

proportion of the Collegiate work of the country that it does. With submission, I say that such an argument has only to be stated in words to be rejected. Every item of the conclusion would be combatted by men in sympathy with a truly national system of higher education. But, as some might agree with me on one item but not on others, let us

LOOK AT THE CONCLUSIONS ONE BY ONE:

1. Does it follow that because there is a public system of education, there should be only one College? That would be the idol of excessive simplification runmad. We have more than a hundred High Schools and Collegiate Institutes. These ought to supply and they do supply students enough for three or four Colleges. There is a limit to the number of students that class-rooms can accommodate, and a limit to the number of students that professors can attend to, unless the students are to be neglected and the professors confined to hack work. *More than one College is needed in Ontario.* Why, then, if public support is to be given, should it be limited to one? Would it not be in true accord with our High School system to have at least two or three Colleges in suitable centres? And if voluntary effort has already established these, would it not be wise and economical on the part of the legislature to recognize and stimulate that voluntary effort? The legislature does so in the case of schools of art, mechanics' institutes, and other institutions. Why not in the case of colleges? Must a fetish called the State enter into senseless competition with more than half of the people who constitute the state? Such a position seems to me irrational. A college may have been

FORCED INTO EXISTENCE

by the unjust attitude of the State; it may have been the first in the country free to all without distinction of creed; it may be completely unsectarian so far as its arts and science courses are concerned; it may be situated in an appropriate centre; it may be open to both sexes and thus to all, instead of half the population; it may have as many professors as University College, or twice as many, and yet it has only to be snobbishly styled "denominational" to be ruled out of court. Is it not about time for men of candour to cease pretending to be frightened by this bogey? What the country needs is not phrases but facts. It needs more than one college. In Great Britain the principle adopted to secure and to perfect the colleges that are needed is that the Government shall help those who help themselves. On this principle it helps all the Scottish colleges, though all of them have theological faculties, and it is now proposing to give \$20,000 a year to a new college in Wales. The same principle is adopted in India, Cape Colony, and elsewhere. We are asked to adopt the principles of helping only those who will not help themselves.

GRANTS BY PARLIAMENT.

2. It is not in accordance with our educational system that schools or colleges shall receive the whole of their support from the Legislature. In the case of common and high schools the people who are chiefly benefitted have to contribute the largest proportion of the support. The grant that the Legislature gives to high schools does not amount to one-third of their annual cost. If the Province has more money to give to education, it should first of all give it to improve the High Schools. These need it most and, in fact, the best way to help the colleges is to improve the secondary education of the country. We ought to have in Ontario a dozen first-rate High Schools. I would not like to say how many or few we have, for, what I wish to point out at present is that it

does not follow, because an institution is Provincial it should therefore be wholly and unconditionally supported by the Province. The grant to the High Schools and Collegiate Institutes, though comparatively trifling in amount, is conditioned by results—the sum contributed by the county or city, the number of teachers employed, and other factors. A year or two ago, University College recognized the principle I am now pointing out by

IMPOSING CLASS FEES.

May it not take one or two more steps on the same line? May it not appeal to the citizens of Toronto? May it not appeal to those graduates who were educated in the Consulship of Plancus? Should it not cease to take money for Scholarships out of its endowment? May it not raise its fees to something like the standard in other countries? There is nothing peculiarly sacred in its present rate of \$20 a year. Scottish students are poorer in purse than Canadian, yet the class fees in the national universities of Scotland average \$50 a year, and the fact that the number of students is much greater in Scotland in proportion to population, shows that such fees exclude none who are determined to obtain a university education. Indeed I would vote for putting up such a fence in the hope that it would keep some men from coming to college. I want no men at college unless they have minds, and a mind to work. Men with such minds can earn money more easily in Canada than in Scotland. Again, Upper Canada College is as well endowed relatively to its sphere, as University College, yet its fees are \$50 a year. If the boys have to pay \$50, why not the aspiring and ambitious young men? In a word, the Province has

DONE A GREAT DEAL FOR UNIVERSITY COLLEGE,

and some of us think that it is in order now that the persons and places that have benefitted most should do a little. The Province has given half a million for buildings and a million for endowment. My friends, call you that little? I wish we had as much. And we have done much. And we have done something. How much have you done?

3. I quite agree with "A Toronto Graduate," that "higher education cannot safely and advantageously be left to denominational effort." I think the Legislature acted wisely in determining at the outset that there should be at least one college in Ontario well equipped. If all the people had patronized that college till its class-rooms were filled, the Province would have been called upon, as the population increased, not to pamper and overload the one, but to establish another college and then another in different centres; but at least one half of the people preferred to establish colleges on what they conceived

A GRANDER IDEAL.

They did so, not for mere denominational ends, as is ignorantly asserted, but from the highest public motives. Those men were among the noblest that ever lived in this great province. Read the list of our founders, if you would know what manner of men they were. Their names are inscribed in the Capitol. They did their work with a view to the best interests of the country. Such voluntary activity should be encouraged in a highly organized society. The less that "the state" is called upon to do the better. Doubtless the men who gave its constitution to Toronto University also acted in the public interest. And I say that the country is richer from possessing both kinds of institutions. Its educational life is fuller, more varied and more independent. Every one but the fanatics, who would reduce all life to the pattern of their own brickyard, will agree with me in this. Well, is the actual history of the country not to be recognized? If the university question is to be re-opened, is it to be