

(Nature of the Question.)

The practical question now is, whether our system of University education shall include one endowed College only, or several Colleges in one University, teaching the same subjects of literature and science, and up to the same standard, yet varied in their religious oversight and modes of instruction, suited to the different sections of the community, and adapted to secure a wholesome emulation; whether all the means provided for Collegiate education, should be expended in supporting one set of Professors for all Upper Canada, or several sets of Professors; whether one College—that is, a School next higher than a Grammar School,—with its teachers, without emulation, without oversight, with salaries secured independent of pupils or amount of labour, is likely to do more for either the quality or diffusion of higher education in the country, than several Colleges erected by voluntary effort, and developing and combining the influence and energies of religious persuasions, and their several bodies of Teachers animated to duty by mutual emulation, and largely depending upon their exertions and success for their remuneration, and guaranteed to the community as to character and principles, as well as ability, not by a government appointment, but by the character and oversight of the religious persuasions establishing Colleges interested in their efficiency and success. This is the practical question at issue in the present discussion. All the dust raised about “sects,” “apolliation,” “vandalism,” &c., &c., are the mere tactics employed by partizanship to prejudice the question in the minds of the misinformed, just as reformers were called revolutionists, and the advocates of equal rights used to be called spoliators, in former days in this country. What the country at large, and what every good friend to it, is interested in, is not whether Collegiate education shall be given in Toronto alone, or in other towns also, or by any one or more religious persuasion, or by no religious persuasion, but how, by a given amount of public aid can the means and influences in behalf of University education be most extensively developed, and University education most widely imparted, with the best precaution and provision possible for the principles and character of the young men educated. Such is the practical question for the reader's consideration and decision.

(Belief and Proceedings of the Wesleyan Church.)

The Wesleyans as a body, and some other large religious persuasions, believe that several emulating Colleges will do more work and educate more

youth, than one monopolist college; they believe that youth are more likely to be good and useful citizens if they are religiously taught and watched over at the same time that they are secularly instructed; and believing this, they believe the past and present system of expending the University endowment is unjust and impolitic, and that a one-college monopoly is at variance with the best interests of the Province, and with the just rights of large sections of the community. They embodied the expression of their convictions in petitions to the Legislature, and asked for inquiry. Inquiry was granted, and proofs were adduced in support of the justice of their complaints. A Commission was issued to investigate the management of the University endowment, and the working of the University system, and report the results, with such recommendations as the investigation might suggest. That Commission has reported. The report has been printed, and attacked by the advocates of monopoly. We now proceed to answer these attacks.

(Reply to the "Globe's" attacks on the Commissioners.)

The *Globe* of the 20th ult. says—

“The chief result of the inquiry seems to us to be the establishment, almost beyond question, that Messrs. Jas. Patton, of Toronto, John Beatty, of Cobourg, M. D., are the most impudent men that the Province contains. The only doubt which remains on our mind, arises from the question whether Messrs. Patton, Beatty, and Paton are really the authors of the report bearing their name, or whether they have not been used as the plastic tools of Dr. Egerton Ryerson, whose hand may, we fancy, be traced in many of its pages.”

We can state, in reply, on the best authority, that “Dr. Egerton Ryerson” did not write or suggest one line of the report, and that every line of it was suggested and written by one or the other of the Commissioners themselves.

Mr. Paton is a scholar and member of the Senate of Queen's College; Dr. Beatty is a member of the Senate of Victoria College; and Mr. Patton is Vice Chancellor of Toronto University—made so, not by Government appointment, but by election of the Senate, and against Mr. Langton, who was proposed and stoutly advocated by Dr. Daniel Wilson. Such a Commission could not have been more fairly selected. The *Globe* of the 30th ult. makes repeated and lengthened attacks upon Mr. Paton personally. The *Globe* represents Mr. Paton as a “self-appointed member” of a committee of which he was not a member at all, and at not one meeting of which he was ever present. The *Globe* also sneers at the “Hon. James Patton” for receiving \$800 per annum for “doing the little bit of formality” of conferring degrees on students entitled to receive them; but the *Globe* does not