

Spanish were honor subjects taken by few ; it was thought wasteful to duplicate classes in these. This was conceded to Victoria. On the other hand, Dr. Young, whom we all held in honor, desired to be associated with the University staff. This we conceded at once, holding the remedy in our hands that if we wished we could resume at any time the full work in philosophy. By a careful estimate of the hours of instruction under the various courses for the B.A. degree I have found that the work thus assigned to the College constitutes about fifty-seven per cent. of all the teaching required by our present time tables. In that respect, therefore, the division as between College and University was not unfair.

On the other hand, with the single exception referred to, you will find that the subjects assigned to the University are mainly those bearing on the great industrial, commercial and political life of the State, and which thus touch the great common interests of the community. The division was thus not illogical or unnatural, but one constructed upon clearly defined principles. But, after all, this has no bearing on the question between us. At least I am not disposed to press it in that direction.

The next inference which you attempt to impose upon me is what you call the "theory of a first charge." Now, it is true that I did in my last letter use the expression "first charge" once. But I used it with *careful limitation*. I asserted that by the very fact that certain lectures were made free to the students of both colleges they were "virtually placed on the original endowments of the University." I was very careful not to say that they were placed there by statutory enactment, but that such must be the effect of the enactment by which they were made free. This I call the "federation free franchise." It is, in fact, the right which we acquired or supposed we acquired by federation, and stands in the preamble of the Act as the very object of its enactments. Of course I knew very well that they were not made a first charge in technical law or by statutory enactments, though the very order in which the charges on the common fund are named might give countenance to such a contention—"The University endowments and all additions thereto shall be applied to the maintenance of the University, the University Faculty, and University College." But we have never for a moment insisted on any such construction of the Act or agreement as would exclude University College from *reasonable claim* on the common endowment. What we do object to is such a policy as *robs the University Faculty of its reasonable claim, and then, in the face of both Act and agreement, seeks to impose fees for maintenance on our students.*

As to your inferences that we would deprive University College of "effective claim upon the endowment," or that we would force it to "receive from the common fund even less than the amount of the fees contributed by it thereto," or that we "claim that University College does not enjoy equal rights with the University as regards the endowments," they are all of a piece with the inference already examined. So also with your "logical (?) inference" that "University College exists only by sufferance or until the claims of the University subjects shall have extinguished this semblance of a claim." A man who is one of the very ablest masters of finance on this continent can surely not fail to see the difference between denying a right to a reasonable share of the endowment and resisting such an exclusive appropriation of it as infringes upon the rights of others. In raising this imaginary inference of danger to University College you are creating false alarm and sowing the seeds of antagonism such as I had done my utmost to avoid by express admission of the rights of University College, although to you this admission is only "apparent and amounts to nothing."

The same perversity of inference appears in your next paragraph. Speaking of my reference to the staff agreed upon at federation for the College and the University, you say "your assumption evidently is that this is to be regarded as a maximum staff, and as imposing for all time the limits beyond which University College may not expand." Now, I neither made, nor implied, nor did I require for the purposes of my argument any such assumption. I simply called attention to a certain definite provision, laid down in the agreement, though slightly veiled in the Act, as to the two faculties, College and University. I did not call this provision the maximum, nor did I call it the initial. All that my argument required was the contention that the two faculties should reach this