

hours in Ontario will tolerate an entire deprivation of existing facilities, under public provision, for superior education—if they will suffer the incompleteness which will then be manifest in their educational system. But perhaps we should allow this opinion of the Governor to be gratified by the mention which is made of the mode of assistance in immediate connection with it, and infer that it is not the inexpediency of the state providing colleges that is affirmed, but only the inexpediency of supporting or assisting them by “the payment of any sums of money out of the treasury.” Does this condemnation of a particular mode of assistance imply a reservation in behalf of some other mode, to be hereafter defined and acted upon by the government? Does it indicate a rectification of the wrong done by the mal-administration of the University Act of 1853, whereby the colleges were deprived of the ample provision intended for them by the framers of that act? We might indulge in a supposition of this kind but for the report now before us, of the explanations made by the Treasurer, when he introduced the supplementary estimates to the House. He must be understood, we presume, as speaking on behalf of the government, as defining the policy agreed upon in the councils of the ministry. To quote from the *Leader's* report of his speech, “he contended that the Toronto University should be the central point for obtaining a superior education and that pupils should be compelled—if they desired a superior education—to attend it.” If this be the view of the government, they must be regarded as being perfectly satisfied with a single College situated at Toronto. That institution has been erected at the public expense, and it costs the country annually not less than \$400,000, probably a good deal more. Well, the Province being committed to the support of a system of education, and the people in all sections being heavily taxed for it, the result is, as respects a collegiate training and the highest departments of learning, they are expected to be contented with the numerous inconveniences attending the obtaining of these advantages at a single point. They are to have no choice either as to institution or locality. An attempt to introduce this state of things must certainly be regarded as a retrograde movement, when compared with the ideas and plans embodied in the University Act of 1853, and, should it succeed, will place Ontario, in respect of its system of education, at a dis-

creditable distance behind the advancing nations.

In the Lieutenant Governor's message an extraordinary transition is made from the opinion expressed at the beginning to that enunciated at the close of it. *The comparative mildness of inexpediency is transformed into the stern rigour of illegality.* The concluding portion reads thus—“His Excellency submits to the Legislative Assembly the propriety of granting to the said colleges the several amounts mentioned in the said schedule, declaring at the same time that it shall not be lawful to continue such grants hereafter.” Over these words, we understand, a keen battle has been fought between bad government and bad grammar. We fancy, we hear not a few Western Legislators jealous of their prerogatives and disposed to be indignant, interrogating each other after this fashion: Does the Governor presume to say what shall be unlawful? Are we, the lawmakers, to be dictated to in this style? I shall not vote for the grants, says one, but I will not be told by His Excellency or any other person that in future it will be illegal to do so. I shall vote for them, says another, this year and every year I am in this House, the Governor's declaration to the contrary, notwithstanding. In my opinion, observes a canny bystander who must have obtained his rudiments in a parish school North of the Tweed, you are both wrong, His Excellency makes no such declaration as you attribute to him. Instead of believing this, I prefer to think that the Governor's scribe or the printer's devil is at fault, or else that the message has been penned by the dexterous hand of one I need not name. I read the document this way. His Excellency “submits to the assembly the propriety of making the grants proposed, *and of* declaring that it shall not be lawful to continue them.” It is suggested to the House to declare the continuance of the grants to be unlawful. This observation has the effect of calming the rising wrath of the interlocutors, and they simultaneously and somewhat carelessly drop the remark. In that case the House is not likely to commit itself this session to a course which there may be the best of reasons, after consulting our constituencies, for reversing the next session.

Accordingly the House did not commit itself. The Governor's message was read, but the legislature did not, either by resolution or by a clause in the supply bill, so far as we have learned, give the declaration