

mention that Mr. Langton had received the same sum per annum during four years for performing the same duties of Vice Chancellorship; and which duties involve the preparation of all business for the Senate, and conducting all correspondence in behalf of the University.

It is also just to observe that Mr. Patton, after two years of service in the office of Vice Chancellor, has, within the last two months, been *unanimously* re-elected to that office by the Senate, on motion of Dr. McCaul, (President of University College) seconded by Adam Crooks, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.

The Commissioners acted quite within the varied objects, and visitatorial powers of their Commission. The *Globe* cannot object to the questions they proposed, or the fairness of their selection of parties to whom answers to the questions were requested; yet the *Globe* calls the Commissioners the "most impudent men that the Province contains," because they adopt the suggestions which the replies to their questions warrant, and make those suggestions almost in the very words which the Senate of the University had unanimously adopted. The *Globe's* imputation, therefore, upon the Commissioners, is most unjust and unfounded, whether it comes or not from "the most impudent men that Canada contains."

(Reply to the "*Globe*" and "*Leader's*" attacks on the Wesleyan and other Petitioners for University Reform.)

The *Globe* and *Leader* can scarcely find epithets of odium strong enough to designate the Wesleyan and other advocates of University Reform. They are "greedy sects," "spoliators," "plunderers," enemies of our common school system, and indeed every thing that is selfish, mean, and mercenary.

We may ask, in reply, whether the very writer of some of these assailing articles in the *Globe* and *Leader* is not a salaried officer in the very College whose monopoly he advocates, and whether he is not largely profiting by that monopoly? We may also ask, whether the *Globe* and *Leader* establishments have not also profited not a little by that same monopoly? Are these the parties to impute mercenary motives to others, and especially to whole communities? And is a resort to such imputations the proper style, and spirit, and method to discuss the great question of the higher education of a country? The *Globe* descends to personalities, and names three Heads of Colleges who have for several years been members of the Senate, as objects of attack. He speaks of "the Rev. Drs. Nelles and Leitch and the Very Rev. Vicar

General McDonell," as charging for their "board, lodging, and travelling expenses to the University fund" "every time" they favour the Senate with their presence." Now, though nothing is more just and reasonable than that members at a distance should be paid their travelling expenses while attending the Senate—though the Legislature provides for the payment of the travelling expenses of its own members—though both Victoria and Queen's Colleges, and we dare say the other Colleges, pay the travelling expenses of the distant members of their Boards of Trustees and Senate, and do so as a matter of economy as well as of justice, as the distant members of such bodies are generally more economical in the expenditure of funds, than local members resident where the funds are expended, and who may have some interest in their expenditure; yet those Toronto members of the Senate who have wished to keep the control of University affairs in Toronto hands, have resisted every measure which has been proposed to pay the travelling expenses of non-Toronto members of the Senate, (though said Toronto members have provided for paying the travelling expenses of non-Toronto Examiners of the University), and neither Dr. Nelles, nor Dr. Leitch, nor Vicar General McDonell, has ever received a farthing from the "University fund" in payment of their "board, lodging, and travelling expenses" while attending meetings of the Senate. The *Globe's* statement is therefore as untrue, as his attack is unworthy of a public journalist.

Then as to the Wesleyans being a "greedy sect," spoliators, &c., to whom do these epithets most justly apply? To those who largely profit by the monopoly which they advocate, or to those who advocate equal rights upon equal terms among all sections of the community according to their works? The Wesleyans have ever been the earnest advocates of equal rights and privileges among all classes, and that long before most of their assailants had a name or a habitation in this country. Every time a minister of any other Church than that of England, of Scotland, or of Rome solemnizes matrimony in behalf of his own or other people, or performs a funeral service over their remains in grounds regularly secured by law, he, together with all parties concerned, enjoys fruits of the many years' labour in the cause of civil and religious liberty of some of those very men, sustained by the Wesleyan body, who have been most traduced by the advocates of monopoly as University reformers. The Wesleyan body has a character and a history in the country which its assailants may envy and asperse, but cannot destroy.