

# THE PRESBYTERIAN.

JULY, 1863.

WE continue our notice of the defence of University Reform prepared at the instance of the Trustees of Queen's College. Without following the order of its statements, we shall endeavour to give a concise and correct view of the leading points of the case as submitted by the defendants.

It is contended :—

1. That a Collegiate education consists of a training at College as the means, and a certain acquaintance with the higher branches of study as the end; but the University of Toronto dispenses with the attendance at College, and by thus separating the means from the end disparages and weakens the usefulness of its own College, and makes the end, supposed to be attained, of a very inferior and questionable order. It requires no attendance at College, though the costly and magnificent buildings at Toronto, called University College, were erected for the reception of students. It has no fixed standard of attainment in learning; the present requirements from its graduates are very low; and candidates for University honours may be examined on such subjects as suit their taste.

2. That the province of a University, in relation to the work of its College or Colleges is to appoint a proper curriculum of study; to fix a standard for the examination of students; and generally to act as a superintending and governing Board. But the University of Toronto has not exercised these functions in a manner that should be considered satisfactory to the country, or duly respectful to the various important interests involved. It has secured a College for Toronto, but not thereby a system of Collegiate education for the Province. For that College it has provided imposing buildings, large revenues, and a wonderful power of spending money; but it is the only College in the country over which it has any control, not from the unwillingness of the other Colleges to affiliate, for

they are free to do that by law and inclination, but because they refuse to be controlled by a University which ignores a Collegiate education and degrades the standard of Academic learning. This one College, though situated in a great centre of country and population, and though, as might be supposed, specially favoured by the influence and funds of a University designed to be national, does not compare advantageously with the other Colleges in the country, in respect of its capacity for doing work, the amount of work done by it, the attendance of students, and the value of its degrees.

3. It is the need of the country, and should be its great aim, to have a national University. This is the design of the University Act of 1853. But the University of Toronto neither supplies the need nor satisfies the aim just mentioned. It has pursued a system which has alienated the other Colleges. They will not accept its examinations and degrees because they are of an unequal, uncertain, and inferior value. They are necessarily dissatisfied with the constitution of the University Board, because its members are not limited in number, and their election is not fixed by any wholesome principle of election or distribution. In consequence of these circumstances the Senate is apt to become the arena of political strife, and its measures are liable to assume a detrimental party complexion. A University to be truly national ought, in a great country like this, to have all fully equipped and thoroughly working Colleges affiliated to it; but to secure this object its composition, government, and influence, must be attractive and not repulsive to such Colleges.

4. That a National University must be undenominational—not for the fostering of sects or the propagation of particular theological opinions. But the University of Toronto, however strange the assertion may seem, is actually more denominational