

upon. It was true that the report emanated from a committee appointed for the purpose of watching any legislation with reference to University reform. But the committee, in their discretion, had thought proper to take a wider range, and place themselves in communication with the different parties capable of informing them as to what were the wishes and intentions of different bodies in regard to University reform. The latter part of this report embodied clearly and distinctly what at the present time was the intention of the various colleges in Upper Canada in reference to university education. It said,—“Your committee have much pleasure in being able to report that their labours have not been entirely in vain, as the Senate of the University of Toronto have unanimously assented to a scheme of affiliation, which, it is confidently believed, will hold out inducements sufficient to cause the several chartered colleges to become connected with the University of Upper Canada.” That was the pith of the report. The committee stated that a scheme of affiliation had been assented to unanimously by the body most interested in it,—the Senate of the University itself. And the scheme assented to by the Senate was one which had not the approval of all the chartered colleges, if he might except Trinity College, in Upper Canada. From a full knowledge of the facts, both in his capacity as a member of the Senate [and Vice-Chancellor of the University of Toronto], and having been intimately connected with this scheme of affiliation as one of the Commissioners appointed by the Government to inquire into the expenditure of University College, he was able to state that this scheme had been assented to by Victoria College, by Regiopolis College, by Queen's College, and also by the University College in connection with the University of Toronto. In this affiliation there was no departure from principle. It was not, as he had heard, and as he had seen it stated this morning, in one of the journals of this city, a scheme by which the National University was to be plundered, by which \$10,000 was to be handed over to each of the colleges affiliated, something which, after all, was neither more nor less than a scheme on the part of the Chief Superintendent of Education to destroy the National University. He (Mr. Patton) would state deliberately to the Synod, that the thanks of this Synod, and of the people of Western Canada, were due to the Chief Superintendent of Education for the part he had taken in endeavouring to bring about this system of affiliation. He (Dr. R.) had acted a noble and patriotic part in the course he had taken; he had not endeavoured to destroy the University, or to strip it of its endowment, but to bring about a system of affiliation which would secure a uniform system of education, and that the degrees conferred in Canada would have a value which they did not now possess. The scheme was not such as had been described by the Rev. Provost, by Dr. Beaven, and other speakers. It was simply that there should be an affiliation on the part of the different colleges. They were not called upon to surrender their power of conferring degrees. (Hear, hear.) They were not called upon to give up any of their rights and privileges, except perhaps in this small particular, that they should admit the examiners from the Central Board. It was proposed that a Central Board should be established, similar to the bodies referred to in his lordship's letter, the Regents' Board of the State of New York, the University Commissioners in Scotland, and the Medical Council in England; that this Central Board should have power to appoint examiners, to take part in the examinations of the different universities; that the returns made by these examiners to the Central Board should be reported on by them, and sent back to the different colleges; and that the degrees should be conferred by the colleges themselves. (Hear, hear.) He asked, was there in this a surrender of any of the power which Trinity College possessed? Were they called upon in any one way or shape to give up the powers they had under their separate charter? He heard a voice saying “Yes,” but he could not take that view. It was simply the power of examining that was to be assumed by the Central Board,—not the power of conferring degrees. It had been the difficulty hitherto, that the proposition had been that the colleges should give up the power of conferring degrees, or hold it in abeyance. But the scheme which had just been assented to did not involve any proposition of that kind, but affirmed the right of the different colleges to confer degrees, and provided, moreover, that there should be a uniform standard, to be brought about by the appointment of examiners by the Central Board. It might be said that the Central Board might be of such a character that would not be impartial, that it might have a leaning to this or that college. But it was provided that the board,—not the present board now existing,—but the new board to be established, should be composed of representatives, equal in numbers, from each of the affiliated colleges.

How, then, could there be anything in the shape of partiality? The board would comprise the heads of the different colleges, and one or more members appointed by the corporations of these colleges, and a certain number appointed by the Crown. All the colleges would thus have an equal and fair representation on the board, and would meet with impartial justice at its hands. He understood every one who had yet spoken on this question to say that what he desired was that there should be a higher standard of education. He cordially concurred in that sentiment, and it should be the desire and aim of every one connected with any of the colleges in Upper Canada to co-operate heartily and cordially with a movement of this kind, which was intended to bring about something like uniformity in university education, and by which the standard must be materially raised. He could not conceive what objection could be entertained to the scheme. If they were asked, by voting on the report, to say they were willing to surrender the powers of Trinity College, he could understand objections to that, but the case was entirely different when they were simply asked to co-operate in a movement by which the standard of university education would be raised throughout Western Canada. They were asked, as one of the most influential bodies in Western Canada, to lend their countenance to a scheme which had been taken in hand, he was sorry to say, by others before them. He was sorry they should not, as the religious body of greatest wealth and intelligence, be leading public opinion in this matter, instead of lagging behind, and having to be dragged into it. He believed, however, that the clergy and laity of this Church, as a whole, would endorse the action taken by the other bodies, and that they would not hold back and leave it to others to carry out what he would say unhesitatingly, would, with or without the co-operation of this Synod, be carried into effect. It had been taken up by the other bodies, there was justice and impartiality on the face of it, and he thought it would be much better that they should go with good grace into the arrangement which had been entered into by the others, and that they should adopt this report.

Rev. Provost Whittaker said, after hearing the explanations of Mr. Patton, he must say that what was taken from them was the power, what was left them was the form of conferring degrees; for it was proposed that a new body should be established, exterior to the college, and that to that body should be confided the power of prescribing the examinations under which the degrees should be conferred. The executive power also of appointing examiners would be taken from the college and given to the board, and the Chancellor instead of being an officer of Trinity College, would become really an officer of the University of Upper Canada.

Dr. Bovell said he never had been prepared, and trusted never would be prepared to surrender one single principle on which Trinity College was founded, but if they could improve the interests and standing of the college, without the sacrifice of principle, it was their duty to do it. He thought that under the scheme as explained by Mr. Patton, Trinity College would be left all its powers and privileges as they stood at present. There was nothing in it that would interfere with the regulation which allowed degrees to be conferred only on those who had passed an examination by the Bishop. These were his opinions, but he should not give any vote which was directly opposed to the expressed wishes of the Bishop. He only wished to state freely his own opinion that it would be for the good of the country if some such scheme as that explained by Mr. Patton were carried into effect.

Rev. Mr. Dewar having been informed by Mr. Gamble that there was a rule of the Synod, requiring that every motion to lay upon the table should be decided without debate, begged to withdraw his amendment, so as not to stop debate.

Col. O'Brien spoke in favour of the report being referred back to the committee. He objected to any scheme about University education being sent forth by this Synod, which did not have his Lordship's full concurrence.

Mr. Grover, of Colborne, moved in amendment, “That the report on University Education be not now adopted.”

Mr. R. Baldwin seconded Mr. Grover's amendment. He begged to ask Mr. Patton whether it was intended that any moneys of the University should go to the denominational colleges, beyond what might go in the shape of scholarships.

Hon. Mr. Patton said that, as part of the scheme of affiliation, it was considered by all interested in the question, by the authorities of University College, by the Senate of the University, and by the other parties concerned, that the Act of 1853, under which the University of Toronto and University College were established, should be carried out, as the Legislature intended it should be, when it was passed. That Act provided that,