

with relentless tenacity in order to divert attention from the great principles and merits of the question. Dr. Wilson in his last paper laid before the Committee, says, in reference to his speech, (which commenced the personalities of the discussion) "On obtaining permission to address you," "I felt it to be my duty to show to the committee that, neither by previous education, by special training or experience, nor by fidelity to the trust reposed in him as a member of the Senate of the University, does Dr. Ryerson merit the confidence of the Committee, or of the Province, as a fit adviser on a system of University education." This is Dr. Wilson's own admission and avowal of having turned attention from the merits of the question to the demerits of Dr. Ryerson. Hence the painful necessity of my answering these personal attacks (which are renewed in the notes of the new pamphlet by Mr. Langton and Dr. Wilson) while discussing the general question. But that the reader may, at the outset, understand the whole question, (apart from any personalities,) I will conclude this introductory letter by giving a summary view of it. The advocates of University reform maintain the following positions:

1. That there shall be a National University for Upper Canada, as was contemplated by the University Act of 1853,

2. That the Senate of the University shall be under the control of no one college more than another; shall be independent of all colleges, and prescribe the standard and course of studies for all colleges (except in Divinity), and direct the examinations, and confer the University honors and degrees on the students of all the colleges.

3. That no college connected with the University shall confer degrees in the Faculties of Arts, Law, or Medicine; that no college shall receive any public aid for the support of a Faculty or Professor of Divinity.

4. That each college connected with the University, (whether denominational or non-denominational) shall be entitled to public aid from the University Fund according to the number of its students matriculated (not by such college but) by the University, and taught in the course of studies prescribed by the University: provided that a stipulated sum adequate for the efficient support of University College at Toronto, as the college of these who wished to have their youth educated in a non-denominational college be allowed; and provided that no denominational college shall receive more than half the amount allowed to University College. This last is a generous concession on the part of the advocates of denominational colleges, upon the ground that those colleges will do as much work at half the public expense as a non-denominational college will.

5. That the public provision for University (as for Common or Grammar School) education, whether arising from the sale of lands or parliamentary grants, or both, shall constitute one University Fund, and distributed, as in the case of Common and Grammar Schools, to each college according to its works in imparting the education prescribed by national authority.

The advocates of University Reform complain that the present system of college monopoly at Toronto is at variance with the intentions of the University Act of 1853; that most extravagant expenditures of the University endowment have been made, while the standard of University education has been greatly reduced, instead of being kept up as intended

by  
fair  
ver  
all  
the  
tho  
wil  
elev  
cip  
com  
pub  
can  
circ  
tion  
cati  
here  
T  
ing  
the  
all  
two  
  
T  
  
S  
note  
dice  
(  
  
T  
about  
Lib  
ers;  
Coll  
Lan  
Bar  
his s  
of M  
And  
neve  
or t  
first  
mee  
ally  
Bar  
Uni