

it into so much importance, shows how, in their paucity of materials of justification, they have laid hold of the most trivial circumstance that could be construed into a show of plausibility in their favour. I will now demonstrate the absurdity and groundlessness of their assertions. In the first place, Dr. Barrett never did and never could sit in the Senate "to represent the Medical Faculty of Victoria College;" and no man should know this better than Mr. Langton himself. When the Senate was constituted in 1854, the Governor in Council appointed certain persons by name as members, and certain others by office. Of the latter class were the Chief Superintendent of Education, Presidents of several Colleges named, and the *President of the Toronto School of Medicine*, which was then by the Governor admitted on application as an affiliated College of the University; and it has remained so ever since. As President of the Toronto School of Medicine Dr. Workman took his seat in the Senate. That was long before the Medical Faculty of Victoria College was in existence. When Dr. Workman resigned his place as President of the Toronto School of Medicine, Dr. Barrett was elected in his place, and as his successor took his seat, and as such occupies it to this day. Nearly a year after the President of the Toronto School of Medicine took his seat in the Senate, one of its Professors appeared before the Board of Victoria College, and sought on behalf of himself and colleagues to be recognized as the Medical Faculty of Victoria College. The application was entertained; but Dr. Barrett has declared, and it appears made oath before the Court of Chancery that the Toronto School of Medicine never did become the Medical Faculty of Victoria College, and the Court has so decided. Yet in the presence of these facts, Mr. Langton and Dr. Wilson state that "Dr. Barrett took his seat to represent the Medical Faculty of Victoria College!"

*(Scholarships—Mr. Langton answered.)*

To Mr. Langton's lengthened observations and tabular sophistry on Scholarships in the English and Irish Universities and Colleges, I have amply replied in my Defence of the Petitioners; and the criticisms in his notes on the 19th page do not in the least weaken the force of the English documentary authorities by which I established my positions. On the contrary, any one who, after having read Mr. Langton's criticisms, will turn to my statements and authorities (pp. 20-23 of the Quebec edition, or pp. 36, 37 of the Toronto edition of my Defence of the Petitioners,) will be the more confirmed in their conclusiveness. Dr. Wilson quotes the remarks of the Rev. Provost Whitaker, that the case of Scholarships in the English Universities and Canada is so unlike, that there is no analogy. That was my chief argument in reply to Mr. Langton and Dr. Wilson; and I therefore showed that Mr. Langton's references and statements as to Scholarships in England and Ireland, were fallacious and irrelevant. I shall also have more to say on this subject, as also on several other topics over which I now pass, in my concluding General Observations.

*(Standard of Matriculation—Mr. Langton's statements corrected and refuted.)*

On no subject have Mr. Langton and Dr. Wilson evinced more