

don, &c., to tell them what kind of education they shall have. But I doubt whether Dr. *Wilson* has been authorized by his colleagues to make such assumptions, especially by the President of the College, who, I believe, has reluctantly submitted to much that has been done in regard to both the standard of matriculation and the system of Options. Then, Sir, in pursuance of the same line of remarks, the same kind of assumption, Dr. *Wilson* told you that I was altogether incompetent to decide upon questions of this kind. Dr. *Ryerson*, he said, was not a graduate, had never enjoyed the advantage of a College education, and was to be blamed for dealing with subjects the details of which he did not comprehend. Now the principle which lies at the foundation of this assumption and imputation is, that no man who has not been trained up in a University is able to judge or decide upon anything that pertains to University College,—an assumption which, I am sure, will not be very readily submitted to by the people of “this Canada of ours”. A man, Sir, may never have graduated at a University and yet have acquired more knowledge than half its graduates. Going within the walls of a College is one thing, and pursuing the subjects of enquiry and investigation involved in a College course is another; and that man who pretends that one who has not gone to College is unacquainted with what are the proper subjects of a Collegiate education, and incapable of judging of the course which should be studied, is a man who must stand before us, in this respect at least, as one of the “relics” of past ages, who will not be much tolerated in this our day. If I am on this account proscribed from being connected with the direction of University education, I stand on the same ground with the late Sir *James* and *Andrew Stuart* of Quebec, two minds that adorned the horizon of this country with a splendour unequalled in our day. I stand on common ground with *Archdeacon Bethune*, of *Cobourg*, one of the most refined men of the country; on common ground with the late Hon. *Robert Baldwin*, one of the most patriotic men of Canada, whose memory we all revere. I stand too in the same position as the late Sir *James Macaulay*, one of the most learned and indefatigable jurists that ever sat on the bench of Upper Canada; on common ground with the Chancellor of Toronto University, *Judge Burns*; so that if I am to be proscribed from deciding on this question, the Chancellor himself is an intruder on the ground he now occupies. I stand on common ground with Sir *J. B. Robinson*, the Chief Justice of Upper Canada, one of the most accomplished men, the finest intellects, the most profound jurists of our day, of whom Sir *Robert Peel* said on one occasion, “he was the cleverest man he ever met.” Then, Sir, if this assumption be true, what business has the Committee with the question before it? There is but one member of it a graduate, the Hon. Mr. *Cayley*, and all the others must sit down in silence and leave the report to his dictation, inspired by the gentlemen of whom he is the “organ”. For what business have you laymen, who never graduated at a University, with the affairs of the Educational Institutions of our country? You are not competent, you are undertaking to decide a question of which you can know nothing! On that principle too, I may ask, what business have legal and farming gentlemen upstairs to deal with the mercantile business of the country? How are merchants and farmers to judge of laws? They are not lawyers, they never studied in a Lawyer’s office or passed an examination for admission as Barristers. Let them sit down then and receive their laws at the hands of the learned gentlemen of the bar. What business have Mr. *Galt* and other gentlemen to interfere with questions of political economy—they were never at a College where political economy was taught, so that what can they know about it? What business has the whole Legislature of Canada to deal with any questions of civil polity—perhaps not one of them ever attended a course of lectures on Civil Polity? If you proscribe me, you proscribe Parliament itself from judging of Civil Polity,