

Turning now to the consideration of your inferences, the first of these you have expressed in these words: "The legitimate inference from your letter of 31st May seems to be, in short, that you hold that whilst before federation the duty was laid upon the State of making provision for all the subjects of higher education, under federation this duty is only binding as regards certain subjects (the so-called 'University' subjects), and that this duty is no longer imperative as regards certain other subjects (the so-called 'College' subjects). In other words, that in 1887, on the passage of the Federation Act, the State abandoned its previous policy of providing instruction in all necessary branches of higher learning, and bound itself to furnish adequate instruction in only a part of these."

Now, I will ask any candid man to read my two letters carefully and say if in a single sentence or argument I have expressed or implied any such theory as is here set forth. Instead of a legitimate inference, the whole thing is a fabric of your imagination, for which I certainly must most respectfully decline to be held responsible. At the very outset it begins with an assumption for which I can find no foundation in the facts of our University history, and the correctness of which I should feel very much inclined, as a citizen of Ontario, to dispute, and which certainly three-fourths or nine-tenths of our electors would dispute at the polls if it were propounded as a political doctrine to-morrow. This assumption is purely your own, and in your own words reads as follows: "That before federation the duty was laid upon the State of making provision for all the subjects of higher education." When, where and by what compact or principle was that duty laid upon the State, either before or since federation? So far as I know, the Parliaments, Legislatures or governments of our country have done nothing to engage them to such a responsibility. They have recognized the need of such a provision, and they have set apart a public property which has now become a trust fund to make some degree of provision for that need, but they have never engaged themselves or the State to provide any specific measure of instruction, either in University subjects on the one hand, or in College subjects on the other, to all who may desire it or apply for it. On the contrary, the principle has always prevailed in higher education, of supplementing individual or local effort by State aid. Again, you say, setting forth this time your own opinions, not inferring mine, "From the beginning the Province was admittedly responsible for the teaching of all the subjects of higher learning. This responsibility was unchanged by federation." The first sentence of this statement should open the eyes of our legislators. It is a statement which I have never made and would not presume to make. While there are many departments of higher learning which are absolutely necessary to the State, and which, as I have endeavored to show elsewhere, it is true economy for the State to provide for those of its young citizens capable of using them for her advantage; there are other elements of the higher learning that are purely matters of personal, ecclesiastical or sectional interest, and which it would be obviously unfair to tax the people at large to provide for a favored few. I am quite ready to admit the second sentence above, that whatever duty did lie upon the State previous to federation still remains, although the method and extent of provision may have been changed by the terms of the Federation Act.

As to the assertion that "the allotment of the subjects to the one side or the other" (*i.e.*, to College or University) "appears to be in itself unnatural and illogical, and was apparently determined by mere expediency in an endeavor to meet the exigencies of Victoria College at the time," both predicates are incorrect. A twofold principle of the deepest significance in education determined the general line of cleavage. Literature and philosophy are and must ever be the instruments of personal culture. These were selected for the College. They are also the subjects in which the moral sympathies, the taste, and all the human impulses of the teacher are brought to bear upon the scholar. They are the point at which religion and morals enter into education, not formally, but as a spirit and power. They are therefore the subjects in which it is most necessary for teacher and scholar to come into living contact, to know each other. They are thus, again, the subjects for the smaller class in the College. A lecture in chemistry is as good for five hundred as for five. There are few who could hold and impress five hundred in the study of Shakespeare. This general principle was clearly recognized in the limitation of classes to twelve and thirty. Two departures were made from it, Italian and