

UNIVERSITY REFORM DEFENDED:

IN REPLY TO

SIX EDITORIALS OF THE "GLOBE" AND "LEADER,"

On the University Commissioners and the Advocates for
University Reform in Upper Canada.

By a Committee of the Wesleyan Conference.

Toronto:
PRINTED AT THE "GUARDIAN" STEAM PRINTING ESTABLISHMENT.
1863.

UNIVERSITY REFORM DEFENDED:

IN REPLY TO

SIX EDITORIALS OF THE "GLOBE" AND "LEADER,"

On the University Commissioners and the Advocates of
University Reform in Upper Canada.

By a Committee of the Wesleyan Conference.



Toronto:

PRINTED AT THE "GUARDIAN" STEAM PRINTING ESTABLISHMENT.

1862

UNIVERSITY REFORM DEFENDED:

IN REPLY TO

Six Editorials of the "Globe" and "Leader" on the University
Commissioners and the Advocates of University Reform
in Upper Canada.

BY A COMMITTEE OF THE WESLEYAN CONFERENCE.

The Committee appointed by the Wesleyan Conference to advocate a National System of University and Collegiate Education, upon the basis of equal rights to all denominations and classes of the community, feel ourselves called upon to vindicate the University Commissioners and the denominations advocating University Reform, from the strictures of the *Globe* and *Leader* newspapers, and to present a summary view of the equitable and patriotic grounds on which that Reform is advocated.

(Importance of the Question.)

The great importance of the question is such as to invite the best attention of every friend of his country, of education, of religion. And when we speak of religion, we speak of it not in reference to any religious persuasion, but in relation to those great principles of truth and morals which are common to all religious persuasions, and which form the chief elements of individual and national character, the only basis of confidence between man and man, and without which no neighborhood or country can be happy or prosperous. Religious persuasions are the only agencies of teaching these principles, and are therefore the greatest benefactors of society. To employ towards them terms of opprobrium and contempt must be the offspring of a feeling opposed to the principles and practice of religious truth and morals.

(History of the Question.)

The University question presents itself historically and practically as follows: In former years

the public endowment for higher education was employed in establishing one College, virtually in the interests and under the control of one church. This caused great dissatisfaction; to remove which the Legislature passed an Act in 1849 extinguishing the very name of the College, and establishing a College under the name of an University, excluding all recognition of religion, and prohibiting every kind of religious worship in the institution. It was as revolting to the feelings of the people generally to exclude all religion, as to establish one dominant church. What the country needed, and what was largely demanded, was, not the exclusion of Christianity from our system of University education, but the comprehension of all the influences of christianity through the religious persuasions upon equal terms to all upon equal conditions, without the exclusion or domination of any. This was the origin and object of the University Act of 1853, as stated in the preamble, and as avowed by members of the Government who introduced it. Both the Acts of 1849 and 1853 sought the affiliation of all the Colleges of the country in one University. The preamble of the second Act states that no College had affiliated under the first Act, and therefore proposed other provisions for the attainment of that object and the wider diffusion of Collegiate education in the country. But the mode in which the Act of 1853 has been administered, or rather mis-administered, has virtually perpetuated the repealed Act of 1849. Hence the dissatisfaction with the present system, and the renewed advocacy of University Reform.

(Nature of the Question.)

The practical question now is, whether our system of University education shall include one endowed College only, or several Colleges in one University, teaching the same subjects of literature and science, and up to the same standard, yet varied in their religious oversight and modes of instruction, suited to the different sections of the community, and adapted to secure a wholesome emulation; whether all the means provided for Collegiate education, should be expended in supporting one set of Professors for all Upper Canada, or several sets of Professors; whether one College—that is, a School next higher than a Grammar School,—with its teachers, without emulation, without oversight, with salaries secured independent of pupils or amount of labour, is likely to do more for either the quality or diffusion of higher education in the country, than several Colleges erected by voluntary effort, and developing and combining the influence and energies of religious persuasions, and their several bodies of Teachers animated to duty by mutual emulation, and largely depending upon their exertions and success for their remuneration, and guaranteed to the community as to character and principles, as well as ability, not by a government appointment, but by the character and oversight of the religious persuasions establishing Colleges interested in their efficiency and success. This is the practical question at issue in the present discussion. All the dust raised about “sects,” “spoliation,” “vandalism,” &c., &c., are the mere tactics employed by partizanship to prejudice the question in the minds of the misinformed, just as reformers were called revolutionists, and the advocates of equal rights used to be called spoliators, in former days in this country. What the country at large, and what every good friend to it, is interested in, is not whether Collegiate education shall be given in Toronto alone, or in other towns also, or by any one or more religious persuasion, or by no religious persuasion, but how, by a given amount of public aid can the means and influences in behalf of University education be most extensively developed, and University education most widely imparted, with the best precaution and provision possible for the principles and character of the young men educated. Such is the practical question for the reader’s consideration and decision.

(Belief and Proceedings of the Wesleyan Church.)

The Wesleyans as a body, and some other large religious persuasions, believe that several emulating Colleges will do more work and educate more

youth, than one monopolist college; they believe that youth are more likely to be good and useful citizens if they are religiously taught and watched over at the same time that they are secularly instructed; and believing this, they believe the past and present system of expending the University endowment is unjust and impolitic, and that a one-college monopoly is at variance with the best interests of the Province, and with the just rights of large sections of the community. They embodied the expression of their convictions in petitions to the Legislature, and asked for inquiry. Inquiry was granted, and proofs were adduced in support of the justice of their complaints. A Commission was issued to investigate the management of the University endowment, and the working of the University system, and report the results, with such recommendations as the investigation might suggest. That Commission has reported. The report has been printed, and attacked by the advocates of monopoly. We now proceed to answer these attacks.

(Reply to the “Globe’s” attacks on the Commissioners.)

The *Globe* of the 20th ult. says—

“The chief result of the inquiry seems to us to be the establishment, almost beyond question, that Messrs. Jas. Patton, of Toronto, John Beatty, of Cobourg, M. D., are the most impudent men that the Province contains. The only doubt which remains on our mind, arises from the question whether Messrs. Patton, Beatty, and Paton are really the authors of the report bearing their name, or whether they have not been used as the plastic tools of Dr. Egerton Ryerson, whose hand may, we fancy, be traced in many of its pages.”

We can state, in reply, on the best authority, that “Dr. Egerton Ryerson” did not write or suggest one line of the report, and that every line of it was suggested and written by one or the other of the Commissioners themselves.

Mr. Paton is a scholar and member of the Senate of Queen’s College; Dr. Beatty is a member of the Senate of Victoria College; and Mr. Patton is Vice Chancellor of Toronto University—made so, not by Government appointment, but by election of the Senate, and against Mr. Langton, who was proposed and stoutly advocated by Dr. Daniel Wilson. Such a Commission could not have been more fairly selected. The *Globe* of the 30th ult. makes repeated and lengthened attacks upon Mr. Paton personally. The *Globe* represents Mr. Paton as a “self-appointed member” of a committee of which he was not a member at all, and at not one meeting of which he was ever present. The *Globe* also sneers at the “Hon. James Patton” for receiving \$800 per annum for “doing the little bit of formality” of conferring degrees on students entitled to receive them; but the *Globe* does not

mention that Mr. Langton had received the same sum per annum during four years for performing the same duties of Vice Chancellorship; and which duties involve the preparation of all business for the Senate, and conducting all correspondence in behalf of the University.

It is also just to observe that Mr. Patton, after two years of service in the office of Vice Chancellor, has, within the last two months, been *unanimously* re-elected to that office by the Senate, on motion of Dr. McCaul, (President of University College) seconded by Adam Crooks, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.

The Commissioners acted quite within the varied objects, and visitatorial powers of their Commission. The *Globe* cannot object to the questions they proposed, or the fairness of their selection of parties of whom answers to the questions were requested; yet the *Globe* calls the Commissioners the "most impudent men that the Province contains," because they adopt the suggestions which the replies to their questions warrant, and make those suggestions almost in the very words which the Senate of the University had unanimously adopted. The *Globe's* imputation, therefore, upon the Commissioners, is most unjust and unfounded, whether it comes or not from "the most impudent men that Canada contains."

(Reply to the "*Globe*" and "*Leader's*" attacks on the Wesleyan and other Petitioners for University Reform.)

The *Globe* and *Leader* can scarcely find epithets of odium strong enough to designate the Wesleyan and other advocates of University Reform. They are "greedy sects," "spoliators," "plunderers," enemies of our common school system, and indeed every thing that is selfish, mean, and mercenary.

We may ask, in reply, whether the very writer of some of these assailing articles in the *Globe* and *Leader* is not a salaried officer in the very College whose monopoly he advocates, and whether he is not largely profiting by that monopoly? We may also ask, whether the *Globe* and *Leader* establishments have not also profited not a little by that same monopoly? Are these the parties to impute mercenary motives to others, and especially to whole communities? And is a resort to such imputations the proper style, and spirit, and method to discuss the great question of the higher education of a country? The *Globe* descends to personalities, and names three Heads of Colleges who have for several years been members of the Senate, as objects of attack. He speaks of "the Rev. Dra. Nelles and Leitch and the Very Rev. Vicar

General McDonell," as charging for their "board, lodging, and travelling expenses to the University fund" "every time" they favour the Senate with their presence." Now, though nothing is more just and reasonable that members at a distance should be paid their travelling expenses while attending the Senate—though the Legislature provides for the payment of the travelling expenses of its own members—though both Victoria and Queen's Colleges, and we dare say the other Colleges, pay the travelling expenses of the distant members of their Boards of Trustees and Senate, and do so as a matter of economy as well as of justice, as the distant members of such bodies are generally more economical in the expenditure of funds, than local members resident where the funds are expended, and who may have some interest in their expenditure; yet those Toronto members of the Senate who have wished to keep the control of University affairs in Toronto hands, have resisted every measure which has been proposed to pay the travelling expenses of non-Toronto members of the Senate, (though said Toronto members have provided for paying the travelling expenses of non-Toronto Examiners of the University), and neither Dr. Nelles, nor Dr. Leitch, nor Vicar General McDonell, has ever received a farthing from the "University fund" in payment of their "board, lodging, and travelling expenses" while attending meetings of the Senate. The *Globe's* statement is therefore as untrue, as his attack is unworthy of a public journalist.

Then as to the Wesleyans being a "greedy sect," spoliators, &c., to whom do these epithets most justly apply? To those who largely profit by the monopoly which they advocate, or to those who advocate equal rights upon equal terms among all sections of the community according to their works? The Wesleyans have ever been the earnest advocates of equal rights and privileges among all classes, and that long before most of their assailants had a name or a habitation in this country. Every time a minister of any other Church than that of England, of Scotland, or of Rome solemnizes matrimony in behalf of his own or other people, or performs a funeral service over their remains in grounds regularly secured by law, he, together with all parties concerned, enjoys fruits of the many years' labour in the cause of civil and religious liberty of some of those very men, sustained by the Wesleyan body, who have been most traduced by the advocates of monopoly as University reformers. The Wesleyan body has a character and a history in the country which its assailants may envy and asperse, but cannot destroy.

(Reply to Remarks of the "Globe" and "Leader" on the Commissioners' Report as to Expenditures.)

The *Globe* and *Leader* both affirm that the Report of the Commissioners contains no proof of the extravagant expenditure complained of. The Petitioners had complained that a large portion of the capital of the endowment had been spent, at variance with law, for the erection of College buildings, and that much of the Income Fund had been lavishly expended. The *Leader*, as usual, deals in vague and general denials, and imputations of "monstrous vandalism." The *Globe* says—"We are happy to find that the Commissioners, imbued, as they undoubtedly were with the strongest desire to find fault, have been unable to point out a single case of either jobbery or culpable extravagance on the part of the authorities of the University."

Neither the Commissioners nor the Petitioners had any thing to say, nor any desire to say, any thing about "the authorities of the University." It was the *expenditure* complained of and investigated, without reference to those who directed it. The Commissioners state as follows in respect to the diversion of the endowment for the erection of buildings:

"Had the University Funds been always strictly applied to the purposes for which they were intended, namely, to create a permanent Endowment, the annual proceeds of which should be devoted to sustaining the cause of higher education in Upper Canada, the result would have been very different from that which we have now to consider. The chief diminution has arisen from the large expenditure on the new University and College Buildings, Museums, and Library, amounting to \$355,907 for Buildings, and \$65,569 expended on Library and Museums. [No. 50 App.]

"In the opinion of the Commissioners, the Act appears especially to provide that the Endowment should remain intact, and the only expenditure from the permanent fund appears to be authorized in clauses 78 and 84, where provision is made for "maintenance and ordinary repairs of the property assigned for the use of the said University, or College, and for such permanent improvements and additions to the buildings, as may be authorized by the Governor in Council." Even a liberal construction of the clauses referred to, as well as of the spirit and tenor of the Act, would seem to afford grounds for doubt as to whether so large an expenditure as has been permitted, was in accordance with Legislative enactment. A careful examination of the University Building has convinced the Commissioners that the expenditure has been upon a scale disproportionate to its uses and requirements, as well as inexpedient, when the necessity for public aid to sustain the higher educational interests of the country is considered. Comfort and utility have, it is feared, been less studied than appearance and decoration; and even now, when the number of students is far smaller than in this growing country may reasonably be expected to assemble within its walls, complaints are made that the accommodation afforded to University College is greatly limited.

"It is obviously too late to offer further objections to this expenditure, and the Commissioners merely point to the facts as showing that they afforded some ground

for dissatisfaction on the part of those other institutions for Academical Education, whose claims to a share of the surplus income funds are provided for by clause 81 of the Act. The sum of nearly \$55,000, taken from the Endowment, is also invested, as already stated, in the building occupied by the Branch Lunatic Asylum. [No. 50 App.]

"The total amount realized from the sales of lands is \$1,129,178, and according to the intentions of the Act, this should have been invested as the Permanent Fund or Capital of the University, and would have produced an annual revenue of \$67,750. This will be seen from return (App. No. 49,) which is a "Statement of Capital invested and amount expended on account of the University of Toronto, up to the 31st December, 1841," and from return No. 50 App., giving subjects of expenditure and modes of investment. On looking, however, at investments productive of revenue, the Commissioners find that out of the above amount derived from the sales of Endowment lands, the following five items form the chief sources of income:

1. Building rented to Medical School	value	\$ 7,020
2. Bank Stock		1,440
3. Mortgages		66,374
4. Debentures		354,047
5. From investments in property		41,001

\$469,882

"Presuming that from the above five sources an income of \$28,188 is derived, it will be seen that the annual income of the University has been reduced to the extent of \$39,562 per annum."

Thus a vast building for great show, but with slender accommodations, has been erected, when the law only authorised *repairs and improvements* in the existing buildings; the capital of lands sold to the amount of *twelve hundred and twenty-nine thousand dollars* has been reduced to *four hundred and sixty-nine thousand dollars*; the *Income* fund has been reduced to the amount of *thirty-nine thousand dollars* a year; and yet we are told these facts prove no "culpable extravagance" in the expenditure of the University fund! We may appeal to any candid man of any party, whether these facts do not more than justify and establish all that the advocates of University Reform have complained of and alleged in regard to unlawful and extravagant expenditures of the University fund.

But these are only a part of the facts relative to extravagance. On the 16th page of the Commissioners Report, we have the following statement:

"As an instance of the want of proper adjustment of expenditure to the income actually collected, reference may be made to the first year in which a deficiency occurred, viz. 1859—when the excess amounted to the large sum of \$18,569.36. In this one year the following sums are charged to Income Fund.

Furniture for College residence	\$5,125 15
Grounds	6,256 20
Observer's residence	4,340 00

\$15,721 35

"Of the expediency of apending so large a sum on the residence now occupied by only 19 Students, and also upon the grounds, at a time when the income fell short,

very great doubts may be entertained; and the Commissioners are strongly of opinion that the last item of expenditure, for the benefit of the Observatory, was not a legitimate application of the University funds."

Here we have expenditures *beyond the actual income* to the amount of upwards of *eighteen thousand dollars*; of which upwards of *four thousand dollars* was expended for an Observer's residence, which has no more to do with the College than the Light house of the Toronto harbour; upwards of *six thousand dollars* was expended to ornament the College grounds; upwards of *five thousand dollars* was expended in furnishing a boarding hall for the residence of students, which first included 55 boarders, and last 19, and has now been abandoned as a failure! And all these expenditures are over and above the *actual income*—in the teeth of the Act of Parliament, and reducing the endowment. This was in 1859; but, we learn from 15th page of the Report, that in the following year the *expenditure exceeded* the income to the amount of \$8,777,96, and the year following again, to the amount of \$11,473,95—since which time we have no returns; thus in three years, exceeding the income, and reducing the capital to the amount of \$39,606,77. What is all this but "extravagance," whether "culpable" or not?

We need not enter into further details of expenditure, or remarks upon the recommendations of the Commissioners as to reductions in regard to certain professorships, scholarships, &c. The *Leader* affects anger in regard to these matters; but the admissions of the *Globe* are ample to our purpose. In regard to the expenditure on the buildings themselves, the *Globe* of the 20th ult., concedes that "too much money may have been spent on the buildings, and we certainly do not approve of the style of architecture adopted;" and in the *Globe* of the 28th ult., we have the following admissions:

"It is a somewhat startling fact, that of the \$61,829 expended in 1861, only \$39,500 went for the support of University College, where the real work of education is done. The rest was spent in management of the endowment, the support of scholarships, and in the maintenance of what is called the University of Toronto. The sum of \$8,554 was spent in the Bursar's Department."—"Between \$12,000 and \$13,000 are expended on the University of Toronto, including \$5,719 on scholarships; \$3,273 on salaries; \$1,200 on examiners; \$1,699 on stationery and printing, [a very large amount]; incidental expenditure, \$1,185. There is evidently room for *great* reduction in these items."—"The proposal that the Professor of Agriculture, who has never had more than seven matriculated students in any one session, and generally from two to four, should become an officer of the Board of Agriculture, and give public lectures in various parts of the Province, is a judicious one."—"The University funds should also be relieved of the burden of providing houses for the Director of the Observatory and paying

a portion of his salary, in consideration of the very slight services he performs as Professor of Meteorology."—"We cannot help saying, that when the Province pays for professors and buildings, fuel and lights, the friends of students should pay for board and lodging. If scholarships are to be given, however, in order to attract young men within the groves of the national University, they should be given, not to the sons of the rich, but to the poor. Hitherto it has not been so; it has been considered, we are told, 'inadvisable to affix the stigma of poverty to the holder of a scholarship.' The simple answer to this is, that if a student does not like the reputation of being poor, he need not accept a scholarship. Poverty is no disgrace in this country, and there are plenty who will receive with thankfulness the assistance of the State towards their education, even when coupled with the understanding that their parents are unable to provide for them during their University course. It is a practical absurdity that the University should be encroaching upon its capital in order to pay the board of the sons of wealthy parents. Let the rich receive medals for proficiency, but let the scholarships be given to those who need them."—"If the income is systematically exceeded, the capital will disappear, and University education will be left to the tender mercies of the Legislature, manipulated by the sects. We hope that condition of affairs so direful as far off. But there is no safety save in rigid economy. There ought to be no mealy-mouthed regard for the interests of individuals in this matter. If there are incompetent clerks in the Bursar's Office, or useless Professors in University College, their services should be dispensed with. There is no money to spare for drones. We cannot afford to peril one of our most useful and important Institutions for the sake of individuals. The University lands were set apart to afford higher education to the youth of Upper Canada, and not to give snug places to incapable servants."

We submit to any just man, whether the *Globe*, in the above quotations, has not admitted all that the Petitioners for University reform have complained of, and whether they have not therefore rendered signal service to the country by bringing before the public and Legislature facts involving the greatest misapplication of educational funds which has occurred in America. In 1854, when the large sum was appropriated for scholarships in order to attract students to University College, Drs. Ryerson and Nelles (as was proved before the Committee at Quebec), sought to get it reduced, and then to have it applied in aid of poor young men of merit; the *Globe*, after having abused them for years, now advocates the views as to scholarships, which they pressed in 1854. They also contended at Quebec that the Senate of the Toronto University ought not to cost more than the Senate of Queen's University in Ireland, whose expenses of all kinds amount to only about £500 per annum; and now the *Globe* maintains the very same thing. It must be no small satisfaction to those advocates and petitioners for University reform who have suffered so much obliquity and abuse, to find the very *Globe* which exceeded all other journals in the severity of its attacks upon them, now admitting every material fact which they alleged, condemning the

same extravagance and misappropriation of which they complained, and advocating the same reductions and retrenchment for which they contended.

On the score of expenditures and extravagance therefore the case of University reformers is established to the very letter, and beyond the letter, of their memorials.

It only remains for us to consider the plan of University reform proposed, and the objections which have been made to it. This will be done in another paper.

Having shown by indubitable proofs, and the admissions of the *Globe*, that expenditures of the University Funds unauthorized by law and extravagant in themselves, have been made, we now proceed to consider the plan of University reform proposed, and the objections which have been made to it. The plan of University reform proposed involves chiefly three questions,—1st. The improvement and unity of the University fund; 2ndly. The affiliation of Colleges in one University; 3rdly. The public aid to be given to affiliated Colleges.

I. Improvement and Unity of the University Fund.

One of the most humiliating facts in the history of Upper Canada is, that the capital of a fund set apart and consecrated to the higher education of the country, has been misapplied and reduced to the amount of hundreds of thousands of dollars, and the annual income of the fund has been thereby proportionably diminished. Apart from very large sums expended, as already shown, we may add that the part of the fund expended, in behalf of the Upper Canada College, (a Toronto Grammar School) with interest which would have accumulated had the money been invested at six per cent., would amount to no less than *three hundred and sixty-eight thousand one hundred and ninety-six dollars*, (\$368,196).

It is of no use to inquire now when and by what authority the capital of the University Fund has been so deplorably reduced, and its annual income so misapplied and exceeded; but every one must admit the duty of protecting, improving and economizing that fund in every way possible. The recommendations of the University Commissioners for that purpose, deserve the highest praise, instead of censure, whether each detail of their recommendations be thought best or not.

One of the recommendations of the Commissioners is to *capitalize* the fund and convert it into public debentures; which, (without increasing the public debt) would at once put an end to further mismanagement of the fund and prevent its further reduction.

Another recommendation of the Commissioners

is, that the Fund should be *improved*, not by adding to the original endowment, but by regarding that endowment as a sacred deposit and consecration to the higher education of the country, and by therefore restoring to the endowment what has been diverted from it to other objects, by whomsoever such diversion may have been made. And we submit that nothing would contribute more to the dignity of the country, to its noblest educational interests, to the feelings of self-respect and patriotic pride of every lover of it, than the fact that the Canadian Legislature had stamped by its fiat the *inviolableness* of its highest educational fund—repairing the breaches which have been made in it, and restoring to the last farthing the spoliations which have been committed upon it, or the diversions which have been made from it. What a guarantee would such an act be to our every educational and social interest; and what a hope and future would it awaken and open up to our country! In comparison of such a principle, such an object, such an interest, such a future, how utterly trivial and unworthy are the petty objections about increasing the public debt! Such an act would be only paying a debt to a wronged and abused interest of the country, and would be one of the best preventatives against any future abuse of public trust, and improvidence in the contract and expenditure of public debt.

Every man competent to review the progress of Government, legislation and society in our country, as well as in the neighboring States, during the last ten years, must feel that the standard of the public virtue has been lowered, that the sense of public, in contradistinction to personal interests, has been blunted, that even the spirit and method of discussing public questions has declined, and the moral sinews of uprightness, justice, manliness, and patriotism in political procedures, from local elections up to the highest acts of civil polity have been greatly relaxed. There is, therefore absolute need of reform; and the first step of reform, in a nation, as in an individual, is confession, restoring what has been wrongfully taken, and amendment of life. The language and influence of an act of reparation of the wrongs which have been committed against the University Endowment, would be of infinitely more value in girding up and strengthening the loins of public virtue in the Government and Legislation of the country aside from the direct advantages to higher education, than any sum of money which such an Act might require. When it is recollected that more than ten hundred thousand dollars have been expended on contemplated public buildings at Ottawa, and that eight hundred thousand dollars

more are intimidated by Commissioners as necessary to complete them, what man of any sect or party, impressed with the essential part and offices of moral and intellectual elements in rearing the noblest structure of civil and social progress, could hesitate as to the importance of restoring the spoliation and repairing the wrong which incompetency or degeneracy has, in past years, committed against the University endowment of Upper Canada? A small part of the Ottawa buildings, expenditure would restore to the University endowment its integrity, and confer priceless benefits upon the country in all time to come.

II. *The Affiliation of Colleges in one University.*

The question of the affiliation of Colleges is entirely distinct from that of economizing and improving the University endowment, and entirely distinct also from the question of public aid to Colleges. The Colleges have not asked, and do not ask, public aid upon the ground of affiliation, but upon the grounds of public justice, merit, and usefulness. If the whole of the University endowment were to be confined to one College at Toronto, it would not lessen one whit the necessity, the importance, the usefulness, the just claims of other Colleges to public aid. The question of affiliation is not, therefore, a means of getting aid to certain Colleges,—as has been so wrongly represented—but a measure for improving the character and system of the higher education of the country.

(History of the Question of Affiliation.)

The question of affiliation of all the colleges in one University is not of recent date. It reaches back to 1843. In 1840 Victoria College was incorporated as an University College, with a grant of £500 per annum; and Queen's College was incorporated as an University College by Royal Charter the following year, and afterwards received similar aid from Parliament. In 1842, Victoria College was inaugurated as an University College, and Queen's College was opened the same year; and King's College, at Toronto, in 1843. The University endowment was confined to King's College, with the service and Divinity Professor of the Church of England, and the Bishop as Visitor. Complaint was made against an endowment for higher education in Upper Canada being applied to one College, and that the College of one Church, to the exclusion of all others. To remedy the injustice and liberalize the system, Mr. Draper, (then Attorney General), brought in a Bill in 1846, based upon the principle of affiliation and unity of Colleges upon equal

terms; but the Church of England advocates of the exclusive claims of King's College opposed Mr. Draper's liberal Bill, and he was obliged to abandon it, and he soon after retired from Parliament to the Bench. In 1849, Mr. Baldwin brought in a Bill, abolishing the very name of King's College, prohibiting all recognition of religion, and establishing a secular University College, assuming that as denominational Colleges refused to affiliate because the King's College was of one Church, they would affiliate because Toronto University was of no church. The Toronto University (for such King's College was then called) was the antipodes of King's College, and was not less revolting to the feelings of the Christian public. Mr. Baldwin was so sensible of the mistake, that he afterwards introduced a Bill declaring the recognition of Christianity in the Toronto University; but a declaratory Bill of that kind had no practical effect. The Bishop of the Church of England, aided by liberal contributions in Canada and England, proceeded to establish Trinity College, and other parties so strongly opposed the Act of 1849, that it was repealed and superseded by the present University Act of 1853. The spirit and leading object of this Act of 1853 was to affiliate all the Colleges in the country into one University, by removing the obstacles which had heretofore prevented it. These obstacles to affiliation were chiefly two—first, the identity of the University with one College at Toronto, thereby giving that College an advantage over all others in the Constitution of the Senate; *secondly*, the exclusive application of the endowment to the support of one College, thereby giving it an advantage over all others in the means of support. To remove the former of these obstacles, the Toronto *University* was entirely separated from *University College*—the latter being a *teaching* Institution under the control of a Council, and the Act declaring that the former, under the control of a Senate, should contain no Professor or Teacher, but simply examine candidates and confer degrees, and prescribe the courses of study or conditions on which degrees should be conferred in the several faculties of Arts, Law and Medicine. Nothing therefore could be more at variance with the express objects and provisions of the University Act of 1853, than the later additions to the Senate so as to give the College at Toronto the virtual control of it, and identify the University as effectually with one College at Toronto as it had been by the repealed Act of 1841.

To remove the second obstacle to affiliation, the Act of 1853 provided that expenditures of the

University endowment at Toronto should be confined to defraying current expenses of University College, and the repairs and improvements of its buildings, and that the surplus of the endowment over and above these current expenses and expenses of repairs and improvements of the buildings of University College, should form a fund for general academical education as might be directed by Parliament.

Every man of common sense knows that to repair and improve buildings, is not to erect new buildings, much less to erect observatory buildings, ornament grounds, &c.; and therefore that doing the latter, instead the former, is an abuse of the provisions of the Act, and a misapplication of the University endowment fund.

The Bill (which became the University Act of 1853,) as brought into Parliament contained a clause providing for the application of a part of the Income of the Endowment to other Colleges than University College; and the Members of the Government of 1853, who are still in public life in Canada—namely, the Hon. James Morris and the Hon. M. Cameron—declare that the Government intended to fill up the blank in said clause with the sum of fifteen hundred pounds, to be paid annually to each affiliated College. But when it was objected that the Income fund was insufficient for that purpose, the section was changed for the one providing for the expenditure of the surplus of the fund, (after defraying the current expenses of University College, and of the repairs and improvements of its buildings,) for the promotion of general Academical education as Parliament might direct—leaving that part of the question to the future decision of Parliament.

The immediate friends of other colleges than that of Toronto, were well aware that the University Income fund would soon be sufficient to meet their just claims; they therefore awaited the result—in the meantime, of course, reserving the exercise of their University powers, until they should be placed upon fair footing with the College at Toronto; and it was not until they found out beyond doubt, that the objects of the University Act of 1853, had been altogether disregarded, and the University Permanent and Income Funds were both being expended contrary to the provisions of the Act, that they opened anew the discussion of the whole question, and made their complaints to Parliament.

No sincere man can deny that the object of the University Act of 1853 was the affiliation of the Colleges of the country, as also was that of the Acts repealed by it, when the very preamble of it

commences with the following words: "Whereas the enactments hereinafter repealed have failed to effect the end proposed by the Legislature in passing them, inasmuch as no College or Educational Institution hath under them become affiliated to the University to which they relate," &c. Nor can any man truly say, that it was ever supposed that any College would or could relinquish its own University powers to a body in Toronto identified with another College, or until that body should be impartially constituted, and each College impartially aided according to its works.

(The Nature of the Question of Affiliation.)

It being then clear that the affiliation of the several Colleges of the country in one University, was contemplated by successive acts of the Legislature, long before the present agitation of the question, and is therefore no recent device of certain Colleges, as has been so unjustly stated, let us now consider what is meant by it, and why it is desired.

The affiliation of several colleges in one University implies two things: First, That there be one body called the University which shall not teach, but which shall prescribe what is to be taught in order to obtain degrees and honors, examine candidates for such degrees and honors, and confer them, or authorize the conferring of them. Secondly, That the several Colleges affiliated shall teach what is prescribed by the University, and confer degrees on no candidates except those who have been examined and approved by the university.

In this plan it is, of course, assumed and required that the University shall be impartially constituted in respect to all the affiliated and competing Colleges; that such Colleges shall have a "fair field and no favour," so far as relates to the University, the Government and Legislature; that whatever advantages one competing College shall have over another shall arise from voluntary efforts, not from state patronage; that each College, irrespective of what is required to be taught by the University, shall equally prescribe its own religious instruction and discipline, and manage its own affairs.

In this plan there is unity in the required science, literature, and training of a University education; and there is liberty and diversity in what relates to financial management, modes of teaching, religious instruction, discipline and oversight. The University body that prescribes what an University education shall be, and who alone shall be certified to the country and to the world as having attained such an education, has no teach-

ing duty or competing interest in the work prescribed; the Collegiate bodies that do the prescribed teaching and training work, have to submit the results of their work to the examination and judgment of a common tribunal. By this plan the country has, of course, the best guarantee as to the character and value of the University education given; and the Colleges have all the freedom of action which the religious condition of the country requires, and all the promptings of mutual emulation and competition, in addition to the obligations of duty.

The affiliation of the several Colleges in one University has been considered so important, both as to the character and extension of University education, that it has been contemplated by successive Acts of Parliament for many years. The idea did not originate with any religious persuasion or denominational College, but with statesmen immediately after more than one College became established. At the present time we have the American system—almost every College is an University, and obtains more or less aid from the State, as influence and circumstances may favour. The plan of affiliation contemplates but one University, and Colleges aided upon an equitable system—putting an end to denominational petitions, or “manipulation,” in respect to Parliamentary grants in aid of Colleges.

It was therefore natural that the University Commissioners should direct their anxious attention to the important question of affiliation as well as to that of expenditure. The Commissioners addressed to the Heads of Colleges the following questions:

“I. Do you approve of the affiliation of the Colleges of Upper Canada to one University Board, and if so, state the advantages?”

“II. Do you consider the present system of affiliation to the University of Toronto unsatisfactory, and if so, state the reasons?”

“III. What system of affiliation would you consider most satisfactory with special reference to the following points: (1.) The mode of securing an equal standard of education. (2.) The principle of the apportionment of funds from public sources. (3.) The exercise of University powers by the affiliated Colleges. (4.) The composition of the General University Board.”?

The Commissioners addressed the same questions to the Senate of the Toronto University, through the Chancellor. The Senate referred the question to a Committee to prepare and report answers to them. The *Globe* says the Committee was packed by the Vice Chancellor Patton, and names as members of it, “Dr. Ryerson, Dr. Nelles, Dr. McCaul, Dr. Leitch, Vicar General McDonnell, Dr. Lillie, Dr. Willis, &c., all of whom, (says the *Globe*) we have ascertained were on this Committee, though it included three scarcely ever seen at

meetings of the Senate before.” All the gentlemen thus named on the Committee had frequently attended meetings of the Senate; and as Heads of Colleges, (except Dr. Ryerson) it was important that they should be upon it. But the *Globe* omits other names which he could, of course, as easily have ascertained as those which he has given. The names of members of the Committee omitted by the *Globe*, are—Hon. W. Cayly, Dr. Barrett, Mr. T. A. McLean, Mr. Adam Crooks. The mention of these names would have disproved the statement of the *Globe* that the Committee was packed in the interest of denominational Colleges against the Toronto University; for every one knows that the four gentlemen just named, together with Dr. McCaul and Dr. Lillie (constituting a majority of the Committee) would not do any thing prejudicial to the Toronto University. Fairness in the discussion of the question, and justice to all parties, required the *Globe* to mention the names which he has suppressed; and the omission of them argued a consciousness on the part of the *Globe* that his case required the use of unfair means in order to success. The Committee, after long discussion and deliberation, agreed *unanimously* upon the answers to be reported to the questions of the Commissioners. The report of the Committee was as carefully considered by the Senate, as it had been prepared by the Committee. The members of the Senate present at the final meeting when the report was adopted *nemine contradicente*,—first clause by clause, and then as a whole, (on motion of Dr. McCaul, seconded by Dr. Ryerson,) were as follows, as recorded by the Registrar: “The Vice Chancellor, Rev. Dr. McCaul, Rev. Dr. Willis, Rev. Dr. Ryerson, Mr. Jones, Dr. Barrett, Mr. Thomson, Mr. McLean, Dr. Smith, Mr. Crooks, Rev. Dr. Nelles, Rev. Dr. Lillie, Vicar Gen. McDonnell, Rev. Dr. Leitch, Rev. Dr. Jennings, Dr. Wilson, Mr. Cockburn, Mr. Cayley, Dr. Croft, Mr. Cherriman.”

The *Leader* makes no mention of any thing done by a Committee of the Senate, or by the Senate itself, on the question of affiliation; and the *Globe* omits the names of the lay members of the Committee, and also the names of more than half the members of the Senate present when the Report of the Committee was adopted. Now, the unanimously expressed opinion of the Senate on the subject, in answer to the above-quoted three questions of the Commissioners is as follows:—

“I. The Senate are of opinion that it is desirable to have one University Board for Upper Canada, which may be designated ‘The University of Upper Canada,’ to which certain Colleges, such as are hereinafter stated should be affiliated.

“Among the advantages of this arrangement may be mentioned: the fixing of the value of degrees,

the promotion of emulation among the affiliated Colleges, and the testing of the merits of different modes of instruction.

"II. The present system of affiliation under the statute is unsatisfactory, as it is practically inoperative, no sufficient inducements are held out for those Colleges which possess University powers, to give up or restrict them; the absence of limitation relative to the number and composition of the Senate is also objectionable.

"III. (1.) The Colleges affiliated under the University Board should be those which adopt a common curriculum, prescribed by a General University Board, which submit their students for simultaneous examination by Examiners appointed by such Board, and should have a competent staff of Professors for giving instruction in the curriculum.

"(2) The Senate would suggest that whatever sums the Legislature may see fit to set apart in aid of the Colleges affiliated by the University Act, exclusive of University College, should be divided into three equal parts, two of these to be divided equally among such Colleges, the other to be distributed in proportion to the beneficial results effected by such College. It is to be understood that this suggestion is not intended to interfere with the endowment of University College, it being the opinion of the Senate that University College has a first claim to a fixed endowment amply sufficient to its support in its present state of efficiency; and that it should have the power to establish Faculties of Law and Medicine, with the same support which is granted to corresponding Faculties in other Colleges, and also that it should be placed as to University powers on a par with them.

"(3) Such exercise should be limited to conferring degrees on such of their students as may have passed the prescribed examination in the University of Upper Canada, except in the Faculty of Divinity.

"(4) The number of the members of the Senate should be determined by the number of affiliated Colleges, one-third to be heads of such Colleges, one-third to be elected by the graduates of each College, and one-third to be appointed by the Provincial Government.

"In connection with these answers the Senate would further beg to suggest that in any new arrangement of the proposed University of Upper Canada, a Convocation should be created composed of the graduates of the Provincial University, with such powers as the Legislature may seem fit to confer upon the said Convocation, and especially with that of the election of the Chancellor of the University."

The above unanimous expression of opinion and recommendations by the Senate of the Toronto University (not published by the *Globe* or *Leader*) on the whole question of affiliation—the unsatisfactory character of the present system—the advantages of the affiliation of Colleges—the principle on which such Colleges should be aided—the composition of the Senate—must be considered as impartial and intelligent, worthy of universal respect, and of the deepest consideration of Statesmen and Legislators.

III. *The Public Aid to be given to Affiliated Colleges.*

We now advance to consider the last question—the public aid to be given to affiliated Colleges.

We have said that the claims of the several Colleges to public aid had no connexion with their affiliation in one University—that those

claims to legislative aid rested on the grounds of public necessity and justice, upon their merits and usefulness, whether they become affiliated Colleges, or remain as University Colleges.

We have also said, that upon the principles of equity all Colleges affiliated to a National University should be placed upon equal footing, so far as it relates to national aid or patronage. The fairness of the view is as plain as day to every candid mind, and involves principles so homebred and strong in the bosom of every just man, that it could not be long resisted by the advocates of monopoly if perseveringly insisted upon and pressed upon the Legislature and the country by the advocates of equal rights. The application of this principle could be the more strongly urged upon in the present case, inasmuch as one College has enjoyed an unjust and exclusive monopoly in times past—it has the less claim to any advantage over any other affiliated College in time to come. But the advocates of the rights of the classes represented by other Colleges, have waived the advantage of this claim over the classes represented by University College; that as the Free Church, the Baptists and Congregationalists, and some individuals of other churches, have expressed their preference for a non-denominational College over any denominational College, (though very many individuals in those three denominations think otherwise), the advocates of University reform concede what is desired by the Senate of Toronto University, that University College shall first have "a fixed endowment amply sufficient to its support in its present state of efficiency."

(Adequate support to University College.)

The first condition, therefore, involved in the plan of public aid to affiliated Colleges, is that an ample and *fixed* sum shall be provided out of the University endowment for the efficient support of University College at Toronto. This is asked, and all that is asked, by the Senate of the University itself. And Dr. Daniel Wilson, in his evidence before the University Committee of the Legislative Assembly at Quebec, as Representative of University College, expressed himself as follows on this subject:—

"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 may be the legitimate object 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."

In the above quotation, while Dr. Wilson, as the Representative of University College, explains the philosophy of the extravagance which has characterized the expenditure of the University endowment, he admits that that College has no claim to anything beyond an adequate support; and says the "should be delighted to see an adequate *specific endowment* set apart for us."

It is therefore admitted by the extreme advocates of University College, as well as unanimously proposed by the Senate of the University, that a specific and fixed sum shall be set apart for the support of University College. Against such authority the monopolist objections of the *Globe* and *Leader* can be of little worth.

As for ourselves, we have not specified any sum, large or small, which we think is adequate to support University College. We leave that to the justice and wisdom of the Legislature to decide. We simply advocate, and give authorities in support of, that principle that there should be a *fixed sum* for that purpose; and that Dr. Wilson and his colleagues, who, he admits are, only "men" should not continue to be placed in the way of temptations which, experience has so fully proved, are too strong for weak humanity, and especially when such a system of temptations has caused such enormous losses to the University endowment.

(*Public aid to other Colleges.*)

In regard to public aid to other colleges, the Senate of the Toronto University itself, has unanimously recognized the importance and advantages of such colleges; and has even suggested the mode in which the funds set apart by the Legislature for their support should be apportioned to each of them. We shall not here specify the sum which should be set apart for that purpose, any more than we have specified the sum which should be adequate to the support of University College. But if, after the erection of buildings and all the expense which has already been incurred in behalf of University College, twenty-eight thousand dollars per annum be considered necessary for its support, will the objector himself say that the one half of that sum is too much to aid each of the other, affiliated colleges, considering the work

they have done and are doing; considering the population they represent, and that their buildings have not cost the public revenue, or any public endowment, one farthing, but have been wholly provided by voluntary exertion?

(*Reasons for Public Aid to other Colleges.*)

Saying nothing more as to the amount of public aid to each of the affiliated colleges—leaving that for decision to the justice, wisdom and patriotism of the Legislature—we will briefly state some reasons why such aid should be given.

1. Public aid has been granted to all but one of these colleges since their first establishment—now more than twenty years. Though that aid has been insufficient, immense good has been done by it. If a comparison be instituted between what has been done by these colleges with what has been done by University College, and the amount of public aid given to each, the result will prove a thousand percent of public advantage in favour of the public aid given to those colleges.

2. It is just to grant public aid to these colleges. If large public support is granted to University College, which represents the views and provides for the wants of certain classes of the community in a manner agreeable to their wishes, it is only just that support should be given to colleges which represent the views and supply according to their wishes other large classes of the community.

3. It is liberal. The recognition of all colleges as fellow-laborers, that do the same higher educational work, and entitled to stand on equal footing of public aid according to their work, whether of one denomination, or of no denomination, is the true liberality of Christianity and patriotism. Treat alike all colleges doing the same public work—aid all, or aid none. To aid one alone, to the exclusion of all others doing the same work, is bigotry, monopoly, injustice, intolerance.

4. It is best for the diffusion of higher education. Hundreds of young men who have been educated in the several denominational colleges, and are already doing good service to the country as well as credit to themselves, never would have been thus educated at all, had there been no more than one college, or no such colleges in Upper Canada. And never were they so largely useful as at the present time. Their efficient aid is therefore a matter of great public interest for the wider diffusion of higher education.

5. It is best for elevating the standard and character of higher education. This is well stated by the Senate of the Toronto University, as above quoted. One separate and distinct Provincial

Board to prescribe the standard and subjects of teaching for all the colleges, and they all—stimulated by emulation and competition, as well as by duty, to work up to that standard in all the subjects prescribed, how greatly must the standard and character of higher education be improved, in comparison of a system in which each college would have no standard or emulation beyond itself, and in which there would be a dead monopoly of one college?

6. It is the best, and indeed the only system, for developing voluntary efforts and powerful influences in behalf of higher education. It is never supposed, except by the advocates of a one-college monopoly that public funds are to defray all the expenses of University education. The sections of the community represented by the several colleges, erect their buildings, and largely sustain them, independent of public aid, which, however liberal, only supplements their own exertions. And the very influences which have contributed to provide these buildings, are employed to fill them with students. Such exertions and influences, developed and encouraged by public aid, must operate most beneficially upon both the character and extension of higher education. All such exertions and influences are discouraged and deadened by the Toronto monopoly system.

7. Uniting the University endowment and all the appropriations made by the Legislature into one fund, and aiding the several colleges from it, is the best for the integrity and economical management and expenditure of the Fund. All the sections of the community represented by the colleges would have a common interest in conserving and improving the Fund, and in securing its most economical management and application—the very reverse of what has been done under the Toronto monopoly system.

8. The plan proposed of aiding colleges will put an end to the system of annual grants to individual colleges, and to all the “manipulation” and inconveniences connected with it. These grants are the only case in which aid to education is given by an annual vote, and not by a permanent Act of Parliament. By the plan proposed, the colleges will be aided more effectually upon the principles of equity according to their works; no denomination will be brought in contact with the Government or Parliament; the efficiency of each college will be tested by the University Board examination of its students, and the public aid to it be determined accordingly.

9. It is the best for the interest of religion. After all, religion is the highest interest and only hope of the country, as well as of each individual in it;

and religion exists only among and by the several religious persuasions. Notwithstanding the sneer of the scorner, no fact is more certain and important than this. Without the religious persuasions, there would be no religion in the country, and Canada would soon become what France was during the French revolution—a cesspool of vice, a volcano of anarchy, a field of blood. Every good christian and patriot must desire that the best educated youth of the country should be imbued with religious principles and habits; and every wise parent must desire his son, while pursuing his education from home, should be under all the religious influences which christian example, instruction and oversight can exert upon him. Whether this is likely to be done in a college of no religious persuasion, or of some religious persuasion, can be decided by every reader.

10. Aiding several colleges is the only system which keeps faith with the terms of the original endowment. In the despatch of the Duke of Portland in 1797—seventy years since—communicating the intention of His Majesty George III, to set apart a portion of the Crown Lands for the purposes of higher education in Upper Canada, the object of the University endowment is expressly declared to be, not for the establishment of a College, but “of *Seminaries of a larger and more comprehensive nature*,” (than the Grammar Schools just before mentioned and provided for) “for the promotion of religious and moral learning, and the study of the arts and sciences.” Whatever, therefore, is alleged upon the ground of public faith as to the endowment, must apply to the purposes for which the endowment was created.

11. To aid several colleges is the only way to meet the higher educational wants of the country. It is well known in Toronto, and is stated in the Commissioners' Report, that notwithstanding the vast expenditure in the erection of the college buildings at Toronto, convenience has been so completely sacrificed to show and decoration, that “even now, when the number of students is far smaller than in this growing country may reasonably be expected to assemble within its walls, complaints are made that the accommodation afforded to University College is greatly limited.” It is known that the buildings were specially erected for University College; that the name of the University was used as a means of getting a larger expenditure and more magnificent buildings for the college. The Senate Chamber, so called, is the Council Chamber of the College; the Convocation Hall of the Senate, so called, is the Convocation Hall of the College. The Senate does not meet in the college at all, but in a class-

om in Upper Canada College, where even de-
rees have been conferred on students of the Uni-
versity. The *Globe* is right in saying that the ex-
penditure in relation to the cumbrous machinery
of the University, as heretofore managed, is need-
less waste. Yet after all the expenditure for col-
lege accommodations at Toronto, the college
class-rooms are already crowded to excess. Sup-
pose then that all the students attending the
several colleges of the country, were to come to
University College at Toronto, as the advocates
of monopoly contend, where would they find
room, and what one professor could teach them
all classics, what other professor could teach them
all mathematics? To deny aid, therefore, to
other colleges, is either to provide additional
college accommodations and employ additional
professors at Toronto, or leave more than half of
the now college going youth of the country with-
out any facilities of higher education, unless pro-
vided for them by voluntary exertion. The
Globe has admitted, that "the University lands
were set apart to afford higher education to the
youth of Upper Canada, not to give places to in-
capable servants;" but not one-half of the youth
of Upper Canada now pursuing collegiate educa-
tion can be educated in the one college at Toron-
to, with its present accommodations and present
corps of teachers, notwithstanding the immense
expense incurred in providing them. The only
just and effectual, as well as most economical
method of providing facilities for the higher
education of all the youth of Upper Canada seek-
ing it, is through the several colleges appertain-
ing to and established by different sections of the
people.

(Objections Answered.)

A few words, in conclusion, in answer to ob-
jections.

Objection 1. "To aid the several Colleges is to encour-
age sectarian education."

Answer. Suppose this were the case, would it
not be better that the youth of the country, edu-
cated or uneducated,—and the more so if highly
educated—should be carefully taught and trained
in the doctrines, principles and duties of religion,
as believed by their denomination, than to have
no religious tendency or training at all? What
would soon be the state of our country, if its youth
were not nurtured in the doctrines, principles or
practice of any religious persuasion—for that is
the simple import of the objection against what
is called "sectarian education." If the youth of
the country are taught in religious doctrine and
worship at all, must they not be taught and

trained in the doctrines and worship of some re-
ligious persuasion? Is there any such thing as
non-denominational religion or worship? Have
not all the great good men that have blessed
Great Britain or America, been members of some
"sect," and received, earlier or later, a "sectarian,"
that is a religious, education? There is no such
thing as religious instruction which is not given
by the member of some "*Sect*", that is a "secta-
rian." To oppose an education, which involves
religious instruction by some sect, is therefore to
oppose all religious instruction of youth. If
"sectarian" worship, (that is worship according to
the forms of some sect) teaching, habits, are good
on Sabbath, are they evil on other days? If a pa-
rent wishes his son to be nurtured in Christian
doctrines, worship and duties, does he wish that
son to be without any such nurture or even over-
sight during four years of his education—four of
the most critical years of his life? Will the ob-
jector answer these questions? Besides, are Clas-
sics, or Mathematics, or Chemistry, or Natural or
Mental and Moral Philosophy, sectarian because
taught in a denominational College? Is not a
bushel of wheat grown by a sectarian as good and
worth as much as one of like weight and quality
grown by a non-sectarian? And is not a given
amount of Classics, Mathematics and other pre-
scribed subjects of an University education, of as
great value to the student and to the country at
large, if taught in a denominational College as if
taught in a non-denominational one? And is not
the religious worship, religious instruction, and
religious oversight of a denominational College as
useful to a student and likely to be as useful to
the country, as no religious worship, no religious
instruction, nor religious oversight of a non-de-
nominational College? When both Colleges teach
the same subjects of literature and science and up
to the same standard, if the College of no religion
is supported with both buildings and income, and
the College of some religion is denied even an in-
come, is not the conclusion irresistible that no
religion is to be endowed and some religion is to
be proscribed when connected with higher educa-
tion? For a man of no religion to make the ob-
jection in question is quite consistent; but for a
man professing religion to make it, does it not
prove beyond doubt that his bigotry to his own
denomination and his jealousy and hatred of
other denominations having Colleges are stronger
than his convictions of religion itself? When the
objector shall have answered these questions, we
will be prepared to give a still more ample answer
to his objection.

Objection 2. "To grant public aid to denominational Colleges is inconsistent with the fundamental principles of our non-denominational common school system."

Answer. The reverse is the case, as will presently appear. But observe, there is a wide difference in the circumstances of pursuing common school and university education. In pursuing the former the pupil is with his parents sixteen hours out of twenty-four, and the whole of Saturday and Sunday, and has therefore the security and benefit of ample parental and pastoral instruction and oversight; in pursuing the latter he is not with his parents or pastor from one month's end to another.

Now the objection is founded upon the assumption that the fundamental principle that our common school system is non-denominational—an assumption founded upon an ignorance of the school law; for the law provides, and has provided during twenty years, that there may be a denominational school in every school section if desired; it provides also that the Board of School Trustees may establish denominational schools, and denominational schools only, if they please, in every city, town, and incorporated village in Upper Canada. The law leaves it with the electors and their Trustee representatives in each of these municipalities to decide for themselves whether their schools shall be denominational or not. What is optional cannot be fundamental, but must be contingent or incidental.

The fundamental principles of our common school system are two. First, the right of the parent and pastor to provide religious instruction for their children, and that they shall have facilities for that purpose. For this express provision is made in the law and general regulations. Apply this principle to the Collegiate system of the country. Should the United right of the parent and pastor not be provided for during the years that the son is away from home pursuing his higher education, or should it be provided for as far as possible? Let parental affection and conscience reply. Then can the combined care and duty of the parent and pastor be best provided for in a denominational or non-denominational College? This question admits of but one answer.

The second fundamental principle of our common school system is, the aid of the State upon the condition of, and in proportion to local effort in each school section. This is a most vital principle of the system, and as a chief element of its success, no public aid is given until a school-house is provided, and a legally qualified teacher is employed, when public aid is given according to the work done in the school; that is, in proportion to

the number of children taught and the length of time the school is kept open; and public aid is given for the purchase of school maps and apparatus, prize books and libraries in proportion to the amount provided from local sources.

Now, apply this vital principle of our system of common school education to our system of collegiate education. A section of the community—a denominational or not—provides college buildings and employs the professors. The State, through a University Board prescribes the kind or curriculum of collegiate education to be given and decides upon the amount and merits of the work done in each college by examining its students and determining their degrees, and then aids each college in proportion to the number of students taught and approved. This is the system of collegiate education which we have advocated; and is not this the fundamental principle of our common school system instead of being opposed to it? On the contrary, the advocates of a one-college monopoly repudiate, in relation to the system of collegiate education, this fundamental principle of our common school system. They have provided no college buildings, nor employed professors, nor done a certain amount of collegiate work, and then asked for public aid in proportion to the work done. They have contributed nothing, have done nothing as a condition of public aid in the great work of collegiate education, yet, though drones, and standing with folded arms, they claim to consume all public aid given for its promotion, and have even the hardihood to denounce, as sectarian and selfish, the bee-like industry of their fellow-citizens for insisting upon sharing in the bread of the common hive in proportion to their own contributions of educational honey to it! Now, if the principle of public aid combined with local effort is so vital to our common school system, and has produced such wonderful results, why should it be repudiated in our collegiate system? Whether it be a municipal, or a denominational section of the community that puts forth the efforts and fulfils the conditions of public aid, involves no principle, is merely incidental, is no part of the concern or business of the State; the principle of co-operation is the same; the work is the same; the education is the same; the public benefit is the same; and the public aid should be the same.

We may also add, that while the system of collegiate education we advocated, thus accords with the fundamental principles of our common school system, those denominations and parties who have most earnestly advocated University Reform, have

been from the beginning, most earnest promoters of the common school system.

Objection 3. "Your system will lead to the establishment of too many colleges."

Answer. The supply in this respect never has exceeded, and in the nature of things, never will exceed the demand. No denomination or section of the community will incur the heavy expense and obligation of providing buildings and an adequate staff of professors to teach the subjects of the prescribed University curriculum, unless they can command a sufficient number of students to require a college. In Cambridge University there are sixteen competing colleges, and the average number of students annually matriculated in each college, is *thirty-one*. In Oxford University there are twenty-six colleges, and the average number of students admitted per annum into each college, is nineteen. The number of colleges, when not independent Universities, but competing colleges in one University, increases the competition, and therefore elevates the standard and character of the University education given.

Objection 4. "The denominations that have no colleges will not share in the University funds."

Answer. Certainly not, when the apportionment is upon the condition of work, any more than a school section that does no work can share in the apportionment of the common school fund. But no one ever proposed to apportion the University fund to denominations, but to colleges, whether denominational or not, doing publicly prescribed University work, and on account of doing that work, irrespective of their denominational character or control. The denominations not having, or caring to have, colleges of their own, can send their sons to the colleges of other denominations most agreeing with them, or to the non-denominational college more amply provided and endowed in proportion to the numbers of non-college denominations than any other colleges in the country.

Objection 5. "The heads and representatives of the several colleges being members of the University Board, will lower the standard of University education."

Answer. The Heads of those colleges have been members of the Senate in past years. It has been proved and admitted that the standard of Uni-

versity education has been materially lowered since 1853, but has been lowered entirely by parties connected with or advocating the monopoly of University college; and not one of the Heads of other colleges has ever suggested or advocated lowering the standard of University education, and some of them have lamented that it has been done.

Objection 6. "The Senate so largely composed of Heads and Representatives of Colleges, they will control the University endowment and dispose of it as they please."

Answer. It is not proposed to give the Senate the control of the University fund at all, but that the endowment shall be managed, and the fund apportioned, by the Government through its responsible officers, as are the Grammar and Common School Funds.

Be it also observed, that whatever has been said as to the composition of the Senate or any other matter of University reform, has been merely suggested for the consideration of the Government and Legislature, to whose judgment and decision the whole question is submitted.

To conclude. On reviewing the whole question, it must be seen how groundless and unjust are the statements that the advocates of University reform are seeking to pull down a national University and destroy University College at Toronto. Many well meaning men have been misled by the frequency and boldness with which these truthless statements have been made by ignorant or interested partizans. The unanimously expressed judgment and recommendations of the Senate of the University on the subject are our ample vindication and complete refutation of the misrepresentations which have been propagated on the subject.

We confidently appeal to every candid and attentive reader, whether the system of University reform which we advocate does not involve the true principles of nationality, of justice to all parties, of public co-operation with voluntary effort,—of unity in what is essential, and liberty in what is circumstantial—of a high standard of University education, and the most economical and efficient means of widely diffusing it.