

the Senate of the University, or the convocation of the graduates that we are, in all the positions which we take, the creatures of the public will, established by the statutes of the land, and that we are carrying out to the best of our ability the duties which have been assigned to us under the laws of the land. Many years ago the endowment, by virtue of which this institution lives, was created; but it was created not for the benefit of all, but for the benefit of the adherents of one particular denomination. At a subsequent period a considerable portion of it was withdrawn for an institution of great consequence indeed, but not of the character of a university. Against the application of that endowment to the purposes and objects of a single church there arose naturally and properly a struggle, and ultimately the constitution of this institution was modelled on a large and comprehensive basis. I have always regretted that the Church to whose special use the endowment was at first applied did not accept the situation and avail itself of its denomination funds and energies to create a great theological college in close connection with the State University, and help on that which had become the settled policy of the country, and which I believe would have been by its assistance rendered beneficial to the State at large, and to the particular denomination to which I refer. But after all it was not very unnatural that those who obtained this endowment should be very much disappointed when it was thus set off. It was only the other day that we learned that the peculiar ideas, which I thought had vanished, still hold, for no less a person than the Archbishop of Canterbury has declared that an act of confiscation and spoliation was committed when the endowment was diverted from the improper purposes to which it was at first applied, to the

only proper purpose, a purpose available for the general good of all, whatever the creed or denomination. Owing to this and other circumstances there were for many years those who were dissatisfied with the new constitution of the University. It had been devoted to the purposes of one denomination—it became applicable to the purposes of all, and there were those who insisted that this was a bad thing too; who insisted that it ought to be divided, ought to be made applicable to the various denominations. An organized effort, which sometimes threatened serious consequences, was made to subvert the remodelled constitution. But this University has survived those efforts, and survives them still. It has grown in spite of all that opposition, and it will grow still. It is strong in spite of all that opposition, and it will, I believe, become stronger still. The University, as such, has never had any hostility towards any other educational institution. Its officers desire to live on the most friendly relations with all such institutions. We feel that it is our duty to forward the interests, to advance the claims of this State institution, of which we are the guardians, and of that duty there is no part which obliges us to assume hostility to others. But it is necessary, after all has been said, that a few words should be spoken from this platform upon a great question which I supposed was settled finally many years ago. I need not say to you that I do not speak to you to-day as explaining the views of the Senate of the University of Toronto. I speak to you as official heads of other universities in the Old Land are permitted to speak on their annual celebrations—on my individual responsibility, and expressing my own sentiments. Nor do I intend to enter into any argument or reason upon points which