

by the act. They claim that the reform which they advocate is but the faithful carrying out of the avowed intentions and provisions of the University Act of 1853; that it provides one high standard of education for all the colleges, and recognizes the equal rights of all classes according to their works; that it combines the efforts of all denominations, as well as those of no denomination, in the great work of liberal education; that it will contribute greatly to the extension of University education, while elevating its character; that it is in harmony with the fundamental principles of our public school system—the state aiding each section of the community according to its works in teaching the prescribed subjects of public education, and providing that parents and the clergy of each church can in the one case as well as in the other, according to the nature and circumstances of each kind of education, provide for the religious instruction and oversight of their sons while taught the secular branches of education. The illustrations and proofs of these statements will be given hereafter.

The sole plea for the present system of monopoly is the pretext of keeping up a high standard of University education, while the whole course of the proceedings of its managers has been to lower that standard beyond all authoritative precedent or parallel, as I shall *demonstrate* in my next two letters.

I have, &c.,

E. RYERSON.

Toronto, March 26th, 1861.

---

## LETTER II.

SIR,—I now proceed to particulars, and address myself first to the notes appended to Mr. Langton's speech, which occupies (with its appendices) the first fifty pages of the pamphlet.

*(Misstatement as to Dr. Barrett representing Victoria College in the Senate.)*

To all that Mr. Langton has said in the first twelve pages of his speech about the intentions of the University Act as to buildings, other Colleges, Library and Museum, I have fully replied in my Defence of the Petitioners; but in a note on the 8th page, in regard to Dr. Barrett (of U. C. College) sitting in the Senate as a Representative of Victoria College, Mr. Langton says—"Dr. Wilson and Mr. Langton never said that he (Dr. Barrett) now represents Victoria College; but they said that he first took his seat and for some time sat there as President of the Toronto School of Medicine, which was at that time the Medical Faculty of Victoria." And on page 62, Dr. Wilson says, that "Dr. Barrett, it is well known, never had a seat in the Senate in any other capacity than as Dr. Rolph's or the Toronto School of Medicine; and who as such took his seat for the first time to represent the Medical Faculty of Victoria College at the meetings of the University of Toronto, while its students were systematically prevented from graduating there." The character in which Dr. Barrett took his seat in the Senate is not of the least importance to the University question; but Mr. Langton and Dr. Wilson both magnifying