

STATE AID TO COLLEGES.

THE PRINCIPAL ANSWERS THE ATTACKS, MADE ON HIM DURING THE PAST MONTH.

ON Saturday evening a meeting of the resident members of the University Council was held in the Senate room, when it was decided to summon a full meeting of the Council before the Christmas holidays. A discussion took place on the University question, after which the Principal delivered the following address:

On University Day I took the liberty of warning the friends of University College that if the question of direct aid to Colleges from the public purse was opened, it could not be settled in the one-sided way proposed. Last month I referred again to the subject, endeavoring to look at it from my critics' points of view, answering their arguments and stating our position. I propose now to review briefly what has been written since, and to state the three courses of collegiate policy that have been suggested, that the public may judge which of the three is most in accordance with right reason, and, therefore, promises most for the best development of the people as a whole.

AS TO THE PERSONALITIES

that have been imported into the controversy I put them aside as—in the literal sense of the word—impertinences. Anonymous writers are doubly bound to avoid those, but, when men violate the unwritten code of honor, it would be a mistake to answer them according to their folly. To that style of writing there is no end, and endless columns of it contribute nothing to the settlement of the question. Suppose, with Mr. Biggar, that my addresses are "garlands of rhetoric," or with an anonymous ally of his, that they are "Chinese stink-pots;" suppose that Dr. Williamson is "rude," and that Professor Burwash and Dr. Nelles, men to whom the country owes a debt of gratitude for life-long services of the noblest kind, are worthy only of taunts and sneers; suppose that the Rev. D. J. Macdonnell—one of the clearest intellects in Canada—is quite incapable of judging whether a paragraph in one address is or is not inconsistent with another, what then?

Does it follow that University College should have 225 Professors in Arts because Berlin has 225 in arts, science, law, medicine, theology, dancing and fencing? And that University College should have them all salaried at the public cost, because the great majority of the Berlin "Professors" are paid wholly by fees?

It seems, too, that we are enemies to the public school system; that we seek to cripple University College; that we are acting the part of the dog in the manger; that we are ungenerous, and that we are plotting for the Union or Church and State in Canada. Prodigious!

It is perhaps a waste of time to answer such charges, but a sentence may be given to each lest silence may be taken for contempt.

Are not those the truest friends of public schools who have given hundreds of thousands of dollars to establish, in different local centres, colleges open to all without distinction of class or creed? Does earnest exhortation to the thousand friends—of whom I profess myself one—of University College to give liberally to it of their substance instead of wasting time chasing a shadow, indicate a desire that it should be crippled? How can we be the fabled dog when we have never been in the manger at all, and when the only proposal is to give more hay to the stalled ox, and not a mouthful to his toiling brothers outside? Is it seemly that Dives should upbraid Lazarus for lack of generosity to his worship? And certainly not we, but those who demand a State College, occupy the position of those who in historic countries support a state church.

THERE IS A DIFFERENCE.

There is, indeed a difference. The most ardent friends

of the oldest established Churches do not dream of asking the Legislature to give new grants to them at the expense of Dissenters. Our State College men are not so considerate. The first argument they used was that as the denominations supported their Colleges so should the State support its College. When it was pointed out that the denominations compose the State, the argument was turned right about face. We are now told that more Presbyterians support University College than Queen's. Very good. I appeal to the sense of justice of my fellow churchmen. Do they, can they, think it just to tax us to pay for University College, when they admit that we were forced to build up Queen's at our own expense, and when Queen's is doing a part of the common collegiate work of the province that could not possibly be done by University College? If they answer "yes," I have nothing to say, except that it seems to some of us very poor patriotism, very poor Presbyterianism, and very poor religion.

THE ACTUAL QUESTION.

But, putting aside not only personalities but meaningless charges, let us come to the actual state of the question. If the Legislature deals with collegiate education at all, it must grapple with the subject and see that the Province is supplied with a college or colleges reasonably efficient and adequate to its necessities. That is surely its duty and its whole duty in the matter. Forty years, thirty years, twenty years, perhaps even ten years ago, the condition of secondary education in Ontario was such that it could be fairly argued that all the students for the degree of B. A. could be accommodated in one college and efficiently educated by one staff of professors; and, therefore, that it was better to have one college well equipped by giving to it all the land set apart for university purposes than to divide it among several colleges. It was also reasonable that such a State College should be in Toronto. A Provincial system offers various advantages, in particular, the bringing together young men of different denominations, and the cultivating a breadth of view which we are glad to see is now appreciated. If any locality or any body of men considered it necessary to have other colleges, then, as I have said more than once, the necessity must be proved by the sacrifices their friends were willing to make, and the real extent of the necessity by the survival of the fittest. Well, the necessity has been proved?

THE FITTEST HAVE SURVIVED.

It was no fault of ours, it was the fault of the State, that the development was not harmonious. But we must accept the development, in other words every man of common sense must recognize facts. At any rate, the State has been aided in its collegiate work, and is surely grateful for that; were it only for the large sum saved to the treasury by our sacrifices. Had it not been for the existence of outside colleges, the State would have had to establish others before this, either in Toronto or elsewhere, just as it had to establish a Normal School in Ottawa in addition to the one in Toronto. And now we have to deal with the position as we have it to-day. What is that? So far as University College and Queen's are concerned, both are evidently needed. According to the *Globe*, University College has 270 undergraduates, and its class room and staff are taxed to the utmost. Queen's has exactly half that number of undergraduates, and we could accommodate nearly as many more. Of course I am speaking now not of our divinity students, nor of the medicals from our two affiliated colleges who attend classes in science, but simply of the students in arts. Now this statement of facts shows what the problem really is. And what is the solution? "Bring all your students to Toronto," it is airily proposed. "Is not Knox College in Toronto, and Wycliffe College and McMaster Hall? Why not Queen's also?" Gentlemen, it is a fact that