

section of the University Senate takes the same view of this matter. I know also, that however large the amount which has been spent in what I regard as the unjust, and unwise way objected to, and which was all public money quite as much as the grant—even if it had exceeded the amount of the grant, it would have been raised somehow or other, and the entire \$160,000, that is the whole grant, as a matter of course, applied to the special purpose for which it was voted. Everybody at all acquainted with the financial affairs of Toronto University at the present time is aware that the money already spent on these buildings, has seriously crippled the University, and prevents the possibility of some departments, however urgent their needs, having their due share of money spent upon them. From Sir Daniel Wilson's letter it might be gathered, that the Medical and Biological Departments constitute almost the entire University. This is, however, by no means the case. Yet from the lavish way in which money has been spent on these, and the warm justification of this expenditure by the learned President, and his proved willingness to increase it, one cannot help thinking that he considers it the right thing to do, although the inevitable result of this policy is to leave some important departments largely unaided to struggle along as best they can. Is this policy not likely in the near future to prove injurious to the best interests and usefulness of the University?

#### VI.—Sir Daniel Wilson on the Biological Buildings and the Uses to which they are Applied.

The President seeks to throw doubts on my statements as to the Biological Buildings being used to any great extent, or having been intended largely for medical teaching purposes. He seeks to befog his readers by quoting the number of square feet contained in the buildings, etc. This the President parades as "facts," but they have very little bearing indeed on *facts* of another kind taken from the official calendar of the University of Toronto Medical Faculty, for 1890-91, in which there is a full-page-sized cut, of the main part of the Biological Building (facing page 28), while on page 27 is the following: "The teaching in this 'department will follow closely the requirements 'of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, and 'will, in addition, comply with the regulations of 'the University of Toronto' (that is, in medicine).

#### "University of Toronto Medical Faculty.

"The fourth session since the re-establishment  
"of the Medical Faculty of the University will commence on Wednesday, Oct. 1st, 1890, when the  
"opening lecture will be delivered in the *Biological*

"*laboratory* (page 19)." On this occasion, Oct. 1st, 1890, Sir Daniel Wilson, LL.D., etc., is reported in the *Toronto World* of Oct. 2nd, 1890, to have said that "Toronto University had spent some \$130,000 on these magnificent buildings to give medical students the best equipped school in Europe or America." Why did the President not refer to this speech in his letter? He should have quoted it.

The official calendar of the University Medical Faculty for 1891-2, has the following paragraph:

"UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO MEDICAL FACULTY.—  
"The fifth session since the re-establishment of the  
"Medical Faculty of the University of Toronto  
"will commence on Thursday, Oct. 1st, 1891, when  
"the opening lecture will be delivered in the *Bio-logical laboratory*."

"The lectures and demonstrations in the subjects of the first and second years will be given in the *Biological laboratory* and in the *lecture rooms of the University*."

This last paragraph means that *two* sessions of medical teaching work, out of the *four* required—that is exactly one-half of the *medical course*—is done in buildings erected at the public cost. After trying, notwithstanding his full knowledge of this being the case, to show how little the new buildings are used for medical teaching, and saying, although they contain dissecting-rooms, bone-rooms, vat-rooms, etc., that they would have been built all the same had no Medical Faculty existed, he virtually admits that his contention is incorrect, because compelled to do so, for on page 6 he says, "And in so far as certain portions of the building are set apart for the Medical Faculty, a report was obtained from the architect, specifying their estimated cost, and on the basis thus furnished an annual rent of \$1,200 is charged to the Medical Faculty, in accordance with the report of a joint committee of the Board of Trustees and the Senate, as what, in their estimation, 'would be a just and adequate allowance' as interest at four per cent. on the cost of erection." (See recent Finance Report of University Committee.) It is said that this decision to charge rent was only recently reached, and was not contemplated by the promoters of the medical part of the building. This \$1,200 looks well and fair on paper, but in reality it is not in any sense an adequate return for the great cost, as well as the deterioration in the value of the property. To understand this last point clearly, it has to be borne in mind that dissecting-rooms, vat-rooms and others, where human anatomy is studied and taught for at least six months of each year, now form part of this fine pile of buildings. The parts of the building actually used for this work, must necessarily have a very strong and—even to many medical men and students—a most unpleasant smell. This is so all-pervading that it creates a dissecting-room atmosphere far