not overpaid for the work that falls upon him. Gentlemen, who are not acquainted with the practical details, can easily get rid of the office, or throw its duties upon another officer, whom, be it remembered, they have already declared to be unnecessary for the University; but the fact, that two Registrars have already resigned, upon the ground that they could not afford to devote the necessary time to the duties of the office, is enough to show that that the work is not overpaid. In fact I do not believe that any competent person would undertake the office permanently, although the salary may be an object to a young man at first starting in life, and therefore prove a useful reward for distinguished young graduates. As to the Vice-Chancellor's salary, I admit that, if funds are insufficient, it is the first that should be reduced. Not that it is too high for the duties that fall on that officer, but that any person who is worthy of filling the office, would accept the labour and responsibility from zeal for the institution, and for the honorable position which it gives him. I found the office in existence with a salary attached, when I came to reside in Toronto. Since I was appointed no member of the University will be found to say that I have not given full work for my hire; but if there had been no salary I should have equally accepted the office, and I trust I should as zealously have discharged its duties, as a labour of love; but it has not been found prudent in practice to rely upon the gratuitous performance of important duties, and therefore I think that a salary was wisely attached to the Vice-Chancellorship.

Examiners.

The next head of expenditure specially referred to, is the allowance to Examiners—officers who, it is thought, may also be obtained gratuitously. I have already alluded to the difficulty of obtaining proper persons on any terms, but, unless for an adequate remuneration, it would be impossible. Let us look into the question of cost, which was in 1857, \$2160, reduced in 1858, to \$2000, and in 1859, to \$1760, and let us compare it with the cost in similar bodies elsewhere. I find in the estimates of 1857, [1857—XXXIV] the sum set down for Examiners in the Queen's University, Ireland, £1510, stg., or \$7348, and it is stated in a note that, in the previous year, 44 persons were examined. In the Report of the same University for 1860, the cost of Examiners is estimated at £1450, stg., or \$7056, and the number of students examined during the previous year is given as 78. Taking the latter year as the most favourable, our examiners, in 1859, examined more than twice the number at just one-fourth of the cost. Again in the same estimates, I find the Examiners in the University of London set down for £2560, stg., or \$12,458. I find also in its Calendar of 1859, that in the year 1857, 151 students matriculated, and 109 degrees were conferred, and allowing a number equal to the matriculants for those who came up to the intermediate examination, which is not given, these Examiners must have examined 410 persons, at the rate, in the aggregate, of about \$30 per head, whilst ours were paid at the rate of less than \$10 per head. It may be proper to state in regard to this comparison, that a considerable part of the expenses of the University of London is paid by fees, and reducing the estimate for the Examiners, which is about half of the whole cost, by the same proportion of the fees, the cost to the country is with them only about \$22 per head, whilst if our matriculation fees are deducted, the similar charge is reduced to about \$8.50 per head. Perhaps, in consequence of my habits as Auditor, I may be excused for entering into these financial details, although I admit that cost is not always the test of efficiency. But when the question is raised, whether the Examiners are overpaid, the true test of their work is the number of students they have to examine, and I cannot think that either our learning or our wealth is so inferior in Canada, that \$10 is too high a remuneration here, for services which in London and Dublin are paid at the rate of \$30 and \$90 respectively.

Scholarships.

The remaining item of expenditure specially referred to as extravagant, is the allowance for scholarships, and here I admit, that, if the allegations of the Petitioners were true, a strong case would have been made out against the University. But they are not true. I do not, for a moment suppose, that Dr. Green would state any thing to the Committee, which he did not believe to be correct; but having undertaken to give evidence upon a subject, with which he had made himself but slightly acquainted, he has fallen into an error. I do not know how he has obtained the proportion which he has stated, between the scholarships and students, 34 amongst 37, but I suspect it has been by a process, which he himself must have perceived to be a dangerous one, viz. :

by taking the number of scholarships from the returns of the University, and that of the students from the returns of the College.* An examination of the same official documents would have shewn him that in 1856, the year referred to, 76 students were examined, and 35 scholarships awarded, or, excluding those who were not entitled to compete for scholarships, 35 were awarded amongst 61. This is undoubtedly a high proportion. When the University was first established upon its present basis, the Senate, acting upon the authority given them by the Act, established 90 scholarships.† The number may certainly have been disproportioned to the students continuing on from the old University, but not to what they might be expected to become, or to what they would have been, had the denominational Colleges thought fit to send their students to compete. Believing the number, however, to be too great under existing circumstances, one of my first measures, after I became Vice-Chancellor, in 1856, was to reduce the number offered for competition from 90 to 61, and I would have made a still greater reduction, with the view of making subsequent additions, as they might be required, had not the general feeling of the Senate been against it. I am happy, however, to be able to state, that if 61 was too large in 1856, it will not be found to be so in 1860, the number of students having grown up to the provision made for them in this respect, as was, no doubt, contemplated when the scholarships were originally founded. But as this enquiry is not taking place in 1856, when the new organization had just been completed, but after it has been in operation for five years, (a small period, it must be allowed, for the growth of a University,) it will be necessary to show how the Scholarships have been distributed in the succeeding years. The following table will show the number awarded in each succeeding year, and the number of students entitled to compete for them, with the proportion between the two, and the amount per student which the Scholarships have cost, with a view to comparison with other analogous institutions.

	No. of Scholarships awarded.	No. of Students competing.	Proportion of Scholarships to competitors.	Cost in the year.	Cost per Student.
1855.....	33	64	1 to 1.94	\$3,200	\$50
1856.....	35	61	1 to 1.75	4,633	76
1857.....	48	123	1 to 2.56	4,973	40
1858.....	51	143	1 to 2.80	6,140	43
1859.....	45	196	1 to 4.35	6,013	30

N. B.—As the financial year and the scholastic year do not correspond, the proportions of Scholarships to Students, and of cost per Student, do not exactly agree.

* In answer to Question 501, Mr. Poole shews, that Dr. Green did in fact obtain his figures in the way indicated, including amongst the students only those of University College, but amongst the scholarships those in Law and Medicine and others awarded to students who had no connexion with the College.

† In the proceedings at the Conference at Kingston, the Rev. Mr. Poole states (p. 10 C. P.) that the *Globe*, Mr. Langton, and Dr. Wilson charged Dr. Ryerson with originating the expenditure on Scholarships. Not only did neither Dr. Wilson nor Mr. Langton make any such charge, but Mr. Langton expressly stated to the Committee (Q. 476,) that Dr. Ryerson's motion had no such effect.

I will now compare this statement with what is done in other Universities.* With the University of London it is not easy to make a comparison, as its arrangements differ from ours in two essential particu-

* In his reply, (pp. 36 and 37,) Dr. Ryerson has several paragraphs headed "Mr. Langton's misstatements," "Mr. Langton's misrepresentations," &c., endeavouring to show that there is no analogy between the Toronto Scholarships and those of other Universities. In each case, however, Mr. Langton, has distinctly shewed wherein the differences consisted. They are principally threefold :

(1.) In all the older English Universities, the scholarships are held for a certain term of years ; in the Queen's Colleges alone, they are competed for annually as at Toronto, —a system which has this advantage, that it requires the students to keep up their acquirements, and does not permit them, as is too frequently the case in England, to relax their exertions upon obtaining the prize. This difference, however, has been taken advantage of to magnify the apparent number of Scholarships established by the University of Toronto, as the eight Scholarships annually offered for Undergraduates in Arts, count as thirty-two separate Scholarships, whereas on the other system, at the same cost, they would only count as eight. Thus also, a student who annually succeeded in obtaining a scholarship throughout his course, is said at Toronto to have taken five Scholarships ; but in England he would only have been said to have gained one, which he would have held for five years.

(2.) In the British Universities, the Scholarships are principally attached to a College, and not to the University. Here, also, the advantage is in favour of the system adopted by the University of Toronto, as on the former plan, the competitors are limited to a comparatively small circle, whereas, on the latter, the Scholarships are open to all attending the University. The Oxford Commissioners have proposed to remedy this, by making all the Scholarships, (though still attached to the Colleges,) open for competition to members of other Colleges, which, in a few instances, was already the case. It is difficult to see in what essential particular these differ from University Scholarships.

(3.) In the British Universities, many Scholarships are limited to "founder's kin," to certain schools or to certain counties, as was proposed in the original draft of the Statute for the University of Toronto. Of late years, however, the Universities and Royal Commissioners have endeavoured to abolish this exclusive arrangement, and to throw them all open unreservedly.

Dr. Ryerson, however, has imagined a further distinction, viz., that the British Scholarships are not founded by the State, but by individual benefactors. Now, the University endowment here was created by George III., as that of Dublin was by Queen Elizabeth, and those of the two principal Colleges at Oxford and Cambridge by Henry VIII., whilst the Queen's Colleges, Ireland, and the University of London, were endowed by Queen Victoria. Many of the minor Colleges at Oxford and Cambridge, also owe their funds to royal, or quasi-royal benefactors ; and if these endowments have been also largely increased by individual beneficence, it only effects the question to this extent, that the original foundations have hitherto tied the hands of the University authorities, and have rendered it necessary for the State, which did not originally provide the funds, to interfere for their beneficial application. The question is not an antiquarian one of the origin of each Scholarship ; but the Legislature having endowed a University in Canada, with all the necessary aids to its successful operation, which in England were partly provided by private benefactors, the simple question arises—are these aids extravagant, as compared with those afforded to the students in the English Universities ? and the comparison shows that they are not. It shows, moreover, that the Oxford Commissioners recommend that the old foundations, private and royal, shall be so far diverted from their original purpose, as to increase the appropriation for Scholarships far beyond what is provided at Toronto, at the same time rendering them open to all, so as to make them closely analogous to University Scholarships, which are the only ones the foundation of which is authorised by the charter of the University of Toronto.

Dr. Ryerson further objects to the fairness of Mr. Langton's quotations from the Oxford Commissioners, inasmuch as the section from which his extracts are made is headed, "Application of College revenues to stimulate and reward those *who have not yet entered the University*," inferring that these scholarships are therefore something quite different from those gained by the Toronto students during their course *through the University*. It is astonishing that a person occupying Dr. Ryerson's position should descend to so petty a cavil. In the previous section, the Commissioners have been treating of fellowships, the rewards offered to persons *who have completed the University course*,—the aggregate annual value of which is stated by Dr. Jewitt, (Ev. p. 34,) to be £108,000, sterling, but to which in Canada we have nothing analogous except five Bachelor Scholarships tenable for one year. In the next section, they treat of Scholarships, or the rewards held out to those *entering the University*, and destined to aid in their support whilst prosecuting their studies, and they head it as above quoted. The Scholarships there spoken of are in their objects precisely similar to those established by the University of Toronto, that is, they are designed to stimulate and reward industrious students, and to make a University education accessible to such good men as would otherwise be unable to afford it ; but those at Toronto have the advantage of keeping up the stimulus throughout the course by annual examinations.

lars. 1st. The University of London was founded for the purpose of giving scholastic honours to students in a great number of Institutions already existing on their own endowments, and others which might be founded. The State only proposed to provide an organization for the *encouragement* of learning, and not for the *support* of either Teachers or Students. In Canada, on the other hand, both objects were contemplated. Scholarships, therefore, many of which already existed in the separate Colleges, were, in the University of London, a secondary consideration. 2nd. Their scholarships are tenable for two or three years, whilst ours must be competed for annually. As our course, therefore, is one of four years, to institute a fair comparison with the usual English system, our sixty scholarships should only count as fifteen, or theirs should be increased in proportion to the number of years for which they are held. Strictly speaking, they have only nine Scholarships; but there are eight Exhibitions, ranging from £30 to £40 stg., which are the same thing under another name. But there are always forty individuals holding the seventeen Scholarships and Exhibitions, and it is the same thing for our purpose, whether a student upon examination obtains a Scholarship and holds it for three years, or whether he has to contend at the end of every year for the continued possession of it. With this explanation, it appears that in the University of London, forty Scholarships are held by about 400 students, or by about one in ten, and at a cost of about \$20 per student,—a much less proportion than with us, but by no means at so much less a cost.

A case much more nearly resembling our own is to be found in the Queen's University, Ireland. The circumstances of the two countries are not very dissimilar. The comparative poverty of the country, the general absence of good endowed schools, which form such a remarkable feature in the educational position of England, and the great denominational differences which exist there, are all strong points of resemblance, and dictated the same policy, of not only establishing a central University, but of endowing here one and there three Colleges, entirely free from denominational influences. The recent origin, also, of both Universities, is favourable to a fair comparison. The only difference so far as relates to the subject immediately before us is, that here the Scholarships are founded by the University, and may be held by the students of any College, or even by a person attending none, whilst there, each endowed College has its own set of Scholarships. I think there can be little doubt that in this respect ours is the better and more liberal system. In each of the three Colleges, there are endowed by the State, ten senior Scholarships of £40, and forty-five junior ones, ranging in value from £15 to £24. They are annual, and, as with us, are not all necessarily awarded. I have not found perfect annual returns from these Colleges, and from Galway none which give the Scholarships in a reliable shape; but I subjoin a statement for the last two years I can find for the Colleges at Cork and Belfast, in a similar form to that which I have given for the University of Toronto:

		Scholarships awarded.	No. of Com- petitors.	Proportion.	Cost.	Cost per Student.
Cork,	1856.....	44	144	1 to 3.27	\$6,944	\$48
"	1859.....	47	125	1 to 2.66	6,792	54
Belfast,	1857.....	51	153	1 to 3.00	Cost not given, but as the en- dowment is the same, it must be in a very similar proportion.	
"	1859.....	48	159	1 to 3.53		

I find also a return from all the three Colleges, giving the number of their students holding Scholarships and Exhibitions, for every year, from 1850, including apparently the Exhibitions given by the University. I subjoin the substance of it at three periods, to show the increase of students, and the decrease of cost per head, as compared with us :

Three Colleges, 1850.....	132	...	220	...	1 to 1.66	\$71
“ 1855.....	156	...	307	...	1 to 1.96	57
“ 1859.....	153	...	385	...	1 to 2.51	50

Thus it will be seen that even at the commencement, the comparison was a little in our favour, and that we in five years have reduced the proportion to one in $4\frac{1}{2}$, and the average cost to \$30, whilst they in ten years have only reduced them to one in $2\frac{1}{2}$ and \$50.

It may be useful to institute a similar comparison with the older Universities, though the data are not so accessible, and the circumstances are more various. At Trinity, Dublin, it will be seen from the calendar of 1857, that there are 70 Scholarships on the foundation, 107 Scholarships and exhibitions not on the foundation, and 30 Sizarships. As in the other older Universities they are not competed for annually, but the number of Scholarships, Exhibitions and Sizarships held are 207 amongst about 850 students in 1857, but the number more generally exceeds 1000, or about 1 to 5,—nearly the same proportion as with us last year ; whilst the annual value, which varies somewhat, may be set down as £7,500 sterling, or, on the average, 36 per student, a not very dissimilar proportion.

From the report of the Royal Commissioners, who themselves could not always obtain reliable information, it appears that at Cambridge, including the Colleges and the University, there are about 645 Scholarships, or 1 to about 2 students. The cost is not accessible except for Emmanuel College, which, having no fixed Scholarships, divides annually £1000 sterling, amongst about 80 under-graduates, or about at the rate of \$60 per student. This statement, however, as well as that for Trinity, Dublin, cannot be exactly compared with us, as most of the Scholarships are tenable for some time after graduation, and many are of inconsiderable value, and two or more may be held by the same individual. But on the other hand, the statement for Cambridge does not include Exhibitions and Sizarships, which are very numerous. St. John's alone, with from 200 to 300 under-graduates, has, according to the Commissioners, 124 Scholarships, and besides this, according to the Cambridge Calendar, about 100 Exhibitions, one of which is worth £100 a-year, and four are worth £70 ; and it is to its wealth in this respect that it mainly owes the distinction of producing even more high honor men, many of whom are from the humbler classes, than its great rival Trinity.

At Oxford the information is more precise in some respects, and more capable of comparison with ourselves, as the number of *under-graduates* holding Scholarships is given, as well as the total cost. In the statistical table appended to Mr. Heywood's edition of the recommendations of the Oxford Commissioners, the number of under-graduates “on the foundation,” which will include most Scholars, but not Exhibitionists, is given as 233, and the whole number of undergraduates as 1222, or one in $5\frac{1}{2}$, and the value of their stipends is given as £8,700 sterling, or at the

average rate of \$31 per student. This it will be perceived is just the average rate in the University of Toronto in the year 1859, but the Royal Commissioners do not think even this enough. Their thirty-fifth recommendation is: "That any surplus remaining, after making due provision for the Fellows, should be applied to increase the number and value of Scholarships, and that no Scholarship should be of less amount than £50 a-year." In a body of their report, (p. 94, *et seq.* Heywood's edition) they enter upon this subject at large; they say: "We are of opinion that it is a matter of the highest importance, that Scholarships should be augmented where they are of inconsiderable value, and that they should also be greatly increased in number." "To the efficiency of the Colleges, open Scholarships, to supply good learners, are as essential as open Fellowships [in Canada, we may substitute *as liberal salaries*,] are to supply good teachers. Some judgment of the influence of open Scholarships on the utility and honor of a College, may be formed from the amount of University distinctions obtained by the several Colleges. It will be found, that they more nearly correspond to the number of the open Scholarships offered to undergraduates, than to the other merits and advantages of the respective societies." Then follow the changes they recommend in the several endowments, and they add: "By these simple changes we calculate that nearly 500 Scholarships of the value of £50 a-year or more, besides rooms, might be provided, of which at least 100 would become vacant annually." Supposing that these Scholarships were so arranged, as with us, that the fortunate candidates had to contend annually for the retention of them, instead of holding them for five years without further competition, the whole 500 would be competed for annually by about 1200 students, or they would be about as 1 to 2½ students, at an average cost of \$100 per student, as compared with ours last year, 1 to 4½, at an average cost of \$30 per student, which Dr. Cook would further reduce to a sum which, even if our students never increased beyond the present number, would only be \$10 per student.

I must apologise for the length at which I have treated this subject, but it is one of vital importance, and even more so, perhaps, in this country than in England. The University Act authorised the Senate to endow Scholarships for the aid and encouragement of students, and that it was no niggardly endowment that was originally contemplated is shown by the intention expressed in the Bill to endow two for each county in Upper Canada. This clause was withdrawn, principally at my own instigation, not because it was excessive in amount, but because it was falling back upon the old idea, which was being abandoned in England, of close Scholarships. The Senate, therefore, created these open Scholarships, more truly open than those recommended by the Oxford Commissioners, inasmuch as, though *obtainable* by any one, theirs can only be *held* in a particular college, whilst ours,—be it said once for all, in spite of the repeated assertions of different witnesses, that they are intended to lure students away from the minor colleges—are unconnected with any college. A student of Queen's or Victoria may hold one, if he can obtain it, and may continue to pursue his studies there; or a young man who can come up to the standard may hold one, whether he belong to any college or not, and many are so held. All that we require is that he shall compete with the whole Province before us, and that he shall

proceed to his Degree in the Provincial University, from whose endowment he has benefited.*

I have now gone through the principal items in which we are accused of having misappropriated the University endowment, and I am quite content that the Committee shall judge between us. Some minor items are also instanced, as a Commission of Inquiry with which the University had nothing to do; and Incidentals, an item ingeniously made up by combining the contingent expenses of managing the endowment with the incidental expenses of the University and College, although given separately in the accounts. Many of the minor items are exceptional in their character, and others have been reduced. If any remain which are excessive, let them be reduced also; but let not the efficiency of the teaching staff of the College, and the power of the University to reward and encourage meritorious students, be impaired.



Comparative Expenditure of the University of Toronto and other Universities.

Dr. Ryerson, who does not go into details, gives a comparative statement of the expenses of different Canadian Educational Institutions.† I have not attempted to verify all that gentleman's figures. When I found the University income stated at \$81,000, by mixing up Upper

* In his reply (p. 40 C. P.) Dr. Ryerson has a paragraph, the heading of which designated the Toronto Scholarships as a shame and an insult, and as of a pernicious character; and the shame and perniciousness from the body of the paragraph, appear to consist in their being mostly awarded for excellence in special departments, as 2 for Classics and 2 for Mathematics throughout, and in the later years 1 for each of the following subjects: Modern Languages, Natural Sciences, Ethics, Metaphysics and Civil Polity, and Oriental Languages. Now this is exactly what is done in the London University and Queen's Colleges, Ireland, where all the scholarships, exhibitions and prizes are appropriated to special subjects; and Dr. Ryerson himself (p. 37 C. P.) quotes with approbation from the Cambridge Calendar, that more than half of the prizes are given for the encouragement of Classical Literature. If on the older foundations Scholarships are not more generally awarded for proficiency in special subjects, though many of them are so, it is that the old University course was itself almost restricted to one or two. But since the range of studies has been enlarged, a change is taking place in this respect. The Cambridge Commissioners, in a draft statute for Trinity, have proposed to devote some of the scholarships to special subjects, and at Oxford, Christ Church, Magdalen, and Balliol, have already done so. It is also worthy of notice, that of the scholarships proposed to be founded by the New Brunswick Commissioners, of whom Dr. Ryerson was one, all but two are for special subjects.

As for the objection that the examinations, upon which the Scholarships are awarded, are on "subjects not included in the ordinary collegiate curriculum," it only shows Dr. Ryerson's ignorance, either of the practice of the University of Toronto, or of what is essential in such an examination. With the exception of Oriental Languages, which are optional throughout, as they are made in all Universities, no Scholarship is given for any subject which is not included in the regular curriculum; but in each subject to award honors and prizes, you must go deeper into the examination, and besides all the ordinary work, you must require branches of the subject, and books, which are not demanded from candidates who are not aspirants for honors. In the older Universities the Scholarships are generally awarded on a special examination, for which the students may offer themselves or not as they please. At London and Toronto they are awarded for proficiency at the annual examinations, where all must present themselves, but in either case, it is, and necessarily must be, the practice of every University to require from candidates for honors and rewards, more extensive knowledge of the subject than from those who merely desire to pass, whether this be ascertained by a separate paper or by separate questions in a paper submitted to all.

† It appears from the evidence that Dr. Ryerson is not the original author of these errors, having obtained his figures from the Rev. Mr. Poole; but he assumed the responsibility of them by making them part of his statement before the Committee, and even

Canada College with it, and ignoring the expenses of managing our endowment; and a salary of £125 a year to the Bursar of Trinity, compared with the staff necessary to manage our landed property;—when I saw the incidental expenses of the same institution called \$386, whereas they were £386, and its total expenses per year set down as \$7526, whereas the statement published in the Journal of Education for January gives them as \$16,744, and that expressly excluding \$1380 for Scholarships which are chargeable on the general fund, besides which there are others to the amount of \$2820, which are specially provided for;—when, proceeding to the next item, I found Victoria was set down as \$6000, whilst Dr. Green has shown that the salaries alone are \$7600—I gave up the attempt as useless. I will, however, subjoin a comparative statement, which I hope will be found more accurate, of the expenditure of the Provincial University and College in Canada, and the analogous establishments in England and Ireland.

In comparing the University of Toronto with that of London, I have excluded in the former the cost of Buildings, and the formation of the Library and Museum, there being nothing analogous to this in the latter; nor is there any necessity for them, as the British Museum is free to all, and is, in fact, frequented by students to an extent embarrassing to the officers in charge:—

	London, from Estimates of 1857.	Toronto. 1859.	Toronto average since 1854.
Salaries, including servants	\$ 5,010	\$3,026	\$2,967
Examiners	12,459	1,760	1,957
Scholarships, Medals, and Prizes ...	5,429	6,417	5,067
Incidental	2,307	2,624	2,831
	<u>\$25,205</u>	<u>\$13,827</u>	<u>\$12,812</u>

Of these amounts, as I have before stated, \$6324 is estimated to be paid by fees, but even deducting them the portion of the expense paid by the State very much exceeds ours.

I find by a Parliamentary Return of 1859, that, exclusive of the Buildings, which were otherwise provided for, the Queen's University and Colleges in Ireland cost the country for the last year £26,930, or \$131,000, which is only a trifle more than the average since 1851. This is about three times the cost of the University and University College, in Canada, for the same period, and with the same exclusions, but they had not quite double the number of students, viz:—385 to 196.

now he reiterates them. In his speech before the Conference at Kingston (p. 15 C. P.) he makes an attack upon Dr. Wilson on this ground, and states that the clerical error of putting dollars for pounds in one item, is the only error in the whole table. This is a cool way of escaping from as monstrous a specimen of Mr. Poole's statistics as even his enumeration of the salaried officers of the University. Give Mr. Poole the benefit of his clerical error, which only makes a difference of \$1158; is there no error in calling the expenses of Victoria \$1600 less than Dr. Green says the salaries alone amount to? Is there no error in setting down Trinity as \$7526, when the very document from which he got his information distinctly states its expenditure to have been \$18124, besides some Scholarships specially provided for? Is there any thing like truth or fairness, when Mr. Poole, in striving to exculpate himself (Qs. 503-4,) says that it was his object to state the amount of *salaries only*, with two selected items in Trinity College, whilst he compared this with *all* the expenses of the University of Toronto and University College, including items purposely omitted from the other colleges, and saddling it moreover with the Bursar's office, and an entirely different corporation, Upper Canada College?

The different items of the expenditure are not so easily accessible, and cannot be compared separately, as the Scholarships there are included in the Colleges, and the libraries are provided for, not by a definite appropriation, but out of an annual grant. Suffice it to say that each College receives £8,600 sterling a-year, or \$41,850, and the University about \$11,000. The larger items of expenditure, for Examiners and Scholarships, have already been compared, and the only other large item, the cost of the Professorial Staff in each College, is nearly the same as our own. At Cork, in 1859, it is given as \$24,820, besides tuition fees; with us for the same year it was \$24,480, with no fees except from occasional students. Other fees have been almost abolished, as with us, the Government having increased the former grant by £1,600 sterling, in lieu of them.* This sum for salaries, however, includes the Professors of Law and Medicine, amounting together to £700 sterling, or \$3,406, so that the amount paid to the Professors in Arts is about \$3,000 less than with us, but the amount estimated for fees from matriculated students, upwards of \$2,000, brings them nearly to the same. It is also to be remarked that the salaries paid are very low as compared with other similar institutions elsewhere, and that this evil has notoriously resulted from it, that their most efficient Professors are constantly drafted into other better endowed Institutions.

(4.) STANDARD OF EDUCATION IN THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.

I now come to the fourth charge against the University, insisted upon principally by Dr. Ryerson, viz. : that the standard of education has been lowered. This charge divides itself into three several heads, (1) that the examination for Matriculation has been reduced; (2) that an unprecedented number of options has been introduced; and (3) that the standard for a Degree has been lowered.

Matriculation.

A definite course of study having been laid down in a College, the object of a Matriculation examination is to ascertain that a student presenting himself is far enough advanced to enter upon that course; if not, either the other students would be impeded in their progress, or he would be neglected. The Matriculation examination must, therefore, be adapted to the course of study in the College, but the course in the College itself must be made to harmonise with the education which can be obtained out of its doors. If the College commences at too high a standard for the schools, the great bulk of the youth must be debarred from entering it at all; or another evil will follow, that not only the examination for Matriculants, but, as a necessary consequence, the earlier years of the College course itself, will become a mere paper scheme which is not acted upon in practice. The real standard for entering the University, whatever it may be in theory, must be based on the standard of the schools of a country. If that should be low, you must not be content to

* It is made a charge against the University, that tuition fees have been abolished (Q. 268.) It is singular that, in the model University proposed to Mr. Hincks, the lectures of the Professors were to be free.

sink the Colleges to their level ; but you must not place them so far out of reach as to make the entrance into them hopeless. It is a somewhat delicate process to make the adjustment, and in a growing country like this, it will require not unfrequent revision. The Colleges should certainly not commence above the standard of the best schools, but they should be greatly in advance of that of the inferior ones ; and as the schools improve, the standard of entrance to the Colleges may be raised, first by increasing the difficulty of the honor subjects, and then by adding to the qualifications required from all students, and before long we may, perhaps, return to a three years' course. Some excellent Grammar Schools we no doubt have, and I have no doubt but that they will continue to improve ; but it is notorious that if a much higher Matriculation examination were prescribed *and acted on*, the young men from many parts of the country would be altogether excluded from the University, unless their parents were able to afford to send them for preparatory training to Upper Canada College, or some other superior Grammar School. In confirmation of these views, I would appeal to the valuable evidence of Dr. Cook,* as to the impossibility of establishing a Matriculation examination which is not in harmony with the capabilities of the schools, and in his earlier statement he shows the necessity of having tutors in the Colleges, as well as Professors, for the express purpose of bringing forward those who are deficient in particular branches. Dr. Ryerson asks, why this complaint of the inefficiency of the Grammar Schools was not made before ? The answer is that it was made, and no complaint with regard to the old University was more frequent, than that its high standard of entrance practically confined its benefits to a favoured class. With the object of remedying this evil, the new University added a year to the course of study, so as to complete in the University what had been left unfinished in the schools. But says Dr. Ryerson, "they did not, at the same time, lower the entrance examination, except by leaving out one book." It is true they did not, but there were not wanting a large number of the Senate,† Dr. Ryerson amongst the rest, who contended that this was a mistake, and that the object of adding a year to the course was not fully accomplished without a further reduction, and when a fitting opportunity occurred, the change was made to harmonise with the new arrangement. Dr. Ryerson says that the Grammar School Act forbids the employment of any person not a graduate, or who has not been examined in all the subjects of our Matriculation, both for pass and for honors ; but does he mean to say that they in fact do pass such an examination, and are competent to teach the subject ?‡ I hope

* Rev. Mr. Whitaker also says, (Qu. 358,) "Mr. Langton justly observed yesterday, that our Grammar Schools are not like those at home ; and I quite agree with him in his paradox, that the students must fix the standard of examination themselves."

† Dr. Ryerson states that he never was in favour of reducing the Matriculation Examination. Let him have the benefit of the denial, though there are many persons who have a different recollection. It is not true, however, as stated by Mr. Poole, (p. 10 C. P.,) that he recorded his vote against the reduction, March 4, 1857. That vote, as explained in the evidence, (Qu. 454,) was upon another Statute, for abolishing Matriculation in the University, and transferring it, as in Queen's University, Ireland, to the Colleges. That Statute was afterwards dropped, and the existing Statute was only introduced March 26, and carried without a division.

‡ Dr. Ryerson, in his reply, produces the names of about a dozen Grammar School-masters who are fully competent for their important functions, which is readily admitted by every one ; but the inferior condition of the seventy-five schools as a whole, from the inadequacy of the remuneration, is as universally acknowledged. The following

the Committee will call for the Grammar School Inspectors, who can tell them what chance the mass of the Grammar School pupils, and even a great many of the Grammar School Masters, would have of passing the common Matriculation examination only, even as at present established. As for myself, I have now had experience of four Matriculation examinations, and can answer for the test being strictly applied, except, perhaps, in Latin composition,* which has hitherto been much neglected in our Grammar Schools; and from the difficulty that many of the students, even from schools of some repute, experience in coming up to the mark, I am not surprised at the complaints which were formerly made, that King's College was practically closed to the bulk of the people.

It is stated in the Memorial of the Methodist Conference, that the standard of Matriculation is below that of other Universities. I will proceed to show, confining myself for the present to Greek and Latin, the department complained of, that though it is below that in the old University,—because, as I have explained, that was too high,—it is not below those which we may well take, and by the law are directly instructed to take, as our models. At Oxford and Cambridge, there is, properly speaking, no Matriculation examination in the University, though there is in some of the Colleges. Generally speaking, nothing is required but the certificate of a Graduate, probably his schoolmaster, that a student is competent. I am not aware of the precise requirements of any of the Colleges at Cambridge, (at my own there was no examination,)[†] but the Oxford Commissioners state what is required by the best Colleges at Oxford, viz.: “some facility in Latin writing, and a fair acquaintance with the grammatical principles of Greek and Latin. To this is now generally added Arithmetic, and a portion of the Elements of Euclid,” p. 276. They, however, recommend that a Matriculation examination should be established, somewhat similar to that now called Responsions, which is passed between the 3rd and the 7th terms, and the subjects at that examination are one Greek author and one Latin author, to be selected by the student from a list given, and translation into Latin prose. The authors we require occur in this list, but they must take more of them, as both the Jugurtha and Catiline of Sallust, and four

are Dr. Ryerson's own observations upon the subject, in his letter to the Chancellor, dated March 23rd, 1857, and published in the Evidence before the Committee, p. 53:—“One of the most pressing wants of the grammar schools is that of duly qualified masters. Several of the schools are now closed on that account, the boards of trustees being unable to procure masters qualified according to law. In some of them the masters now employed would not be eligible, had they not been engaged before the passing of the present Grammar School Act.”

* Latin composition is, perhaps, the best test of scholarship, not only as a proof of an accurate knowledge of the grammar of the language, but as requiring the student to possess a vocabulary which can only be obtained by a tolerably extensive course of reading. In the present state of our schools, however, it would be hopeless to expect much proficiency in this exercise from students entering the University. Even at Oxford, at the final examination for Degree, Professor Walker says, “If decent Latin writing should be insisted upon, the number of failures would be more than quadrupled.” (Rep. App. K. p. 72.) And Dr. Peacock makes a similar remark with regard to Cambridge.

† Latterly there has been a Matriculation examination at Trinity, Cambridge, slightly more difficult in classics than at Toronto, viz., Cicero de Am. and de Sen.; Virgil Æn. B. I.; Hom. Il. B. I.; Xen. Mem. B. I.; but it is to be observed that Dr. Whewell, the master of Trinity, objects to a Matriculation examination in the University, and states the object of the examination in the College to be principally useful in turning the attention of the tutors to deficiencies in the students who may nevertheless be allowed to pass.

books of the *Anabasis*.* We, however, require two Latin authors, and it must be remembered that the Commissioners do not contemplate a strict examination ; for, in answer to the objection that the standard must be made so low as to exclude almost none, they recommend that good answering in one subject may excuse insufficiency in another.

At Cambridge, the examination corresponding to the Responsions at Oxford, and the only substitute for a Matriculation examination, consists of one of the Gospels in Greek, Paley's Evidences, and one Greek and one Latin author, which were, in the year when I passed the examination, one book of Homer, and one book of Virgil ; and for the present year, the 6th book of Virgil, and the last of the *Anabasis*.

In the University of London, which was proposed as our model, they require, together with translation into Latin, *one* Greek, and *one* Latin book, selected annually from a list given, in which list appear all the *three* books we require, and the same quantity of each. Our examination is, therefore, if the number of books be taken as a test, higher than theirs.

In the Queen's University, Ireland, the Matriculation is conducted in the Colleges. I have not been able to find the subjects at Galway, if there be such an examination there ; at Belfast, it is two Greek and two Latin books ; at Cork, it is the first book of the *Anabasis*, and first book of Virgil—*two* of the *three* books we require.

Dr. Ryerson, whilst quoting the recommendation of the Commissioners, that the Matriculation examination should not be reduced below what it is, laid upon the table the course at Belfast, which is rather higher than ours. Why did he not also submit that of Cork, which is rather lower ? Both, no doubt, were right, being guided by the qualifications of the schools they had to deal with, and both were equally alluded to in the recommendation of the Commissioners.

I think that I have thus satisfactorily shewn that we, even with the imperfectly organised schools of a new country, require from our students at entrance, as much as has been thought advisable even in England, with all the facilities for acquiring classical knowledge, which its numerous and long established schools afford.†

In Canada, at Trinity College, which is certainly not inferior in its appreciation of classical learning to Victoria or Queen's, the Matriculation examination is substantially the same as our own, but rather lower, only requiring two books to our three. As to the Colleges in the United States, I am unacquainted with the measure of strictness with which

* The Rev. Mr. Ambery is quoted by Dr. Ryerson, in his reply, as stating that this examination, to which it is proposed by the Commissioners to assimilate the Matriculation examination, is about equal to that for an ordinary degree at Toronto. At Oxford, a list of books is given from which the candidate himself selects those he will be examined in. If from the list given for Responsions a candidate deliberately selects the most difficult, Mr. Ambery's comparison may be true ; but if he selects the easier ones, which he has a perfect right to do, there can be no question as to the greater difficulty of the books required at Toronto,—not to mention that it is a single examination at Oxford, and the last of four consecutive ones at Toronto. Compare, for instance, four books of the *Anabasis*, at Oxford, with a play of Euripides and a book of Thucydides, at Toronto ; or Sallust's *Catiline* and *Jugurtha*, with Tacitus' *Germania* and *Agricola*, and four *Satires* of Juvenal.

† Upon this subject the following evidence was given by Mr. Meredith, Assistant Provincial Secretary, and a Medalist and Scholar of Trinity, Dublin :

Qu. 524.—Have you compared the Matriculation examinations of the University of Toronto with those prescribed in other Universities, and what is your opinion of their comparative standards ?—I have compared it with the Matriculation examinations at Cam-

their examination is applied ; but this I will say without any fear of contradiction, that if, as the italics of the pamphlet of the Methodist Conference imply, they expect a lad upon leaving school to have read the *whole* of Virgil, and the *whole* of Cæsar, his time would have been much better employed in learning something of other authors. To any one acquainted with the subject it bears upon the face of it the stamp of a paper programme, as much as does the *whole* of Livy and the *whole* of Herodotus, as a part of the first year's course at Victoria College. *

bridge, London, Cork, Belfast, and Dublin. It seems to me to be about equal to Cambridge, rather greater than London, greater than Cork, less than Belfast, and less than Dublin.

Qu. 537.—State the subjects of Matriculation examination in each of the Universities and Colleges referred to in your Answer to Question No. 524?—The following are the subjects for the ordinary or pass Matriculation Examination, in the Universities mentioned, namely :

NAME OF UNIVERSITY OR COLLEGE.	SUBJECT OF MATRICULATION EXAMINATION.			
	Greek.	Latin.	Latin Composition.	Other Subjects.
1. University of Toronto.	Xenophon, Anabasis Book I.	Sallust, Catilina, Virgil, Æneid Book I.	Translation from English into Latin Prose.	Elements of Mathematics, History, and Geography.
2. University of Cambridge.	Xenophon, Anabasis last Book, Gospel of St. Mathew.	Virgil, Æneid Book VI.	No Composition.	Elements of Mathematics, Paley's Evidences, and History.
3. University of London.	Xenophon, one Book.	Horace, two Books of the Odes.	No Composition.	Elements of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy ; History and Geography, French or German.
4. Trinity College, Dublin.	^a Homer Iliad, Books I., II., III. ; New Testament, four Gospels, and Acts of the Apostles.	Virgil, Æneid Books I., II., III., IV., Horace, Odes.	Latin Composition.	English Composition and Arithmetic.
5. Queen's College, Cork.	Xenophon, Anabasis Book I.	Virgil, Æneid Book I.	Re-translation into Latin of parts of Cæsar.	Elements of Mathematics.
6. Queen's College, Belfast.	^a Homer, Iliad two Books, Xenophon, Anabasis 2 Books.	Virgil, Æneid Books I., II., III., IV., Livy, Books I., II.	Do. do. do.	Elements of Mathematics, History, and Geography.

^a These Books are taken from a list of authors, out of which the Candidate is allowed to make his selection, or from which a selection is made by the College authorities during the preceding year.

* The Commissioners who reported upon the constitution and studies of King's College, New Brunswick, at the end of 1854, which report was stated by Dr. Ryerson to be drawn

Options permitted in the University.

Upon the subject of the options permitted in the University of Toronto, Dr. Ryerson is very decided. His argument is this, in the main features of which he is supported by Dr. Cook—"that a University course is not intended to be adapted to the tastes and capacities of the various students, but "to discipline the powers of the mind by a common course of application and exercises, sanctioned by the experience of ages, and for which Utopian experimenters have found no substitute; any more than they have found a substitute for ordinary food and exercise requisite for physical development and discipline"—the two subjects for which no substitute can be found being Greek and Latin and Mathematics.* Now, I am far from undervaluing these two studies, which, when I was

up by himself, recommend that the standard for Matriculation shall be similar to that established in the University of Toronto. It is remarkable, however, that when they came to give the detail in schedule A. of the draft bill, they omit from the Toronto subjects as they then stood, one Greek book, the Elements of Natural Philosophy, the Elements of Chemistry and French, which is exactly the difference between the present Matriculation at Toronto and that established in 1854.

* Mr. Langton in the text has gone into considerable detail upon this subject, and has quoted largely from the Oxford, Cambridge, and Irish Commissioners, in order to shew the latitude of individual choice, which they recommend in the subjects of academical study. He might also have referred to the opinions of certain other commissioners, not perhaps of such authority upon University education generally; but whose recommendations cannot be without considerable weight in Canada at least, as two of them, Dr. Dawson and Dr. Ryerson, occupy prominent positions as educationists here. This report upon collegiate education in New Brunswick, which Dr. Ryerson in his evidence (p. 146) states that he himself prepared, recommends that the following subjects should be embraced in the general course, which are identical with the subjects which form the course of study at Toronto: English Language and Literature, Greek and Latin, Modern Languages, History, Natural History, Chemistry, Mineralogy and Geology, Mathematics, Natural Philosophy, Mental and Moral Philosophy, and Civil Polity. The first year consists of Greek and Latin, Mathematics and Modern Languages, including English. The second year of Chemistry, Natural History, and Mineralogy and Geology, together with *any one* of the three subjects of the first year. In the third and last year, (all the previous subjects being finally disposed of,) the course contains only Natural Philosophy, English Literature and History, Mental and Moral Philosophy and Civil Polity. Thus Dr. Ryerson, who when criticising the course of study in the University of Toronto, incorrectly represents it as lowering its standard by permitting options to commence at the end of the first year, himself recommends that in New Brunswick they should then commence. Dr. Ryerson, who denounces by quotations from Dr. Whewell, and otherwise, the severance of the studies of Classics and Mathematics, or the substitution of Modern Languages for the former at any period of the course, himself introduces both options in New Brunswick at the end of the first year. Dr. Ryerson, who in his evidence at Quebec, (p. 29,) says: "It is only therefore when the foundation, common to all, is broadly and deeply laid, and at an advanced stage of the collegiate course, that options are admitted in the essential subjects of a University education; but in no case are both Classics and Mathematics allowed to be abandoned during any part of the course, and least of all at the end of the first year"—this same Dr. Ryerson recommends that they may *both* be omitted, and that precisely *at the end of the first year*. It is not true, as stated by Dr. Ryerson in his evidence, p. 29, "that a student (at Toronto) may take a degree in honors, without performing a single exercise in either Classics or Mathematics after his first year;" but it is true, that according to his own scheme for New Brunswick, a student may do exactly what he above denounces.

Dr. Ryerson's opinions upon other points have undergone a change since he framed this report; for when the College Council in their memorial adduced the authority of Dr. Wayland of Brown University, for the system of options, he argues in his evidence, (pages 29 & 30,) that Dr. Wayland's authority is of no account, and his plan a failure. But Dr. Ryerson, the Commissioner for New Brunswick, says that: "As the Rev. Dr. Wayland, of Brown University, at Providence, R. I., stands confessedly amongst the ripest scholars and most distinguished educationists of the age, and as he has written and done more on the subject of Collegiate and University reform than any other man in America, and as he has been specially referred to by Sir Edmund Head in his correspondence on the subject of King's College, the Commissioners were anxious to obtain the advantage of Dr. Wayland's judgment and suggestions in regard to their contemplated recommendations." They

at College, were the only recognised subjects of an Academical course—the former more particularly, as a means of mental discipline, and the latter far more for its practical utility. But there have not been wanting men of the highest position in the intellectual world, who have argued that they were, not merely, not the only, but not even the best studies, for forming the mind; whilst the practical utility of many new subjects has been gradually forcing them into the established studies of the Universities. There has been also a growing conviction, that from the narrow limits of the studies of our Public Schools and Universities, they were not fitting men for the actual business of life. The whole tendency of educational reform, for the last thirty years, has been in this direction, and if the transactions of this Committee ever find their way into the hands of persons interested in such subjects at home, it will raise considerable surprise in their minds, that the exploded systems of Europe are finding refuge in the new world, and that a new dynasty of Latin and Greek is sought to be raised up in the Universities of Canada.

Old prejudices are not easily overcome, especially in Universities, which are the most conservative of bodies, and the change has been gradual, but it has been steady; and as new subjects have been introduced, options, as a necessity, have followed in their footsteps. Where Classics and Mathematics, as at Cambridge, or Classics and Mental Sciences as at Oxford, formed the staple of the University course, no great amount of individual choice could be left to the students; but as the various branches of Natural Philosophy increased in intricacy and importance; as Chemistry, Geology and Political Economy assumed the proportion of Sciences, and with Natural History and Modern Languages, claimed a position as recognised subjects of study, it became evident that no student could give equal attention to all, and that some latitude of selection must be allowed. At first, as was natural, the old subjects retained their position, and the new ones alone were made optional. But this, also, is passing away, and the exclusive supremacy of Latin and Greek, though their intrinsic value can never be forgotten, is almost at an end.

I will not pursue the argument as to whether this has been wise or not; I believe the Committee would prefer to learn from me what is the actual practice of the English Universities, and what are the recommendations of the Royal Commissioners for their further reform. The University of London naturally presents itself first to our notice, not only as the model proposed to us, but also as being untrammelled in its action by time-honored statutes and prejudices; I must, however, notice a difference which exists in their method of conferring Degrees, which affects the question of the course of study. We prescribe a four years' course; that is, the examination for the Degree of B.A., in the ordinary way of proceeding to it, is the fourth examination after that for Matriculation, and the degree of M.A., as in the older English Universities, follows as a matter of course without examination. In London they have a two years' course, or the degree of B.A. is given on the second examination after Matriculation, and that of M.A. follows the next year on a third

therefore visited Providence expressly to consult him, and having received his approbation, Dr. Ryerson says: "The Commissioners could not but be gratified by such an expression of opinion by a man, whose writings on Collegiate reform have so pre-eminently distinguished him; and who holds so high a position amongst the first scholars and educators in America."—(Rept. II., 13.)

examination. In comparing the two courses, we must therefore remember that, with them, the examination for M.A. is the third or final one; with us the fourth, or final one, is that for B.A.

Now, in the University of London,* the first examination after Matriculation is extremely similar to ours, excepting that there is no Greek at all, and, as with us, no options are allowed. The second examination is rather above us, especially in Mathematics, and no options are allowed, neither are they with us, except to the few who have been first-class honor men, in *either* Classics or Mathematics, or in *both* Natural Sciences and Modern Languages. To our third examination they have nothing corresponding, and at their final examination they allow any one of these three branches to be taken, viz.: Classics, Mathematics, or Mental and Moral Sciences; a greater license than we allow to any but first-class honor men. But this is not all, for to meet the growing necessity of options, they have established a new degree, unknown before in English Universities, though existing in the University of Paris, viz.: that of Bachelor and Doctor of Science. A student offering himself for this course, may, *after Matriculation, i. e.*, one year, before we permit any options at all, and two years before we permit them to mere pass men, drop Classics and Modern Languages altogether. At the second examination, he may drop pure Mathematics altogether, and at the final examination, that for Doctor of Science, he need only take one of no less than 16 options. The extent to which the different branches of Science are subdivided in this scheme, may be conceived from the fact, that Organic and Inorganic Chemistry are distinct branches, and so are Geology and Palæontology. Nay, the several branches are again subdivided into principal and subsidiary subjects, and he is to have a thorough knowledge of the one, but need only show a general acquaintance with the other. Thus, a candidate selecting Mathematics as his branch, may take pure Mathematics as the principal subject, with only a general knowledge of applied Mathematics, or *vice versa*. The Committee, therefore, can judge

* In his reply (p. 36 C. P.,) Dr. Ryerson heads a paragraph, "Mr. Langton's misquotations in regard to London University," but gives exactly the same account of the two examinations for the degree of B.A., excepting for his amusing mistake in supposing that the two years' course means two separate degrees of B.A. At the two first annual examinations after Matriculation, no options are allowed; they commence at the third year, which is the final examination in the Faculty of Arts. So also do they practically commence at the third year in the University of Toronto. Much misrepresentation has taken place in that respect. The rule for the second year is this:

"A candidate for honors in any department, who has obtained first-class honors in the University, in his first year, either in Classics or Mathematics, or in both Modern Languages and Natural Sciences, is not required in other departments to pass an examination in any branch, in which he has already been examined in his first year; but having only been examined in pure Mathematics in his first year, he must also take applied Mathematics this year."

Now the effect of this rule is, that a student who has taken first-class honors in either Classics or Mathematics, need not take a second course of Modern Languages, or of Chemistry, or of Natural History, and several have availed themselves of the option. But with the essential subjects of Classics and Mathematics, the case is very different. Mathematics cannot be omitted in the second year by any one, and Classics only in two cases: 1st, by a student who has taken first-class honors in both Modern Languages and Natural Sciences, a contingency which has never occurred yet; and, 2nd, by a student who has taken first-class honors in Mathematics. During the last five years, eleven students have had this privilege, and only four have availed themselves of it, which is the sum total of the much talked of option of dropping Classics and Mathematics, which is always spoken of by Dr. Ryerson as universal, and is described in his evidence (p. 118) as permitted "almost without limit." The real options commence, as in London, at the end of the second year, and then only for first-class honor men, to the extent which they permit.

for themselves, how far Dr. Ryerson is borne out in his assertions, that "it is not the object of Collegiate education to minister to individual tastes," that "in English Universities, Natural Sciences are not admitted as a substitute for Mathematics," that "in no case are both Classics and Mathematics allowed to be abandoned during any part of the course," and that "there is not a University or College in Great Britain, that would not scout the idea of conferring a degree on such terms."

At the Queen's University, Ireland, the system of options is also permitted, though differing in arrangement from ours. At the first examination after Matriculation, as with us, there are no options. At the second (one year before we permit any, except to first class honor men) there is an option between Classics and Mathematics. At the end of the third year, (and herein they differ principally from us,) they take over again some branches of all departments, and it is to be observed that this is exactly the examination which the Commissioners propose to alter. At the fourth or final examination, which with them also is that for M. A., four options are allowed. Classics with one Modern Language, Mathematics and Natural Philosophy, English with Logic and Metaphysics, or with Jurisprudence and Political Economy, and the Natural Sciences—any one of the four being sufficient for obtaining the degree. In his supplementary evidence, Dr. Ryerson has appealed to the report of the Commissioners of the Queen's University and Colleges, and considering the length to which his extracts from other writers extended, it is singular he should only have quoted from the Commissioners, their statement of the existing examination for B. A., and not the proposals which have been made to amend it. I will content myself with referring to the 19th page, the perusal of which will satisfy any member of the Committee, that they are not opposed to the system of options, and never dreamt of the exclusive studies recommended by Dr. Ryerson and Dr. Cook. They shew that the object of the present course contemplates "a wide and extensive general education," and that devotion to special subjects is encouraged by the M. A. Examination, and by the prizes and honors. They say that all the Professors are in favour of a general course, but think the present work too much, and what they mean by a general course is shewn by their different schemes as given in the Appendix, all of which, except one, greatly extend the system of options. They object to all these schemes as making too radical a change, and then give the remedy which meets most with their approbation, which is a step beyond what we go in the University of Toronto, viz : that there shall be an examination at the end of the second year, on the subjects of the course up to that time, which shall be final, as far as these subjects are concerned, and that at the B. A. Examination, they need take only *one* of the three groups of the present B. A. Examination, given in Dr. Ryerson's evidence, excluding Latin and Greek, Mathematics and Modern Languages, which have been finally disposed of at the end of the second year.*

At Cambridge, the options until quite lately were permitted to honor men alone, that is, all must pass the Previous Examination, the only

* Here again, Dr. Ryerson heads the paragraph of his reply (p. 37 and 38 C. P.) "Mr. Langton's Misquotations" and then proceeds to give the passage just as Mr. Langton gave the substance of it, and caused the Clerk of the Committee to read it at length at the table; shewing, as stated above, that Latin, Greek, Mathematics, and Modern Languages, are to be finally disposed of at the end of the second year, and that at the B. A. Examina-

substitute for, and certainly not more difficult than our examinations required from all students.* The candidates for Mathematical Honors, might then branch off, being only required to take the Theological subjects of the general Degree Examination. The candidates for Classical Honors used to be more limited, as they could not present themselves unless they had obtained a certain standing in the Mathematical *Tripes*. This arrangement, however, was modified some years ago, and the candidates for Classical Honors were only required to have taken a fair standing at the general examination. Two new *Tripes* were also established on the same terms: viz., Moral Sciences, and Natural Sciences, a further proof of Dr. Ryerson's accuracy in stating that no British University admits of an option between Mathematics and Natural Sciences. Whether the fifth *Tripes* for Modern Languages has been actually established or not, I am not quite certain. If it has not it most certainly will be. Upon this subject, the Commissioners make the following observations: "Another addition still more obviously suggested by considerations of utility is the study of Modern Languages. A system of liberal education cannot be regarded otherwise than as defective, if it does not afford facilities and inducements for acquiring a knowledge of the treasures of German, French, and Italian literature." "We confidently indulge the

tion, only one of these three groups need be taken:—A. English, Philosophy, and Criticism, Logic, Metaphysics or Jurisprudence, and Political Economy. B. Chemistry and Natural Philosophy. C. Zoology, Botany, and Physical Geography.

Such was the recommendation of the Royal Commissioners, at p. 19 of their Report. From the reports of the colleges for the year 1860, it appears that a change has actually been introduced, differing a good deal from that recommended by the Commissioners, and assimilating their practice very closely to that of the University of Toronto. It is as follows:—at the end of the second year, there is an examination in the University embracing Classics, Mathematics, and one Modern Continental Language. Then the options commence, and a candidate for Honors may take any one of group A., or any two of group B., viz.:

GROUP A.	GROUP B.
Greek and Latin,	English Language and Literature,
Modern Languages,	Logic and Metaphysics,
Mathematical Science,	Logic and History,
Experimental Science,	Logic and Political Economy.
Natural Science.	

Candidates who seek a Degree without Honors, may take any combination of the subjects in group C., provided the sum total of the values attached to each subject is at least four:

GROUP C.	
English Language & Literature	2
Mathematical Science	2
Experimental Science	2
Chemistry	2
Zoology	1
Botany	1
Greek	1
Latin	1
Modern Languages, each	1
Logic	1
Metaphysics	1
History	1
Political Economy	1

* Dr. Ryerson, in his reply, (p. 38 C. P.,) takes exception to this comparison, because, before branching off into options, the Cambridge student must pass the previous examination in the middle of his second year, whereas those of Toronto may do so at the end of the first, "and that," says he, "without any such previous examination as the one required at Cambridge." Omitting the misrepresentation that our options commence at the end of the first year, the evidence of Mr. Meredith (Qu. 227) shows that even at the end of the first year, our students have been as severely tested as those at Cambridge. But Dr. Ryerson adduces Mr. Whitaker's evidence, to show that the previous examination at Cambridge is now made nearly if not quite equal to the B.A. Examination. Mr. Whitaker, however, acknowledges, (Qu. 331, &c.) that he knows of no addition to the classical subjects, and the Cambridge calendar for 1860 shows that there are none, and he further adds, that the B.A. Examination is higher not so much in the difficulty of the books, as in the greater strictness of the examinations.

hope that it will, ere long, be recognised by the University as worthy of being fostered by honors and rewards." I am aware that the objection may be made that these options were only for the *honor* men, and that they, except the Mathematicians, must also pass the Degree Examination. But what is the Degree Examination itself? It is little more than a repetition of the previous examination. One Greek and one Latin book, part of the Acts or an Epistle, instead of a Gospel, in the Greek Testament, Algebra, the rest of Euclid, and the Elementary Principles of Mechanics and Hydrostatics, with Paley, and some Church History, certainly not more than we expect from all our students at some part of their course. I am sure the Committee will excuse me if I quote from the report of the Commissioners, the recommendations of which were in a great measure adopted last year. After speaking of the Previous Examination, they add, "after the completion of five more terms, those candidates for the degree of Bachelor of Arts, who do not offer themselves for mathematical honors, are again subjected to an examination, differing but little in its general character from that which they passed in the middle of their term. Mathematics, and Greek and Latin still form a considerable part of it. But these are subjects in which time had long shown that most of this class of students did not possess the desire or the aptitude to excel. If their taste and talents had inclined that way, the majority of them would no doubt have been found in the career of competition for mathematical and classical honors. For five weary terms they have been compelled to continue a course of reading, which, whatever attractions, whatever benefits it may have for others, is to them irksome, and, need we hesitate to say, little better than unprofitable." "What we suggest, then, is that the examination of students in Arts, at the end of the fifth term, should take place as at present, and in the same subjects, with the addition of such further parts of Euclid and Algebra as are now introduced at the final examination for those who are not candidates for mathematical honors. After the general body of students have passed this examination collectively, they might then, in our opinion, be allowed, for the following four terms, to select freely for themselves, with the sanction of their college tutor, such lines of recognised academical study as were best suited to their aptitudes and tastes and professional destinations. Some would aspire to honors in the several *Tripases*, others would prepare themselves for the first degree in Law or Physic. The rest, who sought or obtained no honors, would be finally subjected to some process of examination, in order to make it evident that they had attended such a range of lectures in their last four terms, and acquired such a proficiency as to qualify them for a first degree in Arts." They then go on to show how candidates for honors in the four existing *Tripases*, and others which might be added, as Modern Languages and Civil Engineering, would obtain their degree, and they proceed—"Corresponding to the examination for honors in each several *Tripas*, there would be a collateral examination at the same time and in the same subjects for those students who had adopted that particular line of study, though not seeking the distinction of an academical honor in it. As many as passed this collateral examination satisfactorily should also thereupon be entitled, in point of academical proficiency, to the degree of Bachelor of Arts," which they would accord on the same terms as those whose final examination was in Theology. "The change itself of the

system, which we have proposed, would, in our opinion, be attended with great advantages. There would still be, as now, an ardent competition and high standard of attainment preserved both in the Mathematical and Classical *Tripeses*. Eminent distinction gained in them would still continue to be the prelude to a Fellowship in a college. At the same time the Moral and Natural Science *Tripeses* would rise into increased importance, in proportion as the colleges began to recognise superior merit in those departments as forming also a recommendation to a Fellowship. But the positive advantage would probably be more marked in the case of that numerous class of students who are contented with an ordinary degree, not feeling themselves fitted to embark in the competition for academical honors. After passing the previous examination they might turn their four remaining terms to a really profitable account, by preparing themselves for their future professions; or at least they might continue to find in academical pursuits that degree of interest and improvement which arises from variety and choice of study." (p. 27.) This is the scheme of academical study recommended by men of such European reputation as the Bishop of Chester, Peacock, Herschel, Romilly and Sedgwick, and it goes even further in admitting the principle of options than the Senate of the University have ventured to follow. The Committee can have an opportunity of comparing it with what Dr. Ryerson in his evidence has stated to be the nature of their recommendations.*

At Oxford they have not as yet proceeded so far in introducing a principle which must ultimately prevail, but they have already advanced

* The changes which have been cautiously and successively made in the system at Cambridge, illustrate well the tendency of the progress in University education, and offer strong evidence in support of the wisdom of the system adopted at Toronto. Formerly the only option allowed at Cambridge was to the Mathematical honor-men, who, after passing the previous examination, were permitted to lay classics wholly aside, while classical honor-men were compelled to take honors in Mathematics also. Relaxations in favor of the classical honor-men were, however, made successively, by permitting them to evade the honor examination in Mathematics, and go out in the Poll or general examination for the ordinary B. A. degree, at first requiring them to be in the first class of the poll, but afterwards removing even this restriction. At length, in 1855, a portion of the Mathematics required for the poll was thrown into the previous examination as additional subjects, and after passing these, a student could then take his degree by proceeding in honors, either in Mathematics or in Classics. Finally, in 1859, the same privilege was extended to the tripeses of moral and natural sciences, and at present a student, after passing the previous examination, (in the middle of his second year,) can proceed to a degree by taking honors in any one of these four tripeses, without passing an examination in any other subject whatever than that of his special tripese.

The syndicate by whom these last changes were recommended, comprised the names of Whewell, Phillpott, Miller, Grote, and others of the highest standing, and in the discussion that took place on its adoption, the only dissentient voice was raised by Dr. Donaldson, who objected on the ground that the title B. A. should be restricted to classics and mathematics, and that some new title (as in London) ought to be applied to the degree obtained in the moral and natural sciences; but all other speakers concurred in repudiating the narrow meaning this attached to the word *arts*, and contended for placing all the tripeses on the same footing. When the vote was taken, there were 97 to 24 in favour of the moral sciences tripese, and that of natural sciences was carried *nem. con.* The scheme of the previous examination now stands as follows: "One of the four Gospels in Greek, Paley's Evidences of Christianity, one of the Greek and one of the Latin Classics, Euclid's Elements Bb. I. II. III., and Arithmetic," and additional for Candidates for honors, "Euclid Bb. IV. VI., Elements of Algebra, Elementary Mechanics treated without Trigonometry."

It is thus evident that the options at Cambridge are not only carried out more extensively than at Toronto, but that the elementary knowledge of other subjects, required previously to the permission of an option, is much less in amount and lower in difficulty at Cambridge than at Toronto.

to a considerable extent in the same direction. The subjoined extract from the 'Commissioners' report will show both what the present practice is and what it is recommended that it should become. "The Senate has admitted the necessity of affording some liberty of choice to the student with regard to the subjects which he is to pursue during the latter part of his course. We are of opinion that this liberty should be extended. All students will henceforward (from 1850) be permitted to choose at pleasure the special studies of Law and History, of Mathematical Science, or of Natural Science; but previously to his examination in any of these branches, each candidate must still present himself in the school of *Litteræ Humaniores*, to be there examined in classics for the third time, as well as in philosophy and history. No doubt this restriction was maintained in consequence of an opinion which has long prevailed at Oxford with regard to the nature of a liberal education," (and which, it would appear, is to be revived in Canada.) "It has been held to be the sole business of a University to train the powers of the mind, not to give much positive or any professional knowledge; and the study of classical books is regarded as the best means of refining and invigorating the mind. The education given has hitherto been the same for all, whether clergymen or barristers, medical men or private gentlemen. It has been limited to such subjects as were presumed to be common to all these kinds of life; and no one has left Oxford, under the system hitherto pursued, much more fitted for one profession than for another." (p. 281.)
* * * * *

"Now the Statute of 1850 was an effort in the right direction; but its present regulations, which still retain the compulsory study of the *Litteræ Humaniores* to the end of the course, will scarcely remedy the evil." (p. 282.) * * * * *

"The obvious mode of amending this scheme would be to enact that all students, after giving satisfactory evidence of classical knowledge at the intermediate examination, (the *first** in the University) should be relieved from the necessity of continuing the studies of the grammar school, and should be at liberty for the latter period† of their career to devote themselves to pursuits preparatory to their future professions. To this end it seems to us that the University might with the best results institute a division of studies, with corresponding examination schools, such as

* Strictly speaking, this examination, though officially called "First Public Examination," is now the second in the University, that called Responsions having preceded it; but the Commissioners recommend the Responsions to be converted into a Matriculation Examination, and thus the examination they here speak of would be strictly the first in the University.

† Dr. Ryerson (p. 38 C. P.) finds fault with Mr. Langton for quoting the words of the Commissioners, "for the latter period of their career," whilst the heading of the section shows that this means "during the last year;" thus, as he states it, concealing that their recommendation is to permit options only during the last year "of a four years' course of study." Now it is evident from this, that Dr. Ryerson does not know that the course at Oxford is not, as in most Universities, precisely limited—a latitude being allowed to the students. They cannot take a degree earlier than their 13th term, (after a complete *three years' course*), and candidates for honors are not admitted later than their 18th term. Thus also they need not appear at Responsions at any fixed date, but between the 3rd and 7th terms, and similarly of the Intermediate Examination. If, therefore, Mr. Langton had spoken as precisely as Dr. Ryerson wishes him to do, he would not have spoken truly. He used the words of the Commissioners themselves, who spoke vaguely because the period was vague; but that they did not mean, as interpreted by Dr. Ryerson, the last of a four years' course, is evident from their elsewhere (p. 272) stating the object of the Intermediate Examination to be "to promote industry during the *second* year."

would better accord with the freedom of choice which should, as we think, be left to the student, after the intermediate examination, to be passed by all alike." (p. 287.) The Commissioners then proceeded to explain the four schools, with minor subdivisions, making in all nine branches, any of which might be chosen by the student after the middle* of his second year, as all that would be requisite to entitle him to a degree, viz : I. Theology ; II. Divided into two, viz : (1) Mental Philosophy ; (2) Philology, in which the student may be examined in Greek and Latin, *or* the Oriental and European Languages, *or* in Comparative Philology ; III. Jurisprudence and History, including Political Economy ; IV. Divided into two ; (1) Pure and applied Mathematics ; (2) Physical Science.

General Standard of Education.

In rebutting thus at length the charge that our options have lowered the standard of our degree to an extent unprecedented in any other University, I have incidentally compared our requirements with others, and have shown, that in no sense is the study for our degree below that required in our best models.† I might, therefore, have passed over altogether the general accusation of the inferiority of the standard of education in the University of Toronto, had not Dr. Ryerson offered a proof of it, from the alleged inferiority of our students as Grammar School Teachers. Now the preparation of young men for teaching Grammar Schools, is not the only, not even the highest object of a University ; and until means have been provided to increase the remuneration offered, it is hopeless to expect that the best men will select such a miserably paid profession. Other qualities also are required in a teacher than mere learning, as Dr. Ryerson must be well aware, having before him the example of a distinguished graduate of Oxford, who lately failed to maintain even a moderately successful school in Toronto—and of two men, graduates of British Universities,‡ selected by himself for his Normal and Model Grammar Schools, who, upon trial, proved inefficient. I might also say, that even if the imputation were true, it would reflect little discredit upon our present course of study, which has only been established five years. The first men who entered with our present course, and have pursued it throughout, only graduated in June last ; and to test the present University by the men it has hitherto produced, would be much like looking for fruit the year after planting an orchard. But I also have looked over the returns of the Grammar School Inspe-

* This should be "after the *end* of his second year."

† To exhibit more fully how groundless is this charge, a statement is annexed of the number of subjects in classics and mathematics in which an examination is required by various Universities, before the option of omitting them can be exercised :—

In Classics.—Cambridge, 3 ; Oxford, 11 ; London, B. A. 6, B. Sc. 2 ; Toronto, 7, and, with rare exceptions, 11.

In Mathematics.—Cambridge, 4 ; Oxford, 2 ; London, 10 (not all necessary) ; Toronto, 6.

‡ Dr. Ryerson's reply (p. 40 C. P.) has a long paragraph, headed as usual, "Mr. Langton's Mis-statements," denying the correctness of this. No names were given for obvious reasons, of which Dr. Ryerson takes advantage to suppose that Mr. Langton meant as one of these graduates a person who was no graduate at all, quite ignoring the fact that there was a third master selected by Dr. Ryerson, and found for some reasons inefficient, who was a graduate of Dublin. The very defence made by Dr. Ryerson in both the cases he has taken, proves all that was asserted in the text, viz. : that a man may have abundance of learning, and yet be deficient in some of the qualities which are essential to the making of a good schoolmaster.

tors, whose own evidence the Committee can call for, and I say unhesitatingly, that their returns do not bear out Dr. Ryerson's statement of any inferiority in our students as compared with those of other colleges.* That such a charge against the kind of instruction given in University College should come from Dr. Ryerson, whose only Canadian Master in his Model Grammar School has been selected from our graduates, does, I confess, surprise me; especially when I remember a formal proposition made by him not very long since, for the foundation of certain Scholarships in connection with University College, for the express purpose of educating Grammar School Masters. This proposition, which will be found recorded in our Minutes, was rejected by the Senate, because we thought we had already a sufficient number of Scholarships provided, without establishing 10 more; because we thought £30 a-year a sufficient stipend, whereas he proposed £50 a-year for his; because ours are awarded for proficiency in the honor as well as the pass subjects, and his candidates were to be examined in the mere common pass subjects of the first year only; and because ours are open to the whole Province, whilst no one was to be allowed to compete for his, except those who came with a recommendation from the Council of Public Instruction. I think the Committee will agree with me, that this proposition is an instructive comment, not only upon the alleged incompetency of University College for preparing Grammar School Teachers, but also upon the extravagance and exclusiveness with which we are charged, and upon the desire which Dr. Ryerson expresses to maintain a high standard of education.

(5) GENERAL POLICY OF A PROVINCIAL UNIVERSITY.

Having now disposed of the several heads under which the Petitioners have brought charges against the management of the University, it remains only for me to speak to the general question of the policy of denominational or non-denominational Colleges, supported by the State, and of establishing one College, which shall be thoroughly and efficiently organized, or dividing the endowment amongst several.

As to the first question, I do not desire to enter into the general argument. The Committee, I conceive, wish to obtain from me facts and not opinions, which they have no doubt long since formed for themselves, upon a subject which, for the last twenty years, has been so prominently before the country. I would merely remark that, whether the prevailing opinion of Upper Canada, that no aid from the State should be given towards education exclusively under the control of any particular religious denomination, be right or wrong, we should at least be consistent in our application of the principle which guides us. Dr. Cook is perfectly consistent in the views which he advocates. He holds that all education should be in the hands of persons, for whose general

* Dr. Ryerson, before the Conference meeting at Kingston (p. 15,) says, that his challenge to go over the official reports of the Inspectors was not accepted. What, then, is the meaning of the above passage? Mr. Langton expressly denied the truth of Dr. Ryerson's statement, and Dr. Wilson adduced in addition the contradiction of them by one of the Inspectors themselves.

character some particular religious community stands sponsor, and quotes with approbation the opinion of Baron Alderson, that it is impossible to give secular instruction in common, and that it is essential even for a teacher of arithmetic to hold orthodox views upon the doctrine of the Trinity. If such be the opinion of the majority of the people of Upper Canada, then it follows as a matter of course, that the endowment should be divided amongst the denominational Colleges, and University College should be abolished. But if an opposite opinion prevails, as it would appear to do from the constitution of our Common and Grammar Schools, I can see no argument against Separate Schools, which does not equally apply to separate Colleges. "If" says Dr. Ryerson, in his evidence, "aid is provided in support of a College for those who prefer a College without any religious character or influence, it is unjust and preposterous to deny aid to Colleges for those who demand colleges invested with a religious character and influences." And again, "If an institution teaches the subject of a collegiate education in connexion with no religion, it is to be endowed; but if it teaches the same subject in connexion with any religious persuasion, it is to be proscribed. Thus the religious character of a college is a disqualification for public aid! Can any thing be more monstrous?" Read *Schools for Colleges*, and you have the argument for Separate Schools forcibly put. Again, in his report of 1856, Dr. Ryerson says, "It is only, therefore, for very grave causes, that the State can be justified in allowing any portion of the population to be isolated from a system of public instruction. But where this is claimed, with the avowed view to the interests of a religious persuasion, the answer is, 'The State has nothing to do with the peculiar interests of sects, but has every thing to do with the school education of its youth.' The State equally tolerates and protects the former, but it largely provides for the latter. As, therefore, a system of Public Schools is based upon public interests, members of no sect or religious persuasion can claim on constitutional or public grounds, that any of such schools should be made sectarian, or that public funds should be expended for the support of sectarian schools at all, much less that such schools should be placed on the same footing as Public Schools. The sole object of public schools is secular education; the leading object of sectarian schools is sectarian interests—with which the State does not interfere where there is no semblance of union between Church and State." Here, if you read *Colleges for Schools*, the contrary argument is still more forcibly sustained.*

* These are not the only instances in which Dr. Ryerson's faith in non-sectarian public instruction, upon which his whole character as a public man is based, seems to be in a very unsettled condition. In his reply, (p. 43 C. P.,) there is an apparent admission that the Grammar Schools should be rendered denominational. "Granting that a defect exists in the Grammar Schools, that the primary education does not afford sufficient opportunity for religious instruction," &c. How long will it be before a similar doubt extends to the Common Schools?

Religious instruction cannot be given except in connexion with a denomination, whether at a Common School, a Grammar School, or a College; but a general oversight over the moral conduct of students, and the maintenance of religious habits may be as well undertaken by a purely secular, as by a denominational institution. This Dr. Ryerson can clearly perceive to be the fact, in a non-denominational institution under his own control; though he thinks it impossible if under the control of others. In his letter to Mr. Hincks, in 1852, Dr. Ryerson, speaking of the former University, (with what truth may be doubtful,) complains that no oversight was exercised in this respect," and he adds, "I do not think this need be so, constituted as the University now is; it is not so in the administration of the Provincial Normal School." So also in his report upon Collegiate education, New

But putting the religious argument aside altogether, and supposing a College to be as free from denominational bias as Victoria is claimed to be, when it is no longer to the liberality of the Methodist persuasion, but to the sympathies of the public at large that the appeal is made; is it for the interest of the country that the endowment should be scattered in small sums over the country in support of a number of local institutions? I entirely concur in the general principle of the London University, that students, wherever educated, should have the same facilities for obtaining scholastic honors,—the principle upon which our University was constituted, and which has been fully acted on by the Senate; but I also believe that it was a wise policy to found one College, free to all, having no advantages over any others, except what its greater educational capabilities might naturally afford it. I should be sorry to see the smaller Colleges closed, be they denominational or otherwise, and I should wish to see them, and I do not yet despair of seeing them, sending their fair quota to the examinations of the Provincial University, and sharing in the Scholarships and Honors which it has provided. But at least one College should be sustained by the State, in which every branch of learning and science, which forms a recognised part of a liberal education, can be taught efficiently under the best instructors. It cannot be expected that the minor Colleges would keep up a teaching staff embracing all the numerous ramifications of modern science, and it is hardly to be desired that they should, for the number of Professors would thus become unnecessarily multiplied,—if thoroughly efficient, at a cost altogether disproportioned to the number of students,—or what is far more probable, as a mere repetition in unnecessary profusion of an imperfect and incompetent model. But there is nothing to hinder them from having competent men in some of the most essential departments; and as the preferences for special studies of the ruling denomination, or the tastes of each locality dictated, or from the lucky acquisition of some eminently successful teacher, each College would gradually acquire, as has been the case in England, a reputation for success in particular departments. The system of options already adopted, and which must hereafter ever form the basis of a University scheme, would give their students the fullest opportunity of carrying off their share of honors and emoluments; and if the preference of the petitioners for one or two time-hallowed studies, over the more modern extended course be correct, the superiority of their scheme of instruction would be manifested. But the Provincial College should

Brunswick, he says, that *'the evidence' of the truths, and morals of Christianity* should lie at the foundation of all Collegiate instruction," referring even to the introduction of what he calls the Normal School system into University College, Toronto. And he adds that, "Where a boarding-house is retained in the College for those who prefer it, provision is, or should be, made for the observance of all the duties of a Christian family." But when he comes to speak of University College, in his present position as a claimant for part of the endowment, he finds fault with the daily prayers with which, as in every well-ordered establishment, the business of the day commences and closes, and with the lectures on Natural Theology and the Evidences of Christianity in which all denominations may join. "Its duty," he says, "was to teach secular branches of education, irrespective of all religion—leaving every thing pertaining to religion to the religious denominations."

There is not any thing in the tissue of misrepresentation and vulgarity put forward by the Reverend Superintendent more discreditable than his sneer at the unpretending religious exercises, as now practised in University College, under the auspices of the Dean of Residence, Mr. Buckland, whose high moral and Christian character is so well known in Canada, but whom he represents as having *"got through the prayers in three jerks."*—(P. 21, C. P.)

make provision for every thing that it is desirable to include in a University course. To leave the selection of studies to the individual Colleges, would be to run the risk of leaving some important subject unrepresented, and would drive our youth to go elsewhere to gain the desired knowledge; to prescribe a uniform course for all, would be, as I have said, to multiply teachers unnecessarily, to force upon Victoria History and English Literature, which Dr. Ryerson thinks are already sufficiently taught in the Grammar Schools, and Modern Languages upon Queen's, whose Principal thinks them not only an unnecessary, but a positively injurious addition to Academical studies. The present University Act provides every thing that is requisite for such an organisation, which I think the best adapted to the state of the country, and any modifications in the Constitution of the Senate, or in other minor particulars, could easily be introduced even without additional legislation. My own idea of the best constitution for that body would be, that a certain fixed number should be appointed by the Crown, that each College which sent up a certain number of Students for examinations should be entitled to elect one member, and after a certain number of Students two members, and that the Graduates yearly assembled in convocation, should elect certain other members—it being provided that if any affiliated College surrendered its charter, or as long as it held its charter in abeyance, all the graduates of such College should rank as graduates of the Provincial University. I should also think it advisable that all members of the Senate, whether elected or appointed, should hold their seats only for a fixed term of years, but should be re-eligible.

As to the endowment, having shown the cost of similar institutions elsewhere, I do not believe that it will for some years to come much exceed what is requisite to keep up the Provincial College in full efficiency, and the University with its expenditure, in maintaining a Provincial Library and Museum, competent examiners and a liberal allowance for Scholarships. If any considerable surplus should arise,—and I agree with the petitioners that all extravagance should be discouraged and prevented, for which the Visitor has ample powers,—such surplus might most profitably in my opinion be devoted, under such regulations as Parliament might make in accordance with the 54th clause, to an object in which all the Colleges have an equal interest, and not only the Colleges but the whole country, viz.: the improvement of our Grammar Schools. This is at present the weakest point in our whole educational system. We have admirable Common Schools, and a liberal appropriation for the Normal and Model Schools; we have a staff of professors connected with the Provincial College, who would reflect credit upon any similar body even in England, and the denominational Colleges have, I believe, under considerable difficulties, accomplished their work well. But in the higher schools we are unfortunately deficient, not from the lack of men to undertake them, so much as from the want of funds from which to provide a stipend liberal enough to attract thoroughly qualified teachers. Perhaps the best way of doing this would be to found certain annual allowances which should be awarded on examination, and should be tenable only by persons actually engaged in teaching Grammar Schools, or employed as tutors or professors in incorporated Colleges not otherwise endowed by the State.—As the word fellowship seems appropriated to a connexion with a particular College, such recipients of stipends from the

University funds might be called "associates," or some equivalent term, and the emoluments might be held for a limited term of years.

DR. COOK'S UNIVERSITY SCHEME EXAMINED.

The scheme propounded by Dr. Cook would, no doubt, have been improved in its details, had he had an opportunity of maturely considering them, and I will not therefore judge it by its minor arrangements. But it appears to me, apart from its denominational aspect, to be based upon three unsound principles. 1. It establishes a uniform, and, therefore, necessarily limited, course of study for all, in direct opposition to the practice of the best Universities, and the strong recommendation of both the Oxford and Cambridge Commissioners, whose guiding principle is liberty to individual choice. This it does, not only in accordance with Dr. Cook's individual opinions as to what are the most important branches of study, but as a necessary consequence of the equal subdivision of Government aid; for it is impossible that several small bodies can be so organised as to afford much opportunity of selection to the students. This can only be accomplished by one large institution, or by several small ones united under one superintending power, but each selecting its own favourite branches, or, as I recommend, by both united. This variety in the means of study is not inconsistent with uniformity in the qualifications required by the general superintending body. The University must still regulate the choice of departments which it would permit, the relative values which it would assign to each, and the uniform standard of proficiency in each, which it required as a qualification for its degree or its honors. A high honor at Cambridge has a definite and well appreciated value, though one man obtained it in mathematics alone, and another by classics; and the London M.A. is equally valuable, whether obtained on an examination in Classics, Mathematics, or Mental and Moral Sciences.

2. It is based upon the extremest views of decentralization. Dr. Cook admits the greater stimulus to intellectual activity in a numerously attended institution, but thinks it counterbalanced by a greater chance of moral corruption. I am by no means sure that a youth, who has soon to go out into the world without any control, is not the better for a preparatory training amongst those of his own age, with such supervision as can always be exercised in a College; and that a higher tone of morality may not be cultivated under the influence of the public opinion of a large body, than by mixing only with a limited society. I am very sure that if he has mixed freely with men of various habits of thought, and various religious denominations, if he has met upon equal terms with his superiors and his inferiors, both in intellectual power and worldly position, if he has seen bright examples to emulate as well as evil ones to avoid, he will be a better member of society, and freer from those petty prejudices which always grow up in a narrow circle, and not the least so in a strictly denominational College. But as a question of education, in the sense of acquiring knowledge, there can be doubt at all. One young man of really superior attainments exercises an exciting influence, both upon his fellow students and his teachers, which you can rarely hope to find

in a small body. Emulation is the great spur, especially amongst the young, and the larger the body of competitors the greater is the emulation excited. The reason is plain. The best man in twenty, having no one further to contend with, is apt to be content with, and over-estimate his position; but bring him into competition with five more men similarly situated, each urges the other on, and you obtain five men in the hundred, each superior to what he would have been in the narrower sphere. The mere encounter of such men at an annual examination is not sufficient, it is the daily contest in the lecture room which keeps up an animation in their studies. But it is not only from studying the common College course, not even with the emulation of the common lecture room, that the great benefit of a University education is derived. In the free intercourse of the College every student finds some one well informed upon a subject of which he is comparatively ignorant, and gets indications which help and direct him in his private studies. He learns to appreciate talent, and to have a taste and respect for learning, even when he does not himself excel. He comes out from College a man of enlarged and cultivated mind, which no number of books of Livy, or propositions of Euclid would ever have made him. These advantages can be but partially obtained in a small community, and though small Colleges will doubtless continue to exist for local and denominational reasons, and perhaps not without some special advantages, I cannot think it a commendable scheme, which would systematically break up the youth, who seek a College education, into numerous small societies.*

(3.) But if this decentralizing system is bad in itself, even if all were amply endowed; to divide a limited sum so that no College would be efficiently supported, must be fatal to the superior education of the country. It is idle to say that because Victoria and Queen's are the only bodies petitioning, they alone, with the addition perhaps of Trinity, would claim a share. When the principle was once established, Knox's College and other institutions, now existing only as Theological Schools, would establish secular chairs and assert their right to a free distribution. Nor would the demand be confined to colleges connected with a particular religious persuasion. Local interests would come into play, and every large town would claim to have its college. Already there are in Upper Canada twelve institutions of this kind in existence, or with charters of incorporation, and this year two new ones have sent in memorials to obtain a share with Kingston and Cobourg of the Government allowance. Dr. Cook thinks that he has provided a remedy to prevent them from becoming too numerous, but even the existing ones he can only support by cutting off from the teaching staff several departments, which, though

* Dr. Ryerson (p. 42 C. P.) appears to think that his argument in favour of a great number of small scattered colleges, in preference to one central one, is supported by the fact of there being a great many small Colleges at Oxford and Cambridge. Now even there the superiority of the large colleges as places for study, is evident from the greater proportionate number of first class honor men that they produce. Thus, at Cambridge, the two large colleges, Trinity and St. John's, form about half the University, and the fifteen small colleges the other half (the number of entries as given by Dr. Ryerson—from Heywood—were 248 and 251 respectively); but the first-class honor men during the last ten years sent out by the two large colleges were to those from the fifteen small as 3 to 2. But besides this, it must be remembered that all these small colleges are congregated together in one country town, with the freest intercourse of the students amongst each other, and that the advantage of the competition of numbers is almost as much felt as if the whole University were one college.

thought unnecessary or even injurious at Queen's, are fostered and encouraged by the British Commissioners. Dr. Ryerson, however, contemplates with satisfaction the possible establishment of 10 Faculties in competing Colleges, each as he proposes receiving £1,500. What sort of a teaching staff they could afford to maintain, is evident from the complaints of Queen's and Victoria that their present means are inadequate. For it must be remembered that if the Government aid is proposed to be increased, the means supplied by voluntary contributions would be diminished; not only because it is the tendency of all Government assistance to paralyse individual liberality, but also because this source of income would be exhausted. The number of young men who seek, or can spare time for, a College career is limited in all countries, and a multiplication of Colleges would not bring an equal increase of students; the receipts from fees would therefore be reduced. Denominational piety and individual liberality have also their bounds, and the majority of men who would contribute to such purposes have already done what they can afford. What aid could be expected from Municipalities to Institutions, from which the bulk of the people would derive no immediate advantage, may be judged from the starving condition of our Grammar Schools. Other sources of income to supplement the Government grant being dried up, we should have ten or fifteen miserable attempts at a college, and should have destroyed as noble an endowment as any young country ever possessed. Nor can I see any safeguard in Dr. Cook's tests of the efficiency of the colleges. A certain number of professors is to be required. Professors will not be wanting if £1,500 is to be divided amongst them; but as to the efficiency of the professors, it may be as difficult to determine that by legislation as it has been found in the case of Grammar Schoolmasters. Then the Senate is to determine the standard of education. Surely Dr. Cook must have forgotten that the Senate, which, in its legislative capacity, is to fix the standard, and in its examining capacity is to ascertain whether that standard has been reached, is to be composed mainly of those professors, or persons elected by them. The professors may not, as has been unjustly alleged of the present Senate, fix the amount of their own salaries, but practically they will determine whether they are to have any salaries at all. You cannot by law fix a standard of education. It may sound paradoxical, but it is nevertheless true, that practically it is the students who fix it. If they are badly prepared the standard is low, for you cannot find Examiners who will reject the majority of the students. The only way to obtain a high standard is to provide such teachers as can bring their students up to it, and this can only be done by employing a sufficient number to enable them to do the work effectually, and by giving them such a remuneration as will ensure the obtaining of able men.

QUEBEC, April 19, 1860.

JOHN LANGTON.

APPENDIX.

- I. *Comparative Statement of the requirements of the Principal British and Canadian Universities and Medical Schools for a Degree or License in Medicine, submitted by John Langton, Vice Chancellor of the University of Toronto, April 23rd, in reply to question 457—“Have you any observations to offer with reference to the School of Medicine in the University?”*

I put in a statement in a tabular form, of the requirements of different Schools of Medicine, both in the Old Country and in Canada. Those in the Old Country are extracted from the Edinburgh Medical Journal of October, 1857—those of the Canadian Schools from their own prospectuses. There will be observed a remarkable difference between the two, namely, that the British Schools require a less attendance upon lectures, and a larger attendance upon the Hospitals, owing, in all probability, to the greater abundance of hospitals there than in Canada. As compared with each other, the requirements of the Canadian Schools of Medicine are very similar.

I would, at the same time, state what the work of Matriculation Examinations in the Canadian Institutions is,—

Matriculation Examination, VICTORIA.—Satisfactory evidence of classical and general attainments. In		
Classics — London Pharmacopœia, Gregory’s Conspectus, or		
Sallust or any other Latin book.		
“	“	MCGILL’S.—Proof of competent classical attainments either by examination or otherwise.
“	“	QUEEN’S. —Proof of classical attainments.
“	“	TORONTO.—Sallust Catilina.
		Elements of Chemistry and Natural History.
		Arithmetic and Algebra.
		English Grammar and Composition.
		Outlines of English History.
		Outlines of Ancient and Modern Geography.

(Greek and French for honors only.)

With regard to the Matriculation in Medicine, it stands upon an entirely different footing from Matriculation in Arts. The object of a Matriculation Examination in Arts is to shew that the student is sufficiently far advanced to go on with his studies in the prescribed course. The object

of a Matriculation Examination in Medicine is to ascertain whether he has finished his studies in those departments in which he will never be examined again. I am aware that any examination for Matriculation will be very partially acted upon, and it is impossible at any one examination, to decide whether a man is a sufficiently well educated man to fit him for the Profession of Medicine. I entirely agree with Dr. Cook, that it would be a great deal better, if he were required, before proceeding with Medicine, to be either a graduate in Arts, or to have taken a certain number of definite courses in Arts. But no one University can introduce this system, when it is not the custom in other Universities ; it can only be done by the combined action of them all, and I hope it may yet be done,

REQUISITES FOR MEDICAL DEGREE OR LICENSE.

N. B.—THE BRITISH UNIVERSITIES, &c., ARE TAKEN FROM THE "EDINBURGH MEDICAL JOURNAL," OCTOBER, 1857.

UNIVERSITIES, &c.	Anatomy.	Physiology.	Demonstrations.	Dissections.	Surgery.	Practice of Medicine.	Chemistry.	Practical Chemistry.	Materia Medica.	Medical Jurisprudence.	Midwifery.	Botany and Natural History.	Practical Pharmacy.	Pathology.	Surgical Hospital.	Medical Hospital.	Clinical Surgery.	Clinical Medicine.
University Edinburgh	6 m.	6 m.	6 m.	6 m.	6 m.	6 m.	6 m.	3 m.	6 m.	6 m.	6 m.	6 m.	12 m.	3 m.	6 m.
Do. Glasgow	6 m.	6 m.	6 m.	6 m.	6 m.	6 m.	3 m.	6 m.	3 m.	6 m.	3 m.	24 m.	24 m.	24 m.	24 m.
Do. Aberdeen	12 m.	6 m.	6 m.	6 m.	6 m.	6 m.	3 m.	6 m.	3 m.	6 m.	3 m.	3 m.	24 m.	24 m.	3 m.	6 m.
Do. St. Andrews	12 m.	6 m.	12 m.	6 m.	6 m.	6 m.	3 m.	3 m.	3 m.	24 m.	24 m.	6 m.	6 m.
Do. London	6 m.	6 m.	9 m.	15 m.	6 m.	6 m.	6 m.	1 cr.	1 m.	1 cr.	1 cr.	6 m.	1 cr.	6 m.	12 m.	12 m.	12 m.	12 m.
Do. Dublin	6 m.	6 m.	6 m.	6 m.	6 m.	6 m.	6 m.	3 m.	6 m.	3 m.	3 m.	9 m.
Do. Queen, Ireland	12 m.	6 m.	12 m.	12 m.	6 m.	6 m.	6 m.	3 m.	6 m.	3 m.	12 m.	9 m.	3 m.	24 m.	24 m.	24 m.	6 m.
Royal College of Physicians, London	6 m.	6 m.	6 m.	6 m.	3 m.	3 m.	6 m.	3 m.	36 m.	36 m.
Do. do Ireland	6 m.	6 m.	6 m.	6 m.	6 m.	6 m.	6 m.	3 m.	6 m.	3 m.	6 m.	3 m.	24 m.	6 m.	24 m.	6 m.
Army Medical Board	12 m.	6 m.	12 m.	12 m.	12 m.	12 m.	12 m.	6 m.	3 m.	6 m.	3 m.	3 m.	18 m.	18 m.	8 m.	8 m.
Navy do	18 m.	6 m.	12 m.	12 m.	12 m.	12 m.	12 m.	3 m.	3 m.	6 m.	3 m.	6 m.	18 m.	18 m.	6 m.	6 m.
McGill College	12 m.	12 m.	12 m.	12 m.	12 m.	12 m.	12 m.	3 m.	12 m.	12 m.	1 cr.	1 cr.
Queen's do.	12 m.	12 m.	12 m.	12 m.	12 m.	12 m.	12 m.	6 m.
Victoria do.	12 m.	12 m.	12 m.	12 m.	12 m.	6 m.	12 m.	6 m.	12 m.	12 m.
Trinity College, Toronto	1 cr.	1 cr.	15 m.	1 cr.	1 cr.	1 cr.	1 cr.	1 cr.	1 cr.	1 cr.	1 cr. 6 cs.	1 cr.	1 cr.	18 m.
University of Toronto	12 m.	12 m.	12 m.	12 m.	12 m.	12 m.	3 m.	6 m.	3 m.	12 m.	12 m.	12 m.	6 m.

The only differences amongst the existing Canadian Colleges are—

- 1.—Queen's requires no lectures on Physiology or Institutes of Medicine, apart from Anatomy and Physiology, which McGill, Victoria, Toronto, and all the British Schools do.
- 2.—Victoria does not require Anatomy as distinguished from Practical Anatomy, which McGill, Queen's, Toronto, and all the British Schools do.
- 3.—Neither McGill, Queen's, nor Victoria requires Practical Chemistry, which Toronto and all the British Schools do, except Edinburgh and the Royal College of Physicians, London.
- 4.—Toronto only requires 6 months of Materia Medica, which is the highest amount required by any of the British Schools, whilst McGill, Queen's and Victoria require 12 months.
- 5.—Victoria requires 6 months and Queen's nothing in Medical Jurisprudence, as a separate subject, whilst Toronto, McGill, and all the English Schools require 3 months.
- 6.—Victoria requires 6 months of Pathology or Morbid Anatomy, whilst McGill, Queen's and Toronto, and all the British Schools, except Edinburgh and London, do not require it to be treated separately from General Anatomy.
- 7.—Victoria requires 12 months' attendance on Clinical Lectures, whilst Queen's and Toronto only require 6, and McGill College two courses of two hours a week, but in this respect Victoria is supported by the practice of the British Schools.

*II. Final Statement by Mr. Langton, made before the Committee, the
26th April.*

I can acquit myself of having given rise to any of the personalities which have unfortunately been introduced into the present investigation. The petitioners have brought forward certain arguments against the present constitution and management of the University, which I have met, with what success it is for the committee to judge. They have also adduced certain statements of fact and figures, to the accuracy of which I have demurred, but I have stated my objections as temperately as is consistent with my distinct denial of their truth. No attempt has been made to impugn the correctness of the figures I have given,—I allude principally to my statements as to the comparative cost of our Professorships, Examinations, and Scholarships, as compared with those of other Universities; but Dr. Ryerson has accused me of misleading the Committee on this latter point by confounding together University and College Scholarships. A reference to my evidence will show that I have in all cases, where instituting the comparison, shown the distinction in this respect, and have argued that our system of University Scholarships is much more liberal and more calculated to promote the end for which they were established, than when they are exclusively connected with a particular college.

In answer to the objections adduced against our system of options as unprecedented and injurious, I have shewn by a reference to the course prescribed in other Universities, and to the recommendations of the Royal Commissioners, that we are supported by the example of those whom we may well take as our models, in arranging a scheme by which an extended course of study may be combined with a thorough mastery of the special branches selected by the student. Here, also, Dr. Ryerson has attempted to show that, in quoting from the Commissioners on the Queen's University, Ireland, I have misrepresented their recommendations. But the passages which I have requested the clerk to read at the table, show that the subjects which they recommended should not be required from all students after the second year, embrace, as I stated, Classics, Mathematics and Modern Languages.

There is another part of my argument which is more a question of opinion than of fact, viz, the relative standard required by us and by other Universities. It will be admitted that the full course in each department, including Honour Work, is with us a high standard, and we have had students who would have distinguished themselves in any University, but it never was argued, and it would be absurd to suppose, that our students, as a rule, could compare with the picked men of Great Britain. What I have argued is this: (1) that we have wisely lowered the matriculation examination, which was too high; but that even now it is as high as it has been thought prudent to insist upon at home, being rather above that at London and Cork, and the only equivalent examination at Cambridge, though rather below that at Belfast, and the only equivalent examination at Oxford; (2) that the standard for a common degree is as high as in the British Universities; and (3) that the stage at which we permit students to branch off into the special

department each may select, is very similar to that already established in the same Universities, or strongly recommended by the Royal Commissioners. The relative difficulty of the subjects proposed for examination is, as I have stated, a matter of opinion, and can only be judged of by a scholar, and I therefore desire upon this point to take the evidence of a gentleman unconnected with the University, whose ability to speak upon the subject is well known to the Committee.*

* Vide evidence of E. A. Meredith, Esq., Assistant Provincial Secretary, *ante* p. 28.

ADDRESS

BY

DANIEL WILSON, LL.D.

PROFESSOR OF HISTORY AND ENGLISH LITERATURE,

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, TORONTO,

BEFORE

THE UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE.

REPORTED BY J. K. EDWARDS, ESQ.

MR. CHAIRMAN,

I observe from the minutes of this Committee, that you have now been sitting for a month, and up to this time no representative of University College has appeared before you. You wisely determined that those who have prayed for an enquiry into the management of the University and College should in the first place submit to you the grounds on which they preferred their charge against us, and that afterwards we should be heard in reply. I am deeply conscious of the responsibility of the position I occupy as the sole representative of University College. I should have been better pleased if some of my colleagues who have been longer in this country, and are more familiar with the habits of Canadian society and the feelings of Canadian legislators, had appeared in our behalf. Nevertheless, I feel this confidence that I have a good cause, which can be subjected to the closest investigation, without any apprehension on our part as to the result. Had I addressed you at an earlier stage, the many details of the course of study, the matriculation examinations, the honour work, &c., which have been objected to, would have naturally formed subjects of comment by me, but they have already been so ably dealt with by the Vice-Chancellor of the University that I feel myself at liberty to omit much, which at an earlier period I should have deemed it my duty to submit to the Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor.

As members of the Senate we have felt no slight satisfaction in having as our representative a gentleman who, after graduating in the University of Cambridge, has spent the most important years of his later life in Canada, and alike as a member of the Legislature, and in the occupation of offices of high trust and responsibility, has won for himself a character of undoubted probity and sterling worth. To our Vice-Chancellor, therefore, as one familiar with the details of the English Universities, I may fitly resign the defence of our Canadian system on all those points on which we have deliberately and advisedly departed from such ancient models. But there is one statement in your evidence, of a somewhat personal nature, to which it seems indispensable that I should refer at the outset.

The Rev. Dr. Ryerson has paid me the unlooked for compliment of selecting me as the foremost of "*several eminent individuals*," from whose writings he has presented extracts to you on the subject of education. As the passages will appear in his printed evidence, along with my own, I need not read the quotations, which occur in a review article, written upwards of four years ago. I presume it must be ascribed to some accidental oversight that he has represented two passages occurring in the same brief article, within a few pages of each other, as opinions published, the one in "March, 1856," and the other in "August, 1858." It is not always convenient, as Dr. Ryerson must by this time be well aware, to have the opinions of former years thus reproduced. Happily, however, those quotations express opinions which I still retain unchanged. But the Committee will form a very false idea of what these are, if they judge of them by the detached fragments of the article which have been selected by Dr. Ryerson as alone suited to the line of argument he has adopted. Reviewing certain educational papers, then recently published, and especially an exceedingly grandiloquent discourse delivered by the Chancellor of an American University, in which, while speaking of the English University system with great disparagement, he exhibited gross ignorance of all which specially pertains to it, I took occasion to commend the thoroughness of that system, in "the subjects specially cultivated," viz., classics and mathematics; and quoting the American scholar, Mr. Bristed's "Five years in an English University," where he describes the healthy and vigorous intellectual powers acquired by a Cambridge "honour man," I remarked, "to such a man of ripe mind and studious habits, the acquisition of a modern language such as the French or Italian is a mere pastime, and the German only a pleasant task. What would he say to the substitution of them by our university reformers as equivalents for the Greek and Latin—the sole keys to all the treasures of Theology, Philosophy and Science?"

An incompetent adviser on higher Education.

I desire to speak personally of Dr. Ryerson with the utmost respect. In the earlier years of my residence in Canada, I have been in habits of frequent friendly intercourse with him; and have been wont to look up to him as, to a great extent, the builder up of that unsectarian common school system of which Canada may well be proud. His very official

connexion with a non-denominational system of education so entirely in accordance with my own views, led me frequently to consult him on educational details in relation to the University, at a time when he had a seat on its senate, while I was excluded from it. But the duty I owe to the College, in the responsible position I here occupy, compels me to draw the attention of the Committee to the fact—forced into much more important prominence by the general nature of the evidence already given by Dr. Ryerson, and produced at his suggestion, than even by the use he has made of quotations from this slight article—that part at least of the otherwise unaccountable conduct he is now pursuing in his assault on our University system must be ascribed to his ignorance of the details of a College and University course, consequent on his never having enjoyed the advantage of a University education.

I say this in no disparagement of Dr. Ryerson; for if it were possible by such means to account for all that is otherwise indefensible in the course he has pursued before this Committee, his errors would be venial indeed. For it can be charged as blamable to no man, that he received his education in this province at a time when there was scarcely a grammar school within its borders. He is not to blame for this. But he is to blame for insisting on laying down the law on matters in which he has not had the slightest experience, and to men who have been trained in the best Universities of Great Britain. To this cause I must ascribe the fact that Dr. Ryerson was manifestly unaware of the distinction very clearly apparent to all familiar with the English University system, that my remarks referred exclusively to honour men.

I am confirmed in this belief by the quotation of another passage, from the very next page in which I referred to the fact that Oxford and Cambridge furnish professors of classics and mathematics—their own special departments,—to all schools and colleges of the empire. But what has this to do with Dr. Ryerson's views on options, matriculation, &c.? The present professor of mathematics in Edinburgh University, was a senior wrangler of Cambridge—the highest honour man of his year; but does Dr. Ryerson, therefore, assume that the poll men, who constitute the great majority of Cambridge students, would form “highly qualified teachers” even for common schools? And yet when I remember that in a letter Dr. Ryerson has given in evidence relative to his own scheme for grammar school scholarships in University College, *he actually proposes to complete their whole college education in a single year*,* I may assume

* Extract from a letter addressed to the Chancellor of the University of Toronto, by the Rev. Dr. Ryerson, March 23rd, 1857, containing his “Suggestions for the establishment of Exhibitions in University College, for Masterships of Grammar Schools; each to be of the value of £50, and tenable for one year only.”

“Each Exhibition to be bestowed upon the following conditions:

- “1.—The Exhibitioner must have taught a Common School in Upper Canada;
- “2.—He must have attended the Provincial Normal School at least one session;
- “3.—He must have been recommended by the Council of Public Instruction;
- “4.—He must engage to teach a Grammar School in Upper Canada for at least three or four years; and provide security for the fulfilment of this promise, or refund the amount of his Exhibition, with interest.

“One of the most pressing wants of the Grammar Schools, is that of duly qualified Masters. Several of the Schools are now closed on that account—the Boards of Trustees being unable to procure Masters qualified according to law.

“In our present Normal and Model Schools, and in our proposed Grammar School, the Exhibitors would receive a thorough preparatory training, both as students and

that he did so entirely misunderstand me as to interpret my remarks as equally applicable to every graduate of Cambridge or Oxford.

It could not need the weight of any testimony from me to confirm the value of the language of Plato and Aristotle, or of Cicero and Tacitus; nor was it for any such purpose it was quoted; but to make me appear, per force, as a witness in favour of the line of argument by which Dr. Ryerson has endeavoured to discredit the system of options adopted by the University of Toronto. The truth is, it is just because Latin was almost the sole language in which all works on Theology, Philosophy and Science were written; and that Aristotle constituted the recognised fountain head from whence they drew, that in the 16th and 17th centuries Oxford wisely gave the pre-eminence to classical studies in her University curriculum; and it is just because this has ceased to be the case, and that German and French are now the keys to so much modern Philosophy and Science, that all wise University reformers are learning to give to modern languages the place they justly claim in a liberal education.

A strange contrast.

In calling in question the system of options introduced into our University, Dr. Ryerson contrasted in very strong and unfavourable terms the advantages enjoyed by the students of Yale and Harvard Colleges in the United States, with the inferior and lowering system of Toronto University. He has spoken of Harvard and Yale, as if these American Colleges presented a course of instruction altogether superior to what we have been establishing for the benefit of Canadian youth. But yet in this very article from which he found it convenient to quote detached fragments of what I had written years ago, for a mere temporary purpose, it by no means tallied with his object to notice this passage quoted from Mr. Bristed, an honour graduate of Cambridge, and a distinguished American scholar of the present day. "Were I to be questioned," says he, "by an educated foreigner, Englishman or Frenchman, German, Hollander, or Dane, about the standard of Scholarship in our Universities in the United States, I would be obliged to answer it is exceedingly low. When I went to Yale College in 1835, the first thing that struck me was the classical deficiency of many of the students and of some of the

teachers, in all the subjects in which candidates are examined FOR MATRICULATION, into the University.

"With this preparation ONE YEAR'S ATTENDANCE AT UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, where, in addition to the able corps of Professors, so many advantages are enjoyed by students in the excellent apparatus provided, and in the valuable collections of the Museum and Library, WOULD ADMIRABLY QUALIFY THE EXHIBITIONERS FOR THE MASTERSHIPS OF GRAMMAR SCHOOLS. In some instances they would doubtless persevere until they obtained a degree."—*Evidence of Select Committee*, p. 53.

Compare this scheme of Dr. Ryerson's, of 1857, rejected by the University on account of the inadequate and lowering standard of education it proposed for Grammar School teachers, with his statement before the Committee, in 1860:

"The individuals connected with myself—the party unconnected with what may be called the National University of the country, stand as the conservators of a high standard of Education, and appear before you as the advocates of a thorough course of training that will discipline, in the most effectual manner, the powers of the mind, and prepare the youth of our country for those pursuits and those engagements which demand their attention as men, Christians, and patriots; while the very persons to whom has been allotted this great interest, this important trust, stand before you as the advocates of a reduction, of a puerile system which has never invigorated the mind, or raised up great men in any country."—*Dr. Ryerson's Reply—Evidence*, p. 141.

instructors. Harvard is no better off, and the state of other colleges through the country, many of which derive instructors from these two New England colleges, may be easily inferred."

Such is the impartial testimony of an American scholar with respect to those very American colleges which Dr. Ryerson has found it suit his purpose to laud, in contrast with Toronto University; the graduates of which, I hesitate not to say, would not only compare favourably, but would contrast strikingly in their attainments with the graduates of either Yale or Harvard. I may remark also that it is a curious illustration of Dr. Ryerson's knowledge of the requisites of a university scheme of education, to find him urging that whereas for a particular examination we name certain definite and prescribed portions of books on which the student shall be examined—thereby guaranteeing that those portions shall be well and thoroughly got up—Harvard requires the "whole" of Cæsar, and the "whole" of Livy, &c., instead of prescribing, in accordance with the practice of all the British Universities, certain portions, and ascertaining by examination that the student has thoroughly mastered them.

Unwise, because untenable Charges.

A great deal of work has been made in this discussion about the question of options. But I almost venture to think, from what I have already seen in relation to the feelings of gentlemen on both sides, that by this time there are some of those engaged in advocating the cause against which I have to defend University College, who regret that this question of options was ever brought up, or that they based their claims on untenable charges against us. You have before you the representatives both of Queen's and Victoria Colleges, and had they appeared here—as, had they been left to their own unbiased judgment, I believe they would have done—presenting their claims in the aspect in which Dr. Cook is now prepared to rest his cause; and saying: University education ought to be denominational, and that £2,500 added to the annual income of Queen's College, Kingston, would be a great advantage to its funds; these are simple propositions which you could have discussed temperately and impartially, and which we might have found it difficult effectually to resist. But those gentlemen, the representatives of Queen's and Victoria Colleges, have been betrayed against their better judgments into bringing up a set of charges against the University and University College of Toronto, which, I venture to say, are utterly untenable, and which the Principal of Queen's College has already declared himself ashamed of.

Our new Model for a Canadian University.

You had a curious exhibition before the Committee yesterday, which was to me, at least, exceedingly instructive. We had the pleasure of seeing the Provost of Trinity College, and one of the masters of Dr. Ryerson's model grammar school, formerly a professor of Trinity, cross-examined by the Doctor, on the peculiar characteristics and special virtues of Oxford and Cambridge Universities. You know, gentlemen,

what these Universities are—wealthily endowed institutions, where the accumulated bequests of centuries have been gathered together; where a large number of colleges are collected,* and where chiefly the aristocracy of England receive their education; colleges where, unless a man can give his son, at the very least, something like \$750 a-year, to sustain him during his brief term of residence, he had better keep him at home. And these are the institutions you are to accept as your models for training the youth of Canada in this nineteenth century! But, besides that, there was something amusing in the special points to which your attention was directed. I have no great familiarity with the systems of Oxford or Cambridge. I was educated in Scottish halls, and it must have been scarcely less puzzling to Dr. Cook and other gentlemen of Scottish university training, than to myself, while listening to Dr. Ryerson putting Provost Whitaker and Mr. Ambery through their questions as to the virtues of Acts and Opponencies at Cambridge, and Responsions and other mysterious forms of medieval Oxford, which have survived to our day; very admirable things, in their way, but on which I can profess to throw exceedingly little light. Dr. Ryerson, however, has got himself up on them; and, perhaps, if subjected to cross-examination, we might succeed in comprehending the merits of those precious relics of ancient Oxford, which are to invigorate and restore our University system. With regard to the system of options which we have introduced, I need not go into details, as these have been so well and so satisfactorily explained by the Vice-Chancellor. I would remind you, however, of this, that the very Act under which our University and College exist, specifies London University, and not Oxford or Cambridge, as our model,—London University, established in the nineteenth century, with a view to meeting all the advanced requirements of this age, rather than Oxford University, which is understood from vague tradition to have owed its origin to a meeting of three monks in a barn, some time in the good old times of the Saxon Alfred; and which from such practical characteristics as chiefly distinguish the men it turns out—notwithstanding some noteworthy exceptions—does not strike me as precisely the institution to be recommended to you as the model for a Canadian University.

* In his subsequent statement Dr. Ryerson remarks: "We are told that, by multiplying colleges we shall reduce the number of our students to an extent almost without precedent in any country;" and in refutation of this he quotes the list of sixteen Cambridge colleges, averaging thirty-one students each; and of twenty-four Oxford colleges, averaging eighteen students each, (by a strange misprint it appears in the evidence as 182!) But the deception of averages was never better shown. Those of Cambridge are made up with the help of the great open college of Trinity with its 151 new entries, and upwards of 400 undergraduates, and St. John's with its 97 entries. With such the following may make shift to pass muster: Christ's, 20; Clare, 19; Pembroke, 10; Trinity Hall, 10; King's, 4; Sidney, 8; Downing, 4.

As for Oxford, its list winds up with—St. Edmund's, 7; Corpus Christi, 6; Magdalene, 2; All Souls', 1; New Inn, 1; St. Alban's, 0.

These may suffice to illustrate the deception involved in speaking of the colleges of Canada, as though they were identical in any thing else but name with the wealthy corporations of Fellows and Scholars of Oxford or Cambridge. The fallacy is obvious to every English student, though it may deceive some Canadians. The Rev. Mr. Whittaker thus replies to a question of Dr. Ryerson:

"*Ques.* 321.—How many Scholarships are there belonging to the University of Cambridge?

Ans.—I cannot say; but the number of University Scholarships is small, as compared with the College Scholarships. *But the case is so unlike that of this country that there is no analogy.*"

The New Canadian System.

Returning, however, to the system of options, it is one which I feel assured only requires to be fully understood to recommend itself to acceptance, in the judgment of an intelligent body of Canadian legislators. It is very easy for a wealthy English nobleman or gentleman to send his son to Oxford or Cambridge, to devote three, four, or five years to acquiring the most critical mastery of Latin and Greek; to be utterly incapable of a false quantity; to be able to compose the most perfect Latin verse; and to prove, it may be, a thorough master in all the little niceties of classical refinement; and then, after he has sown his wild oats, and spent £700 or £800, or, perhaps, £1000 sterling, at college, to make up his mind what his special profession in life may be. But that is not what Canada requires. We want an educational institution which shall train our young men for the practical duties of life. And when the Legislature of Canada established anew Toronto University and University College, on the modern system of the University of London, I doubt not you endeavoured to select men to whose judgment you could entrust the arrangement of their details.

For I must crave your attention for a moment, while I correct an error, forced upon your acceptance in various forms. Neither the Senate of the University nor the College Council have presumed to dictate a system of education to this Province.* By the solemn Act of the Legislature, passed in 1853, the old system was abolished; and in lieu of its exclusively classical and mathematical training, the Legislature established chairs of Natural Sciences, Modern Languages, English Literature and History; and prescribed to the University of Toronto, that of London as its model. In full accordance with this, therefore, the Senate have aimed at establishing such a system of options as shall practically carry out the wishes of the Legislature, and give just encouragement to all those departments of knowledge. But so far have they been from ignoring or slighting classics and mathematics, that a double number of scholarships is apportioned to each of these subjects; and special encouragements are held out to the students to devote their chief energies to them throughout the course.†

* "Now, sir, I think that Dr. *Wilson*, and the other gentlemen to whom he referred, from whose attainments and abilities I wish to detract nothing, must themselves admit that they came to this country as teachers—he of English literature and language; the rest of certain other branches. He, however, seems to think they did not come for that purpose only, but for the more noble, exalted, almost legislative purpose of giving to the people of Canada a system of collegiate instruction. Dr. *Wilson* says,—Shall not we be entrusted with determining this question—we all graduates, we all men from old universities, and will you pretend, people of Canada, to dictate to us, learned persons, what kind of superior education shall be adopted for the training of your youth? *Sir, I went to Europe for the purpose of obtaining persons qualified for special work, but I did not go to them to dictate the kind of education to be given here or the manner of giving it. I procured them to carry out a system already devised for this country, not to dictate one to us, much less to do so in the assuming tone in which these words were addressed to you the other day.* I think these gentlemen, whatever may be their talents, whatever may be their attainments, mistook considerably the purpose for which they were brought to this country, when they set themselves up for judges as to what kind of superior education the people should receive from them."—*Dr. Ryerson's Reply—Evidence*, p. 144.

† By mixing up with the scholarships in the Faculty of Arts, those for Law and Medicine, with which University College can have no connexion, most exaggerated and false

The Professors.

And when the Legislature of Canada thus re-modelled its system of instruction, I am justified in presuming that it also endeavoured to select for its Professors men who could be entrusted with carrying out the details of such a system. I may be pardoned, therefore, if I make some special reference to what the men of University College actually are. We have at the head of the institution a gentleman who took the foremost rank in Trinity College, Dublin, carrying off the gold medal as the highest classical scholar of his year. In the Professor of Metaphysics we have a representative of the ancient University of Oxford; a representative of its special characteristics as well as of its learning. We have two graduates of Cambridge, both men who took distinguished honours in their respective years; Professor Cherriman, who not only attained high rank as a wrangler, but also obtained a fellowship in St. John's College, Cambridge; Dr. Croft, who, after receiving his earlier education in England, completed his studies in the famed University of Berlin, and mastered his special science of Chemistry under Mitscherlich, one of the most celebrated chemists of Europe. The benefits of his knowledge thus acquired you now enjoy in frequent cases in the courts of law, as well as in the College and University. Another of the College staff, Professor Hincks, resigned for his present duties the corresponding chair of Natural History, in Queen's College, Cork; and Professor Chapman—who as a Mineralogist takes a rank not inferior to any in the old world,—before he was transferred to a chair in Toronto, occupied with distinguished credit that of Mineralogy in University College, London. Of myself I may be permitted to say this at least, that having some familiarity with the specialities of our Scottish educational system, my experience may not be without its value, when added to that of others, looking on the requirements of our Canadian University from such varied points of view.*

I trust, therefore, it will not seem altogether unreasonable if we venture to appeal our case in this form—Are we not fit to be trusted with advising in some degree in reference to a course of study for Canadian students? Or do you believe a class of men thus selected from the

ideas of the number of scholarships have been circulated. The facts are these, in relation to the Faculty of Arts :—

At matriculation there are *three* scholarships for *general proficiency in the subjects appointed for all students*.

At matriculation, and in each subsequent year, there are *two* in *Greek and Latin classics*, *two* in *mathematics*, and *one* in each of : natural sciences; modern languages with history; of ethics, metaphysics, &c., and in oriental languages.

These, if held on the English plan, would only count as eight scholarships in all. But because the better plan has been introduced of compelling their holders to compete against all rivals, at the end of each year, this is made an excuse for counting each year as a distinct scholarship, when comparing it with those held for a term of years. The injustice and untruthfulness of this is obvious.

Again, it will be seen by the above scheme that double encouragement is held out to the pursuit of Classics and Mathematics, over all the other subjects, from the beginning to the end of the course.

* *Ques. 264.*—Notwithstanding all you have said to the disparagement of the institution, is it not the fact that University College has an able and efficient staff of professors, and do not the students attending it enjoy great advantages from the excellent apparatus, library and museum?

Dr. Ryerson's answer.—Yes. I entertain a high opinion of the professors at that institution, and I have always so expressed myself.

different Universities of Britain are likely deliberately to pursue a plan for deteriorating the education of this country, by admitting into the University youths not fit to enter a Grammar School, and by giving degrees to men whose inferiority will degrade the character of the University of our adopted country, and on which our own future reputation depends ?

I think I might fairly stake the whole question on such ground. But that is not the ground on which we shall appeal : for I maintain that the course we have adopted is one which will stand the thoroughest investigation. I know that during the time it was in deliberation, since I had a seat as member of the Senate, we have met week after week, and sat patiently over every detail of the system many a time long after midnight.

Conduct of Professors on the Senate.

It has indeed been strangely enough advanced by Dr. Ryerson, in his defence against certain complicity in objectionable acts of the Senate, that he, being appointed to a seat there specially in his official capacity as Superintendent of Education, attended rarely except when he had some particular purpose in view. It seems, moreover, that it is actually made a charge against certain of the Professors, that since our appointment as members of Senate, our names are to be found frequently on its sederunts ! I confess I have exposed myself to this charge. It has not been my practice to accept the membership of any Board without intending to fulfil its duties. During the whole time that I have been a member of the Senate, I believe I have only been absent twice from its meetings, and on those two occasions from indisposition ; and from the meetings of the College Council during the seven years that I have been a member of that body, I have, I believe, only been absent once. My colleagues could render a similar account of their stewardship. We have fulfilled our duties carefully and patiently, and have earnestly tried to mature a system of study adapted for Canada ; neither taking Oxford, nor Dublin, nor the Scottish Universities, nor the Queen's University of Ireland, as our sole model ; but trying to get from each what was specially fitted for the requirements of this new country, which occupies a position different from all.

The Matriculation Examinations.

We have also turned our attention to the condition of the Grammar Schools. And no fact is more obvious, or commends itself more clearly to your common sense, than this, that—if the University and College are to be for the benefit of the people at large—there can be no gap or interval between the Grammar Schools and the University. The Grammar Schools train the youth up to the point at which the University receives them, and are we to adopt a standard for matriculation placed at a point which these Grammar Schools cannot reach ? I hold in my hand the original matriculation examination of the University of Toronto,

inherited from the old King's College,* which, I do not hesitate to say, if persisted in by us, would have been the most solemn farce educated men ever attempted to perpetrate in a new country. It actually requires a youth at his examination for admission to the University to have read Homer's *Illiad*, Xenophon, Lucian, Virgil, Ovid, and, if he competed for a scholarship, to have read more of Homer, of the *Illiad* and *Odyssey* both. Horace's *Odes*, Virgil's *Ænied*, Ovid's *Fasti*, Lucian's *Menippus*—to have gone in fact through nearly all the chief classics of ancient times. That is a higher requirement than a man can take his degree not only in any University in Scotland, but in Oxford or Cambridge, or in the University of London, which has been expressly assigned by the Legislature as our model; and yet we are arraigned before you on the grave charge of venturing to depart from that extravagant model as the sole entrance examination of the University.†

In truth, gentlemen, if our examinations were to be strict, and *bona fide*, as we had resolved they should, we might just as well have literally nailed up the University door. When old King's College was practically confined to a small and exclusive class, and when Upper Canada College had its seventh form where youths were retained to their seventeenth or eighteenth year, and then transferred, with a College bursary or exhibition, to the higher institution, such a state of things was possible enough; and if it is desired that the old monopoly shall be restored, let us be informed of it, and our course will be an easy one. But meanwhile our decision has been, that if our true aim is to elevate the education of the whole province, we must provide a matriculation adapted to the specific capacity of the grammar schools. Any other system, while pretending to elevate education, must either have restricted its whole advantages to a favoured and wealthy few; or been a mere deceptive paper programme. We have therefore adapted our entrance examination to the schools of the country; and you heard yesterday the clear testimony of the Principal of Queen's College in favour of the course we have pursued; Dr. Cook having shown there that practical sense, and that appreciation of the true aspects of a collegiate system, designed, not for a class, but for the people

* Matriculation :—Greek and Latin languages, in 1847 :

† Homer, <i>Iliad</i> , B. I.	Horace, <i>Odes</i> , B. I.
Homer, <i>Odyssey</i> , B. IX.	† Sallust, <i>Bellum Catilinarium</i> .
† Xenophon; <i>Anabasis</i> , B. I.	† Ovid, <i>Fasti</i> , B. I.
† Lucian, <i>Vita</i> , <i>Charon</i> , and <i>Timon</i> .	Translation into Latin verse.
† Virgil, <i>Æneid</i> , B. II.	† Translation into Latin prose.

† The subjects marked thus are necessary for passing.

‡ "E. A. Merredith, M.A., of Trinity College, Dublin, examined :—

Ques. 522.—Did you obtain honors in that University?

Ans.—Yes, I obtained honors in the University at almost all the examinations of the undergraduate course, both in classics and mathematics, also a scholarship in classics, and a medal in science at the degree examination, besides some other honors.

Ques. 524.—Have you compared the matriculation examination of the University of Toronto with those prescribed in other universities, and what is your opinion of their comparative standards?

Ans.—I have compared it with the matriculation examinations at Cambridge, London, Cork, Belfast and Dublin. It seems to me to be about equal to Cambridge, rather greater than London, greater than Cork, less than Belfast, and less than Dublin.

It thus appears that, instead of lowering the standard, the present matriculation examination is higher than that of the University named in the act, viz., London.

at large, which I should have expected from a gentleman educated in a Scottish University.*

The System of Options.

With regard to options, our aim has been in like manner to devise such a course of study as would prove an effective source not only of intellectual culture, but would prepare the youth of Canada for the practical duties of life. The old classical course of Oxford is not fitted to accomplish that object. Notwithstanding the distinguished names to be found among the graduates of that University to which the sons of England's nobles almost exclusively resort—the majority of Oxford-trained students whom I have seen do not strike me as men whose University training seems to have had practical business and duties in view. Not a few of them rather seem like men who have just emerged from the cloister, and are far from being at home in the ordinary business of life. We therefore adopted a plan which the Commissioners of Oxford University have recommended for the improvement of that very institution; and some credit may be claimed for the men of your own Canadian University, that they have carried into practice what the wisest men connected with Oxford University are only yet recommending. They recommend that the young men attending Oxford shall at a certain point take options, under the advice of their tutors. That is precisely what our young men do. A youth enters our College and goes through the first two years of the course. He then comes to the President, or one of the Professors, for advice as to what options he shall take. The matter is very simply dealt with. He is asked what is your object in life? If you intend to be a medical man drop your Greek and Latin and go on with the Natural Sciences and Modern Languages, for every educated man in this country, and especially every medical man, ought to know at least French—which here is a spoken language—and German also. If the young man intends to become a theological student, to qualify himself for entering the ministry of any of our churches, then we say go on with your classics, your moral science, your mental philosophy. If he proposes to become a Grammar school teacher, we say—go on with your classics and mathematics.† If a Land Surveyor—devote your chief attention to your mathematics, geology, and

* The Rev. Dr. Cook, Principal of Queen's College, stated explicitly before the Committee his concurrence with Mr. Langton, in his views as to the proper matriculation examinations for the University, and the wise changes that had been made on the books required:—

Ques. 292.—On the 13th instant you were requested to put in writing some remarks upon the subject of matriculation. Have you done so? and if you have, please to put them in.

Ans.—I do not think the mere list of books which any college or university publishes as the subject of examination before admitting young men, gives any correct idea of the mental attainments of those who are admitted; that can only be learned from the actual examination, which might be very slight with a long list, and very thorough with a small one. I think one advantage of having all the colleges of the country affiliated under the University, would be to establish a uniform standard of attainment. *That standard would have to be fixed with a reasonable regard to the state of grammar school education in the province, and raised from time to time as that education admitted, and with a view of stimulating both teachers and scholars over the country to greater exertion.*

† A very unfair use has been made of a special exceptional case provided in the system of options, so as to misrepresent the whole. The principle laid down is that no undergraduate shall exercise any *options*, or, in other words, be permitted to select any portions of the University course, as specially adapted to his future aim in life, till the end of the

mineralogy. If a farmer—and I hope that is a class of students which will be found to multiply every year, for I trust we are to educate not merely professional men, but the youth of Canada generally; and men will make all the better farmers and merchants and tradesmen for having highly cultivated minds—if a farmer, we say, go on with Modern Languages, and still more with Natural Sciences, which will be of practical use to you in all the future duties of life. Is there not common sense in that? Is not that the most rational system for Canada, whatever may be the proper system for Oxford and Cambridge—a system which the Chief Superintendent of Education seems disposed to dictate to us and to you?

In reference to the whole system of options, I am surprised that the gentlemen who advocate the interests of Victoria and Queen's Colleges fail to perceive that, so far from involving any injustice to affiliated colleges with an inferior staff to University College, they are the very means of placing all on an equality. Under the University system of options, a college with only mathematical, classical, and mental philosophy chairs, may send its men to compete for first class honors, and to carry off the classical or mathematical scholarships, against the best of University College students with all their advantages of Modern Languages and Natural Sciences, which are unavailable in these special competitions. Permit me to add that no opinion is more unfounded than that which supposes that the Professors of University College desire any monopoly of the University of Toronto, its examinations, scholarships, or other privileges. The very article referred to by Dr. Ryerson was written with the earnest desire to bring about a union of Canadian Colleges under one University—as I venture to hope may be perceived by any candid reader who will pursue it as a whole, and not in imperfect and detached extracts.

Members of the Senate.

But it is a singularly one sided view of the case for the advocates of the interests of Victoria College to protest indignantly at certain Professors of University College—four in all—being admitted to the Senate of the University to which their College is attached, and for which alone it can train its students, while there were sitting on that same board the members of another, and independent University which disclaimed all collegiate relation to it. Before University College had more than its President on the Senate, there sat on that Board the Rev. Mr. Nelles, Principal of Victoria College, the Rev. Dr. Ryerson, a member of the College Board, and Dr. Barrett—who it has been found convenient to represent as a teacher in Upper Canada College—but who, it is well known, never had a seat at the Senate in any other capacity than as President of Dr. Rolph's or the Toronto School of Medicine; and who, as

second year. The only exception to this is in the case of a student who achieves the rank of first class in honors in *both Greek and Latin*, in mathematics, or in *both modern languages and natural sciences*. In mathematics, however, this is limited; and, by a special provision, applied mathematics is imperative on all in the second year. Again, it is obvious that no man taking first class honors in classics, is likely to drop the very subjects in which he is pre-eminent. In reality, the records of the University show that, from 1855 to the present time, only *eleven* in all have been in a position to avail themselves of this option; and of these only four have actually dropped classics; that is less than *one each year*. Yet it is by taking advantage of this rare exceptional case, and representing it as the rule, that the system of options has been so grossly misrepresented.

such, took his seat for the first time to represent the Medical Faculty of Victoria College at the meetings of the University of Toronto, while its students were systematically prevented from graduating there.

It may sound very plausible to those who know nothing about the facts of the case to talk of the injustice of four Professors sitting on a Board numbering forty-three members, which had the entire control of their courses of teaching and system of study. Let it be remembered, however, that until they were added to it, the seditious of the Senate frequently presented the anomaly of a University and College controlled in all their arrangements by those who systematically withheld, not only the students of Cobourg, but the medical students of Toronto, from the very University over which they exercised so much control. Had Victoria, Queen's, or Trinity College actually recognised the University as such, while maintaining a thorough independence as separate Colleges, the Senate would never have been driven to the necessity of giving so large a share in the oversight of the University examinations to Professors of University College; although, as I shall hereafter show, the amount of this share has been greatly exaggerated. If, as seems inevitable in the present condition of Canada, Professors must be appointed examiners, they would have been selected equally from all the colleges; but it is a proposition which no reasonable man could entertain, that the Professors of such Colleges should—as they now do—examine their own students, confer degrees on them by right of their own university powers, and even establish a faculty at the seat of the University of Toronto, so as to confer the degrees of Victoria College on Toronto students—and yet that they should also be the governors and examiners, or electors of the examiners, of the University they disown.

Had the various denominational Colleges acted up to the idea implied by the University of London, with its numerous and varied privately endowed Colleges, as the model of the Canadian Provincial University, the system could easily have been worked so as to satisfy all as to thorough impartiality in the constitution of the Senate, the appointment of examiners, and the distribution of honors and prizes. But, on the contrary, the Provost of Trinity refused to take his seat on the Senate; the Principal of Queen's practically adopted the same course; and the Principal of Victoria—while sharing in the government of the University, and fixing the course of studies of the College—only lent the aid of his wisdom and experience, but refused all practical co-operation. Nevertheless, the Senate, in its anxious desire to secure a thoroughly impartial system of examinations, has, in spite of those obstacles, appointed Professors of both Victoria and Queen's Colleges as its examiners, as it has selected others wherever they could be found at once competent and impartial.

No Monopoly Desired.

Again, let me say for myself and my colleagues in University College, we have no desire to monopolize the endowments of the Provincial University. Let the just and proper costs of maintaining the College in a state of efficiency be properly ascertained, with some adequate regard to future requirements, and, whatever be the legitimate objects on which to expend the surplus funds, the College can advance no claim to them.

The statements made to you with regard to the cost of our College represent it as nearly double what it actually is. But as for the surplus, it is for the Legislature to determine what shall be done with it. I should be delighted to see an adequate specific endowment set apart for us, in such a way that, if we exceeded the appropriation, we should make up the difference out of our own salaries; but also with the proviso that, if we were able to retrench, we should have liberty to expend the balance in improving the efficiency of the institution. At present, it is provided that, if we save any money, it is only that thereby it may pass away for ever from the funds of the Institution to which we belong. We are men, and that must be an unwise system to place us under which provides that the more we economise, the more we lose.

Shall we revive State-Church Colleges?

But it does not follow, because we say we have no desire to ask a dollar more than is absolutely necessary for our fair and legitimate expenditure—it does not necessarily follow that the University Act of 1853 designed, or that wise policy requires, that the surplus should be expended on denominational colleges. In the memorial presented on behalf of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference to the Legislative Assembly, praying for an investigation into the manner in which the University Act has been administered, the memorialists declare their entire approval of our Canadian “National School System.” Nevertheless, they affirm that “the same considerations of fitness, economy, and patriotism which justify the State in co-operating with each school municipality to support a day school, require it to co-operate with each religious persuasion, according to its own educational works, to support a college. The experience of all Protestant countries shows that it is, and has been as much the province of a religious persuasion to establish a college, as it is for a school municipality to establish a day school; and the same experience shows that while pastoral and parental care can be exercised for the religious instruction of children residing at home and attending a day school, that care cannot be exercised over youth residing away from home, and pursuing their higher education except in a college where the pastoral and parental care can be daily combined.”

That the experience of all Protestant countries is entirely misrepresented in the above statement, I think might almost be appealed to the common sense interpretation of it. What is the relation between school municipalities and religious persuasions? Is there any relation between the superior body, a religious persuasion, and the inferior body, a school municipality? The relation between a denominational body, such as the Wesleyan Methodists, the United Presbyterians, the Church of England, or the Church of Scotland, and an inferior body, is the relation between that denomination and its various congregations. And moreover that is the very principle which the Protestant and Roman Catholic advocates of Separate Schools are maintaining. We have in Toronto, besides University College, Trinity College, which will give a degree to no man who does not declare himself a member of the Church of England; and different congregations of that body, Holy Trinity, St. James's and St. George's, are maintaining denominational schools, and are trying, under the guidance of able legal advisers, to prove that they have a right to a Separate School

System; and such is truly the logical following out of the argument proposed in the memorial of the Wesleyan Conference. But there is in reality no relation between a religious denomination and a municipality. The analogy of a municipality with its Common and Grammar Schools carries us at once to a Provincial University as the superior body.

British University Reforms.

But let me turn to another view of the case in relation to the supposed teachings of the modern experience of protestant countries. Let me refer to the recent University reforms at home. An appeal to the examples of Oxford and Cambridge on those points, is out of place in the present enquiry—if for no other reason—on this ground, that so far are these from being educational institutions, open to the people at large, they have been until recently exclusively, and are still to a great extent, limited to one favoured denomination,* while they are accessible to the wealthy alone—the lowest estimated cost for a student during the academic year being \$750. Nevertheless, although they are still recognised appendages of the Church of England, the whole tendency of recent changes has been towards the removal of their denominational features, and their restoration to the nation at large, without distinction of sect or party.

* In discussing this question of *Tests*, the all important distinction between tests for *Teachers*, and tests for *Students* was evaded. Dr. Ryerson quotes a statute abolishing the B. A. test at Oxford, and then triumphantly exclaims: (*Evidence*, p. 151.)

“So, Sir, even at Oxford itself, that Alma Mater of the ‘Relics of the dark ages,’ this test has been abolished. In the Scottish Universities, while *the test* has been done away with too, the Church of Scotland has a Theological Faculty just as the Church of England has Theological Professors at Oxford.”

This reference to “*the Test*,” as though the two things were analogous, must be ascribed either to gross ignorance or wilful misrepresentation. In the Scottish Universities, *Tests for Professors* have been recently abolished. No *Tests for Students* have existed there for generations. But Dr. Ryerson does not seem to be at all aware of the significance of abolishing the Oxford *Students’ Test* at the preliminary B. A. Degree, or to know that the Oxford M. A. is still obliged to subscribe to the Thirty-Nine Articles, and the three articles of the 36th Canon of the Church of England. Hence, though a Non-Conformist may take his B. A. Degree, he does not thereby acquire the privileges of a Graduate. He cannot be a Member of Convocation; neither can he be admitted to any office for which the B. A. degree formerly qualified, without subscription of the Articles. Moreover, at Oxford, even now, only persons “*extra ecclesiam Anglicanam*,” can be exempted by a certificate from the head of their College, from *examination in the Thirty-Nine Articles*, of course with the liability to rejection if their answers are not satisfactory. But the matter is best illustrated by facts. Sir Culling Eardley, after passing all requisite examinations, left Oxford in 1827, without graduating, in consequence of conscientious scruples about signing the Thirty-nine Articles. After the passing of the recent act, he applied for his Degree, and was, by the present Master of Oriel, referred to the statutes, which recognise no scruples of conscience in members of the Church. Nor did he obtain his Degree!

But besides this direct enforcement of tests, there are other means at Oxford and elsewhere, quite as effective as prescribed articles or creeds. It was attempted to be shown, by the absence of any Undergraduate Test, at Trinity College, Toronto, that denominational Colleges are not practically sectarian. But the Rev. Provost Whitaker stated the true bearings of the case with honourable candour; as in the reply to the following question:

Ques.—360. “At the present moment, there is no test nor other impediment to a student not a member of the Church of England, going through the whole course of study at Trinity College up to the period of taking his B. A. Degree, except that, if it be an impediment, of attending Chapel?”

Ans.—“None, but he must attend chapel and the lectures on the Catechism, and Articles of the Church of England.”

Such, therefore, are the educational reforms recommended for Upper Canada by its Chief Superintendent, as a beneficial substitute for our present unsectarian and truly Provincial Grammar School, College, and University system.

In Scotland, however, where the Universities are strictly people's colleges, adapted to the educational wants, and to the pecuniary means of the great mass of the community, recent proceedings furnish the best illustration of "the experience of Protestant countries," in reference to its being the "supposed province of a religious persuasion to establish a College." The Scottish Presbyterian Church being the legally recognised religious persuasion of that country, its Church Courts exercised the denominational oversight over the colleges of the country; and no Professor could be inducted into a Chair without first signing the Westminster Confession of Faith. The consequence was, that during the greater part of the present century the denominational restrictions thus imposed on Professors came to be recognised as the greatest of educational grievances, and a serious bar to the filling of University chairs with the men best qualified for the various branches of secular education. But an important religious revolution took place in Scotland within the last quarter of a century, by the disruption between the Scottish Established Church, and that large body of conscientious non-conformists, who separated from it on important questions, not of doctrine, but of discipline and relation to the State; and that body, the Free Church, showed their practical zeal and earnestness by raising £30,000, with which they erected the New College, Edinburgh, a beautiful and ornate building—designed to be not a mere theological, but a complete collegiate institution for secular training. Chairs of natural history, logic, metaphysics, and moral philosophy, were filled by able men, for whom salaries were provided on a more liberal scale than those now paid to the Professors of University College, Toronto;—a chair of chemistry was also in contemplation; and a complete organisation was thus provided for the permanent establishment of a rival denominational college. Fortunately for Scotland, at this stage of her University system, the Act was passed which, by abolishing all religious tests for secular chairs, entirely deprived them of their denominational character. In the Scottish universities as now constituted, the Theological Faculty exists as a part of the Established Church; but in the Faculties of Art, Law, and Medicine, every trace of denominational oversight has been removed. And what is the result? How did the judgment and discretion of Protestantism in Scotland pronounce on the system? The result has been that the New College, Edinburgh, has ceased to be more than a Theological College for the clergy of its own church. The chairs of Moral Philosophy, Metaphysics, and Natural History, successively became vacant, and were not filled up; the students of that denomination, as of all other Scottish denominations, receive all their secular education in the common halls of the University of Edinburgh; and it is regarded by every layman in Scotland, be he Churchman or Dissenter, as one of the greatest blessings of the Scottish University system, that men, whatever be their opinions, and those qualifying to be clergymen, for whatever church intended, are trained in the same university halls, under the same rule; so that those who are to mix afterwards in the various walks of life, in the discharge of its great and practical duties shall not inherit little sectional prejudices, which under the best denominational system men must acquire, when trained exclusively among those of their own peculiar opinions.* But no one, familiar with Scotland, will say that men

* In 1828, a series of letters was published by the Rev. Dr. Ryerson, addressed to the Hon. and Rev. Dr. Strachan. One of these letters, VIII., is devoted to *The University*:

under that training grow up indifferent as to denominational views, or less earnest and sincere in their religious opinions, or that they lapse into any lukewarm indifference which sacrifices faith and conscience; but, on the contrary, morality and religion flourish best under that very non-denominational system.

The last relic of the denominational university system of Scotland, in connexion with her secular education, has been swept away during the past year, by the Act which throws the Principalships of the Universities open to laymen, without respect to their denominational views or religious opinions. Now, accordingly, in the Scottish Universities, as in our Canadian Provincial College, "no religious tests or professions of religious faith are required of any professor or lecturer, nor are any religious observances, according to the forms of any particular religious denomination, imposed on them." The precise words of the Toronto University Act would, in fact, equally apply to the Faculties of Arts, Law, and Medicine, in the Scottish Universities. Thus all denominational oversight and control have been withdrawn from them.

Is Canada to Return to the worn-out System of Medieval Europe?

Yet what has been abandoned there, your Superintendent of Education urges you to perpetuate here, along with the Acts and Opponencies, the Optimes and Responsions inherited from medieval centuries by Oxford and Cambridge. In Great Britain most of the older educational institutions were founded before it was a Protestant country, and all of them in connexion with an established Church. The exclusive principles on which such were administered, in England especially, compelled the conscientious nonconformists to establish schools and colleges of their own; not because they objected to the national Universities, but because they were forcibly excluded from them. But it surely would be a strange infatuation for a new country like Canada, altogether free from that element which now shackles and complicates every effort in Great Britain for the development of a truly national system of public instruction, to transplant

and the terms in which Oxford and Cambridge are there condemned as utterly unfit to be the models for Canada contrast strangely with their laudation now, as the perfection of all examplars. An extract or two may be of use to throw light on the singular changes that have since taken place:

"So bound up in bigotry were the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and so opposed to evangelical piety, that Locke, that great light of his day, and benefactor of the literary and Christian world, was expelled from their priest-governed halls; and the memorable John Wesley, together with several others, equally eminent for their holy deportment, shared the same fate, for singing hymns, reading and expounding the scriptures in private houses."

A Review article is then quoted with entire approval, as stating, "without the least fear of contradiction, that there is absolutely no religion taught, and no attention to its observances inculcated," notwithstanding the daily attendance at chapel, and other provisions for their own denomination at Oxford and Cambridge.

But the following double quotation is much more comprehensive in its bearings. Addressing the Hon. and Rev. Dr. Strachan, he proceeds:

"You say,—'In Edinburgh, Episcopalian youth go to the University for science and literature, but for religious instruction they attend Dr. Walker, an eminent divine belonging to the Episcopal Church.' *Why may not Episcopalian, as well as the youth of other denominations, be instructed after a similar arrangement in Canada?*"—*Dr. Ryerson's Letters*, p. 40.

Whence the marvellous change of sentiments since the above pertinent question was asked?

to its free soil the rival sectarian educational institutions which are only defensible by reason of the injustice that closed the halls of Oxford and Cambridge against all but the adherents of one favoured church.

But the most recent action in England has been to a great extent in the strictly non-denominational direction ; and since the establishment of the University of London on a truly liberal and national basis, colleges have been founded and liberally endowed, entirely independent of denominational control or supervision, such as those of Hull, Wakefield, Cheltenham and Manchester. University College, London, had already been established by private enterprise, before the State provided the requisite University organisation. But that done, the separate colleges, whether denominational or otherwise, were left in Britain to rely for their support on the liberality of a wealthy country. In Ireland, however, it was otherwise ; for there, as in Canada, the private wealth was wanting, and the State founded and endowed both the Colleges and the University, and placed their honors and advantages alike free to all.

Such institutions the State may justly endow with public funds, and it is for the members of a free community for whom such inestimable advantages are secured, to place such national institutions under the control of a governing Board, which shall adequately represent the wishes and desires of a Christian people in relation to all the essential non-sectarian questions which pertain to the discipline and training of the rising generation. But in a free country like ours, where the separation between Church and State is absolute, the existence of a Church Institution, supported by the State, is an *incongruity* ; the supervision of it by the State is an *impossibility*.

Denominational Colleges and their Tests.

The tendencies suggested by modern experience in relation to national Universities and superior education, are abundantly illustrated by the new Universities and Colleges of England and Ireland ; the removal of all denominational restrictions from the faculties of arts, law, and medicine, in the Scottish Universities ; and the throwing open to all denominations the privileges of Oxford and Cambridge. It is manifestly, therefore, totally at variance with facts to say that "the experience of all Protestant countries shows that it is, and has been, as much the province of a religious persuasion to establish a College, as it is for a School municipality to establish a school," unless by such statement a mere denominational theological institution is meant. On the contrary, the experience of Canada sufficiently illustrates how "religious persuasions," by going out of their province, and interfering with secular education, may retard the development of a well organised system for a whole generation.

That Queen's College, Canada, is purely the educational institution of the denomination under whose control it exists, is shown by the report presented to the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada, on the 25th of May last ; which, if reported correctly in the public prints, stated the number of students in attendance as eleven in theology, and fifty-three in arts ; but added : "*In all, forty-five are studying for the Ministry.*"

Credit has been repeatedly claimed of late for Victoria College, that it has no tests, but such a statement is a mere play upon words. What real difference is there between requiring that a Professor shall sign the pre-

scribed creed of a Church—be it the Thirty-nine Articles, or the Westminster Confession of Faith—or that he shall satisfy the Wesleyan Conference, or other Ecclesiastical Court? In reality, the latter is the more stringent of the two.

I speak on this subject feelingly, for I have reason to feel strongly upon it. I had a brother once, a man of high personal character and blameless life, admitted to be one eminently distinguished among the scientific men of his native land—and from among whom he has recently passed away, mourned with an earnestness of public grief not often manifested even for Scotland's most gifted sons—yet that man was long shut out from honors justly his due, and many students were deprived of his instructions in his favourite science, because he was too conscientious to make falsely or carelessly a declaration of faith in the prescribed tests of the dominant Church. It was not because he was indifferent to religion that he was thus excluded, for no more earnest Christian was to be found among British scientific men; and when at length better times came, and such antiquated absurdities of the dark ages were swept away by the abolition of all religious tests in the Scottish Universities, he was appointed to a chair in his own University of Edinburgh; and was acknowledged there, not only as one of the most distinguished men of science, but as one of the most upright and conscientious Christian men of his day.

But, again, it is affirmed that Victoria College is not sectarian, but provincial, because, it is said, the President of the Executive Council, the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, and other high official dignitaries are named on the College Board. Might it not be well to ascertain how often they are named on its sederunts? I put the question to the Rev. Mr. Ormiston, formerly a Professor of Victoria College, and his answer was that during the years he sat on its board he never saw one of them, or heard of their being summoned to its meetings. For any practical purpose, therefore, the Archbishop of Canterbury, or the Lord High Chancellor of England might as well be named for the duty. But meanwhile, this is unquestionable, that the Victoria College Board is one of the Committees annually appointed by the Wesleyan Methodist Conference, and that no man can be appointed to one of its Chairs who does not satisfy the requirements of the Conference, or its appointed delegates; nor can any doubt exist that the whole management is in the hands of the Wesleyan denomination,—a Christian body justly held in admiration for its earnest zeal and self-denying missionary labours; but not therefore to be selected from among other denominations for State patronage, or educational oversight, in a country where all connexion between Church and State has been utterly abolished.

Victoria College.

In Victoria College there is, of course, no test for students. It is only too well known, that—not in Methodist Colleges only, but also in Roman Catholic Colleges—all are welcome who are prepared to submit to their teaching. But from the return made to Parliament in 1856, the denominational statistics present the significant figures relative to the matriculated students of Victoria College of twenty-eight Wesleyan Methodists to three Presbyterians, one Church of England, and one Baptist. Or, again, taking the whole pupils in the institution, there were only 39 be

longing to other denominations, including children at the preparatory school, while 190 were Wesleyan Methodists. It is stated in the Conference Memorial that no aid is asked "towards the support of any Theological School or Theological Chair in Victoria College;" and Mr. Nelles, in answer to the question, "Is there any Theological Chair, or Divinity students in Victoria College?" replies: "Neither. We have students attending the College who are preparing for the ministry, but are not pursuing theological studies, but general studies; and are not known in the College as Divinity students, but as general students. They receive no allowance or consideration from the funds in any shape whatever." It appears, however, from the 7th of the Miscellaneous Resolutions adopted by the Wesleyan Conference at its last meeting, that "when preachers on trial are allowed to attend Victoria College for two years during their probation, the two years shall be counted but as one year in their probation." Again, in answer to the thirteenth question:—"How are the ministers and preachers stationed for the ensuing year?" "Under-graduates and students" to the number of twenty, are named in the "Cobourg District" as at Victoria College. In the previous year, 1858, they numbered seventeen; and in the report furnished by the President of Victoria College to the Conference in the same year, he remarks: "Judging from present indications, the College is destined to furnish very valuable accessions to the Christian Ministry, and the attention of the Conference and the Church is earnestly invited to this important result, as a reason for more ardent and united exertions in behalf of the Institution." It is obvious, therefore, that whatever difference may be entertained as to the designation of "preachers on trial during their probation" at Victoria College, that is the Wesleyan denominational college. It supplies for the Wesleyan Methodist Church the same purposes as Queen's College does for the Presbyterian Church of Canada. Accordingly, in the same report of the Principal of Victoria College to the Wesleyan Conference, Mr. Nelles, says: "It is necessary to show that our college is a *connexional necessity*—that it is an essential part of our machinery as a Church—that without it we shall either lose our youth, or retain them in a state of mental and social inferiority—that without it our ministers will suffer in numbers and efficiency—that without it in fine, we shall be unequal to the great work God has assigned us in Christianising this extensive country."

Sectarian or Denominational?

We may dispute about the meaning of such terms as sectarian and denominational, but if a college is a "connexional necessity," and if the number of ministers of the denomination fall off if that college be not supported, it matters little by what convenient name you may agree to designate it. But when you remember that this college is connected with one of the most influential and most earnest religious communities in the country, whose zeal in sustaining missions and a numerous body of clergymen, and in all the onerous duties of a Christian Church, is unsurpassed by any denomination in the Province, and yet that this college cannot obtain the means of support,—it proves that, while some leaders of the body, or some officials of the college, may regard it as a connexional

necessity, the people at large are of a different opinion ; and, as is shown even by the presence of their sons at University College in annually increasing numbers, they are perfectly satisfied with our Provincial collegiate system. The efforts of the Conference to uphold the College, for the purpose of maintaining the efficiency of their denomination, may be highly laudable, in a strictly denominational point of view, and worthy of praise when effected by the denomination to be thus benefitted. But it cannot be the function of the State to prevent the Wesleyan Church losing its youth as church members, any more than to assist it in other religious and missionary work ; unless it is also prepared to re-assert the principle it has disavowed, in the abolition of all State provision for religion in Upper Canada.

Is our Provincial School System to be abolished ?

Again, returning to the consideration of the statements already quoted from the memorial of the Wesleyan Conference, a complete fallacy is involved in the attempt to apply certain characteristics of our Common Schools to the whole provincial system of education. It is true that our Common Schools, being easily multiplied in every district, are mere day schools ; so that the attendance there does not deprive the pupils of daily parental or pastoral care and religious instruction ; but such is not, and never can be the case, with the Grammar Schools, the Provincial Normal School, or the Model Grammar School. In order to attend each of these, pupils necessarily leave their parents' homes, and are placed, some of them under a system greatly less conducive to strict moral and religious oversight, than that which is secured by the system of University College, as applied to its resident students.

In the Model Grammar School, for example, established under the authority of the Chief Superintendent of Education at Toronto, it is expressly provided that pupils shall be received from every part of the Province ; and thus necessarily be removed from daily parental and pastoral instruction and oversight. Yet its establishment and supervision are equally independent of any religious persuasion ; and it is placed under the authority of the Council of Public Instruction, a public board constituted on nearly the same principle as the Senate of Toronto University. The same remarks equally apply to the Normal School, to which is entrusted the all important function of training teachers for the whole Common Schools of the Province ; nevertheless no difficulty appears to have arisen hitherto from the adoption, in those institutions, of one national system instead of a denominational and necessarily sectarian one. But if the principle now affirmed, is to be carried out, instead of the Province maintaining at a reasonable expense, one efficient Model Grammar School, Normal School, and College ; which are abundantly sufficient to meet the present demand for the departments of higher education embraced by them, it must multiply such institutions in the same ratio as all denominational colleges, "now established or which may be established in Upper Canada ;" or even in each city of Upper Canada. Or, are we to be seriously told that so long as the youth of Canada are under the care of Dr. Ryerson, no matter what the system may be, all is religious and moral ;

but with the same system in the hands of the provincial professors, all is goddess and naught.*

The course pursued by the British Parliament in all recent reforms of higher education, as exemplified, not only by the new Scottish Universities Act, but also by the establishment of the Queen's University in Ireland, and the London University in England—abundantly proves how thoroughly British Statesmen are alive to the importance of all the members of a free community receiving their secular education in national, rather than in denominational institutions, and being thereby trained to co-operate in all the great public duties that devolve on a free people.—The Queen's University in Ireland is designed to extend the same advantages of University degrees and honors to students of all denominations, as is done by Toronto University; but the public endowment is entirely devoted to the national, non-denominational Queen's Colleges, founded on precisely the same principle as our Provincial University College, at Toronto. In England also, the London University confers degrees and university honors on students presenting themselves at its examinations, from Episcopalian, Roman Catholic, Presbyterian, Wesleyan Methodist, Congregationalist, Baptist, and other denominational colleges; but these neither receive nor claim any other share of the university funds, excepting the common right enjoyed, not only by all their students, but by every one possessed of the requisite knowledge wheresoever acquired, to compete for the University Scholarships. In these respects, therefore, the University of Toronto fully carries out the plan adopted by London University, and also by the Queen's University of Ireland. It also fulfils the purposes of its institution as set forth in the preamble of the Act, in placing within the reach of every youth of the Province, wheresoever educated, "facilities for obtaining those scholastic honors and rewards, which their diligence and proficiency may deserve."

* That our unsectarian Grammar School system must stand or fall with our Provincial and unsectarian University and College system, is abundantly apparent from the following remarks in Dr. Ryerson's reply (Evidence, p. 170,) so totally the reverse of his defence of the provincial system in the Educational Reports of earlier years. It is consistent, however; for if Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Methodists and Roman Catholics are to divide among them the University endowment, on what principle is that of the grammar schools to be withheld?

"Granting that a defect exists in the grammar schools, that the primary education does not afford sufficient opportunities for religious instruction, is it not all the more important, as every good parent must feel, that religious instruction should be afterwards given to that part of our youth who are to give character and heart to, and to be the leaders of our country? When our sons go away from immediate parental and pastoral authority, to train their minds for becoming the instructors and guides, if not the rulers of the province in future years, is it not most important that every possible care should be taken to give them every facility for obtaining religious instruction to form their character? If there is a defect in our grammar schools, it is a reason for remedying it at our colleges."

Again, the Principal of Queen's College lays down as the only security for education, (Ques. 86,) "having men enjoying the confidence of the religious bodies to which they belong." And that this idea embraces not only our grammar, but our common school system, will be illustrated by the following views of Baron Alderston, quoted by Dr. Cook, as best expressing his opinions in reference to the importance of the religious opinions of professors:—"They will add, 'give secular instruction in common.' I believe that to be impossible, because all learning and all science may be so taught, and in fact must be so taught as to include in it some perversion or true teaching of religion. An unbeliever teaching a boy arithmetic may insinuate that the doctrine of the Trinity in unity is not true, and geology may be taught so as to throw doubts on the Bible."

EXAMINERS AND EXAMINATIONS.

I must now return to a matter, personal not to myself, but to the whole staff of Professors whom I represent, and that is the question of Examiners and Examinations. No charge has been more strongly brought against us than that founded on the alleged partiality and unfairness of Professors examining their own students. At one aspect of this charge I have already glanced. That the principle, however questionable in theory, has many practical reasons in its favour, is proved by the fact that at McGill College, Trinity, Queen's, and Victoria College, this practice is the rule. Dr. Cook and others have admitted that only Professors and practical teachers are qualified for the duty, and from among such our examiners are annually selected with anxious care, and placed in the examination hall along with the Professors, with co-ordinate power, and full control of all examinations. Professors of Trinity, Victoria, Queen's and Laval Colleges have all been nominated and invited to act as examiners; and, instead of the Professors monopolising the appointments and examination fees, as has been most unjustly represented to you, out of twenty-six examiners in 1858, and twenty-two in 1859, nine only in each year were Professors of University College.

To us, moreover, the complaints of the representatives of Victoria and Queen's Colleges, appear peculiarly unfair on this point. For, what are the real facts of the case? The Legislature appointed the Senate of Toronto University, with power to establish scholarships and name examiners. University College adapted itself to the system, but no other college did so, or at least none having University powers. St. Michael's College, Knox's College, the United Presbyterian Institution, and the like, affiliated; but Queen's, Victoria, and Trinity all refused. The Provost of Trinity College declined to attend. The President of Queen's College took no notice of our invitations. The Principal of Victoria College did indeed vote upon our plans and proceedings in arranging our course of study, but he never sent students to compete; and Dr. Ryerson himself was either the mover or seconder of the first resolution which not only appointed the Professors of University College as examiners, but named the very Professors who should act. If he saw it to be wrong in the abstract, he must at the same time have seen it to be an inevitable necessity.

It has been charged also that we receive fees for examining our own students. Let me state in the first place that all our college examinations are quite independent of this. We do receive a fee of £20 for conducting a totally distinct series of University examinations—and for this enormous fee I have read answers to nearly 10,000 questions, and these the answers, not of my own students exclusively, but of students also from all other colleges and schools, as well as of the candidates in the faculties of law and medicine, whose examinations all include subjects in arts. I may also add that among the examiners of the London University, Professors of the colleges are named; while in the Queen's University—which in relation to the peculiar circumstances of the country, and the national non-denominational colleges connected with it, more nearly resembles our Provincial University and College—the Professors of the Queen's Colleges are systematically appointed members of the Examining Board. It is easy for Oxford and Cambridge, with a large

staff of wealthily endowed fellowships and numerous resident graduates, to place any restrictions they may please on the choice of examiners; but the Queen's University has been compelled to resort to the Professors of the National Colleges, as those best qualified for the duties, until such time as a numerous class of well-trained graduates shall enable them to adopt a wider choice; and in this respect the University of Toronto labours under still greater disadvantages, and a more absolute necessity for resorting to the same source for well qualified and experienced examiners.

Had such Canadian Colleges as Trinity, Victoria and Queen's, become, in the true sense, Colleges of the University, instead of being, as they are, distinct and rival Universities, each with its own Examining Board, Convocation and body of graduates, the difficulty would have been easily solved, as already observed, by apportioning the appointments on the Examining Board equally among the Professors of all the colleges, as is done in the Examining Board of the Queen's University of Ireland. This, however, has hitherto been rendered impossible by the relations maintained by those colleges as independent Universities; and I can only say, that if the Senate can find the requisite number of well qualified examiners, fit and willing to undertake the duty, I know that I speak the minds of my colleagues in University College, as well as my own wish, in saying that we shall heartily welcome the change as a most acceptable relief to ourselves, and a great improvement on the present system. If such appointments are made, it will then be seen by those who undertake the arts examinations, not only in the faculty of arts, but also of law and medicine, how entirely the statement is founded on error which represents the Professors of University College as receiving the examination fee for reading the papers of their own students.*

IMPARTIALITY AND STRICTNESS OF EXAMINATION.

But meanwhile I must be permitted to avail myself of this occasion to assert in the most unqualified terms, that the examinations of the University have been conducted with a strictness and impartiality that may

* Examinations are conducted by the Professors of the College, in each of their classes; preparatory to the terminal examinations at Christmas and Easter, by which the College honours and prizes are determined. These are totally independent of the subsequent University Examinations, at which candidates, not students of the College, present themselves; and from which all students of the College, not undergraduates in the University, are excluded. Dr. Ryerson, when commenting before the Committee on the College "*Family Compact*," as he styled it, remarked,

"How far the interests of the College family have been consulted, I need not further remark; and I have shown, in a statement to which neither Mr. Langton nor Dr. Wilson has ventured to refer, that the Professors of the College family at Toronto, have consulted their convenience, by giving themselves two months less work each year, and twelve hours less work each week of that short year, than have the Professors of Harvard College."

To this Dr. McCaul has already replied by showing that the statements are totally unfounded. The session is from four to five weeks longer than that required for the attendance of students at Oxford or Cambridge, and is the same length as that of Edinburgh. As to the comparison of University College with Harvard as to lectures, it is not only not the case that there are twelve hours less work per week in University College, but the direct opposite is the truth, inasmuch as there are but 37 hours per week at Harvard, whereas there are 39 at University College. An examination of the lectures attended by the students of each year, will also show a very considerable superiority in University College, Toronto; besides which there are extra lectures and the examinations, occupying many additional hours.

challenge the severest scrutiny. Our printed returns tell of the number of scholarships taken—and full use has been made of these. But no record meets the public eye to tell of the number rejected; though no examination passes without the list of candidates being reduced by this eliminating process. For in truth no single candidate passes without the concurrence of an examiner selected expressly as being totally independent of the College.

The following names of gentlemen who have acted as examiners in arts during the past four years, and have had an absolute voice in the admission or rejection of candidates, alike to matriculation, honors and degrees, supply the best guarantee of the practical character of the examinations—the high standard of which is attested by the examination papers:—the Rev. M. Willis, D.D., Principal of Knox's College; Rev. S. S. Nelles, M.A., President of Victoria College; Rev. A. Lillie, D.D., Theological Professor of the Congregational Institution; Rev. J. Taylor, M.D., Theological Professor of the United Presbyterian Divinity Hall; Rev. G. P. Young, M.A., Professor of Logic and Metaphysics, Knox's College; Rev. E. J. Senkler, M.A., of Caius College, Cambridge; Rev. E. Schluter, M.A.; Rev. W. Stennett, M.A., Principal of Upper Canada College; Rev. W. Ormiston, B.A., late one of the masters of the Normal School; Adam Crooks, LL.B., barrister-at-law; James Brown, M.A.; T. J. Robertson, M.A., head master of the Normal School; Robert Checkley, M.D.; Thomas Ridout, Esq.; F. Montivani, LL.D.; E. Crombie, M.A., barrister-at-law; Michael Barrett, B.A., M.D., President of the Toronto School of Medicine; L. S. Oille, M.A., M.D.; G. R. R. Cockburn, M.A., Rector of the Model Grammar School; William Wedd, M.A., classical master, Upper Canada College; H. Haacke, French translator to the Legislative Assembly; Emile Coulon, French master, Model Grammar School; E. Billings, F.G.S., palæontologist to the Provincial Geological Survey.

With such gentlemen, selected, as they have been, with an anxious desire to secure able and independent examiners, I feel confident that no University examinations have ever been conducted with stricter impartiality than those of the University of Toronto, under the very system so unjustly maligned.

MORAL AND RELIGIOUS OVERSIGHT OF STUDENTS.

Returning, however, from this digression, suggested by analogies in the University of London and the Queen's University of Ireland, I revert once more to another aspect of the question of sectarian, in contradistinction to provincial or national education. It is assumed in the memorial of the Wesleyan Conference that under the system of a provincial non-denominational College, the youth educated in it must be placed beyond the reach of religious training and pastoral oversight. If by pastoral oversight is meant the placing of each student, while in the College, under the care and teaching of resident ministers of his own denomination, this is manifestly beyond the reach of any system but one which limits all education to the training of each youth in schools and colleges of his own sect, and it is as impossible under the constitution of Queen's or Victoria, as of University College. When Victoria College admits a Wesleyan Methodist student, the desired end is secured for

him. But when it admits an Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Baptist, or Roman Catholic student, he must be dealt with precisely as he would be by University College, and as is done by the Normal School of the Province.

In University College daily religious services are provided, the resident students are placed under the charge of the ministers of their respective denominations, their parents or guardians are consulted as to the place of worship they are to attend, and the minister of religion whose teaching they are to wait upon. The resident Professor—who has been selected with a special view to his fitness for the duties—has prayer and reading of the Scriptures daily, morning and evening, in the College Hall, for all who do not object, themselves, or by their guardians, on conscientious grounds, to be present; and it is his duty to ascertain that they attend regularly at their respective places of worship. Permit me to read to you the circular addressed by the resident professor to the parent or guardian of each student, on his coming in to residence; it will show the systematic care with which we aim at fulfilling this part of our duty:—

“As your son proposes coming into residence in this College, I beg to inform you that it is the desire of the council that, where there is no conscientious objection, all the students under their charge should be present in the Hall at daily morning and evening prayers, with reading of the Scriptures. It is also their wish, that they should regularly attend on Sundays their respective places of worship, and receive such other religious instruction as their parents and guardians may desire. I have to request that you will be so good as to let me know whether you desire your son to attend such daily prayers in the College, and that you will also mention the minister under whose charge you wish to place him. The council will afford every facility for the carrying out of your intentions, and with this view, will exercise such control over your son during his residence, as may be best calculated to effect your wishes. In the event of your not informing me of your desire on the subject, the Council will assume that you have no objection to his being required to attend the daily prayers of the College, and will exercise an oversight as to his attendance on the ministrations of a clergyman of the denomination to which he belongs.”

Provincial or Sectarian College Education ?

Looking to the system thus in force, it is manifest, therefore, that the Provincial College—though strictly *non-denominational*, is not therefore *non-religious*; nor can there be any need that it should be so in a Christian country. In this, indeed, is illustrated the only possible system for a publicly endowed national education. It is the same principle which pervades our Common Schools, Provincial College, and University; a public system in which no sectarian distinctions are recognised, and in which no denomination meddles as such—equally open to all, and under public control. It is the national educational system of the people, consistent throughout. The teachers, trustees, county boards, and inspectors; the Deputy and Chief Superintendent, and Council of Public Instruction; the College Professors, University Senate, and Chancellor, are all chosen by the people:—through direct election in local cases; through the Executive in the provincial departments.

The establishment of a well appointed College and University is necessarily a costly thing. The Province cannot hope to command the services of men of the highest class without offering salaries and all requisite equipments of lecture rooms, museums, and library, in some degree approximating to similar institutions at home ; but if the Government were to comply with the prayer of the Wesleyan Conference Memorial, and "cause an Act to be passed by which all the Colleges now established, or which may be established in Upper Canada, may be placed upon equal footing in regard to public aid." It must necessarily involve the maintenance of many very imperfectly organised institutions, at an increased outlay, to do the work of one. Under any possible system of public education, whatever may be the facilities afforded for the higher branches of instruction in a country situated as Canada at present is, only a limited number will be found prepared to avail themselves of them. The multiplication of denominational Colleges would, therefore, tend very slightly—if at all—to increase the number of students, while it so greatly multiplied professors.

It cannot be overlooked also, that whereas it appears by the last census that there are *twenty-four separate denominations* specified in Upper Canada—apart from smaller bodies grouped under a general head—the greater number of which embrace thousands in their communion ; any attempt to endow denominational Colleges, in lieu of a non-sectarian institution, where all enjoy the same rights and privileges, must involve great injustice to those who, although belonging to religious bodies too few in number, or too poor to effect the organization achieved by wealthier sects, have an equal right to share in the denominational division of public funds set apart for higher education. The evil assumes a still worse aspect, when it is considered that some religious denominations have conscientious objections to any such system of distributing public funds ; and while they are thus excluded from availing themselves of them, they would be subjected to the grievance of the common funds of the Province being thus expended by their representatives in opposition to their religious scruples, and to their own personal loss. If, therefore, the Province provides an adequately endowed and well appointed Provincial College, to which every youth in the Province has free access, without any distinction as to sect or party ; and also provides a University to grant degrees—not only to such students, but to all in the Province—in like manner, without reference to sect or party, who are found qualified to pass the requisite examinations ; they can have no just ground of complaint who—declining to avail themselves of the Provincial Institution to which they have free access—voluntarily choose to take their preparatory training under professors and teachers appointed by their own denominations.

University College truly Provincial.

It is accordingly seen by the returns both of the University and College, that the laity of all the leading denominations in the Province—Protestant, Roman Catholic, Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Methodist, Congregationalist, Baptist, &c.—have freely availed themselves of the untrammelled advantages thus offered to them ; and that every year witnesses an increase in the number of students entering University College, and of graduates admitted to the degrees of the Provincial University.

The following are the returns of the students of University College, for the academic year 1859-60, according to their respective denominations,—apart from the undergraduates in the faculties of arts, law and medicine, attached to the University, but not attending the College :

Free Church.....	49
Church of England	35
United Presbyterian.....	24
Methodists.....	22
Congregationalists.....	16
No returns	11
Presbyterians	10
Church of Scotland.....	7
Church of Rome	5
Baptists.....	5
Reformed Presbyterians	2
Plymouth Brethren.....	1
Quakers.....	1
<hr/>	
Making a total of	188
*Matriculated students	80
Occasional students	108

These returns furnish satisfactory evidence that the non-denominational character of University College has not been a bar to the full acceptance of the educational advantages it offers, by members of all the leading denominations in the Province, including a fair average of the very religious persuasions, whose leaders appear before you as objectors to the system.

Anonymous Pamphleteering.

One or two other points I must note before concluding. It would have better pleased me had I been able to omit all reference to some of the very strange charges which have been brought against us ; and I feel confident when I look at the respected gentlemen who represent both the denominations that appear before you as claimants of the fund, that they already repent the course unwisely forced upon them in regard to us. I was particularly struck, as you all must have been, when, on Mr. Langton addressing you, and inadvertently appealing to this widely circulated pamphlet as that of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference, the reverend President of the Conference most markedly shook his head, in clear testimony that the Conference disowns all responsibility for it. Mr. Chairman, I am not familiar with parliamentary forms, but if it accords with the regular proceedings of this Committee, I should exceedingly desire that a minute be made of that shake of Dr. Stinson's head.

* The true test of the efficiency of the College is its progress in the number of Matriculated Students, when the above returns were made they were 80, an increase on previous years. This year (1860) they number 110. The whole number of Matriculated Students entered at the ancient university of Cambridge the same year is only 380. If our Provincial College is left to go on in its present successful career, it cannot be doubted it will ere long equal this, if not surpass it.

It was a very grave and speaking shake of the head! It said as plainly as the shake of a doctor's head could do, that he, for one, repudiated the burden of responsibility for this anonymous miscellany of misrepresentations and blunders. I am not surprised that the earnest and justly esteemed religious body, of which Dr. Stinson is the representative, should abjure this pamphlet, for it is a tissue of the most absurd and extravagant contradictions and blundering mis-statements ever put together in the same number of pages.

Novel Teachings of History!

It has been stated in evidence that my own chair of history is useless, and Dr. Ryerson has specially assigned as a reason, that history is taught in the Grammar Schools. A singular idea indeed, the Doctor must have of a University course of study, if, because a boy learns by rote certain things in a Grammar School, a Professor of a University can have nothing more to teach him! But I find in this same pamphlet a passage which remarkably coincides with this brilliant idea of the functions of a Professor of History, whoever its author may have been. "History teaches us," says this erudite commentator on the duties of its professor, "history teaches us that just in proportion as Greece and Rome lavished their resources upon stone or marble, upon the material and inanimate, they declined in the intellectual and moral," and that, therefore, because an architectural collegiate edifice has been reared for the University of Toronto, the day of her intellectual and moral ruin is at hand! I should be gratified if the learned Superintendent of Education, who has so clear a perception of how history should be taught, would refer to the chapter of Greek or Roman history, where such lessons are to be learned. We read, indeed, of the age of Pericles, an age in which Greece did lavish her resources on stone and marble—in which Phidias wrought those exquisite sculptures, which, as the Elgin marbles, now constitute the priceless treasures of our British Museum—in which under Callicrates and Ictinus, the marble columns of the Parthenon were reared on the heights of Athens, where still their ruins stand, the unrivalled architectural models of all later centuries. That was indeed an age of stone and marble, but was it an age of intellectual decline? That age in which, under Æschylus, the Attic drama was called into being, which witnessed in succession the wondrous intellectual triumphs of Sophocles and Euripides, which revelled in the comic genius of Aristophanes, and drank in wisdom from the philosophy of Socrates; the era of the most impartial and philosophic of historians, Thucydides; and ere its close, of the vigorous and graphic Xenophon. Or did all intellectual and moral vigour perish in that age of marble, which was succeeded in later generations by the wisdom of Plato and the philosophy of Aristotle? Or was it not after that very age of Greece's architectural triumphs that she produced the most precious gifts of that classic literature which has constituted the priceless treasure of all later times?

Financial misrepresentations.

But there are other statements laid before this committee at which reverend doctors might well shake their heads, did they only know all

the truth. Mr. Langton having imposed on him, as Vice-Chancellor of the University of Toronto, the grave responsibility of defending it against its assailants, found it his duty as an experienced financier, to call in question certain figures which have been placed before you in evidence. Dr. Ryerson had submitted to you, and handed in, in writing, a series of very singular financial statements—comparing the cost of the Bursar's office of Trinity College, consisting of one individual, with very few lands to look after, and that of the Bursar's office of Toronto University, which has in charge the sale and management of lands, and the investment of funds, throughout the province; and he had revealed to you the wonderful discovery that the one actually costs a good deal more than the other! The unfairness of these and similar comparisons was sufficiently apparent.* But on looking into their details, Mr. Langton had found that what Dr. Ryerson stated as the total annual expense of Trinity College, was not only given in his own "Educational Journal," at more than double the amount, but that this total omitted the whole cost of the Trinity Scholarships, amounting to \$4,200; that his total annual cost of Victoria College was \$1,600 less than the mere amount of the salaries stated to you by its own Bursar, Dr. Green; and that, not to multiply details, the sum stated as the cost of Trinity College incidentals, and since triumphantly printed, with double marks of exclamation, in your own evidence, as only one-thirteenth of the corresponding charge of Toronto University, has actually been made to suggest this false impression, by changing the Trinity pounds into dollars—when, I say, Mr. Langton pointed out these grave, misleading errors, Dr. Ryerson disclaimed the responsibility of his own statement, and blamed another person, who had furnished him with the material.

Mr. Langton felt it to be his duty to refer to this, because it was not a hasty calculation made by Dr. Ryerson in addressing you, but a written statement handed in to this Committee, printed by the Committee, and circulated without correction among all its members. Yet, when Mr. Langton referred to it, there was a cry of "Shame! Had not Dr. Ryerson repudiated it? Had he not corrected it two days before?" If he did, it still stands on your records unamended, and I say Mr. Langton was thoroughly justified, and simply did his duty, in pointing out those inaccuracies; and Dr. Ryerson must have a singular idea of his position, if he thinks he can evade the responsibility of such gross inaccuracies in a statement thus deliberately framed and handed in, or shift its burden upon any one but himself. But on examining Dr. Ryerson's own manuscript, it turned out that the comparisons in question were not in

* Mr. David Buchan, the Bursar of the University of Toronto, examined:

Ques. 275.—Referring to your accounts for 1857 as published in 1858, No. 2, is not the statement of Dr. Ryerson, as to the expenses of your office and of stationery, correct so far as the amount is stated by him?

Ans.—On referring to Appendix No. 12, printed with the Journals of the Legislative Assembly, 21 Victoria, 1858, I find there an account headed "No. 2 (Abstract,) University of Toronto." This abstract was not prepared in my office. If I take the first item, "Bursar's Office," £2261, and the second, "incidental expenses," which most people, on examining the account, would suppose referred to the incidentals of the office, £379 12s. 4d., I get a total of £2640 12s. 4d., which is the amount charged to the office in my detailed accounts submitted to Parliament. *But if, in place of taking the second item, I overleap it and the six following ones, and arbitrarily select the ninth, which has nothing to do with the office,—by adding the first and the ninth together, I do obtain a sum corresponding to the \$11,438 given in question 185, and said in that question to be "reported for 1857 as expended in the Bursar's office!"*

writing, but clipped out from some publication, having already done duty elsewhere, before they were thus produced to complete the work of misrepresentation here.

Perverted Evidence.

Nor is this the only story which has done duty against us elsewhere, but which would not bear investigation. There is another point I must speak upon, because I see present the chief adviser of the Representative of Her Majesty in the Government of this Province, the Hon. Attorney-General West. Dr. Ryerson, in the written statement which he handed in to this Committee, presented originally in his own manuscript a paragraph which has since been withdrawn. I received in Toronto a proof of this statement, as printed for you from his own manuscript, which I presumed was the evidence as finally given in to the Committee; and it is only since I came down to Quebec that I learned this passage had been suppressed, though not before it had been read to you, and widely circulated elsewhere. It is a statement with reference to Grammar School teachers educated in University College. Dr. Ryerson said in that passage:—"The reports of the Inspectors of Grammar Schools show that Toronto University supplies only eight masters to seventy-five Grammar Schools, while Queen's College supplies ten. *The same reports show that the graduates of Toronto University as a whole are less efficient masters of Grammar Schools than those of Queen's College, Victoria College, or Trinity College, of Toronto or Dublin.*"*

This, Sir, is a very grave charge, which, when I read it, not knowing that its author had since repented of it, received my very special attention. I felt that, even if true, we could answer that our University had only been six years in operation, and that it was not till the year before last, we had been able to turn out a graduate at all. It would have seemed only reasonable, if it had been found expedient, that we should be allowed a little time to develop the institution, before a Committee of Investigation sat upon it. Nevertheless, with every consideration of the circumstances in which we are placed, I was surprised at the statement, and wrote to the Rev. Mr. Ormiston, one of the Inspectors of Grammar Schools, a graduate of Victoria College, and who, having been one of the teachers of the Toronto Normal School under Dr. Ryerson, could have no special leanings in our favour. Mr. Ormiston came down to Toronto, and favoured me with an interview, in which he assured me that whatever motive or reason could have induced Dr. Ryerson to make such a statement, it was unsupported by his reports. He gave me

* Copies of Dr. Ryerson's printed statement, as circulated among the members of Committee and others, were procured from the Clerk of the Parliamentary Committee in the ordinary course; and duly forwarded, with the other evidence to Toronto. This extraordinary and unfounded statement was forthwith investigated, and the inspectors of Grammar Schools were called on to state what were the actual facts, but after they had been summoned as witnesses, the passage disappeared from the Chief Superintendent's statement. Hence the following proceedings in Committee:

"Reference having been made to summoning witnesses, Mr. Cayley put the following question to Mr. Langton:

Ques. 143.—Do you still desire that Mr. Cockburn and the Rev. Mr. Ormiston shall be summoned before the Committee?

Ans.—I have no longer any desire, so far as I can see at present, for the appearance of Messrs. Cockburn and Ormiston, because as Dr. Ryerson's evidence now appears in its revised shape, it does not contain the imputation which I desired these gentlemen to rebut."

comments, which he permitted me to write down from his lips, relative to the graduates of the University, on whom he had reported as Inspector of Schools. He had specially reported two graduates of Toronto University, as inefficient masters. One was a good scholar, but his eccentricities marred his success. And is it imagined that the wisdom of the Legislature can devise a University that will cure a man's eccentricities? But I found on examination that we were not responsible for him at all. He was a gentleman who had taken his whole course of education at Trinity College, Dublin, and having produced evidence of that before the Senate of Toronto University, was admitted to his degree *ad eundem*. And, in strange contradiction to the statements made by Dr. Ryerson, Mr. Ormiston added that there were two Trinity College Dublin men, whom he had been obliged to recommend to withdraw. In another bad case of a Toronto University graduate, it was reported he would never make a good teacher, and this is very likely, as he is now an inmate of the Lunatic Asylum. [Dr. Wilson continued to read the notes furnished him by Mr. Ormiston, which were altogether at variance with Dr. Ryerson's statement, and proceeded.]

It is a very serious charge to bring against a University; but I say unhesitatingly, in the presence of the head of Her Majesty's Executive Government, that the reports from the Inspectors of Grammar Schools do not bear out Dr. Ryerson's statements; and it is a most grave charge against the Chief Superintendent of Education, that he should have so far betrayed his trust, or so far have permitted prejudice to warp his judgment and pervert the evidence of his official reports, as to submit to you, and to give you in writing a statement of this nature, which, when challenged, he has been compelled to withdraw.

Gentlemen, call for and examine these reports of the Inspectors of Grammar Schools. You will find in them no evidence to bear out such allegations. Mr. Langton has inspected them, and I have perused the extracts made from those manuscripts now in Dr. Ryerson's possession; and they abundantly account for his withdrawal of the unfounded charge. Let him summon those inspectors before you, if he dare. It was on Mr. Langton's calling for their appearance as witnesses that the statement was erased. They are not men to hide the truth on our behalf. They owe their appointments to Dr. Ryerson, and are, or have both been teachers in his schools. Nevertheless, they are men of honour and probity, and that is all that we require in witnesses on our behalf.*

The Family Compact of Professors.

Had I consulted my own feelings, or appeared here merely in my own defence, I should have left this unsaid.* Dr. Ryerson well knows I have no personal feeling against him. On the contrary, I have had much friendly intercourse with him in former years; and when he went home to select a rector for his Model Grammar School, he owed it to my introductions, and to my brother's aid, that he obtained his present efficient rector. Nor did I come to Quebec even now with unkindly feelings towards him, though his conduct before this Committee seemed strange and indeed inexplicable. But the *animus* he has shown before

* It is sufficient to say that the Grammar School Inspectors were not produced as witnesses, nor were their reports read to the Committee or printed in the evidence.

this Committee, since I have been present at its sittings, has not only changed my opinion greatly, but has led me to look back upon past events and the circumstances of my former intercourse with him, and to see them in a new light. I read with scorn his statement to this Committee, as I find it recorded in the evidence, that "If the committee should order the minutes of the proceedings of the Senate to be laid before them, and mark who were present, and what was done at each meeting, they would see how the system has been worked, and how parties connected with the University and Upper Canada Colleges have directed as to expenditures, studies, scholarships, &c.;" and again, "The minutes will show that those expenditures have been chiefly directed by a family compact of gentlemen receiving their salaries from the University and Upper Canada College endowments."

Why did he put in the word "*gentlemen*?" I read, and I believe my colleagues have also read, his statement as equivalent to characterising us as a pack of scoundrels. I have not been much engaged in duties like this. My habits have been acquired in the pleasant retirement of years, chiefly expended in literary pastime and study. I have not been accustomed to appear before such Committees, and perhaps, therefore, I may seem to attach too much importance to language, which may not present itself in the same aspect to men accustomed to confront the bold and rough usages of Parliamentary life. But I can conceive of no explanation that can be put upon this language, characterising us as a family compact, directing as to expenditures, studies, scholarships, and salaries, other than that we were something closely allied to a pack of swindlers; a set of men abusing the great trust committed to them, for their own private ends, and personal aggrandisement.

I believe Dr. Ryerson will be able, in his explanation of statements he has been compelled to make to you, to show that he advocated the expenditure of a smaller sum than was ultimately appropriated for scholarships in the University; but he cannot deny this, that we bore no part in relation to the largest of the expenditures which has been specially brought as a charge against us: that appropriation of £75,000—that frightful extravagance of ours for a new building. Dr. Ryerson stated in his evidence that he believed that appropriation was made during his absence from the country. I doubt not he stated so in perfect sincerity; but I find on looking at the minutes that he was not absent on the 17th March, 1854, when Chief Justice Draper gave notice of an Address to His Excellency, with a view to the appropriation of a sum for buildings. I find, too, that Dr. Ryerson was present, and there is no record on the minutes that he objected, when, on the 24th March, Chief Justice Draper, seconded by Hon. J. C. Morrison, moved the Address to His Excellency. And on the 25th March, when that Address was read a second time and carried, Dr. Ryerson again was present, and the minutes record no protest or opposition to the appropriation as recommended. I had an interview this morning with the Solicitor-General, who is prepared to give evidence that Dr. Ryerson was present and offered no opposition to that Address, which was to lead to such "frightful extravagance."* And I believe there are other charges brought against

* Question submitted by the Rev. Dr. Ryerson, and put to the Hon. Joseph C. Morrison, by the Chairman:

us, of which we are equally innocent, but on which Dr. Ryerson cannot clear himself. The salary of the President of University College was recommended on his motion. That large, but not excessive, salary now enjoyed by the President, was moved by Dr. Ryerson. And he cannot deny that to that same motion, in the absence of the Professors who had not then a seat on the Senate, and without the slightest instigation from them, he made an addition, declaring that we were underpaid, and that our salaries should be raised. I of all men in the world need not object to that act, enjoying as I do at this present moment an increase of salary owing to that motion; but I wish to show that we did not, as we have been charged, ourselves vote that addition to our salaries, or even know that such a proposition was entertained. Nor can he deny that he voted the present salary of the Principal of Upper Canada College, which he has declared to be extravagant, but apologised for it by saying he did not believe a Canadian would have been appointed. He cannot deny that, in opposition to that very family compact of Professors, he was one of the most active leaders in getting a pension to Mr. Maynard, dismissed from Upper Canada College for improper conduct, and who, many think, ought to have been dismissed long before. And nothing can justify Dr. Ryerson for having preferred this abominable and baseless charge of a family compact, for this simple reason, that all the expenditures on buildings, library, scholarships, salaries, and pensions with which he charged them—with the solitary exception of the pension to Mr. Maynard—were authorised long before a single Professor of University College, except Dr. McCaul, as its President, had a seat in the Senate.

This, gentlemen, is a specimen of the baseless charges that have been circulated through the country, and have helped to mislead the minds of hundreds, and to burden your table with petitions originated by misrepresentation, and founded on error. And I ask you now, as an impar-

Ques. 464.—“Do you recollect particularly the proceedings of the Senate in 1854, and the part that Dr. Ryerson took in them?”

Ans.—“I recollect, generally the proceedings, but I cannot at this time say the particular course that Dr. Ryerson took.”

Passage in Dr. Ryerson's Reply, Evidence, p. 152 :

“I cannot give implicit credit to the statement of the gentleman, (Dr. Wilson) upon the subject, because in the same speech he introduced the name of the Hon. J. C. Morrison as a witness that I had supported and voted for measures to which I now object. I took the liberty, yesterday, of putting, through the Chairman, a question to Mr. Morrison on the subject, whether he remembered these proceedings. What was his answer? That he did not recollect them, nor the course I pursued. I leave the Committee to decide between the gentleman's assertion the other day and the testimony of Mr. Morrison. And if he was so far wrong as to his statement of what Mr. Morrison said, it is not too much to assume that he may have been as far wrong in regard to the imputations he ascribes to Mr. Ormiston.”

The minutes of the University Senate were referred to, from which it was shown that Dr. Ryerson was present at each of the three meetings in question. No counter motion or protest betrayed the slightest indication of his opposition, when it was time to have done it effectually; and the Hon. Solicitor-General was again summoned and asked,

Ques. 538.—“Had you any conversation with Dr. Wilson, and did you tell him that Dr. Ryerson was present when the address for the building was carried, and that Dr. Ryerson offered no opposition to it?”

Ans.—“Dr. Wilson, in a conversation respecting the appropriation made for the University Buildings, asked me whether, on the occasion of the proposition of the address to His Excellency, by Chief Justice Draper, seconded by myself (in 1854,) any objection had been made by Dr. Ryerson, who was stated to be present? I told Dr. Wilson, that in my recollection no objection was made to the appropriation by any member of the Senate, and that if Dr. Ryerson had opposed it, I thought I should have remembered it.”

tial tribunal, if you think the Chief Superintendent of Education for Upper Canada—who had sat on the present Senate from its organization in 1853 till 1857, when Professors of University College, for the first time, took their seat at that Board, without ever recording a single protest, counter-motion, or other evidence of practical opposition to all the chief expenditures, and other acts, now charged against us—I ask if he was justified in making this family-compact charge which he has recorded on your evidence? But Dr. Ryerson has asked that the minutes be produced, and they shall be produced; and he will be called upon, I trust, to show you, from those minutes, the evidence on which he grounds so base, and let me add also, so baseless a charge.*

New University Buildings.

With regard to the new University buildings, while I have disclaimed all responsibility for the original appropriation, as an act done long before I was a member of the Senate, I am prepared to assume all responsibility for the building, as not only a justifiable but an indispensable thing. Your memorialists charge us with acting in defiance of the law of 1853 in the erection of new buildings, and in providing accommodation in these for faculties which the Act expressly forbids. The latter blunder I believe the memorialists themselves are now fully aware is without foundation. As to the other illegal act, I can only say it was done under the presidency, and with the zealous concurrence of the present Chancellor Blake, one of the ablest and most upright Judges of Upper Canada. The Address was moved by the Chief Justice Draper, and seconded by the present Solicitor-General; and the final appropriation was made by the Governor in Council, with the advice of the present Attorney-General. I venture to think that under these circumstances this Committee will acquit the Professors of any blame, if they should be inclined to interpret the Act differently from such high legal authorities.

In defence of the necessity of the building, I will only say that during seven years in which I have been a Professor of University College, I have witnessed five removals. Since the Act of 1853 was passed we have been turned out of the old King's College building, and established

* The Rev. Dr. Ryerson further examined. Question submitted by Professor Wilson, and put by the Chairman:

Ques. 411.—"You stated to the Committee, 'that if the Committee would order the proceedings of the Senate to be laid before them, and mark who was present, and what was done at each meeting, they would see how the system has been worked, and how parties connected with the University and Upper Canada Colleges had directed as to expenditure, studies, scholarships, &c. The minutes will show that all these expenditures have been directed by a family compact of gentlemen receiving their salaries from the University and Upper Canada College endowments.' Dr. Ryerson has the minutes before him; will he specify in detail the facts to which he refers, seeing that no Professor, except Dr. McCaul, had a seat at the Senate, before 2nd February, 1857?"

Ans.—"I refer to the minutes."

Ques. 509.—"Can you refer to any other minute of the Senate, after the date of my appointment as a member, on which either I, or Professor Cherriman, or Professor Croft, either voted in reference to our salaries, or were present when such a question was discussed?"

Ans.—"Certainly not. *The presence or absence of a member of a body, when his salary is taken up, is a matter of no consequence, since his influence as a member of the body, would be precisely the same in regard to the proceedings in matters of the kind, whether he were absent or present.*"

Yet the minutes were wanted to "*mark who were present, and what was done at each meeting!*"

in the Parliament buildings on Front-street. Parliament returning to Toronto, we were sent back to the old building; Government requiring that, we were thrust into a little brick edifice originally built for a medical school; and before we at length moved into our present permanent buildings, we had been compelled to waste thousands of dollars on removals, fittings, and temporary make-shifts, as distasteful to us as they were wasteful and extravagant. Surely it was wiser to put up adequate and permanent buildings, than fritter away the endowment in a system like that, which destroyed all faith in the perpetuity of the institution, and impeded every thing but the mere daily scramble to accomplish such work as could be got through, in the absence of nearly every needful provision of a well-appointed College.

But while affirming that the new buildings are not only justifiable, but were an absolute necessity, if the University and College were to be maintained, I utterly deny the charge of useless extravagance in their erection. Having myself acted throughout on the building committee, I can say confidently that no committee ever strove more earnestly with a view to economy. After the plans had been approved of by the Government, we revised them, and ordered the omission of many features, which, though ornamental, were not indispensable to the practical objects of the building. Send for the contractors, Messrs. Worthington, and Jacques & Hay, and ask them if they were ever so watched and worried by a building committee for purposes of economy; or summon our architect, and enquire of him whether he found a committee of University Professors, or of the lawyers of Osgoode Hall, more unyielding on every threat of extra expenditure.

Investigation welcomed.

We have, Sir, in this, as in other matters, earnestly striven to do our duty; and we do feel, after such earnest endeavours, at thus being summoned, like culprits before your bar, on charges so baseless, and on statements so loose and intangible, that—like the soil of secret slander—while the consequences are only too keenly apparent, the source is difficult to combat as the viewless wind. But, gentlemen, we have not shrunk from this investigation, though feeling a natural repugnance to coming into collision with those who have proved themselves capable of assailing us with such unworthy weapons.

We have every confidence in this Committee; having nothing to fear from the fullest enquiry. In our matriculation examination our courses of study, our systems of options, and our modes of examination, we have set ourselves deliberately and earnestly to work out an educational system for Canada, such as we believe will secure—not for any special and privileged class, but for the people at large—all the advantages a University can afford. We have not taken Oxford as our model; for, without any disparagement to that ancient seat of learning, we believe that, could it be transplanted, with all its abstruse learning and all its antiquated and venerable forms, to our Canadian soil, it would prove little less useless to us than a college of medieval monks or learned eastern pundits. We have in our own University, representatives alike of the old and of the modern Universities of the mother country; and we have anxiously striven to combine the experience of all; while seeking, at the same

time, to add to that the means indispensable for adapting such experience to the novel circumstances of a young country like Canada.

Having been appointed to the important and responsible trust implied in our selection to fill the various chairs in the Provincial College, I ask you, have we forfeited the confidence of the Government or of the country? And if not, then I may be permitted to ask if such men as I have described as those constituting the Council of University College, are not capable of advising this Province in relation to the precise amount of Latin and Greek, of mathematics and sciences, that shall be required of a youth on entering the College? If they are incapable of advising you, who is to be your adviser? Is this Committee prepared to resolve how many books of Xenophon and Virgil shall be read? Whether Homer shall be taken at matriculation, or Horace be put in the place of Sallust? And if men who have taken some of the highest honours in Cambridge, Oxford and Dublin—who have filled chairs in British Universities, and even bring to us the science of the famed University of Berlin, and the honours of the ancient seat of learning of Padua—if such men are not to be permitted to advise you on the details of a collegiate system, are you prepared to submit yourselves to the advice of Dr. Ryerson, who never was in a college in his life, but who has told us in his famous scheme of University organization, propounded in his voluminous letter addressed to the Hon. Francis Hincks, in 1852, that he meditated it on some of the highest mountains of Europe—a circumstance which abundantly accounts for the windy and insubstantial character of its recommendations!

A High Standard of Education Maintained.

In order to meet the arguments which have been adduced against the system adopted by the University of Toronto, the Vice-Chancellor has produced in evidence the recommendations of the Commissioners of Oxford and Cambridge; the practice of the Universities of London and Ireland, &c.—and evidence having thus been produced in proof, I may now be permitted to re-affirm, in concluding my defence, that the one aim of the Senate, and of the College Council, has been to devise a system of study whereby the youth of this Province may acquire those higher branches of education best calculated to fit them for becoming intelligent and useful members of the community. In Canada, at least, education must be practical. It may be all very well for certain Oxford men, and their indiscriminating admirers, to maintain that the highest aim of a perfect collegiate training consists in the mastery of classical learning, but the scholarship of Oxford, if forced without restriction or choice on the youth of Canada, would in most cases prove of comparatively little practical avail.* Nevertheless, let me not be misunderstood.

* The Rev. Provost Whitaker examined:—By the Chairman.

Ques. 344.—"Do you think that, in a country like Canada, the system of collegiate education should be exactly similar to that which prevails in and may be adopted by an old and wealthy country like England?"

Answer.—"No."

Ques. 347.—"Are you of opinion that in this province, without an endowed church, without fellowships in the universities, without old and richly endowed grammar schools, and the many and various inducements in England to acquire eminent classical and mathematical attainments, the university education of this country can be fairly brought into comparison with that of Cambridge, or be reasonably expected to reach the same standard?"

Answer.—"No."

I have freely admitted that the standard of matriculation, or the entrance examination, has been lowered; but I have not admitted, and I do most positively deny, that *the standard of education* has been lowered. A student who goes through the whole classical course of the University will compare favourably with a graduate of equal ability in any other University in the British empire; and if, in the exercise of options, he abandons classics at the prescribed point in his course, he can only do so in order to take in lieu of classics the defined substitutes of modern languages, natural sciences, and mathematics, which will no less thoroughly train his mind, and in many cases will supply him with far more useful acquirements for the future course he is to pursue. The English Universities, under their old rigid system, turned out a class of educated men, with whom too frequently the people found little sympathy; but the Scottish University system, by the very laxness which left the student's choice of studies so much to himself as practically to amount to a comprehensive system of options, has made *an educated people*; and the latter I conceive is what Canada desires.

Our Canadian Honor-men.

Only one further point seems to require attention. Referring to our system of honors and scholarships, Dr. Ryerson has spoken of one-half of the time of the Professors of University College being taken up with teaching the honor-men, who, in an English University, employ their own tutors. The charge in reality amounts to this: that by its liberal endowments for the highest departments of education, at the Provincial College the son of the humblest Canadian peasant may enjoy precisely the same advantages as the son of the wealthiest nobleman in England does at the aristocratic and exclusive University of Oxford.*

A Specimen Accusation!

It only remains for me to thank the Committee for the patient hearing you have favoured me with, while thus endeavouring to place before you the broad grounds of defence, on the charges brought against my colleagues and myself. I have not attempted to go minutely into details, nor to meet every petty charge, for indeed I have as yet only obtained partial access to the printed evidence, and I only know from rumour, of such accusations as the famous story of \$2,000 expended on a Chancellor's gown—a perfectly true story—only it does not happen to refer to *our* Toronto University. Toronto, in the luxury of its modern civilization, actually rejoices in three independent Universities—with a host of colleges. And one of those did resolve on doing fitting honour to its Chancellor; and, entrusting his dignity to a Cambridge tailor, got out so magnificent a fac-simile of Prince Albert's robes, that its Chancellor could not be persuaded to wear it till they had clipped off its superfluous tail! And this story—which little fits the homely official garb of our University Chancellor, an heir-loom of old King's College, now considerably the worse of wear—this story has been gravely retailed to you as

* It ought also to be noted that the honor lectures are free to all the students, and many of them are largely attended. Every encouragement is held out for them to do so.

one of the many proofs of University extravagance. It is a sample of the stories that have been hawked about the country, accompanied with the cry of *Papist* and *Infidel* coupled with our names—in order to obtain those signatures which you have found appended to petitions against us. We may well welcome the sitting of this Committee, which now at length affords us an opportunity of repelling, with fitting scorn, some of the many slanders and falsehoods that have been bandied about against us. But let this example suffice. A few words are sufficient to give currency to a mis-statement which it takes many to disprove; and I should have to encroach on your forbearance not for hours, but days, were I to attempt to deal in detail with all the baseless charges that have been circulated against us.

In these remarks I have confined myself to a few leading points of fact, and to one important matter of opinion. The Vice-Chancellor of the University has already done for that institution all that its friends can desire; and I shall leave to the President of University College to treat in like detail the specialities pertaining to the college, excepting in so far as the Committee may desire to question me on the subject.

I have only to say, we have absolutely nothing to conceal. We welcome this enquiry as a means of bringing to the test of proof a thousand blundering mis-statements and slanderous insinuations that have been circulated throughout the Province for months past, without the possibility of contradiction.* I rest confident in the assurance that the Committee

* The following may suffice as a specimen of the manner in which charges of extravagance were sustained. Rev. Mr. Poole examined.—(Evidence, p. 57):—

"Another source of extravagance may be seen in the number of persons employed in connection with that establishment. Including the Rev. President, there are eleven Professors, and one Tutor, the Vice-Chancellor, the Bursar and his *five* assistants, the Librarian and two Registrars, one for the University and another for the College, the Bedel, acting Bedel, Steward, Messenger, Porter, Bellringer, Labourers, Woodcutters, and other servants, the Dean of residence and seven servants employed about the premises. There are seven persons connected with the Observatory, and in addition to all these, an attendant servant is provided to wait on each of the following professors, viz.: Professor of Natural History, Professor of Natural Philosophy, and Professor of Chemistry—these latter servants being required only thirty weeks in the year, although receiving a full year's salary. Here are 45 persons regularly salaried, besides others occasionally employed—the salaries varying from \$400 to \$4,000 a-year. If we include the 29 Examiners, we have more paid officers connected with the establishment than undergraduates admitted to its halls."

Such is an example of the statements made use of to prejudice the Committee. Let us see what they are worth:—

The Bursar and his assistants are appointed by the Government to manage certain public property, including not only the University lands, but also the lands and endowments of Upper Canada College, and the parliamentary grants to the Magnetic Observatory. They may, or may not be too numerous, but the University has as little to do with their appointment, removal, or salaries, as with those of the Crown Lands Department.

Of the seven persons said to be connected with the Observatory, only one, the Director, receives one-third of his salary from the University funds, as Professor of Meteorology. The others are all paid by the annual vote of parliament for that purpose, and the University has no share in their appointment, duties, or salaries. With the partial exception of Meteorology, the number of chairs in University College remains as determined by the Act of 1853. But their occupants are here made to count double, first as professors, and then as examiners!

In the same piece of *evidence*, one of the professors being also Dean, appears as two persons; and the College Tutor figures first as such, and then as Registrar. As to the servants, one, for example, waits on the Professors of Chemistry, Natural Philosophy, and History, assists in the practical laboratory, takes charge of the philosophical apparatus, &c. He, therefore, counts for some four or five different persons. The same is the case with other servants. The Bedel, acting Bedel, and Steward are only three names for the same person. Porter, Bell-ringer, Labourer, Wood-cutter, are in like manner the

will be satisfied by the evidence produced on all the various charges—and still more, by the inconsistencies, blunders, and contradictions which have marked the statements in which they are made—that they are entirely founded in error. The University and College have only now been furnished for the first time with the means of accomplishing the objects for which they were established; and I rest in full confidence that the wisdom of the Legislature will permit them still, untrammelled, to carry out, with such means, the noble and patriotic objects already inaugurated by them, under many difficulties and impediments, to success.

various duties of one or two, multiplied into as many persons. By such a process, a dozen men may pass muster at any time for a hundred!

But such gross misrepresentations,—which were not always replied to, from their notorious absurdity,—having once been affirmed, are repeated and quoted again and again as facts. Equally gross financial mis-statements are re-produced, and paraded as substantial and well established truths, merely because they have been once affirmed by Dr. Ryerson, Mr. Poole, or some other witness, in the course of the protracted discussions.

