

ing duty or competing interest in the work prescribed; the Collegiate bodies that do the prescribed teaching and training work, have to submit the results of their work to the examination and judgment of a common tribunal. By this plan the country has, of course, the best guarantee as to the character and value of the University education given; and the Colleges have all the freedom of action which the religious condition of the country requires, and all the promptings of mutual emulation and competition, in addition to the obligations of duty.

The affiliation of the several Colleges in one University has been considered so important, both as to the character and extension of University education, that it has been contemplated by successive Acts of Parliament for many years. The idea did not originate with any religious persuasion or denominational College, but with statesmen immediately after more than one College became established. At the present time we have the American system—almost every College is an University, and obtains more or less aid from the State, as influence and circumstances may favour. The plan of affiliation contemplates but one University, and Colleges aided upon an equitable system—putting an end to denominational petitions, or “manipulation,” in respect to Parliamentary grants in aid of Colleges.

It was therefore natural that the University Commissioners should direct their anxious attention to the important question of affiliation as well as to that of expenditure. The Commissioners addressed to the Heads of Colleges the following questions:

“I. Do you approve of the affiliation of the Colleges of Upper Canada to one University Board, and if so, state the advantages?”

“II. Do you consider the present system of affiliation to the University of Toronto unsatisfactory, and if so, state the reasons?”

“III. What system of affiliation would you consider most satisfactory with special reference to the following points: (1.) The mode of securing an equal standard of education. (2.) The principle of the apportionment of funds from public sources. (3.) The exercise of University powers by the affiliated Colleges. (4.) The composition of the General University Board.”

The Commissioners addressed the same questions to the Senate of the Toronto University, through the Chancellor. The Senate referred the question to a Committee to prepare and report answers to them. The *Globe* says the Committee was packed by the Vice Chancellor Patton, and names as members of it, “Dr. Ryerson, Dr. Nelles, Dr. McCaul, Dr. Leitch, Vicar General McDonnell, Dr. Lillie, Dr. Willis, &c., all of whom, (says the *Globe*) we have ascertained were on this Committee, though it included three scarcely ever seen at

meetings of the Senate before.” All the gentlemen thus named on the Committee had frequently attended meetings of the Senate; and as Heads of Colleges, (except Dr. Ryerson) it was important that they should be upon it. But the *Globe* omits other names which he could, of course, as easily have ascertained as those which he has given. The names of members of the Committee omitted by the *Globe*, are—Hon. W. Cayly, Dr. Barrett, Mr. T. A. McLean, Mr. Adam Crooks. The mention of these names would have disproved the statement of the *Globe* that the Committee was packed in the interest of denominational Colleges against the Toronto University; for every one knows that the four gentlemen just named, together with Dr. McCaul and Dr. Lillie (constituting a majority of the Committee) would not do any thing prejudicial to the Toronto University. Fairness in the discussion of the question, and justice to all parties, required the *Globe* to mention the names which he has suppressed; and the omission of them argued a consciousness on the part of the *Globe* that his case required the use of unfair means in order to success. The Committee, after long discussion and deliberation, agreed unanimously upon the answers to be reported to the questions of the Commissioners. The report of the Committee was as carefully considered by the Senate, as it had been prepared by the Committee. The members of the Senate present at the final meeting when the report was adopted *nemine contradicente*,—first clause by clause, and then as a whole, (on motion of Dr. McCaul, seconded by Dr. Ryerson,) were as follows, as recorded by the Registrar: “The Vice Chancellor, Rev. Dr. McCaul, Rev. Dr. Willis, Rev. Dr. Ryerson, Mr. Jones, Dr. Barrett, Mr. Thomson, Mr. McLean, Dr. Smith, Mr. Crooks, Rev. Dr. Nelles, Rev. Dr. Lillie, Vicar Gen. McDonnell, Rev. Dr. Leitch, Rev. Dr. Jennings, Dr. Wilson, Mr. Cockburn, Mr. Cayley, Dr. Croft, Mr. Cherriman.”

The *Leader* makes no mention of any thing done by a Committee of the Senate, or by the Senate itself, on the question of affiliation; and the *Globe* omits the names of the lay members of the Committee, and also the names of more than half the members of the Senate present when the Report of the Committee was adopted. Now, the unanimously expressed opinion of the Senate on the subject, in answer to the above-quoted three questions of the Commissioners is as follows:—

“I. The Senate are of opinion that it is desirable to have one University Board for Upper Canada, which may be designated ‘The University of Upper Canada,’ to which certain Colleges, such as are hereinafter stated should be affiliated.

“Among the advantages of this arrangement may be mentioned: the fixing of the value of degrees,