

Again, Dr. Ryerson complains, that the annual examinations make it too burdensome for students educated out of Toronto to attend; but as a member of the Senate, Dr. Ryerson should be aware, that no student in any Affiliated College is required to appear except at the examination for the second year, and at the final examination; a certificate from the head of his College that he has satisfactorily passed in it the examinations required for matriculation, first year, and third year, being sufficient to admit him to his standing; an arrangement adopted by the Senate with the special view of accommodating the Colleges which are not situated in Toronto.

All the parties who have appeared have complained of the appointment of three professors of University College upon the Senate. It must be remembered that the Senate as originally constituted, with the head of each educational institution as an *ex officio* member, had been in existence for three years before these appointments were made, and yet the denominational Colleges had not only taken no steps to take advantage of the Act, but one of them had even expressly declined to recognize its affiliation. It is therefore not surprising that the Government, in the absence of the assistance which might have been expected from them, should give the Senate the advantage of the practical experience of gentlemen of such acknowledged learning as Dr. Croft, Dr. Wilson, and Professor Cherriman.

There is one point connected with this charge which I cannot pass over, as it implies an imputation against these gentlemen. It is stated by Dr. Cook, and it was as broadly asserted by Dr. Ryerson, in his oral evidence, that the Professors form part of a body which fixes their own salaries, though, as it appears in print, the latter gentleman's charge is somewhat modified. I have reason to know that Dr. Cook stated this in ignorance of the facts, but Dr. Ryerson is certainly fully cognizant of them. The salaries of the Professors are determined by Order in Council, and not by the Senate. It has indeed twice occurred, that His Excellency has referred to the Senate for advice on this point, and that the Senate recommended an increase of salary; but what share any of the gentlemen, whose salaries have in any way come before the Senate, had in determining their amounts, may be judged of from the following facts. When a memorial of Dr. McCaul's to His Excellency, praying that his emoluments might be raised to their former amount, was referred to the Senate, Dr. McCaul not only left the meeting, but objected that it was a matter with which the Senate had nothing to do. Upon this Dr. Ryerson himself moved and carried a resolution in favour of an increase, not only of Dr. McCaul's salary, but also of those of the other Professors, not one of whom had at that time a seat on the Senate. Upon the second occasion of a reference from Government, requesting the Senate to define their general recommendation of an increase to the Professors' salaries, the only professor present left the meeting, and Dr. Ryerson was also present and assenting to the progressive increase for length of service, but without any retrospective effect, as erroneously stated by Dr. Ryerson in his answer to Question 210.* The salary of the Vice-Chancellor

these, 100 were awarded to candidates who were not at the time students in University College. Many of them afterwards became students in the College, but many had no connexion with it in any part of their course.

* This is a plain statement of the facts as they occurred, which it was sought without success to invalidate by questions 435 to 475, suggested by the Rev. Mr. Poole. An^d