

## Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming are checked below.

- Coloured covers / Couverture de couleur
- Covers damaged / Couverture endommagée
- Covers restored and/or laminated / Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- Cover title missing / Le titre de couverture manque
- Coloured maps / Cartes géographiques en couleur
- Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black) / Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- Coloured plates and/or illustrations / Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- Bound with other material / Relié avec d'autres documents
- Only edition available / Seule édition disponible
- Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin / La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure.
- Blank leaves added during restorations may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming / Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.
- Additional comments / Commentaires supplémentaires: **Various pagings.**

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- Coloured pages / Pages de couleur
- Pages damaged / Pages endommagées
- Pages restored and/or laminated / Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- Pages discoloured, stained or foxed / Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- Pages detached / Pages détachées
- Showthrough / Transparence
- Quality of print varies / Qualité inégale de l'impression
- Includes supplementary material / Comprend du matériel supplémentaire
- Pages wholly or partially obscured by errata slips, tissues, etc., have been refilmed to ensure the best possible image / Les pages totalement ou partiellement obscurcies par un feuillet d'errata, une pelure, etc., ont été filmées à nouveau de façon à obtenir la meilleure image possible.
- Opposing pages with varying colouration or discolourations are filmed twice to ensure the best possible image / Les pages s'opposant ayant des colorations variables ou des décolorations sont filmées deux fois afin d'obtenir la meilleure image possible.

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below /  
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

|                          |                          |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 10x                      | 14x                      | 18x                      | 22x                      | 26x                                 | 30x                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 12x                      | 16x                      | 20x                      | 24x                      | 28x                                 | 32x                      |

PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

OF THE

SELECT COMMITTEE

ON THE

PETITION

*Of the Rev. Joseph Stinson, D.D., President, and the Rev. Ephraim B. Harper, Secretary,  
on behalf of the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church of Canada, (in  
relation to the University of Toronto.)*


Printed for the use of the Committee.



QUEBEC.

PRINTED BY THOMPSON & CO., ST. URSULE STREET

1860.



## TABLE OF EVIDENCE.

---

### *Evidence of*

REVD. DR. COOK.—Statement, p. 5, ex. 10, 13, 22, 66, 193.

REVD. DR. STINSON, “ 7, ex. 18, 22, 101.

REVD. DR. RYERSON.—Address, 9, ex. 22, State. 27, ex. 30, 42, 46, Stat. in reply to Hon.  
Geo. Brown, 114, ex. 120, 127, 128, 138.  
Reply to Wilson & Langton, 140, 161.

REVD. DR. GREEN, ex p. 17.—Statement, p. 18, ex. 22, 24.

REVD. MR. NELLES.—Statement, p. 21, ex. 25, 56, 58, ex. 113. Stat. 190.

PROF. WEIR, ex. 25, 25.

D. BUCHAN, Esq., ex. 44, 58, 64, 65.

REV. MR. POOLE, ex. 56. Stat. 112, 137.

J. LANGTON, Esq.—Statement, 68, 88. ex. 92, ex. 121, 125, 128, 132, 139. Stat. 186.

DR. WHITAKER, ex. p. 92. Stat. 96, ex. 98.

REV. MR. AMBERY, ex. 98.

DR. WILSON.—Stat. 101, ex. 125, 133.—Sup. Stat. 184.

HON. J. C. MORRISON. ex. 128, 190.

E. A. MEREDITH, Esq., 187.



## ORDER OF REFERENCE.

---

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,

*Monday, 19th March, 1860.*

*Resolved*,—That the Petition of the Rev. *Joseph Stinson*, D.D., President, and the Rev. *Ephraim B. Harper*, Secretary, on behalf of the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church of Canada, (in relation to the University of Toronto), be referred to a Select Committee, composed of—

HON. MR. CAMERON,  
HON. MR. Atty. Genl. MACDONALD,  
HON. MR. BROWN,  
HON. MR. CAYLEY,  
HON. MR. FOLEY,  
MR. WILSON,  
MR. ROBLIN,  
MR. SIMPSON,  
MR. MCCANN,

to examine the contents thereof, and to report thereon from time to time, with power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Attest,

T. PATRICK,  
Clerk Committee.

W. B. LINDSAY,  
Clerk Assembly.

---

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,

*Tuesday, 23rd March.*

*Ordered*,—That the Petition of the Revd. *C. H. Davis*, Chairman, on behalf of the Members of St. John's Circuit, be referred to the said Committee.

---

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,

*Monday, 26th March.*

*Ordered*,—That the Petition of University College, Toronto, received and read this day, (in relation to the University of Toronto), and all other Petitions on the same subject, be referred to the said Committee.

---

## PROCEEDINGS OF COMMITTEE.

COMMITTEE ROOM,

*Wednesday, 21st March.*

In Committee on the above Order of Reference.

PRESENT :

HON. MR. CAYLEY,  
HON. MR. Atty. Genl. MACDONALD,  
MR. ROBLIN,  
MR. SIMPSON,  
MR. WILSON.

On motion of the Hon. Attorney General *Macdonald*,  
The Hon. Mr. *Cameron* was chosen Chairman.  
Adjourned to the call of the Chair.

*Friday, 23rd March.*

COMMITTEE MET.

PRESENT :

The HON. MR. CAMERON, Chairman,  
HON. MR. CAYLEY,  
HON. MR. FOLEY,  
MR. ROBLIN.  
MR. SIMPSON,

*Ordered*,—That the Clerk do summon the Revd. *Joseph Stinson* and the Revd. *E. B. Harper*, Petitioners on behalf of the Methodist Conference, or others in their behalf, to attend the Committee, and that they be telegraphed to that effect.

Adjourned to the call of the Chair.

*Monday, 26th March.*

COMMITTEE MET.

PRESENT :

HON. MR. CAMERON, Chairman,  
HON. MR. CAYLEY,  
HON. MR. BROWN,  
HON. MR. FOLEY,  
MR. ROBLIN,  
MR. SIMPSON,  
MR. WILSON.

On motion of the Hon. Mr. *Foley*,

*Ordered*,—That the Chairman move the House for the printing of the Petitions of the Rev. *Joseph Stinson*, D.D., and of the University of Toronto.

*John Langton*, Esq., Vice-President of Toronto University, was in attendance.

The Revd. Messrs. *Stinson*, *Green* and *Cook*, appeared, and addressed the Committee on the part of complainants.

*Ordered*,—That the Rev. Dr. *Ryerson*, now in Quebec, be summoned to attend the Committee on Thursday next.

Adjourned until Thursday next, at 11 o'clock, A. M.

*Thursday, 29th March.*

COMMITTEE MET.

PRESENT :

HON. MR. CAMERON, Chairman,  
HON. MR. BROWN,  
HON. MR. CAYLEY,  
HON. MR. FOLEY,  
MR. McCANN,  
MR. ROBLIN,  
MR. WILSON.

The Revd. Dr. *Ryerson* appeared in answer to the summons of the Committee.

The Revd. Messrs. *Nelles* and *Poole* appeared on the part of Revd. *E. B. Harper*.

The Revd. Doctors *Green* and *Stinson*, on the part of complainants, were in attendance.  
*John Lungton*, Esquire, on the part of Toronto University, was in attendance.  
 The Revd. Dr. *Cook* appeared and read the following statement :—

*STATEMENT of the Reverend JOHN COOK, D.D., President of the University of Queen's College.*

The Act of the 16th Vic., Chapter 89, passed in the Session of 1853, established a University to be called the University of Toronto, and a Collegiate Institution in the City of Toronto, to be called University College. These, according to the provisions of the Act, are entirely distinct and separate, the one from the other; having different functions, and being placed under different Government. The functions of the University are simply to examine for, and confer degrees and University honors. Those of University College, to give to Students, the ordinary education of Collegiate Institutions. The property of all kinds, belonging to the University of Toronto, as formerly constituted, was vested in the Crown, to be managed by a Bursar, under the direction of the Governor in Council; and the income thence arising, omitting for the present, all reference to what is called Upper Canada College, which has property of its own, to be applied, first to defray the expenses of the University; second, of University College; and third, if there were any surplus to form a fund, to be from time to time appropriated by Parliament, for Academical education in Upper Canada.

The undersigned is of opinion, that this law was seriously objectionable in some of its provisions, and that it was especially defective, in providing no means for carrying into effect, what the preamble of the Act shews, and what is well known, and can easily be proved, was the policy of the framers of the Act, in regard of Academical education.

But taking the law as it stands, it may fairly be doubted, whether the administration of it has been such as to command the approbation of those who take an intelligent interest in the cause of Academical education in Upper Canada. The two Institutions,—the University and University College,—were designed to be under separate Government. It may surely be questioned whether Professors, who are governors of the College, should be placed in the Senate of the University, in sufficient numbers to constitute a majority of the quorum of that body, for the transaction of business. The University was specially constituted to be an examining body, as separate from that, the function of which was to teach. It may be questioned if the Examiners of the University should be selected from the Professors of the College. It may be questioned whether, in view of the interest of general Academical education in the Province, contemplated in clause 54, of the Act, there has not been an expenditure, which may, not unjustly, be characterized as wasteful and extravagant, and calculated effectually to prevent from being realized, the just expectations of other Academical bodies engaged in the same work as the University College, and prosecuting it with not inferior efficiency and success. It may be questioned, if clause 57 of the Act giving power to the Governor in Council, "to authorize such permanent improvements or additions" to the College buildings, as might be required for the University, and for University College, warrants the expenditure of well nigh £100,000, in the erection of entirely new building, on a different site;—or if it does, whether the interests of Academical Education might not have been better secured by a less expensive building and by a commencement of that Fund for Academical Education in Upper Canada, apart from University College, which clause 54 of the Act contemplates. It may be questioned whether a revenue understood to amount to £15,000 a year, be not greatly more than is necessary for the legitimate purposes of the University, and University College, and whether, if a judicious economy had been practised, there would not have been ample funds to give liberal aid to the other Academical Institutions. On these points, there is certainly enough of doubt and dissatisfaction among those interested in the progress and advancement of Academical Education, to call from the Legislature for searching enquiry, and a deliberate judgment. It is scarcely to be denied by any one, that under the Law as it now stands, much might have been done useful to the Province, and calculated to give satisfaction to all parties, which has been left entirely unaccomplished.

But the Law, as it now stands, is defective in providing means for carrying into effect the policy in regard to Academical Education, on which it was framed. That policy is indicated by the reference in the preamble of the Act, to the University of London, and there are now in the Legislature, members of the Government from which that Act emanated, who can testify what that policy was. It was after the example of the University of London, to have all the collegiate bodies of the Province affiliated to the University, which alone was to have the power of conferring Academical degrees. In this way, it was supposed there would be given to the University the dignity and importance necessarily belonging to a body, to a great extent, regulating and controlling the whole collegiate education of the Province, that there would be a uniformity of value in the University honours and degrees, and that there would be created, in the different affiliated colleges, a spirit of generous rivalry, to send up their respective Students, well qualified to claim such honors and degrees. That such was the policy of the Government at the time of the passing of this Act, the undersigned can himself testify, having been consulted by a member of the Government, as to the terms and conditions on which the affiliation of Queen's College would be brought about.

And it was a wise policy. Mr. Gladstone, one of the most accomplished scholars, as well as statesmen, in the Imperial Parliament, and peculiarly fitted by his academical experience to give advice on such a matter, recently recommended the same policy to the Scottish Universities, giving it as his opinion that, for the advancement of learning in Scotland, it was desirable that there should be in it only one University—an examining body—to confer degrees, and that the present Universities should be affiliated Colleges, for the sole purpose of giving collegiate instruction. How it was that a policy, the benefits of which are so many and obvious, was not carried out, can easily be stated. The Government required, as a preliminary and necessary condition to affiliation, that Colleges having University powers, either from the Crown or by Provincial enactments, should surrender their powers; and there was a cry at the time, as there probably still is in many, a feeling, against the application of public funds to Denominational Colleges. The Colleges were naturally unwilling to surrender their University powers in order to enjoy what, under the fluctuating legislation of this Province, might prove but an uncertain and precarious benefit; and the Government did not care, by the partial endowment of Denominational Colleges, by which only affiliation could be obtained, to place itself in opposition to the party cry against such Colleges, however well convinced of the folly of it—as how, indeed, should the Government or any reasonable man not be? For what objection could it be to Academical education, if sound and good, of which not any Denomination, but the University, was to be the judge, that such education was given by Episcopalians, or Presbyterians, or Methodists? Unfortunately, the wise policy of the Government was abandoned, and another initiated, according to which, the University and University College, instead of being separate, and the one the judge of the efficiency of the other, are, as was recently stated by Dr. McCaul, practically one and the same, and the whole University endowment of the Province is applied to the exclusive benefit of University College. Against such exclusive application of the public funds for University purposes, I am instructed by the authorities of Queen's College to protest, as unjust, unnecessary and injurious to the extension and improvement of Academical education in Canada.

The policy now seems to be to build up one College, and by its ample endowments, its numerous scholarships, and its magnificent buildings, to crush all others. What is done for University College has been already stated. Of the sum of £5,000 set apart by the Legislature, out of the general revenue of the country, for the encouragement of Academical education in Upper Canada, £1,100 are given to a Grammar School in Toronto, already richly endowed, and the residue is divided among four other Collegiate Institutions. It is certainly possible that the success of this policy might be attended with some advantages. In an Institution numerously attended, there is a greater stimulus to intellectual activity and exertion;—an advantage, however, counterbalanced by the greater chance of moral corruption, there being of necessity a less close and watchful surveillance over the Students. But however this may be, what has been assumed to be the present policy is not likely to prove successful. Trinity College, Queen's College, and Victoria College will continue to be sustained, whatever be the fate of the present application to the Legis-

lature; and, with the growing education and intelligence of the Province, there will be a growing conviction, that though in humble buildings, and with but scanty resources, a College may have able and energetic Teachers, and have in *them*, what, after all, is most essential to the education of youth.

The probability of success in such policy is rendered further doubtful, by what appears to many a well founded objection to the constitution University of College. By that constitution the appointment of Professors belongs to the Government of the day, and there is no restraint, on religious grounds, on the liberty of choice. A Professor may be Catholic or Protestant, Trinitarian, or Unitarian, Christian or Infidel—waiting regularly on the ordinances of some Christian Church, or showing utter and habitual disregard of any Christian ordinances. There may be, no doubt there are many persons in the Province who hold this a matter of no consequence,—perhaps an advantage,—and who are satisfied if nothing directly hostile to religion be taught in the classes of a Professor. But there are many also who think very differently. It is not of directly infidel or irreligious teaching that such persons are afraid. It is of the impression made on young men, at a time when the awakened intellect is beginning to deal with all questions, and to hold every proposition a matter for dispute,—when the passions, too, are claiming to be released from the restraint of principle, by the mere fact—known to them—of the person set over them—eminent, perhaps, for intellectual powers, and great attainments—being infidel in his opinions or irreligious in his practice. The impression is, if such a man cares nothing for religion, there cannot be much in religion that is worthy to be cared for. A foolish impression, to be sure, but what usually does infidelity rest on but such impressions? It may be safely assumed of the great body of serious thinking and religious persons over the Province, that in sending their sons to a distance to receive Academical education, they will prefer placing them under the charge of men in whom the religious bodies to which they belong place confidence, rather than in an Institution of which, however it be now composed, the constitution gives no security for the religious character of the Professors.

And so, unless some change be made by the Legislature, matters are likely to remain much as they are at present; one large body of the people of the Province choosing that their sons should receive Collegiate Education, under Episcopal,—another under Presbyterian,—another under Methodist—another under Roman Catholic influences,—another indifferent, as far as Collegiate Education goes, under what influences of a religious kind—and the whole University Endowment of the Province be given to the last, it is to be hoped, the least numerous of all.

In these circumstances, and with these views, the undersigned is instructed by the Board of Trustees of the University of Queen's College, Kingston, to petition the Legislature, for an investigation into the management, and for a more beneficial and equitable application of the public University Endowment, in Upper Canada.

JOHN COOK, D. D.,

Principal of the University of Queen's College.

Quebec, 29th March, 1860.

The Revd, Doctor *Stinson* appeared and handed in the following statement:—

*STATEMENT of the Reverend JOSEPH STINSON, D.D., President of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference of Canada.*

GENTLEMEN,—The promotion of Education in our Country, is an object, in which every good Citizen must feel a deep interest. The imperative necessity of providing for our children, such an amount of learning, as will qualify them to occupy, with credit to themselves and satisfaction to their Parents, those positions in life which the Providence of God may assign them, is now generally admitted. The excellent Common School system of this country, places within the reach of all our children the means of obtaining a good English Education. But amongst our young people, there are not a few who cherish a laudable ambition to realize the inestimable advantages of a thorough Classical and

Scientific course of instruction. Our youths, by scores and hundreds, are determined as far as possible, to secure the blessings, and win the honours of literary culture. Every encouragement should be afforded them, in the pursuit of an object alike desirable for themselves, and beneficial to their country. But we deem it to be a matter of unspeakable importance to our young men—that they should obtain their Education in connection with influences which will be *most favourable* to their moral, as well as their intellectual culture,—otherwise their learning may be to them a curse instead of a blessing; may make them conceited, selfish, cunning and unprincipled villains, instead of generous, honourable citizens, and useful and happy Christians. Influenced by these views, the Wesleyan Methodist Church originated Victoria College, which, although a denominational, is not a *Sectarian College*; inasmuch, as no theological test is required from its *Professors* or its *Pupils*—no denominational tenets are inculcated in its devotional exercises, and every student is *required to attend* the religious services of the Church of his Parents or Guardians.

The erection and support of this College has cost the Wesleyan Church nearly eighty thousand dollars. In its halls nearly five thousand youths have been educated; many of them are creditably occupying positions of great responsibility and influence in this noble and rising colony. Victoria College is now in circumstances of considerable embarrassment.—Thus far, it has been chiefly supported by the voluntary efforts of its own denomination. It was never expected that it would be entirely dependent upon, or could be sustained by such limited and precarious support, but that it would receive a fair share of such public funds as were to be appropriated by the Government for the encouragement of Educational Institutions. We do not intend to relax our voluntary efforts, but we believe that those efforts ought to be encouraged and supplemented by an appropriation from the University Fund. To such an appropriation we believe we have a legal and a just claim. We found that claim on the plain letter and the obvious designs of the amended Laws of the University of Toronto, passed in the year 1853.

The following is the Act to which we refer. It is called an Act to amend the Laws relating to the University of Toronto, by separating its functions as a University from those assigned to it as a College, and by making better provision for the management of the property thereof, and that of Upper Canada College.

Whereas the enactments hereinafter repealed, have failed to effect the end proposed by the Legislature in passing them, inasmuch as no College or Educational Institution hath under them become affiliated to the University to which they relate, and many parents and others are deterred by the expense and other causes, from sending the youth under their charge to be educated in a large city, distant in many cases from their homes; and whereas from these and other causes, many do and will prosecute and complete their studies in various parts of this Province, to whom it is *just and right* to afford facilities for obtaining those scholastic honours and rewards which their diligence and proficiency may deserve, and thereby to encourage them and others to persevere in the pursuit of knowledge and sound learning; and whereas experience hath proved the principles embodied in Her Majesty's Royal Charter to the University of London in England, to be well adopted for the attainment of the objects aforesaid, and for removing the difficulties and objections hereinbefore referred to:—Be it therefore enacted, &c., &c., viz. Statutes 1852 and 1853, page 2.

In the amended laws here referred to, laws sanctioned by the Legislature of the Country, settled in accordance with the voice of a majority of the people, to whom the University properly belongs and for whose general benefit it ought to be expended, we are taught: That the former University with the College and Royal Grammar School, which were instituted by His Majesty George the Fourth, *failed to accomplish the purposes contemplated by their Establishment*. The sense in which they failed to accomplish those purposes, is clearly stated. 1. No College or Educational Institution became affiliated to the said University. 2. Many parents and guardians were deterred by the Expense and other causes, from sending the youth under their charge to a large City, distant in many cases from their Homes.

Hence, many youths prosecuted their studies, and completed those studies and do so still, in Literary Institutions in various parts of the Province, to whom the Law *v. e.*, the present University Law says it is just and right to afford encouragement in the prosecution of their scholastic labours

Therefore, in accordance with that just and right purpose, and with a view as we think to its being practically carried out, it was enacted, that any surplus of said University fund, remaining at the end of any year after defraying the expenses payable out of the same, shall constitute a fund, to be from time to time appropriated by Parliament for academical education in Upper Canada, Vict., chap. 89, page 328, Stat. of C., 1853, clause 54.

Hence we maintain that Victoria College, being a regularly incorporated College, a college affording a high literary training to hundreds of the youth of the Province, a college struggling under financial difficulties, has a just claim to a share of that Surplus Fund; but up to the present day, not the smallest part of that fund has ever been given to that Institution. We claim a part of that fund, not for sectarian purposes, but because *we are doing a great educational work*, and because, as a community, second to none in our number and in our efforts to promote and defend all the interests of the country, we have an indisputable right to a share of the munificent University endowment, an endowment not designed for the exclusive benefit of a very limited number of the people, but for the good of the whole of the population of the country.

That generous and patriotic design has been thwarted by the exclusive spirit, and as we think the unjust and extravagant expenditure of those who had the control of this fund. We need not present a stronger proof of the truth of this complaint, than that which is furnished in the fact, that up to the year 1857, no less than one million and a quarter of dollars had been expended on one collegiate institution in the city of Toronto. To this enormous sum, the expenditure of 1858 and '59 (which, for some reason, has not yet been given to the public) must be added. When this is done, there will be ample proof, that one of the most splendid educational endowments, in the world, is being frittered away to gratify a few College Monopolists, instead of being invested and employed as was intended, to improve and benefit the whole community.

The undersigned therefore respectfully and earnestly requests, on behalf of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada, that your honorable committee will give to this subject your most careful attention, and, in your wisdom, devise some plan by which the evils complained of may be speedily remedied.

The Revd. Doctor *Ryerson* addressed the Committee on the part of complainant.

On motion of Hon. Mr. *Foley*,

*Ordered*,---That the statements of the Rev. Doctors *Cook* and *Stinson* be printed for the use of the Committee.

On motion of Mr. *Wilson*,

*Ordered*,---That the Clerk do summon the Revd. *George Weir*, Professor of University of Queen's College, Kingston; and that he also be telegraphed, for his immediate attendance.

Adjourned until to-morrow, at 11 o'clock, a m.

*Friday, 30th March.*

#### COMMITTEE MET.

*Present* :

|                        |            |
|------------------------|------------|
| Honorable Mr. CAMERON, | Chairman,  |
| do                     | " BROWN,   |
| do                     | " STINSON, |
| do                     | " FOLEY,   |
| do                     | " CAYLEY,  |
| do                     | " WILSON,  |
| do                     | " McCANN.  |

Dr. Cook appeared before the Committee, and was Examined.

[By Honorable Mr. Brown.]

Ques. No. 1.—In the evidence you give before this Committee, are you authorized to speak the views of the Presbyterian Church, in connection with the Church of Scotland?—I am not.

Ques. No. 2.—Have the College Trustees and Senate, maturely considered the question before this Committee, and have they arrived at a formal decision upon it, so that you can say definitely what they desire?—Yes, in the shape of resolutions.

Ques. No. 3.—Will you lay these resolutions before the Committee?

Witness hands in resolutions, as follows:—

“Extract from the minutes of the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees of the University of Queen’s College, Kingston.

“UNIVERSITY OF QUEEN’S COLLEGE,  
“KINGSTON, 26th March, 1860.

“Which day the Executive Committee, of the University of Queen’s College met, and, being constituted *inter alia*, it was, after deliberation, unanimously resolved, that the very Reverend Principal Cook, be authorized to prepare, and sign, in name of the Board of Trustees, a Petition to the Legislature, praying for an investigation into the management, and a more beneficial and equitable application of the public University endowment in Upper Canada; it being provided that any plan which may be proposed for a juster apportionment of that endowment, be submitted for consideration to the Board, before being concurred in on their behalf.

By Order of the Executive Committee,

ANDW. DRUMMOND,  
Chairman,  
*Pro Tem.*

Ques. No. 4.—The Committee perceive that this resolution of the College extends no further than demanding an inquiry into the present management of Toronto University, and a more equitable application of the endowment of that Institution. Are you in a position to express the views of your College beyond that point, and if so, to what extent?—I think I am, to some extent.

Ques. No. 5.—Are you in a position to give any evidence to this Committee, from your own knowledge, as to the alleged waste of public funds in the management of Toronto University?—Only from the Public Accounts.

Ques. No. 6.—Can you point out to the Committee any plan for economising the expenditure you complain of, in the management of Toronto University?—I only see a *prima facie* case of great extravagance, which ought to be inquired into by the Legislature

[By Honorable Mr. Cuyley.]

Ques. No. 7.—Do you think an average of from 4 to £600 a year, excessive for competent Professors?—I do not consider £500 a year, by any means too much. I would rather make it more than less.

[By Honorable Mr. Brown.]

Ques. No. 8.—Would £600 be too large a salary for a Professor of Mathematics?—I do not think it would. I think that men of science ought to be well paid.

Ques. No. 9.—Do you then make any objection to the salaries now paid to the Professors of University College?—I am not sufficiently acquainted with them, to give an opinion on that point.

Ques. No. 10.—Do you make any objections to the salaries now paid to the Professors of Toronto University?—I am not sufficiently informed.

Ques. No. 11.—Do you make any objections to the salaries now paid to the Masters of Upper Canada College?—I am not sufficiently acquainted with them to judge. I have derived my opinion, in regard to the expenditure of that Institution, from comparing the Returns from Upper Canada College, with those of Montreal and Quebec High Schools.

[By Mr. Simpson.]

Ques. No. 12.—State on the average of the last three years, the number of pupils in the High School at Quebec; the fees paid for tuition; the charge for Board; the masters employed, and the salaries paid to them—and the other expenses of the establishment, under their several heads. Answer the same question with regard to the high School at Montreal, and any other Institution of the same, or a higher grade, which you can answer?

The average attendance at the High School of Quebec, during the last three years, has been 135 pupils, including the 26 named by the Government, for whose education, the Institution receives an annual sum of £282, and including also, 9 other pupils who receive a free education. The fees paid are £10 per annum, for boys under 10 years of age, and £12 10s for boys over 12. There is no Boarding establishment connected with the High School. At present four teachers are employed, and the average salaries paid to them during the last three years, have been to the Rector, £425; and to the second, third, and fourth masters £425, £250, and £96, respectively—in all, £1,196. The other expenses of the Establishment have averaged as under:

|                      |        |
|----------------------|--------|
| Rent, .....          | £70    |
| Prizes, .....        | 35     |
| Janitor, .....       | 25     |
| Fire Wood, .....     | 35     |
| Other charges, ..... | 20     |
|                      | 185    |
| In all, .....        | £1,381 |

[By Honorable Mr. Brown.]

Ques. No. 13.—Are the same branches taught in all three schools, and is the scale of Education no higher in one than in the others?—The branches of Education are substantially the same. I may almost say entirely the same.

[By the Honorable Mr. Cayley.]

Ques. No. 14.—Are you aware what fees are paid by the scholars at Upper Canada College?—I am told £5 per annum.

Ques. No. 15.—Can you state what fees are paid by the Scholars at the High Schools of Montreal and Quebec?—Yes. £10 in Montreal, and £10 in Quebec, for pupils under 10 years of age, and £12 10s. for pupils over 10 years, per annum.

[By Honorable Mr. Brown.]

Ques. 16.—What is the annual income of Toronto University, and University College?—I am given to understand that it is about £15,000.

Ques. 17.—From what sources is that Revenue derived?—From public grants of land.

Ques. 18.—What amount of surplus annual Revenue, do you think could be spared for other purposes, than the support of Toronto University and University College?—I think about £6,000 would be ample for the necessities of Toronto University, and University College, exclusive of Scholarships.

Ques. 19.—Do you think Scholarships should be abolished; and if not, what allowance should be made for them?—I do not think Scholarships should be abolished. I am not prepared to state what amount should be appropriated for them; nor what number there should be.

Ques. 20.—How many Professorships do you think there should be in University College?—A Principal, with five or six Professors, doing their duty efficiently, would be ample.

[By Honorable Mr. Cayley.]

Ques. 21.—Do you object to any portion of a Professor's time, or Lectures being given specially to Students, preparing for honors?—I have not considered that question.

[By Honorable Mr. Brown.]

Ques. 22.—Do you think there should be a Professorship of Classical Literature, in University College; and if so, what salary would secure a competent person?—I think there should be a Professorship of Classical Literature, with a salary of £500 currency.

Ques. 23.—Should there be a Professorship of Metaphysics; and if so, what salary attached?—Yes, certainly, of Metaphysics and moral philosophy united: same salary.

Ques. 24.—Should there be a Professorship of Chemistry; and if so, with what salary attached?—Yes, a Professorship of Chemistry and Natural History united: same salary.

Ques. 25.—Should there be a Professorship of Agriculture; and if so, with what Salary attached?—In the present state of University Education in this country, I think there should be no more Professors than necessary, to give a Classical and Scientific Education. I think there should be no Professorship of Agriculture, with a salary.

Ques. 26.—Should there be a Professorship of Natural Philosophy; and if so, with what salary attached?—There should be a Professorship of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy united, with a salary of £500 currency.

Ques. 27.—Should there be a Professorship of History and English Literature; and if so, with what salary attached?—I do not think it necessary.

Ques. 28.—Should there be a Professorship of Natural History; and if so, with what salary attached?—I think that ought to be combined with the Chemistry Chair. I think £500 not too much.

Ques. 29.—Should there be a Professorship of modern languages; and if so, with what salary attached?—I do not think there should.

Ques. 30.—Should there be a Professorship of Mineralogy and Geology; and if so, with what salary attached?—I think it desirable; perhaps £500

Ques. 31.—Should there be a Professorship of Meteorology; and if so, with what salary attached?—I think not

Ques. 32.—Or of Oriental Literature?—I think not.

Ques. 33.—Do you think there should be a Classical Tutor in University College; and if so, with what salary?—I think there ought to be several Tutors, at a salary of £120 each.

Ques. 34.—Should there be a Librarian; and if so, at what Salary?—If the University, or University College has a Library, there should be a Librarian; if his whole time is given, his salary should be £250; if part of his time, £100.

Ques. 35.—Should there be a Registrar; and if so, what salary should be received?—I do not think it necessary; the Librarian could do the duty perfectly.

Ques. 36.—Should there be a special allowance for the President of the College?—An additional allowance of two hundred and fifty pounds, if he be one of the Teachers, which I think he should be.

[By Honorable Mr. Cayley.]

Ques. 37.—Do you consider Modern Languages objectionable in forming part of a University course?—Yes. Objectionable.

Ques. 38.—Will you give your reasons?—I think the study of Modern Languages, to any great extent, at a University, injurious to the acquirement of Classical and Mathematical learning, which it is the main purpose of a University Education to communicate.

[By Mr. Simpson.]

Ques. 40.—Do you think it right that Professors, receiving annual salaries, should be paid by fees for the examination of students for degrees?—Yes, but they should not be employed in examining their own students.

Ques. 41.—Is not \$2,160 paid annually for the examination of students, a very large sum indeed for that service to cost?—I think it an exorbitant sum for the service.

[By Honorable Mr. Cayley.]

Ques. No. 42.—Do I understand you to say by your answer to No. 40 that you object to Teachers being examiners?—No: The objection applies only to Teachers examining their own students.

Ques. No. 43.—Do you believe that you can have efficient examiners who have not had practice in teaching?—Teachers make the best examiners, or persons who have been teachers.

[By Honorable Mr. Brown.]

Ques. No. 44.—Have you any matured plan for the remodelling of Toronto University?

Witness was allowed to hand in his reply to the question at the next meeting of the Committee.

Order—That the Clerk do summon the Rev. George Weir, Professor of the University of Queen's College, to appear before the Committee on Monday, 2nd April. Also, the Rev. W. Poole, to attend on the Committee to-morrow.

Order—That the evidence and proceedings of the Committee be printed for the use of the Committee.

Adjourned until to-morrow at 10 o'clock.

Saturday, 31st March.

### COMMITTEE MET.

Present:

Honorable Mr. CAMERON, Chairman;

“ “ BROWN,  
 “ “ CAYLEY,  
 “ “ FOLEY,  
 “ “ McCANN,  
 “ ROBLIN,  
 “ SIMPSON,  
 “ WILSON,

The Reverend Dr. Cook appeared and was further examined.

Read, his evidence given the previous day.

Answer to question 44—I should be sorry to call anything I can now say a matured plan, but I offer the following as suggestions in forming such a plan:—I think there should be a complete separation between the University and University College; that the University should be designated the University of Upper Canada; and that all Educational Institutions, incorporated by Royal Charter or by an Act of the Provincial Legislature, which are willing to submit to the Curriculum for Degrees, which is or may be established by the University, which have a competent staff of Professors, say five, and in which students are or shall be received without regard to religious persuasion, should be, if the authorities of such Institutions wish it, affiliated to the University; all affiliated Colleges to be bound to hold University powers in abeyance while receiving allowance from the University Fund; that the Senate, consisting of twenty-four members, should be appointed, one-half by the affiliated Colleges and one-half by the Government (and it should be a principle, in making the Government appointments, not to give the preponderance to any one College or neighbourhood); that the examination of students for degrees and scholarships should take place in rotation at each College seat, no Professor to be an examiner of his own students; that the sum set apart for University scholarships be not more than £500; that the salary of the Vice Chancellor should be abolished; that for all the expenses of the Senate there be set apart the sum of £1,250, of which not more than £500 to be for scholarships; that if the Library and Museum of the University be given in charge to University College, a liberal allowance be made to each of the affiliated Colleges for the collection of a Library and Museum; that the remaining income of the University be divided among the affiliated Colleges, University College to re-

ceive not more than double of each of the other Colleges, the present grant from the Consolidated Fund to continue till the revenue from the University Endowment reach £20,000 a year,—no part of the income so received by any affiliated College, to be employed in the support of a Theological Faculty or Professor. Upper Canada College to be entirely disconnected from the University and University College.

[By Hon. Mr. Cameron.]

*Ques. 45.*—In stating yesterday that you thought University College could be carried on with a revenue of £5,000, did you mean to say that that sum would be sufficient, in all cases, for an Academical Institution, or sufficient in the present circumstances of this Province?—I do not think that a University is intended to teach all sorts of things to all sorts of people. I think its purpose is to give classical and scientific education, and in particular to fit young men for entering advantageously on what are called the learned professions; and this purpose a College can serve, as I think, and serve effectually, with a revenue of £5,000 a year. I do not undervalue any branch of knowledge; but, taking into account the number of students in Canada, and the short time they can usually afford to spend in attending the classes of a University, I think the establishment of many Chairs, which might elsewhere be useful,—and at all events, in large Academical establishments, ornamental,—quite unnecessary and wasteful. This would probably appear, if a return were called for, of the students who have attended, during different College terms, the classes of Agriculture, Meteorology, Oriental Literature, and some others, in University College. With respect to Modern Languages, I must not be understood to undervalue the acquisition of them. But I think the, as it seems to me, proper subjects of a University course, both are, and ought to be engrossing; that Modern Languages should be acquired before or after such a course; and that, where there is a taste or necessity for such languages, private tutors can generally be found at a College seat to give the required instruction quite as effectually as could be done in a College class.

*Ques. 46.*—In your estimate of the annual expense of maintaining Toronto University and University College, did you include the expense of managing the property forming the endowment of the Institution, such as the Bursar's office expenses, collections, insurance, taxes, &c.?—No.

*Ques. 47.*—Did you make any allowance for boarding the students, and do you think it well that they should be inmates of the institution?—I do not think it desirable that the students should be so boarded.

*Ques. 48.*—Under your plan for affiliating the denominational colleges with the Toronto University—what existing institutions would be entitled to affiliation?—Toronto, Queen's, Victoria, and perhaps others; I am not sure that Regiopolis would be entitled to share.

*Ques. 49.*—Would Regiopolis be entitled to affiliate?—I am not sufficiently acquainted with it.

*Ques. 50.*—On what point do you need information to enable you to say whether Regiopolis would or would not be entitled to affiliate?—I do not know the curriculum.

*Ques. 51.*—If Regiopolis were to model her curriculum to suit your plan, would she be entitled to affiliate?—Certainly.

*Ques. 52.*—Would St. Michael's College, Toronto, be entitled to affiliate?—I do not see the necessity of asking the question with respect to each college one after the other; because I think that every college which complies with the conditions specified should be received to share in the endowment. I have no positive knowledge of the intentions of any college with respect to this proposition.

*Ques. 53.*—Would the Roman Catholic College at Ottawa be entitled to affiliate?—Every college seeking affiliation should come under these conditions.

*Ques. 54.*—Would Knox's College, Toronto, be entitled to affiliate?—If it came under the arrangement I propose.

*Ques. 55.*—Would Hamilton College be entitled to affiliate?—I know nothing of Hamilton College.

Ques. 56.—Does your plan embrace only those Colleges now existing or do you think the right to affiliate should extend as well to all Colleges hereafter to be chartered?—To all Colleges which may be established hereafter as well as to those now existing.

Ques. 57.—Are you aware that the College at Hamilton has already applied to be affiliated under the existing charter of Toronto University, and has asked how much money it would be entitled to receive from the endowment?—I am not.

Ques. 58.—Supposing all those Colleges were to come into affiliation with the Toronto University, would the endowment be sufficient to sustain the number of Chairs which you judge requisite for a higher school of learning?—I do not know the number of Colleges which your question includes, I can conceive of a number so great as to make the share of each insignificant for its support, without the supplement of private liberality.

Ques. 59.—Is there any possibility of applying a limit if every denomination shall be entitled to an equal support?—I think there is.

Ques. 60.—Please state how you would apply such limit?—Let the character and amount of the work required of the Colleges to be placed on the University foundation, be fixed at a sufficiently high standard, and there will neither be harm in the multiplication of Colleges, nor danger of such multiplication as would render the portion of the public endowment applicable to each insignificant.

Ques. 61.—Do I understand that it should be a condition precedent to the right of affiliation that any institution seeking that benefit, should be in operation.—If so for how long?—I think such institution should be in operation. I do not think it necessary to fix the length of time. I think it should give reason to believe in its stability.

Ques. 62.—Are you aware how many Students in Arts there are in Upper Canada?—No.

Ques. 63.—Can you make an approximate estimate?—No.

Ques. 64.—Your plan is that the surplus of the endowment of the University should be divided among different affiliated Colleges *pro rata*, according to the number of the Students?—I have not yet said so, but it might be very properly so stated.

Ques. 65.—Is that the principle of division which you propose?—I know of none better.

Ques. 66.—Are you able to estimate the sum which would probably fall to each affiliated College on this plan of division?—I cannot enter into such details.

Ques. 67.—Would not the tendency of such a plan be to induce Colleges by undue means to increase the number of their students?—I think the University should have the power of regulating that, and would prevent any such abuse.

Ques. 68.—What is the annual revenue of Queen's College?—I think about £2,600; I am speaking without the precise figures.

Ques. 69.—Has that revenue been steady?—For some years it has been about that.

Ques. 70.—Can you state the revenue of Queen's College year by year since its foundation?—Not without a great deal of trouble. The following are nearly the sources of revenue at present existing, viz. :—From the Government, £750. General Assembly of Church of Scotland, £360. Church Fund, £500; Fees, £150. Interest on Bank Stock, forming the endowment, £800. Total, £2,560.

Ques. 71.—How is the managing body constituted?—There are thirteen clerical trustees who are appointed by the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada; the lay trustees are appointed by themselves. Two go out every year, and their places are filled by those who remain, from lists furnished by the various congregations. The lay members are I think, fourteen, making in all twenty-seven. That body has the entire control of the College.

Ques. 72.—How many Professors are there, name them with their salaries?—Rev. Dr. Cook, (myself) Principal, without salary. Rev. Jno. Mowat, Professor of Hebrew and Church History, at £375 per annum. Rev. Geo. Weir, Professor of Classical Literature, £375 per annum. Rev. Dr. Williamson, Professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy, £375. Rev. Dr. George, Professor of Metaphysical and Moral Philosophy, £375.

Dr. Lawson, Professor of Chemistry and Natural History, £400. The latter salary is made up partly of fees. There are also five medical Professors; viz: Dr. Stewart, Anatomy; Dr. Dickson, Practice of Surgery; Dr. Yates, Principles and Practice of Medicine; Dr. Fowler, Materia Medica; Dr. Litchfield, Medical Jurisprudence. These are all supported by fees, with the addition of a grant of £250 per annum from the Legislature.

*Ques. 73.*—Did any Clergy Reserve money go to this College? The Temporalities Board, which manages the Church Fund gives £500 a year.

*Ques. 74.*—What number of students attend the College? Professor Weir will be examined and can answer all these questions.

*Ques. 75.*—Your proposal is that the Colleges which may affiliate, should put their charters in abeyance; how is that to be done?—Yes, in so far as giving degrees is concerned. It should be done by resolution of the Trustees.

*Ques. 76.*—Do you desire the Colleges, after affiliation to have the power of returning to their present condition, whenever they desire it?—Whenever the public allowance shall be taken away. I should not think it reasonable that they should return to it otherwise than, however, is a matter of arrangement.

*Ques. 77.*—Is Queen's College prepared to surrender her present charter on receiving the requisite powers to carry on a College under such a plan as you suggest, with a share of the endowment accorded to her?—I do not think she will surrender her charter on any terms. But I believe she is prepared to hold in abeyance, the power of granting degrees under an arrangement which would enable her to affiliate with the University.

*Ques. 78.*—Would she surrender the right to grant degrees?—I think so, during the continuance of a satisfactory arrangement to which she would give her consent.

*Ques. 79.*—Do you consider the religious opinions of Professors important?—I do, and am anxious to quote on that head the opinions of the late Baron Alderson, as follows:—  
“With reference to the general subject of education, I cannot say I like compromises on such points. I grieve over our unhappy divisions, and not the least that they are the real obstacles to education. I accept them as a *fait accompli*, and try to make the best of the case. I hope I have a true Catholic toleration for all who conscientiously differ from me, knowing how little right I, or, indeed, any man, has to set up for being infallible. But I must act after all (and I assure you I sincerely wish others to do so too) according to my own convictions. These lead me to educate others as I believe myself to be bound to do in vital truths, which I myself accept, and in no others. Everybody will perhaps say the same, but they will add, ‘give secular instruction in common.’ I believe that to be impossible, because all learning and all science may be so taught, and in fact must be so taught as to include in it some perversion or true teaching of religion. An unbeliever teaching a boy arithmetic may insinuate that the doctrine of the Trinity in unity is not true, and geology may be taught so as to throw doubts on the Bible. It is unnecessary to multiply examples. I look a great deal more to the opinions of the persons teaching than to the things proposed to be taught; for education is the bringing up a child as a responsible being to God and to Society, and in most cases the boy follows the master, as I believe, both for good and evil”

*Ques. 80.*—Do you consider that a Professor being a clergyman is an absolute security for that?—By no means, nor the having signed a test; nor that he says prayers every morning.

*Ques. 81.*—You mentioned on a former day that the Church of Scotland had at one time fallen into a very depressed moral state, very much in consequence of the character and teaching of the Professors of the Universities. Were those Professors not clergymen?—Some were. Not all.

*Ques. 82.*—Is it not possible in the University as now constituted at Toronto, that the Professors should be men of high moral and religious character?—It is, but it is also possible that they may not. There is not the desirable security that they should be so.

*Ques. 83.*—Are the moral and religious characters of the present Professors objectionable?—I know nothing of them.

Ques. 84.—Who holds the patronage of the chairs?—The government.

Ques. 85.—Supposing the Senate of the University were constituted with a view to a proper representation of and protection of the moral and religious interest of the Province, and if the patronage were vested in that body, would you not have as good a guarantee for the moral standing of the Professors so to be appointed, as you could have by that patronage being vested in the various sects?—I doubt whether this could be done. The security is not in having clergymen, but in having men enjoying the confidence of the religious bodies to which they belong.

Rev. Dr. Green, Bursar of Victoria College, appeared and was Examined.

[By Mr. Coyley.]

Ques. 86.—What is the annual revenue of Victoria College?—Last year it was \$9,420, including \$3,350 contributed by our people.

Ques. 87.—Has that revenue been a steady one?—No. The Tuition Fees have been somewhat diminished.

First. From the fact, that when it was known that University College taught Under-Graduates free out of public funds, besides giving nearly all of them scholarships and prizes, we deemed it prudent to reduce the Tuition Fees from thirty-six to twenty-four dollars per annum, and no unendowed Colleges, it is submitted, can reasonably be expected to compete successfully with such fearful odds against them.

Secondly. Because many Students now attend on account of scholarships, by which we are endeavouring to create an Endowment Fund for the College.

Ques. 88.—Give the amount of the revenue and the sources whence derived?—

|                              |            |        |
|------------------------------|------------|--------|
| Parliamentary Grant          |            | \$3000 |
| Tuition Fees                 | \$1,438 75 | 3070   |
| Interest from Endowment Fund | 1,631 25   | 3350   |
| Personal Contributions       |            |        |
| Total                        |            | \$9420 |

Ques. 89.—How is the managing body of Victoria College constituted?—The Board of Directors consists of twenty-nine individuals. Five of whom are *ex-officio*, viz.:—

- The Hon. the President of the Executive Council.
- The Hon. the Speaker of the Legislative Council.
- The Hon. the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly.
- The Hon. the Attorney General for Upper Canada.
- The Hon. the Solicitor General for Upper Canada.

Twenty-four (twelve Clergymen and twelve Laymen) are appointed by the Conference—of these twelve are Trustees and twelve Visitors: all the Visitors and four of the Trustees go out of office annually, but are eligible for re-election.

Ques. 90.—How many Professors are there? Name them. State the amounts of their respective salaries. Mention all other incidental expenses of an annual character?—There are five Professors and five Tutors, viz.:—

|  |                 |
|--|-----------------|
| Rev. S. S. Nellis, M. A., Professor of Mental Philosophy, &c., &c. | Salary \$1,400. |
| William Kingston, M. A., Professor of Mathematics, &c.             | Salary \$1,000. |
| John Wilson, M. A., Professor of Latin and Greek Languages         | Salary \$1,000. |
| Rev. George C. Whitlock, L. L. D., Professor of Natural Sciences   | Salary \$1,000. |
| Elijah P. Harris, D. P., Professor of Modern Languages             | Salary \$800.   |
| John Campbell, M. A., Classical Tutor                              | Salary \$600.   |
| Nathaniel Burwash, B. A., Mathematical Tutor                       | Salary \$600.   |
| William S. Thompson, Rector of Collegiate School                   | Salary \$600.   |
| Alexander Burns, Assistant Master                                  | Salary \$600.   |

|                     |        |
|---------------------|--------|
| Incidental Expenses | \$ 266 |
| Assurance           | 270    |
| Repairs             | 308    |
| Interest            | 3376   |
| Janitor             | 300    |

Ques. 91.---What number of Students in arts attend Victoria College ?

*Students.*

|  |           |     |
|--|-----------|-----|
| Students in Arts, under-graduates, [in attendance] | - - - - - | 60  |
| do Special Students                                | - - - - - | 36  |
| Students in Medicine                               | - - - - - | 73  |
| Preparatory Students                               | - - - - - | 119 |

Total 288

*Faculty of Medicine.*

The Hon. John Rolph, M. D., L. L. D., M. R. C. S., England.

Walter B. Geikie, M. D.

C. V. Berryman, M. D.

John M. Reid, M. D.

Wm. Canniff, M. D., M. R. C. S., England.

Walter A. Watts, M. A.

John Harvey.

This department is conducted in Toronto; the Professors are paid by Tuition Fees and a Parliamentary Grant of \$1,000 per annum.

Ques. 92.---Do you in general concur with the views expressed here by Dr. Cook, with reference to the affiliation of Colleges?---Yes, in general.

Ques. 93.---Do you also concur in the sketch given by Dr. Cook of the proper mode of maintaining and constituting the Toronto University and the Toronto College?---Yes.

Ques. 94.---Do you limit the affiliation of Colleges in the same way as Dr. Cook?---I fully concur with him in that respect.

The Reverend Dr. Stinson, President of the Conference, was then called in and Examined

Ques. 95.---Do you concur in the views which have been expressed by Dr. Cook?---I do and am prepared to aid in carrying them out.

The Revd. Doctor Green handed in the following statement:

*SUBSTANCE of REMARKS made by the Reverend Doctor GREEN, D. D., Bursar of Victoria College, furnished by request of the Committee.*

In calling the attention of this committee to the memorials now before you, we claim,

*First.* That the Government in proposing, and the Parliament in sanctioning the University Act of 1855, evidently designed to extend the benefits arising from the *Income Fund* to those colleges situated in different parts of Upper Canada, as well as to the University Colleges in Toronto.

In proof of this position we assert, that the bill of 1849 was repealed for the avowed and clearly expressed purpose of providing for such extension of the said fund.

The preamble of the late Act declares that the former "enactments have failed to effect the end proposed by the Legislature, in as much as no college or educational institution has affiliated, &c."

That many parents and others are deterred by the expense and other causes from sending youth to be educated in a large City distant from their homes, that from these and other causes many do and will *prosecute and complete* their studies in *other institutions* in various parts of the Province to whom it is *right and just* to afford facilities for obtaining scholastic honors and rewards, and thereby *encourage them* and others to persevere in the pursuit of knowledge and sound learning, and as the royal charter of the London University is "*well adapted for the attainment of the objects aforesaid,*" therefore the former Act is repealed. Now, the Parliament either did or it did not design, by repealing the Act referred to, to provide for the assistance of other colleges. If they did not really design to afford those "facilities" mentioned in the preamble, then they were hypocrites of the deepest dye for declaring

that it was "*just and right*" for them to afford facilities for doing what they never intended to do, and they have been playing off a game of deception against the country alike discreditable to them and injurious to us. But if they did intend, honestly, to carry out the principles which they laid down, then we affirm that these reasonable and honest intentions have been entirely frustrated by the parties who have had the management of the income fund; for up to the present hour not a farthing of the surplus fund has been given to any college out of Toronto.

We leave our opponents to their choice of these alternatives; but we have no hesitation in taking the affirmative, for however inconsistent it may appear for the Parliament deliberately to declare that it is *right* and *just* to afford facilities which they have never afforded, still we have heard that at least three gentlemen who belonged to the Government of that day have most distinctly affirmed that in proposing the "University Bill," the Government did sincerely design to help those colleges in different parts of the country which were not placed on the foundation of the University. The Honorable Chairman of this committee, asserted this in his place in the house, the Hon. Dr. Rolph assures me of the fact, and I am told the Hon. James Morris affirms the same thing.

*Secondly.* Because the Bill makes provision in its *fifty-fourth* clause for the formation of a *surplus fund*, to be devoted to that purpose. The first tax upon the *Income Fund* is to meet the current expenses of the University, and University College, and the balance of that income, the law says, *shall form a fund* for Academic purposes throughout Upper Canada. Why provide a fund for that purpose if it is never to be used? For, be it remembered, that the balance remaining at the *end* of each, or any year, must go into that surplus fund, and when once placed there, it cannot be used for any purposes other than for Academic education in Upper Canada. From the *fifty-fourth* clause of the Act, we can scarcely suppose that the Parliament even contemplated the University itself would ever dream of laying the hand of spoliation upon the surplus fund, for if so, why form such a fund at all?

*Thirdly.* Because we cannot suppose that a Parliament, elected to represent the interests of the people at large, would deliberately provide that the munificent endowment set apart for *higher Education* in the country, should be devoted to the interests of a minority of the population, while the great majority who have provided Colleges for their youth, are to be deprived of any participation in these public funds, merely because they prefer *Denominational* Colleges for the instruction of their youth to any or to all others. For these, and other reasons, we are forced to conclude that the present law was enacted in view of extending the benefits of the endowment to other colleges as well as to University College in Toronto. But why have these wise provisions not been promptly and legitimately carried out? It cannot be for want of funds, for I find that one year the *Income Fund* amounted to upwards of £15,000, and another year to more than £17,400. Now it is quite preposterous to suppose that the University, with its one college, required this amount to educate the number of students in University College, when there were less than forty (40) under-graduates in attendance. From the expenditure of other colleges I am led to conclude, that one-half of this income would have furnished ample means to meet the current expenses of that institution. The other half should, in all justice, have gone to the *Surplus Fund*. The *Surplus Fund* was commenced, apparently, in good faith, and in 1855 it amounted to £6,580, and in 1856 it was increased to £6,922 19s 6d. What has become of this fund? It cannot lawfully be used for building, or for the current expenses of the University; for the law says "*it shall form a fund,*" and a fund too, for a *specified object*, and it certainly has not been devoted to the object specified, and therefore, I take it for granted that it must be on hand, together with the interest thereof, subject to the order of Parliament.

Hitherto we have been speaking of the law as it *now exists*, and of our claims under it, that law has been rendered nugatory so far as the interests of other colleges are concerned, and its limited provisions for their support entirely ignored and frustrated by means of an *extravagant and wasteful expenditure*.

Had the Act of 1855 been carried out in a spirit of common fairness to all interests involved, this agitation would probably have been prevented, or at least delayed for years; but former expenditure and operations convince us that other and more specific provisions

must be made to secure the interests of all parties concerned, and therefore we now claim that *such a change may be made in the present Act*, as will clearly define and secure to us our rights, instead of allowing Toronto College to use up all the funds they can, and then merely allow us to pick up any *surplus crumbs which may be left*.

The permanent fund has been very much reduced by large and expensive buildings, which are reported to have cost nearly \$400,000! This sum I am inclined to think is much more than was really needed to meet the necessities of the case, and more than a new country like ours demanded, or can well justify under the circumstances. It appears to us that arrangements might have been made by which ample accommodation could have been provided for that College without such an expenditure from the "*Permanent Fund*," as will necessarily lessen the Income Fund to the amount of from \$20,000 to \$24,000 per annum.

But we also complain of the wasteful and extravagant manner in which the income has been voted and frittered away, instead of carrying a large annual balance to the Surplus Fund.

In proof of this we refer the Committee to the Reports of the Bursar as contained in the appendices to the Journals of the House of Assembly. I shall not detain the Committee to read them now as they are contained in the books which lie on the table.

I am asked to mention particulars, and as the Committee desire it, I beg to refer them to the Bursar's Report for 1856.

The total income for this year is said to be £17,461 13s. 8d. The total expenses, (exclusive of the Royal Grammar School) £17,188 18s. 10d., leaving the small sum of £342 14s. 10d. to be carried to the surplus fund! Will any one say that this Institution requires such a large amount over and above *tuition and graduation fees* to educate the students in attendance? There are several items in this expenditure which appear to us to be extravagant. Take the item of Salaries, £8,048, besides £540 for Examiners, the most of which went to the same Professors. The Bursar's Office £2,238, Stationery and Printing, £463, Incidentals, &c., £1,146, and a very extraordinary item of £800 for a certain commission. Prizes, £128, and Scholarships £1,158. Now these scholarships were designed as rewards to students of remarkable talent and industry, and yet we find thirty-seven (37) undergraduates carrying off thirty-five (35) scholarships, with five double and one triple scholarship.

These scholarships of £30 each or more are calculated to lure students away from unendowed colleges, and especially when those scholars get their *tuition free*, besides prizes and medals in great variety. We turn now to the report for 1857.

|                             |         |
|-----------------------------|---------|
| Total Income reported ..... | £15,161 |
| Total Expenditure.....      | 15,357  |

Excess of Expenses over Income.....£ 196

A poor prospect here for a surplus fund; but look at the items. Salaries, £7670, or more by £3,173 than was given in 1853, apart from faculties of medicine and law. Incidentals, £1,247, nearly double the whole grant to Victoria College. Prizes, £193. Scholarships, £1,234. Stationery, £598. Bursar's Office, £2,261, &c., &c.

Is there the slightest indication of economy in these expenses. Compare them with other Colleges and what do we find? Why, simply this, that this one Institution has spent within £820 as much as the seven largest Colleges in the province are said to have spent. Trinity, Victoria, Queen's, Regiopolis, McGill, Bishops' and Laval. These seven Colleges are reported to have spent this year £16,177, and Toronto College has spent £15,357. But if we include the Grammar School in the latter, then this Institution, alone, has expended more by some £4,000 than all these other Colleges put together.

Surely these other noble Institutions must be extremely niggardly in their operations, or the Toronto College has been shamefully wasteful and extravagant. Let this committee judge the matter, and give the country the benefit of their judgment. I need not detain this Honorable Committee with any further statistical facts. Enough has been proved to show the necessity of some amendment to the Act under which these transactions have occurred.

We have been accused of wishing to break down the University, and break up the endowment. We repudiate the charge. We neither wish to do the one nor the other; but we wish to extend the usefulness, and increase the popularity of the University by placing all the Colleges upon its foundation, with equal privileges and equal rights, and thus make it what it ought to be, *A great National University*, alike the friend of all, and the enemy of none. Give it all the money it needs to conduct its operations with efficiency. Give it the power of prescribing a Curriculum of study for all the Colleges in Upper Canada placed on its foundation. *Remodel the Senate*, so as to secure *economy in the management*, and equal justice to all interests concerned in the *appointment of examiners*.

Then let all affiliated Colleges receive a portion of the income in proportion to the students instructed by them. In this way all parties will enjoy their preferences as to the Institution where their children are to be educated without constraint or proscription; and thus all will be equally benefitted by the public funds to which all are equally entitled. Two objections have been urged against this plan. First, that it would encourage a large number of petty Colleges, and secondly, that it would encourage sectarian education. As to the first, it must be apparent to all that if all the students in these petty colleges come up to the standard prescribed by the University, they will be quite equal to those educated in large Institutions. Besides which, when all are compelled to adopt *one Curriculum*, there can be no petty College, so far as the *quality* of the instruction is concerned, though all may not be equal in the *number of students they educate*. As it now is, we have neither security against petty Colleges nor petty scholars.

As to the *sectarian view of the question*, it appears to me that there is a wide difference between a denominational and a sectarian institution. A *sectarian institution* is one got up especially for the education of one denomination—for the exclusive promotion of one set of doctrines or form of faith. Hence, religious tests are required, and one form of worship prescribed. A denominational institution is one for the sustentation of which one denomination is pledged, and for the character and morals of which it is also responsible; but to which all are admitted on equal terms without any religious tests or party distinctions.—Victoria College is not sectarian. Five members of the Government are *ex-officio* members of its College Board and Senate; five members may call an extra meeting at pleasure. The Royal Charter prohibits any religious tests. All Students are required to attend that place of worship which their parents or guardians may direct, and no effort is made to proselyte, or to influence their religious opinions. Our Professors are selected from all churches, with reference to their moral and literary qualifications, and not to their religious faith, as the present staff will show, in which we have Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and Methodists.

Adjourned till Monday at 11 o'clock.

Monday, 2nd April.

#### COMMITTEE MET.

*Present:*

HON. MR. CAMERON, Chairman,  
 HON. " CAYLEY,  
 HON. " FOLEY,  
 " McCANN,  
 " ROBLIN,  
 " SIMPSON,

The Rev. Doctors *Cooke, Ryerson, Stinson* and *Green*, were in attendance.

Rev. Mr. *Nelles* supplemented Dr. *Green's* statement by adding—That the time of the Professor of Modern Languages is but partially occupied in giving instruction in Modern Languages. That instruction in Modern Languages is confined chiefly to the French—that the rest of the time of the Professor is occupied in giving instruction in other branches of the curriculum.

Rev. Dr. *Cook* further Examined :

[*By the Chairman.*]

*Ques. 96.*—Do you think that, under the provisions of the University Act, other Colleges, besides University College, had a right to look for and expect aid from the surplus funds of the University?—Most assuredly, as clause 54 of the University Act clearly shews, and judging from a conversation I held with a member of the Government at the time.

*Ques. 97.*—Do you think that the Surplus Fund has been greatly diminished by any extravagant expenditure of the Income Fund?—Undoubtedly it has.

[*By Mr. Cayley.*]

*Ques. 98.*—Do you desire that the statement you put in shall be considered as evidence, in the same way as if the information and statements therein given had been elicited from you by examination and cross-examination?—I should wish the statement I put in to be considered as my evidence on the subject, but with this remark: I refer there to the expenditure of other Colleges. I have not the official documents from those Colleges, but I believe that my statement is substantially correct with regard to the expenditure of those other Colleges.

Rev. Dr. *Stinson* Examined,—

*Ques. 99.*—Do you desire that the statement you put in shall be considered as evidence in the same way as if the information and statements therein given had been elicited from you by examination and cross-examination?—I should say my statement chiefly referred to the design of the Act to include other Colleges, and I am quite willing that any facts I state should go as evidence.

The following question and answer was put in by the Rev. Dr. *Stinson*.

I believe that the University Law indicates the meaning and design of that Law. Is it so? Or is it not so? I require a distinct answer to this Question.—That the University Law of 1853 was intended to encourage Collegiate Institutions already established in the Province of Canada West. My reasons for this are—the Preamble refers to many young men who were at that time prosecuting their studies in different Colleges in the Province—to whom the preamble says it is just and right to afford encouragement—the Colleges in which the young men to whom it was just and right to afford such encouragement, were Denominational Colleges, therefore, I conclude that those Institutions must be included. I am strengthened in this belief by the assurance, that in the first copy of the Act, other Colleges, and their having a right to a share in the honors and Funds of the Toronto University, was distinctly recognized.

JOSEPH STINSON,

President of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference of Canada.

Rev. Dr. *Green* Examined,—

*Ques. 100.*—Do you desire that the statement you put in shall be considered as evidence, in the same way as if the information and statements therein given had been elicited from you by examination and cross-examination?—I gave my statement as a statement of the views I held in reference to the matter.

Rev. Dr. *Ryerson* Examined—

[*By the Chairman.*]

*Ques. 101.*—Do you think that, under the provisions of the University Act, other Colleges besides University College had a right to look for and expect aid from the surplus funds of the University?—I think so most assuredly: From the opinions expressed by individual members of the Government at the time, and also by a clause in the original draft of the Bill as it was introduced into the Legislature, and passed the first reading, which shewed the deliberate policy of the Government at that time, fixing an aggregate sum from the University Fund for the several colleges, and stating that it should be distri-

buted to them in proportion to the grants then made, that is, an equal distribution. The 53rd clause of the Bill, as introduced, was as follows:—

“Such sum as shall be required to defray the current expenses of the said University of Toronto, including Scholarships, Exhibitions, Rewards and Prizes authorized by the 25th section of this Act, and to defray the current expenses of University College; including in both cases the care, maintenance and ordinary repairs of the property assigned for the use of the said University or College, and with power to the Governor in Council to decide what shall be deemed ordinary repairs as distinguished from permanent improvements.”

And then the clause follows, which was afterwards omitted and superseded by the 54th section of the Act:—

“A sum to be divided among the several Colleges in Upper Canada, not exercising the power of granting degrees except in Divinity, and affiliated to the said University, and receiving pecuniary aid from the Legislature for the same year, the sum awarded to each such College being in proportion to the amount of such aid received by it; Provided firstly, that the receipt of any portion of such sum by any College, shall be held to imply an abandonment by such College of any clause in its Charter providing or authorizing any religious Test or profession of faith, on the part of any student in such College, or of any Professor or Teacher therein, except the Professor of Divinity, and to be a declaration by such College that no such religious Test or profession of faith shall be required of any Professor, Teacher or student, except as aforesaid: Provided secondly, that the sum received by any such College under this section shall be applied exclusively to the payment of the salaries of Professors and Teachers employed in such College, in teaching those branches of knowledge, and those only, which shall form part of the course of study prescribed by the Statutes of the University for candidates for Degrees or Certificates of Proficiency, and that no part of such sum shall be applied to pay the salary or remuneration of any Professor or Teacher of Law, or of Medicine, Anatomy or other subject immediately connected with the study and practice of Medicine or Surgery; And provided, lastly, that the Senate of the University may require from any College in Upper Canada, receiving aid from the said Income Fund, or from Parliament, a Statement shewing the manner in which the sum received as such aid shall have been expended; and such statement shall be embodied in the then next Annual Report of the Senate.”

This clause clearly shews that the matter had been deliberately considered and determined upon by the Government. I think £15,00 for each of the Colleges, should be inserted in the blank.

*Ques. 102.*—Do you think that the Surplus Fund has been greatly diminished by any extravagant expenditure of the Income Fund?—I think so assuredly, for the reasons contained in my written statement. I have mentioned there that the expense of supporting the Faculty of Arts is trebled since 1845, when it was considered as efficient as in any of the Colleges in either of the English Universities, and twice the amount it was before the passing of the present Act.

*Ques. 103.*—Do you think there should be a Professor of Agriculture in University College?—I certainly think not. I think any one who wishes to learn Agriculture would learn more with Hon. Mr. Christie on his farm, in six months, than he would learn for three years with the Professor of Agriculture in Toronto University. In the list of subjects in the University Calendar, I find “The Practice of Manuring,” “The Management of Stock,” “Construction of Farm Buildings,” “Dairy Management,” &c. I do not think any valuable instruction on such subjects can be given in a University. I believe there have not been more agricultural students attending that class, than there have been years since its establishment.

*Ques. 104.*—Do you think there should be a Professor of Modern Languages?—I think not. I think there should be a tutor, but I think the tutor should be chiefly paid by the fees of students. In Harvard University these are extra studies, and the tutors are paid by fees. I think that the period of attendance at a University is not the time for studying modern languages, but that the student's attention should be exclusively devoted to the

recognized subjects of a University education—that the study of the elements of the modern languages should be an extra study, and that the tutors should be chiefly paid by fees from students.

*Ques. 105.*—Do you regard it as essential to have in University College a Professor of History?—Looking at the outline of the subjects of the History course in the University Calendar, it is very clear that the subjects comprehended in the course of History and English Literature are embraced in the Grammar School course. These subjects are taught in the Grammar Schools, and from the same text books. I do not think they can be taught by lectures. Every one who has been accustomed to hear sermons from his infancy, knows that he cannot learn Theology by attending the services in church. So, by attending lectures, you may get many suggestions and useful thoughts, but you cannot learn History itself.

*Ques. 106.*—Are you aware of the number of Students attending the class of Meteorology—or the number attending the class of Oriental Literature?—I am not. I think those special studies should be paid by the fees of students.

*Ques. 107.*—Should there be a Professor of Hebrew? He should be paid by fees chiefly.

*Ques. 108.*—Is there anything in the study of Latin and Greek, or Metaphysics and Logic, which renders those subjects more adapted to be taught by lectures than History? Certainly not—in the University sense of the word *lecture*, but I should say that is differently understood. In the German Universities there are lectures which are delivered in the form of discourses, the same as some in the University of Oxford, but it must be recollected the German Universities are not Colleges like our Colleges, to which the *gymnasia* of Germany more nearly correspond. Every student entering a German University, enters some faculty, the faculty of Medicine, the faculty of Law, the faculty of Theology, or the faculty of Philosophy. When I spoke of lectures in History, I used the word in the German sense, but though the instruction in Latin and Greek is equally by lectures, it includes the examination of exercises and drilling.

[By Mr. Simpson.]

*Ques. 109.*—You spoke of the intention of the Government as shewn in the original Draft of the Bill submitted to the Legislature. Was not that intention materially modified in the Bill as it actually passed the Legislature?—No. As the precise sum that would be available to those Colleges could not be ascertained, the 54th clause was substituted for a part of the 53rd Clause. I may assign another reason. I addressed to Mr. Hincks a letter on the subject, which has been published, and I understood his views were in harmony with my own on the general scheme of Collegiate Education.

[By the Chairman.]

*Ques. 110.*—How many Professors do you deem necessary in University College?—I think five. The present President of University College, in a publication issued some years ago, stated that only 4, including the Principal, had been employed in King's College, which was considered efficient, and he said that four with a Principal would be sufficient for many years to come.

*Ques. 111.*—What subjects do you think most essential to Collegiate discipline?—I agree with Dr. Cook, that Classics, Greek and Latin, Mental and Moral Science, and Mathematics, are the most essential. I would of course, add Chemistry, and Natural Philosophy. Mineralogy and Geology may be useful, but I do not think them so essential.

Rev. Dr. Green Examined.

[By the Chairman.]

*Ques. 112.*—Do you think that under the provisions of the University Act other Colleges, besides University College, had a right to look for and expect aid from the surplus funds of the University?—Most undoubtedly, for the reasons assigned in my general statement, and also for the reasons just stated by Dr. Ryerson.

*Ques. 113.*—Do you think that the Surplus Fund has been greatly diminished by any extravagant expenditure of the Income Fund?—Most undoubtedly, for the reasons mentioned in my general statement, and as shown by the reports of the Bursar of the University and University College, submitted from year to year.

Rev. Professor *Weir*, of Queen's College, Kingston, Examined.

[*By Hon. Mr. Cayley.*]

*Ques. 114.*—Is Dr. *Cook* now connected with Queen's College, and at a salary?—Dr. *Cook* is Principal. The salary of the Principal of Queen's College is £600; but Dr. *Cook* has never been in the enjoyment of a salary as Principal. He taught one year the Divinity Classes, and received a salary in that capacity. I understand that Dr. *Cook* had been invited to occupy permanently, the position of Principal and Professor of Divinity, at a salary of £750.

*Ques. 115.*—What fees are paid by Students of Queen's College?—There are no fees charged in the Faculty of Arts, for such Students as are studying with a view to the Ministry in our Church. For other Students the fees, including £1 Matriculation Fee, are—first year, £9; second year, £10; third year, £7.

*Ques. 116.*—Can the Student pay a larger fee by attending other classes?—Yes. If he attends the Chemistry Class he pays £3 extra for each session of attendance. But the Chemistry Class does not form a portion of the curriculum for degrees. The fees for the Medical Faculty are also extra.

*Ques. 117.*—Have you any Students resident in the building?—None. The Students boarded in the College when I first became connected with it, but we have found it better that they should board out of the Institution.

*Ques. 118.*—What did they pay when they boarded in the Institution?—I believe \$2 or \$2 50 a week. Now they pay from \$2 50 to \$4 out of the Institution.

Rev. Mr. *Nelles*, Principal of Victoria College, examined.

[*By the Chairman.*]

*Ques. 119.*—Is there any Theological Chair, or Divinity Students, in Victoria College?—Neither. We have students attending the College who are preparing for the Ministry, but are not pursuing theological studies, but general studies, and are not known in the College as Divinity Students, but as general Students. They receive no allowance or consideration from the funds in any shape whatever. We have had at times, also, Students preparing for the Ministry in the Church of England and the Presbyterian Church, but we do not know them as such.

[*By Mr. Simpson.*]

*Ques. 120.*—How many Students are there at Victoria College who are preparing for the Ministry in your own Church, how many for the Church of England, and how many for the Presbyterian Church?—I am not prepared to say in regard to the Presbyterian Church or the Church of England, inasmuch as it is no part of our business to ascertain that, except accidentally. The number of our Students who are preparing for the Ministry in our own Church can only be ascertained from the Minutes of Conference. The number from year to year may be twelve or fourteen. I understand there are nine this year.

*Ques. 121.*—Do these Students receive any theological instruction other than what they receive in Victoria College?—They receive none in Victoria College. They are obliged to pursue their theological studies in connection with their itinerant work on the circuit, and are examined by persons appointed, not by the College, but by the Conference authorities. There is no theological school for them. I may state, however, that there are certain studies, which may be called theological studies, embraced in every College curriculum—such as Butler's Analogy and Paley's Evidences of Christianity. These are embraced in our curriculum as they are in that of the University of Toronto. The candidates for our Ministry, who may be in attendance at the College, have access to those classes in common with other students.

Professor *Weir* further Examined

[*By the Chairman.*]

*Ques. 122.*—Do you think the Professorship of Modern Languages essential in University College?—I do not.

*Ques. 123.*—Are you not of opinion that the time which would be occupied in attention to Modern Languages and History, might be better employed in studying Mathematics, Latin and Greek, and other subjects of a University course?—I certainly think so, unless the curriculum was to be very much lengthened, which it cannot be conveniently in Canada, as yet. As regards our own students we find that, without attending to Modern Languages, they have little enough time for the proper work of a College. But, wherever there is a desire on the part of the Students to learn Modern Languages, they can find the means of doing so in the City where the College is situated, without there being a chair in connection with the College.

*Ques. 124.*—Do you consider it essential to have a lecturer in Hebrew and Syriac in this Country, except for the advantage of Divinity Students?—I do not think so.

*Ques. 125.*—Do you think it is the tendency of the present system to crush all other Colleges, and to maintain but one College in the Province?—I certainly think so, inasmuch as the encouragements to attend the Toronto University must have a damaging effect on the other Colleges. The education is gratuitous, and inducements are held out in the shape of Scholarships, the tendency of which is to withdraw Students from other Colleges.

*Ques. 126.*—Would it be advantageous to the cause of Academical Education, that there should be no competition in Academical Education in the Province?—I think not. All monopolies work badly.

*Ques. 127.*—Are you aware that the Scholarships are confined to Students attending University College. And if not, how do they act as an inducement to attend University College?—I am not aware that they are necessarily so confined, but I have understood they are practically so.

*Ques. 128.*—Do you think the income from the University Endowment is more than is required to carry on a College?—I should certainly say it is. I understand it is greater than is given to any one College in connection with the Universities of England, and greater than is given to any of the Colleges in the United States.

*Ques. 129.*—Are you of opinion that the scheme proposed of having a number of Colleges affiliated with the University, is preferable to the system at present carried on?—I think so. But it would of course depend very much on the constitution of the University, whether the examining Board comprised an equal representation from the different Colleges throughout the Province. By having one University and a number of Colleges scattered over the Country, you would have a wholesome rivalry between them, and it would very soon become known where the best education was given. In any City, also, where there is a College, there are many who will embrace the opportunity of getting a Collegiate Education, who could not go to another City to obtain it.

[*By Hon. Mr. Cayley.*]

*Ques. 130.*—Would you then encourage the establishment of similar institutions in Hamilton, London, and other places, where the population seemed sufficiently large to warrant it?—I think, if you make the standard of education sufficiently high, there will not be much danger of new Colleges starting up in those places. But I do not see that there would be any harm in there being more Colleges than at present.

*Ques. 131.*—Do you see any objection to more than one College of the same denomination being affiliated to the University?—I have not particularly considered that question. But I do not see there would be any harm, although we had one College in connection with our Church at Quebec, and another at Kingston.

[*By the Chairman.*]

*Ques. 132.*—Do you think it at all likely the same denomination would establish a second College?—I do not.

*Ques. 133.*—Does the College with which you are connected depend on public endowment?—It does not. It depends more on private endowment.

*Ques. 134.*—If a number of Colleges were established, would they have to depend mainly on public endowment or on private?—Mainly on private exertion.

*Ques. 135.*—Will there be any harm in the increase of Colleges, if security is taken to have the Professors sufficiently numerous, and the standard of Education sufficiently high?—Certainly not.

*Ques. 136.*—If the prospect of receiving aid from the University Fund encouraged private exertion in various localities and by various bodies, to establish Colleges according to such standard, would it not be advantageous to the Province?—Certainly it would, inasmuch as it would diffuse education, and would create at each of the College Seats a greater desire among the youth to have a Collegiate Education. It would cluster High Schools, and Grammar Schools around those Colleges, and there would be a salutary rivalry among the various seats of Collegiate learning in the Province.

[By Mr. Simpson.]

*Ques. 137.*—Is it not the fact—that private contributions—added to the Endowment Funds and Legislative grants—are insufficient, at this time, to meet the proper expenditure of Queen's College and Victoria College at their present standard, and far short of the standard which the managers of these Colleges desire to establish?—I believe such is the fact.

[By the Chairman.]

*Ques. 138.*—What is the difference between the aggregate income from all sources of Queen's College and that of the University of Toronto?—I believe about £12,000.

*Ques. 139.*—Do you think University College ought to be dependent in part on income from private individuals, or from tuition fees, as well as other Colleges?—I certainly think so.

*Ques. 140.*—If there be any disadvantages and embarrassments resulting from a deficiency of endowment, should not these disadvantages and embarrassments be shared by University College in common with the denominational Colleges?—I do not see why University College should have any advantage over denominational Colleges within the Province, in point of endowment or of exemption from tuition fees.

And then he withdrew.

Rev. Mr. Nelles handed in the following request:—

We desire the Committee to call for the Records of the Senate with a view to ascertain the attendance at the Senate, particularly for the last two or three years.

Mr. Langton promised to obtain what was requisite.

The Rev. Dr. Ryerson put in his statement as follows:—

*STATEMENT and REMARKS by the Reverend Doctor RYERSON, to the Committee of the Legislative Assembly, in support of the Memorial of the Wesleyan Conference on the University question.*

MR. CHAIRMAN:—In appearing before you, in obedience to your summons, I beg to remark that the views I am about to express on the University question, were formed and expressed by me in my first official report in 1846, when I devised and submitted a system of public and elementary instruction for Upper Canada; and they have been repeatedly expressed by me from that time to this. I also concur in the views and statements of the memorial of the Wesleyan Conference.

I address myself in the first place to the standard of matriculation and course of study prescribed by the University, and, in doing so, I must notice the statements contained in a memorial to the Legislature by the Toronto College Council, and by the Vice-Chancellor of the University. The College Council says:

“That said curriculum contains a course of study extending over four years, whereas that of the London University is limited to two years, and that of King’s College, Toronto, and of the University of Toronto, before 1853, was comprehended in three years; the consequence of which addition necessarily has been the adaptation of the matriculation examination to an earlier stage of study; but not only has the degree in honors not been reduced, but the number of subjects required from all candidates for the degree has been increased by the addition of Modern Languages and of the Natural Sciences.”

The Vice-Chancellor, in his memorial, admits that the standard of admission to the University has been reduced about one year, and assigns as a reason the inefficiency of the Grammar Schools. These admissions of the Vice Chancellor, and of the Toronto College Council, prove the statement of the Wesleyan Conference, that the standard of admission to the University has been lowered, instead of being elevated, since the passing of the Act of 1853. In further confirmation of this fact, I refer you to the standard of matriculation and course of study given in the official return, published in the Appendix L to the Legislative Assembly Journals of 1852 and 1853; also to the Appendix M to the Journals of 1855, where the University curriculum of 1854 is given; and, finally, to the Appendix No. 12 to the Journals of 1858, where the present University curriculum is given. I present you these official returns themselves, by referring to which you will see that the standard of admission in 1852 and 1854 was substantially the same; but that, in the entrance examination prescribed in 1857, two Greek and three Latin authors, previously required, are omitted, namely, the first book of Homer and Lucian’s *Vita and Charon*, the fifth and sixth books of *Cæsar* and first book of *Ovid’s Fasti*, retaining only *Sallust’s Cataline* and the first book of *Xenophon’s Anabasis*. It is therefore clear that the standard of admission to the University has been greatly lowered, instead of being elevated, or even maintained, since the passing of the Act of 1853.

As to the reason assigned by the Vice Chancellor, that the standard of admission to the University was reduced on account of the inefficiency of the Grammar Schools, I remark that it was singular that this was never thought of in 1854, and during the first eighteen years of the existence of the University, but was only perceived in 1857, when the Grammar Schools were more efficient than they had ever been. Besides, the Grammar School Act of 1853 forbid the employment of any person as Master of a Grammar School who was not either a graduate of some University College, or who had not a certificate of qualification from a Committee in Toronto, who examined such candidate in all the subjects required for matriculation, even in honors. I cannot, therefore, imagine that the Grammar Schools had anything to do with the reduction of the standard of admission to the University, but must suppose that it was done for the convenience of particular parties, if not to underbid the other University Colleges, in order to increase the number of students in Toronto University College. At all events, it was a step in the opposite direction to that contemplated by the University Act of 1853.

It is alleged in the memorials referred, that this reduction in the standard of admission to University College, was made when the period in the course of study was increased from three to four years, and in consequence of it. The reduction was made in 1857; but in the official returns for 1855, as contained in Appenpix No. 11 to the Journals of 1856, will be found the express mention of the four years course of study, and the subjects of instruction for each of the four years; and yet the reduction in the standard of admission was not made until 1857. The reduction could not, therefore, have been made at the time and for the reasons given.

I next refer to the course of study and options established by the Toronto University. On this point, the Toronto College Council, in addition to the statement above quoted, says:

“That such additions rendered a system of options necessary, and that these changes, viz: the introduction of Modern Languages, and of Natural Sciences, and of the adoption of the principles of options are conformable to the regulations of the Universities of Great Britain and Ireland, and the recommendations of Commissioners appointed to inquire into the state of those Universities, and to a report of Dr Wayland, formerly President of Brown University, Rhode Island, in which those subjects are specifically discussed.”

The Vice Chancellor in his memorial, says:—“The course of study as originally deter-

mined upon, in 1854, was revised in some of its details, in 1857, the main features remaining unaltered; but there has been no other alteration in the subjects of examinations, although there have been some changes in the text books recommended—a species of revision, which will always be necessary as new improved works appear upon the subjects of the course.”

Now, in proof of what the Wesleyan Conference has stated, that the *Curriculum* of the University studies has been reduced by options and otherwise, below what it was formerly, I refer to the *Curricula* of 1852, 1854 and 1857, which I have laid before the Committee, and may appeal to the judgment of any person who will examine and compare them, whether that of 1852, and even that of 1854, is not a much higher and more thorough course of study, than that adopted in 1857, even apart from the numerous options pervading and enfeebling the latter. But when the options (which were not allowed at all in the *Curriculum* of 1852) are taken into consideration, there is scarcely any ground for comparison, the former is so far superior to the latter. I herewith present a copy of the Toronto College Calendar, for 1858 and '9, by which it will be seen, that a student may take a degree in honors, without performing a single exercise in either classics or Mathematics, after the first year: and the Vice Chancellor has admitted, that a student at the end of his first year, in the present course, is only equal to a newly matriculated student in the former course. Thus, a student may now take a degree in honors with no higher classical attainments than were formerly required for matriculation, and with only one year in Mathematics. I am confident there is not a University or College in Great Britain, that would not scout the idea of conferring a degree on such terms.

The principle of options is admitted in certain subjects, and at certain periods of the course, in the English Universities. In Oxford, and I suppose in Cambridge also, even every honor man in mathematics, must, on taking his degree, pass the pass examinations in classics, and *vice-versa*. Nor, in English Universities, are modern languages ever admitted as a substitute for the ancient Classics, or the natural sciences in place of mathematics, much less other options established in the Toronto University. Harvard University allows no options in Mathematics until the third year, and none in Classics until the fourth year. In Yale College, out of twelve terms during the four years, options in Classics are allowed during but two terms, and that only in order to take higher Mathematics. It is in the superficial Colleges of the States, that a kind of popular favour is sought by plausible pretensions of various options, to consult all varieties of tastes and supposed capacities; but the old and thorough Colleges, will not descend to such means to build themselves up. They know that it is not the object of Collegiate, any more than of Common School Education, to minister to individual tastes and whims—not to deal out snatches of knowledge on various subjects; but to develop and discipline the powers of the mind, by a common course of application and exercises, sanctioned by the experience of ages, and for which Utopian experimenters have found no substitute, any more than they have found a substitute for the ordinary food and exercise requisite for physical development and discipline. It is only therefore, when the foundation, common to all, is broadly and deeply laid, and at an advanced stage of the Collegiate course, that options are admitted in the essential subjects of a University Education; but in no case, are both Classics and Mathematics allowed to be abandoned during any part of the course, and least of all, at the end of the first year.

It is to be lamented that an institution expressly created to give a high tone and character to University education, should be the first to set the example of lowering both, and of placing the professedly educated men of Canada upon a footing so inferior to the liberally educated men of Great Britain, or of the New England States. It shows that the supporters of denominational colleges, rather than Toronto University, have sought to maintain the standard of collegiate education contemplated by the University Act of 1853.

The Toronto College Council have referred to Dr. Wayland as authority for this unprecedented system of options. Dr. Wayland propounded his optional scheme several years ago. In reply to my inquiries, the Rev. Dr. Walker, President of Harvard, told me at the time that he had no confidence in it, as did the Rev. Dr. Sears, then Secretary of the Board of Education for Massachusetts. The result was, that Dr. Wayland's plan did not succeed,

or give satisfaction to the Trustees or Officers of Brown University; Dr. Wayland soon resigned, and Dr. Sears was elected to succeed him. The plan no longer obtains, even in Brown University, and has not been adopted, to my knowledge, in any College in the United States. Yet this tried and abandoned scheme is adduced by the Toronto College Council, as authority for their system of options.

The English University Commissioners have indeed recognized the *principle* of options and have recommended the giving of certificates, honors, and diplomas for proficiency in almost every branch of learning, however obtained; but they have never recommended emasculating the English College *Curriculum* by such a system of options as has been established in Toronto University College.

In reference to the statement of Toronto College Council, that the *Curriculum* of London University "is limited to two years," I remark that it is not correct. The London University prescribes the matriculation and final examinations for degrees, and that no candidate shall come up for the latter in less than two years after he has passed the former, but does not limit the course of study to that period.

As to the increase of the period of the *Curriculum* from three to four years in the Toronto University College, I have to observe that while a year was added to the course, the terms of each year were reduced from three to two, and the period of work was so much shortened each year, that the work of four years only exceeds by a few weeks in duration that of the former three years.

The length of the period of work and of vacations each year in Toronto University College, as compared with that of the oldest American Colleges, is worthy of remark. The working year is *thirty-nine* weeks; in Yale, *forty* weeks; in Toronto College, *thirty* weeks—*nine* weeks less than that of Harvard, and *ten* weeks less than that of Yale. The vacations each year at Yale are *twelve* weeks; at Harvard *thirteen* weeks; at Toronto *twenty-two* weeks. I see no good reason why rest from work should be so much longer in Toronto College than in the other colleges referred to, and for those employed in other branches of the public service; and more especially when the salaries of the Professors in the Toronto College are larger than those of any other collegiate Professors in America.

The time of weekly and daily labor during the term is also much less in the Toronto College than in Harvard College. The time of daily lectures in the former is from four to six hours for five days in the week; in the latter the time of daily lectures is seven hours five days in the week, and two hours on Saturday—in all twelve hours (or two days) more each week than in Toronto College.

But there is a still greater injustice done to the undergraduates in Toronto College, in the little time devoted to their instruction. In this college the undergraduates are divided into two classes, namely—*pass men* and *honor men*. The former are pursuing the ordinary prescribed course of study; the latter take additional, or rather optional studies, and are candidates for honors, prizes, and scholarships. In the English Universities, the *honor men* employ their own tutors to aid them in their efforts to obtain honors and scholarships. In Toronto, one-half of the time of the Professors is devoted to the *honor men*, reducing by one-half the time which ought to be devoted to the ordinary students. In the first year of the course, three hours each week are devoted to *pass men* in Classics, and two hours to *honor men*; the same in Mathematics. In the second year, two hours each week are devoted to *pass men*, and two hours to *honor men*, in Classics; in Mathematics, one hour to *pass men*, and two hours to *honor men*. In the fourth year, two hours to each class per week.

Now, in Harvard College each student, during the first year, has lectures each week six hours in Latin, and six hours in Greek, and four in Mathematics, and in the same proportion in subsequent years—thus receiving twice as much professorial aid in Mathematics, and more than three times as much in Classics, than do the students of Toronto University College. In Harvard, all the students do the same work, and receive equal aid from the Professors, and those who perform their work best, obtain the highest distinctions and rewards. In Toronto College, one-half of the time employed by the Professors in instruction is withdrawn from the ordinary students and given to the aspirants for honors and scholarships. Now, if these aspirants were left to employ their own tutors for the work they voluntarily undertake

in order to obtain honors and scholarships, and twice the time given to all students alike, in critical expositions and drilling, how much more just would it be than the present partial system, and how much more beneficial to the interests of sound collegiate education.

I herewith present the last catalogue of Harvard University, which, in connection with the Toronto University Calendar already presented, will verify the comparisons and statements above made. I submit, therefore, that the complaints in the memorial of the Wesleyan Conference on these matters above referred to are amply justified; that the objects of the University Act to elevate the standard of University education, have not been accomplished; and that Toronto University College has no exclusive claim, upon the ground of merit, over the other Colleges to the University endowment. In Victoria College there are no options in Classics throughout the four years, and there are options in Mathematics only during the third year; and I believe it is substantially the same in Queen's and Trinity Colleges. The reports of Inspectors of Grammar Schools show that Toronto University College supplies only eight masters to the seventy-five Grammar Schools of Upper Canada, while Queen's College alone supplies ten, and also the comparative efficiency, as a whole, of the graduates of Toronto University, and those of Queen's, or Victoria, or Trinity Colleges, of Toronto or Dublin. I think the influence of the system at the Toronto College is not calculated to promote that appreciation of time, regular and plodding industry, practical views, tact, and self-reliance, which are generally very marked in the students and ex-students of some other colleges. To the Toronto University College several teachers and former students of the Normal School have proceeded, some of them on my advice; all of them, I believe, without exception, have attained scholarships in subjects in which they had been drilled in the Normal School; the character and habits of these and many other young men have been formed before entering the University College; and they will no doubt be an honour and a blessing to their country. But I refer to the influence of the system itself, apart from other counteracting influences. For instance, in the College calendar laid before the Committee, it will be seen that the lectures in the College cease six weeks before the end of the term, in order to the examination; thus occupying more weeks than days are occupied in other colleges in similar examinations. This, and similar wastes of time and suspension of regular exercises, apart from the long vacations, cannot but be unfavorable to that economy of time and systematic industry (not to say purity of morals in such a city as Toronto) which are essential to high character, success, and usefulness.

I now advert to the constitution of the Senate of the University, respecting which the Wesleyan Conference has complained. It is perfectly clear that the University Act contemplated the most complete separation between the University and the University College, limiting the functions of the latter to teaching, and those of the former to prescribing the curriculum of studies, and examining and conferring certificates, honors and degrees; the very absence of that separation is stated in the preamble of the present act to have been the chief cause of the failure of the University Act of 1849, now there are four professors of University College, and two masters of Upper Canada College, members of the Senate, the legal quorum of which is five; and nearly all of the large additions last made to the Senate consists of the Students of University College. Thus University College is as perfectly supreme in, and as practically the Senate, as if no separation had been made between the University and the College.

The objects of the University Act in separating the College from the University, are entirely neutralized and counteracted. Three members of the Senate—the Vice-Chancellor, and two masters of the Upper Canada College—receive their salaries under the statutes of the Senate, and the Professors of University College, though not receiving their salaries under a Statute of the Senate, their periodically increasing salaries, if not fixed on the recommendation of the Senate, have, I believe, been settled on the recommendation of certain of its members. The whole of the enormous expenditures in behalf of University and Upper Canada Colleges, has been made under the authority of the Senate, six of whose members were officers of those colleges. I hold it to be a false principle that any persons should be members of a body for the expenditure of money in the application of which they have a personal interest. If the com-

mittee should order the minutes of the proceedings of the Senate to be laid before them, and mark who were present, and what was done at each meeting, they would see how the system has been worked, and how parties connected with the University and Upper Canada Colleges have directed as to expenditures, studies, scholarships, &c. The Vice-Chancellor, a salaried officer of the University, after having recommended and overseen these various expenditures, audits the accounts of such expenditures.

The payment of the expences of members residing at a distance from Toronto having been refused, they very rarely attended the meetings of the Senate, the minutes of which will show that those expenditures have been chiefly directed by a "family compact" of gentlemen receiving their salaries from the University and Upper Canada College endowments, I submit, therefore, that the composition of the Senate is not only unjust to various institutions, but adopted to promote the expenditure and regulations complained of.

The appointments of examiners by the Senate appear to me to be even more objectionable than its composition. It is a statute of the English Universities and the practice of the best American Colleges that no professor, or tutor shall examine his own students; yet every Professor in Toronto University College, (eleven in all) has been appointed examiner of his own students, and in his own department, and at a remuneration of £20 each for so doing, in addition to his salary. The students have of course been lauded for their great proficiency, and honors, prizes, and scholarships have been liberally awarded. But how contrary is this practice to the very intentions of the University Act of 1853, as well as to English and the best American practice; and degrees and honours thus conferred cannot possess the slightest superiority over those conferred by any other University College in Upper Canada.

There being no faculties of Law and Medicine in the Toronto University College, there were no Professors in those faculties to appoint as examiners; but, as one Professor of a Toronto School of Medicine was a member of the Senate, an examiner was of course selected from the Faculty of that school, and the curriculum of medical studies was modified and reduced as much as had the curriculum in the Faculty of Arts, as may be seen by comparing the curriculums in medicine in the Appendix to the Journals for 1852-3, and that to the Journals of 1858.

The expenditures of the University Funds are increased, and are large beyond all precedent, and under every head, salaries, incidentals, stationary, examinations, &c., as well as buildings. I will not enter into particulars; but great ingenuity seems to have been exercised to reduce the Fund as much as possible in order to justify the plea that there is not enough left to share any part of it with other than the University and University College. The Minister of Finance pointed out clearly the other evening the difference between *floating* and *fixed* capital in a country, and the disadvantages to the practical business of a country resulting from converting the former into the latter by large investments of money in buildings, &c. This is what the senate of the University has done by sinking nearly if not quite a hundred thousand pounds in buildings, and thus reducing the income of the fund several thousand pounds per annum.

Nothing can be more clear than that the University Act of 1853, never intended such an expenditure of the fund. The 51st, 52nd, 56th, and 57th sections of the Act carefully and guardedly specify "current expenses of University College," "ordinary repairs," "permanent improvements and additions to the buildings." The plain import of this language may be distorted and perverted by ingenuity, but its intention is as clear as the light to every candid mind. Other and very different expressions must and would have been used had the Legislature intended to expend large sums for a library and museum, and some four hundred thousand dollars for the erection of new buildings on a new site, besides considerable sums in improving and ornamenting the grounds. In the Act as prepared and brought into the Legislature by the government and as printed, express provision was made for other colleges besides University College. I herewith present a printed copy of the Bill in which there is one clause, (fifty-three) providing for other colleges; I was not in Quebec, nor in communication with members of government on the subject at the time; but the Rev. Dr. Cook has stated that a member of the government mentioned the sum with which it was proposed to fill up the blank you see in this clause of the bill;

but it having been objected that the University endowment was not sufficient to pay so large a sum to each of these colleges mentioned, the clause was superseded by the 54th clause of the Act, providing that "any surplus of the said University Income Fund remaining at the end of any year after defraying the expenses payable out of the same, shall constitute a Fund to be from time to time appropriated by Parliament for academical education in Upper Canada." The preamble and the whole of the Act were framed with a view of aiding other colleges as well as providing for University College; but the Senate has determined to defeat that object by frittering away and reducing the funds in buildings and other purposes never contemplated by the Act, increasing expenses of every kind and reducing the annual income by spending more than one hundred thousand pounds of the principal. It cannot be claimed that the faculty of arts is more efficient for the legitimate purposes of a University College now than it was in 1850; yet since then, its expenses have been increased from £3,350 to £7,670, and all other expenses increased in proportion.

The following table of the comparative expenses of the different colleges in Canada, compiled from official sources, will show the monstrous current expenditure connected with University College.

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| Trinity College Salaries \$6,640—Toronto                    | \$28,520 ! |
| Trinity, Bursar's office. 500—Toronto, including Stationery | 11,438 !   |
| Or 23 times as much ! !                                     |            |
| Trinity College incidentals \$386—Toronto,                  | 4,988 !    |
| Or 13 times as much ! !                                     |            |
| Trinity, total expenses per year                            | 7,526      |
| Victoria and preparatory department                         | 6,000      |
| Queen's—Total   | 9,104      |
| Regiopolis—Total  | 7,000      |
| McGill, with her three Faculties                            | 12,480     |
| Bishop's College—Total                                      | 6,300      |
| Laval University  | 16,300     |
| Toronto, and Preparatory Department                         | 81,022 !   |

From these returns of *actual annual* outlay, we see that the managers of the Toronto Colleges spend, in one year, \$16,312 more than all the other Colleges above named put together!

Then as to the large sum sunk in the buildings, it may gratify an old country and fastidious taste to have costly and magnificent college buildings at Toronto, as it does to have St. Peter's at Rome; but are the people thereby instructed? and is that the way to educate a country? The Normal School buildings at Toronto have been as much admired for their simple elegance as for their adaptation to the purposes of their erection; yet that whole pile of buildings, providing accommodation for five hundred students and pupils, besides education offices, and for a library and depositories, a whole story of the large building for an Educational Museum and School of art, including various appendages, and the purchase and enclosure of nearly eight acres of ground, has cost less than £35,000. The education of a country requires what is necessary and useful, before erecting structures of magnificence. It may be a fine thing for a man to erect a magnificent residence; but it would be worse than foolish for him to do so, and then say he had no means to educate his children. I think it is adding insult to injury for the managers of Toronto University to fritter away the funds in the manner they have done, and then say their are not funds enough left to aid more than one College in the whole country. But this plea is the old pretext for preventing the liberal and useful application of the University endowment; the old policy for building up a system of magnificent extravagance at Toronto. The expensive magnificence of a building adds nothing to the value of instruction given: the speeches of members of the Legislature, delivered in this plain building, would require no additional value by having been delivered in the magnificent British House of Parliament. It is not buildings of costliness and splendor that make the sound system of collegiate education; it is the standard of scholarship established, the kind of instruction given, and the religious principles and moral discipline maintained.

But while the senate has thus sought to absorb all the University funds in connexion

with University College, it has, during the last three years, reported, expended on Upper Canada College, the Grammar School of University College—a Toronto Union Common and Grammar School—twenty-five thousand dollars more than has been received from the Grammar School Fund, by the whole seventy-five Grammar Schools of Upper Canada.

The system of expenditure in connexion with both University College and Upper Canada College is essentially bad. Successive and formal attempts have been made during the last ten years to retrench and reform both institutions in these respects, and each attempt has been followed by a large increase of expenditure in both cases—showing that the system itself is radically bad and incurable, and that it should be superseded by another and entirely different system.

I entirely agree to the system of a Provincial University, to prescribe the standard of Collegiate education; to examine and confer degrees; but I can conceive of nothing more utopian, more unjust, and vicious, than a one college monopoly system.

The writer of the college council memorial in favour of a Toronto college centralization system, advocated very different views *fifteen years* ago, when, in a pamphlet on the university question, he said “There can be no doubt that there are many parents who would not only complain of this as a heavy tax, but would regard with aversion any plan whereby their children would be removed from their care, and left without their supervision amidst the temptations of a large town. Nor can it be questioned that many would thus be wholly excluded, by the narrowness of their circumstances, from affording their sons the advantages of the University, whilst some would prefer foregoing them, to running the risk necessary for their enjoyment.” And, in speaking of the system of colleges in different parts of the province, the same writer says: “It would distribute through the Province the advantages which a University brings to the place in which it is situated, and to the whole country in its vicinity, instead of securing a monopoly of these to any one district.”

The principle of both the English and Continental *Collegiate* system is *dispersion*, no *centralization*. Without referring to other countries, there are *twenty-six* Colleges in France (some of them Protestant), though there is but one University. At Cambridge, in England, there is one University, but there are *seventeen* completing Colleges in that University. At Oxford, there are *twenty-six* completing Colleges in one University; and in the London University there are not less than forty completing Colleges and Schools, besides medical institutions. To have there but one College with each of these Universities would be an unthought-of absurdity. The more competition there is in any department of life, the more energy, activity and efficiency will there be in the work done; but there can be no fair competition except on equal terms; the competing Colleges should therefore be placed upon equal footing.

The Toronto Council make the following curious appeal to the Statute, and the London University, on this point:—

‘That your petitioners believe that the object of the Legislature in passing the Provincial Statute of 1853, whereby the University of Toronto was separated into two institutions, one for examining and the other for teaching, was to create a Provincial Establishment of each class, without any religious tests or qualifications, such as would be sufficient to meet the wants of the community, and in no part of said Statute is there anything to warrant the assumption, that it was intended to divide the revenues of the endowment between the Provincial University and any of the denominational Universities, or between the Provincial College and any of the denominational Colleges. Such a division would be in direct opposition to the arrangements of the University of London, from which no funds are supplied in any establishments connected with it, but each institution whose certificates are recognized, bears its own expenses from its own resources.’

As to the intention of the University Act, that has been already sufficiently referred to. The Toronto College Council admits the equality of the Colleges affiliated to the London University, as to the sharing in the sum allowed by Government to defray the expenses of that University. There is also a London University College which was once identical with the University itself, but the two have been separated; and although the London University College is non-denominational, and there-

fore as much national as Toronto University College, it receives not a farthing more of the University funds than the Wesleyan, Presbyterian, or Congregational Colleges affiliated to the University. To place, therefore, the colleges in Upper Canada upon the same footing in regard to Toronto University, as are the affiliated Colleges in England to the London University, it is necessary to leave all without any endowment, including the Toronto College, or equally aid all from the endowment upon equal terms.

But the Toronto College Council claim even the *surplus fund*, as well as the income fund, necessary for their current expenses; they say: "Your petitioners cannot believe that it was the intention of the Legislature, in this 54th section, to sanction the formation of a surplus for the benefit of the denominational institutions, by crippling the efficiency and dwarfing the growth of those Provincial establishments which they had themselves created, as best adapted to the circumstances of the country."

It thus appears that the College Council claims the surplus itself to be bestowed upon University and Upper Canada colleges—evincing as cool unscrupulousness of assumption, as there has been of expenditure in connexion with the University funds. But this exclusive assumption and monopoly of the Toronto College is the reverse of the whole English collegiate and University systems, as well contrary to public interest, and the rights of a large majority of the people.

If aid is provided in support of a college for those who prefer a college without any religious character or influences, it is unjust and preposterous to deny aid to colleges for those who demand Colleges invested with religious character and influences. It is admitted by the College Council that the religious instruction of students should be provided for by ministers of their own respective persuasions. If so, then what is elsewhere characterized and denounced as a sectarian instruction, is admitted to be necessary. How would the country be deprived of the essential foundation and elements of its institutions, character, and civilization, if the religious instruction given by the Church of England, Presbyterians, Methodists, and other denominations were distinguished. The more constant and energetic is that instruction, the better for the youth and welfare of the country; and yet it is held that that portion of the community who wish to educate their sons under the fullest influence of that instruction, are to be proscribed from all public aid in doing so, while those who are indifferent to such influence in connection with the education of their sons, are alone to have the aid of public endowments! I think nothing can be more illiberal and unjust than the one college monopoly system; the just and religious heart of the country must revolt against such proscription of religion, and such bounty to non-religion. If an institution teaches the subjects of a collegiate education in connection with no religion, it is to be endowed; but if it teaches the same subjects in connexion with any religious persuasion, it is to be proscribed! Thus the religious character of a college is a disqualification for public aid! Can anything be more monstrous?

A college at Toronto, abolishing fees, abounding in options, scholarships, and all the other appliances of a monopoly of the country's gift for University education, cannot fail to attract a large number of students of various denominations; but, in both Victoria and Queen's College, the students are of equally various religious denominations, while the long recognized and essential course of collegiate education is maintained throughout, and the influences of religion are blended with instructions in learning.

As to the influence of the number of students upon the efficiency of collegiate instruction, and the number of professors requisite, the author of the College Council memorial expresses himself as follows in 1845:

"The Professors must for some years be content to discharge chiefly the duties of tutors; and under these circumstances, the smallness of their classes is rather an advantage, inasmuch as it enables them to test the preparation and ascertain the deficiencies of each of the students on every occasion of attendance. The other universities, (besides King's College,) should be endowed so as to enable them to have sufficient schools of arts and divinity, and also to have good preparatory seminaries attached to them. *The head, with four Professors, would be fully equal, for some years, to the discharge of the University duties.* This, indeed, is a stronger staff than King's College at present possesses in those faculties."

It is beyond doubt that five or ten such faculties in competing colleges, (all educating up to a standard prescribed by Provincial authority), situated in different parts of the Province, and the efforts of denominational piety, liberality and influence, united with and developed by public aid, must tend to the more thorough education of a vastly larger number of young men than a one college monopoly system at Toronto, without oversight, without competition, without religious life, cadening rather than prompting to individual effort, sucking the state for everything and relying upon itself for nothing.

I submit, therefore, that there are good grounds for the complaints in the memorial of the Wesleyan Conference, and that justice, religion, and patriotism require a thorough change in the unjust and extravagant university and college system inaugurated at Toronto.

E. RYERSON.

Quebec, March 29th, 1860.

The Committee adjourned till Thursday, 12th April.

Thursday, 12th April

### COMMITTEE MET

*Present:*

HON. MR. CAYLEY.

HON. MR. FOLEY.

" McCANN.

" ROBLIN.

" SIMPSON.

Hon. Mr. *Foley* called to the Chair *pro tem*.

Rev. *E. Ryerson* appeared agreeable to the summons of the Committee.

On motion of Hon. Mr. *Cayley*.

*Ordered*, That Professor *Wilson* be summoned, by Telegraph, to attend the Committee forthwith; and that Dr. *McCaul* be summoned to appear.

On motion of Mr. *Roblin*,

*Ordered*, That the Rev. Dr. *Whittaker*, Provost of Trinity College, the Rev. *Jno. Anberry*, late Professor of Classics in Trinity College. Mr. *Cochburn*, Master of the Model Grammar School, Toronto, Rev. Mr. *Ormiston* of Hamilton; and the Rev. *Wm. Poole* of Cobourg, be summoned to appear before the Committee.

The Rev. Dr. *Ryerson's* Examination continued.

[*By the Chairman.*]

*Ques.* 141. Have you any further statements to make to the Committee?—I offered opinions on several subjects, in an earlier part of my examination, and I wish now to put in extracts from several eminent individuals on the subject of education, in support of the views I have expressed.

#### MODE OF TEACHING.

Professor *Wilson* of Toronto, writes this at p. 172 and 173 of the *Canadian Journal* for March, 1856.

"No Institutions in the world turn out a greater number of highly qualified teachers on the subjects specially cultivated by them. Apart from the Tutors, public and private, numbering hundreds, within the circuit of the two Universities, Oxford and Cambridge, provide professors and teachers, in their own special departments of classics and mathematics, to the great majority of the public schools of England and the Colonies. The Colleges of London, Manchester, Birmingham and Durham, all the great public schools, and even mathematical and classical chairs of the Scottish Universities, are supplied from the ancient seats of learning on the Cam and the Isis. The English College Tutor again is precisely what we term in Canadian or American Institutions a Professor; his functions in no degree differ, and the more our Canadian Professor imitates the thoroughness of the

"English College Tutor in his mode of instruction, the better will it be for the future scholarship of the Province."

MODERN LANGUAGES NO SUBSTITUTE FOR ANCIENT.

In confirmation of the views expressed by me on *English university studies*, and against substituting the modern for the ancient languages in a university course of study, I quote the language of Dr. *Daniel Wilson*, Professor in University College at Toronto, who, in the *Canadian Journal* for August, 1858, pages 180—181, wrote as follows:—

"We have spoken of the thoroughness of the education at Cambridge, in the subjects taught and encouraged at that university. That a too limited and exclusive devotion to one or two subjects of study has been engrossingly fostered at the English universities we readily admit; but even in this respect the evil is more apparent than real, and a little, well and thoroughly learned, is worth all the popular, superficial doses of crude science and learning which figure so grandly under every variety of superlative nomenclature in the prospectuses of American educational institutions. Mr. *Bristed*, after having taken his B.A. degree with honors, at Cambridge, remarks: 'I had more opportunities of observing what had often struck me before,—the development which takes place in an Englishman's mind after the age of twenty-two, when he recovers in two or three years all the ground which he *appeared* to have lost as compared with an American, Scotch, or continental student, and gains a great deal more. The Cambridge student acquires manly habits of thinking and reading. He becomes fond of hard mental work, and has a healthy taste in his mental relaxations. The trash of the circulating library he despises as he would sugar candy. No works of fiction but the very best, and those rarely, are to be found in his room. Such a taste is, indeed, late in forming; but the habit of mind once started, he goes on drawing in knowledge from all quarters at a vast rate, and whatever he does take into his well-prepared mind assimilates itself with matter already there, and fertilizes the whole, and fructifies; nothing of what he reads is thrown away.' To such a man of ripe mind and studious habits the acquisition of a modern language, such as the French or Italian, is a mere pastime, and the German only a pleasant task. What would he say to the substitution of them by our university reformers as equivalent to the Greek and Latin—the sole key to all the treasures of theology, philosophy and science?"

LATIN AND GREEK AS A PART OF UNIVERSITY EDUCATION.

In further confirmation of the views which I have expressed against substituting the study of the modern for the Latin and Greek languages in a University course, I beg to quote the words of the Rev. Dr. *Whewell*, Master or President of Trinity College and Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Cambridge, (formerly Professor of Mineralogy,) author of a *Bridgewater Treatise*, and the *History and Philosophy of the Inductive Sciences*, *Elements of Morality*, and various other works, and known as one of the most advanced University Reformers in England, and one of the most scientific and eminent men of the present day. Dr. *Whewell* in his book on the *principles of an English University Education*, remarks as follows:

"The cultivated world, up to the present day, has been bound together, and each generation bound to the preceding by living upon a common intellectual estate. They have shared in a common development of thought, because they have understood each other. Their standard examples of poetry, eloquence, history, criticism, grammar, etymology, have been a universal bond of sympathy, however diverse might be the opinions which prevailed respecting any of these examples. All the civilized world has been one intellectual nation; and it is this which has made it so great and prosperous a nation. All the countries of lettered Europe have been one body, because the same nutriment, the literature of the ancient world, was conveyed to all, by the organization of their institutions of education. The authors of Greece and Rome, familiar to the child, admired and dwelt on by the aged, were the common language, by the possession of which each man felt himself a denizen of the community of general civilization; free of all the privileges which it had been gifted from the dawn of Greek literature up to the present time.

"What can the best authors of modern days do in the way of filling such an office?"

“Even if their language were universally familiar in cultured Europe, how do they connect us with the past? How do they enable us to read the impress which was stamped upon thought and language in the days of Plato and Aristotle, in virtue of which it is still current? How do they enable us to understand the process by which the language of Rome conveyed the culture, the philosophy, the legislation of the ancient civilized world into the modern? How do they enable us to understand the thoughts and feelings to which they themselves appeal? If the Greek and Latin Languages were to lose their familiar place among us, Montesquieu and Bossuet, Corneille and Racine, would lose their force and their charm. Those who read and admire these authors constantly make a reference in their minds to the works of the ancients, which they know immediately or through a few steps of derivation. If this knowledge were taken away many of the strings would be broken in the instrument on which these artists played. And though so long as a liberal education continues what it has been, the well-educated diffuse to others a general admiration of the ‘classical authors’ of their own language; if Greek and Latin were to cease to be parts of general culture, the admiration of the classical authors of England and France would become faint and unintelligent, and in a few generations would vanish.

“The same may be said of language. The languages of ancient Greece and Rome have, through the whole history of civilization, been the means of giving distinctness to men’s ideas of the analogy of languages, which distinctness, as we have seen, is one main element of intellectual cultivation. The forms and processes of general grammar have been conveyed to all men’s minds by the use of common models and common examples. To all the nations of modern Europe, whether speaking a Roman language or not, the Latin grammar is a standard of comparison, by reference to which speculative views on grammar become plain and familiar.

“And then, as to the derivation of the modern European languages:—Those who are familiar with Greek and Latin cannot but feel, in every sentence they read and write, that the whole history of the civilized world is stamped upon the expressions they use. The progress of thought and of institutions, the most successful labors of the poet, the philosopher, the legislator, have, in a thousand of cases, operated to give a meaning to one little word. Those who feel this, have a view of the language which they speak, far more intelligent, far more refined, than those who gather the force of words from blind usage, without seeing any connection or any reason. What does intellectual culture mean, if it does not mean something more than this? What does it mean, but that insight, that distinctness of thought with regard to the terms we employ, which saves us from soliloquies, not by habit, but by principle, which shows us analogy, where others see only accident, and which makes language itself a chain connecting us with the intellectual progress of all ages.

“In what a condition should we be, if our connection with the past were snapped;—if Greek and Latin were forgotten? What should we then think of our own languages?—They would appear a mere mass of incoherent caprice and wanton lawlessness. The several nations of Europe would be, in this respect at least, like those tribes of savages who occupy a vast continent, speaking a set of jargons, in which scarcely any resemblance can be traced between any two, or any consistency in any one. The various European languages appear to us obviously connected, mainly because we hold the Latin thread which runs through them; if that were broken the pearls would soon roll assunder, and the mental connexion of the present nations with each other, as well as with the past, would thus be destroyed. What would this be but a retrograde movement in civilization.

“In nations as in men, in intellect as in social condition, true nobility consists in inheriting what is best in the possessions and character of a line of ancestors. Those who can trace the descent of their own ideas, and their own language, through the race of cultivated nations; who can show that those whom they represent, or reverence as their parents, have everywhere been foremost in the fields of thought and intellectual progress, —those are the true nobility of the world of mind; the persons who have received true culture; and such it should be the business of a liberal education to make men.  
 (Pages 34–37.”

#### CLASSICS AND MATHEMATICS

Against severing the studies of Classics and Mathematics as has been done by the

Toronto University system of options, and as argued by Mr. Vice Chancellor *Langton* in his memorial to the Legislature, Dr. *Whewell* expresses himself in the following terms in his English University Educator:—

“The study of elementary mathematics, *along with the study of classical authors*, ought to be imperatively required by all universities. To separate these two branches of study, and to allow students to neglect one of them, because some persons have a taste for one and some persons for the other, is to abdicate the functions of education altogether. Universities and colleges do not exist merely for the purpose of enabling men to do what they best like to do; or for the purpose of offering and awarding prizes for trials of strength in modes selected by the combatants. Their business is the general cultivation of all the best faculties of those who are committed to their charge, and the preservation and promotion of the general culture of mankind. And it is certain, that of all the persons who derive advantage from a university education, none are more benefited than those who, with a great general aptitude for learning, are prevented, by the requisitions of such institutions, from confining their exertions to one favorite channel. The man of mathematical genius who, by the demands of his college or his university, is led to become familiar with the best Greek and Latin classics, becomes thus a man of liberal education, instead of being merely a powerful calculator. The elegant classical scholar, who is compelled, in the same way, to master the propositions of geometry and mechanics, acquires, among them, habits of vigour of thought and connexion of reasoning. He thus becomes fitted to deal with any subject with which reason can be concerned, and to estimate the prospects which science offers; instead of being kept down to the level of the mere scholar, learned in the literature of the past, but illogical and incoherent in his thoughts, and incapable of grappling with the questions which the present and the future suggest. To neglect to demand a combination of these two elements, would be to let slip the only machinery by which universities, as the general cultivators of the mind, can execute their office.” Page 39.

Again Dr. *Whewell* employs the following irresistible reasoning on the same subject:—

“There is one leading question, in such an education as we are contemplating, on which I have already spoken, but on which it may not be useless to add a few words:— I mean, the question whether both mathematical and classical instruction should be considered necessary in the case of every student. It is sometimes said that we shall educate men better by encouraging in each that study for which he has talent and inclination;—not tormenting the man of classical taste with fruitless lessons of algebra, or the man of mathematical intellect with obscure passages of Greek. It is said, sometimes, that by such a genial education alone, do we really educate the man, or bring out his genius; that the seeming of mathematical prowess, or of classical learning, which we wring by force from ungenial and unwilling minds, is of no value, and is no real culture. But to this we reply, that if men come really to understand Greek or Geometry, there is then, in each study, a real intellectual culture, however unwillingly it may have been entered upon. There can be no culture without some labor and effort; to some persons, all labor and effort are unwelcome; and such persons cannot be educated at all without putting some restraint upon their inclinations. No education can be considered as liberal which does not cultivate both the faculty of reason and the faculty of language, one of which is cultivated by the study of mathematics and the other by the study of classics.— To allow the student to omit one of these is to leave him half educated. If a person cannot receive such culture, he remains, in the one case irrational, in the other illiterate, and cannot be held up as a liberally educated person. To allow a person to follow one of these lines of study, to the entire neglect of the other, is not to educate him. It may draw out his special personal propensities, but it does not draw out his general human faculties of reason and language. The object of a liberal education is, not to make men eminently learned or profound in some one department, but to educe all the faculties by which man shares in the highest thoughts and feelings of his species. It is to make men truly men, rather than to make them men of genius, which no education can make them.

“But even with regard to men of genius, it is not true that they have generally been men of one kind of education only, or capable only of one kind of intellectual excellence. The case

“ has been quite the reverse. During the middle ages, and down to the last century, the greatest mathematicians were almost invariably good classical scholars ; and good scholars were almost invariably well acquainted with mathematical literature, and often very fond of it. And this connexion, in the main, has continued to our own day, so far as the mathematics and classics belonging to a liberal education are concerned. Not to speak of living persons whose career at Cambridge might be adduced to prove this the greatest Greek scholar of the last generation, *Porson*, was fond of algebra, and was a proficient in it ; and if we run over the highest wranglers of the last sixty years, we find at every period men known to be well versed in classical literature, as *Otter, Brinkley, Outram, Ramcock, Wrangham, Palmer, T. Jackson, R. Grant*, and many others.

“ Indeed, there can be no doubt but that the clearness of mind and vigour of character which make a man eminent in one line of study will also enable him to master the elementary difficulties of another subject, if it is fairly brought before him as something which must be done ; although, if it be presented to him as a matter of choice whether he will make the attempt, caprice, fastidiousness and the pleasure of doing what he can already do easily and well, may make him turn with repugnance from a subject in which he has not learned to feel any interest.

“ To which we may add that to be able to command the attention and direct the mental powers so as to master a subject which is not particularly attractive to us, is a very valuable result of mental discipline. Whatever acuteness or sagacity a man may have on a special subject, if he be so helpless or so fastidious that he cannot employ his thoughts to any purpose or any other subject, we cannot consider him as a well cultured person, nor ought we to frame our education so as to give to men such an intellectual character.” (Of a Liberal Education in general, and with particular reference to the leading studies of the University of Cambridge.)

#### MODERN SCIENCES AND CLASSICS.

Against substituting the study of the Modern Sciences for the Ancient Classics and Mathematics, Dr. *Whewell*, in his elaborate work on *Cambridge Studies*, page 21, 22, expresses himself as follows :—

“ Of the two classes of studies above mentioned, the Permanent and the Progressive Studies, the former are the most essential as parts of education, and must be mastered before the others are entered on, in order to secure such an intellectual culture as we aim at. The Progressive Sciences are to be begun towards the end of a liberal education. On the other hand, the Permanent Studies, Classical Literature and Solid Reasoning, are fundamental parts of a liberal education, and cannot be dispensed with. Modern Science and Philosophy ought to be introduced into education, so far as to show their nature and principles ; but they do not necessarily make any considerable or definite part of it. The intellectual culture, though it will be incomplete if these are excluded, may still be a culture which connects a man with the past and prepares him for the present ; but an education from which classical literature or mathematical reasoning is omitted, however familiar it may make a man with the terms of modern literature and philosophy, because he has not the intellectual culture which the greatest authors in literature and philosophy have always had.”

#### CHAIR OF AGRICULTURE.

In support of what I have offered on this subject, I desire to put in the following expression of opinion by the Commissioners appointed to enquire into the management of the Queen's College in Ireland.

“ For reasons which we shall hereafter state, we recommend the abolition of the Chair of the Celtic Languages, in the Literary Divisions, and of the Chair of Agriculture, in the Science Division of the Faculty of Arts. From its nature it is questionable whether agriculture should have a place in the course of studies at the college of a university. Practical agriculture is best taught by that experience which constant occupation on a well managed farm affords. The scientific knowledge which a farmer requires will be readily acquired by any one who has attended the ordinary courses of lectures on Chemistry, Natural History, Geology and Engineering. \* \* \* \* \* The agriculturist is formed in the field of the farm, not in the Hall of the College.”

## MATRICULATION.

On the subject of Matriculation the Commissioners on the Irish Queen's Colleges, speak thus :—

“ The Matriculation examination is the first point of contact between the college and school, and the only point through which the action and reaction, of each on the other, are being constantly communicated. This examination must, therefore, be always maintained at a high standard, as indicating the termination of school education and the starting point of college studies. Nothing could, we conceive, be more injurious to the interests of education than a low standard of Matriculation examination as the preliminary qualification for college pursuits. We are of opinion with the late Sir *William Hamilton*, that, ‘ Professo-rial prelections are no substitute for scholastic discipline,’ and that the University loses its proper character when obliged ‘ to stoop in order to supply the absence or incompetency of the inferior Seminaries.’ We therefore recommend that the Matriculation Examination be maintained at the same standard as originally fixed by the Board of Colleges: and if any change be hereafter made therein, that the tendency of such should always be to elevate, and never to deprecate, the general standard of school education throughout the country.”

## COST OF COLLEGE BUILDINGS, &amp;c.

Respecting the cost of College Buildings, the following statement is found in the same Report :—

“ A sum not exceeding £100,000 was placed at the disposal of your Majesty's Government, to purchase and provide sites and the necessary buildings for one or more Colleges, and for establishing and furnishing the same. An annual endowment, chargeable on the Consolidated Fund, was also created, not exceeding £7,000 for each College, or £21,000 in the whole, which sum was to be applied for the payment of the salaries of the President, Vice President, and such Professors in the Faculties of Art, Law and Physic, as should, from time to time, be established by your Majesty; and also for the payment of salaries of office-bearers and servants, and prizes and exhibitions.”

“ It appears that of the sum of £100,000, placed at their disposal for the former purposes, £10,107 0s. 3d., were expended in the purchase of College sites, containing nearly eleven acres, at Belfast, upwards of seven acres at Cork, and fourteen at Galway; £85,375 5s. 11d. on buildings; and £4,507 11s. 1d. on furniture.

“ The proportion, expended in the case of each of the three Colleges, was—on Belfast College, £34,375; on Cork College, £32,899 7s. 2d.; and on Galway College, £32,743 6s. 4d.”

I beg to add, that each of these College buildings of the Queen's Colleges in Ireland, contain residences for the Principal and Vice-Principal and accommodations for the Faculties of Law and Medicine, besides the Faculty of Arts.

## OPTIONS OF STUDIES.

I think that there should be no options by which Students may be able to escape from particular branches of study, and in support of what I have already said on that point, I quote again from the report of the Queen's College Commissioners.

The Senate of the Queen's University, though making it compulsory on the Student to pursue the foregoing curriculum, does not require him at the Degree Examination to answer on all the subjects on which he has attended lectures in the College. It requires every candidate for the A. B. degree to answer on the following groups of subjects :

The Latin Language and Literature.

The Greek Language and Literature.

A Modern Foreign Language.

Mathematics.

And on any of the three following groups which he may choose to select:

A. English Philology and Criticism, Logic, Metaphysics or Jurisprudence, and Political Economy.

B. Chemistry, Natural Philosophy.

C. Zoology, Botany, Physical.

Dr. *Ryerson* expressed his desire to give further evidence, and then he withdrew.

The Committee then adjourned till 11 o'clock to-morrow.

Friday, 13th April.

### COMMITTEE MET.

*Present :*

Hon. Mr. CAYLEY,  
 Hon. Mr. FOLEY,  
 " McCANN,  
 " ROBLIN,  
 " SIMPSON.

The Hon. Mr. *Foley* was called to the Chair, *pro. tem.*

The Rev. Messrs. *Cook, Ryerson, Stinson, Nelles, and Poole* were in attendance.

The Rev. Dr. *Ryerson's* Examination continued.

[*By the Chairman.*]

*Ques. 142.* Is there anything more to be submitted on the part of the Petitioners?—  
 I yesterday stated that I desired to submit to the Committee some statements relative to the reduction of the character of the studies required from candidates in the faculty of Medicine in the University of Toronto. I now desire to make the following statement on that subject:—

In my written statement and remarks, I have referred to the reduction in the course of studies requisite for a DEGREE IN MEDICINE.

The Statute passed by the Senate of the University early in 1854, (given in Appendix M. to the Journals of 1855,) required, among other conditions, that the candidate for the Degree of Bachelor of Medicine, should have passed the Matriculation Examination, and have regularly attended lectures in the following branches of Medical Education, and for the periods mentioned, viz. :

|   |   |   |   |   |                            |
|---|---|---|---|---|----------------------------|
| Anatomy,                                      | - | - | - | - | Two Courses of Six months. |
| Physiology,                                   | - | - | - | - | do. do.                    |
| Practical Anatomy,                            | - | - | - | - | do. do.                    |
| Theory and Practice of Medicine,              | - | - | - | - | do. do.                    |
| Principles and Practice of Surgery,           | - | - | - | - | do. do.                    |
| Midwifery, and Diseases of Women and Children | - | - | - | - | do. do.                    |
| Therapeutics and Pharmacology,                | - | - | - | - | do. do.                    |
| Chemistry,                                    | - | - | - | - | do. do.                    |
| Botany,                                       | - | - | - | - | One Course of six months.  |
| Practical Chemistry,                          | - | - | - | - | do. do.                    |
| Medical Jurisprudence                         | - | - | - | - | do. do.                    |

By the Statute passed by the Senate in 1857, the following conditions, under the same heads, were prescribed as the requisites for the Degree of Bachelor of Medicine, viz. :—

The candidate must have matriculated in any of the Faculties of Law, Medicine or Arts.

He must have regularly attended lectures in the following branches of Medical Education, for the respective periods mentioned, viz. :

|   |   |   |   |                            |
|---|---|---|---|----------------------------|
| Anatomy,                                      | - | - | - | Two Courses of Six months. |
| Practical Anatomy,                            | - | - | - | do. do.                    |
| Theory and Practice of Medicine               | - | - | - | do. do.                    |
| Principles and Practice of Surgery,           | - | - | - | do. do.                    |
| Chemistry,                                    | - | - | - | do. do.                    |
| Midwifery, and Diseases of Women and Children | - | - | - | One Course of Six Months:  |
| Therapeutics and Pharmacology,                | - | - | - | do. do.                    |
| Physiology,                                   | - | - | - | do. do.                    |
| Practical Chemistry,                          | - | - | - | do. do.                    |
| Medical Jurisprudence,                        | - | - | - | do. do.                    |

It will be recollected that, as I have shown in my written statement, the standard of Matriculation of 1854 was reduced in 1857, by the omission of two Greek and two Latin authors, and translation of English into Latin—retaining only Salhurst's Cataline; and it is seen above that in five branches (two of the most essential) in the course of Medical studies were reduced one-half. The previously required attendance at Lectures on Medical Jurisprudence, also on Practical Chemistry, was reduced in each branch from six to three months.

The attendance at Lectures on the all-important and comprehensive subjects of Midwifery, and diseases of women and children, was reduced from twelve months to six months; and the attendance at Lectures on the scarcely less important branches of Physiology, Therapeutics and Pharmacology, was also removed from twelve to six months in each case.

Thus, in both the primary and professional education of the Medical men of the country, the Senate of the Toronto University, has made the first downward steps.

Against this reduction in the course of Medical studies, the Medical Department of Victoria College, made a strong protest at the time, declaring against relaxing requirements, which had been "held sacred in every civilized country, and lately acted upon by the Toronto University, of Toronto itself," and remarking as follows:—

"With such a minimum of requirement, the student cannot be prepared for those scenes of impending death, so peculiar to Midwifery, where a knowledge and prompt action are alike required to avert the fatal issues." "One course of nine months, (instead of two), upon Midwifery and the Diseases of Women and Children, present a contrast most forbidding to the knowledge and humanity of the age, and it can scarcely be doubted, that an enlightened and deeply interested public, will seek in every possible way, to avert the tendency of so seductive an advertisement, as "graduation made easy."

"The same reduction has been made in the *Materia Medica*, and Therapeutics, in a branch embracing a knowledge of the numerous and increasing remedies in Medicines, and of the rules for their application in the various forms and stages of disease."

"A like reduction has been made in Physiology, and this science, with all its relations to the laws of life, and the functions of the living body, (so necessary to a knowledge of the deviations constituting diseases), are made secondary to Chemistry. The latter is in no way undervalued, by entering this protest which duty requires, against so severe a blow inflicted upon the above essential branches of Medical education.

I may remark that in the Universities of Victoria, Queen's, and McGill Colleges, two courses of lectures, of six months each, in Midwifery, and the Diseases of Women and Children, Therapeutics, and Pharmacology, and Physiology, are still held indispensable to a Medical Degree.

Dr. *Cook* having made some remarks upon the subject of Matriculation, was requested to submit the same to the Committee, in writing.

Reference having been made to summary witnesses, Mr. *Cayley* put the following question to Mr. *Langton*.

Ques. 143. Do you still desire that Mr. *Cockburn* and the Rev. Mr. *Ormiston* shall be summoned before the Committee?—I have no longer any desire, so far as I can see at present, for the appearance of Messrs. *Cockburn* and *Ormiston*, because as Dr. *Ryerson's*

evidence now appears in its revised shape, it does not contain the imputation which I desired these gentlemen to rebut.

Dr. *Ryerson* here requested permission to state that he had made no imputation, at least had not intended to make any imputation on individuals, but that his remarks were directed only against the tendency of the system. He was not responsible for the *circulation* of the document referred to by Mr. *Langton*, and took the earliest opportunity to state to the Committee before its distribution, that it was incorrect, and to put in a revised copy.

*David Buchan, Esq.*, Bursar of the Toronto University, Examined by the Chairman, the questions being submitted by Dr. *Cook*.

*Ques. 144.* What was the revenue of the Toronto University for the year 1853?—I cannot undertake to say. The accounts will tell.

*Ques. 145.* What was the revenue of the University in the years 1853, 1854, 1855, 1856, 1857, 1858, 1859? Was there any surplus in each of those years? If so, what has been done with the money?—I have by accident a memorandum which will show in what year there was a surplus, and the amount. I put in this memorandum. The memorandum is as follows :

SURPLUS INCOME FUND.

|       |                        |                      |               |       |             |
|-------|------------------------|----------------------|---------------|-------|-------------|
| 1853— | Balance of Income Fund | carried to credit of | Surplus Fund, |       | \$12,148 26 |
| 1854— | do                     | do                   | do            | - - - | 13,475 72   |
| 1855— | do                     | do                   | do            | - - - | 696 99      |
| 1856— | do                     | do                   | do            | - - - | 1,370 98    |

Amount at credit of Surplus Income, - - - 27,691 95

*Ques. 146.* Where is this money?—It is supposed to be lying in the Bank of Upper Canada, forming part of the general funds in my charge.

*Ques. [By the Chairman.] 147.* What do you mean by supposed to be lying in the Bank of Upper Canada? State the thing as it is?—The money is in my hands, but I have had to draw upon it and various other funds in my hands to meet the costs of the building.

*[By the Chairman, the question having been submitted by Dr. Cook.]*

*Ques. 148.* How has the money been employed?—I have received no direction as to what should be done with it, except that it was to be considered as a surplus fund lying in the Bank of Upper Canada to my credit; but in consequence of the outlay for the building, I have been obliged to overdraw on the bank. Owing to the state of the money market, I could not dispose of the Debentures which I hold; but until recently, there have been more than sufficient funds to meet the drafts upon me.

*Ques. 149.* Then, in point of fact this money has been temporarily employed for the use of the Building Fund?—Yes.

*Ques. 150.* How will the money be forthcoming?—I hold Debentures, and money is constantly coming in from sources belonging to the University. In the beginning of the year, for instance, the balance against me was large, but since that the payments on account of purchase money have reduced that balance, till it is now very trifling. I can procure the exact figures to-morrow.

*[By Hon. Mr. Cayley.]*

*Ques. 151.* Do you consider yourself at liberty to apply the cash at your credit in the bank to the Building Fund, instead of selling Debentures; and if so, by what authority?—I am authorized to pay for the building out of the permanent fund by Order in Council. It was better to draw on the balance in Bank than to sell Debentures at a sacrifice, when the arrangements for the building were made. I had a large amount of money in the bank, and some part of it—about £20,000—to invest. I invested it in Debentures, which I bought of the Receiver General, on condition that I should get back the money at par whenever I wanted it. It was thought at that time there would be no difficulty about disposing of Debentures, as money was required; but although I got back the £20,000 I could not get any more.

*Ques. 152.* Where are these Debentures?—In the Bank of Upper Canada, deliverable to my order.

*Ques. 153.* If a demand came from the Government for the production of this surplus fund would you have to obtain it out of cash in your hands, or by the sale of these Debentures?—Yes, or from the Bank until I could replace it.

[*By the Chairman, the Question being submitted by the Rev. Mr. Nelles.*]

*Ques. 154.* Would the money be forthcoming with interest?—That would depend on the action of the Government.

Mr. *Buchan* was then requested to prepare answers to the following questions, submitted by the Rev. Dr. *Stinson*, and put by the Committee:—

*Ques. 155.* What do you report the expenditure in 1857 to have been?—

*Ques. 156.* What was the increase since 1854?—

*Ques. 157.* What necessity was there for this increase, and how was it applied?—

*Ques. 158.* You report a loan in 1857 of £1,500. On what authority was that loan made, and what amount of interest has the Surplus Fund received from the same?—

*Ques. 159.* What balance remained from year to year in the Bank of Upper Canada?

*Ques. 160.* Has any, and if yes, what interest has been allowed for the same? State the particulars.

*Ques. 161.* What was the expense for stationery in 1854 and what in 1858?

*Ques. 162.* What amount has been expended for buildings out of the University Funds from 1853 up to the present time? and what portion of the entire amount has been incurred for the new buildings recently erected?

*Ques. 163.* What sums have been received for fees since 1853?

*Ques. 164.* The present Law requires that the Tuition and Graduation Fees shall form part of the Income Fund; please inform the Committee what amount, arising from these sources, has been, in each year, carried to the Income Fund, since 1853?

*Ques. 165.* What amount of money now over due for interest, remains unpaid? Has the loans to Buffalo and Brantford Railroad been repaid, with all the interest due thereon, and how has it been applied?

*Ques. 166.* What money has been loaned towards the erection of the Lying-in Hospital, since 1853?

*Ques. 167.* To what individual or individuals, or Bodies Corporate, has money been loaned, since 1853? On what security have such loans, if any, been made?

*Ques. 168.* What was the income of the University and College in 1853, when the present Law was enacted, and what the expenditure?

*Ques. 169.* Has the balance of 1853, if any, been placed out at interest, for the benefit of the Surplus Fund? If not, why not?

*Ques. 170.* What would have been the balance carried to the Surplus Fund of 1853, had there been no expense for Faculties of Law and Medicine, or for building and other purposes, not included in current expenses, such as the Act of 1853 sanctioned?

*Ques. 171.* What balance has been carried to the Surplus Fund since 1853?

*Ques. 172.* State the total amount of those balances at the present time?

*Ques. 173.* What amount of interest would they have yielded at six per cent. had they been invested each year?

*Ques. 174.* Has any disposal been made since 1853, of any portion of the University Grounds within the Limits of Toronto, and if yes, on what terms?

*Ques. 175.* Was this in reality, University property—explain its position?

*Ques. 176.* How much has been received on account of Land Sales?

*Ques. 177.* How much Land remains now unsold?

*Ques.* 178. Where situated? How valued? By whom?

*Ques.* 179. Does the office issue deeds at its own expense? What does the purchaser pay for each deed?

*Ques.* 180. Is this included in the office expenses?

*Ques.* 181. How much of the endowment now expended?

*Ques.* 182. On new buildings how much? Museum how much? Library how much? Grounds how much?

*Ques.* 183. On what authority was the sum of \$32,000 paid of that fund, to defray the expenses of the commission of Mr. *O'Reilly*, *W. Coffin*, and *F. Daniels*?

*Ques.* 184. Did the Plaintiff pay his own cost?

*Ques.* 185. Explain the expenditure of \$11,438 reported for 1857, as expended in Bursar's Office. Incidentals and stationery, as per account?

*Ques.* 186. What amount of income is derived from the University property in Hamilton?

*Ques.* 187. Has any of this property been sold within the past five years; to whom sold? for what sum? and on what terms of payment?

*Ques.* 188. Have the conditions of sale been complied with?

On motion of Mr. *Roblin*.

*Ordered*, That Mr. *Simpson*, be a Sub-committee to examine the Bursar's statements of University of *Toronto* and of *Upper Canada* College, with a view to the necessity of printing for the use of the Committee a portion, or the whole for the years 1858 and 1859. The Committee then adjourned until Monday next, at 11 o'clock a.m.

*Monday, 16th April.*

### COMMITTEE MET.

*Present:*

Hon. Mr. CAMERON, Chairman,  
 " " BROWN,  
 " " CAYLEY,  
 " " FOLEY,  
 " McCANN,  
 " WILSON.

The Rev. Messrs. *Cooke*, *Ryerson*, *Stinson*, *Nelles* and *Poole* were in attendance.  
*John Langton*, Esq., was also in attendance.

Professor *Wilson* appeared in answer to the summons of the Committee.

The Rev. Dr. *Ryerson* was further Examined.

[*By the Hon. Mr. Brown.*]

*Ques.* 189. You have stated in your previous examination, that "the whole of the enormous expenditure" of which you complain, "have been made under the authority of the Senate;" that "great ingenuity seems to have been exercised to reduce the Fund as much as possible, in order to justify the plea, that there is not enough left to share any part of it with other than the University and University College;" and that "the Senate has determined to defeat that object," [the object of the University Act of 1853], "by frittering away and reducing the funds in buildings and other purposes never contemplated by the Act." Please to state how long this conspiracy has been going on in the Senate of the University?--I do not call it a conspiracy. Nothing I have said implies a conspiracy. I believe some members of the Senate intended from the beginning to apply all the funds in that way. For the last four or five years that policy has been adopted by the Senate. My testimony goes to the reverse of saying that the Act of 1853 contempla-

ted that object. The items of expenditure for buildings, are matters of fact, whether they were enormous or not, is matter of opinion. I believe that there was a certain design; but others can say whether there is evidence of that design or not.

*Ques.* 190. Have you been a member of the Senate during the whole time the Senate, as you allege, has been striving to defeat the object of the University Act, by "frittering away, and reducing the funds?"—I have.

*Ques.* 191. Did you at any time make a formal representation to Government pointing out the systematic extravagance carried on by the Senate?—Not except in private conversation, with individual members of the Government. I opposed the establishment of Scholarships in my capacity of member of the Senate, and expressed my views that other Colleges were entitled to the same advantages as University College. But my views were responded to in such a manner, that I ceased to attend the Senate regularly, as I had done previously; I found that any expression of my opinion was regarded as an intrusion, and with jealousy. Therefore, when there, for a particular purpose, I gave my opinion, otherwise not.

*Ques.* 192. To what Members of the Government did you, in such private conversation, give information of the systematic extravagance that was going on, and what reply did they make to you?—I could not say it was systematic extravagance. I could not know what the expenditure was until the statement of it appeared in the public accounts. Do not recollect accurately to what Member of the Government I expressed the opinion I have mentioned. I think to Mr. Attorney Gen. *MacDonald*.

*Ques.* 193. You say you have only attended the Senate of the University for particular purposes. Please to state what those purposes were?—One of the particular purposes I have spoken of, was the attempt to get something done for poor Mr. Maynard, who, I thought, had been badly treated. Sometimes things came up occasionally, to which persons wished me to attend, and I did so.

*Ques.* 194. How long have you been a Member of the University?—I was appointed under the Act of 1849. At what period I do not recollect.

*Ques.* 195. You have stated that "if the Committee should order the minutes of the proceedings of the Senate to be laid before them, and mark who were present, and what was done at each meeting, they would see how the system has been worked, and how parties connected with the University and Upper Canada Colleges have directed, as to expenditure, studies, scholarships, &c." The Minutes will show that all these expenditures have been directed by a Family Compact of gentlemen, receiving their salaries from the University and Upper Canada College endowments. The expenditures of the University funds are increased, and are large beyond all precedent, and under every head, salaries, incidentals, stationery, examinations, &c., as well as buildings. Please state the names of the parties here charged with the guilt of this wasteful extravagance, on these several heads?—I refer to the minutes, as I have already done, to show who constituted the majority of the Senate present at the meetings, where these determinations were arrived at. I do not admit the accuracy of any quotations contained in the questions put to me, unless such quotations are first verified.

*Ques.* 196. You have charged that "all these expenditures have been directed by a directed by a Family Compact of gentlemen receiving their salaries from the University and Upper Canada College endowments;" will you please state the names of the gentlemen forming this Family Compact?—Every one knows who are the Professors of University College and of Upper Canada College, and the members of the Senate.

*Ques.* 197. Then are the Committee to understand that you charge the Professors of University College and of Upper Canada College, who are members of the University Senate, as chargeable for the wasteful extravagance you complain of?—I charge the persons who directed those proceedings—the persons who were present at the meetings when these Statutes were passed.

*Ques.* 198. Did you, as a member of the University Senate, resist the enormous expenditures, the magnificent extravagance of which you complain; and when overborne in your efforts to accomplish economical reforms, did you place your protest on record in the minutes of the Senate?—I have no recollection of having been present when the ques

tion of buildings came up. My impression is that I was out of the country during a great portion of the time in which the subject was deliberated on. In speaking of extravagance, I allude to the whole system. I do not recollect being present at any meeting when the finances were discussed, having expressed myself in general terms of disapprobation of the expenditure. It was in consequence of the language held to me by the Chancellor, and by the present Vice Chancellor, that I determined not to attend the future meetings of the Senate.

*Ques. 199.* Do you refer to Mr. *Blake*, the Chancellor of Upper Canada, and Mr. *Langton*? and what were the observations of those gentlemen, of which you complain, or the subjects of those observations?—I cannot recollect the subject; but it involved the general policy of the Senate.

*Ques. 200.* When were those observations made, and how long did you absent yourself from the Senate in consequence of them?—I do not recollect. It was before Mr. *Blake* resigned. I think that took place in the latter end of 1854. I sometimes attended at the Senate meetings after his resignation.

*Ques. 201.* You say you think you were absent in England when the sum of \$300,000 was appropriated for the University Buildings.—please state the dates when you left for England, and when you returned?—I left some time in May, 1855, and returned the following April or May. I was afterwards absent a short time in 1857—from August till November.

*Ques. 202.* You have severely assailed the gentlemen you style the Family Compact, for the expenditure of so large a sum in the erection of the University buildings: will you please state how they are responsible for that expenditure?—For recommending it.

*Ques. 203.* Is it true that the sum of \$300,000 was appropriated for the erection of the said buildings, long before the gentlemen you assail as responsible for that wasteful appropriation became members of the Senate?—I do not know. It must have been during the year 1856, and in the earlier part of the year I was absent. It appears from the following extract, which I take from the report of the Senate for the year 1856, that the subject must have been discussed in that year.

“The sum of £75,000 having been placed at their disposal for buildings, out of the permanent fund, before assenting to any plan, or entering into any contract, it became their duty to inquire whether there was such an amount available, without trenching on the capital, necessary to provide for the ordinary annual wants of the University, and of Upper Canada College.”

*Ques. 204.* Did you ever enter your protest at any time, in the Minutes of the Senate, against the large appropriations for buildings?—I told my friends that nothing could be done till the public accounts should appear, and show what the expenditure had been.

*Ques. 205.* But had not the Senate long before that (or in March, 1854,) applied to Government for power to erect the said buildings, and were you not a party to that application?—I have no recollection of it.

*Ques. 206.* Were you present at the meeting of the Senate when an address was carried to the Government praying for authority to expend a sum of money from the permanent fund of the University, for the Library?—I do not know.

*Ques. 207.* Do you now approve of that appropriation, or do you regard it as a wasteful expenditure?—I have stated my opinion. I thought it was too large an expenditure.

*Ques. 208.* Do you charge the gentlemen whom you style the “Family Compact,” with having improperly increased the number of Chairs in University College?—I said nothing about that. I raised the question of the Surplus Fund in the Senate, as early as 1854, and this shows what must have been my views with regard to this matter.

*Ques. 209.* How was it in regard to the extravagant salaries of which you complain: did you protest against them? Did you at any time propose their reduction? Were they increased by the Senate while you were a member of it, and did you oppose the increase?—I was never present at any discussion about salaries, and did not know what they were. I doubt if they were fixed by Statute at all. The salaries of the officers of Upper Canada College were fixed by Statute.

*Ques.* 210. Is it true that you yourself proposed and carried in the University Senate an address to the Governor in Council, praying His Excellency to increase the salaries of the Professors of University College, "as a just compensation for their able services," and that in consequence of that address the salaries of the said Professors were raised to their present rate?—I have no recollection of that; but I thought they should be better paid than they were at that time. I have understood since that there have been arrangements for a retrospective and periodical increase. Of that I know nothing. I have made no objection to the amount paid to any Professors. No part of the policy which I have advocated tends to prevent University College from being properly maintained; nor its Professors from having a good remuneration for their services.

*Ques.* 211. Was the prospective increase of which you speak, the result of the address you yourself moved in the Senate?—I do not know.

*Ques.* 212. Are the Committee to understand, then, that you make no objections to the salaries now paid to the Professors and Officers of the University, University College or Upper Canada College?—I do not say that. I never objected to a proper remuneration for their services. Remuneration should depend on the service rendered. If a Professor only lectures for a couple of hours a day on subjects with which he has been familiar for years, I do not conceive that he is entitled to £750 or £1,000 a year.

*Ques.* 213. Will you please point out any salaries of which you complain as extravagant?—I do not complain of any, though my impression is that some are largely paid.

*Ques.* 214. Is it true that it was on your motion in the Senate, that the salary of the President of University College was raised to its present high amount of \$4,000 per annum?—Certainly not, so far as I recollect. I do not remember his salary ever being before the Senate. My reason for thinking it was not, is that about that time the Government determined to raise the salary of the Superintendent of Education, and I have understood since, that the salary of the President of University College was raised to £1000 per annum. I concluded that the raising of the salary of the Superintendent of Education had something to do with the increase of the salary of the President of Upper Canada College.

The Honorable Mr. *Cameron* having here left the room, Mr. *Wilson* became the Chairman of the Committee.

*Ques.* 215. Did you on the 10th December, 1856, move, seconded by the Rev. Dr. *Lilly*, in the Senate, the following resolution; viz.: "That in reference to the memorial of the Rev. Dr. *McCaul*, President, and Professor of University College, referred by command of His Excellency for the report of the Senate thereon, this Senate is of opinion that Dr. *McCaul* is justly entitled to a salary, at least equal to the amount of the emoluments he formerly enjoyed. The Senate avails itself of this occasion to submit to the consideration of His Excellency in Council whether some addition should not also be made to the salaries of the other Professors of University College, as a just compensation for their able services, and in consequence of the unprecedented dearness of living; and that the Registrar be requested to submit a copy of this resolution for His Excellency's information?"—Now that the resolution has been read, I have some recollection of it. It expresses my opinions at the time, and those which, if present, I should have advocated, because I am opposed to lowering salaries after they are once fixed.

*Ques.* 216. You have referred reproachfully to the Vice Chancellor as "a salaried officer of the University;" is it true that it was on your motion, seconded by Dr. *Nelles*, that a salary was for the first time granted to the Vice Chancellor, and that salary the very sum that is now paid?—To the best of my recollection, I either moved or advocated it. Dr. *McCaul* had just then rendered important services in forming the curriculum, which was adopted in 1854, and which I approved.

*Ques.* 217. Is it true that it was on your motion, as a member of the Senate, that the statute was introduced increasing the salary of the Registrar of the University to its present amount?—I have no recollection of that.

*Ques. 218.* Is it true that you introduced the statute in the Senate, [that granted an increase of salary to the Porter and Messenger in the Bursar's Office?—I do not recollect.

*Ques. 219.* Is it true that you seconded the motion in the Senate, by which the salary of the Principal of Upper Canada College was raised to its present high rate of \$2,400 a year, with a free house, a certain portion of the tuition fees and \$8 per annum for each pupil resident in the Institution?—Yes, I wish to state the circumstances that gave occasion to the making of that statute. It was a communication from the Governor General, containing the letters of distinguished members of the English Universities, respecting the procuring of an eminent member of one of those Universities as the Principal, who objected to the low salary. After the statute had been passed, however, one of the masters of Upper Canada College was promoted to the post instead of the gentleman who it was proposed to get from England. I think no member of the Senate would have concurred in that vote, except under the idea of getting a distinguished gentleman from England.

*Ques. 220.* You say that, in your opinion, not one of the members of the Senate would have concurred in the statute increasing the said salary had they known that one of the masters of Upper Canada College would be appointed to the post—do you include the family compact?—I think the members of the Senate would not have done so.

*Ques. 201.* When Mr. Stennett was appointed did you take any steps to repeal the statute and reduce the salary?—Certainly not.

*Ques. 222.* Is it true that you seconded the motion for the adoption of a statute increasing the salaries of the servants of Upper Canada College?—I may have done so.

*Ques. 223.* Is it true that every one of these additions to the expenditure was proposed by you and carried in the Senate, PRIOR to the appointment of the gentlemen you have assailed as responsible for them?—It will be seen, that in my remarks I have made no reference to the salaries of the officers of Upper Canada College; but only to the large expenditure made in connection with that Institution. I did not think the servants of that Institution sufficiently paid.

*Ques. 224.* Is it true that after the Rev. George Maynard's removal from his situation as Teacher in Upper Canada College on the ground of grossly improper conduct, you, as a member of the Senate, advocated the granting of a pension for life to that individual of \$600 a year, after he had received a gratuity of over \$1,300, when defeated by the gentlemen you have styled the "Family Compact;" did you continue to urge the matter on the attention of the Senate; and did you at last succeed in burdening the Institution with a pension of \$300 during the life of Mr. Maynard?—The minutes will show who moved and who voted for it. Mr. Maynard was removed after an investigation by a Committee. There were about forty meetings and about ninety witnesses, and the report was that both Mr. Barron and Mr. Maynard should receive the same consideration. Mr. Barron resigned and received £250 per annum for a pension. Mr. Maynard was dismissed without any pension. The report of the Senate, however, applied to both, and stated that one was as blameable as the other. I thought it unjust that one should have £250 a year and the other be put off with a small gratuity. The report stated that the compensation to Messrs. Barron and Maynard ought to be in the form of an annuity.

*Ques. 225.* In addition to voting on all occasions for the pensions to Mr. Maynard, did you after the Senate had rejected the motion for a pension, write a special letter in Mr. Maynard's favour, urging a reconsideration of the matter, and did you obtain such reconsideration with the result you desired?—I either wrote such note, or signed one written and signed by Dr. Willis.

*Ques. 226.* Did you not also write a separate letter addressed to Mr. Maynard?—Yes. I did all I could to get a pension for Mr. Maynard, on the grounds I have stated. He was master of Upper Canada College for twenty years, and he had received the highest testimonials as to his efficiency and industry up to the time when the difference occurred between him and Mr. Barron.

*Ques. 227.* Is it true that you aided as a Member of the Senate, in procuring a life pension of \$1,000 a year to Mr. Barron, when that gentleman was declared incompetent for the duties of the situation he held as Principal of Upper Canada College?—I do not recollect

But I understood that Mr. Barron resigned owing to strong language addressed to him by Mr. Blake, with an agreement, however, that Mr. Blake should try to obtain for him a pension of £250 per annum. I seconded Mr. Blake's endeavours.

*Ques. 228.* You spoke of your having attended forty meetings of the Senate, in regard to those pensions to Messrs. Maynard and Barron—were these meetings at the time you ceased to attend the sittings of the Senate?—I did not attend forty meetings in connection with the pensions. They were in connection with the disputes.

*Ques. 229.* The Senate has been assailed for a misuse of the funds of the University, in attaching the Toronto Observatory to the Institution, and for the extravagant management of that establishment; is it true that you yourself seconded the address to the Governor General, on which the said Observatory was attached to the University, and which entailed on the University the existing burden on its funds?—I was in favor of its being connected with the Observatory, as it is now. It was proposed that Government should allow so much a year. I submitted to the Government a plan for placing the whole control of the Education of the Province in the hands of the Provincial University.

*Ques. 230.* Was not this address, which fastened the expense of the Toronto Observatory on the University, carried by you in the Senate, in May, 1855, nearly two years before the gentlemen you style "the Family Compact" became members of the Senate?—I am not responsible for any expenditure the Government may have thrown upon the Senate. No one could believe that the appointment of the Keeper of the Observatory would entail such an expense as now exists. I think it was proposed in the Senate that a certain portion of the expenditure should fall on the Senate.

*Ques. 231.* Was the motion that you carried in the Senate, "That the Senate would gladly co-operate with the Government in carrying out the plan for the organization of the Observatory, which has been approved by the Governor General, and will accordingly pass the necessary Statutes for the establishment of Scholarships, as proposed in the above-mentioned communication, and will contribute to the establishment of the amount of the stipends of the scholars, in addition to one-third of the salary of the Director of the Observatory, and of the Professor of Meteorology. They would suggest to his Excellency that, as it is highly desirable that there should be an effective supervision of the Observatory, by a body directly interested in the efficiency of the Institution, and so circumstanced as to insure immediate action, the control of the establishment should be vested in the Senate?"—I may have moved that Statute: I at least supported it. I wished the observations made at the Grammar Schools to be connected with the operations of the Observatory.

*Ques. 232.* Please answer my question No. 230. Was the motion I read, carried by you in the Senate in May, 1855, nearly two years before the gentlemen you style the Family Compact became members of the Senate?—I have referred in my statement to no expenditure respecting the Observatory. I did not originate the plan, though I may have moved it.

*Ques. 233.* Do you believe it was before the appointment of the Family Compact to the University Senate?—I do not know. I do not think they had anything to do with it, because it is a Provincial Institution, not connected with University College.

*Ques. 234.* You have assailed in unmeasured terms the system of options established by the University; is it true that as a member of the Senate you seconded the adoption of the Statute which established the very system of options now existing?—That is not the system now existing; I assented to the Statute passed on that subject, in 1854.

*Ques. 235.* Did not those Statutes of 1854 essentially establish the system of options now existing?—They established options; but not to the extent of the present system. The principle exists in all Universities.

*Ques. 236.* To what extent have the options then established been since altered?—The Documents will show.

*Ques. 237.* Did those Statutes of 1854, not establish an option between Classics and Modern Languages, and between Mathematics and Natural Sciences, which you specially report in your evidence?—Not at the period that the latter does; the Matriculation

examination in 1854, was a year in advance of that in 1857, and I always admitted that options might be allowed at the end of the second year.

*Ques. 238.* Wherein do you charge the "Family Compact" with extravagance, as regards Examiners? You have objected to the Professors examining their own students; but suppose other parties were to do the work, could the number of examiners be fewer, or the remuneration less?—I object to the principle of appointing Professors of the College as examiners, and of these Professors being paid to examine their own students. When officers of a College examine their own Students, I think it is part of their regular duty.

*Ques. 239.*—Then you do not think the sums now paid for Examiners, extravagant?—Not if they are paid to others than the Professors of the College.

*Ques. 240.* Is it true, that as a member of the Senate, you seconded the Statute establishing the examination, now existing?—I may have agreed to the Statute relative to Examinations; but not to Professors examining their own Students.

*Ques. 241.* You have referred to the extravagance of the University, in regard to Stationery and incidentals: what is the total sum paid annually under these heads, and to what extent could retrenchment be applied?—I referred to the increase under each of these heads.

*Ques. 242.* Did you at any time, as a member of the Senate, endeavour to stop the increase of expenditure by the Senate, for Stationery and incidentals?—I had nothing to do with that. It was an affair of that College, of which I am not a member.

*Ques. 243.*—You have charged the gentlemen you have styled the Family Compact with extravagance in regard to scholarships in the University—is it the number of the scholarships or the amount of them you complain?—It is both.

*Ques. 244.*—How many scholarships do you think there should be in the University, and of what amount each?—I am not prepared to answer: I agree with Dr. *Cooke* on that subject.

*Ques. 245.*—Is it true that three years before the gentlemen you style the Family Compact were members of the University Senate, you, as a member of the said Senate, seconded a series of resolutions establishing *sixty* scholarships at an annual cost of \$7,200?—I opposed that.

*Ques. 246.*—Did you on the 18th March, 1854, second the following Resolutions:

"1st. That there should be fifteen scholarships open to competition at the matriculation of each of the three succeeding annual examinations in arts, each to be held for one year?

"2nd. At the matriculation ten scholarships should be appropriated to those who held the highest places in general classes and five to those students who have most distinguished themselves on the following special subjects, viz.: Two for mathematics, two for classics, and one for modern languages.

"3rd. At the first year's examination seven scholarships shall be appropriated to those who hold the highest places in the general classes and eight in the following subjects, viz.: two in classics, two in natural sciences, and two in modern languages.

"4th. At the two following annual examinations five scholarships shall be appropriated to the highest in the general classes, and ten to those who have most distinguished themselves, &c., &c.

*Ans.*—I cannot recollect. I know the subject of such scholarships was discussed.

*Ques. 247.*—Were these resolutions referred to a Committee of yourself, Dr. *Willis*, Dr. *Taylor*, and Mr. *Barron*?—It is possible; I do not recollect.

*Ques. 248.*—Is it true that three years before the gentlemen you style the Family Compact became members of the Senate, you were one of a Committee of two to whom was referred the preparation of draft statutes on the subjects of Prizes, Scholarships, Degrees and Certificates of Honor in the Faculty of Arts? Did you report in favor of establishing Scholarships alone, involving an annual expenditure of \$12,000—and did you second the motion made in the Senate for the adoption of your report?—I do not know.

*Ques. 249*—Is it true that after the introduction into the Senate of the gentlemen you have styled the Family Compact, the Scholarships were reduced to 37, and the annual amount of them to \$4,400?—I do not know.

*Ques. 250*.—Is it true that only three weeks after this reduction on the number and amount of the Scholarships you proposed to the Senate the establishment of ten additional Scholarships of \$200 each—or in all \$2,000 per annum?—Yes; but the question is imperfectly stated. I proposed what you speak of in connection with the masterships of grammar schools, and I put in the letter addressed by me to the Senate to show the kind of Scholarships I advocated—which letter is as follows:—

(Copy.)—No. 860.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION FOR UPPER CANADA.

EDUCATION OFFICE.

TORONTO, *March 23rd*, 1857.

SIR,—I take the liberty of submitting through you, to the favorable consideration of the Senate, the following suggestions for the establishment of the Exhibitions in University College for Masterships of Grammar Schools; each to be of the value of £50, and tenable for one year only.

Each Exhibition to be bestowed upon the following conditions:

1. The Exhibitioner must have taught a Common School in Upper Canada;
2. He must have attended the Provincial Normal School at least one session;
3. He must have been recommended by the Council of Public Instruction;
4. He must engage to teach a Grammar School in Upper Canada for at least three or four years; and provide security for the fulfilment of this promise, or refund the amount of his Exhibition with interest.

One of the most pressing wants of the Grammar Schools, is that of duly qualified masters. Several of the Schools are now closed on that account—the Boards of Trustees being unable to procure masters qualified according to law. In some of them the masters now employed would not be eligible, had they not been engaged before the passing of the present Grammar School Act,—by the provisions of which the standard of qualifications for Masterships of Grammar Schools has been raised, and the appropriate duties of those schools strictly defined. Several masters of respectable attainments in classics and mathematics have little knowledge of the English branches required to be taught, and no experience in school teaching and management.

The object of the foregoing suggestions is to provide each year at least ten Grammar School Masters, who will have given proof of their talents and merits, and who will have had practical experience in teaching, as also a thorough training in all the branches to be taught in the Grammar Schools.

In our present Normal and Model Schools, and in our proposed Grammar School, the Exhibitioners would receive a thorough preparatory training, both as student and teacher in all the subjects in which candidates are examined for matriculation into the University.

With this preparation one year's attendance at University College, where, in addition to the able corps of professors, so many advantages are enjoyed by students in the excellent apparatus provided, and in the valuable collections of the Museum and Library—would admirably qualify the Exhibitioner for the Masterships of Grammar Schools. In some instances they would doubtless persevere until they obtained a degree.

One master thus trained would render as much service in a Grammar School in one year as an ordinary master would in two. A small annual sum thus expended, would, in my opinion, soon stamp a new character upon the Grammar Schools and confer immense advantages upon the country. We would thus provide a Normal training for the masters of Grammar Schools, as we now do for the teachers of Common Schools, and we would also

open a path of advancement and reward to intelligent and enterprising young teachers of Common Schools, among whom I have found persons of fine talents. From my knowledge of the character, attainments and aspirations of young men who have attended the Normal School, I have no doubt that all Exhibitions proposed to be established would be filled in the course of two years, if not before.

I have proposed to connect these exhibitions with University College, because the efficient staff of Professors in that College and its great facilities for instruction, are supported and provided out of a branch of the public revenue; and the country may, therefore, be considered as having a legitimate claim upon it for such a service.

Nevertheless, I would not propose imposing this duty upon University College without the formal consent of the Council, which I have no doubt will be cordially given.

I have the honor to be,  
Sir, your most obedient servant,  
(Signed,) E. RYERSON.

The Chancellor of the  
University of Toronto. }  
That plan was rejected by the Senate.

*Ques. 251.*—During the period you refer to, has not your own salary been increased from \$1,840 per annum in 1850 to \$4,000 per annum in 1860, besides casual advantages?—I have no advantages beyond my salary, which was increased by law; the Government having no discretion, as the School Act specifies, that my salary shall be the same as that of the Superintendent of Education for Lower Canada; but there is no specified sum mentioned in the Act. When the salary of the Superintendent in Lower Canada was increased, mine was increased also by mere operation of the law.

*Ques. 252.*—You have not yet answered my question. Please to do so?—I think I received £500 per annum in 1850, and that was the same salary as was received by the Superintendent of Education in Lower Canada. It is now £1,000 per annum; that being the salary at present fixed for Lower Canada.

*Ques. 253.*—Does not a mere Clerk in the Common School Office at present receive a higher salary than any Professor in University College except Dr. *McCauley*?—The Deputy-Superintendent in my office is not a common Clerk. He receives £550 a year. He is justly entitled to the same salary as the Deputies in other Departments of the Government; but he does not, up to the present time, receive as much as they. I have represented this to the Government.

*Ques. 254.*—Has the Government rejected your application made in his behalf?—I have received no answer yet.

*Ques. 255.*—Does Mr. *Hodgins* receive any “casual advantages” besides this salary?—Not that I am aware of.

*Ques. 256.*—Does he not receive a farther sum for some special services?—He does.

*Ques. 257.*—How much, and for what?—£50 per annum for assisting to edit the *Journal of Education*.

*Ques. 258.*—Anything more?—Not that I am aware of

*Ques. 259.*—Is it true that there has been enmity between you and the professors of University College, for a long time past?—I bear no enmity. We have ever been on terms of personal friendship, so far as I know.

[*By Honorable Mr. Cayley.*]

*Ques. 260.*—What addition to his emoluments would Mr. *Hodgins* receive, if your application in his favour is complied with?—Fifty pounds per annum. I maintain that the Clerks in the Education Office should be put on the same footing as those in other public offices. My application is not confined to the case of Mr. *Hodgins*.

[*By Honorable Mr. Brown.*]

*Ques. 261.*—Are you a graduate of any University, or were you at any time a Student at any University?—I graduated in the Grammar Schools of the country and taught

Grammar School for two years, before I was twenty years of age. I never was a Student at any University, but I have both studied and taught many of the branches commonly taught in University Education.

*Ques. 262.*—From what Institution did you receive your degree of Doctor of Divinity, and had you previously any personal connection with the Institution from which you received it?—Certainly not! The degree was offered me without my knowledge.

*Tues. 263.*—Is it true that you have sought to have Toronto University brought under your control as a branch of your department, and that the educated men of the University have indignantly scouted your interference in Classical and Scientific Education, as totally beyond your sphere?—Certainly not; and if my recommendations to the Government are brought forward, it will be found that I tried to lessen the degree of authority which I may have. The insinuation is without foundation, and the very reverse of the truth.

*Tues. 264.*—Notwithstanding all you have said to the disparagement of the Institution, is it not the fact, that University College has an able and efficient staff of Professors, and do not the Students attending it enjoy great advantages from the excellent apparatus, Library and Museum?—Yes! I entertain a high opinion of the Professors at that Institution, and I have always so expressed myself.

[*By the Chairman.*]

*Ques. 265.*—Have you anything which you desire to add?—I desire to add to my answers that I have never had the slightest enmity towards the University College. I have always advocated its efficient support, and the liberal remuneration of its officers. My objection has been to the exclusion of all other colleges from associating on equal terms, in connection with the Provincial University, and to assumption that the University College is the sole Collegiate Instructor in the Country.

I also wish to add the following extracts from the Cambridge University Calendar, in reference to the constitution of the University; the number and relations of its colleges; the payment of its professors; and the nature and extent of its endowments.

“The University of Cambridge is a Society of Students in all and every of the liberal arts and sciences, incorporated (13 Vic., cap 29) by the name of “the Chancellor, Masters, and Scholars of the University of Cambridge.” This commonwealth is a union of seventeen Colleges or Societies devoted to the study of learning and knowledge and for the better service of the Church and State. All these Colleges or Halls have been formed since the beginning of the reign of King Edward, First, and are maintained by the endowment of their several founders and benefactors. Each Colledge is a body corporate bound by its own Statutes; but it is likewise controlled by the paramount laws of the University. The Professors are paid from various sources: many of them have ancient stipends, which were considerable at the period at which they were fixed, but which have become inadequate from the diminished value of money; to some Professorships foundation estates are attached, and to the Regius and Lady Margaret’s Professorships of Divinity the inappropriate Rectories of Somersham and Terrington, the others are paid by stipends from the Privy Purse or by the Government one of them receiving £400, another £200, and the rest £100 per annum.”

“The annual income of the University arises from various sources; of which the following are the principal:—

“The Rectory of Burwell and a farm at Barton producing about £1,000 per annum.

“The produce of fees at matriculation for degrees, cautions for certain Academical exercises for degrees, and other irregular sources of income not easily enumerated, the gross amount of which is very variable but does not average more than £2,000 per annum.

“The trading profits of the Pitt (University) Press, which have as yet seldom been very considerable.

“In the statement of the ordinary income and expenditure of the University, no account has been taken of the amount of the fees paid to the Bedells, Proctors, Moderators, Pro-proctors, their servants, the Registry amounting to about £2400 per annum, by

" which these officers are entirely paid ; nor of the Library tax (of 6s. per annum upon every member of the University,) which is appropriated entirely to the purchase of books for the Public Library ; nor of various trust funds appropriated to specific objects over the distribution of which the University possesses no control.

" The whole of the funds of the University are managed by the Vice Chancellor or the specific Trustees, and the accounts are examined annually by those Auditors who are appointed annually by the Senate."

The Revd. Dr. *Nelles*, Examined.

[*By the Chairman.*]

*Ques.* 266. Have you anything to say respecting the evidence of Dr. *Ryerson* which you have heard this morning?—I have a distinct recollection of objecting to some of the items of expenditure proposed at some of the earlier meetings of the Senate in 1854, and of calling the attention of the Senate to the 54th sec. of the Act, which we considered was intended to provide a surplus fund for assistance to other academical institutions, I was met by the reply that that was not the view taken by the members of the Senate, particularly those who opposed me. It is my opinion that a much larger sum was proposed for the establishment of scholarships than that finally adopted, and I think the amount so adopted was proposed as an amendment and was a considerable reduction on the original report. It is possible that Dr. *Ryerson* and myself fell in with the second proposition as with the measure most in harmony with our views which we could carry.

Submitted by Mr. *Langton*, put

[*By the Chairman.*]

*Ques.* 267. Do you recollect any altercation between Messrs. *Langton* and *Ryerson* that could give rise to the determination of the latter to cease to attend the Senate?—I recollect on one occasion a marked difference of opinion, but cannot recollect the conversation referred to. I think the one I refer to was with respect to the curriculum. I have rarely attended meetings of the Senate since 1854, the period of the organization made under the new Act. It has been impracticable because the expenses are not paid by the University, and have been drawn from the funds of the denominational College at Cobourg, which was besides too distant for me to spare the time to go thence to Toronto.

The Rev. Mr. *Poole* was then Examined

[*By the Chairman.*]

*Ques.* 268. Do you desire to submit a statement to the Committee?—Yes, I wish to make the following statement:—

In giving evidence in behalf of the Memorial of the Wesleyan Conference, I beg to remark, in the first place, that when I received your summons, I hoped that it would have been possible for you to have heard my statements before Easter, thereby rendering it unnecessary for me to incur expense and loss of time in returning.

As the financial aspects of the question, were, in part, presented before my arrival, there are only two or three additional points to which I wish particularly to direct the attention of your Honorable Committee.

I notice in the Bursar's Statement for 1856, that he received fees from Upper Canada College to the amount of \$4,380, which was only half the fees for that year; the other half being divided among the teachers. The Bursar reports that he receives no fees from University College. In that College Calendar for 1858-9, there are reported 191 students, including those of all grades, now at £8 tuition fee (about an average charge in other Colleges) there would be an income of \$6,112, which according to the 49th clause of the Act, should be paid into the "*General Fund*," and should be deemed "*Income Fund*," to use the words of the Act. This amount of legitimate income for the past six years, would make a handsome addition to the Surplus Fund.

It may be replied, that, by the Statute of University College, no fees are required from under graduates. Admitting this, there is yet a large amount from the students, and occasional students, of which there is no account, and of which the Income Fund is unlawfully deprived

This is a double wrong done to the Denominational Colleges: *first*, in that, while University College is supported wholly from the endowment, the inducement of free tuition is offered to lure the students of other Colleges; *secondly*, that the "*Income Fund*," and consequently the "*Surplus Fund*," is also by this means largely diminished.

It seems unjust that University College should be allowed to take from the endowment that portion of income which by law ought to arise from tuition fees, and that thus she should virtually deprive the other academical institutions of that share of the Surplus Fund to which, by law, they are entitled.

In other words, University College by collecting no fees from her students as income, really collects the same amount from the denominational colleges.

I find in the report of 1859 a large amount spent in erecting, furnishing, and maintaining the boarding hall department connected with that College; though, judging from the small number boarding there, it can never half sustain itself. Here a great wrong is done to the claimants of the Surplus Fund, by diminishing that fund in order to furnish board and lodging at less than cost.

I submit to this Committee that the income fund should not furnish Tuition, Board and Lodging for those students who prefer receiving their education in a secular school, unless the same fund can deal as liberally with those students who conscientiously prefer receiving the same education under proper religious influence.

I also remark that, in the report of 1859 it is stated that the classical Tutor in University College receives a salary of \$1,000, from which statement we might suppose that he was employed teaching the students who had matriculated in that College, whereas it appears from the calendar of University College that he is engaged five days in the week instructing the students of those theological schools, and others who are on their way to matriculation. He is therefore doing work belonging to the grammar school or preparatory department, though paid out of the Fund of the University.

Another source of extravagance may be seen in the number of persons employed in connection with that establishment. Including the Rev. President, there are eleven Professors, and one Tutor, the Vice Chancellor, the Bursar and his *five* assistants, the Librarian and two Registrars, one for the University and another for the College, the Bedel, acting Bedel, Steward, Messenger, Porter, Bellringer, Labourers, Woodcutters, and other general servants, the Dean of residence and seven servants employed about the premises. There are seven persons connected with the Observatory, and in addition to all these, an attendant servant is provided to wait on each of the following Professors, viz.: Professors of Natural History, Professors of Natural Philosophy, and Professors of Chemistry—these latter servants being required only thirty weeks in the year, although receiving a full year's salary. Here are 45 persons regularly salaried, besides others occasionally employed—the salaries varying from \$400 to \$4,000 a year. If we include the twenty-nine Examiners, we have more paid officers connected with the establishment than undergraduates admitted to its halls.

Attention was drawn by another witness to the fact that of thirty-seven students, thirty-five of them won Scholarships. I beg to draw the attention of the Committee to another fact, that in 1855 there were \$3,200 given for Scholarships, while in 1859 the Scholarships given amounted to \$6,013.—[See Bursar's Statement.]

A minute examination of the University College Calendar will show that one Student, during his course in College, bore off some *fifty honors*, including Scholarships, Prizes, &c. Such a system of bestowing Honors, in the estimation of Honor men from Oxford, or Cambridge, would, instead of reflecting honor on the Alumnus, reflect dishonor on the Alma mater.

In 1856 there was only one Student in Medicine, and yet the sum of \$560 Examiners fees is reported as paid that year to the Medical Examiners. It is also well known that there is no School of Medicine in connexion with University College, yet the Bursar reports 1856; \$90 as paid for Insurance on Medical School.

In 1859 it was thought very desirable to have Photographs of certain distinguished Students of University College, and accordingly they were taken, and paid for out of the Income Fund. There are several other such items, which, though small in themselves, serve to show the *free* and unwarrantable use that is made of the public money.

Committee then adjourned until 11 o'clock A. M., to-morrow.

Tuesday, 17th April, 1860.

COMMITTEE MET.

*Present :*

Hon. MALCOLM CAMERON, Chairman.  
 " Mr. FOLEY,  
 " SIMPSON,  
 " McCANN,  
 " WILSON.

The Reverend Messrs. *Cook, Ryerson, Stinson, Nelles, and Poole* were in attendance  
 Professor *Wilson* was also in attendance

The Reverend Mr. *Nelles* was again called, and Examined

[*By the Chairman.*]

*Ques. 269.* Do you think it desirable that yourself and Mr. *Stinson* should continue your attendance before this Committee?—I think it desirable that Dr. *Stinson*, as President of Conference, should remain to watch the proceedings. Upon what terms he should do so, it will be for the Committee to say. We want nothing but what is usual.

Committee adjourned until twelve o'clock to-morrow.

Wednesday, 18th April

COMMITTEE MET.

*Present :*

Hon. MALCOLM CAMERON, Chairman;  
 " Mr. CAYLEY,  
 " Mr. FOLEY.  
 " Mr. Atty. Gen. MACDONALD,  
 " McCANN,  
 " ROBLIN,  
 " SIMPSON,  
 " WILSON,

The Reverend Messrs. *Cook, Ryerson, Stinson, Nelles* and *Poole* were in attendance

*John Langton*, Vice-Chancellor, University of Toronto, was in attendance.

Professor *Wilson* was in attendance.

*David Buchan*, Esquire, Bursar of the University and Colleges at Toronto, appeared, and read his replies to the questions given him on Friday last, as follows :—

|   |             |
|---|-------------|
| <i>Ans.</i> To Questions 155, 156, and 157. The expenditure for 1857, as per account submitted to Parliament, was | £15357 19 4 |
| That for 1854.  | 10291 11 7  |

|           |            |
|-----------|------------|
| Increase. | £ 5066 7 9 |
|-----------|------------|

This increase was caused partly by new Appointments and Salaries—partly by additions to salaries, under order in Council, proceeding either on the Petition of parties interested, or on the Act of Parliament authorizing a per centage increase on Public Salaries—partly

by increase in Scholarships and Examiners Fees, and partly, in the year 1857, in particular, by an allowance made to myself by order in Council, as Chairman of the Board of Endowments: the arrears on which were charged to that year. There was also an extra expenditure for that year, on account of the Observatory, of £1255 0s. 0d.; nearly all of which was for building the Observer's cottages.

These items well account for the difference, or nearly so.

*Ans.* To 158. This was merely a temporary transfer of £1500 from University accounts to Upper Canada College accounts, with the Bank of Upper Canada.

An order in Council or approved Statutes of Senate had been passed, authorizing the erection of an office, on the Upper Canada College grounds, for the accommodation of the Bursar. Of course this had to be done with Upper Canada College money, and as there was not then a sufficient amount of cash on hand, a transfer was made of the amount specified, from one account to another, until the College cash should accumulate. Whenever the necessary amount was realized, and it was needed for University purposes, it was re-transferred: but in the meantime, I had to charge it to some particular account in my books, and the surplus income one was selected. I did not conceive that I required any superior authority to make this arrangement, because at any moment I could replace the amounts by overdrawing on Upper Canada College accounts; and I did not charge interest, because, being used for building purposes for the accommodation of an office in which all the funds were interested, I felt that it would not be fair to charge interest to the College, whilst it derived no income from the building. Any saving effected on Joint Management Account would, as a matter of course, tend to the production of surplus income; and therefore, that account was as much interested, if not more so, than any other.

*Ans.* To 159 and 160. I cannot answer question 159 without reference to the Bank account in the Ledger.

But I can state that the Bank allows interest at the rate of three per cent per annum on the floating balance, at the credit of each Institution. The amounts due are credited every six months, and are embraced in my Quarterly and Annual Returns, submitted to the Auditor for the Province.

*Ans.* To 161. The expense for Stationery for the Bursar's Office was, in 1854, £77 15s. 10d. In 1855, £56 5s. 5d.

For the University and University College in 1854, £249 4s. 6d. In 1855, £282 6s. 8d. But I believe these sums include the prizes for University College.

*Ans.* To 162. Between 1853 and 1856, the expenditure for Buildings was quite trifling and incidental only. Since then the expenditure on the new Building down to 31st March last, was

|   |              |
|---|--------------|
|   | \$297,754 87 |
| For building the new residence for the Directors of the Observatory, I paid                                       | 4248 17      |
| And for Cottages for the Observers  | 4762 18      |
| <i>Ans.</i> To 163. In last year only were any fees paid into the office, when I received for matriculation fees. | \$216 00     |
| For fee for degree <i>ad eundem</i> .   | 10 00        |

\$226 00

*Ans.* To 164. The provision in Section 49 of the Act, is incorrectly stated in this question. It is not enacted that *all* fees shall form part of the income fund, but that "such part thereof as shall be payable into the general funds thereof shall," along with other items named, "be deemed income." The amount received by me is stated in answer to 163.

*Ans.* To 165. The first part of this question would require a minute calculation for each of between 700 and 800 accounts, and would take some time to complete. I may state, however, in general terms, that if my memory does not deceive me, there was, about the middle of 1858, an arrear due from all sources of income, of from a half to two-thirds of a year's Income. Perhaps I may be pardoned for stating in this connection, that when I was appointed Chairman of the Board of Endowment in June, 1851, the arrears of interest on purchase money of University lands alone, were about £12,000; and the arrears of rent of leased lots were as returned to me, about £18,000; but a very considerable part of this

rent was irrecoverable, and a large portion had to be merged in purchase money, when the lots were sold. Other sources of income were in a similar position. The Hamilton property, for example, was about a year and-a-half in arrears for rent.

The remainder of the question will be answered with 167.

*Ans.* To 166. None.

*Ans.* To 167. Since the passing of the present Act all investments have been made in Provincial or Municipal loan fund debentures under special order of His Excellency the Governor in Council, and through the Receiver General. The only exception is the advance of £15,000, made in Spring, 1855, for one year to the Buffalo, Brantford and Goderich Railway Company, under order of the Governor in Council; of which by the way I knew nothing until I received my instructions. The advance was made on the security of certain Bonds of the Company, hypothecated to the University through Government, and a mortgage of the rolling stock of the road. The loan was repaid, with all interest, and charges even to an unpaid postage, on 16th July, 1856.

The transfer of £1,500 from one account to another with the Bank, and in the Books of my Office has been explained in answer to question 158.

*Ans.* To 168. As the present Act was passed in April, 1853, the income and expenditure of 1852, will furnish the best reply to this question. I therefore telegraphed to my Bookkeeper to send me the amounts in round numbers.

The reply is—

|                                  |                |
|----------------------------------|----------------|
| Income received - - - - -        | \$66,800       |
| Expended - - - - -               | \$43,500       |
| Transferred to Investment Fund - | 23,300         |
|                                  | ————— \$66,800 |

*Ans.* To 169. No part of the Surplus Income Fund has been placed out at interest. Section 54 of the Act provides that surplus income "shall constitute a fund to be, *from timeto time*, appropriated by Parliament for Academical Education in Upper Canada." I have regularly reported to Parliament, every year, the state of that fund; but I have never received any instructions what to do with it, further than the general direction, by Order in Council, to lodge all cash with the Bank of Upper Canada, to the credit of the University. This is regularly done.

*Ans.* To 170. I do not clearly comprehend what is asked for by this question, but I will answer it far as I can.

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| The Income received, in 1853, was greater than the expenditure by -                           | £3037 1 4 |
| There was paid to the Faculties of Law and Medicine, as salaries<br>or compensation - - - - - | 3481 5 0  |
| Incidentals for Medical School - - - - -  | 139 1 10  |
| To the Lying-in Hospital - - - - -  | 65 0 0    |

These added together amount to - - - - - £6722 8 2

which (less the Medical Schools share of the fund for the year) would have been the Surplus Income for 1853, had nothing been paid on account of the Faculties of Law and Medicine, and had other expenditure remained as in the account.

The remainder of the question I do not understand.

*Ans.* To 171. The answer has been already given in my examination on Friday last.

*Ans.* To 172. \$27,691 95.

*Ans.* To 173. At simple interest the amount on 31st Dec. last would have been \$8,830 07.

*Ans.* To 174. By Act of Parliament and approved Statute of Senate I was authorized to lease to the city of Toronto, for 999 years at a nominal rent, about 50 acres of the University grounds, including the avenues. The conditions were that the Corporation should lay out the ground as a public park, with the necessary walks, fence, plant and keep it in order. There is a provision for forfeiture in case the conditions are not complied with.

*Ans.* To 175. The University Park containing about 150 acres, and the Avenues are in reality University property. The same year the present University Act was passed, another Law was enacted which authorized Government to take possession of any portion of the Park, not in actual use for University purposes on which to erect Parliament and other Public Buildings.

They took possession accordingly, including all the Buildings, sent the University down to the Parliament Buildings in Front Street, and made preparations for the erection of the new Public Buildings contemplated at that time.

When Government removed to Toronto, five years ago, the University and University College were sent back to the old Medical Building, to which Government made a temporary addition for their accommodation, until new University Buildings could be erected. All that part of the Park west of the Queen Street Avenue was returned to the University, about the time the erection of the new University Building was determined on. The remainder, including the Stone Building or East wing of the first contemplated University Building, and the greatest part of the ground now leased to the City, with the Avenues remained in the possession of Government until I was authorized by the Act of Parliament and order in Council to execute the lease to the City. The portion of the Park East of the Avenue, not leased to the City, is still held by Government.

*Ans.* To 176. The account for 1859, laid before Parliament, shews that the amount received from sales of the original endowment, up to 31st December of that year, was \$957,359.83.

*Ans.* To 177. Of the original endowment about 24,000 acres.

*Ans.* To 178. Scattered over the Province from the Eastern line to Sandwich. There been three general valuations made. One just after the grant was made, or about the year 1828. Another, which is known as the 1840 valuation; and a third in 1852-3 and 4. The latter was made, partly by Mr. R. B. Denison of Toronto, and partly by the late Mr. John K. Roche, of Port Hope. The previous valuations were made before I had any connection with the office. Occasionally when further information is wanted about a lot the best man who can be found is selected, as near the lot as possible.

*Ans.* To 179. By Statute of Senate of the University of Toronto, while Mr. Baldwin's Act was in operation, it was ordered that, for every contract, a fee of \$2 should be charged, and for every deed, including the memorial, \$3. Also for the examination into and registration of each transfer, \$2. Of these fees the Solicitor receives, under the same Statute, for examining the Instruments, \$2 for each contract or deed. The Instruments are prepared in the office. When a Special Deed is required, it is prepared by the Solicitor, who makes his charge, and either receives it himself or receives it through me.

*Ans.* To 180. I scarcely know how to answer this question. As these fees are in the shape of receipts, they cannot form part of the expenditure of the office; but if the object of the question is to ascertain whether any part of these fees goes into my pocket, I answer distinctly and emphatically, no! The only pecuniary advantage I derive from my office is, my Salary, as determined by His Excellency the Governor General in Council, including the allowance paid to me as Chairman of the Board of Endowment, and distinctly stated in the annual account. All the fees referred to in the query are credited to the Institution to whose lands they relate, and when the Solicitor's account comes in, each is again debited with its share.

*Ans.* To 181. The Return to Parliament for 1859, shews that from the earliest date up to 31st December last, the amount of capital invested in Securities, Buildings, Library and otherwise, was \$1,117,729.08, and the amount of income expended from the commencement of King's College to same date, \$382,927.77.

*Ans.* to 182. On new Buildings up to 31st March, \$297,754.87.

Appropriated to Museum \$8,000,

“ to Library \$20,000.

These two latter sums are up to 31st December last.

No part of permanent fund has, since 1853, been expended on the grounds.

*Ans.* to 183. I presume the sum here stated ought to be hundreds not thousands. The expenscs of the Commission referred to, were paid by me in compliance with order of His Excellency in Council, as stated in the annual account.

*Ans.* to 184. I know nothing about it; except that they were not paid by me.

*Ans.* to 185. The statement of the expenditure given in the query is incorrect. The whole expenditure of that year chargeable to the Bursar's Office, was £2,640 12s 4d, or \$10,562.47; and of that there was charged to Upper Canada College in the accounts of 1858, as its share \$1,790.90. The particulars of the expenditure are given in the account for the year; which I am told the Committee have ordered to be printed in detail.

I trust the Committee will pardon me for offering a few remarks in regard to the matter embraced in this question. In reading the evidence given by Dr. *Ryerson*, I perceive that he names the sum to which I object as the office expense of that year, and I therefore infer that he is the originator of the mis-statement. At any rate he assumes it as his own, and contrasts the amount with that paid to the Bursar of Trinity College. I regret that he has done so; for even had he been at the pains to seek out the exact truths, he must know that the comparison even then would be most unfair. I have lately had some correspondence with him on this very subject, in consequence of the reflections on the management of the endowment contained in his letter to the Hon. Mr. *Hincks*, written in 1852, and published last year, when I endeavoured to correct the erroneous ideas he seemed to hold as to the work done in the office. I can produce the correspondence if necessary; and as the statements he has made, must to some extent, affect me personally, I crave permission to quote three extracts from his letter, the first two relating to my management of the endowment, the third to the remuneration he conceived me to be entitled to. The extracts are as follows:—

1st. "Alluding to the latter (the actual management) "I said, 'I have no doubt the management of the present University endowment is honest and judicious.' In this I referred, of course, to the manner in which you discharged the duties of your office."  
\* \* \* "By your communications and references (to the Senate), I was most favorably impressed in regard to the judgment, economy, and zeal with which you were endeavoring to manage the endowment." &c., &c.

2nd. "In regard to the system of managing the endowment, so far as your office is concerned, since the Act of 1853, I have known nothing about it; but I have always understood that, as I had expected, it was managed with your well-known judgment and energy, and I certainly have no desire to interfere with it."

3rd. As to my remuneration, he says: "So far from thinking of your removal from office, I said to members of Government when the University Bill was before Parliament in 1853, that your salary ought to be at least £500, instead of £400 as provided in the Bill; but I was given to understand that Government proposed £400 in order to avoid opposition in the House."

Perhaps the Committee will also permit me to tender for their perusal a copy of a letter addressed by me to the Honorable *J. C. Morrison* in 1856, as to the amount of work done in the office and its cost.

BURSAR'S OFFICE, Toronto, 26 August, 1856.

My Dear *Morrison*,—I trust you will pardon me for troubling you with this communication: but hearing from you this morning, and being aware from other sources, that remarks had been made regarding the expense connected with this office,—in which remarks it was, at least, inferred that I could materially control the expenditure. I think it is but justice to myself to put you in possession of a few facts, in order that you may be able to judge whether, during the time I have been Bursar, that expenditure has been *very* excessive—even supposing I were entirely responsible for it.

The amount of work done in 1854 and 1855, respectively, did not vary very much. Although the expence of the Bursuar's office was greater in 1855 than the preceding year, I shall take 1855 as the example.

The amount of money received in the office during that year, was a little short of £51 000. The expence of the office was £2,091 12s. 6d., or about 4 per cent. on the receipts.

The amount of *new* sales effected in 1855, was a little over £58,000. The expence, taking the sales as the criterion was about 3, 3-5ths per cent.

But nearly £100 of the expence was caused by the removal of the office, which ought of course to be deducted—in which case the per centage on sales would be about 3 4-10ths per cent.

|   |       |
|---|-------|
| The <i>number</i> of receipts given for money paid into the office was— |       |
| For the University, - - - - -   | 1,011 |
| For the College, - - - - -  | 243   |
| In all, - - - - -   | 1,254 |

By far the greater proportion of these receipts involve, at the times they are made out, calculations of interest or rent, and the appropriation of the gross payment made by the party to the different items of purchase money and interest, rent, fees for Deeds, &c.

|  |       |
|--|-------|
| The <i>number</i> of payments during 1855 was— |       |
| For the University, - - - - -                  | 739   |
| For Upper Canada College, - - - - -            | 273   |
| In all, - - - - -                              | 1,012 |

most of them involving the preparation of Bank cheques and all of them entry in the requisition book and preparation of the receipts (now required in duplicate) as vouchers.

The number of letters sent was about 2,100, besides circulars with contracts and Deeds, which are not copied, but merely entered in the letter book in which the "Received" letters are minuted. There were, as nearly as I can estimate, about 2,500 letters and circulars sent, and as many received.

I have already stated the *amount* of the sales; the *number* of the sales in 1855, was—

|                                     |     |
|-------------------------------------|-----|
| For University, - - - - -           | 177 |
| For Upper Canada College, - - - - - | 46  |
| In all, - - - - -                   | 223 |

The number of new applications, into which I had to examine during the year, for Deeds, transfers and purchase, was 335, or thereabout; besides all the renewals of former applications of the same kind, to an extent I cannot estimate.

In the year ending with 1st July, 1856, there were about 500 contracts and Deeds prepared in the office, each with its duplicate or memorial, and the registration in the office books of registry, involving three copies.

Then there is the preparation of the Quarterly and Annual, and occasional returns, which involve a very great amount of trouble; besides having to keep all the letters, transfers, Deeds, &c., posted to the different lots to which they relate.

The extra Book-keeper, you are aware, was engaged by the late Board of Endowment to bring up the Commission books, but such has been the pressure of business the last two years, that I have had to employ him to a very great extent with the ordinary accounts. I expect to be able to do without him after the end of this year. Indeed he will leave then at any rate, of his own accord. He has told me so.

Before closing, let me just suggest that in criticising the expenditure of an office like this, it is hardly fair to say the income is so much; and the expenditure is so much; therefore the cost of recovering that income is excessive. The mere collection of the income is, as I think I have shown, and as you otherwise know, but a very small proportion of the work. I and the Board of Endowment with me have had to *make* the income to a great extent; and when it is considered that the income of the two institutions taken together

has been doubled in five years, and that in an office where I have not the choice of my own clerks—nor the fixing of their salaries, I have managed so that the expenditure is but about  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. on one of the various classes of work which passes through the office; I really cannot see where there is room for any fault being found with me. Of one thing I am sure—and that is that, considering my position and responsibilities, I am the worst paid man in the office; and I sincerely hope, that you will find it within the power of His Excellency in Council, to make my remuneration more commensurate to my situation.

I am, yours very truly,

DAVID BUCHAN.

The Hon. J. C. MORRISON.

*Ans.* to 186, 187 and 188. This property was, by direction of Government, exposed by Public Auction in the Spring of 1854, when it was sold to Mr. *James Beaty* of Toronto, who was the highest bidder, at the price of £11,215: one-fifth to be paid down, and the balance by eight equal yearly instalments, with interest, either quarterly or half-yearly I forget which, on the unpaid balance. The whole amount now unpaid is £3,000, with interest from a quite recent date, (a few weeks ago), Mr. *Beaty* having completed an arrangement by which he paid all but the £3,000, and got his deed for the more northerly three of the six shops which he purchased.

*Mr. Buchan* was further Examined:—

[*By the Chairman.*]

*Ques.* 270. In reference to your answer to question 164, what becomes of the remaining portion of the fees?—I do not know.

*Ques.* 271. Can you give the Committee an approximate estimate of the whole amount that would be received for fees?—I do not know, it does not come within my department.

*Ques.* 274. Please state the amount of incidentals and Stationery for the Bursar's Office, and also for other purposes for the year 1857?—Witness was allowed to write his answer and hand into the Committee to-morrow.

*Ques.* 275. Referring to your accounts for 1857 as published in 1858, No. 2, is not the statement of Dr. *Ryerson*, as to the expenses of your Office and of Stationery, correct, so far as the amount is stated by him?—Witness was allowed to write his answer to this question and hand into the Committee to-morrow.

The following questions were submitted by Honorable Mr. *Cayley* to the Reverend Dr. *Cook*.—To be answered to-morrow.

*Ques.* 276. From the tenor of your statement in chief, it is to be inferred that the present revenues of Queen's College do not enable the Authorities to undertake all they could wish to promote the objects of the institution?

*Ques.* 277. What additional annual sum would enable you to place the College in the condition you desire?

*Ques.* 278. How would you distribute that additional sum?

*Ques.* 279. Can you name the additional Professors.

The following questions were submitted by Honorable Mr. *Cayley* to Rev. Dr. *Stinson*, to be answered to-morrow.

*Ques.* 280. From the tenor of your statement in chief, it is to be inferred, that the present revenues of Victoria College do not enable the authorities to undertake all they could wish to promote the objects of the Institution?

*Ques.* 281. What additional sum would enable you to place the College in the condition you desire?

*Ques.* 282. How would you distribute that additional sum?

The Committee adjourned till to-morrow at 11 o'clock, A. M.

Thursday, 19th April.

COMMITTEE MET.

Present:

The Hon. MALCOLM CAMERON, Chairman;  
 " Mr. CAYLEY,  
 " " FOLEY,  
 " " Att'y Gen'l MACDONALD,  
 " McCANN,  
 " ROBLIN,  
 " SIMPSON,  
 " WILSON.

The Rev'd Messrs Cook, Ryerson, Stinson, Nelles, and Poole were in attendance.

David Buchan, Esq., Bursar of the University and Colleges at Toronto, was in attendance.

Professor Wilson was in attendance.

The Rev'd Messrs. Whitaker and Ambery appeared, agreeable to the summons of the Committee.

Mr. Buchan appeared and handed in his replies, as follows, to Ques. 274 and 275, submitted yesterday, and was further Examined.

Ans. to 274. For the year 1857, the amount charged to the Bursar's office was £379 12s. 4d. Of this £32 7s. 10d. was for stationery, £156 5s. for rent of office for a year and a quarter, and for fuel about £50. For "other purposes" the amounts are as follows: stationery, £598 10s. 4d., of which £429 14s. 11d. was charged to the University and £168 15s. 5d. to the University College. The incidentals amounted to £867 16s. 11d., of which a very large amount was not chargeable to the educational department, as for example—commission paid to Mr. Roche on amount of sales of *Port Hope* property, £108 11s. 6d.; compensation to Dr. King's representatives, per order in Council, £150; balance of commission expenses paid to Mr. O'Reilly, £89 10s. and for inspection of lands, £20; *Upper Canada* College incidentals for same year, £259 12s. 10d.; stationery, £36 6s. 3d.

Ans. To 275. On referring to Appendix No. 12, printed with the Journals of the Legislative Assembly, 21 *Victoria*, 1858, I find there an account headed "No. 2 (Abstract), University of Toronto." The Bursar's statement of "receipts and disbursements, on account of the Income Fund, for the year ended the 31st of "December, 1857." This abstract was not prepared in my office. If I take the first item, "Bursar's office," £2,261, and the second, "incidental expenses," which most people on, examining the account, would suppose, referred to the incidentals of the office, £379 12s. 4d, I get a total of £2,640 12s. 4d, which is the amount charged to the office in my detailed accounts submitted to Parliament. But if, in place of taking the second item, I overleap it and the six following ones, and arbitrarily select the ninth, which has nothing to do with the office; by adding the first and the ninth together, I do obtain a sum corresponding to the \$11,438 given in question 185, and said in that question to be "reported for 1857 as expended in the Bursar's office."

Questions submitted by the Rev. Mr. Poole, and put

[By the Chairman]

Ques. 283.—State the income and expenditure of the Boarding Hall Department of *Upper Canada* College for each year since 1853?—In the accounts for 1853, '54 and '55, the fees for tuition and board are intermingled so that I cannot give the receipts for board dues separately.

The expenditure on account of the Resident School House, was, in 1853, £476 2 2, in 1854, £437 13 10, in 1855, £787 8.

|   |        |    |           |
|---|--------|----|-----------|
| In 1856, the receipts on account of board dues were | £659   | 2  | 6         |
| “ the expenditure as per account                    | -      | -  | 764 14 6  |
| <hr/>   |        |    |           |
| In 1857, the receipts were                          | £732   | 15 | 0         |
| “ the expenditure                                   | -      | -  | 1025 19 3 |
| <hr/>   |        |    |           |
| In 1858, the receipts were                          | \$7508 | 60 |           |
| “ the expenditure                                   | -      | -  | 8477 35   |
| <hr/>   |        |    |           |

But this expenditure includes \$1159 85 laid out that year for furniture and fittings; so that the expenditure of the year for the boarding of the boys was \$7317 50, or within the amount received.

|   |   |   |           |
|---|---|---|-----------|
| In 1859, the receipts for board dues were | - | - | \$6604 00 |
| “ the expenditure                         | - | - | 6536 00   |

*Ques.* 284. What amount has been expended in furnishing the Boarding Hall of University College?—According to my account for 1859, I paid, up to 31st December of that year, furnishing, for outfit, &c., \$5676 86, but what portion of that belongs exclusively to the “Boarding Hall,” as it is called in the question, I cannot say.

*Ques.* 285. Did Mr. *Beaty* pay for the *Hamilton* property in cash; and if not, in what other way?—Mr. *Beaty*'s payments have all been in cash.

*Ques.* 286. What is the salary of the Chairman of the Board of Endowment, and how many meetings were there last year?—The salary is £100 per annum. There have not been many meetings.

*Ques.* 287. Were there more than two?—I cannot tell. I will not say there were.

[By Mr. *Simpson*.]

*Ques.* 288. Has the Chairman any other duties than attending those meetings?—As Chairman of the Board of Endowment he has no other duties than attending these meetings; but the Board is an advisory body ordered to be constituted by the Governor in Council. The Chairman, in connection with his bursarship, has all the practical duties of the Chairmanship of the Board. In order to fulfil them, it has been necessary to call meetings. He does call such meetings; but it has been difficult to obtain meetings in consequence of the many duties of the other members of the Board. When I have wanted them I have been obliged to run round and arrange a meeting first with one member and then with another, and I have sometimes had to make three calls on two different persons before I went to the meeting.

Questions submitted by Rev. Mr. *Poole*, and put

[By the *Chairman*.]

*Ques.* 289. How many persons attended that one meeting which occurred in 1859?—Three persons.

Submitted by Rev. Mr. *Nelles*, and put

[By the *Chairman*.]

*Ques.* 290. Why was the balance of £89 10s. paid to the Commissioners to investigate the charges against Dr. *McCaul*, included in the accounts among the incidental expenses?—Because it was an incidental.

Submitted by the Rev. Mr. *Poole*, and put

[By the *Chairman*.]

*Ques.* 291. Does the Treasurer reside in *Paris*; and if so, who pays his expenses to and from *Toronto*?—I pay my own expenses and reside at *Toronto* from Monday morning to the end of the week. I receive no pecuniary advantages except my salary.

Dr. *Cooke* handed in his replies, as follows, to Questions No. 276, 277, 278 and 279, submitted yesterday, and was further Examined:—

*Ans.* To 276. May do it.

*Ans.* To 277. The Trustees of Queen's College receive now an annual grant of \$3000— if from any source, they had seven thousand more, I believe they would be able to carry out their views of collegiate education satisfactorily. In giving this answer, I am not to be understood as expressing any opinion as to what should be expected or given from the University Endowment Fund.

*Ans.* To 278. If such additional means were from any source at the command of the Trustees, they would extend the Library and Museum, probably add two more Professors, improve the College Buildings, and if not affiliated to the University, establish a few scholarships of moderate amount.

*Ans.* To 279. I think we should have a Professor of Latin, another of Greek; a Professor of Mathematics and another of Natural Philosophy, four, instead of two now.

[By the Chairman.]

*Ques.* 292.—On the 13th instant you were requested to put into writing some remarks upon the subject of matriculation. Have you done so? and if you have, please to put them in.—I do not think the mere list of books which any College or University publishes as the subject of examination before admitting young men gives any correct idea of the actual attainments of those who are admitted; that can only be learned from the actual examination, which might be very slight with a long list, and very thorough with a small one.

I think one advantage of having all the Colleges of the Country affiliated under the University would be to establish a uniform standard of attainment before admission. That standard would have to be fixed with a reasonable regard to the state of Grammar School education in the Province, and raised from time to time as that education admitted, and with a view of stimulating both teachers and scholars over the country to greater exertion.

I cannot say that I think any examination likely to be made before admission into the classes of a medical school sufficient to ensure a good preparatory education. The tendency always is to laxity in such examinations. I think nothing would tend more to increase the respectability of the Medical profession, or to prepare young men for entering advantageously on the study of medical science, than a previous attendance on a general College course, or such part of it as should be fixed by law.

[By Hon. Mr. Cayley.]

*Ques.* 293.—What impediments do you understand to be in the way of the students of Queen's College competing for the University scholarships?—I am aware that there is no legal impediment. The condition, however, that students receiving scholarships shall graduate in the University of Toronto is not agreeable either to students or professors; and there is a feeling among the students, that Queen's College is not adequately represented in the Senate.

*Ques.* 294.—In what way does the want of representation of Queen's College interfere with such competition for scholarships.—I do not say that it interferes. I only say there is a feeling that this want may interfere. It is thought that a preference may be given to other students.

*Ques.* 295.—Will that feeling be removed if Queen's College receive a portion of the endowment?—Not by the endowment, but by combining with that the conditions of affiliation and fair representation in the senate.

*Ques.* 296.—You stated that examiners have been chosen from University College. Are you aware that one of the Professors of Queen's College was invited to examine, and declined to do so?—I do not know. Very possibly it was so.

*Ques.* 297.—Are you aware that the Head of Queen's College is a member of the University Senate, and that he declines to attend the meetings?—He does not attend.

*Ques.* 298.—If an equal number of Professors of Queen's College were added to the Professors of the University College in the Senate, would the Professors of Queen's College attend?—I do not think the Professors should be in the Senate at all. I think only the Heads of the Colleges should be in the Senate:

*Ques. 299.*—Who form the great bulk of the Senates of the Scotch Universities?—The Senates of the Scotch Universities are composed of the Professors of the Schools. It is an exceedingly bad arrangement, and will doubtless be shortly put an end to.

John Langton, Esquire, Vice-Chancellor of University of Toronto, Examined.

[By the Chairman.]

*Ques. 300.*—Have you any statement to make on the subject of this investigation?—I desire to put in a written statement, as has been done by the other witnesses who have appeared before the Committee, as follows :—

The method of investigation adopted by the Committee has been, that each of the gentlemen appearing on behalf of those who have prayed for an enquiry, has put in as evidence a written statement of the facts and arguments, by which he substantiates his objections to the present constitution and arrangement of the University. In conformity with this arrangement, before answering such questions as may be put to me, I desire to submit a reply on behalf of the University of Toronto, with a reference to such documents as I believe will aid the Committee in coming to a correct judgment upon the questions before them. If my reply should be thought to extend to an unreasonable length, I hope the Committee will remember that each of these gentlemen has principally confined himself to one or two particular points, whilst I have to enter into them all; and that the complainants frequently make a general charge in a few words, the truth of which I can only enable the committee to judge of by examining it in detail.

The subject naturally divides itself into three principal heads, the University, University College, and Upper Canada College, which must be judged of separately, although having many points of mutual connection. Upper Canada College is supported by a distinct endowment, and is only so far connected with the University, that the general superintendence of the Institution has been committed to the Senate. It is very proper that the subject should be enquired into, and I am prepared to go into the question of its management by the Senate; but whatever may be the conclusion of the Committee, whether the management be continued in the hands of the Senate, or be vested as formerly in a separate corporate body, or even if that College were to be altogether abolished, the main question of the constitution of the University would remain unaltered. With regard to University College, whilst on the one hand the connection is closer, as it is supported out of the same endowment, and forms an essential portion of the Provincial University as contemplated by the Legislature, on the other hand its internal government rests with a body entirely independent of the Senate, and the details of its organization and discipline are beyond our controul. In this enquiry I only appear for the University, and it is not my intention to enter into questions relating to the College, apart from its connection with the general scheme, unless in answer to questions which may be put to me by the Committee.

(1.) It is argued that the Collegiate Institutions supported by the different denominations, have, by the Act, an equitable, if not a legal, right to an apportionment of the University endowment. Dr. Cook supports the view upon what he conceives to be the well known and easily proved policy of the framers of the University Amendment Act; Dr. Stinson upon what he considers "the plain letter and obvious design" of the Act itself. I cannot agree with either of them. It would be very unsafe to judge of the meaning and intention of an Act from the recollection of conversations with leading politicians, or even from the individual wishes of members of the Government, several years ago; and still more so, from a clause in the Bill as originally introduced, which does not appear in the Act as finally passed. If any conclusion is to be drawn from this latter fact, it is rather a presumption that the Legislature did *not* sanction the principle of the suppressed clause; but that, it having been originally proposed to make a specific grant to certain Institutions, it was judged by the framers of the Bill, and by the Legislature, wiser to leave the appropriations of any surplus which might arise, after the main objects of the Act had been accomplished, to future legislation. That the present 54th section cannot have been intended to carry out in other words the principle of the suppressed clause, is obvious from the fact, that the latter expresses, as a condition of the grant, the abandonment of their Charters by

the Colleges; whereas the former in no way limits the apportionment which may be made by Parliament of any surplus.

Neither does the Act, as it stands, bear out the intention assigned to it by Dr. Stinson. To understand properly the meaning of the Preamble of the University Amendment Act, reference must be had to Mr. Baldwin's Act of 1849, which it repeals. The Preamble to the Act 12 Victoria, chapter 82, recites that "whereas the people of this Province consists of various denominations of Christians, to the members of each of which denominations, it is desirable to extend all the benefits of University Education," &c. The Act therefore, goes on to purge King's College of its denominational aspect, and under another name to constitute one central Institution in Toronto, *both for teaching and examining*, intended to be entirely free from all denominational bias. The 43d section provides that any existing College, upon surrendering its right to confer Degrees, except in Divinity, may become affiliated; but the only privilege they obtain thereby is the power of electing Members to the Senate. The only teaching Body, except in Theology, was to be the University of Toronto, and no Degree could be conferred except upon students who had gone through their regular course in Toronto. This being premised, the meaning of the Amendment Act is obvious: It recites in the Preamble that no Colleges have affiliated; that parents are deterred by the expense and other causes, from sending young men to Toronto, and that it is just and right to afford facilities to those who pursue their studies elsewhere, to obtain Degrees and other Academical honors in the Provincial University, according to the system pursued in the University of London. The Act therefore goes on to establish the University as a distinct Body; to constitute University College out of the teaching staff of the former University, as a College supported by the State endowment; and the 17th section enacts that all existing Colleges in Upper and Lower Canada, and such others as may afterwards be so declared, shall have all the rights of Affiliated Colleges, and students who have pursued in any of them the course of study prescribed by the University, shall be as eligible for Degrees and other distinctions, as those educated in University College. This, then, is the remedy provided for an acknowledged grievance under the old Law, and not, as is contended by Dr. Stinson, that the Denominational Colleges should be supported from the State Endowment. That the present 54th section could not have been intended as any pledge that the Affiliated Colleges should receive pecuniary aid from the Endowment, is evident, if only from this fact, that no distinction is made in the affiliation between Colleges in Upper and in Lower Canada, and it will hardly be contended that there was any intention of supporting Lower Canada Colleges out of an exclusively Upper Canadian Fund. Dr. Green is even more distinct in his assertion that the Act of 1849 was repealed for the avowed and clearly expressed purpose of providing for an extension of the Fund to the Denominational Colleges. It must strike the Committee as somewhat singular, that this avowed purpose should have been entirely unnoticed in the Act, except by the power given to Parliament to deal hereafter with any surplus which might arise, for Academical education generally, and that the Act should only have assigned an altogether different reason for the repeal of Baldwin's Act, viz: that instead of pursuing all their studies in Toronto, students might be allowed to pursue them any where, as in the University of London. Dr. Green, thinking only of the money, accuses the Government and the Legislature of holding out fallacious promises; the Legislature, thinking only of the convenience of the students, provided for them everything that it promised. I entirely concur in the views stated by almost all the gentlemen who have appeared before the Committee, that the true policy is to have one Central Body for conferring Degrees, which judges of candidates only by their proficiency in the subjects of examination prescribed, without regard to the College in which they have pursued their studies, or indeed whether they have been students in any incorporated College at all, a point strongly insisted upon by the Oxford Commissioners, (p. 213, *et seq.*, Heywood's Ed.) and sanctioned by the revised charter of the University of London. For such a system of University Education the Amendment Act makes provision, and the Statutes framed by the Senate are adapted to give it effect. That the Denominational Colleges, whilst, praising it in theory, have not thought fit to adopt it in practice, is much to be regretted; but the University authorities are in no way to blame. It is not, as stated by Dr. Cook, that "the Government required, as a preliminary and necessary condition to affiliation, that Colleges having University powers, either from the Crown or by Provincial

enactments, should surrender their powers," for no such provision is contained in the Act. It is not, as, in various forms, is asserted by the appellants, that exclusive privileges are given to University College; for, as will be shewn hereafter, no such action has been taken either by the Government or the Senate. One reason why the Denominational Colleges have not adopted the University course, has been stated to be that they are unable, from insufficient means, to teach all the subjects required. It certainly cannot be expected that each College should maintain a staff of Professors capable of efficiently teaching, in their higher branches, all the subjects embraced in the University course—a very strong argument in favor of maintaining one Provincial College that can; but by the system of options permitted, this would not debar their students from entering the University, and competing for honors in departments which their College can teach well. But there is a reason beyond this. It is not that any part of the machinery is wanting to establish in Canada a system similar to that which works so well in England, that has formed a bar to the full carrying out of the Act as yet; but it is the desire of the Denominational Colleges to have them supported from Provincial Funds, a desire inconsistent with the well known feelings of the people of Upper Canada, and at variance with the principle upon which all our other National Educational Institutions have been established. As far as Academical studies and rewards are concerned, the Act proposed to itself the University of London as a model, but in relation to endowment it distinctly recognizes a difference; whereas in England no Government aid is given to any of the Affiliated Colleges as such; in Canada, as in Ireland, the Legislature founded and endowed one non-denominational College, which otherwise has no privileges over the others.

(2) It is contended that the intention of the Act has been frustrated by the action of Government, and of the University, which have pursued the policy of building up one College to the exclusion of all others. This charge is mostly expressed in general language, but there are some few cases where it is made in a tangible shape.

Dr. Cook instances "its (the College's) numerous scholarships," but he must be aware, or, before making the charge, should have informed himself, that the University Scholarships are as open to the students of Queen's as of University College. They are not even, as Professor Weir says he understands they are, practically confined to University College, for many of them are held by Students who have no connection with that Institution.

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 2nd 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 especial 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 those 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 recom-

mended 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 favor 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 in 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 was fixed on the motion of Dr. Ryerson before the present holder of the office became resident in Toronto; the salary of the Principal of Upper Canada College was determined with the concurrence of Dr. Ryerson before the Principal had a seat on the Senate; and the only other member of the Senate receiving a salary from the University or Upper Canada College Funds, enjoys the same income as master in Upper Canada College, which had always been attached to his office for twenty years before he first made his appearance on the Senate as president of a School of Medicine, which was then the Medical Faculty of Victoria College. It is obvious therefore, that in no single instance is this imputation borne out by the facts.

It is objected by all the witnesses, and in the memorial of the Methodist Conference, that the Professors of University College are always appointed examiners. I agree with the Memorialists that these appointments are objectionable, but there have been practical difficulties in the way, which have hitherto prevented the abandonment of the custom. Every person acquainted with examination will acknowledge, as is stated by Dr. Cook in his cross-examination, that no Examiner can be efficient who has not had practical experience in teaching. An amateur, however great his attainments may be, will make a bad Examiner. I hold it essential that a good examiner must be a good teacher. But good teachers are, unfortunately, not numerous in Canada; and from the length of time over which the examinations extend, the choice is necessarily almost limited to Toronto and its immediate vicinity. Persons engaged in teaching cannot spare the time from their duties, and to mention this year alone, a Professor of Queen's College, and one of Victoria College, have for this reason declined the appointment. Besides this, if it is objectionable that the Professors should examine their own Students in the later years, it is equally wrong that other teachers should examine matriculants, some of whom have probably been their own pupils. We always appoint a co-examiner with the Professor, and the Professor always takes the principal part in examining the matriculants, where he certainly is the best that can be selected, and throws a large part of the work of the later years upon his colleague. Still, I fully admit the present practice to be objectionable; and several of the Professors have expressed to me their desire to be relieved from this duty. I believe that in former years the evil could hardly have been avoided; but well educated young men are becoming more numerous in the country now, and I think it may ere long be made a general rule that no Professor shall examine except for matriculation. I may mention, however, that it is the common practice in the Queen's University, Ireland, to select the examiners in rotation from the several Colleges—a practice which I think open to serious objections, unless there be, as is the case with us, a second examiner in each subject. It is also worthy of remark, that the first appointment of examiners, when, as now, the names of all the Professors appeared in the list, was made on the motion of Dr. Ryerson himself. In thus alluding to that gentleman's action, I do not wish to infer, if this decision was wrong in itself, that it was any excuse for the Senate that they followed an evil counsel. But the fact is important in this view, that Dr. Ryerson, who doubtless then held the same decided opinions upon the subject which he does now, nevertheless saw such practical difficulties in the way of making any other satisfactory appointments, that he adopted the present system as upon the whole the best that offered itself.

I believe I have now answered all the specific charges which have been brought of favoritism to one College, and have shewn how groundless they are, except the last be so

considered. I may add, that I know of no action of the Government or of the Senate, apart from the fact that University College is endowed by the State, which places it in a different position from any other College, excepting in two instances, necessarily arising from the joint endowment. As we occupy the same buildings, it is provided that the President of University College shall be *ex-officio* a Member of the Committee, on the grounds, surrounding it, and that one other Member of that body shall be appointed if there be one on the Senate; and as the Government have never acted upon that clause in the Statute giving them that power, by assigning the old Library for the use of either the College or the University, whilst the Senate is entrusted the duty of making additions to it, a similar clause exists in the Statute respecting the Library Committee.

(3) The next head of complaint which is made, is the alleged extravagance of the expenditures upon the University and University College. It is argued that even if the denominational Colleges have no claim to any specific appropriation, and I deny that they have any, they have at least a contingent interest in any surplus which may remain after the University and University College have been maintained in a state of efficiency, and which Parliament may devote annually to the support of Academical education in Upper Canada, in any manner which it may judge to be most conducive to the interests of the country, instead of its being necessarily applied, as formerly, to the increase of the Permanent Fund. Whether there had been any such provision or not, I admit that any extravagance of expenditure which may exist should be enquired into and checked. It remains, therefore, to enquire whether the expenditure has been upon a scale disproportioned to the wants of the Provincial Institutions, for directing and for practically carrying out the higher branches of Education. The principal points insisted on are the Buildings and Library, the Museum, the Professorial Staff, Examinations, and Scholarships. These I will reply to separately; but, before doing so I must be allowed to allude to an implied charge against myself. Dr. Ryerson, in his evidence before the Committee, merely alluded in passing to the salaried Vice-Chancellor, who audited the expenditure which he had himself authorized; but in the printed document put forth by the Conference in support of their memorial, intended to produce its effect in another sphere, the same point is more frequently insisted upon, and it is stated that some undue influence has been exerted to prevent the publication of the Accounts. As Provincial Auditor, it is certainly my duty to see that the Bursar makes no improper use of the public monies, and produces vouchers for all his expenditure, and his accounts are accordingly examined in my office as all others are; but, as Auditor, I have no more power to interfere with the objects of the expenditure, than I have with Dr. Ryerson's distribution of the Grants placed under his superintendence. As to the publication of the Accounts, the Bursar is required by law to lay them annually before Parliament; and whether they are printed or not rests with the Printing Committee, and not with me.

Before going into details I must also explain a point, which the public would never gather from the evidence of the gentlemen at whose instance this investigation is made, viz.: that the endowment, consisting of lands in various parts of the Province, requires an extensive establishment to manage it, and is, in fact, a department of Government over which the University authorities have no control. Whether its arrangements may not be economised, is a question which the Committee may ascertain from the evidence of the Bursar; but as far as the University authorities are concerned, it is the net revenue only which they have to deal with, and this is all which at present is available for academical education. The revenue in the preceding evidence is spoken of as \$60,000 or \$70,000; and by adding to it that of Upper Canada College it is set down by Dr. Ryerson as \$80,000; but the highest amount which the net revenue ever reached was \$56,000, in 1856, when the run after land was at the highest, and the average net revenue since 1853, has only been \$48,000. It will be for the Committee to decide, whether this amount is so much more than a Provincial University can require, as it has been argued, and whether it is sufficient to be divided amongst the numerous claimants, without destroying the object for which it was set apart.

It is objected generally to the expenditure on the buildings, that the Act, which contemplates only additions to the present buildings, does not authorise new ones on a new site. Unfortunately, in the same session when the University Amendment Act was passed,

another Act gave the Government authority to take possession of the whole property for Provincial purposes, and the University and College were ejected, and temporarily accommodated in the Parliament Buildings. When, in 1855, the Seat of Government returned to Toronto, the College was again moved, and temporary additions were made to the old Medical School, which rendered it available for a time; but this had become perfectly inadequate to the accommodation of the College before the new buildings were ready; and the frame additions were so temporary in their construction, that the Bursar has reported to me, now that it has returned into his possession, that it would be more economical to pull them down and sell the material, than to put them in effectual repair. The stone building, originally intended for the College, is still in the occupation of Government for another public object. If then the Act is to be interpreted in the literal sense given to it by Dr. Cook and others, there were no buildings to which to make the additions. This, however, is not the view to take of the question. The Act had established a central University and a College, endowed from public funds, with a staff of efficient professors. It was necessary to provide a building for their occupation, and especially to provide the means of accommodating resident students, without which one of the great advantages of a University education would have been lost. Such an institution was not intended to be of an ephemeral character, to be moved about, as convenience dictated, from one public building to another; and as the endowment fortunately supplied the means, it has been provided with a durable home, worthy of the position it holds in the country, and of the still higher destiny which the rapidly increasing number of its students shows that it is destined to achieve. The Government of the day, therefore, wisely, as I think, exercised the undoubted power given by the Act, and authorized the Senate to expend £75,000 out of the Permanent Fund for this purpose.

The Government also authorized the expenditure, from the same source, of £20,000 upon a Library and Museum. It is objected that such an expenditure is foreign to the purposes for which the University was established; but I can hardly think that the Committee and the Legislature will entertain that view. There is not a University or College in the world of any standing which has not already acquired, or is not accumulating, a Library and Museum, as essential to the prosecution of the higher studies. Dr. Cook partially, it would seem, admits of a Library, but he would have it to belong to the College and not to the University, and would give out of the endowment a similar sum to all other Colleges for their Libraries. Now, it must be remembered, that although the University and the College are distinct in their functions, the College, or teaching body, forms an essential part of the University scheme, as established by the Act, and whether the Library be supposed to belong to the one body or to the other, is immaterial, provided it be established. As the University, however, represents the whole country, as the heads of all educational institutions, and the representatives of all denominations find a place in it, I think it better that the management and control should be vested in the Senate than in the College. But to expend the money in forming five or six collections is utterly to ignore the great use of a public Library. The ordinary text books used in education, the classical authors in various languages, the books of reference in common use, are not so numerous as to be beyond the reach of any College, or even of many private individuals; but there is another class of books which you will not find there, consisting principally of books of reference of a more special character, not so often used it is true, but as essential when the occasions for consulting them occur; and those numerous periodical publications issued by learned and scientific bodies in various parts of the world, in which almost all new views and discoveries first make their appearance, and without access to which a scholar or a man of science in this country would have to remain contented with his ignorance, till years after all Europe had been turning their attention to something new, he gathered the information from some digest published in a more popular and accessible form. Such publications, often of a very costly kind from their limited circulation, can only be found in a public Library; and, until Canada possesses such a collection, she must be content to remain in a position of inferiority, ill adapted to her growing wealth and intelligence. Such a collection the Senate has been authorized to form and is now acquiring, and it has provided for giving the public the freest access to it.

It is argued also that the Professorial staff in University College is beyond the wants of the country, and the charge excessive. As to the rate of remuneration I may fortunately

appeal to the appellants themselves. Dr. Cook admits that the salary of a Professor should be at least £500 a year, and that he would rather see it £600, and none of the other gentlemen have appeared to dispute his views. It is true that in a later portion of his evidence, when driven to the necessity of keeping his proposed expenses within a sum to which he would limit the expenditure of University College, he has been compelled to confine himself to the lower amount; but I would rather accept his opinion on the abstract question, than when modified to suit a predetermined result. Now the amounts approved of by Dr. Cook are very nearly those at which the salaries of the Professors in University College are fixed by the present Order in Council, viz., £500, rising with length of service to £650. It is therefore only against the number of Professors that there can be any cause of complaint, and Dr. Cook's proposition is to reduce them by striking off five, viz., History and English Literature, Modern Languages, Agriculture, Meteorology, and Oriental Languages, and by combining the present three Professorships in Natural Sciences into two. To a certain extent I agree with Dr. Cook, but on other points I differ from him entirely. I do not believe that the Professorships of Agriculture, which have been established either here or in any other University, have answered the expectations of those who founded them; and I do not think that it is in the nature of the subject that they should. Meteorology is also too limited a subject to form an exclusive chair, and all that is necessary of it might well be taught by the Professors of allied sciences. The history of the foundation of the chair may not be known to the Committee. The British Government having established, and for years maintained, the Meteorological Observatory, determined to abandon it. The Provincial Government, feeling that we had just cause to be proud of the results obtained there, gave an annual grant for its maintenance, and proposed to connect it with the University. When the proposition was submitted to the Senate, Dr. McCaul, the Vice-Chancellor, moved, seconded by Dr. Ryerson—"That the Senate will gladly co-operate with the Government in carrying out the plan for the organization of the Observatory, which has been approved by His Excellency the Governor General, and will accordingly pass the necessary Statute for the establishment of Graduate Scholarships,—and thus, as proposed in the above-mentioned communication, contribute towards the expense of the establishment the amount of the stipends of the scholars, in addition to one-third of the salary of the Director of the Observatory, and Professor of Meteorology, &c., &c." The idea of the Scholarships was dropped on further consideration, but the Professorship remains, and the subject has been introduced into the University course, but only as an optional one, not because it was considered an essential part of academical study, but because there was a Chair in the College, and it was thought some Undergraduates might wish to pursue the study, especially those who were intending to teach Grammar Schools, in which a system of meteorological observations has been established. I think that it was a mistake to connect the Observatory with the College, but as long as Government maintains it, I see no objection to its continued connection with the University, and the Director, if disconnected with the College, might very properly have a seat on the Senate. I agree also with Dr. Cook that the study of Oriental Languages is not a necessary portion of a College education, and the Senate has made it optional throughout. It more properly belongs to the Faculty of Divinity.

On two other points I partially agree with Dr. Cook. If funds were insufficient, two Professors in the Natural Sciences might be made to take the place of our three, although I would adopt a different arrangement, viz., Geology and Natural History which are intimately allied, and Chemistry and Mineralogy, which latter can only be studied effectively in connection with the former. But it is only rarely that you can obtain a man equally and thoroughly versed in those separate branches, and in almost all Universities separate chairs exist, and the subjects are even more subdivided than with us.

Again, a chair of Modern Languages, in the sense of teaching the languages themselves, and not the principles of comparative philology, appears to me very inadvisable. It could only be efficiently filled under very peculiar circumstances. But when Dr. Cook and other witnesses condemn the study of the Modern Languages in a University, I differ from them *toto cælo*. I believe that there should be no single Professorship, but Lectureships in each separate Language, or two or more combined in one Lectureship, according to the individuals that can be procured to teach. French, in a

country circumstanced like Canada, may well be considered essential, and now that Latin has ceased to be the common language of educated men, and three quarters of the learning and science of the world is published in French or German, no man should pass through a University who has not acquired at least one of them.

History and English Literature, I also consider essential, and I cannot conceive that there is anything in the study of these two subjects, which makes them less adapted to be taught by Lectures, as argued by Dr. Ryerson, than in that of any other subject of education. I cannot indeed imagine that Dr. Ryerson himself perceives any such difference, for when the question is put to him (No. 13), he diverges into a disquisition upon German Universities, and admits that his remark applies to Lectures "in the German Sense" as distinguished from the usual meaning of the word. In the "University Sense," it seems, he does not think History a subject which cannot be taught by Lectures. Dr. Ryerson has triumphantly quoted the Report of the Queen's University Commissioners, which recommends the abolition of the Chair of Agriculture, but he ought to have added that they do not recommend the abolition of those of Modern Languages and of English Literature and History, nor the compression of the three Chairs in the Natural Sciences into two. As to the importance of these subjects, I shall have occasion to return to this when I come to the subject of options. I would only now remark that the witnesses who have been heard in favor of Latin and Greek, and Mathematics, being the proper Studies of a University, and most of the rest mere works of supererogation, run counter to the daily growing opinion of all the best authorities upon University Education in Europe, as I shall shew from the published opinions of the Commissioners on the English Universities.

In thus stating my concurrence with some points of Dr. Cook's scheme, I wish to be understood as explaining what would be my recommendation, if called upon to organize a new college in circumstances similar to those of University College, and what should be kept in view for future arrangements, as opportunity offers. But I by no means wish to say that existing professors, who have accepted their offices on the faith of the Government, should be dismissed, and I feel convinced that neither would the Committee recommend, nor the Legislature sanction such injustice. It must also be borne in mind that the University, which is charged with extravagance, is in no way responsible for this organization, which was adopted before it had any existence. The Professor of Agriculture and the Lecturer on Oriental Languages are amongst the oldest of those connected with the teaching staff, and all the other chairs which Dr. Cook would abolish, with the exception of that of Meteorology, formed the establishment which the Act provided should be supported out of the endowment. The University is not even responsible for by far the greater part of the increase which has been made to the rate of salaries, though I for one do not think it excessive. In the printed document put forth by the Conference in support of their Memorial, the salaries of the Professors at the passing of the University Act are set down at £1497, including Librarian and servants. This does not give quite a correct view of the case, as the salaries of the four newly appointed Professors only appear for seven months in the accounts of that year; but Dr. Ryerson, desirous of shewing a still larger increase, goes back to 1850, before the addition to the staff which the Act of 1853 provides for. He states that "it cannot be claimed that the Faculty of Arts is more efficient for the legitimate purposes of a University College than it was in 1850, yet, since then, its expenses have been increased from £3350 to £7670," leaving out of view the fact that in the meantime five new Professorships and a Tutorship have been created, some of which, even in Dr. Cook's view, are necessary; and giving the present cost, however arrived at, £1420 greater than the greatest amount paid to Professors in any one year. The true difference is this. The salaries of the Professors and Lecturer, as established in 1853, were £3930. From the 1st of January 1854, the salaries of the newly appointed Professors were put upon the same footing as those of the old ones, making the amount £4430, and this was done, be it observed, before the Senate was constituted, and by the same Ministry who are represented to have made, six months before, such generous provision for the Denominational Colleges, which we, it is said, have rendered of none effect. The present salaries, *including* the Classical Tutor and Professor of Meteorology, since added, are £6070, being an increase of 44 per cent. upon those of 1854, and of 54 per cent. upon

those of 1853. This is not more than the increase made in almost all salaries during the same period. In a somewhat allied branch of the Public Service, for instance, the salaries of the educational staffs, east and west, were £900 in 1854, and the same officers now receive £1775 and £1800, respectively, being an increase of 100 per cent., *without reckoning the increased number of the staff.*

Besides the salaries of Professors in the College, there are three connected with the University, the Vice-Chancellor's, the Librarian's and the Registrar's, which Dr. Cook would abolish, or materially reduce. He admits that, if the Librarian gives his whole time, he must have a sufficient salary; but it is suggested that some of the students might be employed, and that he might also perform the duties of Registrar, whilst the salary of the Vice-Chancellor he would abolish altogether. It is true that, if the Library were made a mere college library, it might be kept locked up, as I have known to be the practice in small colleges, and a Librarian might be in attendance for half an hour a day to give out books, and a promising student might well have some small allowance for attending to this duty. But if it is to be open to the public, which I submit to be a much more proper application of public funds, it is clear that a competent person must be employed at a fair salary. To appoint a student would be to injure him for life, as interfering with his studies. The Registrar is an equally necessary officer, and he is not overpaid for the work that falls upon him. Gentlemen, who are not acquainted with the practical details, can easily get rid of the office, or throw its duties upon another officer, whom, be it remembered, they have already declared to be unnecessary for the University; but the fact, that two Registrars have already resigned, upon the ground that they could not afford to devote the necessary time to the duties of the office, is enough to show that the work is not overpaid. In fact I do not believe that any competent person would undertake the office permanently, although the salary may be an object to a young man at first starting in life, and therefore prove a useful reward for distinguished young graduates. As to the Vice-Chancellor's salary, I admit that, if funds are insufficient, it is the first that should be reduced. Not that it is too high for the duties that fall on that officer, but that any person who is worthy of filling the office, would accept the labour and responsibility from zeal for the institution, and for the honorable position which it gives him. I found the office in existence with a salary attached, when I came to reside in Toronto. Since I was appointed no member of the University will be found to say that I have not given full work for my hire; but if there had been no salary I should have equally accepted the office, and I trust I should as zealously have discharged its duties, as a labor of love; but it has not been found prudent in practice to rely upon the gratuitous performance of important duties, and therefore I think that a salary was wisely attached to the Vice-Chancellorship.

The next head of expenditure specially referred to, is the allowance to Examiners—officers who, it is thought, may also be obtained gratuitously. I have already alluded to the difficulty of obtaining proper persons on any terms, but, unless for an adequate remuneration, it would be impossible. Let us look into the question of cost, which was in 1857, \$2160, reduced in 1858 to £2000, and 1859, to \$1760, and let us compare it with the cost in similar bodies elsewhere. I find in the Estimates of 1857, [1857—XXXIV] the sum set down for Examiners in the Queen's University, Ireland, £1510, *stg.*, or \$7,348, and it is stated in a note that, in the previous year, 44 persons were examined. In the Report of the same University for 1860, the cost of Examiners is estimated at £1450, *stg.*, or \$7056, and the number of students examined during the previous year is given as 78. Taking the latter year as the most favorable, our examiners, in 1859, examined more than twice the number at just one-fourth of the cost. Again in the same estimates, I find the Examiners in the University of London set down for £2560, *stg.*, or \$12,458. I find also in its Calendar of 1859, that in the year 1857, 151 students matriculated, and 109 degrees were conferred, and allowing a number equal to the matriculants for those who came up to the intermediate examination, which is not given, these Examiners must have examined 410 persons at the rate, in the aggregate, of about \$30 per head, whilst ours were paid at the rate of less than \$10 per head. It may be proper to state in regard to this comparison, that a considerable part of the expenses of the University of London is paid by fees, and reducing the estimate for the

Examiners, which is about half of the whole cost, by the same proportion of the fees, the cost to the country is with them only about \$22 per head, whilst if our matriculation fees are deducted, the similar charge is reduced to about \$8½ per head. Perhaps, in consequence of my habits as Auditor, I may be excused for entering into those financial details, although I admit that cost is not always the test of efficiency. But when the question is raised, whether the Examiners are overpaid, the true test of their work is the number of students they have to examine, and I cannot think that either our learning or our wealth is so inferior in Canada, that \$10 is too high a remuneration here, for services which in London and Dublin are paid at the rate of \$30 and \$90 respectively.

The remaining item of expenditure specially referred to as extravagant, is the allowance for scholarships, and here I admit, that, if the allegations of the Petitioners were true, a strong case would have been made out against the University. But they are not true. I do not, for a moment suppose, that Dr. Green would state anything to the Committee, which he did not believe to be correct; but having undertaken to give evidence upon a subject, with which he had made himself but slightly acquainted, he has fallen into an error. I do not know how he has obtained the proportion which he has stated, between the scholarships and students, 34 amongst 37, but I suspect it has been by a process, which he himself must have perceived to be a dangerous one: viz., by taking the number of scholarships from the returns of the University, and that of the students from the returns of the College. An examination of the same official documents, would have shewn him that in 1856, the year referred to, 76 students were examined, and 35 scholarships awarded, or, excluding those who were not entitled to compete for scholarships, 35 were awarded amongst 61. This is undoubtedly a high proportion. When the University was first established upon its present basis, the Senate, acting upon the authority given them by the Act, established 90 scholarships. The number may certainly have been disproportioned to the students continuing on from the old University, but not to what they might be expected to become, or to what they would have been, had the denominational Colleges thought fit to send their students to compete. Believing the number, however, to be too great under existing circumstances, one of my first measures, after I became Vice Chancellor, in 1856, was to reduce the number offered for competition from 90 to 61, and I would have made a still greater reduction, with the view of making subsequent additions, as they might be required, had not the general feeling of the Senate been against it. I am happy, however, to be able to state, that if 61 was too large a number in 1856, it will not be found to be so in 1860, the number of students having grown up to the provision made for them in this respect, as was, no doubt, contemplated when the scholarships were originally founded. But as this enquiry is not taking place in 1856, when the new organization had just been completed, but after it has been in operation for five years, (a small period, it must be allowed, for the growth of a University), it will be necessary to show how the scholarships have been distributed in the succeeding years. The following table will shew the number awarded in each succeeding year, and the number of students entitled to compete for them, with the proportion between the two, and the amount per student which the scholarships have cost, with a view to comparison with other analogous institutions.

|      | No. of Scholarships awarded. | No. of Students competing. | Proportion of Scholarships to competition. | Cost in the year. | Cost per Student. |
|------|------------------------------|----------------------------|--|-------------------|-------------------|
| 1855 | 33                           | 64                         | 1 to 1.94                                  | \$3,200           | \$50.             |
| 1856 | 35                           | 61                         | 1 to 1.75                                  | 4,633             | 76                |
| 1857 | 48                           | 123                        | 1 to 2.56                                  | 4,973             | 40.               |
| 1858 | 51                           | 143                        | 1 to 2.80                                  | 6,140             | 43.               |
| 1859 | 45                           | 196                        | 1 to 4.35                                  | 6,013             | 30.               |

N. B.—As the financial year and the scholastic year do not correspond, the proportions of Scholarships to Students, and of cost per Student, do not exactly agree.

I will now compare this statement with what is done in other Universities. With the University of London it is not easy to make a comparison, as its arrangements differ from ours in two essential particulars. 1st. The University of London was founded for the purpose of giving scholastic honors to Students in a great number of Institutions already ex-

isting on their own endowments, and others which might be founded. The State only proposed to provide an organization for the *encouragement* of learning, and not for the *support* of either Teachers or Students. In Canada, on the other hand, both objects were contemplated. Scholarships, therefore, many of which already existed in the separate Colleges, were, in the University of London, a secondary consideration. 2nd. Their Scholarships are tenable for two or three years, whilst ours must be competed for annually. As our course, therefore, is one of four years, to institute a fair comparison with the usual English system, our 60 Scholarships should only count as fifteen, or theirs should be increased, in proportion to the number of years for which they are held. Strictly speaking, they have annually only 9 Scholarships; but there are 8 Exhibitions, ranging from £30 to £40 stg., which are the same thing under another name. But there are always 40 individuals holding the 17 Scholarships and Exhibitions, and it is the same thing for our purpose, whether a Student upon examination obtains a Scholarship and holds it for three years, or whether he has to contend at the end of every year for the continued possession of it. With this explanation, it appears that in the University of London 40 Scholarships are held by about 400 Students, or by about 1 in 10, and at the cost of about \$20 per Student,—a much less proportion than with us, but by no means at so much less a cost.

A case much more nearly resembling our own is to be found in the Queen's University, Ireland. The circumstances of the two countries are not very dissimilar. The comparative poverty of the country, the general absence of good endowed schools, which form such a remarkable feature in the educational position of England, and the great denominational differences which exist there, are all strong points of resemblance, and dictated the same policy, of not only establishing a central University, but of endowing here one, and there three, Colleges, entirely free from denominational influences. The recent origin, also, of both Universities, is favorable to a fair comparison. The only difference so far as relates to the subject immediately before us is, that here the Scholarships are founded by the University, and may be held by the Students of any College, or even by a person attending none, whilst there, each endowed College has its own set of Scholarships. I think there can be little doubt that in this respect ours is the better and more liberal system. In each of the three Colleges there are endowed by the State, 10 senior Scholarships, of £40 each, and 45 junior ones, ranging in value from £15 to £24. They are annual, as with us, and as with us, are not all necessarily awarded. I have not found perfect annual returns from these Colleges, and from Galway none which give the Scholarships in a reliable shape; but I subjoin a statement for the last two years I can find for the Colleges at Cork and Belfast, in a similar form to that which I have given for the University of Toronto.

|              | Scholarships awarded. | Number of competitors. | Proportion. | Cost.  | Cost per student. |
|--------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-------------|--|-------------------|
| Cork, 1856   | 44                    | 144                    | 1 to 3.27   | \$6,944  | \$ 48             |
| " 1859       | 47                    | 125                    | 1 to 2.66   | \$6,792  | \$ 54             |
| Belfast 1857 | 51                    | 153                    | 1 to 3.00   | Cost not given, but as the endowment is the same, it must be in a very similar proportion. |                   |
| " 1859       | 48                    | 159                    | 1 to 3.53   |  |                   |

I find also a return from all the three Colleges, giving the number of their students holding Scholarships and Exhibitions, for every year, from 1850, including apparently the Exhibitions given by the University. I subjoin the substance of it at three periods, to show the increase of students, and the decrease of the cost per head, as compared with us.

|                |      |     |     |           |       |
|----------------|------|-----|-----|-----------|-------|
| Three Colleges | 1850 | 132 | 220 | 1 to 1.66 | \$ 74 |
| "              | 1855 | 156 | 307 | 1 to 1.96 | \$ 57 |
| "              | 1859 | 153 | 385 | 1 to 2.51 | \$ 50 |

Thus it will be seen that even at the commencement, the comparison was a little in our favor, and that we in five years have reduced the proportion to 1 in  $4\frac{1}{2}$ , and the average cost to \$30, whilst they in ten years have only reduced them to 1 in  $2\frac{1}{2}$  and \$50.

It may be useful to institute a similar comparison with the older Universities, though the data are not so accessible, and the circumstances are more various. At Trinity, Dublin, it will be seen from the calendar of 1857, that there are 70 scholarships on the foundation, 107 scholarships and exhibitions not on the foundation, and 30 sizarships. As

in the other older Universities they are not competed for annually, but the number of Scholarships, Exhibitions and Sizarships held are 207 amongst about 850 students in 1857, but the number more generally exceeds 1,000, or about 1 to 5,—nearly the same proportion as with us last year; whilst the annual value, which varies somewhat, may be set down as £7,500 sterling, or, on the average, \$36 per student, a not very dissimilar proportion.

From the report of the Royal Commissioners, who themselves could not always obtain reliable information, it appears that at Cambridge, including the Colleges and the University, there are about 645 scholarships or 1 to about 2 students. The cost is not accessible except for Emmanuel College, which, having no fixed Scholarships, divides annually £1000 sterling, amongst about 80 under-graduates, or about at the rate of \$60 per student. This statement however, as well as that for Trinity, Dublin, cannot be exactly compared with us, as most of the Scholarships are tenable for some time after graduation, and many are of inconsiderable value, and two or more may be held by the same individual. But on the other hand, the statement for Cambridge does not include Exhibitions and Sizarships, which are very numerous. St. John's alone, with from 200 to 300 under-graduates, has, according to the Commissioners, 124 scholarships, and besides this, according to the Cambridge Calendar, about 100 exhibitions, one of which is worth £100 a year and four are worth £70; and it is to its wealth in this respect that it mainly owes the distinction of producing even more high honor men, many of whom are from the humbler classes, than its great rival Trinity.

At Oxford the information is more precise in some respects, and more capable of comparison with ourselves, as the number of *under-graduates* holding Scholarships is given, as well as total cost. In the statistical table appended to Mr. Heywood's edition of the recommendations of the Oxford Commissioners, the number of under-graduates "on the foundation," which will include most Scholars, but not Exhibitionists, is given as 233 and the whole number of under-graduates as 1222, or one in  $5\frac{1}{2}$ , and the value of their stipends is given as £3,700 Stg., or at the average rate of \$31 per student. This it will be perceived is just the average rate in the University of Toronto in the year 1859, but the Royal Commissioners do not think even this enough. Their thirty-fifth recommendation is: "That any surplus remaining, after making due provision for the Fellows, should be applied to increase the number and value of Scholarships, and that no Scholarship should be of less amount than £50 a year." In the body of their report, (p. 94, et seq. Heywood's edition) they enter upon this subject at large; they say: "We are of opinion that it is a matter of the highest importance, that scholarships should be augmented where they are of inconsiderable value, and that they should also be greatly increased in number." "To the efficiency of the Colleges, open Scholarships, to supply good learners, are as essential as open Fellowships [in Canada, we may substitute *as liberal salaries,*] are to supply good teachers. Some judgment of the influence of open Scholarships on the utility and honour of a College, may be formed from the amount of University distinctions obtained by the several colleges. It will be found, that they more nearly correspond to the number of the open Scholarships offered to under-graduates, than to the other merits and advantages of the respective societies." Then follow the changes they recommend in the several endowments, and they add: "By these simple changes we calculate that nearly 500 Scholarships of the value of £50 a year or more, besides rooms, might be provided, of which, at least 100 would become vacant annually." Supposing that these Scholarships were so arranged, as with us, that the fortunate candidates had to contend annually for the retention of them, instead of holding them for five years without further competition, the whole 500 would be competed for annually by about 1200 students, or they would be about as 1 to  $2\frac{1}{2}$  students, at an average cost of \$100 per student, as compared with ours last year, as 1 to  $4\frac{1}{2}$ , at an average cost of \$30 per student, which Dr. Cook would further reduce to a sum which, even if our students never increased beyond the present number, would only be \$10 per student.

I must apologize for the length at which I have treated this subject, but it is one of vital importance, and even more so, perhaps, in this country than in England. The University Act authorized the Senate to endow Scholarships for the aid and encouragement of students, and that it was no niggardly endowment that was originally contemp-

lated is shewn by the intention expressed in the Bill to endow two for each county in Upper Canada. This clause was withdrawn, principally at my own instigation, not because it was excessive in amount, but because it was falling back upon the old idea, which was being abandoned in England, of close Scholarships. The Senate, therefore, created these open Scholarships, more truly open than those recommended by the Oxford Commissioners, inasmuch as, though *obtainable* by any one, theirs can only be *held* in a particular College, whilst ours,—be it said once for all, in spite of therepeated assertions of different witnesses, that they are intended to lure students away from the minor Colleges—are unconnected with any College. A student of Queen's or Victoria may hold one, if he can obtain it, and may continue to pursue his studies there; or a young man who can come up to the standard may hold one, whether he belong to any college or not, and many are so held. All that we require is that he shall compete with the whole Province before us, and that he shall proceed to his Degree in the Provincial University, from whose endowment he has benefited.

I have now gone through the principal items in which we are accused of having misappropriated the University endowment, and I am quite content that the Committee shall judge between us. Some minor items are also instanced, as a Commission of Inquiry with which the University had nothing to do; and Incidentals, an item ingeniously made up by combining the contingent expenses of managing the endowment with the incidental expenses of the University and College, although given separately in the accounts. Many of the minor items are exceptional in their character, and others have been reduced. If any remain which are excessive, let them be reduced also; but let not the efficiency of the teaching staff of the College, and the power of the University to reward and encourage meritorious students, be impaired.

Dr. Ryerson, who does not go into details, gives a comparative statement of the expenses of different Canadian Educational Institutions. I have not attempted to verify all that gentleman's figures. When I found the University income stated at \$81,000, by mixing up Upper Canada College with it, and ignoring the expense of managing our endowment; and a salary of £125 a year to the Bursar of Trinity, compared with the staff necessary to manage our landed property;—when I saw the incidental expenses of the same institution called \$386, whereas they were £386, and its total expenses per year set down as \$7,526, whereas the statement published in the Journal of Education for January gives them as \$16,744, and that expressly excluding \$1,380 for Scholarships, which are chargeable on the general fund, besides which there are others to the amount of \$2820, which are specially provided for;—when, proceeding to the next item, I found Victoria was set down as \$6000, whilst Doctor Green has shown that the salaries alone are \$7600—I gave up the attempt as useless. I will, however, subjoin a comparative statement, which I hope will be found more accurate, of the expenditure of the Provincial University and College in Canada, and the analogous establishments in England and Ireland.

In comparing the University of Toronto with that of London, I have excluded in the former the cost of Buildings, and the formation of the Library and Museum, there being nothing analogous to this in the latter; nor is there any necessity for them, as the British Museum is free to all, and is, in fact, frequented by students to an extent embarrassing to the officers in charge:—

|                                      | London, from<br>Estimates of 1857. | Toronto,<br>1859. | Toronto College,<br>since 1854. |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|
| Salaries, including servants - - -   | \$ 5,010                           | \$3,026           | \$2,967                         |
| Examiners - - - - -                  | 12,459                             | 1,760             | 1,957                           |
| Scholarships, Medals, and Prizes - - | 5,429                              | 6,417             | 5,067                           |
| Incidental - - - - -                 | 2,307                              | 2,624             | 2,831                           |
|                                      | <u>\$25,205</u>                    | <u>13,827</u>     | <u>12,812</u>                   |

Of these amounts, as I have before stated, \$6324 is estimated to be paid by fees, but even deducting them the portion of the expense paid by the State very much exceeds ours.

I find by a Parliamentary Return of 1859 that, exclusive of the Buildings, which were otherwise provided for, the Queen's University and Colleges in Ireland cost the country for the last year £26,930, or \$131,000, which is only a trifle more than the average since 1851.

This is about three times the cost of the University and University College, in Canada, for the same period, and with the same exclusions, but they had not quite double the number of students; viz:—385 to 196.

The different items of the expenditure are not so easily accessible, and cannot be compared separately, as the Scholarships there are included in the Colleges, and the libraries are provided for, not by a definite appropriation, but out of an annual grant. Suffice it to say that each College receives £8,600 sterling a year, or \$41,850; and the University about \$11,000. The larger items of expenditure, for Examiners and Scholarships, have already been compared, and the only other large items, the cost of the Professorial Staff in each College, is nearly the same as our own. At Cork, in 1859, it is given as \$24,820, besides tuition fees; with us for the same year it was \$24,480, with no fees except from occasional students. Other fees have been almost abolished, as with us, the Government having increased the former grant by £1,600 sterling, in lieu of them. This sum for salaries, however, includes the Professors of Law and Medicine, amounting together to £700 sterling, or £3,406, so that the amount paid to the Professors in Arts is about \$3,000 less than with us, but the amount estimated for fees from matriculated students, upwards of \$2000 brings them nearly to the same. It is also to be remarked that the salaries paid are very low as compared with other similar institutions elsewhere, and that this evil has notoriously resulted from it, that their most efficient Professors are constantly drafted into other better endowed Institutions.

(4.) I now come to the fourth charge against the University, insisted upon principally by Dr. Ryerson, viz., that the standard of education has been lowered. This charge divides itself into three several heads (1), that the examination for Matriculation has been reduced; (2), that an unprecedented number of options has been introduced; and (3) that the standard for a Degree has been lowered.

A definite course of study having been laid down in a College, the object of a Matriculation examination is to ascertain that a student presenting himself is far enough advanced to enter upon that course; if not, either the other students would be impeded in their progress, or he would be neglected. The Matriculation examination must, therefore, be adapted to the course of study in the College, but the course in the College itself must be made to harmonize with the education, which can be obtained out of its doors. If the College commence at too high a standard for the schools, the great bulk of the youth must be debarred from entering it at all; or another evil will follow, that not only the examination for matriculants, but, as a necessary consequence, the earlier years of the College course itself, will become a mere paper scheme which is not acted upon in practice. The real standard for entering the University, whatever it may be made in theory, must be based on the standard of the schools of a country. If that should be low, you must not be content to sink the Colleges to their level; but you must not place them so far out of reach as to make the entrance into them hopeless. It is a somewhat delicate process to make the adjustment, and in a growing country like this, it will require not unfrequent revision. The Colleges should certainly not commence above the standard of the best schools, but they should be greatly in advance of that of the inferior ones; and as the schools improve, the standard of entrance to the Colleges may be raised, first by increasing the difficulty of the honor subjects, and then by adding to the qualifications required from all Students, and before long we may, perhaps, return to a three years' course. Some excellent Grammar Schools we no doubt have, and I have no fear but that they will continue to improve; but it is notorious that if a much higher matriculation examination were prescribed and acted on, the young men from many parts of the country would be altogether excluded from the University, unless their parents were able to afford to send them for preparatory training to Upper Canada College, or some other superior Grammar School. In confirmation of these views I would appeal to the valuable evidence of Dr. Cook, as to the impossibility of establishing a Matriculation Examination which is not in harmony with the capabilities of the School, and in his earlier statement he shows the necessity of having tutors in the Colleges, as well as Professor, for the express purpose of bringing forward those who are deficient in particular branches. Dr. Ryerson asks, why this complaint of the inefficiency of the Grammar Schools was not made before. The answer is, that it was made, and no complaint with regard to the old University was more frequent, than that its high standard of entrance

practically confined its benefits to a favored class. With the object of remedying this evil, the new University added a year to the course of study, so as to complete in the University what had been left unfinished in the Schools. But, says Dr. Rycerson, "they did not at the same time lower the entrance examination, except by leaving out one book." It is true they did not, but there were not wanting a large number of the Senate, Dr. Ryerson amongst the rest, who contended that this was a mistake, and that the object of adding a year to the course was not fully accomplished without a further reduction, and when a fitting opportunity occurred, the change was made to harmonize with the new arrangement. Dr. Ryerson says that the Grammar School Act forbids the employment of any person not a graduate, or who has not been examined in all the subjects of our Matriculation, both for pass and honors; but does he mean to say that they in fact do pass such an examination, and are competent to teach the subjects? I hope the Committee will call for the Grammar School Inspectors, who can tell them what chance the mass of the Grammar School pupils, and even a great many of the Grammar Schools Masters, would have of passing the common Matriculation Examination only, even as at present established. As for myself, I have now had experience of four matriculation examinations, and can answer for the test being strictly applied, except perhaps in Latin composition, which has hitherto been much neglected in our Grammar Schools; and from the difficulty that many of the Students, even from schools of some repute, experience in coming up to the mark, I am not surprised at the complaints which were formerly made, that King's College was practically closed to the bulk of the people.

It is stated in the Memorial of the Methodist Conference, that the standard of Matriculation is below that of other Universities. I will proceed to show, confining myself for the present to Greek and Latin, the department complained of, that though it is below that in the old University,—because, as I have explained, that was too high,—it is not below those which we may well take, and by the law are directly instructed to take, as our models. At Oxford and Cambridge, there is, properly speaking, no Matriculation Examination in the University, though there is in some of the Colleges. Generally speaking, nothing is required but the certificate of a Graduate, probably his Schoolmaster, that a Student is competent. I am not aware of the precise requirements at any of the Colleges at Cambridge, (at my own there was no examination), but the Oxford Commissioners state what is required by the best Colleges at Oxford; viz: "some facility in Latin writing, and a fair acquaintance with the grammatical principles of Greek and Latin. To this is now generally added Arithmetic and a portion of the Elements of Euclid," p. 276. They, however, recommend that a Matriculation Examination should be established, somewhat similar to that now called Responsions, which is passed between the 3rd and the 7th terms, and the subjects at that examination are one Greek author and one Latin author, to be selected by the Student from a list given, and translation into Latin prose. The authors we require occur in this list, but they must take more of them, as both the Jugurtha and Catiline of Sallust, and four books of the Anabasis. We, however, require two Latin authors, and it must be remembered that the Commissioners do not contemplate a strict examination; for, in answer to the objection that the standard must be made so low as to exclude almost none, they recommend that good answering in one subject may excuse insufficiency in another.

At Cambridge, the examination corresponding to the Responsions at Oxford, and the only substitute for a Matriculation examination, consists of one of the gospels in Greek, Paley's Evidence, and one Greek and one Latin author, which were, in the year when I passed the examination, one book of Homer, and one book of Virgil; and for the present year, the 6th book of Virgil and the last of the Anabasis.

In the University of London, which was proposed as our model, they require, together with translation into Latin, one Greek, and one Latin book, selected annually from a list given, in which list appear, all the three books we require, and the same quantity of each. Our examination is therefore, if the number of books be taken as a test, higher than theirs.

In the Queen's University Ireland, the Matriculation is conducted in the Colleges. I have not been able to find the subjects at Galway, if there be such an examination there; at Belfast it is two Greek and two Latin Books; at Cork it is the first Book of the Anabasis, and first Book of Virgil, two of the three Books we require.

Dr. Ryerson, whilst quoting the recommendation of the Commissioners, that the Matriculation examination should not be reduced below what it is, laid upon the table the course at Belfast, which is rather higher than ours? Why did he not also submit that of Cork, which is rather lower? Both no doubt were right, being guided by the qualifications of the Schools they had to deal with, and both were equally alluded to in the recommendation of the Commissioners.

I think that I have thus satisfactorily shewn that we, even with the imperfectly organized Schools of a new country, require from our Students at entrance, as much as has been thought advisable even in England, with all the facilities of acquiring Classical knowledge, which its numerous and long established Schools afford.

In Canada, at Trinity College, which is certainly not inferior in its appreciation of Classical learning to Victoria or Queen's, the Matriculation examination is substantially the same as our own, but rather lower, only requiring two books to our three. As to the Colleges in the United States, I am unacquainted with the measure of strictness with which their examination is applied; but this I will say without any fear of contradiction, that if, as the italics of the pamphlet of the Methodist Conference imply, they expect a lad upon leaving School to have read the *whole* of Virgil, and the *whole* of Cæsar, his time would have been much better employed in learning something of other authors. To any one acquainted with the subject it bears upon the face of it the stamp of a paper programme, as much as does the *whole* of Livy and the *whole* of Herodotus, as a part of the first year's course at Victoria College.

Upon the subject of the options permitted in the University of Toronto Dr. Ryerson, is very decided. His argument is this, in the main features of which he is supported by Dr. Cook—that a University course is not intended to be adapted to the tastes and capacities of the various students, but “to discipline the powers of the mind by a common course of application and exercises, sanctioned by the experience of ages, and for which Utopian experimenters have found no substitute, any more than they have found a substitute for ordinary food and exercise requisite for physical development and discipline”—the two subjects for which no substitute can be found being Greek and Latin and Mathematics. Now, I am far from undervaluing these two studies, which, when I was at College, were the only recognized subjects of an Academical course—the former more particularly, as a means of mental discipline, and the latter far more for its practical utility. But there have not been wanting men of the highest position in the intellectual world, who have argued that they were, not merely, not the only, but not even the best studies, for forming the mind; whilst the practical utility of many new subjects has been gradually forcing them into the established studies of the Universities. There has been also a growing conviction, that from the narrow limits of the studies of our Public Schools and Universities, they were not fitting men for the actual business of life. The whole tendency of educational reform, for the last thirty years, has been in this direction, and if the transactions of this Committee ever find their way into the hands of persons interested in such subjects at home, it will raise considerable surprise in their minds, that the exploded systems of Europe are finding refuge in the new world, and that a new dynasty of Latin and Greek, is sought to be raised up in the Universities of Canada.

Old prejudices are not easily overcome, especially in Universities, which are the most conservative of bodies, and the change has been gradual, but it has been steady; and as new subjects have been introduced, options as a necessity, have followed in their foot steps. Where Classics and Mathematics, as at Cambridge, or Classics and Mental Sciences as at Oxford, formed the staple of the University course, no great amount of individual choice could be left to the students; but as the various branches of Natural Philosophy increased in intricacy and importance; as Chemistry, Geology and Political Economy assumed the proportion of Sciences; and with Natural History and Modern Languages, claimed a position as recognized subjects of study, it became evident that no student could give equal attention to all, and that some latitude of selection must be allowed. At first, as was natural, the old subjects retained their position and the new ones alone were made optional. But this, also, is passing away, and the exclusive supremacy of Latin and Greek, though their intrinsic value can never be forgotten, is almost at an end.

I will not pursue the argument as to whether this has been wise or not ; I believe the Committee would prefer to learn from me what is the actual practice of the English Universities, and what are the recommendations of the Royal Commissioners for their further reform. The University of London, naturally presents itself first to our notice, not only as the model proposed to us, but also as being untrammelled in its action, by time honoured statutes and prejudices ; I must, however, notice a difference which exists in their method of conferring Degrees, which affects this question of the course of study. We prescribe a four years course ; that is, the examination for the degree of B. A., in the ordinary way of proceeding to it, is the fourth examination after that for Matriculation, and the degree of M. A., as in the older English Universities, follows as a matter of course without examination. In London, they have a two years course, and the degree of B. A., is given on the second examination after Matriculation, and that of M. A., follows the next year on a third examination. In comparing the two courses, we must therefore remember, that, with them, the examination for M. A., is the third or final one ; with us the fourth, or final one, is that for B. A.

Now, in the University of London, the first examination after Matriculation is extremely similar to ours, excepting that there is no Greek at all, and, as with us, no options are allowed. The second examination is rather above us, especially in Mathematics, and no options are allowed, neither are they with us, except to the few who have been first class honor men, in *either* Classics or Mathematics, or in *both* Natural Sciences and Modern Languages. To our third examination, they have nothing corresponding, and at their final examination they allow any one of these three branches to be taken, viz. Classics, Mathematics, or Mental and Moral Sciences: a greater license than we allow to any but first class honor men. But this is not all, for to meet the growing necessity of options, they have established a new degree, unknown before in English Universities, though existing in the University of Paris : viz., that of Bachelor and Doctor of Science. A student offering himself for this course, may, *after matriculation*, i. e., one year, before we permit any options at all, and two years before we permit them to mere pass men, drop Classics and Modern Languages altogether. At the second examination, he may drop pure Mathematics altogether, and at the final examination, that for Doctor of Science, he need only take one of no less than 16 options. The extent to which the different branches of Science are subdivided in this scheme, may be conceived from the fact, that organic and inorganic Chemistry are distinct branches, and so are Geology and Palæontology. Nay, the several branches are again subdivided into principal and subsidiary subjects, and he is to have a thorough knowledge of the one, but need only show a general acquaintance with the other. Thus, a candidate selecting Mathematics as his branch, may take pure Mathematics as the principal subject, with only a general knowledge of applied Mathematics, or *vice versa*.—The Committee, therefore, can judge for themselves, how far Dr. Ryerson is borne out in his assertions, that “it is not the object of Collegiate education to minister to individual tastes,” that “in English Universities Natural Sciences are not admitted as a substitute for Mathematics,” that “in no case are both Classics and Mathematics, allowed to be abandoned during any part of the course,” and that “there is not a University or College in Great Britain, that would not scout the idea of conferring a degree on such terms.”

At the Queen's University, Ireland, the system of options is also permitted, though differing in arrangement from ours. At the first examination after matriculation, as with us there are no options. At the second (one year before we permit any, except to first class honor men) there is an option for all students between Classics and Mathematics. At the end of the third year, (and herein they differ principally from us,) they take over again some branches of all departments, and it is to be observed that this is exactly the examination which the Commissioners propose to alter. At the fourth or final examination, which with them also is that for M. A., four options are allowed. Classics with one Modern Language, Mathematics and Natural Philosophy, English with Logic and Metaphysics, or with Jurisprudence, and Political Economy, and the Natural Sciences—any one of the four being sufficient for obtaining the degree. In his supplementary evidence, Dr. Ryerson has appealed to the report of the Commissioners on the Queen's University and Colleges, and considering the length to which his extracts from other writers extended, it is singular he should only have quoted from the Commissioners, their statement of the existing examina-

tion for B. A. and not the proposals which have been made to amend it. I will content myself with referring to the 19th page, the perusal of which will satisfy any member of the Committee, that they are not opposed to the system of options, and never dreamt of the exclusive studies recommended by Dr. Ryerson and Dr. Cook. They shew that the object of the present course contemplates "a wide and extensive general education" and that devotion to special subjects is encouraged by the M. A. Examination, and by the prizes and honors. They say that all the Professors are in favour of a general course, but think the present work too much, and what they mean by a general course is shewn by their different schemes as given in the Appendix, all of which, except one, greatly extend the system of options. They object to all these schemes as making too radical a change, and then give the remedy which meets most with their approbation, which is a step beyond what we go in the University of Toronto: viz., that there shall be an examination at the end of the second year, on the subjects of the course up to that time, which shall be final, as far as these subjects are concerned, and that at the B. A. examination, they need take only *one* of the three groups of the present B. A. examination, given in Dr. Ryerson's evidence, excluding Latin and Greek, Mathematics and Modern Languages, which have been finally disposed of at the end of the second year.

At Cambridge, the options until quite lately were permitted to honor men alone, that is all must pass the Previous Examination, the only substitute for, and certainly not more difficult than our Examinations required from all students. The Candidates for Mathematical Honors, might then branch off, being only required to take the theological subjects of the general Degree examination. The candidates for Classical honors used to be more limited, as they could not present themselves unless they had obtained a certain standing in the Mathematical *Tripes*. This arrangement, however, was modified some years ago, and the candidates for classical honors were only required to have taken a fair standing at the general Examination. Two new *Tripes* were also established on the same terms: viz., Moral Sciences, and Natural Sciences, a further proof of Dr. Ryerson's accuracy in stating that no British University admits of an option between Mathematics and the Natural Sciences. Whether the fifth *Tripes* for Modern Languages, has been actually established or not, I am not quite certain. If it has not it most certainly will be. Upon this subject, the Commissioners make the following observations. "Another addition, still more obviously suggested by considerations of utility is the study of Modern Languages. A system of liberal education cannot be regarded otherwise, than as defective, if it does not afford facilities and inducements for acquiring a knowledge of the treasures of German, French and Italian literature."—"We confidently indulge the hope that it will, ere long, be recognized by the University as worthy of being fostered by honors and rewards." I am aware that the objection may be raised that these options were only for the *honor* men, and that they, except the Mathematicians, must also pass the Degree examination. But what is the Degree examination itself? It is little more than a repetition of the previous examination. One Greek and one Latin book, part of the Acts, or an Epistle, instead of a Gospel in the Greek Testament, Algebra, the rest of Euclid, and the Elementary Principles of Mechanics and Hydrostatics, with Paley, and some Church History, certainly not more than we expect from all our students at some part of their course. I am sure the Committee will excuse me if I quote from the Report of the Commissioners, the recommendations of which, were in a great measure adopted last year. After speaking of the previous Examination, they add, "After the completion of five more terms, those Candidates for the degree of Bachelor of Arts, who do not offer themselves for mathematical honors, are again subjected to an examination, differing but little in its general character from that which they passed in the middle of their term. Mathematics and Greek and Latin still form a considerable part of it. But these are subjects, in which time had long shewn that most of this class of students did not possess the desire or the aptitude to excel. If their taste and talents had inclined that way, the majority of them would no doubt have been found in the career of competition for mathematical and classical honors. For five weary terms they have been compelled to continue a course of reading, which, whatever attractions, whatever benefits it may have for others, is to them irksome, and, need we hesitate to say, little better than unprofitable." "What we suggest then is that the examination of students in Arts, at the end of the fifth term, should take place as at present, and in the same

subjects, with the addition of such further parts of Euclid and Algebra as are now introduced at the final examination for those who are not candidates for mathematical honors. After the general body of students have passed this examination collectively, they might then, in our opinion, be allowed, for the following four terms to select freely for themselves, with the sanction of their college tutor, such lines of recognized academical study as were best suited to their aptitudes and tastes and professional destinations. Some would aspire to honors in the several *Tripases*, others would prepare themselves for the first degree in Law or Physic. The rest, who sought or obtained no honors, would be finally subjected to some process of examination, in order to make it evident that they had attended such a range of lectures in their last four terms, and acquired such a proficiency as to qualify them for a first degree in arts." They then go on to shew how candidates for honors in the four existing *Tripases*, and others which might be added, as Modern Languages and Civil Engineering, would obtain their degree, and they proceed—"Corresponding to the examination for honors in each several *Tripas*, there would be a collateral examination at the same time and in the same subjects for those students who had adopted that particular line of study, though not seeking the distinction of an academical honor in it. As many as passed this collateral examination satisfactorily should also thereupon be entitled, in point of academical proficiency, to the degree of Bachelor of Arts," which they would accord on the same terms as those whose final examination was in Theology. "The change itself of the system, which we have proposed, would, in our opinion, be attended with great advantages. There would still be, as now, an ardent competition and high standard of attainment preserved both in the mathematical and classical *Tripases*. Eminent distinction gained in them would still continue to be the prelude to a Fellowship in a College. At the same time, the Moral and Natural Science *Tripases* would rise into increased importance, in proportion as the Colleges began to recognize superior merit in those departments as forming also a recommendation to a Fellowship. But the positive advantage would probably be more marked in the case of that numerous class of students who are contented with an ordinary Degree, not feeling themselves fitted to embark in the competition for academical honors. After passing the previous examination they might turn their four remaining terms to a really profitable account, by preparing themselves for their future professions; or, at least, they might continue to find in academical pursuits that degree of interest and improvement which arises from variety and choice of study." (p. 27.) This is the scheme of academical study recommended by men of such European reputation as the Bishop of Chester, Peacock, Herschel, Romilly, and Sedgwick, and it goes even further in admitting the principle of options than the Senate of the University have ventured to follow. The Committee can have an opportunity of comparing it with what Dr. Ryerson in his evidence has stated to be the nature of their recommendations.

At Oxford they have not as yet proceeded so far in introducing a principle which must ultimately prevail, but they have already advanced to a considerable extent in the same direction. The subjoined extract from the Commissioners' report will shew both what the present practice is and what it is recommended that it should become. "The Senate has admitted the necessity of affording some liberty of choice to the student with regard to the subjects which he is to pursue during the latter part of his course. We are of opinion that this liberty should be extended. All students will henceforward (from 1850) be permitted to choose at pleasure the special studies of Law and History, of Mathematical Science, or of Natural Science; but previously to his examination in any of these branches, each candidate must still present himself in the school of *Literæ Humaniores*, to be there examined in classics for the third time, as well as in philosophy and history. No doubt this restriction was maintained in consequence of an opinion which has long prevailed at Oxford with regard to the nature of a liberal education," (and which, it would appear, is to be revived in Canada.) "It has been held to be the sole business of a University to train the powers of the mind, not to give much positive or any professional knowledge; and the study of classical books is regarded as the best means of refining and invigorating the mind. The education given has hitherto been the same for all, whether clergymen or barristers, medical men or private gentlemen. It has been limited to such subjects as were presumed to be common to all their kinds of life; and no one has left Oxford, under the

system hitherto pursued, much more fitted for one profession than for another." (p. 281.)

"Now the Statute of 1850 was an effort in the right direction; but its present regulations, which still retain the compulsory study of the *Literæ Humaniores* to the end of the course, will scarcely remedy the evil." (p. 282.)

"The obvious mode of amending this scheme would be to enact that all students, after giving satisfactory evidence of classical knowledge at the intermediate examination, (the first in the University) should be relieved from the necessity of continuing the studies of the grammar school, and should be at liberty for the latter period of their career to devote themselves to pursuits preparatory to their future professions. To this end it seems to us that the University might with the best results institute a division of studies, with corresponding examination schools, such as would better accord with the freedom of choice which should, as we think, be left to the student, after the intermediate examination, to be passed by all alike." (p. 287.) The Commissioners then proceed to explain the four schools with minor subdivisions, making in all nine branches, any of which might be chosen by the student after the middle of his second year as all that would be requisite to entitle him to a degree, viz: I. Theology; II. Divided into two, viz: (1) Mental Philosophy; (2) Philology, in which the student may be examined in Greek and Latin, or the Oriental and European Languages, or in Comparative Philology; III. Jurisprudence and History, including Political Economy; IV. Divided into two: (1) Pure and applied Mathematics; (2) Physical Science.

In rebutting thus at length the charge that our options have lowered the standard of our degree to an extent unprecedented in any other University, I have incidentally compared our requirements with others, and have shown, that in no sense is the study for our Degree below that required in our best models. I might, therefore, have passed over altogether the general accusation of the inferiority of the standard of education in the University of Toronto, had not Dr. Ryerson offered a proof of it, from the alleged inferiority of our students as Grammar School Teachers. Now, the preparation of young men for teaching Grammar Schools, is not the only, not even the highest object of a University; and until means have been provided to increase the remuneration offered, it is hopeless to expect that the best men will select such a miserably paid profession. Other qualities also are required in a Teacher than mere learning, as Dr. Ryerson must be well aware, having before him the example of a distinguished graduate of Oxford, who lately failed to maintain even a moderately successful school in Toronto—and of two men, graduates of British Universities, selected by himself for his Normal and Model Grammar Schools, who, upon trial, proved inefficient. I might also say, that even if the imputation were true, it would reflect little discredit upon our present course of study, which has only been established five years. The first men who entered with our present course, and have pursued it throughout, only graduated in June last; and to test the present University by the men it has hitherto produced, would be much like looking for fruit the year after planting an orchard. But I also have looked over the returns of the Grammar School Inspectors, whose own evidence the Committee can call for, and I say unhesitatingly, that their returns do not bear out Dr. Ryerson's statement, of any inferiority in our Students as compared with those of other Colleges. That such a charge against the kind of instruction given in University College should come from Dr. Ryerson, whose only Canadian Master in his Model Grammar School has been selected from our graduates, does, I confess surprise me; especially when I remember a formal proposition made by him not very long since, for the foundation of certain Scholarships in connection with University College, for the express purpose of educating Grammar School Masters. This proposition, which will be found recorded in our Minutes, was rejected by the Senate, because we thought we had already a sufficient number of Scholarships provided, without establishing 10 more; because we thought £30 a year a sufficient stipend, whereas he proposed £50 a year for his; because ours are awarded for proficiency in the honor as well as the pass subjects, and his candidates were to be examined in the mere common pass subjects of the first year only; and because ours are open to the whole Province, whilst no one was to be allowed to compete for his, except those who came with a recommendation from the Council of Public Instruction. I think the Committee will agree with me, that this proposition is an instructive comment, not only upon the alleged incompetency of University

College for preparing Grammar School Teachers, but also upon the extravagance and exclusiveness with which we are charged, and upon the desire which Dr. Ryerson expresses to maintain a high standard of education.

It was then ordered on motion of Mr. *Cayley* that the statement above be printed in full, and that Mr. *Langton* be requested to appear again on Friday.

The Committee then adjourned till Friday, at 11 o'clock.

Friday, 20th April, 1860.

COMMITTEE MET.

PRESENT:

The Hon. MALCOLM CAMERON, Chairman,  
 Hon. Mr. CAYLEY,  
 Hon. Mr. FOLEY,  
 Hon. Mr. Atty. Gen. MACDONALD,  
 Mr. MACCANN,  
 Mr. ROBBIN,  
 Mr. SIMPSON,  
 Mr. WILSON.

The Revd. Messrs. *Cook*, *Ryerson*, *Stinson*, *Nelles* and *Poole* were in attendance.

The Revd. Messrs. *Ambery* and *Whitaker*, of Trinity College, Toronto, were in attendance.

*John Langton*, Esq., Vice-Chancellor, and Professor *Wilson*, of University of Toronto, were in attendance.

Mr. *Langton* continued his statement as follows : and was further Examined.

(5.) Having now disposed of the several heads under which the Petitioners have brought charges against the management of the University, it remains only for me to speak to the general question of the policy of denominational or non-denominational Colleges, supported by the State, and of establishing one College, which shall be thoroughly and efficiently organized, or dividing the endowment amongst several.

As to the first question, I do not desire to enter into the general argument. The Committee, I conceive, wish to obtain from me facts and not opinions, which they have no doubt long since formed for themselves, upon a subject which, for the last twenty years, has been so prominently before the country. I would merely remark that, whether the prevailing opinion of Upper Canada, that no aid from the State should be given towards education exclusively under the control of any particular religious denomination, be right or wrong, we should at least be consistent in our application of the principle which guides us. Dr. Cook is perfectly consistent in the views which he advocates. He holds that all education should be in the hands of persons, for whose general character some particular religious community stands sponsor—and quotes with approbation the opinion of Baron Alderson, that it is impossible to give secular instruction in common, and that it is essential even for a teacher of arithmetic to hold orthodox views upon the doctrine of the Trinity. If such be the opinion of the majority of the people of Upper Canada, then it follows as a matter of course, that the endowment should be divided amongst the denominational Colleges, and University College should be abolished. But if an opposite opinion prevails, as it would appear to do from the constitution of our Common and Grammar Schools, I can see no argument against Separate Schools, which does not equally apply to separate Colleges. "If," says Dr. Ryerson, in his evidence, "aid is provided in support of a College for those who prefer a College without any religious character or influences, it is unjust and preposterous to deny aid to Colleges for those who demand colleges invested with a religious character and influences." And again, "If an institution teaches the subjects of a collegiate education in connection with no religion, it is to be endowed; but if it teaches the same subjects in connection with any religious persuasion, it is to be proscribed. Thus the religious character of a college is

a disqualification for public aid! Can anything be more monstrous?" Read *Schools and Colleges*, and you have the argument for Separate Schools forcibly put. Again, in his report of 1856, Dr. Ryerson says, "It is only, therefore, for very grave causes that the State can be justified in allowing any portion of the population to be isolated from a system of public instruction. But where this is claimed, with the avowed view to the interests of a religious persuasion, the answer is, 'The State has nothing to do with the peculiar interest of sects, but has every thing to do with the school education of its youth.' The State equally tolerates and protects the former, but it largely provides for the latter. As, therefore, a system of Public Schools is based upon public interests, members of no sect or religious persuasion can claim on constitutional or public grounds, that any of such schools should be made sectarian, or that public funds should be expended for the support of sectarian schools at all, much less that such schools should be placed on the same footing as Public Schools. The sole object of public schools is secular education; the leading object of sectarian schools is sectarian interests—with which the State does not interfere where there is no semblance of union between Church and State." Here, if you read *Colleges for Schools*, the contrary argument is still more forcibly sustained.

But, putting the religious argument aside altogether, and supposing a College to be as free from denominational bias as Victoria is claimed to be, when it is no longer to the liberality of the Methodist persuasion, but to the sympathies of the public at large that the appeal is made; is it for the interest of the country that the endowment should be scattered in small sums over the country in support of a number of local institutions? I entirely concur in the general principle of the London University, that students, wherever educated, should have the same facilities for obtaining scholastic honors,—the principle upon which our University was constituted, and which has been fully acted on by the Senate; but I also believe that it was a wise policy to found one College, free to all, having no advantages over any others, except what its greater educational capabilities might naturally afford it. I should be sorry to see the smaller Colleges closed, be they denominational or otherwise, and I should wish to see them, and I do not yet despair of seeing them sending their fair quota to the examinations of the Provincial University, and sharing in the Scholarships and honors which it has provided. But at least one College should be sustained by the State, in which every branch of learning and science, which forms a recognized part of a liberal education, can be taught efficiently under the best instructors. It cannot be expected that the minor Colleges would keep up a teaching staff embracing all the numerous ramifications of modern science, and it is hardly to be desired that they should, for the number of Professors would thus become unnecessarily multiplied,—if thoroughly efficient, at a cost altogether disproportioned to the number of students, or what is far more probable, as a mere repetition in unnecessary profusion of an imperfect and incompetent model. But there is nothing to hinder them from having competent men in some of the most essential departments; and as the preferences for special studies of the ruling denomination, or the tastes of each locality dictated, or from the lucky acquisition of some eminently successful teacher, each College would gradually acquire, as has been the case in England, a reputation for success in particular departments. The system of options already adopted, and which must hereafter ever form the basis of a University scheme, would give their students the fullest opportunity of carrying off their share of honors and emoluments; and if the preference of the petitioners for one or two time-hallowed studies, over the more modern extended course be correct, the superiority of their scheme of instruction would be manifested. But the Provincial College should make provision for everything that it is desirable to include in a University course. To leave the selection of studies to the individual Colleges, would be to run the risk of leaving some important subject unrepresented, and would drive our youth to go elsewhere to gain the desired knowledge; to prescribe a uniform course for all, would be as I have said, to multiply teachers unnecessarily, to force upon Victoria, History and English Literature, which Dr. Ryerson thinks are already sufficiently taught in the Grammar Schools, and modern Languages upon Queen's, whose Principal thinks them not only an unnecessary, but a positively injurious addition to Academical studies. The present University Act provides everything that is requisite for such an organization, which I think the best adapted to the state of the country, and any modifications in the Constitution of the Senate, or in other minor particu-

lars, could easily be introduced even without additional legislation. My own idea of the best constitution for that body would be, that a certain fixed number should be appointed by the Crown, that each College which sent up a certain number of Students for examinations should be entitled to elect one member, and after a certain number of Students two members, and that the Graduates yearly assembled in convocation, should elect certain other members—it being provided that if any affiliated College surrendered its charter, or as long as it held its charter in abeyance, all the graduates of such College should rank as graduates of the Provincial University. I should also think it advisable that all members of the Senate, whether elected or appointed, should hold their seats only for a fixed term of years, but should be re-eligible.

As to the endowment, having shown the cost of similar institutions elsewhere. I do not believe that some will for some years to come much exceed what is requisite to keep up the Provincial College in full efficiency, and the University with its necessary expenditure in maintaining a Provincial Library [and Museum, competent examiners and a liberal allowance for Scholarships. If any considerable surplus should arise,—and I agree with the petitioners that all extravagance should be discouraged and prevented, for which the Visitor has ample powers,—such surplus might most profitably in my opinion be devoted, under such regulations as Parliament might make in accordance with the 54th clause, to an object in which all the Colleges have an equal interest, and not only the Colleges but the whole country, viz: the improvement of our Grammar Schools. This is at present the weakest point in our whole educational system. We have admirable Common Schools, and a liberal appropriation for the Normal and its accompanying Model Schools, we have a staff of Professors connected with the Provincial College, who would reflect credit upon any similar body even in England, and the denominational Colleges have, I believe, under considerable difficulties, accomplished their work well. But in the higher schools we are unfortunately deficient, not from the lack of men to undertake them, so much as from the want of funds from which to provide a stipend liberal enough to attract thoroughly qualified teachers. Perhaps the best way of doing this would be to found certain annual allowances which should be awarded on examination, and should be tenable only by persons actually engaged in teaching Grammar Schools, or employed as tutors or professors in incorporated Colleges not otherwise endowed by the State. As the word fellowship seems appropriated to a connection with a particular College, such recipients of stipends from the University funds might be called “associates” or some equivalent term, and the emoluments might be held for a limited term of years.

The scheme propounded by Dr. Cook would, no doubt, have been improved in its details, had he had an opportunity of maturely considering them, and I will not therefore judge it by its minor arrangements. But it appears to me, apart from its denominational aspect, to be based upon three unsound principles. 1. It establishes a uniform, and therefore, necessarily limited, course of study for all, in direct opposition to the practice of the best Universities, and the strong recommendation of both the Oxford and Cambridge Commissioners, whose guiding principle is liberty to individual choice. This it does, not only in accordance with Dr. Cook's individual opinions as to what are the most important branches of study, but as a necessary consequence of the equal subdivision of Government aid; for it is impossible that several small bodies can be so organized as to afford much opportunity of selection to the students. This can only be accomplished by one large institution, or by several small ones united under one superintending power, but each selecting its own favorite branches, or, as I recommend, by both united. This variety in the means of study is not inconsistent with uniformity in the qualifications required by the general superintending body. The University must still regulate the choice of departments which it would permit, the relative values which it would assign to each, and the uniform standard of proficiency in each, which it required as a qualification for its degree or its honors. A high honor at Cambridge has a definite and well appreciated value, though one man obtained it in mathematics alone, and another by classics; and the London M. A. is equally valuable, whether obtained on an examination in Classics, Mathematics, or Mental and Moral Sciences.

2. It is based upon the extremest views of decentralization. Dr. Cook admits the greater stimulus to intellectual activity in a numerously attended institution, but thinks it

counterbalanced by a greater chance of moral corruption. I am by no means sure that a youth, who has soon to go out into the world without any controul, is not the better for a preparatory training amongst those of his own age, with such supervision as can always be exercised in a College; and that a higher tone of morality may not be cultivated under the influence of the public opinion of a large body, than by mixing only with a limited society. I am very sure that if he has mixed freely with men of various habits of thought, and various religious denominations, if he has met upon equal terms with his superiors and his inferiors, both in intellectual power and worldly position, if he has seen bright examples to emulate as well as evil ones to avoid, he will be a better member of society, and freer from those petty prejudices which always grow up in a narrow circle, and not the least so in a strictly denominational College. But as a question of education, in the sense of acquiring knowledge, there can be doubt at all. One young man of really superior attainments exercises an exciting influence, both upon his fellow students and his teachers, which you can rarely hope to find in a small body. Emulation is the great spur, especially amongst the young, and the larger the body of competitors the greater is the emulation excited. The reason is plain. The best man in twenty, having no one further to contend with, is apt to be content with, and overestimate his position; but bring him into competition with five more men similarly situated, each urges the other on, and you obtain five men in the hundred, each superior to what he would have been in the narrower sphere. The mere encounter of such men at an annual examination is not sufficient, it is the daily contest in the lecture room which keeps up an animation in their studies. But it is not only from studying the common College course, not even with the emulation of the common lecture room, that the great benefit of a University education is derived. In the free intercourse of the College every student finds some one well informed upon a subject of which he is comparatively ignorant, and gets indications which help and direct him in his private studies. He learns to appreciate talent, and to have a taste and respect for learning, even when he does not himself excel. He comes out from College a man of enlarged and cultivated mind, which no number of books of Livy, or propositions of Euclid would ever have made him. These advantages can be but partially obtained in a small community, and though small Colleges will doubtless continue to exist for local and denominational reasons, and perhaps not without some special advantages, I cannot think it a commendable scheme, which would systematically break up the youth, who seek a College education, into numerous small societies.

(3.) But if this decentralising system is bad in itself, even if all were amply endowed, to divide a limited sum so that no College would be efficiently supported, must be fatal to the superior education of the country. It is idle to say that because Victoria and Queen's are the only bodies petitioning, they alone, with the addition perhaps of Trinity, would claim a share. When the principle was once established, Knox's College and other Institutions, now existing only as Theological Schools, would establish secular chairs and assert their right to a free distribution. Nor would the demand be confined to Colleges connected with a particular religious persuasion. Local interests would come into play, and every large town would claim to have its College. Already there are in Upper Canada 12 Institutions of this kind in existence, or with charters of incorporation, and this year two new ones have sent in memorials to obtain a share with Kingston and Cobourg of the Government allowance. Dr. Cook thinks that he has provided a remedy to prevent them from becoming too numerous, but even the existing ones he can only support by cutting off from the teaching staff several departments, which, though thought unnecessary or even injurious at Queen's, are fostered and encouraged by the British Commissioners. Dr. Ryerson, however, contemplates with satisfaction the possible establishment of 10 Faculties in competing Colleges, each as he proposes receiving £1,500. What sort of a teaching staff they could afford to maintain, is evident from the complaints of Queen's and Victoria that their present means are inadequate. For it must be remembered that if the Government aid is proposed to be increased, the means supplied by voluntary contributions would be diminished; not only because it is the tendency of all Government assistance to paralyze individual liberality, but also because this source of income would be exhausted. The number of young men who seek, or can spare time for, a College career is limited in all countries, and a multiplication of Colleges would not bring an equal increase of students; the receipts from fees would therefore be reduced. Denominational piety and individual

liberality have also their bounds, and the majority of men who would contribute to such purposes have already done what they can afford. What aid could be expected from Municipalities to Institutions, from which the bulk of the people would derive no immediate advantage, may be judged from the starving condition of our Grammar Schools. Other sources of income to supplement the Government Grant being dried up, we should have ten or fifteen miserable attempts at a College, and should have destroyed as noble an endowment as any young country ever possessed. Nor can I see any safeguard in Dr. Cook's tests of the efficiency of the Colleges. A certain number of Professors is to be required. Professors will not be wanting if £1,500 is to be divided amongst them; but as to the efficiency of the Professors, it may be as difficult to determine that by legislation, as it has been found in the case of Grammar Schoolmasters. Then the Senate is to determine the standard of education. Surely Dr. Cook must have forgotten that the Senate, which, in its legislative capacity, is to fix the standard, and in its examining capacity is to ascertain whether that standard has been reached, is to be composed mainly of those Professors, or persons elected by them. The Professors may not, as has been unjustly alleged of the present Senate, fix the amount of their own salaries, but practically they will determine whether they are to have any salaries at all. You cannot by law fix a standard of education. It may sound paradoxical, but it is nevertheless true, that practically it is the students who fix it. If they are badly prepared the standard is low, for you cannot find Examiners who will reject the majority of the students. The only way to obtain a high standard is to provide such teachers as can bring their students up to it, and this can only be done by employing a sufficient number to enable them to do the work effectually, and by giving them such a remuneration as will insure the obtaining of able men.

Question submitted by Rev. Dr. Cook, and put—

[By the Chairman.]

Ques. 301. You have entered into a long argument in defence of the management of University College. Are you of opinion that supposing that argument to be ever so successful it affects any part of my statement. Several charges have been brought against the management of the Toronto University, regarding especially, extravagant expenditure, by which the aid which might otherwise have come to other colleges from the surplus revenues of the University has been rendered impossible. There have also been charges respecting the education required by the University, and given in University College. Such charges have been made generally in the memorial presented to Parliament, and a pamphlet professing to be a defence, of that memorial of the Wesleyan Conference has also been circulated giving these charges in greater detail. They have also been reproduced in the evidence of Dr. Ryerson, and partially in that of other witnesses. I think that in my reply I have shown all these accusations to be void of foundation, and that if Parliament were to yield to the wishes of the Denominational Colleges, they would seriously injure the cause of Academical Education in Canada. As far as Dr. Cook's evidence is concerned, he has brought no charges against the course of Education in University College; but I confine myself to the general argument, and the policy of establishing Denominational Colleges for several classes of the population in place of one, and to that I think I have fully replied.

The Rev. Dr. Whitaker, Provost of Trinity College, Examined.

Questions submitted by the Rev. Dr. Ryerson, and put

[By the Chairman.]

Ques. 302.—Are you a graduate of the University of Cambridge?—Yes.

Ques. 303.—Did you take honors at Cambridge?—Yes, in Mathematics and Classics. I was in the junior *optimi* in Mathematics—the first in Classics.

Ques. 304.—What was the period of your residence in Cambridge after taking your Degrees, and did you during that period hold any College office?—I was in residence from 1833 to 1839, and during two years of that time was Classical Lecturer, and subsequently for about two years more.

Ques. 305.—What situations have you filled in this country?—Provost of Trinity College since my arrival in 1851.

*Ques. 306.*—Do you know anything of the system of Options as allowed by the University of Toronto?—Yes.

*Ques. 307.*—Is there anything corresponding with this system in the University of Cambridge?—Something corresponding to it was introduced last year.

*Ques. 308.*—To what extent?—To this extent, that from the time of the previous examination in the middle of the second year, the student is at liberty to relinquish the study of Classics and Mathematics.

*Ques. 309.*—For what studies?—There are four courses. He may take honors in Mathematics or Classics, or may go out in the Natural Science *Tripes*, or in the Modern Science *Tripes*.

*Ques. 310.*—What is the standard of the previous examination at Cambridge, as compared with the second year examination at the University of Toronto?—It is considerably higher. At the time the change was introduced a considerable addition was made to the subjects of the previous examination, which has made it nearly if not quite equal to the former examination for the common Degrees.

*Ques. 311.*—The system of options thus established at Cambridge does not commence there till students have arrived at attainments equal to those formerly required for taking a degree?—I should say so.

*Ques. 312.*—Is there a Professor of Modern Languages at Cambridge?—No. But I think that an accident.

*Ques. 313.*—Is the option of substituting Modern Languages for the Classical ever allowed at Cambridge?—No. I will add that I think it undesirable that it should be so.

*Ques. 314.*—Do you think that the teaching of Hebrew is necessary in any but a Divinity College?—I do not.

*Ques. 315.* What is your opinion as to our Provincial University as an examining body, and for conferring Degrees?—It would be a great benefit on condition that the standard of examination were good; examiners competent and impartial, and the system something like permanent.

*Ques. 316.* Do you not think that several Colleges equally aided by the state would contribute much more to the extension of liberal Education, than one Endowed College?—I have no *data* sufficient to answer.

*Ques. 317.* Do you not think that competitive examinations of the Students of the several Colleges before a Provincial Board impartially constituted, would contribute greatly to the elevation and thoroughness of University Education in the Country?—Certainly.

*Ques. 318.* Are the Tutors at Cambridge permitted to examine their own students for honors or degrees?—Great care is taken that no such case shall occur, but I believe it is prevented rather by honorable feeling than by positive enactment. It is very undesirable that tutors should examine their own pupils for honours.

*Ques. 319.* Are there any Colleges at Cambridge, which do not charge fees for Tuition to their undergraduates?—No.

*Ques. 320.* What is your opinion of the expediency of allowing Students to hold Scholarships, who are not connected with any College, and not attending College Lectures?—I think it defeats the purpose for which Scholarships are founded.

*Ques. 321.* How many Scholarships are there belonging to the University of Cambridge?—I cannot say; but the number of University Scholarships is small, as compared with the College Scholarships. But the case is so unlike that of this country, that there is no analogy. University Scholarships are there tenable with College Scholarships.

*Ques. 322.* Are they not in your Calendar?—Yes, but it is not easy to reckon them up as there is no Summary.

*Ques. 323.* From what sources are the College Scholarships established, and how are they awarded?—The College Scholarships are sometimes called Foundation Scholarships, because provided by the original foundation. And very frequently other Scholarships have

been founded subsequently by private benefactions. They are awarded by some special examination in the College, or at the annual examinations.

*Ques. 324.* What is your opinion of the expediency of giving honors at a Matriculation Examination?—I think it very undesirable, and for the reason that at home honors are reserved for the final examination, and if we speak of honors gained at earlier examinations, it produces an injurious confusion of terms.

*Ques. 325.* Is it your opinion that there is any tendency in the recent University changes and civil service Examinations at home, to depreciate the study of Classics and encourage the study of more modern branches of learning in their stead?—I think so—in the late changes at Cambridge—not in the other competitive examinations which you mention.

Questions submitted by Mr. Langton, and put—

[*By the Chairman.*]

*Ques. 326.* You have mentioned the options introduced this year at Cambridge. Are you aware of similar options before this year?—There were no options strictly so-called before. I differ slightly from Mr. Langton's statement yesterday, that there have always been options, by which men were allowed to take a degree in Mathematics alone. The Mathematical Degree for honors, as originally conducted, involved a familiar knowledge of the Latin language. Those who took only the ordinary degree, were examined in Mathematics exclusively. But that was no option, but rather a neglect of Classics. In the University examinations afterwards, Classics were introduced for the ordinary degree, and in more recent changes an addition has been made to the studies required for the ordinary degree. But no option is allowed in either Mathematics or Classics.

*Ques. 327.* When you took your degree in Mathematics were you examined on any other subject, for Greek or Latin, than one of the Epistles or the Acts of the Apostles?—I first went into the Schools, where I had to write a thesis on Latin and to keep an act and three *opponencies*. Then I went into the *honour* examination, and then into the examination for Classical honours. For my degree I was not examined even on an Epistle or the Acts of the Apostles; but I should have been examined in Classics had I not been a Candidate for Mathematical honours.

*Ques. 328.* Did you not, after your previous examination in the middle of your second year, exercise an option between the Mathematics and Classics for your Degree; the examination in Classics you afterwards underwent being voluntary?—I had to choose Mathematics against my will.

*Ques. 329.* When were the *Tripases* of natural and moral sciences introduced?—First in 1851—before last year.

*Ques. 330.* You have stated that since the options were introduced, new subjects have been introduced at the previous examination. What were they?—I think the whole Mathematical examination for the B.A. Degree.

*Ques. 331.* Are you aware that any new classical subjects were introduced?—I do not know.

*Ques. 332.* Then as for the classical examination, as far as you know the previous examination stands where it did?—As far as I know; but I think it most improbable.

*Ques. 333.* Are you aware that the Royal Commissioners ordered that it should stand so?—I am not.

*Ques. 334.* What do you understand to be the important difference between the classical examination for the B. A. degree and the previous examination?—1st. In the difficulty of the subjects; and 2nd. On the recognized standard of the examination in the University. I see that the classical subjects for the previous examination in 1852 were the 23rd book of the Iliad and the 1st book of Livy. In the B.A. examination you have the 6th book of Thucydides, certainly more difficult than the Iliad. The contrast on the Latin subject—the 6th book of the *Æneid*, is not so obvious. But I have been examiner in both, and know that the character of the papers is materially different.

*Ques. 335.* You have stated that there is no option between the Modern languages and the Classics. Are you aware that the Royal Commissioners recommended it should be allowed?—I believe they did.

*Ques. 336.* You say there is no Professor of Modern Languages at Cambridge. Are there not lectures on Modern languages connected with the Chair of History?—There was at the time you came in, a teacher of Modern languages with a small stipend from the University.

*Ques. 337.* Is the office a recognized one?—I think it should be so.

*Ques. 338.* Do you know any reason why students from other Colleges should not compete for Scholarships in the Toronto University?—I have no authority to express more than my own views, and these are, that possessing a Royal Charter, it would be suicidal on our part to commit ourselves to any general system of examination till the conditions I have mentioned shall be fulfilled. The history of public education for the last twenty years, in this country, does not offer much encouragement to those who, in the abstract, would greatly desire to come up for examination at Toronto. The conditions to which I refer are, that a fit standard should be adopted; that the examiners should be competent and impartial; and that the system should promise to be permanent.

*Ques. 339.* Were you invited to the first meeting of the Senate of Toronto University?—Yes.

*Ques. 340.* Did you decline?—Yes, because I was summoned *ex officio*, and thought it right to consult the Council of my own College. By their authority I declined. I coincided with them in opinion; but did not consider the matter merely a personal one.

*Ques. 341.* Then it was the voluntary action of the authorities of Trinity College, which prevented its adhesion to that principle of a Central University, which you advocated?—I do not think my appointment to the Senate had anything to do with the other question, or mode of examination, at the Toronto University.

*Ques. 342.* At the time you declined to act, was there any standard or mode of examination prescribed, and were you not nominated on the Senate expressly to prescribe that standard and mode?—Examinations to the best of my belief, have been carried on from year to year. For what purpose I was appointed I never knew. I was simply informed that I was nominated.

*Ques. 343.* Were you not aware that the Act of Parliament authorized the Senate to prescribe the mode and standard of examination?—I was not.

[By the Chairman.]

*Ques. 344.* Do you think that in a Country like Canada, the system of Collegiate Education should be exactly similar to that which prevails in and may be adopted by an old and wealthy Country like England?—No.

*Ques. 345.* Do you not think that the study of Modern languages, History and the Physical sciences is more likely to prove useful to those who are to engage in industrial pursuits for a livelihood, than that of Mathematics and Classics to the exclusion of the former?—They may be; but it belongs rather to the Education at Schools, than to that of the Universities.

*Ques. 346.* Is it your opinion that Episcopalians generally will prefer sending their sons to Trinity in preference to University College? How is it in that respect at present? How is it with the wealthier classes? Are your students mainly those preparing for the Church?—I think we have the good churchmen at Trinity College. In 1854 there were six examinations, and, at these, 61 students graduated in Arts, and this is the analysis of their pursuits. In Holy Orders, 19; study or practice of Law, 18; the Army, 2; Grammar Schools, 2; Medicine, 1; remain Students of Divinity, 8, and 1 dead. Of the twelve others I do not know the destinations.

*Ques. 347.* Are you of opinion that in this Province, without an endowed Church, without Fellowships in the Universities, without old and richly endowed Grammar Schools, and the many and various inducements in England to acquire eminent classical and mathe-

matical attainments, the University education of this country can be fairly brought into comparison with that of Cambridge, or be reasonably expected to reach the same standard?—No.

Question submitted by Mr. *Langton* and put—

[*By the Chairman.*]

*Ques.* 348. How many Episcopalians not intended for the Ministry are at present students at Trinity?—We do not know the destinations of the undergraduates; but the result of this analysis gives about                      We have had about nineteen ordained. There are six students, and the remainder are in the law, army, medicine or other lay pursuits.

*Ques.* 349. How many have you probably now not intended for the Church?—Probably from fifteen to twenty.

Question Submitted by the Rev. Mr. *Nelles* and put—

[*By the Chairman.*]

*Ques.* 350. Do you consider that the present Constitution of University College affords the requisite security for the religious principles of the Professors or of the students?—I do not know.

*Ques.* 351. Under what supervision do you think a College should be placed to afford the best moral and religious security?—I do not think that any satisfactory system can be adopted for religious and moral control, except by Denominational Colleges.

Question submitted by Rev. Dr. *Cook* and put—

[*By the Chairman.*]

*Ques.* 352. Have any overtures been made from the Toronto University to Trinity College, that the latter should affiliate?—No official overture.

*Ques.* 353. Are you not regularly summoned to attend the Senate of the University by the Registrar?—Since Mr. Ross has been Registrar, not before.

Question submitted by Rev. Mr. *Nelles* and put—

[*By the Chairman.*]

*Ques.* 354. Did you receive a summons to attend respecting a memorial which was to be sent to Parliament?—The notices, I think, never specify the business to be transacted.

[*By the Hon. Mr. Cayley.*]

*Ques.* 355. Referring to question 352, in which you say no official overtures were made, —were other overtures made?—I do not think that I should refer to merely confidential communications.

*Ques.* 356. Is there a test required of students entering Trinity College?—No. There is on taking a degree.

*Ques.* 357. What is it?—They declare themselves *bona fide* members of the Church of England.

*Ques.* 358. Then students may go through the whole course at Trinity without belonging to any religious body, and without offence to any religious opinions they may entertain?—They must attend the College Chapel.

Witness here asked leave of the Committee to add the following statement:—

In my evidence I have expressed the opinion that it would be very desirable to have one standard of University Education for the whole country, and perhaps I should mention in a friendly spirit some points which I consider obstacles to union. The options have been already mentioned, and I consider them a serious obstacle. At home the effect of them has not yet been tried; but I believe it will be found that men of inferior capacity will not be able to pass the required examination in the middle of their course. I consider also, that the system of options is tried at home under favorable circumstances. Mr. *Langton* justly observed yesterday, that our Grammar Schools are not like those at home. And I quite agree with him in his paradox, that the students must fix the standard of examination themselves. He told us that a year had been added to the University College course on the ground of the deficiencies of the students. Therefore, we may regard their

first year as a year of preparation for their course of study rather than as strictly belonging to that course. Under these circumstances I think it impossible, that during the first two years of the University Course the student can acquire such a knowledge of the Latin and Greek as will be of permanent advantage to him. I consider, also, that at home the mathematical and classical *Tripases* have a prescriptive dignity of character, which they have not acquired, and that our first duty is to build them up. The introduction of the options at home will hardly affect the number of candidates for classical and mathematical honours. Mr. *Langton* spoke this morning very justly of the influence of a clever youth both on his teacher and his class; and if, with our present limited number of students we are to have any wholesome emulation, we must for the time confine our students to a comparatively limited range of subjects on examination for honours. I think another arrangement greatly prejudicial to the interests of education is the conferring of degrees on examination without residence or attendance at lectures, without any restriction. I am well aware that the circumstances of the country may render this necessary in some instances, and we have adopted it at Trinity College for a limited number of years, guarded by several restrictions, which will appear from the paper I hand in, which is as follows:—

“A Statute to the following effect was passed by the Corporation of Trinity College at its meeting on the 3rd of April:—

“That in consideration of the small opportunity which the members of the Church in the Province have hitherto possessed of availing themselves of a University education, Candidates be admitted to degrees in Arts by examination, without residence or attendance at lectures, for the space of five years, beginning from October, 1860, under the following regulations:

“I. All Candidates shall be members of the United Church of England and Ireland.”

“II. They shall produce testimonials both of good conduct and attainment, signed by at least one parochial Clergyman, and two Laymen of respectability”

“III. They shall satisfy the Corporation that professional duties preclude the possibility of their passing through a regular College course.”

“IV. No candidate shall be less than twenty-five years of age.”

“V. These regulations shall in no way affect the regulations already made respecting Divinity Students.”

“VI. Candidates shall pass the Several University Examinations, that is to say, the Examination for Matriculation, the Previous Examination, and the Examination for the Degree of B. A., at the usual intervals.”

“N. B.—Under this statute Candidates possessing the requisite qualifications will be admitted to the annual Matriculation Examinations from October, 1860, to October, 1864, both inclusive; and may afterwards present themselves at the Previous Examination and at the Examination for B. A., in any year, provided that they do not in either case anticipate the ordinary time of passing those Examinations. The Previous Examination takes place at the end of the Lent Term of the year next but one following that in which the Matriculation Examination is passed, and the examination for B. A., takes place three years after Matriculation.”

But if this be adopted as a permanent rule, without limits as to age, its tendency will be to keep down University attainments to the minimum, and, indeed, to divest the University of its proper character as a place of instruction. I may mention one other point. I consider it a serious objection that a young man prosecuting the study of the law for five years at a lawyer's office, should be simultaneously going through a three year's college course, and should in virtue of a degree which he takes at the end of those three years have the five years reduced to three. I merely refer to these things as constituting difficulties in the way of union, which otherwise would, for many reasons be desirable but I do so in no unfriendly spirit.

Question submitted by Mr. *Langton* and put—

[*By the Committee.*]

*Ques. 359.* Are you aware that the Oxford Commissioners strongly recommend, that students unconnected with any College should be admitted to the University, and especially to meet the case of persons of maturer years, and that the same system is pursued in the London University?—I cannot say.

[*By the Hon. Mr. Cayley.*]

*Ques. 360.* At the present moment there is no test or other impediment to a student not a member of the Church of England, going through the whole of a University course of study at Trinity College up to the period of taking his B. A., degree, except that, if it be an impediment, of attending Chapel?—None, but he must attend Chapel and the lectures on the catechism and articles of the Church of England.

Question submitted by Rev. Dr. *Cooke* and put—

[*By the Chairman.*]

*Ques. 361.* Which would be most advantageous, to have one large College such as that now existing at Toronto, or a number of Colleges competing with and rivalling each other, and sending up their men to one common examination?—The question is not a simple one. The answer would depend upon the manner in which colleges are constituted. If we take the University of Cambridge, I think, the interests of education would be promoted by drawing some of the small colleges together for educational purposes; but I do not think it would be well to resolve them into one large college.

The Rev. *John Ambery*, of Trinity College, Toronto, Examined :—

Questions submitted by the Rev. Dr. *Ryerson* and put—

[*By the Chairman.*]

*Ques. 362.* Are you a Graduate of the University of Oxford?—I am.

*Ques. 363.* Did you take honors at Oxford?—I did.

*Ques. 364.* In what did you take honors?—In Classics.

*Ques. 365.* What was the period of your residence there after taking your degrees?—I resided three years after taking my degree.

*Ques. 366.* What situations have you filled in this country?—I have been three year<sup>s</sup> Professor of Classics in Trinity College, and since that Master in the Model Grammar School.

*Ques. 367.* Have you read the Toronto University College Calendar for the last three or four years?—I have looked over the Toronto College Calendar for three years past.

*Ques. 368.* Have you remarked any and if any, what differences between that of 1857, and the Calendars of the two succeeding years?—In the first Calendar the names of the students in University College only are printed. In the following years it was a Calendar for the University, though retaining the name of the Calendar of University College.

*Ques. 369.* What have you observed peculiar in the mode of entering the names of students and members of the College?—I have observed that the way of arranging the Calendar was different from that of the English Universities, in this respect—that the higher degree in England involves the lower, and a man does not appear three or four times in degrees.

*Ques. 370.*—What do you think is the proper test of the number of students attending a College?—I should think the test was not to be looked for in the Calendar, but in the lists of those who enter for Terminal examinations.

*Ques. 371.* What have you found to be the numbers of undergraduates, or regular Students in Toronto University College according to their Calendar, during the last three years?—Altogether 144. I made the average to be 48 for the last three years. I found in the last Calendar the names of eight persons entered, both as Bachelors of Arts, and in the lists of under graduates, without note or comment.

*Ques. 372.* Do these returns show that these numbers have been in actual attendance at the College? What returns would show it?—I think the returns should consist of the lists of those who enter for Terminal examinations.

*Ques. 373.* What examination at Oxford corresponds with a Matriculation Examination in the Toronto University?—There is no technical Matriculation Examination at Oxford. The Commissioners recommended that the previous examination or responsions should be put forward very early in the Academical course so as to serve in reality in place of the Matriculation Examination.

*Ques. 374.* To what Examination in the Toronto University do you think the first Examinations or Responsions is equal?—If the subjects for the first degree examination at Toronto are those fixed on for the fourth year, I consider that the previous Examination at Oxford is equal to that first Examination in Upper Canada.

*Ques. 375.* To what Examination in the Toronto University do you think the first Public Examination, or Moderations, at Oxford is equal?—I think the first Examination for moderations may be a little inferior to the Honour Examination for degrees, and the Honour Examination for moderations at Oxford to be a very little superior.

*Ques. 376.* Are Candidates for honors at the final or degree Examination at Oxford, exempted from examination in any of the *pass* subjects?—No.

*Ques. 377.* Have you examined the lists of Scholarships, Prizes, Honors and Certificates of the Toronto University and University College?—I have examined them cursorily.

*Ques. 378.* Do you think them excessive for the number of Students?—I think the prizes greatly in excess. I find one person who carried off fifty in the College and University Examinations.

*Ques. 378½.*—Is there any thing equal to them in number at Oxford?—Certainly not as far as prizes are concerned. In my College we had but two prizes.

*Ques. 380.* Is there any example at Oxford of a Student enjoying a Scholarship without pursuing his studies in some College during any part of the period of his Scholarship?—No.

*Ques. 381.* Should a Student who had obtained a Scholarship neglect to attend his College Lectures during any part of the period of his holding his Scholarship, what would be the result?—The result would be that he would receive no emolument for the time of absence.

*Ques. 382.* Have you noticed the advertisement in the daily papers of Toronto, and in the University College Calendar, of the employment of the College Tutor in devoting lectures, during five days in the week, to prepare pupils for Matriculation?—I have.

*Ques. 383.* Have you ever known a salaried College Tutor to be thus employed, or a University endowment to be thus expended?—No.

*Ques. 384.* You have been some time Classical Professor in Trinity College in Toronto?—For three years.

*Ques. 385.* How many students have graduated in Trinity College since 1854, when degrees were first conferred?—Sixty.

*Ques. 386.* Does that number include *ad eundem* or members of other Colleges admitted?—No.

*Ques. 387.* Has there been a higher standard of Matriculation in Trinity College than that which is now required?—Yes; as far as the number of books goes.

*Ques. 388.* Why has it been reduced?—It was reduced to meet the general system of the country. As all the Grammar Schools prepared on certain subjects, the College was bound to fall in with the system.

*Ques. 389.* How many hours a week have been devoted to pass men in Classics, beside special instruction given to candidates for honors?—Thirteen hours a week.

*Ques. 390.* How many hours a day does the Classical Professor devote to lectures or teaching in Trinity College?—From three to four.

*Ques. 391.* What is your opinion as to one Provincial University as an examining body and for conferring Degrees?—It is indispensable to raise the education of the Province.

*Ques. 392.* Do you think that several Colleges equally aided by the State would contribute more to the extension of liberal education, than one endowed College?—I cannot answer.

*Ques. 393.* Do you think that competitive examinations of the Students of the several Colleges before a Provincial Board impartially constituted, would contribute greatly to the thoroughness and elevation of University Education in the country?—I think it would.

*Ques. 394.* Are the Tutors at Oxford permitted to examine their own Students for honors and Degrees?—No.

*Ques. 395.* How many Scholarships are there belonging to the University of Oxford?—Twenty belonging to the University.

*Ques. 396.* How are the College Scholarships established and awarded?—By original foundation, or, since, by private endowment.

*Ques. 397.* Is it your opinion that there is any tendency in the recent University changes and Civil service, examinations at home, to depreciate the study of Classics? As far as Oxford is concerned, I do not think there is any tendency to depreciate the study of Classics. As far as the Civil service examination is concerned, I refer to the report of a Commission in 1854, consisting of Hon. T. B. Macaulay, Lord Ashburton, Rev. H. Melville, Professor Jewett, and Mr. Shaw Lefèvre, in which they assign 1500 marks for Greek and Latin, on the examination, while Mathematics have only 1000.

Questions submitted by Mr. Langton and put

[By the Chairman.]

*Ques. 398.* Do you, in answer to question 378, refer to the University or the College prizes?—To the College Prizes.

*Ques. 399.* You have not replied to that part of the question which relates to Scholarships—please answer?—I have not added them up.

*Ques. 400.* The number of Scholarships in the University of Toronto, though not necessarily awarded, being sixty-one, and the number of Students examined last year being 196, do you think the disproportion excessive?—I do think it excessive.

*Ques. 401.* Are the number of Scholarships already established at Toronto less or more, as compared with the number of Students examined, taking into account the fact of those Scholarships being tenable only for one year, than those at Trinity, taking into account that they are tenable for two or more years?—I do not know the number at Trinity.

*Ques. 402.* You have stated the present practices at Oxford. Are you not aware that the Royal Commission recommend that the system of options shall be greatly extended, and that the Examinators of Responsions shall be the only compulsory Examinators for all Students and that after that the Students may take only one of several options?—I am not aware of what was the recommendation; but it has not been carried out, because from the *Literæ Humaniores* or Classical Schools there is no option allowed.

*Ques. 403.* What was the reduction in the matriculation examination of Trinity lately made?—The reduction was rather a change of subjects. We substituted in Greek the first book of the Anabasis for the Memorabilia of Xenophon, which I think was a less difficult examination, and in Latin, we put the *De Amicitia* and *De Senectute* for the Catilina, which is no easier examination.

Question submitted by Dr. Ryerson and put

[By the Chairman.]

*Ques. 404.* How many terms are there at Oxford?—Sixteen, four each year.

*Ques. 405.* By whom were the Scholarships at Trinity established?—By different individuals. Four of them out of the funds of the College, the amounts being £30, £25 and £20.

Dr. *Stinson* was further Examined

[By *Hon. Mr. Cayley*.]

*Ques. 406.*—From the tenor of your statement-in-chief, it is to be inferred that the present revenues of Victoria College do not enable the authorities to undertake all they could wish, to promote the objects of the Institution?—Yes.

*Ques. 407.*—What additional annual sum would enable you to place the College in the condition you desire?—Two thousand five hundred pounds.

*Ques. 408.*—How would you distribute that additional sum?—In the increase of the Professors' Salaries and the establishment of a Library and Museum, and Chemical and Philosophical apparatus, and, if the means allowed, in the erection of additional buildings.

The Committee then adjourned till Saturday at 11 o'clock.

*Saturday, 21st April 1860.*

### COMMITTEE MET.

*Present :*

Hon. MALCOLM CAMERON, Chairman.  
 “ Mr. Atty. Gen. MACDONALD,  
 “ “ FOLEY,  
 “ “ CAYLEY,  
 “ “ MCCANN,  
 “ “ SIMPSON.

The Reverend Messrs. *Cook, Ryerson, Stinson, Nelles* and *Poole*, were in attendance.

*John Langton*, Vice-Chancellor, and Professor *Wilson*, of University of Toronto, were in attendance.

Professor *Wilson* addressed the following Statement to the Committee.

*STATEMENT of DANIEL WILSON, L. L. D., Professor of History and English Literature, University College, Toronto.*

After a month devoted by this Committee to a patient hearing of every charge that can be advanced against the College of which I am a member, I appear before you at length, as the first witness on its behalf. I gave way with pleasure yesterday to the Rev. Provost of Trinity College; for, indeed, it struck me as an instructive comment on this whole procedure to see the gentleman, who has figured in past years as the champion of an unsectarian common school system, gravely inviting your attention while he elicited the opinions on superior education now recorded on your minutes. I trust that the examination of the Rev. Provost of Trinity by the Rev. Superintendent of Schools has produced its due effect on your minds; and that now, before you bring your proceedings to a close, one at least of the representatives of University College may be able to command your favorable attention while speaking on its behalf.

Had I addressed you at an earlier stage, the many details of the course of study, the matriculation examinations, the honor work, &c., which have been objected to, would have naturally formed subjects of comment by me, but they have already been so ably dealt with by the Vice Chancellor of the University that I feel myself at liberty to omit much, which at an earlier period I should have deemed it my duty to submit to the Committee. I find, however, on looking over the evidence, that one reference at least, in which my own name appears, renders it necessary that I should guard against any misconception of my opinions relative to the course and system of instruction prescribed by the Senate of the University of Toronto, and adopted by University College.

The Rev. Dr. *Ryerson* has paid me the unlooked for compliment of selecting me as the foremost of “*several eminent individuals*,” from whose writings he has presented extracts

to you on the subject of education. As the passages will appear in his printed evidence, along with my own, I need not repeat the quotations, which occur in a review article, written upwards of four years ago. I presume it must be ascribed to some accidental oversight that Dr. *Ryerson* has represented two passages occurring in the same brief article, within a few pages of each other, as opinions published, the one in "March 1856," and the other in "August 1858." It is not always convenient, as Dr. *Ryerson* must by this time be well aware, to have the opinions of former years thus reproduced. Happily, however, the quotations express opinions which I still retain unchanged. But the Committee will form a very false idea of what those opinions are, if they judge of them by the detached fragments of the article, which have been selected by Dr. *Ryerson* as alone suited to the line of argument he has adopted. Reviewing certain educational papers, recently published, and especially an exceedingly grandiloquent discourse delivered by the Chancellor of an American University, in which, while speaking of the English University system with great disparagement, he exhibited gross ignorance of all which specially pertains to it: I took occasion to commend the thoroughness of that system, in "the subjects specially cultivated," viz., classics and mathematics; and quoting the American scholar, Mr. *Bristed's* "Five years in an English University," where he describes the healthy and vigorous intellectual powers acquired by a Cambridge "Honor man," I remarked, "to such a man of ripe mind and studious habits, the acquisition of a modern language such as the French or Italian is a mere passtime, and the German only a pleasant task. What would he say to the substitution of them by our university reformers as equivalents for the Greek and Latin—the sole keys to all the treasures of Theology, Philosophy and Science."

I can only account for Dr. *Ryerson* producing the quotations he has done, under the supposition,—abundantly confirmed by other parts of his testimony,—that, owing to his never having himself had the advantages of a university education, he was wholly unaware of the distinction, pointed to unmistakably at page 171 of the article quoted by him, and very clearly apparent to all familiar with the English University system, that my remarks referred exclusively to *honor men*. I am confirmed in this belief by the quotation of another passage, from the very next page (172), in which I referred to the fact that Oxford and Cambridge furnish Professors of Classics and Mathematics,—their own special departments,—to all the schools and colleges of the Empire. But what has this to do with Dr. *Ryerson's* views on options, matriculation, &c.? The present Professor of Mathematics in Edinburgh University, was a senior Wrangler of Cambridge, the highest honor man of his year; but does Dr. *Ryerson*, therefore, assume that the Poll men, who constitute the great majority of Cambridge students would form "highly qualified teachers" even for common schools! And yet when I remember that in the letter Dr. *Ryerson* has given in, in evidence, relative to his own scheme for Grammar School Scholarships in University College, he actually proposes to complete their whole college education in the first year, I may assume that he did so entirely misunderstand me, as to interpret my remarks as equally applicable to every graduate of Cambridge or Oxford.

It could not need the weight of any testimony from me to confirm the value of the language of *Plato* and *Aristotle*, or of *Cicero* and *Tacitus*; nor was it for any such purpose it was quoted; but to make me appear, per force, as a witness in favour of the line of argument, by which Dr. *Ryerson* has endeavoured to discredit the system of options adopted by the University of Toronto.

The truth is, it is just because Latin was almost the sole language in which all works on Theology, Philosophy and Science were written; and that Aristotle constituted the recognised fountain-head from whence they drew: that in the 16th and 17th Centuries Oxford wisely gave the pre-eminence to Classical Studies in her University Curriculum; and it is just because this has ceased to be the case, and that German and French are now the keys to so much Modern Philosophy and Science, that all wise University reformers are learning to give to Modern Languages the place they justly claim in a liberal education.

In reference to the whole system of options, I am surprised that the gentlemen who advocate the interests of Victoria and Queen's Colleges fail to perceive that, so far from involving any injustice to affiliated Colleges with an inferior staff to University College, they are the very means of placing all on an equality. Under the University system of

Options, a College with only mathematical, classical, and mental philosophy Chairs, may send in its men to compete for first class honors, and to carry off the classical or mathematical Scholarships, against the best of University College Students with all their unavailable advantages of Modern Languages and Natural Sciences. Permit me to add that no opinion is more unfounded than that which supposes that the Professors of University College desire any monopoly of the University of Toronto, its Examinations, Scholarships, or other privileges. The very article above referred to, was written with the earnest desire to bring about a union of Canadian Colleges under one University, as I venture to hope may be perceived by any candid reader who will peruse it as a whole, and not in imperfect and detached extracts.

But it is a singularly one-sided view of the case, for the advocates of the interests of Victoria College to protest indignantly at certain Professors of University College, —four in all,—being admitted to the Senate of the University, to which their College is attached, and for which alone it can train its students, while there were sitting on that same Board the members of another, and independent University, which disclaimed all collegiate relation to it. Before University College had more than its President on the Senate, there sat on that Board the Rev. Mr. *Nelles*, Principal of Victoria College, the Rev. Dr. *Ryerson*, a member of its College Board; and Dr. *Barrett*—whom it has been found convenient to represent as a Teacher in Upper Canada College,—but who, it is well known, never had a seat at the Senate in any other capacity than as President of Dr. *Rolph's* or the Toronto School of Medicine; and who, as such, took his seat for the first time to represent the Medical Faculty of Victoria College at the meetings of the University of Toronto, while its students were systematically prevented from graduating there. It may sound very plausible to those who know nothing about the facts of the case to talk of the injustice of four Professors sitting on a Board numbering 43 members, which had the entire control of their courses of teaching and system of study. Let it be remembered, however, that until they were added to it, the seditious of the Senate frequently presented the anomaly of a University and College controlled in all their arrangements by those who systematically withheld, not only the students of Cobourg, but the Medical Students of Toronto, from the very University over which they exercised so much control. Had Victoria, Queen's, or Trinity College, actually recognized the University as such, while maintaining a thorough independence as separate Colleges, the Senate would never have been driven to the necessity of giving so large a share in the oversight of the University examinations to Professors of University College. If, as seems inevitable in the present condition of Canada, Professors must be appointed examiners, they would have been selected equally from all the Colleges, so as to secure a thorough impartiality, but it is a proposition which no reasonable man could entertain, that the Professors of such Colleges should—as they now do,—examine their own students, confer degrees on them by right of their own University powers, and even establish a faculty at the seat of the University of Toronto, so as to confer the degrees of Victoria College on Toronto Students, and yet that they should also be the Governors and Examiners, or electors of the Examiners, of the University they disown. Had the various denominational Colleges acted up to the idea implied by the adoption of the University of London, with its numerous and varied privately endowed Colleges, as the model of the Canadian Provincial University, the system could easily have been worked so as to satisfy all as to thorough impartiality in the constitution of the Senate, the appointment of examiners, and the distribution of honors and prizes. Had they done so cordially, moreover, it might have been more difficult to resist their claims for some division of the funds. But, on the contrary, the Provost of Trinity refused to take his seat on the Senate; the Principal of Queen's practically adopted the same course; and the Principal of Victoria—while sharing in the government of the University, and fixing the course of Studies of the College,—only lent the aid of his wisdom and experience, but refused all practical co-operation. Nevertheless the Senate, in its anxious desire to secure a thoroughly impartial system of examinations, has in spite of those obstacles, appointed Professors of both Victoria and Queen's Colleges as its examiners, as it has selected others wherever they could be found at once competent and impartial.

Again, let me say for myself and my colleagues in University College, we have no desire to monopolize the endowments of the Provincial University. Let the just and proper

cost of maintaining of the College in a state of efficiency be properly ascertained, with some regard to future requirements, and, whatever be the legitimate objects on which to expend the surplus funds, the College can advance no claim to them. How far, however, it therefore follows either that the University Act of 1853 designed, or that wise policy requires, that such surplus funds should be divided among the denominational Colleges, "either now established, or which may be established in Upper Canada," is a question resting on other grounds, to which I shall, with your permission, direct attention, as a point of vital importance in its relations to any comprehensive National Scheme of Education.

In the memorial presented on behalf of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference to the Legislative Assembly, praying for an investigation into the manner in which the University Act has been administered, the memorialists declare their entire approval of our Canadian "National School system." Nevertheless, they affirm that "The same considerations of fitness, economy, and patriotism which justify the State in co-operating with each school municipality to support a day-school, require it to co-operate with each religious persuasion, according to its own educational works, to support a College. The experience of all Protestant countries shows that it is, and has been, as much the province of a religious persuasion to establish a College, as it is for a school municipality to establish a day school; and the same experience shows that while pastoral and parental care can be exercised for the religious instruction of children residing at home and attending a day school, that care cannot be exercised over youth residing away from home, and pursuing their higher education except in a College, where the pastoral and parental care can be daily combined."

That the experience of Protestant countries is entirely misrepresented in the above statement, will be best shown by a reference to recent University reforms at home. An appeal to the examples of Oxford and Cambridge on these points is out of place in the present enquiry,—if for no other reasons,—on this ground, that, so far are these from being educational institutions open to the people at large, they have been until recently exclusively, and are still to a great extent, limited to one favoured denomination, while they are fitted for the wealthy alone,—the lowest estimated cost for a student during the academic year being \$750. Nevertheless, although they are still recognized appendages of the Church of England, the whole tendency of recent changes has been towards the removal of their denominational features, and their restoration to the nation at large, without distinction of sect or party. In Scotland, however, where the Universities are strictly people's Colleges, adapted to the educational wants, and to the pecuniary means of the great mass of the community, recent proceedings furnish the best illustration of "the experience of Protestant countries," in reference to its being the supposed "province of a religious persuasion to establish a College."

The Scottish Presbyterian Church being the legally recognized religious persuasion in that country, its Church Courts exercised the denominational oversight over the Colleges of the country; and no Professor could be inducted into a Chair without first signing the Westminster Confession of Faith. The consequence was, that, during the greater part of the present century, the denominational restrictions thus imposed on Professors came to be recognized as one of the greatest educational grievances, and a serious bar to the filling of University Chairs with the men best qualified for the various branches of secular education. After a long protracted struggle, and while these denominational supervisions and tests were still in force, the Free Church Presbyterians subscribed a sum of £30,000 sterling, and founded New College, Edinburgh,—not as a mere Theological College, but for general instruction. Chairs of Natural History, Logic, Metaphysics, and Moral Philosophy were filled by able men, for whom salaries were provided on a more liberal scale than those now paid to the Professors of University College, Toronto; a Chair of Chemistry was also in contemplation, and a complete organization was thus provided for the permanent establishment of a rival Denominational College.

Fortunately for Scotland, at this stage of the University system the Act was passed which, by abolishing all religious tests for the Secular Chairs, entirely deprived them of their denominational character. In the Scottish Universities as now constituted, the Theological Faculty exists as a part of the Established Church; but in the Faculties of

Arts, Law, and Medicine, every trace of denominational oversight has been removed. The last relic of it has been swept away, during the past year, by the Act which throws the Principalships of the Universities open to laymen, without respect to their denominational views or religious opinions. Now, accordingly, in the Scottish Universities, as in our Canadian Provincial College, "no religious tests or professions of religious faith are required of any Professor or Lecturer, nor are any religious observances according to the forms of any particular religious denomination imposed on them." The precise words of the Toronto University Act would, in fact, equally apply to the Faculties of Arts, Law, and Medicine, in the Scottish Universities. Thus all denominational oversight and control have been withdrawn from them; but so far has this been from dissatisfying the large and influential non-conformist denominations, that, *in consequence of this very change*, the New College, Edinburgh, has gradually dropt its secular character, as the chairs became vacant. It has ceased to maintain chairs of Metaphysics, Logic, Moral Philosophy, or Natural History; and has voluntarily assumed the character of a mere Theological Faculty for its own denomination, while its Theological students now take their Arts Course at the National University.

In Edinburgh there are Theological Colleges or Institutions in connection with the Free Church, the United Presbyterians, the Cameronians, the Congregationalists, and Baptists; but all mingle together without any distinction, in the classes of the University. The same is the case at the other Scottish Universities, and it is regarded as one of the special advantages of the system, that the Theological Students of all denominations thus acquire their secular education in common, and are thereby better fitted in after life for uniting together in the many public objects, in which it is desirable that all the members of a free community should co-operate without reference to sectarian distinctions.

In Great Britain most of the older educational institutions were founded before it was a Protestant Country, and all of them in connection with an established Church. The exclusive principles on which such were administered, in England especially, compelled the conscientious non-conformists to establish Schools and Colleges of their own; not because they objected to the national Universities, but because they were forcibly excluded from them. But it would surely be a strange infatuation for a new Country like Canada, altogether free from that element which now shackles and complicates every effort in Great Britain for the development of a truly national system of public instruction, to transplant to its free soil the rival sectarian educational Institutions, which are only defensible by reason of the injustice that closed the Halls of Oxford and Cambridge against all but the adherents of one favoured Church. But the most recent action in England has been to a great extent in the strictly non-denominational direction; and since the establishment of the University of London, on a truly liberal and national basis, Colleges have been founded and liberally endowed, entirely independent of denominational control or supervision, such as those of Hull, Wakefield, Cheltenham and Manchester. University College, London, had already been established by private enterprise, before the State provided the requisite University organization. But that done, the separate Colleges whether denominational or otherwise, were left in Britain to rely for their support on the liberality of a wealthy Country. In Ireland, however, it was otherwise, for there, as in Canada, the private wealth was wanting, and the State founded and endowed both the Colleges and the University, and placed their honors and advantages alike free to all. Such institutions the State may justly endow with public funds, and it is for the members of a free community, for whom such inestimable advantages are secured, to place such national institutions under the control of a governing board, which shall adequately represent the wishes and desires of a Christian people in relation to all the essential non-sectarian questions which pertain to the discipline and training of the rising generation. But in a free country like ours, where the separation between Church and State is absolute, the existence of a Church Institution supported by the State is an *incongruity*; the supervision of it by the State is an *impossibility*.

The tendencies suggested by modern experience in relation to national Universities and superior education, are abundantly illustrated by the new Universities and Colleges of England and Ireland; the removal of all denominational restrictions from the faculties of Arts, Law, and Medicine in the Scottish Universities, and the throwing open to all denominations the privileges of Oxford and Cambridge.

It is manifestly, therefore, totally at variance with facts to say that "the experience of all Protestant countries shows that it is, and has been, as much the province of a religious persuasion to establish a College, as it is for a School Municipality to establish a School," unless by such statement a mere denominational theological Institution is meant. On the contrary, the experience of Canada sufficiently illustrates how "religious persuasions," by going out of their province, and interfering with secular education, may retard the development of a well organized system, for a whole generation.

That Queen's College, Kingston, is purely the educational institution of the denomination under whose control it exists, is shown by the Report presented to the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada, on the 25th of May last; which, if reported correctly in the public prints, stated the number of students in attendance as 11 in Theology and 53 in Arts; but added: "*In all, 45 are studying for the Ministry.*"

Credit has been repeatedly claimed of late for Victoria College, that it has no tests, but such a statement is a mere play upon words. What real difference is there between requiring that a Professor shall sign the prescribed creed of a Church—be it the thirty-nine articles, or the Westminster Confession of Faith,—or that he shall satisfy the Wesleyan Conference, or other Ecclesiastical Court? In reality, the latter is the more stringent of the two. There is, of course, no test for students. It is only too well known, that, not in Methodist Colleges only, but also in Roman Catholic Colleges, all are welcome who are prepared to submit to their teaching. But from the Returns made to Parliament in 1856, the denominational statistics present the following significant figures relative to the matriculated students of Victoria College:

|                     |           |    |
|---------------------|-----------|----|
| Wesleyan Methodists | - - - - - | 28 |
| Presbyterians       | - - - - - | 3  |
| Church of England   | - - - - - | 1  |
| Baptist             | - - - - - | 1  |

Again, taking the whole pupils in the Institution, there were only 39 belonging to other denominations, including children at the preparatory school, while 190 were Wesleyan Methodists.

It is stated in the Conference Memorial that no aid is asked "towards the support of any Theological School or Theological Chair in Victoria College," and Mr. Nelles, in answer to the question, "Is there any Theological Chair, or Divinity Students in Victoria College?" replies: "Neither. We have students attending the College who are preparing for the Ministry, but are not pursuing Theological studies, but general studies; and are not known in the College as Divinity students, but as general students. They receive no allowance or consideration from the funds in any shape whatever." It appears, however, from the 7th of the Miscellaneous Resolutions adopted by the Wesleyan Conference at its last meeting, that "when Preachers on trial are allowed to attend Victoria College for two years during their probation, the two years shall be counted but as one year in their probation;" and the sixteenth question annually submitted to Conference includes the query, "what has been collected for the education of Ministers?" Again, in answer to the thirteenth question: "*How are the Ministers and Preachers stationed for the ensuing year?*" "Under-graduates and students" to the number of twenty, are named in the "Cobourg District" as at Victoria College. In the previous year, 1858, they numbered seventeen; and in the Report furnished by the President of Victoria College to the Conference in the same year, he remarks: "Judging from present indications, the College is destined to furnish very valuable accessions to the Christian Ministry, and the attention of the Conference and the Church is earnestly invited to this important result, as a reason for more ardent and united exertions in behalf of the Institution." It is obvious, therefore, that whatever difference may be entertained as to the designation of "preachers on trial during their probation" at Victoria College, that is the Wesleyan denominational College, supplying for the Wesleyan Methodist Church the same purposes as Queen's College does for the Presbyterian Church of Canada.

Accordingly, in the same Report of the Principal of Victoria College to the Wesleyan Conference, Mr. Nelles says: "It is necessary to show that our College is a *connexional necessity*,—that it is an essential part of our machinery as a Church,—that without it we

"shall either lose our youth, or retain them in a state of mental and social inferiority,—that without it our Ministers will suffer in numbers and efficiency,—that without it, in fine, we shall be unequal to the great work God has assigned us in Christianizing this extensive country." All this is highly laudable, in a strictly denominational point of view, and worthy of praise when effected by the denomination to be thus benefited. But it cannot be the function of the State to prevent the Wesleyan Church losing its youth as Church members, any more than to assist it in other religious and missionary work; unless it is also prepared to re-assert the principle it has disavowed in the abolition of all State provision for religion in Upper Canada.

Again, returning to the consideration of the statements already quoted from the memorial of the Wesleyan Conference, a complete fallacy is involved in the attempt to apply certain characteristics of our Common Schools to the whole provincial system of education. It is true that our Common Schools, being easily multiplied in every district, are mere day-schools; so that the attendance there does not deprive the pupils of daily parental or pastoral care and religious instruction; but such is not, and never can be the case, with the Grammar Schools, the Provincial Normal School, or the Model Grammar School. In order to attend each of these, pupils necessarily leave their parents' homes, and are placed, some of them under a system greatly less conducive to strict moral and religious oversight, than that which is secured by the system of University College, as applied to its resident students.

In the Model Grammar School, for example, established under the authority of the Chief Superintendent of Education at Toronto, it is expressly provided that pupils shall be received from every part of the Province; and thus necessarily be removed from daily parental and pastoral instruction and oversight. Yet its establishment and supervision are equally independent of any religious persuasion; and it is placed under the authority of the Council of Public Instruction, a public board constituted on nearly the same principle as the Senate of Toronto University. The same remarks equally apply to the Normal School, to which is entrusted the all important function of training teachers for the whole of the Common Schools of the Province; nevertheless no difficulty appears to have arisen hitherto from the adoption, in these institutions, of one national system, instead of a denominational and necessarily sectarian one. But if the principle now affirmed is to be carried out, instead of the Province maintaining at a reasonable expense, one efficient Model Grammar School, Normal School, and College, which are abundantly sufficient to meet the present demand for the departments of higher education embraced by them, it must multiply such institutions in the same ratio as all denominational colleges, "*now established, or which may be established, in Upper Canada;*" or even in each city of Upper Canada.

The system pursued by the British Parliament in all recent reforms of higher education, as exemplified, not only by the New Scottish Universities Act, but also by the establishment of the Queen's University in Ireland, and the London University in England, abundantly proves how thoroughly British Statesmen are alive to the importance of all the members of a free community receiving their secular education in national, rather than in denominational institutions, and being thereby trained to co-operate in all the great public duties that devolve on a free people. The Queen's University in Ireland is designed to extend the same advantages of university degrees and honors to students of all denominations, as is done by Toronto University; but the public endowment is entirely devoted to the national, non-denominational Queen's Colleges, founded on precisely the same principle as our Provincial College, at Toronto. In England also, the London University confers degrees and university honors on students presenting themselves at its examinations, from Episcopalian, Roman Catholic, Presbyterian, Wesleyan Methodist, Congregationalist, Baptist, and other denominational colleges; but they neither receive nor claim any other share of the university funds, excepting the common right enjoyed, not only by all their students, but by every one possessed of the requisite knowledge, wheresoever acquired, *to compete for the University Scholarships.*

In these respects, therefore, the University of Toronto fully carries out the plan adopted by the London University, and also by the Queen's University of Ireland. It also

fulfils the purposes of its institution as set forth in the preamble of the Act, in placing within the reach of every youth of the Province, wheresoever educated, "facilities for obtaining those scholastic honors and rewards, which their diligence and proficiency may deserve." It may also be added that, among the Examiners of the London University, Professors of the Colleges are named; while in the Queen's University—which in relation to the peculiar circumstances of the country, and the national non-denominational Colleges connected with it, more nearly resembles our Provincial University and College,—the Professors of the Queen's Colleges are systematically appointed members of the Examining Board. It is easy for Oxford and Cambridge, with a large staff of wealthy endowed Fellowships and numerous resident Graduates, to place any restrictions they may please on the choice of Examiners; but the Queen's University has been compelled to resort to the Professors of the National Colleges, as those best qualified for the duties, until such time as a numerous class of well-trained graduates shall enable them to adopt a wider choice; and in this respect the University of Toronto labours under still greater disadvantages, and a more absolute necessity for resorting to the same source for well qualified and experienced examiners. Had such Canadian Colleges as Trinity, Victoria and Queen's, become, in the true sense, Colleges of the University,—instead of being, as they are, distinct and rival Universities, each with its own Examining Board, convocation and body of Graduates, the difficulty would have been easily solved, as already observed, by apportioning the appointments on the Examining Board equally among the Professors of all the Colleges, as is done in the Examining Board of the Queen's University of Ireland. This, however, has hitherto been rendered impossible by the relations maintained by those Colleges as independent Universities; and I can only say, that if the Senate can find the requisite number of well qualified Examiners, fit and willing to undertake the duty, I know that I speak the minds of my colleagues in University College, as well as my own wish, in saying that we shall heartily welcome the change as a most acceptable relief to ourselves, and a great improvement on the present system. If such appointments are made, it will then be seen by those who undertake the Arts Examinations, not only in the Faculty of Arts, but also of Law and Medicine, how entirely the statement is founded in error which represents the Professors of University College as receiving the Examination fee for reading the papers of their own students.

I must be permitted to avail myself of this occasion to assert in the most unqualified terms, that the examinations of the University have been conducted with a strictness and impartiality that may challenge the severest scrutiny. Our printed returns tell of the number of Scholarships taken,—and full use has been made of these. But no record meets the public eye to tell of the number rejected; though no examination passes without the list of candidates being reduced by this eliminating process.

The following names of gentlemen who have acted as Examiners in Arts during the past four years, and have had an absolute voice in the admission or rejection of the candidates; alike to Matriculation, Honors and Degrees, supply the best guarantee of the practical application of examination tests, and the high standard of which is attested by the examination papers:—

The Rev. M. WILLIS, D. D.,

Principal of Knox's College.

Rev. S. S. NÉLLES, M. A.,

President of Victoria College.

Rev. A. LILLIE, D. D.,

Theological Professor of the Congregational Institution.

Rev. J. TAYLOR, M. D.,

Theological Professor of the United Presbyterian Institution.

Rev. G. P. YOUNG, M. A.,

Professor of Logic and Metaphysics, Knox's College.

Rev. E. J. SENKLER, M. A.,

Of Caius College, Cambridge.

Rev. E. SCHLUTER, M. A.

- Rev. W. STENNETT, M. A.,  
Principal of Upper Canada College.
- Rev. W. ORMISTON, B. A.,  
One of the Masters of the Normal School.
- ADAM CROOKS, LL. B.,  
Barrister-at-Law.
- JAMES BROWN, M. A.,  
Mathematical Master, Upper Canada College.
- T. J. ROBERTSON, M. A.,  
Head Master Normal School.
- ROBERT CHECKLEY, M. D.
- THOS. RIDOUT, Esq.
- F. MONTOVANI, LL. D.
- E. CROMBLE, M. A.,  
Barrister-at-Law.
- MICHAEL BARRETT, B. A., M. D.,  
President of the Toronto School of Medicine.
- L. S. OILLE, M. A., M. D.
- G. R. R. COCKBURN, M. A.,  
Rector of the Model Grammar School.
- WILLIAM WEDD, M. A.,  
Classical Master, Upper Canada College.
- H. HAACKE,  
French Translator to the Legislative Assembly.
- EMILE COULON,  
French Master, Model Grammar School.
- E. BILLINGS, Esq.,  
Palæontologist to the Provincial Geological Survey.

With such Gentlemen, selected as they have been, with an anxious desire to secure able and independent Examiners, I feel confident that no University examinations have ever been conducted with stricter impartiality than those of the University of Toronto, under the very system so unjustly maligned.

Returning, however, from this digression, suggested by analogies in the University of London and the Queen's University of Ireland, I revert once more to the question of sectarian in contra-distinction to Provincial or National education. It is assumed in the memorial of the Wesleyan Conference that under the system of a Provincial non-denominational College, the youth trained in it must be placed beyond the reach of religious training and pastoral oversight. If by pastoral oversight is meant the placing of each student, while in the College, under the care and teaching of resident ministers of his own denomination, this is manifestly beyond the reach of any system, but one which limits all education to the training of each youth in schools and colleges of his own sect, and is as impossible under the constitution of Queen's or Victoria, as of University College.

When Victoria College admits a Wesleyan Methodist Student the desired end is secured for him. But when it admits an Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Baptist, or Roman Catholic Student, he must be dealt with precisely as he would be by University College, and as is done in the Normal School of the Province.

In University College, daily religious services are provided; the resident students are placed under the charge of the Ministers of their respective denominations, their Parents or Guardians are consulted as to the place of Worship they are to attend, and the Minister of Religion whose teaching they are to wait upon. The resident Professor, — who has been selected with a special view to his fitness for the duties, — has prayer and reading of the Scriptures daily, morning and evening, in the College Hall, for all who do not object themselves, or by their Guardians, on conscientious grounds, to be present; and it is his duty to ascertain that they attend regularly at their respective places of worship. Along with this statement, I give in a copy of the circular addressed by the Resident Professor

to the Parent or Guardian of each Student, on his coming into residence.\* It is manifest, therefore, that the Provincial College, though strictly *non-denominational*, is not therefore *non-religious*; nor can there be any need that it should be so in a Christian country. In this, indeed, is illustrated the only possible system for a publicly endowed National Education. It is the same principle which pervades our Common Schools, Normal School, Grammar Schools, Provincial College, and University: a public system in which no sectarian distinctions are recognized, and in which no denomination meddles as such—equally open to all, and under public control. It is the National Educational system of the people, consistent throughout. The Teachers, Trustees, County Boards, and Inspectors; the Deputy and Chief Superintendent, and Council of Public Instruction; the College Professors, University Senate, and Chancellor; are all chosen by the people:—through direct election in local cases; through the Executive in the Provincial Departments.

The establishment of a well appointed College and University is necessarily a costly thing. The Province cannot hope to command the services of men of the highest class without offering salaries and all requisite equipments of lecture-rooms, museums, and library, in some degree approximating to similar institutions at home; but if the Government were to comply with the prayer of the Wesleyan Conference Memorial, and “cause an Act to be passed by which all the Colleges now established, or which may be established in Upper Canada, may be placed upon equal footing in regard to public aid,” it must necessarily involve the maintenance of many very imperfectly organized institutions, at a greatly increased outlay, to do the work of one. Under any possible system of public education, whatever may be the facilities afforded for the higher branches of instruction in a country situated as Canada at present is, only a limited number will be found prepared to avail themselves of them. The multiplication of denominational Colleges would, therefore, tend very slightly, if at all, to increase the number of Students, while it so greatly multiplied Professors. It cannot be overlooked also, that whereas it appears by the last Census that there are *twenty-four separate denominations* specified in Upper Canada,—apart from smaller bodies grouped under a general head,—the greater number of which embrace thousands in their communion; any attempt to endow denominational Colleges, in lieu of a non-sectarian institution, where all enjoy the same rights and privileges, must involve great injustice to those who, although belonging to religious bodies too few in number, or too poor to effect the organization achieved by wealthier sects, have an equal right to share in such denominational division of public funds set apart for higher education. The evil assumes a still worse aspect, when it is considered that some religious denominations have conscientious objections to any such system of distributing public funds; and while they are thus excluded from availing themselves of them, they would be subjected to the grievance of the common funds of the Province being thus expended by their representatives, in opposition to their religious scruples, and to their own personal loss.

If, therefore, the Province provides an adequately endowed and well appointed Provincial College, to which every youth in the Province has free access, without any distinction of sect or party; and also provides a University to grant Degrees,—not only to such

\*Circular Addressed to the Parents or Guardians of each Student on his coming into Residence.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, TORONTO.

“As your son purposes coming into Residence in this College, I beg to inform you, that it is the desire of the Council, that, where there is no conscientious objection, all the Students under their charge should be present in the Hall at daily Morning and Evening Prayers, with reading of the Scriptures. It is also their wish, that they should regularly attend on Sundays, their respective places of Worship, and receive such other Religious Instruction as their Parents or Guardians may desire. I have to request that you will be so good as to let me know, whether you desire your son to attend such daily Prayers in the College, and that you will also mention the Minister under whose charge you wish to place him.

The Council will afford every facility for the carrying out of your intentions, and with this view, will exercise such control over your son during his residence, as may be best calculated to effect your wishes. In the event of your not informing me of your desire on the subject, the Council will assume that you have no objection to his being required to attend the daily Prayers of the College, and will exercise an oversight as to his attendance on the ministrations of a Clergyman of the denomination to which he belongs.”

students, but to all in the Province, who are found qualified to pass the requisite examinations, in like manner, without reference to sect or party; they can have no just ground of complaint, who, declining to avail themselves of the Provincial Institution to which they have free access, voluntarily choose to take their preparatory training under Professors and Teachers appointed by their own Denominations. It is accordingly seen by the Returns both of the University and College, that the laity of all the leading Denominations in the Province,—Protestant, Roman Catholic, Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Methodist, Congregationalist, Baptist, &c.,—have freely availed themselves of the untrammelled advantages thus offered to them; and that every year witnesses an increase in the number of students entering University College, and of graduates admitted to Degrees by the Provincial University. The following are the Returns of the students of University College for the Academic year 1859-60, according to their respective denominations, apart from the Under-Graduates in the Faculties of Arts, Law, and Medicine, attached to the University, but not attending the College :—

|                        |           |     |
|------------------------|-----------|-----|
| Free Church            | - - - - - | 49  |
| Church of England      | - - - - - | 35  |
| United Presbyterian    | - - - - - | 24  |
| Methodists             | - - - - - | 22  |
| Congregationalists     | - - - - - | 16  |
| No Returns             | - - - - - | 11  |
| Presbyterians          | - - - - - | 10  |
| Church of Scotland     | - - - - - | 7   |
| Church of Rome         | - - - - - | 5   |
| Baptists               | - - - - - | 5   |
| Reformed Presbyterians | - - - - - | 2   |
| Plymouth Brethren      | - - - - - | 1   |
| Quakers                | - - - - - | 1   |
|                        |           | 188 |
| Matriculated Students  | - - - - - | 80  |
| Occasional Students    | - - - - - | 108 |

The above return furnishes satisfactory evidence that the non-denominational character of University College has not been a bar to the full acceptance of the Educational advantages it offers, by members of all the leading Denominations in the Province, including a fair average of the very Religious persuasions, whose leaders appear before you as objectors to the system.

In these remarks I have confined myself to a few leading points of fact, and to one important matter of opinion. The Vice-Chancellor of the University has already done for that Institution all that its friends can desire; and I shall leave to the President of University College to treat in like detail the specialities pertaining to the College, excepting in so far as the Committee may desire to question me on the subject. I have only to say we have absolutely nothing to conceal. We welcome this enquiry as a means of bringing to the test of proof a thousand blundering misstatements and slanderous insinuations that have been circulated through the Province for months past, without the possibility of contradiction. I rest confident in the assurance that the Committee will be satisfied by the evidence produced on all the various charges,—and still more, by the inconsistencies, blunders, and contradictions which have marked the statements in which they are made,—that they are entirely founded in error.

The University and College have only now been furnished, for the first time, with the means of accomplishing the objects for which they were established; and I rest in full confidence that the wisdom of the Legislature will permit them, still untrammelled, to carry out, with such means, the noble and patriotic objects already inaugurated by them, under many difficulties and impediments to success.

DANIEL WILSON.

Quebec, April 21st, 1860.

The Reverend Mr. *Poole* read certain Memoranda which he requested to have recorded on the minutes, which was ordered and are as follows :—

On a minute investigation into the records of the Senate of Toronto University for the years 1856, 57, 58 and 59,

I find one hundred and twenty-nine meetings ; more than three-fourths of those meetings were composed of Professors of University College, the Vice-Chancellor, and one or two other members resident in Toronto and connected with the Theological Schools located there, there being in very few instances as the records show any of those members present who have resided out of Toronto. Dr. *Ryerson* is reported as being present at only thirty-two of those meetings during that time, and in no instance is his name associated as mover or seconder of those resolutions involving increase of salaries, or other expenditure such as was referred to in the committee ; except in two instances, neither of which had any direct bearing on the present salaries ; their being other Statutes and Resolutions recorded since that time upon which the present salaries depend.

The first of these resolutions was moved by Dr. *McCaul*, and seconded by Dr. *Ryerson* on the 8th of December, 1856. It is found on page 393, vol. 2, and refers to the appointment of a superior person from Europe to be Head Master of Upper Canada College. It reads as follows :—

Ten days after, on the 18th of December, 1856, the record is as follows, page 378.

Moved by Dr. *Ryerson*, seconded by Dr. *Lillie* ;

That in reference to the memorial of the Rev. Dr. *McCaul*, President and Professor of University College, referred to by command of His Excellency, for the Report of the Senate thereon ; this Senate is of opinion that Dr. *McCaul* is justly entitled to at least a salary equal to the amount of the emoluments which he formerly enjoyed, and the Senate also recommends to His Excellency that some addition be made to the salaries of the other Professors of University College, as a just compensation for their able services, and in consequences of the unprecedented dearness of living."

Prior to this the salary of the President had been lowered in consequence of the changes made in the law, and at this time it was \$1200 lower than it is now. In no other instance during those years is his name associated with increased salaries.

The Present arrangement of salaries was the result of the following resolution moved on the 19th of May, 1853, pages 454, and 455, vol. 2.

The Vice-Chancellor, moved to take up the subject of the salaries of Professors in University College, referred to the Senate by the letter of the Provincial Secretary, read at the last meeting, upon which Dr. *Wilson* withdrew.

Moved by the Vice-Chancellor, seconded by the Hon. Mr. *Patton*, and reads as follows, page 453, vol. 2 :—

That in the opinion of the Senate it is not expedient to make any permanent increase to the salaries of the Professors in University College, but they would recommend that the stipends attached to the following Professorships, viz., Greek and Latin, with Logic and Rhetoric, Metaphysics and Ethics, Chemistry and experimental Philosophy, Natural Philosophy, History and English Literature, Natural History, Mineralogy and Geology, and Modern Languages, should be fixed at \$2000 per annum, with an increase of \$200 per annum, after five years from the date of their commission, and further a increase \$200 per annum after every subsequent term of five years." It was also recommended that the salary of the President as such be \$1400 per annum, and that the office of Vice-President be filled up with a salary of \$400.

From this resolution it appears that the Senate does make recommendations to Government, respecting the salary of the Professor of University College. And that the present large salaries were recommended two years after the resolution above referred to.

I remark also that on the 2nd of February, 1857, a memorial was read from the Toronto School of Medicine requesting the Senate to modify the subjects of examinations for matriculation in Medicine.

"I find also that on the 11th of February, the Vice-Chancellor gave notice that he would introduce a Statute to determine the duties and emoluments of the Principal of Upper Canada College, for the year 1857; and on the 18th of February, the Vice-Chancellor moved, seconded by Dr. Willis, a Statute relating to the fees and salaries in *Upper Canada College*.

"On the 4th of March, 1857, the Vice-Chancellor introduced a Statute relating to Matriculation, which was read. (Page 396.)

"Yeas being—Vice-Chancellor, Dr. Lillie, Dr. Barrett, Prof. Croft, Chairman Mr. Wilson and the Rev. J. Jennings--6.

"Nays--Dr. McCaul, Dr. Ryerson, Dr. Willis, Hon. Mr. Patton, and the Hon. Mr. Mowat.--6

"There are several records of Resolutions or Statutes relating to scholarships, prizes and other items of outlay, moved from time to time, by the Vice-Chancellor, and seconded by other members of the Senate, but Dr. Ryerson's name does not appear as connected therewith. See 392, 394, 397.

"It is to be regretted that the original drafts of Statutes and Resolutions were not laid before the Committee, as a still further refutation of the unjust imputations made before the Committee."

The Reverend Mr. Nelles was further Examined.

Questions submitted by Reverend Dr. Ryerson, and put

[By the Chairman,]

Ques. 409. Were you present when the subject of establishing scholarships was first discussed in the the Senate of the Toronto University? And Did Dr. Ryerson oppose the appropriation of the sum proposed for the establishment of scholarships? And did he not contend that any sum allowed for scholarships should be for the assistance and encouragement of poor young men?—I was present, and as to what took place, I put in the following in evidence:—

Extract from minutes of the Senate of the University of Toronto, 15th March, 1854.

"Mr. Langton, seconded by Mr. Justice Draper, moved that all scholarships for "under-graduates shall be of the same amount, viz., £30, and that there shall be *fifteen* "annually.

"That no student shall hold more than one scholarship in any one year.

"That their shall be eight scholarships annually for graduates, to be held for two "years, after taking the degree of B. A., of the value of £50 each.

"That there shall be two exhibitions of the value of £15 each, in every year, which "shall be awarded to students who would have been entitled to scholarships, but are not, "or do not propose to be resident in any affiliated college.

"Dr. Workman, seconded by the Rev. Mr. Nelles, moved in amendment, That the "further consideration of the subject of scholarships be deferred until the information "alluded to in the notice of motion, given to day by the mover, be placed before the Senate, "Which amendment was lost.

"The Revd. Dr. Ryerson, seconded by the Rev. Mr. Nelles, moved in amendment. "That a sum, not exceeding £1000 per annum, be expended for the establishment of "Scholarships in the University. That these Scholarships be established for the purpose "of assisting (as far as possible) with pecuniary aid deserving youth whose parents may be "unable to meet the expense necessarily attendant upon a University education. Which "amendment was lost.

"The original Resolutions, as proposed by Mr. Langton, and seconded by the Hon. "Mr. Justice Draper, were then respectively put and carried.

"Mr. Langton, seconded by the Vice-Chancellor, moved, That there shall be, in every "year, two scholarships for general proficiency; one for honor and one for pass subjects,

“such scholarships to be awarded according to the collective standing of the candidates in all the subjects of that year. Which motion was carried.

Extract from minutes of the Senate of the *University of Toronto*, 17th March, 1854.

“Mr. *Langton* gave notice that he would, to-morrow, move a series of Resolutions respecting the manner of conducting the examinations and awarding scholarships, honors and prizes.”

I find, from the minutes of the Senate meeting, on the 18th of March, that Mr. *Langton*, seconded by Dr. *Ryerson*, moved the Resolutions referred to in the above notice, and these are the resolutions cited by the Hon. Mr. *Brown*, in his cross-examination of Dr. *Ryerson*, question 246.

On reading the resolutions it will be found that they are not resolutions for establishing scholarships and appropriating the necessary money, but for “awarding” scholarships already established, that is, the distribution of them, and for “conducting the examinations,” this being the object expressly stated in Mr. *Langton’s* previous notice of motion. No amount of money is specified in the resolutions, and for the simple reason that £2720 had been previously set apart, in the resolutions moved by Mr. *Langton*, on the 15th March, three days previous. Those previous resolutions, both Dr. *Ryerson* and Mr. *Nelles* opposed, as appears from the minutes which I have quoted.

Mr. *Langton* and others, having succeeded in creating scholarships to the extent of £2720, Dr. *Ryerson* and others, in the minority endeavoured to secure as fair and beneficial a distribution of the money as possible.

Ques. 410. Did Dr. *Ryerson* not oppose the optional system of studies in the University, when it was proposed,—that is, the system of having separate optional subjects of study for candidates for honors, or exempting them from subjects of study required of pass-men, or ordinary students? And Did Dr. *Ryerson* contend that all students should be equally required to pursue the same curriculum of studies, and that no options should be allowed to candidates for honours which were not allowed to all other students; that distinctions and honours should be conferred upon those who excelled in the work required of all; and that if any candidates for honors, pursued other subjects than those prescribed in the regular course, they should take such subjects as extras and not as options, to the neglect of subjects required of all other students?—I cannot speak positively on this subject now, after so long a time has passed, but I believe that Dr. *Ryerson* contended in the Senate, for encouragement to general proficiency rather than special attainments. In support of this opinion, I beg to put in evidence the following extract from the minutes of the Senate, on the 18th of March, 1854, consisting of a resolution which was passed by the Senate, just before the other resolutions referred to by Mr. *Brown*, in question 246 :—

“Mr. *Langton*, seconded by Dr. *Ryerson*, moved, That there shall not be a different Examination for passing, and for honors at the annual examinations, and that any subjects specified as essential or optional, under necessary restrictions, shall be essential or optional to all alike.”

“Which motion was carried.”

The Rev. Dr. *Ryerson’s* Reply to the statements contained in the Questions of the Hon. *George Brown*.

MR. CHAIRMAN,

In appearing before you again, I beg to observe that I sustain a two-fold relation to the public; first, as a member of a religious community; secondly, as the Head of the Department of Public Instruction of Upper Canada. In the former capacity, my freedom of action and discretion has never, in the slightest degree, been interfered with by Government during the fifteen years of my occupancy of my present office. In the latter capacity, I came to Quebec, and could the Government have decided, as soon as I had solicited and expected, upon the school matters which it was my duty to submit to their consideration, I should have left Quebec before this Committee commenced its

sittings, and thus have avoided appearing before you. But having been summoned and brought here against my will and against my previous intentions, I felt it my duty to the great interests involved in your investigations, when thus compelled to appear as a witness, to state without reserve my convictions and views on the whole question, please or offend whom it might.

I think it proper, also, to correct a statement which has appeared in some of the public papers to the effect, that expressions of disapprobation had been conveyed to me from high authority as to my course of proceeding in this question. I feel it my duty to the Government to state—and I state it here, in the presence of the Honorable Attorney General for Upper Canada—that from no official quarter, high or low, has any opinion or sentiment been conveyed to me, by letter or verbally, directly or indirectly, as to any part I have taken in regard to the important subject of your inquiries. I know not the opinion of any member of the Government respecting this great question; but I believe its members have desired a fair and full investigation of it, and they have certainly left me as free as any other individual to communicate such information as I possessed, and to express my own convictions and views. I have done so to the best of my knowledge and belief.

In regard to questions relating to numerous meetings of the Senate of the University, and to a great variety of occurrences during a period of eight years, and respecting which I had no means or opportunity of refreshing my memory, by referring to the Journals, it is scarcely possible that I should have a minute or accurate recollection. Persons much younger, and with vastly less duties and cares than myself, are seldom, if ever, expected to remember every one of the scores of meetings which they may have attended, and every thing which may have been done at each of such meetings. Yet, such has been the vigilance and ingenuity with which the minutes of the Senate of the *Toronto University* have been searched, during a period of seven years, and questions framed containing base insinuations and false statements, in order to entrap and impugn me. I might have declined answering any of those questions, as the parties on the other side have habitually done, until I had the questions before me for at least twenty-four hours' enquiry and consideration; but I thought it best to answer, as I usually do, according to the recollections and impressions of the moment; and I am surprised, on since looking over the documents and records relating to the subjects of the questions, that I made so few mistakes, and was, upon the whole, so accurate in my answers.

I have found myself mistaken in two particulars; and I avail myself of the first opportunity to correct the two mistakes which I made. In answer to questions 255 and 258, I stated what occurred to me at the moment as to what has been allowed Mr. *Hodgins*, (Deputy Superintendent of Education for Upper Canada) for special services, in addition to his ordinary salary. On turning to the Official Accounts (to which I might have contented myself with referring) I find that while I was correct as to his salary, I was mistaken as to the sum allowed him for editing the *Journal of Education, Upper Canada*,—it being £100 instead of £50, or rather £75—as in former years—when I was able to do part of the work of editing it, and for which I never received a farthing. Indeed I edited and published it five years without a penny's expense to the public revenue, paying myself what was wanting in subscriptions to defray the expenses of paper and printing, and allowing Mr. *Hodgins* £75 for his services. I at length determined to discontinue it, if provision were not made to furnish it gratuitously to all local school authorities. In 1853, a sum not exceeding £150 per annum was granted for that purpose—the expense of editing it included, as well as the expense of printing, addressing, &c., nearly 4,000 copies per month; while the corresponding sum for editing the *Journal of Education for Lower Canada* is paid out of the public revenue. Mr. *Hodgins* has also been allowed by the Council of Public Instruction, as its Secretary, the small sum of £25 per annum, the ordinary duties of which are similar to those of the Registrar of the Senate of the *Toronto University*; but in addition to which Mr. *Hodgins* kept all the accounts connected with the erection of the Normal and Model School buildings; and he still oversees everything connected with their repairs and all the expenditures ordered by the Council of Public Instruction. During the last three years, Mr. *Hodgins*, in addition to his ordinary duties, prepared a valuable School Manual, containing not only the School Acts, forms and

regulations, but numerous explanatory notes, and a collection of the decisions which have been made by the Department and the Superior Courts on various school matters since 1850. He has prepared a *General Catalogue of Books for the Public School Libraries in Upper Canada*—a work of much labor, consisting of upwards of 250 closely printed octavo pages. He has also prepared a valuable publication, entitled *The School House: its Architecture, Arrangements and Discipline, with additional Papers on various subjects*. This book includes engravings of plans of school houses, school furniture, apparatus, &c., and extends to upwards of 200 pages royal octavo. For each of these three publications, I thought he was entitled to some remuneration, but before venturing to decide upon it, I showed the Pamphlets or Books themselves to the Honorables Attorney and Inspector Generals at Toronto; and I here lay them before the Committee.

Now, for extra work in preparing school maps, &c., in 1857, Mr. *Hodgins* was allowed £62 10s; and in 1859, £34. For preparing the *School Manual*, he was allowed £25; and for preparing these two books (the *General Catalogue*, &c. and the *School House*, &c.) he was allowed £18 15s. I have no doubt that had this extra work been done by those impugning me, it would have cost many times as much. I take this occasion to add, that Mr. *Hodgins* (having been a student in Victoria College when I was connected with it,) went at his own expense from Canada to Dublin in 1846, on my recommendation, and according to an arrangement I had made with the resident Commissioner of the National Board of Education in Ireland, and remained there a year at his own expense, until he made himself thoroughly acquainted with the details and whole mode of proceeding in each of the seven branches of the great Educational Office in Dublin, and brought back a strong testimonial from the Board, as to the diligence and success with which he had thus specially qualified himself for duties which he has since discharged with so much credit to himself, and benefit to the country. I have never known a more able and efficient Departmental Officer—getting through an immense deal of work himself, and knowing how to see that every subordinate officer thoroughly attends to his duties, and yet out of office hours pursuing studies and labors that seem to be sufficient of themselves to require all the time and energies of an ordinary man. All that has been paid to any person in my Department, as well as the minutest details of expenditure, will be found in the *Public Accounts* and in my *Annual Reports*; and the manner in which I have accounted for every farthing received, may challenge comparison with that adopted in any other branch of the public service.

A second mistake made by me in a former examination, is contained in my answer to question 200, when the discussions took place between Chancellor *Blake*, Mr. *Langton* and myself, which influenced me not to attend the meetings as I had previously done. I said,—“I do not recollect. It was before Mr. *Blake* resigned. I think that took place the latter end of 1854. I sometimes attended the Senate meetings after his resignation.” On turning to the records, I find that Mr. *Blake* did not resign until 1856; and the meeting to which I referred (and which I ascertained by finding the name of the Roman Catholic Vicar-General *McDonnell* of Kingston, the only time he ever was present) took place the 28th of April, 1856, and the discussion arose out of a motion made by Mr. *Langton* to restore the Faculties of Law and Medicine in Toronto University. The discussion on that proposition was very warm, in the course of which Chancellor *Blake* and Mr. *Langton* made remarks which gave me great pain. The proposition was voted against by the Honorable Mr. *Christie*, myself and one or two others; and out of 37 Senate meetings held after that in 1856, the records show that I attended only 4; out of 25 Senate meetings held in 1857, I attended 9; and out of 31, held in 1858, I attended 7; and out of 21, held in 1859, I was present at but two of them.

I now beg the attention of the Committee to the statements expressed or implied in Mr. *Brown's* questions. I refer first to question 219, in which I am made responsible for raising the salary of the Principal of Upper Canada College to \$2,400, besides residence and fees; whereas the records show that the present Principal was not appointed until March 1857, while the resolution fixing the salary of the Principal of Upper Canada College was passed the 8th of December, 1856, and was passed in consequence of correspondence laid before the Senate which had taken place between His Excellency Sir *Edmund Head*, and

a Mr. *Butler*, and afterwards a Mr. *Stephens*—both Classical honor men of Oxford University, and with a view to secure the services of the latter, and also that it was adopted unanimously by the Senate.

By questions 224 and 225, I am represented as the sole author of the pension paid to the Rev. *George Maynard*; whereas the records show that I never moved a resolution on the subject at all; that in every instance his case was brought before the Senate by others and not by me, though whenever I was present I advocated his claim as he had taught diligently and efficiently upwards of twenty years as Mathematical Master in Upper Canada College, up to the time when differences commenced between Mr. *Barron* and him. The Senate, after holding some forty meetings, and examining upwards of 90 witnesses, on those differences and matters arising out of them, stated the impossibility of Mr. *Barron* and Mr. *Maynard* acting together, condemned the conduct of both, and recommended that under the circumstances Mr. *Maynard* be removed, but that he be allowed "a small annuity" for his long services. In accordance with this recommendation, I acted whenever Mr. *Maynard's* case came before the Senate, in concert with the Hon. Mr. *Patton*, the Rev'ds. Drs. *Willis* and *Jennings*, and Dr. *Hoyes*. It may be observed that the salary of the Principal of the U. C. College, as also the allowances to Messrs. *Barron* and *Maynard*, are paid out of the funds of that institution and have no connexion whatever with the Toronto University expenditures.

In regard to the charges contained in questions 214 and 215, that I moved a resolution December 8th, 1856, recommending that Dr. *McCuill's* salary should be made equal to the emoluments he formerly enjoyed, that resolution could never be supposed to fix his present salary. Nor could a recommendation to grant some increase of salary to the Professors at that time, ever justify the charge that the authors of such a recommendation have fixed the salaries of the Professors at their present rate. Whether the salaries of the President and Professors of the Toronto University College are too high or not, the parties who joined in the recommendation of 8th December, 1856, are not entitled to either the praise or blame of it. But every member of the Senate must be influenced more or less in matters affecting the individual interests of some of its own members. It arises from the very nature of the relations subsisting between colleagues of the same Board or Senate. The nature and extent of that influence can be easily conceived. I do not think it is just or proper that the responsibility of any such matter should be imposed upon private individuals in regard to their own colleagues; nor can I conceive it wise or proper in any circumstances that men should be members of a body that is to decide upon their own salaries and emoluments. That in a Senate whose legal quorum is five there should be six persons whose salaries and emoluments are determined by the statute or recommendations of that Senate, is an anomaly which ought not to exist; and that that fact must have greatly influenced the Senate in determining their salaries and emoluments is as plain as day, though each individual concerned might have retired during the moments his own salary and emoluments were being decided upon. But whether those salaries and emoluments are too large, I, at least, have expressed no opinion; much less in regard to the remuneration allowed to the Registrar, and two servants in Upper Canada College. Those servants were almost starved, while the higher officers were largely paid.

But the question of salaries; incidentally alluded to by the Petitioners, and forming a small item of expenditure, has been siezed upon by their opponents from day to day, as if it were the chief grounds of dispute. This attempt to divert attention from the great principles and issues of the question to an incidental circumstance, making literally no defense on the real grounds of complaint under the head of extravagant expenditures,—is worthy of the cause for which it is made, and cannot be misunderstood by any intelligent person. But it will be seen by the evidence of the Rev. Mr. *Poole*, who has searched the Journals of the University Senate, that the salaries and emoluments of the officers of both Upper Canada College and University College, as now existing, have been determined by proceedings in which I have taken no part whatever.

I beg next to direct attention to Questions 234 and 235, in which Mr. *Brown* charges me with having aided to establish in University College the very system of *options* now existing. I shall have occasion at another time; to refer to the general question of options,

and to show how very different is the present system of options (or choosing of studies by students at their pleasure) from that which existed in 1854. I will only at present make two remarks: 1st. As the standard of Matriculation (even by the admission of Mr. *Langton* in his Memorial to the Legislature,) was at least one year higher in 1854 than it is now, and as no options were allowed until the end of the first year, the period at which they are now allowed, almost without limit, the whole optional system is one year lower now than it was in 1854, and is, therefore, a very different system. 2nd. By the resolution of the Senate.—moved by Mr. *Langton* and seconded by myself, March 18, 1854.—it was ordered that there should be but one examination for all students, whether candidates for honors or not; that the same examination papers should be given to all, each student answering as many of the questions as he could, and getting credit accordingly; and that the options allowed to one class of students should be allowed equally for all. At the present time, there are separate examinations, and different subjects of examination, for candidates for honors from ordinary students; and various options are allowed to the former, which are not permitted to the latter class of students; and several options are permitted now which were not allowed at all in 1854. The present system of options is not only thus essentially different from what it was in 1854, but the effect is not only to reduce the standard of University education, to destroy its harmony and efficiency, but to create injurious distinctions among the students.

In Question 263, Mr. *Brown* asked me—"Is it true that you have sought to have Toronto University brought under your control as a branch of your department, and that the educated men of the University have indignantly scouted your interference in classical and scientific education as totally beyond your sphere?" The origin and promptings of this question are transparent. The conclusion of my answer was—"The insinuation is without foundation, and the very reverse of truth." To show the malicious falsity of the statement contained in the question, and that I declined any control in University matters as also the emoluments of the Vice-Chancellorship, I will read two notes-- the one addressed a day or two since to the Hon. Mr. *Christie*, and the other his reply: they are as follows:

[Copy.]

QUEBEC, April 19th, 1860.

MY DEAR SIR:--It having been stated the other day in the University Committee of the Legislative Assembly that I had sought to get control of the University, I beg permission to ask you if, a short time before Mr. *Langton's* election by the Senate as Vice-Chancellor of the University, you did not, in behalf of yourself and certain other members of the Senate, propose to me my election to that office, and if I did not decline the high honor and important trust you proposed to confer upon me.

I remain, my dear Sir,

Yours truly,

(Signed)

E. RYERSON

[Copy.]

QUEBEC, 19th April, 1860.

MY DEAR SIR:--I regret that the proposal which was made to elect you to the Vice-Chancellorship of the University of Toronto should have been construed as a proof of your desire to control the University. The gentlemen who made the proposal supposed that the office in question might, with great propriety, be filled by the Head of the Educational Department in Upper Canada. You declined to accept the position, and there the matter ended.

I remain, my dear Sir,

Yours, very truly,

(Signed)

DAVID CHRISTIE.

THE REV. E. RYERSON.  
Quebec.

In question 250, I am represented by Mr. *Brown*, as having "proposed to the Senate the establishment of ten additional Scholarships of \$200 each—or in all, \$2000 per annum." The letter which I happened to have with me, and which I put in evidence.

shows, that what I proposed, was ten exhibitions "for Masterships of Grammar Schools—each to be of the value of £50, and to be tenable for one year only;" the competition for those exhibitions to be confined to Masters of Common Schools, who had taught a Common School, who had attended the Normal School one session, who had prepared for College at the Model Grammar School, who had been recommended by the Council of Public Instruction, and who should engage to teach a Grammar School in Upper Canada, three or four years, and provide security for the fulfilment of this promise, or refund the amount of the exhibition with interest. Such were the conditions and objects of the competition; and then the competitors were to go before the Examiners of the University, which was to decide the standard of the examination, and afterwards remain and pursue Collegiate studies in University College, one year. The proposal was rejected; the desired encouragement to intelligent and enterprising Common School teachers was withheld; the hope of providing regularly trained masters for the Grammar Schools, was disappointed; and I am now represented as having endeavoured to establish ordinary Scholarships to the amount of \$2000 per annum!

I now address myself to one of the most audacious impositions ever practised upon a Committee of the Legislative Assembly, as well as a most barefaced attempt to misrepresent and impugn me. By questions 245 and 248 I am charged with having, in 1854, supported and reported in favor of *establishing* scholarships, involving an annual expenditure of \$12,000. My answer was, that I opposed it. And then, to convict me of falsehood, and to prove that I supported what I declared I had opposed. Mr. Brown puts the following questions:—

"Ques. 246—Did you, on the 18th of March, 1854, second the following resolutions:

"1st. That there should be fifteen scholarships open to competition at the matriculation of each of the three succeeding annual examinations in arts, each to be held for one year?

"2nd. At the matriculation ten scholarships should be appropriated to those who held the highest places in general classes, and five to those students who have most distinguished themselves on the following special subjects, viz.: Two for mathematics, two for classics, and one for modern languages.

"3rd. At the first year's examination seven scholarships shall be appropriated to those who hold the highest places in the general classes, and eight in the following subjects. viz.: Two in classics, two in natural sciences, and two in modern languages.

"4th. At the two following annual examinations five scholarships shall be appropriated to the highest in the general classes, and ten to those who have most distinguished themselves, &c., &c.

Ans. I cannot recollect. I know the subject of such scholarships was discussed.

"Ques. 247. Were these resolutions referred to a Committee of yourself, Dr. Willis, Dr. Taylor, and Mr. Barron?—It is possible; I do not recollect."

When Mr. Brown put these questions, I had no recollection whatever of having placed my views on record respecting the creation of Scholarships to the amount of £3,000 per annum, although I recollect having opposed it, and that I had advocated scholarships for the assistance of poor young men. But on turning to the Minutes of the Senate's proceedings, I find that the resolutions quoted by Mr. Brown had no relation to the *creation* of scholarships, but to the *manner* of *distributing* scholarships already created, and the creation of which I had opposed.

The resolutions *creating* scholarships were proposed by Mr. Langton, the 15th of March, 1854, three days before the introduction of the resolutions quoted by Mr. Brown. An attempt was made to get them postponed, until a return of the number of students in University College should be laid before the Senate. That motion having failed, I moved an amendment to Mr. Langton's resolutions on scholarships. The following is an extract from the Minutes of the Senate, March 15, 1854, recording the proceedings referred to:—

Mr. Langton, seconded by Mr. Justice Draper, moved,

"1. That all scholarships for undergraduates, shall be of the same amount, viz.: £30 each, and that there shall be 15 annually.

" 2. That no student shall hold more than one scholarship in any one year.

" 3. That there shall be eight scholarships annually for *graduates*, to be held for two years after taking the degree of B.A., of the value of £50 each.

" 4. That there shall be two exhibitions of the value of £15 each, in every year which shall be awarded to students who would have been entitled to scholarships, but are not or do not propose to be resident in any affiliated College.

" Dr. *Workman*, seconded by Mr. *Nelles*, moved in amendment (to the above), " That the further consideration of the subject of scholarships be deferred until the information alluded to in the notice of motion (for the return of students attending University College), given to day by the mover (Dr. *Workman*), be placed before the Senate.

*Which amendment was lost.*

" The Rev. Dr. *Ryerson*, seconded by the Rev. Mr. *Nelles*, moved in amendment " That a sum not exceeding £1000 per annum, be expended for the establishment of " scholarships in the University. That these scholarships be established for the purpose " of assisting (as far as possible), with pecuniary aid, deserving youth, whose parents may " be unable to meet the expense necessarily attendant upon a University education.

*Which amendment was lost.*

" The original resolutions, as proposed by Mr. *Langton* and seconded by the Hon. Justice *Draper*, were then respectively put and *carried*."

Now, Sir, in the face of these proceedings, recorded on the official minutes of the Senate, within three pages of where Mr. *Brown* quotes the resolutions contained in his question, 246 (above cited), he represents me as having supported the *establishment* of scholarships, involving an expenditure of \$12,000 per annum! His questions also assert that the scholarships which I aided in establishing were the same as those now established. The above amendment, moved by me, shows that while I opposed the appropriation of more than £1000 for scholarships, I proposed to confine the competition for such scholarships to poor young men. The resolutions quoted by Mr. *Brown*, specify not the creation, but the *awarding* or *distribution* of the scholarships previously created. They show the preference given to *general proficiency*, ten out of the fifteen scholarships at Matriculation to be given to those who held the highest places in GENERAL CLASSES; *seven* out of the first year, and *five* for each of the two following years, also for general proficiency; whereas, according to the present system, only one scholarship is given for general proficiency the first year, and none for any one of the following years, and none for poor young men; they always competing at a disadvantage, as rich men are able to employ private tutors for their sons. The Rev. Mr. *Nelles*, in his evidence in answer to question 409, quotes the proceedings of the Senate, and shows how contrary to the records themselves, are the statements contained in Mr. *Brown's* questions. As well might Mr. *Dorion* be charged with having voted to divide Montreal into three electoral districts, because when a Bill which he had opposed was passed to make such a division, he wished to render it as consistent with his own views as possible. I opposed the creation of scholarships as proposed, and when they were established, I sought to make the distribution of them as just and beneficial as possible, according to my views. Such false quotations from the official minutes of the Senate, in order to implicate me, are of a piece with the seven forged quotations made by the " Editor-in-chief " of the *Globe*, which I exposed last year, and to which he has never attempted any reply.

E. RYERSON.

Quebec, April 23rd, 1860.

The Reverend Dr. *Ryerson* further Examined.

Question submitted by Professor *Wilson*, and put

[*By the Chairman,*]

Ques. 411. You stated to the Committee, that if the Committee would order the proceedings of the Senate to be laid before them, and mark who were present, and what was done at each meeting, they would see how the system has been worked, and how parties connected with the University and Upper Canada Colleges had directed as to expendi-

ture, studies, scholarships, &c. The minutes will show that all these expenditures have been directed by a family compact of gentlemen receiving their salaries from the University and Upper Canada College endowments. Dr. *Ryerson* has the minutes before him; will he specify in detail, the facts to which he refers, seeing that no Professors, except Dr. *McCaul*, had a seat at the Senate, before 2nd February, 1857?—I refer to the minutes.

It being 3 o'clock, P.M., the Committee adjourned until Monday next at 11 o'clock, A. M.

*Monday, 23rd April.*

COMMITTEE MET.

*Present :*

HON. MR. CAMERON, Chairman,  
 HON. " CAYLEY,  
 HON. " FOLEY,  
 HON. " ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD,  
 " McCANN,  
 " ROBLIN,  
 " SIMPSON

The Rev. Messrs. *Cook*, *Ryerson*, *Stinson*, *Nelles*, and *Poole* were in attendance. *John Langton*, Esq., Vice-Chancellor, and Professor *Wilson* appeared and informed the Committee, that they had on the part of the University of Toronto closed their case of replies.

*John Langton*, Esquire, was further Examined.

Questions submitted by Mr. *Poole*, and put

[*By the Chairman.*]

*Ques. 412.* Was there no extravagance in spending \$297,754.87 in the New Building?—I do not think the expenditure on the Building was beyond the requirements of the University.

*Ques. 413.* Was it not extravagant outlay to send to France for stone for that Building?—I do not think the use of Caen stone in that Building was more extravagant than the frequent use of the same stone in other Public Buildings, in the small quantity in which it was used.

*Ques. 414.* Has not the system of warming the New Buildings proved to be extravagant, when the Bursar reports it cost in 1850 \$1,824 84 for fuel?—I do not think that the system of warming the New Building has yet been sufficiently tried, and it has not been taken off the hands of the Contractor. And other Public Buildings which are warmed in the same way, as the Rossin House of Toronto, are not found to cost more than other means of warming.

*Ques 415.* Has there not been an unnecessary outlay on the grounds?—I do not think there was. It was necessary to provide an approach to the Building, and there has been no outlay upon the grounds, except making the necessary roads up to the Building, and a bridge across the ravine.

*Ques. 416.* Could not the efficiency of the Institution be maintained by a less number of Professors?—I do not think that it could, with the exception of two Professorships. I do not think, as I have stated in my evidence, that a Professor of Agriculture is necessary, and I do not think a Professor of Meteorology is necessary, except in connection with the Observatory.

*Ques. 417.* Is the Professor of Oriental literature and Hebrew necessary for a non-Theological Institution?—I think that the study of the Hebrew language belongs more peculiarly to the Faculty of Divinity. But the Oriental languages as included in our course, comprise more than Hebrew; and I am not aware of any University which does not provide for the study of Oriental languages.

[By Hon. Att. Gen. Macdonald.]

*Ques.* 418. Now that office in India is conferred on competitive of Examination, is it not desirable that Canadian Youth should have an opportunity to compete for Office by the study of Arabic, Persian, and the several Indian languages, and is it not desirable that the study of those languages should be encouraged by the University?—I think that it might be desirable to extend the study of existing Oriental languages, as suggested by the question. But our course relates more peculiarly to extinct oriental languages which, although a useful preparation for the study of the modern ones, would not altogether meet the views expressed in the question.

Question submitted by Mr. Poole, and put

[By the Chairman.]

*Ques.* 419. Is there any real necessity for so many salaried Servants connected with the establishment?—I know very little of the duties of the servants in the College. In the University we have only a messenger.

*Ques.* 420. Would not fewer than seven persons, including the Professor of Meteorology, be sufficient to take charge of the Observatory?—I am not aware how many persons there are in charge of the Observatory, but I think the question states the number erroneously. I do not believe that the staff there is at all beyond what is absolutely necessary to carry on the observations. I have stated in my evidence in chief that, although it is desirable that the Observatory should be kept up, I do not think it ought to be a charge on the University Funds. I think it ought to be maintained by the Province.

*Ques.* 421. Is it not extravagant to spend \$9,044 in the Bursar's Office, as reported in 1857?—It has always appeared to me that the expenses of the Bursar's Office are large, but I have very few opportunities of judging of the matter, and no means of suggesting any alteration.

*Ques.* 422. Are not the items called Incidentals, as reported in 1857, one of \$1510, the other \$3571, indications of extravagance?—The first sum named is part of the expenses of the Bursar's Office, of which I know very little, and over which I have no control. As to the second sum, as stated in the Bursar's evidence, a large portion related to matters entirely foreign to the Educational department of the University, which is all that I am connected with, such as £150 to the heirs of the late Professor of Medicine, ordered by the Government, and considerable expenses for surveying and reporting upon the landed property of the University. That portion of the Incidental expenses under the control of the University authorities, I do not think has been excessive.

*Ques.* 423. Does not the Senate control the Bursar's Office and recommend those expenditures?—The Senate has nothing at all to do with the Bursar's Office, and never recommended any of those expenditures.

*Ques.* 424. The Stationery Account of 1857, is reported by the Bursar as amounting to \$2394 6 cts. Is not that extravagant?—The expense for Stationery and Printing has been very heavy, and was necessarily so at the first commencement of the University. It has been already very much reduced, and by arrangements which I made with the University Printer last year, it will be still further reduced.

[By the Hon. Mr. Cayley.]

*Ques.* 425 Referring to the question put to you by Mr. Poole, relating to the two Incidental expenses, do you understand them as both chargeable especially against the Bursar's Office?—Certainly not. The first is the only one chargeable against the Bursar's Office.

Question submitted by Mr. Poole, and put

[By the Chairman.]

*Ques.* 426. Does not part of those expenses belong to the Bursar's Office.—The first item of incidentals, amounting to £373, relates exclusively to the Bursar's Office.

*Ques.* 427. The Bursar reports for 1859 an expenditure of \$6013 for Scholarships and \$950.90 the same year for Prizes and Medals. Is not that extravagant?—With regard to the Scholarships, in my evidence in chief I have clearly shewn that the expenses in the University of Toronto are not greater for Scholarships than in most similar Institutions.

And, as we may expect, the number of students to increase annually, I do not think the present appropriation for Scholarships at all excessive. As to that portion of the other item for Medals and Prizes which is under the control of the University, I do not think the expenditure excessive. With that portion under the control of the College, I have nothing to do.

*Ques. 428.* Was not the amount of \$3560, paid to certain Commissioners, on examination of certain charges: viz., *Miles and Brily, W. Coffin and F. Daniels* an extravagant outlay.—The amount was ordered to be paid by the Government, who, I presume, are the best judges whether the remuneration was excessive or otherwise.

*Ques. 429.* Was it not extravagance to give 50 Honors, Scholarships and Prizes to *T. Moss*?—I am not aware of the amount of Scholarships and Prizes given to Mr. *T. Moss*. But I will say this for Mr. *Moss*, that a more distinguished young man never appeared in any University, or one who attended to his studies and distinguished himself in all the departments more than he did.

*Ques. 430.* Are they not so stated in the Calendar of 1858 and 1859?—I do not know. I am not in the habit of reading the Calendar, which is not published by the University.

*Ques. 431.* Was it not an extravagant outlay to spend \$1580 in celebrating the Laying of the Top Stone of the New Building, as stated in the Bursar's statement?—I believe it is customary upon the inauguration of any large public building, to have a public celebration. I know there was a public celebration on the occasion of laying the first stone of the Laval University, and also at the installation of the Normal Schools of Lower Canada, and I think it was a very proper thing to have such a celebration at Toronto. I do not think, under the circumstances, the cost of that celebration was too great, considering the importance of the institution which was then opened, and that His Excellency was taking an active part in the ceremony.

*Ques. 432.* Is it not extravagant to lay out \$5676.86 on furniture for Boarding Hall, in connection with University College, as stated in Bursar's Report?—With regard to the outfit of University College, I have no means of knowing what these items were for. But I conceive, if a large building of that kind has to be furnished, and apartments for 50 or 60 students supplied with furniture, bedding, grates, &c., it could not be done properly for much less.

*Ques. 433.* What prospect do you see for that Hall to pay its way, now that it is furnished?—As I stated before, I have no means of controlling the expenditure of University College, but I am aware that the authorities of that College intend that the Board fees of the students shall pay the entire expense of boarding. If the rate as at present fixed, is found to be insufficient, then they will raise the rate.

*Ques. 434.* How many Boarders were attending there the last year?—I am not prepared to give the number. I refer to Professor *Wilson*.

*Ques. 435.* Will you please read for the Committee the resolution passed in the Senate respecting the salaries of the Professors, as recorded in the minute book on the 19th of May, 1858, page 455?—"The Vice-Chancellor, seconded by Mr. *Patton*, moved, That in the opinion of the Senate, it is not expedient to make any permanent increase to the salaries of the Professors in University College. But they would recommend that the stipend attached to the following Professorships, viz., Greek and Latin, with Logic and Rhetoric, Metaphysics and Ethics, Chemistry and Experimental Philosophy, Natural Philosophy, History and English Literature, Natural History, Mineralogy and Geology, and Modern Languages, should be fixed at Five Hundred Pounds per annum, with an increase of Fifty Pounds per annum after five years from the dates of their commissions, and a further increase of Fifty Pounds per annum after every subsequent term of five years.

"The salaries, as recommended, should cover all present allowances for house rent.

"The Senate would also recommend that the Salary of the President, as such, be Three Hundred and Fifty Pounds per annum, and that the office of Vice-President be filled up with a salary of One Hundred Pounds.

"Which motion was carried."

*Ques. 436.* When was that resolution sanctioned by His Excellency?—About a week or two afterwards, with a modification.

*Ques. 437.* What was the modification?—That the limit of the increase should be £650, an amount which could not have been exceeded by the original resolution, except in the case of a person of over twenty years' service in the University.

*Ques. 438.* Is that the resolution upon which the salaries of the Professors are now regulated?—It is. I wish to explain that the salaries are not decided by this resolution, but that this resolution was passed in answer to a reference from His Excellency, asking advice from the Senate. The salaries are determined by the Order in Council.

*Ques. 439.* How long before the passing of that resolution when Dr. *Ryerson* assisted in raising Dr. *McCaul's* salary to the amount he formerly enjoyed?—About two years. Upon that occasion Dr. *Ryerson* moved a recommendation that Dr. *McCaul's* salary should be raised, and added to it a recommendation that the salaries of the other Professors should be raised. When Dr. *McCaul's* salary was afterwards raised by the Government, the reference now spoken of was made with special reference to the recommendation formerly emanating from the Senate, and the Senate was asked to define what additional salaries to the Professors they recommended.

*Ques. 440.* Is there any evidence of that in the Senate records?—I do not know that there is. Such is the fact. The Minutes record that the Vice-Chancellor moved to take up the subject of the salaries of the Professors in University College, referred to the Senate by the letter of the Provincial Secretary read at the last meeting, upon which Dr. *Wilson* withdrew. At the previous meeting I find this record: "Read a letter from Hon. *T. J. J. Loranger*, Secretary, dated 24th April, in reference to the salaries of the Professors of University College."

*Ques. 441.* Has any resolution or statute been passed relating to the salaries of the Professors since May 19, 1858?—Not to my knowledge; and I would say more than that, I feel certain there was none or I should have heard of it. And I know that the reference was especially with regard to the previous recommendation of the Senate, two years before. In the Secretary's Office all these documents will be found.

*Ques. 442.* What were Dr. *McCaul's* salary and emoluments before 1856?—I am not certain. They were a good deal higher than his salary at that time.

*Ques. 443.* What is Dr. *McCaul's* salary now?—£1000 a year.

*Ques. 444.* Is it not true then, that you moved, seconded by the Hon. Mr. *Fatton*, on the 19th May, 1858, the resolutions by which the Professors' salaries are now regulated?—I did,—explanatory of the previously recorded desire of the Senate that they should be raised. And when this motion was carried, Dr. *Ryerson* was present and offered no opposition?

*Ques. 445.* Do the records say that Dr. *Ryerson* supported it?—The records state that he was present, and I state that he offered no opposition to it.

*Ques. 446.* When and under what circumstances was the salary of the Principal of Upper Canada College fixed at £600?—I do not recollect the date of the last decision of the Senate upon the subject. According to my recollection, the question of the salary of the Principal of Upper Canada College came up three times upon references from the Government, and the three references all varied a little from each other.

*Ques. 447.* When was the present Principal appointed?—On the 8th April, 1857.

*Ques. 448.* In 1857, February 2, page 382, vol. 2, the Vice-Chancellor introduced a Statute to determine the salaries and emoluments of the Principal of Upper Canada College. Is it by that statute those emoluments are now regulated?—I believe that would be the Statute on which they are now regulated.

*Ques. 449.* Was the system of options allowed in 1854, the same as that now allowed?—Very nearly the same. There was the same option between Modern Languages and Classics, and between Natural Science and Mathematics. The arrangement of the options has been varied; the principle remains the same.

*Ques. 450.* Was the system of Scholarships the same in 1854 as the present system?—Very nearly the same, except that the number of Scholarships open to competition has been reduced.

*Ques. 451.* Was the course of study revised in 1857.—It was.

*Ques. 452.* Please state the object of the Statute introduced by the Vice-Chancellor and seconded by Dr. *Wilson* on the 4th of March, 1857?—I presume this to be the existing Statute of Matriculation, and if I am right in supposing this, its object was to put our Matriculation examination in harmony with the capabilities of the Schools in the Country to send up young men to undergo it.

*Ques. 453.* Did it lower the standard of Matriculation?—Certainly. The standard of Matriculation was before too high.

*Ques. 454.* Please give the Committee the Yeas and Nays on that Statute?—The Yeas and Nays, as given on the 4th March, 1857, was not a division upon that Statute but upon another Statute. There was no division on the Statute as introduced by me on the 26th March, which I believe to be the present Statute.

*Ques. 455.* Will you produce the Statute on which the division took place?—Theſ will be produced.

Professor *Wilson* Examined.

Question submitted by the Rev. Mr. *Poole*, and put

[*By the Chairman.*]

*Ques. 456.* Does the present Statute lower the standard of Matriculaion?—It decidedly does. I was appointed a Member of the Senate on the 2nd February, 1857. Previous to that time I had expressed very strongly in the College Council, and elsewhere, my conviction that the Matriculation examination was a complete barrier to the admission of Students from the Country Grammar Schools, and in reality created a monopoly for Upper Canada College. I had conversed on that subject repeatedly prior to that date with the Rev. Dr. *Ryerson*, and if he did not concur in that opinion he certainly led me to believe so. There is no step in reference to the interests of education in this Province in which I have borne a part, that I look back upon with more complete satisfaction than the lowering of that Matriculation.

*John Langton, Esq.*, further Examined,

[*By the Hon. Mr. Cayley.*]

*Ques. 457.* Have you any observations to offer with reference to the School of Medicine in the University?—I put in a statement in a tabular form, of the requirements of different Schools of Medicine, both in the Old Country and in Canada. Those in the Old Country are extracted from the Edinburgh Medical Journal of October, 1857—those of the Canadian Schools from their own prospectuses. There will be observed a remarkable difference between the two, namely, that the British Schools require a less attendance upon lectures, and a larger attendance upon the Hospitals, owing, in all probability, to the greater abundance of hospitals there than in Canada. As compared with each other, the requirements of the Canadian Schools of Medicine are very similar. The following are the differences:—

REQUISITES FOR MEDICAL DEGREE OR LICENSE.

N. B.—The British Universities, &c., are taken from the *Edinburgh Medical Journal*, October, 1857.

|  | Anatomy. | Physiology. | Demonstrations. | Dissections. | Surgery. | Practice of Medicine. | Chemistry. | Practical Chemistry. | Materia Medica. | Medical Jurisprudence. | Midwifery. | Botany and Natural History. | Practical Pharmacy. | Pathology. | Surgical Hospital. | Medical Hospital. | Clinical Surgery. | Clinical Medicine. |
|--|----------|-------------|-----------------|--------------|----------|-----------------------|------------|----------------------|-----------------|------------------------|------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| University Edinburgh.....                | 6 m.     | 6 m.        | .....           | 6 m.         | 6 m.     | 6 m.                  | 6 m.       | .....                | 9 m.            | 3 m.                   | 6 m.       | 6 m.                        | 6 m.                | 6 m.       | .....              | 12 m.             | 6 m.              | 9 m.               |
| do Glasgow.....                          | 6 m.     | 6 m.        | .....           | 6 m.         | 6 m.     | 6 m.                  | 6 m.       | 3 m.                 | 6 m.            | 3 m.                   | 6 m.       | 3 m.                        | 3 m.                | .....      | 24 m.              | 24 m.             | 24 m.             | 24 m.              |
| do Aberdeen.....                         | 12 m.    | 6 m.        | .....           | 6 m.         | 6 m.     | 6 m.                  | 6 m.       | 3 m.                 | 6 m.            | 3 m.                   | 6 m.       | 3 m.                        | 3 m.                | .....      | 24 m.              | 24 m.             | 3 m.              | 6 m.               |
| do St. Andrews.....                      | 12 m.    | 6 m.        | .....           | 12 m.        | 6 m.     | 6 m.                  | 6 m.       | 3 m.                 | 6 m.            | 3 m.                   | 6 m.       | 3 m.                        | 3 m.                | .....      | 24 m.              | 24 m.             | 6 m.              | 6 m.               |
| do London.....                           | 6 m.     | 6 m.        | 9 m.            | 15 m.        | 6 m.     | 6 m.                  | 6 m.       | 1 cr.                | 1 cr.           | 1 cr.                  | 1 cr.      | 6 m.                        | 1 cr.               | 6 m.       | 12 m.              | 12 m.             | 12 m.             | 12 m.              |
| do Dublin.....                           | 6 m.     | 6 m.        | 6 m.            | 6 m.         | 6 m.     | 6 m.                  | 6 m.       | 3 m.                 | 6 m.            | 3 m.                   | 6 m.       | 3 m.                        | 3 m.                | .....      | 24 m.              | 24 m.             | 24 m.             | 9 m.               |
| do Queen, Ireland.....                   | 12 m.    | 6 m.        | 12 m.           | 12 m.        | 6 m.     | 6 m.                  | 6 m.       | 3 m.                 | 6 m.            | 3 m.                   | 12 m.      | 3 m.                        | 3 m.                | .....      | 24 m.              | 24 m.             | 24 m.             | 6 m.               |
| Royal College of Physicians, London..... | 6 m.     | 6 m.        | .....           | .....        | 6 m.     | 6 m.                  | .....      | .....                | 3 m.            | 3 m.                   | 6 m.       | 3 m.                        | .....               | .....      | .....              | 36 m.             | .....             | .....              |
| do do Ireland.....                       | 6 m.     | 6 m.        | 6 m.            | 6 m.         | 6 m.     | 6 m.                  | .....      | .....                | 3 m.            | 3 m.                   | 6 m.       | 3 m.                        | .....               | .....      | .....              | 24 m.             | .....             | .....              |
| Army Medical Board.....                  | 12 m.    | 6 m.        | 12 m.           | 12 m.        | 12 m.    | 12 m.                 | 12 m.      | 6 m.                 | 3 m.            | .....                  | 6 m.       | 3 m.                        | 3 m.                | .....      | 18 m.              | 18 m.             | 8 m.              | 8 m.               |
| Navy do.....                             | 18 m.    | 6 m.        | 12 m.           | 12 m.        | 18 m.    | 12 m.                 | 3 m.       | 3 m.                 | 6 m.            | .....                  | 6 m.       | 3 m.                        | 3 m.                | .....      | 24 m.              | 6 m.              | 24 m.             | 6 m.               |
| McGill College.....                      | 12 m.    | 12 m.       | 12 m.           | 12 m.        | 12 m.    | 12 m.                 | 12 m.      | 12 m.                | 12 m.           | 3 m.                   | 12 m.      | .....                       | .....               | .....      | 12 m.              | 12 m.             | 8 m.              | 8 m.               |
| Queen's do.....                          | 12 m.    | 12 m.       | 12 m.           | 12 m.        | 12 m.    | 12 m.                 | 12 m.      | 12 m.                | 12 m.           | 3 m.                   | 12 m.      | .....                       | .....               | .....      | 18 m.              | 18 m.             | 6 m.              | 6 m.               |
| Victoria do.....                         | 12 m.    | 12 m.       | 12 m.           | 12 m.        | 12 m.    | 12 m.                 | 12 m.      | 12 m.                | 12 m.           | 3 m.                   | 12 m.      | .....                       | .....               | .....      | 12 m.              | 12 m.             | 1 cr.             | 1 cr.              |
| Trinity College, Toronto.....            | 1 cr.    | .....       | 1 cr.           | 15 m.        | 1 cr.    | 1 cr.                 | 1 cr.      | 1 cr.                | 1 cr.           | 1 cr.                  | 1 cr.      | 1 cr.                       | 1 cr.               | 1 cr.      | 18 m.              | 18 m.             | .....             | .....              |
| University of Toronto.....               | 12 m.    | 12 m.       | 12 m.           | 12 m.        | 12 m.    | 12 m.                 | 12 m.      | 3 m.                 | 6 m.            | 3 m.                   | 12 m.      | .....                       | .....               | .....      | 12 m.              | 12 m.             | 6 m.              | 6 m.               |

The only difference amongst the existing Canadian Colleges are—

1. Queen's requires no lectures on *Physiology* or *Institutes of Medicine*, apart from *Anatomy* and *Physiology*, which McGill, Victoria, Toronto, and all the British Schools do.
2. Victoria does not require *Anatomy* as distinguished from *Practical Anatomy*, which McGill, Queen's, Toronto, and all the British Schools do.
3. Neither McGill, Queen's, nor Victoria require *Practical Chemistry*, which Toronto and all the British Schools do, except Edinburgh, and the Royal College of Physicians, London.
4. Toronto only requires 6 months of *Materia Medica*, which is the highest amount required by any of the British Schools, whilst McGill, Queen's and Victoria require 12 months.
5. Victoria requires 6 months and Queen's nothing in *Medical Jurisprudence*, whilst Toronto, McGill, and all the English Schools require 3 months.
6. Victoria requires 6 months of *Pathology* or *Morbid Anatomy*, whilst McGill, Queen's and Toronto, and all the British Schools, except Edinburgh and London, do not require it to be treated separately from *General Anatomy*.
7. Victoria requires 12 months' attendance on *Clinical Lectures*, whilst Queen's and Toronto only require 6, and McGill College 2 courses of two hours a week, but in this respect Victoria is supported by the practice of the British Schools.

I would, at the same time, state what the work of Matriculation examinations in the Canadian Institutions is.

Matriculation Examination, VICTORIA.—Satisfactory evidence of classical and general attainments. In Classics—London Pharmacopœa, Gregory's Conspectus, or Sallust or any other Latin Book.

“ “ MCGILL'S.—Proof of competent classical attainments either by examination or otherwise.

“ “ QUEEN'S.—Proof of classical attainments.

With regard to the Matriculation in Medicine, it stands upon an entirely different footing from Matriculation in Arts. The object of a Matriculation examination in Arts is to show that the student is sufficiently far advanced to go on with his studies in the prescribed course. The object of a Matriculation examination in Medicine is to ascertain whether he has finished his studies in those departments in which he will never be examined again. I am aware that any examination for Matriculation will be very partially acted upon, and it is impossible at any one examination, to decide whether a man is a sufficiently well educated man to fit him for the Profession of Medicine. I entirely agree with Dr. Cook, that it would be a great deal better, if he were required, before proceeding with Medicine, to be either a graduate in Arts, or to have taken a certain number of definite courses in Arts. But no one University can introduce this system when it is not the custom in other Universities; it can only be done by the combined action of them all, and I hope it may yet be done.

The Rev. Dr. Ryerson addressed the Committee in explanation of his evidence formerly given.

Rev. Dr. Ryerson further Examined.

[By the Hon. Mr. Cayley.]

Ques. 458. What was the date of your motion for the increase of Dr. *McCaul's* salary, and the recommendation of some addition to the salaries of the other Professors?

Ques. 459. Be so good as to refer to the Bursar's Statement of salaries which Dr. *McCaul* and the other Professors were receiving at the time you made that motion and read the amounts as shewn in vol. xv., no. 5, of the Appendix for 1857?

Ques. 460. What effect had the Order of the Council directing the addition of £60 to the salaries of each of the Professors for the year 1855, on the salaries of those gentlemen for the year 1855.

Ques. 461. In effect then Dr. *McCaul* had been in the receipt of £820, and Messrs. Dr. *Bevan*, *Croft*, *Cherriman*, *Wilson*, *Hincks*, *Forneri* and *Chapman*, had been in the receipt of £510 each, for two years, when you moved the resolution of 18th December, 1856?

Witness was allowed to hand in his answers to the above questions at the next meeting of the Committee.

Committee adjourned until to-morrow at 11 o'clock, A. M.

Tuesday, 24th April.

#### COMMITTEE MET.

Present :

The HON. MALCOLM CAMERON, Chairman  
HON. MR. CAYLEY,  
HON. MR. FOLEY,  
HON. MR. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD,  
MR. McCANN,  
MR. ROBLIN.

The Revds. Messrs. *Cooke*, *Ryerson*, *Stinson*, *Nelles*, and *Poole* were in attendance.

*John Langton*, Esq., and Professor *Wilson*, of University of Toronto, were in attendance.

The Hon. *Joseph C. Morrison* appeared in answer to summons of Committee, and was Examined.

[*By the Hon. Mr. Cayley.*]

*Ques.* 462. You have seen the building now occupied as a Lunatic Asylum, on the University Ground, and are aware that it formed part of the intended University Building; are you aware of what the cost would have been had the original plan been carried out?—I am not aware of the sum. It was, in my opinion, estimated at over £200,000.

*Ques.* 463. What was understood by the Senate as the probable cost of the Buildings proposed to be erected on the present site at the time Chief Justice *Draper* moved in the Senate to request His Excellency to appropriate a sum for that purpose?—The appropriation expected was £100,000, £75,000 for the Buildings, £25,000 toward the Museum and Library.

Questions submitted by the Rev. Dr. *Ryerson*, and put

[*By the Chairman.*]

*Ques.* 464. Do you recollect particularly the proceedings of the Senate in 1854, and the part that Dr. *Ryerson* took in them?—I recollect generally the proceedings, but I cannot at this time say the particular course that Dr. *Ryerson* took.

*Ques.* 465. Do you recollect his having suggested the discontinuance of Upper Canada College, and the use of its Buildings for University College?—I do not, although I do recollect that the subject was mentioned.

Mr. *Langton* further Examined.

[*By the Honorable Mr. Cayley.*]

*Ques.* 466. In your Statement in Chief you say that the scholarships of Toronto University are all open scholarships, unconnected with any College;—that a student of Queen's or Victoria, may hold one if he can obtain it, and continue his studies at his own College: that, in fact, any young men who can come up to the requisite standard, whether they belong to a College or not, may hold scholarships of the University, and that many are so held. Can you state the whole number of scholarships awarded by the University since its commencement, and how many were taken by students not at the time students of the University?—There have been 213 scholarships awarded since 1854. Of these, 100 were awarded to candidates who were not at the time students in University College. Many of them afterwards became students in College, but many had no connection with it in any part of their course.

Reverend Dr. *Ryerson* ended in his answers to questions 458, 459, 460 and 461.

Put by Hon. Mr. *Cayley* yesterday, as follows:—and was further Examined.

(What was the date of your motion for the increase of Dr. *McCaul's* salary, and the recommendation of some addition to the salaries of the other Professors)?—*Ans.* The 18th of December, 1856.

(Be so good as to refer to the Bursar's Statement of salaries which Dr. *McCaul* and the other Professors were receiving at the time you made that motion and read the amounts, as shown in Vol. xv., No. 5, of the Appendix for 1857)?—*Ans.* My motion was made, as is evident from the words of the resolution, intending to raise the salary of Dr. *McCaul* to the amount he formerly enjoyed. The Report in the Appendix was presented to the Government in March, 1857, several months after my motion was made. Of the salaries of the Professors at the time of making my motion I knew nothing, except what was contained in the Appendix to the Journals for 1856; and in that the salaries of each of the Professors was stated to be £450. In the Bursar's Return, in the Appendix for 1857, I, however, find the salaries are stated thus:—

The Rev. *J. McCaul*, Professor of Classical Literature,—12

months' salary, - - - - - £510 0 0

Increase, as per Order in Council, for 1855, - - - - - 60 0 0

|  |   |      |   |   |
|--|---|------|---|---|
| As President of University College,—12 months' salary, | - | 250  | 0 | 0 |
| Allowance for house rent,                              | - | 6    | 0 | 0 |
| In all   | - | £880 | 0 | 0 |
| Professor of Metaphysics,                              | - | £630 | 0 | 0 |
| Professor of Chemistry,                                | - | 630  | 0 | 0 |
| Professor of Agriculture,                              | - | 350  | 0 | 0 |
| Professor of Natural Philosophy,                       | - | 570  | 0 | 0 |
| Professor of History and English Literature,           | - | 570  | 0 | 0 |
| Professor of Natural History,                          | - | 570  | 0 | 0 |
| Professor of Modern Languages,                         | - | 570  | 0 | 0 |
| Professor of Mineralogy,                               | - | 570  | 0 | 0 |

All these salaries include £60 for 1855.

(What effect had the Order of Council directing the addition of £60 to the salaries of each of the Professors for the year 1855, or the salaries of those gentlemen for the year 1855?—*Ans.* It would have made them £60 more.

(In effect then Dr. *McCauley* had been in the receipt of £820; and Messrs. Dr. *Beaven*, *Croft*, *Cherriman*, *Wilson*, *Hincks*, *Fornari* and *Chapman* had been in the receipt of £510 each for two years, when you moved the Resolution of 18th December, 1856?—*Ans.* What the retrospective effect of my Resolution was I cannot say. It may have been applied retrospectively as well as prospectively. It cannot be denied that in 1855, they were as I stated £450. The vouchers of the Bursar's Office ought to show when the advance was made, and upon what authority.

[*By Honorable Mr. Cayley*]

*Ques.* 471. Is this (document now produced) the memorial of Dr. *McCauley*, asked for by you yesterday?—It is dated November 18th, 1856, is accompanied by the Provincial Secretary's letter, dated December 13th, 1856, and must therefore be the memorial required. I will read it:—

“UNIVERSITY COLLEGE,

“Toronto, November 18, 1856.

“SIR,—I have the honor to request that, you will be so good as to submit to His Excellency the Governor General the following statement relative to my emoluments.

“In the year 1842, I was appointed Vice-President of King's College, and in 1843 Professor of Classical Literature, Logic, Rhetoric, and Belles Lettres. The emoluments of the Vice-President had been previously (March 30, 1841) fixed by the College Council at £750 sterling per annum, with a suitable residence; but in consequence of the state of the income of the Institution at the period of my appointment, it was found necessary that I should discharge the duties of both Vice-President and Professor, with the same emoluments for both offices as has been fixed for the former alone. In addition to these emoluments, I was entitled to a proportion of the fees paid by the students and candidates for degrees. This proportion of the fees, during the period in which I held these offices, viz., from 1843 to 1848, exceeded £50 currency per annum. In 1848 I was appointed President of King's College, still retaining the Professorships, and the emoluments remained unaltered, with the exception that having occasion to leave the house which I had occupied as Vice-President, I was allowed £80 currency for house rent. In 1850, however, my emoluments were reduced by the Senate to £600 currency per annum, without any allowance for house rent, and the only counterbalance for this reduction was the provision that I should for the future receive the whole, instead of a proportion, of the fees paid by the students attending my lectures as Professor. Shortly afterwards this statute was repealed, and the salary was raised from £600 currency to £700 currency, with an allowance of £60 per annum for house rent, and the right, as in the former statute, to the whole amount of fees. The emoluments as fixed by this statute remained unchanged from 1851 to 1855, when in common with my colleagues I received the addition of £60 per annum to my salary as Professor; but the receipts from fees have been so far reduced, in consequence

of the lowering of the amount to be paid, and the increased number of Students entitled to exemption, that the income from this source, constantly diminishing since 1851, was last year below £3.

"From this statement it is apparent that at present, when the expense of living is so enormously increased, my emoluments are about £150 less than they were in 1849. I may be permitted to remark in illustration of this increased expense, that the allowance which I receive of £60 per annum for house rent, is not one half of the amount which I pay, exclusive of taxes.

"It is proper that I should mention that the reduction which was made in 1850, was not limited to me, but extended to the other Professors in the Faculty of Arts. Dr. *Beaven's* salary was reduced from £500 sterling, to £450 currency; Dr. *Croft's* and Mr. *Murray's* from £450 sterling, to £450 currency, and the allowance for house-rent was withdrawn from each. Subsequently, however, Dr. *Beaven*, received about £1140 currency as compensation, and an allowance of £60 per annum for house-rent was granted both to him and to Dr. *Croft*. They also received during the last year, the addition of £60 per annum, to which I have already adverted. Mr. *Murray's* death prevented his participation in these measures of relief.

"Under such circumstances, I respectfully pray, that His Excellency in Council will be pleased to take my case into his favorable consideration. In 1852, I addressed a communication on the same subject to His Excellency, the Earl of Elgin, which was duly acknowledged, but was not followed by any action. Since that time I have abstained from bringing the matter under the consideration of the Government, chiefly because the claims of others connected with the Institution had meanwhile been submitted, nor would I now solicit attention to my emoluments, if experience of their inadequacy did not enforce the necessity of application for an increase.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,

"Your obedient Servant,

"JOHN MCCAUL,

"President and Professor.

"The Hon. T. LEE TERRILL,  
"Provincial Secretary,  
"&c. &c."

"I. O., 13th December, 1856.

"PATRICK FREELAND, ESQ.,  
"Registrar, University of Toronto, Toronto.

"SIR,—I have the honor, by command of His Excellency the Governor-General, to transmit to you, herewith, a copy of a Memorial of the President of University College, on the subject of his emoluments, and I have to request you to lose no time in laying the document before the Senate, with a view of their reporting thereon for His Excellency's information.

"Yours, &c.,

"T. L. T.

"UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO, 19th Dec., 1856.

"SIR,—I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 13th instant, transmitting a copy of a Memorial of the President of University College, on the subject of his emoluments, and requesting the Senate to report thereon, for the information of His Excellency the Governor General.

"In relation to that Memorial, I have the honor to inform you, that I availed myself of the earliest opportunity to lay the same, together with your letter, before the Senate, and that after a careful consideration of the prayers of the Memorial, the Senate passed the following Resolution in relation thereto, viz. :

"That in reference to the Memorial of the Rev. Dr. *McCauley*, President and Professor of University College, referred by command of His Excellency for the report of the Senate thereon,

"This Senate is of opinion that Dr. *McCaule* is justly entitled to at least a salary equal to the amount of the emoluments he formerly enjoyed.

"The Senate avails itself of this occasion to submit to the consideration of His Excellency in Council, whether some addition should not also be made to the salaries of the other Professors of University College, as a just compensation for their able services and in consequence of the unprecedented dearness of living."

"I have the honor to be, Sir,

"Your obedient Servant,

"P. FREELAND,

"Registrar

"The Honorable

"T. LEE TERRILL,

"Provincial Secretary, &c., &c.

"Copy of a Report of a Committee of the Honorable the Executive Council, dated the 12th April, 1858, approved by his Excellency the Governor General in Council on the 13th April, 1858.

"On a communication, dated 13th November, 1856, from Dr. *McCaule*, President of the University College, representing that his present emoluments (amounting to £760, and an allowance of £60 for House Rent) are less by about £150 per annum, than they were in 1849, whilst the fees have been gradually diminishing to such an extent, that last year, they yielded but a sum of £3, and praying that in consequence of the high and increasing prices of living, his application for increased emoluments may meet with favorable consideration.

"The above communication having been referred to the Senate of the University for report, that body have passed the following Resolution, which is submitted for Your Excellency's consideration :

"That in reference to the Memorial of the Revd. Dr. *McCaule*, this Senate is of opinion that Dr. *McCaule* is entitled to at least a salary equal to the amount of the emoluments he formerly enjoyed."

"The Senate avails itself of this occasion to submit whether some addition should not also be made to the salaries of the other Professors of University College, as a just compensation for their able services, and in consequence of the unprecedented dearness of living."

"The Committee recommended that the salary of Dr. *McCaule* be increased to £1000 per annum, inclusive of allowance for House Rent, and that he be paid at that rate from the 1st January 1857.

"To the Honorable

"Provincial Secretary, &c., &c.

(Certified)

WM. H. LEE, C. E. C.

"I. O. 14th April, 1858.

"The Reverend DR. McCAULE, President of University College, Toronto.

"REV'D SIR,—I have the honor to inform you that His Excellency the Governor General has had under his consideration in Council, your letter of the 18th November, 1856, renewing your application for an increase of your emoluments as President of University College, Toronto.

"His Excellency has also had before him the Report of the Senate of the University, on the subject of your application.

"In view of the fact set forth in your letter, and of the Report of the Senate thereon, His Excellency in Council has been pleased to order that your salary should be increased to £1000 currency, per annum, inclusive of allowance for House Rent, and that you be paid such increased salary from the 1st January, 1857.

I remain, &c.,

T. J. J. L."

J. O., 14th April, 1858.

"To The BURSAR of the University and College, Toronto.

"SIR,—I have the honor to transmit to you, herewith, for your information and guidance a copy of an Order in Council of the 13th instant, on the subject of the salary of the President of University College.

I remain, &c.,

T. J. J. L."

*Ques. 468.* Did you observe, as you read the memorial, a reference to the sum of £60 that, in common with his colleagues, he received in 1855?—I did. I can only say that the impression made on my mind was that which I have stated, and that I acted upon it I wish the memorial to be put in as evidence.

*Ques. 469.* Are you aware when this resolution of recommendation of the Senate to His Excellency was acted upon?—I do not know, indeed.

*Ques. 470.* Read the date of the letter?—The minute of Council is dated April 13th, 1858.

*Ques. 471.* You will perceive from the letter from the Secretary's Office, that the Memorial of Dr. *McCaul*, of November 15th, 1856, on which your recommendation of Dec. 18th, 1856, was founded, was not acted upon by the Government until 1858. Any addition of salary, therefore, which the Professors received in 1855 and 1856, will not have been the result of your recommendation of 18th December, 1856?—I cannot say, because there is nothing in this minute referring to the salaries of other Professors, and I cannot say when their salaries were raised.

Mr. *Langton*, further Examined.

Questions submitted by Mr. *Poole* and put—

[*By the Chairman.*]

*Ques. 472.* If, as is shown in the Appendix for 1856, No. 11, Statement No. 2, that the salary of the Professors for 1855, run as follows, viz. :—Professor *Kingston*, £450 Professor *Forin*, £450; Professor *Chapman*, £450; Professor *Hincks*, £450; Professor *Wilson*, £450; Dr. *Beaven*, £450 and House rent; Professor *Craft*, £450 and rent; Dr. *McCaul*, Professor, £450 and rent, and £250 as President; and if, as you state, their salaries were raised in 1856 to £510 prior to the resolutions of the 18th of December, 1856, upon what authority were they so raised, and where is that authority? And when a resolution had been moved to raise Dr. *McCaul's* salary and emoluments to what he formerly enjoyed, why was not the mover and seconder of that Resolution informed that they had been so raised?—In regard to that part of Mr *Poole's* question which asks on what authority these salaries were so raised, I have to reply that the Bursar's Accounts shew that it was upon the authority of an Order in Council of 1855. As to the latter portion of the question, why the fact that they were so raised was not communicated to the mover and seconder, I have to say that the fact was distinctly stated in express terms in the memorial in consideration of which the motion was made by the mover.

*Ques. 473.* If the salaries were raised, as the result of the resolution of 1856, by Order in Council in 1858, why then did the Vice-Chancellor move, seconded by Hon. Mr. *Patton*, that an additional salary be made to the Professors?—Because there was no Order in Council, raising the salaries of the other Professors at that time. The resolution moved by myself, and seconded by Hon. Mr. *Patton*, was in consequence of a reference to the Senate from His Excellency, on the 13th of May, 1858, which is thus recorded [Minutes, page 453]—“Read a letter from *T. J. J. Loranger*, Secretary, dated 24th April, in reference to the salaries of the Professors of the University College.” The nature of it was informing the Senate that Dr. *McCaul's* salary had been raised, and asking the Senate to advise the course they recommended with regard to the other Professors.

*Ques. 474.* Was there not an addition made also to the salary of Dr. *McCaul* at the same time?—There was not.

*Ques. 475.* The last clause in the minutes of May 19th, 1858, is "the Senate would also recommend that the salaries of the President, as such, be £350 per annum, and that the office of Vice-President be filled up with the salary of £100"—The effect of that was not to raise the salary beyond £1000.

*Ques. 476.* You stated yesterday that in your promptings to Mr. *Brown* while he was questioning Dr. *Ryerson*, that you told him that he was misrepresenting Dr. *Ryerson*, why then, did you not in justice to the Committee, in justice to the Legislative Assembly by whom that Committee was appointed, and in justice to the people they represented, inform the Committee that one of their own number had so far forgotten himself and his duty, as deliberately and knowingly to misrepresent the witness at the Bar, and that he was doing so with a professed copy of resolutions from the Senate records in his hand, and against the remonstrance of the Vice-Chancellor of the Senate?—I, by no means, admit the accuracy of the wording of the question. The facts are these: when Mr. *Brown* had put the question to Dr. *Ryerson* as regards his seconding my resolution about Scholarships, I told him that did not imply that either Dr. *Ryerson* or I were thereby founding Scholarships, but merely appropriating Scholarships already founded.

[*By Mr. Roblin.*]

*Ques. 477.* When you informed Mr. *Brown* he was mistaken, what did he reply?—My recollection is that Mr. *Brown* replied to the effect that whether he had proposed to found or only to distribute Scholarships, Dr. *Ryerson's* accusations against the professors, for having been guilty of such extravagance was refuted by this motion, which shewed that it was done three years before they had any seat in the Senate.

Professor *Wilson* further Examined

Questions submitted by Rev. Mr. *Nelles* and put—

[*By the Chairman.*]

*Ques. 478.* Is there anything in the present composition or working of the Senate of the University of Toronto, that you deem defective, and if so, state what it is?—I think the present composition of the Senate is defective. It has never been our part, acting under a specific Statute of the Province, and appointed to office under it, to pretend to dictate changes in the Law. The defects, I perceive, consist in the Senate being an unchanging body, nominated entirely by the Crown, although including *ex-officio* members. Care has, however, evidently been taken to place upon the Senate the representatives of the leading denominations of the Province that take an active part in Public Education. Notwithstanding, we have no right, under the present arrangements, to assume that such nomination meets with the approval of the various Colleges, Denominations, or Institutions. I should be glad, therefore, to see the Senate more a Representative body. I wish to add to this, that the refusal or neglect of the various Colleges affiliated to the University in consequence of the Act of 1853, to take advantage of the system thereby introduced, has in reality, I believe, prevented such changes being introduced already

*Ques. 479.* Have you any suggestions to offer for the improvement of the University so far as regards the Senate?—It has naturally occurred to my mind, anticipating the enquiry which this Committee is appointed to make, that the question of re-modelling the Senate would come up. Without putting it forward as a matured opinion I will mention the idea I have of a University Senate that might be satisfactory to all parties. Seeing that the University is a Provincial Institution, under any circumstances the Government ought to exercise some control over its supreme Board. I should, therefore, leave to the Government, as at present, the appointment of the Chancellor. I think, also, that the Government ought to nominate a limited number of members—say 4 or 6.—I think it might be well that the Chancellor himself should nominate one member. The graduates of the University in Arts ought to have the privilege of electing two or more Representatives out of their own number; the Graduates in Medicine and those in Law should at least, have one member each. And when I speak of the Graduates, I conceive that if Queen's College, Victoria College, and Trinity College, were to affiliate with the University, their Graduates should exercise the same privileges as the present Graduates of the University, and have the same vote in the election of their Representatives to the common

body. I think also that the Law Society should have two Representatives, as being specially interested in one department of Education. For the same reason I would give the Medical Board and the Council of Public Instruction Representatives, I would next give Representatives to University College, Queen's College, Victoria College, Trinity College, Regiopolis College, Bytown College, Knox's College, the U. P. Theological Institution, the Congregational Institution, the Episcopal Methodist Educational Institution, the Baptist Educational Institution, and, in fact, to the Educational Institution of each religious denomination in Upper Canada. As to the number of Representatives these bodies should have, I certainly think University College has a right to a larger number than the others, for this reason: in the first place, the Professors constituting the Council of University College, appointed under the authority of the Province, are presumed to be selected as specially fit for their duties, and if they are not fit they ought not to hold office. They therefore constitute as it were, the proper advisers of the Government on Educational questions. Moreover, in reference to pecuniary interests, it is manifest that, whatever differences of opinion may exist between Queen's, Victoria, Trinity, and other Denominational Colleges, their interests are in common as in opposition to University College. Nevertheless, for the sake of securing complete affiliation, I would not press very strongly for special advantages for University College in this respect. But, even supposing Queen's, Victoria and Trinity not to affiliate, I would still allow them one Representative in the Senate, as such seems to me to constitute the best means of electing members of the Senate, in whom the denominations may have confidence, without at the same time admitting the dangerous principle of transferring such election to ecclesiastical bodies. Let me further add, that in carrying out such a plan, I conceive the Colleges should not be bound to elect two of their own Professors, but left free to select their own President if they please for one, and such resident either of Toronto or some neighbouring place, for the other, as they may deem a fit Representative of their interests. By this means, they would secure a Representative invariably present at the ordinary routine business of the Senate, while when important educational questions were under consideration, they could also secure the presence of the head of their College. I would further add, that the election should be for a term of years, say three, one third to go out annually, but to be eligible for re-election. To such a Board, I conceive, might fitly be entrusted, if not the absolute patronage of the Chairs in University College, at least the nomination of three, in the case of each vacancy, from whom the Government should make the appointment.

*Ques. 480.* You speak of the neglect of the representatives of the affiliated Colleges in attending the Senate; Are you aware that when they have attended, the University of Toronto has made no provision to bear their travelling and other expenses?—I am well aware of it, and it is with the special view to meet that difficulty that I have suggested, in constituting the Senate, to allow to each College at least two Representatives, one of whom they could choose either as a resident of Toronto, or as one who otherwise could make it convenient to attend at the ordinary routine meetings. Thereby, no serious difficulty could be thrown in the way of the other's attendance on those rare occasions when questions of importance are under consideration.

*Ques 481.* Is it your opinion that the University of Toronto and University College could be efficiently carried on with any less endowment than they now enjoy?—I am scarcely prepared to answer that question. My position in University College as well as in the Senate of the University of Toronto is quite a subordinate one. I have no special turn for Finance, and have exercised no oversight over the general expenditure.

*Ques. 482.* Do you think that University College should be limited in the amount of its endowment?—I think it should have a fixed income, after ascertaining what its reasonable requirements are, bearing in reference the future as well as the present, and that it should be required to meet its expenses within that limited sum, thereby throwing on the College Council the responsibility of having to pay any deficiency out of their own salaries. At the same time justice would require that if by economical management a surplus accrued, it should either remain in their hands to meet the deficiencies of future years, or be at their disposal for College purposes. The present plan, as provided by the Act, which deprives the University Fund of all the surplus that may result from economical management, seems

about as unlikely a plan as could well be devised for inducing any men to save, seeing that the more they spend the more they get, and the more they economize the more they lose.

*Ques. 483.* Is it true that the Classical Tutor, employs part of his time in preparing students for Matriculation?—I have looked in the library of the Legislative Assembly, for copies of the *Athenæum* of this last year. I regret that I am not able to produce what would show that the practice of the Tutor of University College Toronto, in having a class to prepare candidates for Matriculation, precisely corresponds with the actual practice of University College London, the College corresponding to University College, Toronto, in its non-denominational character, and affiliated to the University prescribed by the Statute as our model. At the same time I must say that the College Council have carefully guarded against this practice as an abuse. No boys, of an age fit to enter a Grammar School, are allowed to avail themselves of it. But, owing to the peculiar position of Canada at this time, we have men, up in years, who come to Toronto for a College education, without the previous preparatory training, who cannot go to School, and who, unless some such facilities were given them, would be prevented from going on with their College studies.

*Ques. 484.* What was the salary of your Professorship in University College, when you accepted it?—£350 *cy.*, but I may state that had I not been led to believe that currency money in Canada, considering the cheapness of living, was worth a great deal more than the same nominal amount, sterling money in England, I should not have come out to Canada at all. Accordingly, at an early date after I arrived here, I drew up a memorial which was presented to the Governor General in Council, at the time when the Hon. Francis Hincks, under whom, the present Act was prepared and passed, was still in power, and our salaries were raised in consequence, to £450.

*Ques. 485.* What is the amount of your present salary, including all perquisites?—£550 and fees.

*Ques. 486.* What amount have you received *per annum* from tuition and fees?—I am unable to state, not having anticipated this question, but I think my fees the last year may have amounted to £10 or £12.

*Ques. 487.* What amount do the other Professors of University College receive from the same source?—I am quite unable to answer.

*Ques. 488.* Where were you educated?—At Edinburgh.

*Ques. 489.* Were you required to pass a Matriculative Examination?—No. There was none.

*Ques. 490.* Did you take out a Degree in Arts?—No; it is very rarely the practice at the Scottish Universities.

*Ques. 491.* How many boarders have there been in the Boarding Hall of University College during the present year?—Before giving a direct answer to that question it is necessary I should state that when the College lectures began in October last, the boarding house was not completed, nor was it ready to receive boarders for nearly six weeks afterwards, consequently the number of boarders and residents this year offers no fair test of what will be the result of the system. Nevertheless, our success has greatly exceeded our anticipations, and I think I am right in stating the number of residents at 32; it certainly was above 30.

*Ques. 492.* Can you state how many Students of University College are also Students of Divinity at Knox's College and the other Presbyterian and Congregational Divinity Schools in Toronto?—By the Act of Parliament under which University College is constituted, it is expressly limited to a Faculty of Arts. I cannot conceive, therefore, of any principle of procedure that can either enable us to ascertain what is the destination in life of the Students who are studying the Arts' course under our care; nor, supposing we could ascertain such, and be sure they would not change their aim in life afterwards, could that in the slightest degree affect our fulfilling our duty in giving the instruction in the Department of Arts we have been appointed to give.

*Ques. 493.* Are you not aware that there is a considerable number of the class I have specified?—I have no direct means of ascertaining, but in the statement I have put in in

evidence, I have pointed out the very great advantages that in our Scottish Universities we believe to arise from the very fact that the Theological Students of the different religious denominations are trained together in the Arts' course in the common halls of the National University. They are thereby prepared for their duties as citizens and as members of a free community, and I can scarcely conceive of a greater curse to a country than having its Theological Students, or its Lay Students either, trained up so exclusively under the guidance of their own sect, that when they for the first time emerge into public life, they have never mingled with any but members of their own communion.

*Ques. 494.* Who prepares the Calendar of University College?—The President, I believe; although, at the same time, I have reason to know that its preparation, or rather the reading of the proof sheets for the press last year, having been entrusted to the College Tutor, the President complains of its containing many inaccuracies.

*Ques. 495.* Have you remarked anything peculiar in the Catalogue of Students?—No; I have not.

*Ques. 496.* Is not the number unduly swelled by including among under-graduates the graduates also?—As the graduates and under graduates are each classified under separate heads, I cannot conceive how that can be the case. I am not prepared to be responsible for the details of this calendar. If indeed, I am pressed on this point, I must say that it does not meet with my approbation. It is constructed, I believe, after the model of the calendars of the English Universities and of Trinity College, Dublin. With those I am by no means familiar, and probably, therefore, my objections to its special characteristics may be the result of ignorance. Nevertheless, I am thoroughly satisfied that there is no design in this calendar to represent a larger number of graduates, undergraduates, and students, than belong to each year under which they are classed; and while I believe a person unfamiliar with such a calendar, may find some difficulty in ascertaining the precise number of students for each year, which difficulty I have experienced myself, yet I have noticed that my colleagues, who have been familiar with the English system and that of Trinity College, Dublin, experience none such. At the same time, allow me to add that this is the College, and not the University Calendar, so that if any statements in reference to the University are placed there, they are entirely without authority, except that of the College Council.

*Ques. 497.* Can a student take a Scholarship or prize in the University of Toronto, when there are no others to compete with him?—Undoubtedly. I am almost surprised that Mr. Nelles, who has himself acted as an Examiner at the University of Toronto for three years, should ask such a question. The system of examination pursued in the University presents, I conceive, as one of its most admirable features, that the merit amongst the various candidates is a positive and not a relative one. The examination is conducted by means of printed papers; the rank of each student is determined by the value of his answers, numerically calculated on the value of the whole paper. Unless he answers to the value of two-thirds of the whole paper, he cannot get into the *first* class in Honors, and is therefore equally disqualified for a Scholarship whether there be one or twenty candidates. In like manner, unless he answers above the value of one-half the whole papers, he forfeits Honors altogether. It is manifest, therefore, that there is no difficulty in determining, supposing there is only one student, whether he gets into the first class or not. The only importance to be attached to a number of candidates instead of one is that you may then have several in the first class, when the highest of the whole will get the Scholarship.

*Ques. 498.* It is much more difficult, then, to take Scholarships or prizes when there is competition?—Unquestionably. The larger the number of candidates, the greater competition there must undoubtedly be. Nevertheless, it may happen that, if only one presented himself, he might be a man of the highest mark, and would carry off the Scholarship even against twenty. There was a reference, for example, made in a former question to Mr. Moss, a graduate of Toronto University, who took a degree with the highest honors, carrying off the gold medals in classics and mathematics and in modern languages, and my belief is that if we could send home Mr. Moss to compete with the Honor men of Cambridge, he would carry off the highest Honors against the best of them.

Rev. Mr. Poole, further Examined.

Questions submitted by the Rev. Dr. Ryerson, and put—

[By the Chairman.]

Ques. 499. Is there any discrepancy between the financial statement made by Dr. Green and Dr. Ryerson as to the comparative expenses of the University Colleges in 1855 and 1857, and referred to by Mr. Langton. If so, can you explain them?—There is no real difference, the Rev. Dr. Green reports the whole outlay of *Victoria* College salaries as they now are. In the extract quoted by Dr. Ryerson the salaries are put down as they were in 1857, when there was one Professor less, and when a less amount was paid to the tutors.

Ques. 500. Can you give any information as to the authority on which you compiled the expenditure of the different colleges, as quoted by Dr. Ryerson, and which are objected to by Mr. Langton?—I prepared that statement and published it in a letter dated the 6th of March 1858; my object was to show the actual outlay, not including repairs, buildings, furniture or interest on debt, but the simple item of salaries, &c. The figures I then present respecting *Laval* College, *Bishop's* College, and *Mc Gill* College are taken from the report of the Chief Superintendent of Education for *Canada East* and are correctly given. The amount of *Queen's* College, as given in the same statement, is taken from an official report from the Vice-Principal's Report, published in 1856 by order of the Parliament, see Return. The same is true respecting *Regiopolis* and *Victoria*. The salaries of University College Professors, as given, admit of no dispute; the figures are found in the Appendix No. 12, Statement No. 2; Thus:—Salaries to Professors and others, £7130 or \$28,520; the salaries of *Trinity* College Professors may be found in the Journal of Education, published by the Bursar of that Institution; the figures are \$6,640. This amount cannot be disputed. I admit that in comparing the incidentals of *Trinity* with the incidentals of University College, I incorrectly, and certainly unintentionally took the sum of £386 and placed them in the columns as dollars. Upon this slight error, the Vice-Chancellor and Dr. Wilson each tried to found a serious charge of incorrectness, and thereby make some small capital against Dr. Ryerson. The Vice-Chancellor objects to our placing Upper Canada College as a preparatory department to University College: a dispute of words here is of no avail; it is well known that it receives its support from an endowment of public lands; that it has the same non-denominational character, is under the management of the Senate of the University, that students are sent there specially to prepare for the University College, that there is a joint management in the funds and that it is commonly and properly regarded as a feeder for University College.

Ques. 501. Can you inform the Committee on what authority Dr. Green stated that 35 Scholarships were given, when there were only 37 students in the College?—Dr. Green took the Appendix to the Journals of the Legislative Assembly for 1857, 20 *Victoria*, No. 28, containing the annual report of the Senate, where you find reported under the heading "*Undergraduates*," the names of 37 students, with their residences and Courses of Lectures for the year 1856—this being the whole number of undergraduates reported for that year. Turning to the Report of scholarships given that year, you find them reported thus:—

|              |   |   |   |   |    |
|--------------|---|---|---|---|----|
| In Law,      | - | - | - | - | 5  |
| In Medicine, | - | - | - | - | 6  |
| In Arts,     | - | - | - | - | 24 |

35

making a total of 35 scholarships given for that year, there being only 37 undergraduates.

Questions submitted by Mr. Langton and put—

[By the Chairman.]

Ques. 502. Supposing you, Mr. Poole, to be the author of the statement in Dr. Ryerson's evidence, can you state on what ground you called the total expenses of *Trinity*, per year, at \$7,526?—I simply mistook the mark £ for \$, thereby making the total less.

*Ques. 503.* You were aware that the expenses of *Trinity College* were upwards of \$16,000 per annum?—My object was to state the amount of salaries only, comparing also the Bursar's Office and incidentals with the same items of expenditure for *University College*.

*Ques. 504.* Then, if you intended in this comparative Statement only to include salaries, as stated in your last answer, why did you set down the *University of Toronto* in the Statement, at \$81,000. Do you mean to say that that only includes salaries? I gave the total for *University College* and its preparatory in contrast with the outlay of the other Colleges, including their actual expenditure for salaries; the Bursar's Office, and incidentals of *Trinity College* being also included. Dr. *Ryerson* is in no way responsible for that Statement, as it was a quotation cut from my letter.

Rev. Dr. *Ryerson* further Examined.

Questions submitted by Professor *Wilson* and put—

[By the Chairman.]

*Ques. 505.* The minutes of the *University of Toronto* have been produced, expressly at your request, in consequence of the following statement given in writing by you to the Committee:—

"If the Committee should order the minutes of the proceedings of the Senate to be laid before them, and mark who were present, and what was done at each meeting, they would see how the system has been worked, and how parties connected with the *University* and *Upper Canada* Colleges have directed as to expenditures, studies, scholarships, &c. The minutes will show that all those expenditures have been directed by a family compact of gentlemen receiving their salaries from the *University* and *Upper Canada* College endowments." Are you prepared now to show from these minutes, by what process those expenditures could have been directed by a family compact of gentlemen who were not added to the Senate, until Feb. 2nd, 1857?—The expenditures to which I referred, are those which have taken place during the last three years, as the requests for the minutes referred to in the question, were expressly made during the last two or three years. The order of the Committee, too, was that copies of the minutes during the last three years should be produced. That order shews the object of my statement. Those minutes shew who were present and who were not, on the occasions when those expenditures were directed. Mr. *Poole's* statement shows the number of Professors and residents in *Toronto*, who were present at the proceedings of the Senate during the last four years.

*Ques. 506.* Look up in the minutes the entry on May 19th, 1858. You will find what is said there concerning a reference from His Excellency to the Senate about the Professors' salaries. Will you read it?—"The Vice-Chancellor, seconded by Mr. *Patton*, moved 'That in the opinion of the Senate it is not expedient to make any permanent increase to the salaries of the Professors in *University College*, but they would recommend that the stipend attached to the following Professorships, viz., Greek and Latin, Logic and Rhetoric, Metaphysics and Ethics, Chemistry and Experimental Philosophy, Natural Philosophy, History and English Literature, Natural History, Mineralogy, Geology and Modern Languages, should be fixed at five hundred pounds per annum, with an increase of fifty pounds per annum, after five years from the dates of their commissions, and a further increase of fifty pounds per annum after every subsequent term of five years. The salaries, as recommended, should cover all present allowance for house rent."

*Ques. 507.* Was that in consequence of a reference from His Excellency? Please read what precedes.—"The Vice-Chancellor moved to take up the subject of the salaries of Professors in *University College*, referred to the Senate by the letter of the Provincial Secretary, read at the last meeting."

*Ques. 508.* You were present on that occasion?—My name is down, so I was there either at the beginning or the close, but I have no recollection of it whatever.

*Ques. 509.* Can you refer to any other minute of the Senate, after the date of my appointment as a member, on which either I, or Professor *Cherriman* or Professor *Croft*,

either voted in reference to our salaries or were present when such a question was discussed?—Certainly not. The presence or absence of a member of a body, when his salary is taken up, is a matter of no consequence, since his influence as a member of the body would be precisely the same in regard to its proceedings in matters of the kind whether he were absent or present.

Question submitted by Mr. *Langton* and put—

[*By the Chairman.*]

*Ques.* 510. Do you deny that you were present on the occasion of the vote being carried?—I have no recollection of it, and I shall shew, from what I have published, that it is impossible I could have known it, for I have been asked scores of times as to the periodical increase in the salaries, but I knew nothing at all about it until I came to this Committee. In illustration, I beg to read this extract from what I wrote; my evidence in my first statement.

“Three members of the Senate, the Vice Chancellor and two members of the *Upper Canada* College, receive their salaries under the Statutes of the Senate, and Professors of *University* College, though not receiving their salaries under a statute of the Senate, their periodically increasing salaries, if not fixed on the recommendation of the Senate, have, I believe, been settled on the recommendation of certain of its members.”

This language I could not have used had I known the salaries were increased by a Statute of the Senate.

Questions submitted by Professor *Wilson* and put—

[*By the Chairman.*]

*Ques.* 511. Was any other case discussed that day in which you took a special interest?—There was the case of Mr. *Maynard*, in which I took a special interest, and during the discussion of which I was probably present.

Mr. *Langton* further Examined.

Questions submitted by Professor *Wilson* and put—

[*By the Chairman.*]

*Ques.* 512. Did you preside at the meeting of the Senate on the 19th of May, 1858?—I did.

*Ques.* 513. Did the reference of His Excellency to the Senate in regard to the salaries of the Professors come on in due course of business, having been produced at the previous meeting?—It did.

*Ques.* 514. As I, therefore, knew that such business was on the order of the day, did I request you to delay it to the close of the meeting?—You did.

*Ques.* 515. Did I then withdraw from the meeting, as recorded on the minutes?—Yes.

*Ques.* 516. Was there then brought forward, without compliance with the usual proceedings of the Senate, and without any previous notice, a proposition to grant a pension of £75 per annum to the Rev. *George Maynard*?—After you (*Dr. Wilson*) left the Senate; there was a quorum remaining, consisting of myself, *Dr. McCaul*, *Dr. Ryerson*, *Dr. Jennings*, and *Hon. Mr. Patton*. The resolution I have mentioned being disposed of, with other minor business of which I had also given notice, the question of *Dr. Maynard's* salary was brought up. I remonstrated from the chair, upon the impropriety of bringing it up under the circumstances, as it had been already before the Senate three or four times—one meeting having been specially called for the purpose. I have never since ceased regretting that I did not take advantage of the rules of the Senate, although they have sometimes been allowed to fall into abeyance, to refuse to put that motion from the chair, upon the ground that there had been no notice given.

*Ques.* 517. Had I, at the various previous occasions on which a pension was proposed to Mr. *Maynard*, resolutely opposed it?—You had.

Questions submitted by Dr. *Ryerson* and put—

[*By the Chairman.*]

*Ques.* 518. Who introduced the question of Dr. *Maynard*?—Hon. Mr. *Patton* moved it, there having been letters read at the meeting that day, from Dr. *Ryerson* and Mr. *Nelles*, and you (Dr. *Ryerson*) having stated that he continued expressly to advocate it.

*Ques.* 519. Were letters read from no other persons, than Dr. *Ryerson* and Mr. *Nelles*?—From the Honorable *James Patton* and *F. J. Haynes* also.

*Ques.* 520. Who seconded Mr. *Patton's* resolution?—Dr. *Jennings*.

The Committee adjourned until to-morrow at 11 o'clock, A. M.

Wednesday, 25 April, 1860.

### COMMITTEE MET.

*Present :*

The Honorable MALCOLM CAMERON, Chairman.  
 “ Mr. CAYLEY,  
 “ “ FOLEY,  
 “ McCANN,  
 “ ROBLIN,  
 “ SIMPSON,  
 “ WILSON.

The Reverends Messrs. *Cook*, *Ryerson*, *Stinson*, *Nelles* and *Poole* were in attendance.

*John Langton*, Esquire, Vice Chancellor, and Professor *Wilson* of University of Toronto, were in attendance.

*Dr. RYERSON'S Reply to Dr. WILSON and Mr. LANGTON'S Statements.*

*Dr. Ryerson* addressed the Chairman and Committee as follows:—

MR. CHAIRMAN AND GENTLEMEN,

I am quite aware of the disadvantage under which I appear before you to-day. I am not insensible of the prejudices which may have been excited in the minds of many individuals by the occurrences of the last few days; I am not insensible of the impressions which some of the questions and statements may have made upon the minds of Members of the Committee as well as others; I am not at all insensible of the fact that the attempt has been made to turn the issue, not on the great question which demands attention, but upon my merits or demerits, my standing as a man, and the course which I have pursued. This subject, of very little importance to the Committee, of comparatively little importance to the country, possesses a great deal of importance to myself. No man can stand in the presence of the Representatives of the People; no man can stand, as I feel myself standing this morning, not merely in the presence of a Committee, but, as it were, in the presence of my native country, the land of my birth, affections, labors, hopes, without experiencing the deepest emotion. But how much more is that the case when attempts have been made, of the most unprecedented kind, to deprive me of all that is dear to me as a man, as a parent, as a public officer, as a minister of the Christian Church. More especially do I thus feel because reading and arranging the papers on this subject, to which my attention has been called, occupied me until five o'clock this morning. Rising to address you under such circumstances and emotions, I respectfully crave the impartial consideration of the Committee and throw myself on their generous indulgence.

Sir, the position of the question which demands our consideration this day is one altogether peculiar, and I will venture to say, unparalleled in this or any other country. The individuals connected with myself—the party unconnected with what may be called the National University of the country, stand as the conservators of a high standard of education, and appear before you as the advocates of a through course of training that will discipline, in the most effectual manner, the powers of the mind and prepare the youth of our country for those pursuits and those engagements which demand their attention as men, Christians, and patriots, while the very persons to whom has been allotted this great interest, this important trust, stand before you as the advocates of a reduction, of a puerile system which has never invigorated the mind, or raised up great men in any country; which can never lay deep and broad the foundations of intellectual grandeur and power anywhere, but which is characterized by that superficiality which marks the proceedings of the educational institutions in the new and Western States of the neighbouring Republic. Sir, I feel proud of the position I occupy; that if I have gone to an extreme, I have gone to the proper extreme, that even if I may have pressed my views to an extent beyond the present standing, the present capabilities of the Province, my views have been upward, my course has been onward, my attempt has been to invigorate Canada with an intellect and a power, a science and a literature that will stand unabashed in the presence of any other country, while the very men who should have raised our educational standard to the highest point, who should have been the leaders in adopting a high and thorough course, have confessed during the discussion of this question that the former standard was too high, and that they have been levelling it down, incorporating with it speculations which have never elevated the institutions of any country, and adopting a course of proceedings which never advanced any nation to the position to which I hope in God my native country will attain. There is another peculiarity in the position of this question, and of the circumstances under which I appear before you this morning. It is that of collision; that of conflict with parties who are arrayed on the other side of this question: it is to a certain extent that of trial in regard to a richly endowed Institution, and the enquiry naturally suggests itself, to whom is due the origin of this position? The attempt has been made throughout these proceedings to throw the blame on the petitioners, and more especially on myself, and to inculcate me with the entire responsibility of the mutually hostile position that the different parties in your presence occupy during this investigation. But what are the facts of the case, and who are the originators of the state of collision which has characterized this investigation? The resolutions on which these proceedings have taken place were adopted by the Wesleyan Conference in June last. Now, whatever other changes may have taken place, I still adhere to the people of my youth, who were the early instruments of all the religious instruction I received until I attained manhood. Whether they are a polished and learned or a despised people, I still am not ashamed of them nor of the humblest of their advocates or professors. I stand before you without a blush, in immediate connection, and identified with that people. The resolutions that were adopted by the Conference, in pursuance of which the Conference appointed a large Executive Committee, consisting of nearly one hundred of the most experienced members of their body, to prepare the memorial which has been presented to Parliament, are these:

“*Resolved*, 1st. That it is the conviction of a large proportion, if not a large majority of the inhabitants of Canada, that their sons, in pursuing the higher branches of education (which cannot be acquired in day schools, and rarely without the youth going to a distance from the paternal roof and oversight) should be placed in institutions in which their religious instruction and moral oversight, as

well as their literary training, are carefully watched over and duly provided for; a conviction practically evident by the fact, that not only the members of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, and other Methodists, but the members of the Churches of England, Scotland and Rome have contributed largely; and exerted themselves to establish colleges and higher seminaries of learning, for the superior education of their children.

"2nd. That no provision for instruction in secular learning alone, can compensate for the absence of provision, or care, for the religious and moral instruction of youth in the most exposed, critical and eventful period of their lives.

"3rd. That it is of the highest importance to the best interests of Canada, that the Legislative provision for superior education should be in harmony with the conscientious convictions and circumstances of the religious persuasions who virtually constitute the Christianity of the country.

"4th. That the exclusive application of the Legislative provision for superior education to the endowment of a college for the education of the sons of that class of parents alone who wish to educate their sons in a non-denominational institution, irrespective of their religious principles and moral character, to the exclusion of those classes of parents who wish to educate their sons in colleges or seminaries where a paternal care is bestowed upon their moral and religious interests, at the same time that they are carefully and thoroughly taught in secular learning; is grossly illiberal, partial, unjust and unpatriotic, and merits the severest reprobation of every liberal and right-minded man of every religious persuasion and party in the country.

"5th. That the ministers and members of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, aided by the liberal co-operation of many other friends of Christian education, have largely and long contributed to establish and sustain Victoria college, in which provision is made for the religious instruction and oversight of students, independent of any Legislative aid—in which there are fifty-nine students in the Faculty of Arts, besides more than two hundred pupils and students in preparatory and special classes—in which no religious test is permitted by the charter in the admission of any student, or pupil, and in which many hundreds of youths of different religious persuasions, have been educated and prepared for professional and other pursuits, many of whom have already honorably distinguished themselves in the clerical, legal and medical professions, as also in mercantile and other branches of business.

"6th. That Victoria College is justly entitled to share in the Legislative provision for superior education, according to the number of students in the Collegiate and Academical courses of instruction.

"7th. That we affectionately entreat the members of our church to use their influence to elect, as far as possible, public men who are favorable to the views, expressed in the foregoing resolutions, and do equal justice to those who wish to give a superior religious education to the youth of the country, as well as those who desire for their sons a non-religious education alone.

"8th. That a copy of these resolutions be laid before the quarterly meeting of each Circuit, for the consideration and co-operation of our official brethren throughout the Province."

These Resolutions were laid before the country, and what was their reception by the University College advocates? They were received by attacks upon the Wesleyan body, upon their Collegiate institution, upon other Colleges in the country, and upon myself individually. These attacks came from the part of the advocates of University College, who drew their inspiration, no doubt, very largely

from those immediately and directly connected with that institution. The Wesleyan body were spoken of as robbers of a public fund; their institution was denounced as a mean, contemptible school, unworthy of the name of a college; and every possible term of opprobrium was used as regards myself. These attacks lasted from June until the following autumn, while I never said a word or wrote a line. Yet the resolutions of the Conference simply treated of a general principle. What was the result? Why, that the advocates of the Wesleyan Conference were compelled in self-defence, in defence of their college and other colleges, of similar character, to say that they had an equal claim to public consideration with University College, that there was nothing in it which should give such a lofty character to its pretensions. The advocates of University College said that was the only College in the country worthy of the name, the only one to which any sort of respect should be paid; and the advocates of the Conference were thus forced to assume the position of comparison, which they did not originally contemplate. Had the writers who drew their inspiration from University College met these resolutions by arguments as to the principles on which a great national system of education shall be based, instead of by attacks on the Wesleyan body, the attitude of collision would not have been witnessed. But when the large Committee appointed by Conference, consisting of between 60 and 100 members, met for the purpose of bringing the question into the immediate view of Parliament, they found themselves compelled to institute and pursue that very enquiry into the merits of the educational course of University College, in justification of their own institution and claims. If, then, there has been anything personal, unfriendly, unpleasant, in this investigation, the indiscrete advocates of University College have themselves to blame. They courted, and they must bear the consequences of the quarrel. I have said that from June to November, I wrote not a word, but when the memorial was prepared by the Committee to whom it was given to prepare it, then, under the auspices of that Committee, the subsequent discussion took place, and papers were prepared in illustration and proof of the complaints and statements of the memorial. Were we to blame for this? I would ask any member of this Committee if he himself, with a cane in his hand, were pursued day after day and week after week by barking curs, that not only constantly annoyed but occasionally bit him, would he not repel them by an occasional rap on the head? When the advocates of the Wesleyan Conference felt that they had the material to refute the imputations thrown upon them—ample material, not only to defend their own institution but to shew that it stood upon equal ground with those who made exclusive pretensions to graduateship or to anything like scholarly judgment in devising a system of superior education for the people of Upper Canada, they would have been cowards and poltroons had they not accepted the challenge thus thrown down, and been ready to meet their opponents here or any where else, face to face, upon the ground of fact, principle and justice. Then, Sir, instead of entering into this question as they should, the attention of this Committee and of the country has been turned from the great issues and fixed upon myself. My sins have been the theme of past days' investigation and remark; my infirmities, weaknesses, inconsistencies and demerits have been the substance of all that has been pressed upon your attention day after day, and the text of the two speeches to which I am now replying, each upwards of two hours in length. I confess that I have infirmities and sins, but at the same time I submit that they have no connection with the real question before the Committee; yet, as they have been brought before you, I may allude to what has been said, although, while the attempt has been made to fix upon me the responsibility of all that has been done, the parties very well know that of the only two points on which they rest their charge,—the one relating to scholarships is confuted by the minutes; the other relating to exami-

nations is shewn by the Appendix, printed in the Journals of the House of Assembly, for 1856, to have been confined to 1854.

With these remarks, Sir, I proceed immediately to the subjects which claim the special attention of the Committee, and shall notice in the first place the pretensions and statements of Dr. *Wilson* alone; in the second, the statements common to both Drs. *Wilson* and *Langton*; in the third place my own estimates for the expenses of erecting buildings suited to a Provincial University, and, lastly, the questions which demand the decision and consideration of the Committee. I am to notice, then, in the first place, the pretensions and statements of Dr. *Wilson* alone. He placed himself before you as the Representative of University College, while he adverted to Mr. *Langton* as the Representative of the Senate. Sir, the assumptions Dr. *Wilson* made, as well as the manner in which he referred to others, are not unworthy the attention of Committee, or without their proper moral and useful lessons. Dr. *Wilson*, in the first place, made a eulogy on the Faculty of University College. He spoke of each member of the Faculty as characterised by some superior attainments and excellencies, and described himself, last but not least, as a man who had attained some distinction in his own country before he came to "this Canada of ours"—(his favorite expression). After this description, he said to you;—Are not we fit to be entrusted with determining the College education of your youth, one of us being from Edinburgh, another from Oxford, another from London, another from Cambridge, another from Dublin, and another from Padua, the city of "relics?" We, he continued, have anxiously devised a system of Education, and sometimes we have sat up until after midnight in doing so. This is the assumption, this the basis of many of the subsequent remarks addressed by that gentleman to the Committee. Now, Sir, I think that Dr. *Wilson*, and the other gentlemen to whom he referred, from whose attainments and abilities I wish to detract nothing, must themselves admit that they came to this country as teachers—he of English literature and language; the rest of certain other branches. He, however, seems to think they did not come for that purpose only, but for the more noble, exalted, almost legislative purpose of giving to the people of Canada a system of collegiate instruction. Dr. *Wilson* says,—Shall not we be entrusted with determining this question—we all graduates, we all men from old Universities, and will you pretend, people of Canada, to dictate to us, learned persons, what kind of superior education shall be adopted for the training of your youth? Sir, I went to Europe for the purpose of obtaining persons qualified for special work, but I did not go to them to dictate the kind of education to be given here or the manner of giving it. I procured them to carry out a system already devised for this country, not to dictate one to us, much less to do so in the assuming tone in which these words were addressed to you the other day. I think these gentlemen, whatever may be their talents, whatever may be their attainments, mistook considerably the purpose for which they were brought to this country when they set themselves up for judges as to what kind of Superior Education the people should receive from them. The people of this country have devised a system for themselves, and these gentlemen were brought here as instruments to carry it out. When they depart from the position of laborers in the work appointed and assume to be dictators, they sadly mistake their office. There are, however, other persons besides Dr. *Wilson*, who think that because they have come across the Atlantic, they are alone wise, and that Canadians are to accept blindly the dictatorial dogmas they may put forth. Sir, although our country may be young, yet the intellect of a country does not depend upon its age. There may be a vigor of intellect, a self-reliance, an energy and perseverance in the very youth of a country that will not bow down to exotic dictation or assumption. The people of Upper Canada know their own wants, and did not send to one gentleman from Edinburgh, another from Lon-

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 in Civil Polity? If you proscribe me you prescribe Parliament itself from judging of Civil Polity,

Political Economy, Jurisprudence, for its members never were at institutions where they were taught! That, Sir, is the doctrine the learned Professor of History in University College has announced to the members of this Committee for the guidance of themselves and of the country! That, Sir, is the new legal light that emanates from University College! I congratulate the learned gentleman in the discovery he has made, the light he is pouring "on this Canada of ours." Then, Sir, I have only to add on this branch of the subject, that you have but to carry the argument a step farther, and ask what claim that gentleman himself has to support his pretensions? Is he a graduate himself? His own evidence shewed yesterday that he had never passed even a matriculation examination, that he took no degree at Edinburgh, and that the degree he holds is purely honorary, like my own. If Dr. Cook were here he could tell you that there is no matriculation examination at Edinburgh, and no examination at all until the degree is taken. Meanwhile, the students attend the lectures of the Professors of Greek, Latin, &c., for so many terms, so many days in each term, and then get certificates from those Professors as to their diligence in attending. So unsatisfactory is this plan that the Church of Scotland would not admit it as a qualification for their ministers—they themselves require a literary as well as a theological examination from their students before they will admit them to be intellectually qualified for the service of the church. I might have gone up to Edinburgh, attended a few lectures here and a few lectures there, and come out again with the assumption that you people of Canada knew nothing about what is proper as a system of education. I feel reluctant to prosecute this subject, but when a gentleman has assailed me on this ground, I throw back the charge, and I say that it ill becomes him to make either imputations or assumptions of this description. Sir, I have no hesitation at all in comparing what I have done for my native land with what that gentleman has done for his, and our claims to the gratitude of our respective countries. He, to be sure, has published a book, but it was a book upon "relics," a book upon antiquities; and I have myself seen in Edinburgh a museum of "relics" arranged by him. He has a peculiar affinity for subjects of that description, and in his leisure moments in this country has devoted himself to the disembowelling the cemeteries of the Indian tribes, in seeking up the tomahawks, pipes and tobacco which may be found there, and writing essays upon them. But look to my efforts, my period of labor for 35 years, and say whether the imputations of that gentleman are deserved. I can appeal to the representatives of the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, whether they have not availed themselves of the labor I have performed in this country for the education of our youth. I can appeal to the Australian Colonies, where my regulations and School Act have been published under the auspices of the Government. The Secretary of the Province of Adelaide lately visited this country in order to make further enquiries with a view of introducing our whole system as far as possible in connection with the Municipal system of those Countries. I appeal to the Province of New Brunswick, the land of my sainted mother. Five years ago I went down thither as one of a Commission to investigate their Collegiate system, which had been the subject of litigation as keen as that which was connected with King's College in this country. I prepared a report at the request of the authorities, and drafted a bill. The Government that was then in power went out, another came in—and I received but a few weeks since a letter from the present Attorney General there, saying that the bill I prepared five years ago had been sanctioned by the Legislature, and, being reserved for the Royal Assent, had received the approbation of Her Majesty. Although I am not a graduate of a University, and should be therefore excluded under the proscriptive principle of the gentleman who has attacked me for meddling with Universities at all, I have made

this contribution to the furtherance of Superior Education in our neighboring Province. Why should I speak of the Common School system I have been mainly concerned in introducing here? I will only say that Lord *Lansdowne*, that Nestor of British statesmen, observed some years ago, that no greater blessing could be conferred upon England than transplanting to it the Canadian system, but that such was the state of public opinion they could do nothing more at present than grant aid to the Denominations, for the elementary education of the people. I think the public can judge between me and the gentleman who has recently come to this country, as to the assumptions he has made, and the imputations he has taken the liberty to pour upon me. I may say this much more, that a salary of £350 sterling would not take me from my country and carry me to one, the very currency of which I did not know when I accepted the appointment.

I turn now to a complaint which it took the gentleman twenty minutes to make, that an ephemeral article in a pamphlet of his was not fairly quoted by me. He says I omitted the first paragraph of it, and ought not to represent him as the advocate of classical studies as the means of giving the best university education. Did I misrepresent him as such? No. The two extracts from what he terms his ephemeral article—and during his apology for himself he seemed to be ashamed of it, as though it came in unpleasant contact with his present views, and he were anxious to disclaim it before he entered into criticism upon it—are such as to show that I did not. The heading of the first is “Mode of Teaching,” and it shows that gentlemen who came from Oxford and Cambridge were not thought to be relics of a past age by Dr. *Wilson* then, whatever they may be thought of by him now, for in that article they are held up as the most successful teachers of any country. Here is the extract in question:—

“No Institutions in the world turn out a greater number of highly qualified teachers on the subjects specially cultivated by them. Apart from the Tutors, public and private, numbering hundreds, within the circuit of the two Universities, Oxford and Cambridge, provide professors and teachers, in their own special departments of classics and mathematics, to the great majority of the public schools of England and the Colonies. The Colleges of London, Manchester, Birmingham and Durham, all the great public schools, and even mathematical and classical chairs of the Scottish Universities, are supplied from the ancient seats of learning on the Cam and the Isis. The English College Tutor again is precisely what we term in Canadian or American Institutions a Professor; his functions in no degree differ, and the more our Canadian Professor imitates the thoroughness of the English College Tutor in his mode of instruction, the better will it be for the future scholarship of the Province.” Again, as to the other extract, how was it headed? “The Modern Languages no substitute for Ancient.” He complained that it was not taken into account by me, that he was then speaking of an honor man who had graduated in Yale College, gone to Europe, entered Cambridge, and graduated there again. Well, speaking of that superior man he said:—

“To such a man of ripe mind and studious habits the acquisition of a modern language, such as the French or Italian, is a mere pastime, and the German only a pleasant task. What would he say to the substitution of them by our University reformers as equivalent to the Greek and Latin—the sole key to all the treasures of theology, philosophy and science.”

Now, Sir, what is the argument of the gentleman? It is that for a man of these superior attainments, it would be improper to substitute the modern for the ancient languages. But if it be wrong for a man of superior knowledge, is it not wrong for one of inferior attainments? If it is wrong for a man who has made

these profound acquirements in Greek and Latin, would it not be worse for one who, like Mr. *Langton*, has taken no honors at all, but went out in the "poll,"—a class of students too low to have their names appear in the calendar? If the argument is strong in the one case, it is much stronger in the other, and I am not at all surprised that Dr. *Wilson* felt a bashfulness in coming to that passage. Then he says Yale is much inferior to the English Universities, and Harvard no better than Yale, and thinks it strange that I have held them up as superior to Toronto University. That just makes my argument the stronger. If the Toronto Institution is inferior to Harvard and Yale, and Harvard and Yale inferior to Cambridge or London, or Oxford, much more then is Toronto inferior to the English Universities. Instead of an objection, the remark is therefore a confirmation of my argument, and refutes the assertions made by the gentleman himself. He says, indeed, to be sure that books are no guide by which we are to judge of a standard in the matter. I am quite sure of that, but I feel confident of my ground when I say that the standing of Harvard College, and of the learned and practical men connected with it, are quite as good a security that the books they put forth are required to be understood by the candidates coming before them, as there is that the books put forth by University College are also required to be thoroughly studied. Any imputation on the integrity of the heads of Harvard College must go for what it is worth. The practical and old, and conservative New Englanders who have set their faces against the extremes which have been forced on the people of Upper Canada by the men from Padua, Edinburgh and London, are at least as good judges as the latter of what is a proper system for the education of youth.

The gentleman then made merry with the personal appearance of Provost *Whitaker*, of Trinity College, and of the Rev. Mr. *Ambery*, and thought the Committee must have been much amused to see those "relics of the dark ages." I am quite surprised that a remark of that kind should emanate from such a source. One of these gentlemen had taken classical and mathematical honors at Cambridge; the other classical honors at Oxford. They came here for the purpose of giving evidence on certain topics which had been brought before this Committee, and which could not otherwise be verified. Dr. *Wilson* has himself written books on antiquities, and it came very ill from him then to refer to those two gentlemen. He attempted, too, to be quite witty as to the terms used during their examination, "Responsions," "Previous Examinations," "Tripos," &c. Now, these terms had been brought forward and are contained in the statement of Mr. *Langton* himself, two or three days before the words ever passed my lips, and that without explanation. The two gentlemen in question were brought before the Committee to explain them, and how they applied to the comparative standard of education in England and Canada. They told us what was meant by Responsions at Oxford, by Previous Examinations at Cambridge, and made clear to us benighted Canadians the application of those terms which had been introduced by Mr. *Langton* himself. Dr. *Wilson's* wit, therefore, when he referred to those profound words which he said must imply a vast deal of learning, was mis-spent, pointless as it was, and did not reach those gentlemen, who, I am persuaded, stand as far before him in accomplishments and profound scholarship as they stand below him in pretensions. He then said the Oxford education was not fitted for the practical duties of life, and went on to deal with the subject at some length. I do not stand here as the advocate of the Oxford system of education, but I do advocate something of the thoroughness and the disciplinary training practiced on the young men who go to Oxford; and if the Oxford education does not fit men for their practical duties, then what is the meaning of his own words, that there are no men who can compare with those of Oxford and Cambridge in teaching youth either the highest or the lowest departments? The gentleman's written testimony stands against his

present assertions. Does not Oxford fit men for positions of the first order in connection with the law? We can appeal to the long array of eminent lawyers and jurists who drew their first inspiration within the halls of that University. Does not Oxford training fit men by its mental discipline for the practical duties of statesmanship? Has not Oxford given us a Baring, a Cardwell, a Spring Rice, a Labouchère, a Canning, a Lord Elgin, a Sir George Cornwall Lewis, a Sir Robert Peel, a Gladstone—men the glory of any age and of any country. And surely he could not have thought, when he said Oxford training did not fit men for the practical duties of life, of Mr. Cayley, an Oxford man, to whom the phrase was not at all complimentary, nor of His Excellency who was for some time a Tutor and Examiner at Oxford. I dare say, though, Mr. *Brown* would have agreed with his expression of opinion in these last cases. I submit these facts as to the Oxford education, which may not fit men to dig for Indian “relics,” but does fit them for practical duties and labors which will perpetuate their names when searchers after Indian relics will have been forgotten.

Sir, I will conclude my remarks on this point by quoting an authority much higher than that of Dr. *Wilson*, namely, the Report of the Commissioners on Civil Service Examinations for India. These Commissioners, consisting of Lord *Ma-caulay*, Lord *Ashburton*, Rev. H. *Melville*, Professor *Jewett*, Mr. *Shaw Lefevre*, (late Speaker of the House of Commons,) do not recommend options to students at the end of the first year of their Collegiate course, with a view of pursuing special studies. Their words are as follows:

“We believe that men who have been engaged, up to 21 or 22, in studies which have no immediate connexion with the business of any profession, and of which the effect is merely to open, to invigorate and to enrich the mind, will generally be found, in the business of every profession, superior to men who have, at 18 or 19, devoted themselves to the special studies of their calling. The most illustrious English jurists have been men who had never opened a law-book until after the close of a distinguished academical career. Nor is there any reason to believe that they would have been greater lawyers if they had passed in drawing pleas and conveyances the time which they gave to *Thucydides*, to *Cicero*, and to *Newton*.” \* \* \*  
“Skill in Greek and Latin versification has, indeed, no direct tendency to form a judge, a financier, or a diplomatist. But the youth who does best, what all the ablest and most ambitious youths about him are trying to do well, will generally prove a superior man. Nor can we doubt that an accomplishment by which *Fox* and *Canning*, *Grenville* and *Wellesley*, *Mansfield* and *Tenterden* first distinguished themselves above their fellows, indicates powers of mind which properly trained and directed, may do great service to the State.”

Then, Sir, Dr. *Wilson* gives you a homily on Scottish University Colleges; says I have mistaken their character; that I do not know anything about them—for that they are non-denominational. And he then grew almost eloquent in speaking of Scotland as a country of brotherly love, where none of the sectarian feeling exists that characterizes “this Canada of ours,” since the students of all creeds are there educated together, and go forth as one united company for the advancement and welfare of their native land. I recollected, when he uttered those sentiments, what I had read in a book called “*Essays on Christian Union*,” and I found it in the library of Dr. *Cook*. Here is an extract from it, written by a Presbyterian Minister in Scotland, in one of the prize *Essays on Christian Union*:

“In no country where religious freedom is enjoyed, is party spirit more prevalent. In some it is more offensively displayed, and more deeply tinged with malevolence; but in none is it more widely spread and more tenacious of its little peculiarities.” \* \* \* \* \* “This hot and schismatic spirit, which

to a greater or less extent pervades all the religious parties in Scotland, does not spring from great conscientious differences as to doctrine or Church order. The Church of Scotland, the Reformed Synod, the Secession Church, the Relief, the United Original Seceders, and the Free Church, are all Presbyterian in their ecclesiastical polity; agree in their doctrine, worship, discipline, government, and ecclesiastical forms of procedure. The Westminster Confession of Faith and its two catechisms, are the principal standards of them all. It is only in a very few points, and these not points that touch a sinner's salvation, that they are at variance one from another. Nay, farther, the Independents, Congregationalists, Baptists, Methodists and Moravians; all teach the doctrine of justification by faith in the atonement of Jesus; so that it may be affirmed that the doctrines of the cross are preached with more or less fidelity, by nineteen out of every twenty ministers in Scotland; and yet there is scarcely such a thing as two ministers of different denominations exchanging pulpits with each other. In the most of parties there are laws strictly forbidding it. Were a minister in some denominations to venture upon the extraordinary step, he would likely be rebuked by his Presbytery; and, if he did not confess a fault, he would be subject to deprivation of office and benefice." (Essay on Christian Union, pp. 387-388.—*Rev. Gavin Struthers, Glasgow, D. D.*)

I am sure no one can say that the denominational Colleges in "this Canada of ours" do not engender feelings of much greater brotherly love than those set forth in this extract as obtaining in a country where, the hon. gentleman says, there are no denominational Colleges at all. Although in that point, as well as in some others, his history is a little astray, and the denominational test the professors were required to subscribe has only been abolished within the last few years. Then he refers to the non-denominational Colleges of Ireland and England. He says:—

"The system pursued by the British Parliament in all recent reforms in higher education, as exemplified not only by the new Scottish University Act, but also by the establishment of the Queen's University in Ireland, and the London University in England, abundantly proves how thoroughly British statesmen are alive to the importance of the members of a free community receiving the secular education in national rather than denominational institutions, and being thereby trained to co-operate in all the great public duties that devolve on a free people."

The Colleges of Ireland, Sir, though by their constitution they are non-denominational, yet for practical purposes they are made to partake to a great extent of that character, owing to the composition of their Faculties. The College in the North, at Belfast, has for the most part Presbyterian Professors at its head. Cork is chiefly Roman Catholic; Galway, chiefly Church of England. Thus the views and preferences of the various classes of the community are met. But the gentleman refers especially to the London University as showing the views of British statesmen in training up the youth of its different denominations together in the course of their College education. What is, however, the fact? Of over forty Literary Institutions and Colleges in England which are affiliated with the London University, and apart from the Medical and Law Schools there are only two or three that are non-denominational, of which University College is the chief. The very object of the establishment of London University was to offer facilities for training up young men in these denominational colleges. Here is the calendar wherein we read as affiliated institutions. "The Wesleyan Institution, Sheffield; "the Wesleyan Institution, Taunton;" two or three Baptist, two or three Presbyterian Colleges, two or three of the Church of England—the young men who receive education in these, going up to the University of London for the purpose of receiving their degrees.

It is not a little singular that the non-denominational college, at first constituting the University, is now as distinct from it as any of the others. Its supporters, it should be also remarked, do not sponge upon the English Government for the maintenance of it. Its own resources, arising from voluntary contributions, like those of the Wesleyan, Congregational, and Baptist Colleges, are made to pay for its buildings, and it does not receive one farthing from the State. Let the advocates of non-denominational colleges here put themselves in a similar position, let them put their shoulders to the wheel in the same way—let them pay, individually, as I have paid within the last two or three years to my friend Mr. Poole, some £150 as a contribution to Victoria College—and others have paid more in proportion to their means than I have. Let them beg, as I did in England, some \$25,000 in 1835 and 1836, and then meet their fellow-subjects face to face. Why, University College is the most complete free school in Upper Canada, the whole Province being taxed for it, while its advocates do not contribute a farthing towards its expenses. For *Dr. Wilson* to allow the buildings of his institution to be quietly erected for him, and then come forward and exclaim against us, denounce us for asserting our right to a single farthing from the State, is a course of proceeding quite original with himself and his friends, and worthy of their cause.

*Dr. Ryerson* here handed in a list of the Colleges affiliated to London University, and said that if the history *Dr. Wilson* taught his classes were generally as faulty as his facts about the non-denominational character of the Colleges affiliated to the London University, his pupils could not be very much edified by his prelections. He then continued :

*Dr. Wilson* says, further, that Cambridge and Oxford are denominational, in contradistinction to the Scottish Universities. It is very well known that, in past times, they were to a great extent close Universities, but years ago religious tests were abolished at Cambridge. He seems, however, to be ignorant of this, as also of the changes which have taken place at Oxford, and I will, therefore, read part of the Statute of the British Parliament abolishing tests for students there :

“From and after the first day of Michaelmas term, 1854, it shall not be necessary for any person upon matriculating in the University at Oxford, to make or subscribe any declaration, or to take any oath, any law or statute to the contrary, notwithstanding.—(17th and 18th Vic. cap. 81, sec. XLIII.)

“From and after the first day of Michaelmas term, 1854, it shall not be necessary for any person, when taking the degree of Bachelor in Arts, Law, Medicine or Music, in the University of Oxford, to make or subscribe any declaration, or to take any oath, any law or statute to the contrary, notwithstanding.”—(Sec. XLIV.)

So, Sir, even at Oxford itself, that Alma Mater of the “Relics of the dark ages,” this test has been abolished. In the Scottish Universities, while the test has been done away with too, the Church of Scotland has a Theological Faculty, just as the Church of England has Theological Professors at Oxford. *Dr. Wilson* then says that the absence of a test in our Victoria College is “a mere play upon words,” and expresses himself thus :

“Credit has been repeatedly claimed of late by Victoria College, that it has no tests, but such a statement is a mere play upon words; what real difference is there between requiring that a Professor shall sign the prescribed creed of a Church,—be it the 39 articles or the Westminster Confession of faith; or that he shall satisfy the Wesleyan Conference or other Ecclesiastical Court. In reality the latter is the more stringent of the two. There is, of course, no test for students. It is only too well known that not in Methodist Colleges only, but also

“ in Roman Catholic Colleges, all are welcome who are prepared to submit to their “ teaching.”

The spirit of the last sentence in this passage is kindred to that of the *Globe*, in its palmy days of High Protestantism, and the insinuation involved in it against Victoria College cannot be misunderstood. Victoria College has been in operation some 25 years; it has not to acquire its character from the testimony of the learned gentleman this day. It has performed its work—a work that sinks deeply into the hearts of the people of Upper Canada—and has given many a spotless mind, a vigorous character, a patriotic heart to the country. And what is the fact with regard to its operations? There have not only been students there, of all religious persuasions, but, during the last 25 years, even the most slanderous papers of Canada have never written a single paragraph as to the proselytizing influences of that College. Not only students, but professors of the Church of England, and of the Presbyterian Church have been connected with it, and amongst others, I may mention the Rev'd Mr. *Ormiston*, who was not only a student there, but who, although a Presbyterian, afterwards became a Professor. Thus it may be seen what kind of test, what kind of surveillance the Wesleyan Conference has exerted over Victoria College. That body has never interfered with the appointments of the Board, which appoints and removes the Professors, and is composed equally of laymen and ministers. I rejoice that I was the instrument of getting for Victoria College, in 1836, the first Royal Charter ever given to any religious body in the colony not connected with the Church of England; though in doing so, I differed in opinion from the late venerable Dr. *Bunting*, he objecting to regard it as a Wesleyan College, because its Charter prohibited any religious test. I may say that the spirit of that clause has been acted upon to this day. When I was connected with Victoria College, there was a Roman Catholic student there—there are two there now—and as much care was taken, and is taken, and the authority of the College is as much exercised to provide, that students of other creeds should have religious instruction as the Wesleyans, from ministers of their own Church.—

Then, Sir, Dr. *Wilson* impugns another statement of mine, not on his own authority, but on that of Mr. *Langton*, in whom he says he has full confidence, as to the comparative efficiency as teachers of Grammar Schools of the graduates of University College, and those of other Colleges. And he presented a formal indictment against me to the Attorney-General for Upper Canada, drawing his attention, as an adviser of the Crown, to what I had said. The intention of the appeal was manifest. It was with a view to my dismissal from office. Sir, if my official position depended upon the course I have taken in this question, I should take the course I now take, and cast office and its emoluments to the winds, sooner than abandon the rights and interests of a people with whom I have been associated from my youth. But, Sir, I think the Ministers of the Crown are not such men as the gentleman imagines. Nevertheless, I take my stand, and I will bear the consequences. If my office depends on the course I pursue this day, let it go, and let me betake myself to the kind of labor in which the sympathies of my heart, especially at my period of life, are most deeply enlisted. He tells you my statement must be incorrect, and quotes what he says is an expression of the Rev'd Mr. *Ormiston's*. Sir, I should require better testimony than that, to believe that Mr. *Ormiston* would say anything to my disparagement. I refer to the reports of the Inspectors, which give their opinions, and these, as the members of the Committee may see, bear out the truth of my remarks. I doubt whether Mr. *Ormiston* used the expression attributed to him—here is his Report, and the Report of Mr. *Cockburn* too, both speaking for themselves. I cannot give implicit credit to the statement of the gentleman upon the subject, because, in the same speech he introduced the name of the Hon. *J. C. Morrison* as a witness that I had supported and

voted for measures to which I now object. I took the liberty yesterday, of putting, through the Chairman, a question to Mr. *Morrison* on the subject, whether he remembered these proceedings. What was his answer? That he did not recollect them, nor the course I pursued. I leave the Committee to decide between the gentleman's assertion the other day and the testimony of Mr. *Morrison*. And if he was so far wrong as to his statement of what Mr. *Morrison* said, it is not too much to assume that he may have been as far wrong in regard to the imputations he ascribes to Mr. *Ormiston*. The learned Professor has remarkable facility in appealing to private conversations in support of his position. He has referred to private conversations, not only with Messrs. *Ormiston* and *Morrison*, but with myself, although when or where, I have no idea, as I never called upon him in my life, on any educational matter. He used to pop into my office sometimes on various pretexts. What passed, I know not; but I cannot permit the gentleman to be the interpreter of my views in private conversations sought by himself, any more than I can pass without rebuke, the conduct which, without the permission of the parties concerned, publicly retails, for party purposes, its own versions of private conversations. If such a violation of the conventional laws of private life is tolerated, no man's character is safe. I have now done for the present with the learned gentleman, and I hope I may ask him, as he sneeringly asked Mr. *Nelles*, after his cross-examination, "are you satisfied?"

[*Reply to Mr. Langton and Dr. Wilson, in connection with each other.*]

Now, Sir, I address myself to the statements, common both to Mr. *Langton* and Dr. *Wilson*, and I have grouped them under distinct heads, that the Committee's attention may be the more easily directed to the salient points of this question. First, they both agree as to the law on this subject; they both say that the law could not have intended anything of the kind I assert. Mr. *Langton* says that "Mr. Baldwin's Act of 1849, required every person to go to Toronto for Collegiate education," while Mr. Hincks's Act of 1853, "provided that Students might be educated wherever they pleased." What is the common sense, honest inference from that? Does not this admitted object of Mr. Hincks's Bill, imply, that young men shall be as much encouraged to pursue their education elsewhere, as in Toronto? How can this be done, unless the Colleges they attend, are equally aided with that at Toronto—how can they be equally encouraged in other parts of the Province, as in Toronto, while you say to them at the same time "though you may pursue your studies elsewhere, you shall not receive a sixpence, unless you come here; you may strive after education where you please, but you must starve unless you come to Toronto." No! the law means to say that the youth of Upper Canada shall be equally aided during their whole course of training, wherever carried on. I have a better opinion of the Legislature, than to think they intended to encourage youth in pursuing studies, in various parts of the Province, without placing the institutions in which they are to be educated, on equal footing, as regards Public aid. It is as absurd as it is unjust and insulting to the parties educating their youth in Colleges, in different parts of the Province, to pretend as the law says, that "they shall be encouraged" to do so, and yet to discourage them from doing so, as the law has been administered, by refusing aid to any College but one, in Toronto. The people never asked, or thought of asking, to be tolerated to educate their youth "in various parts of the Province." They always had that right. The law did not pretend to give them a right which they already possessed, but to "encourage" them in the exercise of it. The spirit and objects of the law are the very reverse of Mr. *Langton* and Dr. *Wilson's* interpretations of it. Mr. *Langton* says, "The Senate has done nothing to prevent Students from coming to Toronto Uni-

versity for degrees." What a great privilege is this, when the degrees are but the dicta of the Professors of University College! To talk of the Students of other University Colleges going to Toronto for degrees, under such circumstances, is only to add insult to injury. The degrees of these University Colleges can suffer nothing in comparison with the degrees conferred at Toronto University, especially since young men can get a degree there, with attainments in Classics and Mathematics, scarcely above those required for Matriculation in former years, when the Hon. Mr. Allan and others of his time, pursued their Collegiate studies. What is required to "encourage" youth (as the law expresses it) to "*prosecute and complete their studies in other institutions* in various parts of the Province," is not going to Toronto for degrees at the end of their course, but aid in the prosecution of studies during that course; aid in the acquisition of what is necessary for degrees. To offer a man the latter, without aiding him to do the former, is like offering a man the title of M. P. P., if he will find a constituency and get himself elected to Parliament. Degrees, especially such as are now given at Toronto, are scarcely worth going for; the only thing of real value is the Collegiate education of which a degree should be a symbol. It is the substance, not the mere shadow, which the law intended for the "various parts of the Province;" otherwise, it was a mockery and an insult, which the Legislature could never have perpetrated upon the country.

I next address myself to the question of the University building and expenditures. The first inquiry is, did the law authorize the erection of such buildings, the purchase of a Library and Museum? Mr. *Langton* appealed to the Act, 16 Vic., cap. 161; but that Act simply speaks of the erection of Government buildings, and has not the slightest reference to the erection of University buildings, any more than has the Act authorising the erection of public buildings at Ottawa. There is therefore not a shadow of legal authority for the erection of the University buildings in the Act to which Mr. *Langton* has referred as having passed contemporaneously with the University Act. The authority, therefore, for the erection of these buildings must be found, if it exist at all, in the University Act, and to this Mr. *Langton* has not ventured to appeal. The phraseology of this Act, in contrast with that of the former Charter and Act, is worthy of special notice. In the former Charter and Act, the provisions for the erection of buildings, &c., are full and explicit; in the present University Act, the guarded and qualified phrases, "current expenses," "ordinary repairs," "permanent improvements and additions to the buildings on said property," are employed instead of the full and explicit authority for the erection of buildings, &c., given by the former Charter and Act. This difference of phraseology alone in the Acts referred to, is conclusive as to the design of the present Act. I confess that until within the last two years or so, I had no doubt as to authority having been given by the present Act for the erection of buildings and all other purposes for which the Senate has recommended expenditures. I knew the scope and design of the present Act; but I did not know that the powers of the Senate had been limited on the subject of buildings, &c., until some two years since, when I heard that a legal gentleman in Toronto had expressed an opinion that the Senate had no legal authority for the expenditures it was incurring. I then examined the law; and the result was the conviction which I have expressed, and that conviction has been confirmed by the perfect failure of Mr. *Langton* to adduce a shadow of legal authority for such expenditures, beyond that of alleged necessity and expediency.

He has enlarged upon the importance of a Provincial Library and Museum. Who questions that? But the Library of Parliament is a Provincial Library; and if any other Provincial Library, and a Provincial Museum, be established, a Provincial grant should be made for that purpose. The

law, as it appears to me, no more authorizes the purchase of a Provincial Library, and a Provincial Museum, out of a Fund designed for College education, than out of the Funds designed for Grammar and Common School education.

Then as to the *extravagance* of expenditures, that is a matter of opinion; what may be economical in one case, may be very extravagant in another. The Hon. J. C. Morrison was yesterday called as a witness and asked two questions. The one was, what was the former estimate for the buildings of Old King's College? To which the correct answer was given, two hundred thousand pounds. The second question was, what was the estimate of Chief Justice Draper and others, for the present University College Buildings and Library? The equally correct answer was, one hundred thousand pounds. The Toronto College advocates of expenditures seemed to think the case was settled beyond further dispute; but they forgot that between 1849 and 1853, under Mr. Baldwin's Act, and under Mr. Baldwin's Administration, an estimate was made, a plan adopted, and tenders given in for University Buildings, at the expense not of one or two hundred thousand pounds, but just *twenty thousand pounds*. I submit that the estimate made under the auspices of Mr. Baldwin's Government is a higher authority than that to which appeal is now made by Mr. Langton. But if the authority of Mr. Baldwin's Government is of no weight, let the example of the Imperial Government speak. That Government, by the liberality of Parliament, has established and erected the buildings for three Queen's Colleges in Ireland. The splendid and spacious buildings of those Colleges, cost, the one at Belfast, £34,357; the other at Cork, £32,899; the third at Galway, £32,743. And yet in each of these Colleges accommodations were provided for the Faculties of Law as well as of Medicine, in addition to the Faculty of Arts, and for the residences of both the Principal and Vice Principal. In the presence of such facts, you may judge of the economy of the Vice Chancellor, and the Senate of the Toronto University, in expending already upwards of \$300,000 in buildings for the single Faculty of Arts, and the examinations and conferring degrees by the University. The attendants and all other matters of equipage must, of course, correspond with the magnificence of the Buildings; and therefore you have no less than 45 officers connected with the establishment, eleven professors, and 34 other officers and servants, besides 29 examiners.

Then Mr. Langton complains that we not only object to his expenditures, but that we represent him as auditing his own accounts, and says, that "as Auditor he has no control over the Bursar's Accounts." Who said that "as Auditor," he had such control? What was asserted, and what he now admits, was, that as *Vice Chancellor* he directed these expenditures, while as Auditor he audited the accounts of them. Mr. Langton, as a pluralist, holds the double office with the double salary of Vice Chancellor and Auditor. As in the case of a former Lieutenant Governor of Upper Canada, who had the habit of granting lands to himself—his Patents running somewhat thus: "I, Peter Russell, Governor, &c., grant to you Peter Russell, Gentleman, &c.," so, "I, John Langton, Esquire, Vice Chancellor, direct the payment of University moneys for various purposes to the amount of some \$400,000; and then I, John Langton, Esquire, Auditor of Public Accounts, audit and I find correct the accounts of moneys which I, John Langton, Esq., Vice Chancellor, have ordered to be expended and paid." This is the financial branch of the University system which Mr. Langton, graduate of Cambridge, has come over from England to establish among us non-graduate Canadians in "this Canada of ours." We being non-graduates of course know not how much money should be expended in the erection of College buildings, or how it should be expended and accounted for; and we must therefore bow in submissive silence and

gratitude to the graduate learning and authority, which condescends thus to spend our money for us.

But here, Dr. *Wilson* adds his authority to that of Mr. *Langton*. He tells us, that "these College buildings at Toronto are not too good!" and then, quoting from a Wesleyan Committee Pamphlet on the University Question, the words, "History teaches that just in proportion as Greece and Rome lavished their resources upon stone and marble, upon the material and the inanimate, they declined in the intellectual and the moral," the Professor of History became indignant at such non-graduate barbarism, and waxed eloquent in praise of "stone and marble," reciting in long array the names of famous Greeks, whose original works he never read, and declaring that the greatest age of Greece—the age of Pericles—was an age of "stone and marble" magnificence. But the learned Professor seemed to have forgotten that in that very age were deposited seeds whose fruit ripened in the decline of Grecian intellect and greatness. He forgot that the golden age of Rome under Augustus and his immediate successors—during which the resources of an Empire were lavished on the magnificence of a city—was followed by a silver age, and that by an iron age. He forgot that from the age of Louis the Fourteenth—the golden age of French magnificence and pomp—commenced the decline of the moral and intellectual grandeur of France. Why, if Dr. *Wilson's* doctrine be true, we have only to pave our streets with stone and build our houses with marble, in order to become the greatest people of America! We have seen individuals practise this doctrine by lavishing their resources in erecting and furnishing magnificent buildings, and how great they soon became!—Yes, great in poverty, and their families great in wretchedness.

Such is the practical and doctrinal economy of Mr. *Langton* and Dr. *Wilson*, in regard to University buildings and expenditures. But in the midst of this scene of "stone and marble" magnificence, Mr. *Langton* becomes liberal, and Dr. *Wilson* economical—the latter thinking that something may be saved from the endowment, and the former, that a surplus may be given to the Grammar Schools. What a pity that this fit of liberality to the Grammar Schools had not seized Mr. *Langton* some years sooner, before his expenditures on buildings at Toronto had reduced the income of the University some £6,000 per annum, and when £50,000 might have been given to the Grammar Schools, and then £40,000 left for buildings, and yet the Income Fund equal to what it is now.

I next advert to what has been admitted and pleaded in regard to the *Standard of Matriculation*, or of admission to University College. It is admitted that the standard has been lowered—so much so, that Mr. *Langton* says in his memorial to the Legislature, that "the true standard of comparison should have been between the former *Matriculation examination and the present examination at the end of the first year.*" The fact, therefore, alleged by the Petitioners on this point is admitted to its full extent. Mr. *Langton* assigns as one reason for this reduction, that "the high standard of Matriculation in King's College, was a subject of loud complaint;" and Dr. *Wilson* has said, that "the standard of Matriculation in old King's College, was equal to a degree in the Scottish Universities,"—thereby admitting that his college course did not advance beyond that of a Canadian youth matriculating in old King's College. Now, as to Mr. *Langton's* statement, I venture to say that not a member of this Committee, nor a man in Upper Canada, ever before heard a complaint against old King's College on account of its high standard of matriculation. The sole objection to old King's College, was its connexion with one religious persuasion and the alleged expense of it. And I will show that Mr. *Langton* himself never thought of such a reason for reducing the standard of matriculation until very recently. King's College ceased to exist as such in 1849,

when Mr. Baldwin's Bill creating King's College into Toronto University was passed. The parties who had chiefly contributed to establish King's College, refused all connexion with Toronto University, and soon commenced the establishment of the present Trinity College in Toronto. The Senate of Toronto University was constituted by the appointment of several new members—myself among the number. Now if there were a shadow of truth in Mr. *Langton's* statement, that "the high standard of Matriculation in King's College was a subject of loud complaint," steps would have been immediately taken by the Senate appointed by Mr. Baldwin's Administration to lower that standard; yet during the operations of Mr. Baldwin's Act from 1849 to 1853, not a word was heard in the Senate or elsewhere about lowering the standard of Matriculation, which remained precisely as it was in King's College. Then when the present University Act was passed in 1853, intended to separate University College from Toronto University, (but which have strangely got together again, contrary to the avowed objects and express provisions of the Act), and a new Senate constituted, including Mr. *Langton* himself, the whole course of studies was considered and revised, yet the standard of Matriculation was actually raised instead of being lowered. In the subjects of the old King's College Matriculation, the same Books were prescribed. The only change was, substituting the word "or" for "and" between Xenophon and Lucian, and extending the examination in Roman History from Augustus to Nero, and adding the Elements of Chemistry and Natural Philosophy. Thus the standard of Matriculation in King's College remained unchanged, except being slightly raised, until 1857, when a new and anti-classical element, of which Dr. *Wilson* was the most active ingredient, was introduced into the Senate; and that is the secret of a full year's reduction in the standard of Matriculation, and that some three years after (according to the returns) the lengthening of the period of study from three to four years. These facts, therefore, entirely disprove Mr. *Langton's* statement as to the loud complaint against the high standard of Matriculation in King's College, as also his other statement, that the standard of Matriculation was lowered when the period of study was extended from three to four years.

Mr. *Langton* contends, but without proof and against fact, that the course of studies has not been reduced, and is not inferior to that of the English Universities, while Dr. *Wilson* ridicules the idea of our thinking of so high a course of studies as that of the English Universities! The Rev. Mr. Ambery—an honor Oxford man—has stated in evidence his opinion, that the Matriculation examination at Oxford, (called "Responsions") is about equal to that required for an ordinary degree in the Toronto University; and that the second or intermediate examination at Oxford is nearly equal to that required for a degree with honors at the Toronto University. But I shall discuss this part of the subject when I come to the question of options.

I beg now to draw your attention to Mr. *Langton's* statements, respecting Scholarships. The combined effort to prove that I had supported the proposal to establish Scholarships amounting to \$12,000 per annum, having utterly failed; and the statements against me on that point, having been disproved by the official records themselves, it has been abandoned, as also the assertion that the system of Scholarships proposed to be established in 1854, was the same as that now established. I have settled these points in my reply to the statements contained in Mr. *Brown's* questions. But Mr. *Langton* has employed much time and space in exhibiting in imposing array, the number of Scholarships established in the Universities in England and Ireland; but singular to say, every one of his quotations is unfair and inapplicable to the purpose for which he adduces them. The object of his quotations is to justify the establishment, at the expense of the University Funds, of a large number of Scholarships in Toronto University, but really, for the

benefit of University College, and to the injury of all others; and he so introduces his quotations, and argues from them, as to convey the impression, that the system of Scholarships in England and Ireland is the same as that established at Toronto, whereas the fact is, that the Scholarships to which Mr. *Langton* has appealed, are not *University* Scholarships at all, except those of the London University, which he admits to be only *nine*, (but which he multiplies into forty,) for *forty* affiliated Colleges in Arts and Law, and *seventy* in Medicine. The Queen's University in Ireland has not a single Scholarship, and expends only £475 per annum in "Exhibitions, Prizes and Medals," for three Colleges, and in the three Faculties of Arts, Law, and Medicine. The Scholarships in Ireland have not been created by the Queen's University at all, but by Royal Patent to each College separately, and independent of the University, and designed, at the establishment of each of the Colleges, to encourage and enable students to attend them from classes in society in Ireland, where higher education had been little cultivated. For that purpose, a grant to each College was made, of £1500 per annum, and over it the University has no control, nor of the Scholarships established by means of it. To have anything like it in Upper Canada would require a special and separate grant to each College, independent of the University—the very system which Mr. *Langton*, and Dr. *Wilson* oppose, and for which no one has made application. Then, all the *University* Scholarships at Cambridge are just *nineteen*, and are as follows: *Craven* Scholarships, 2; *Browne* Scholarships, 1; *Bell* Scholarships, 8; *Porson* Scholarship, 1; *Tyruwhitt* Scholarships (Hebrew), 3; *Crosse* Scholarships (Theological), 3; *Pitt* Scholarship, 1; in all 19. Not one of these Scholarships was founded by the Government, or the University, but by the individuals whose names they bear, except the *Pitt* Scholarship, which was founded jointly by the *Pitt* Club and the subscribers to *Pitt's* Statue. All the other Scholarships at Cambridge are *College* (not *University*) Scholarships, established at various times by individual liberality, for one or other of the seventeen Colleges at Cambridge, and over which the University has no control. The Prizes for the encouragement of literature, whether open to competition for the whole University, or limited to particular colleges, have been established by individual gifts or legacies in the same way. The *Cambridge Calendar* remarks, that three-fourths of the prizes, free and open to competition for the whole University, are given for Classics and English Composition, and more than half of the annual prizes in the different Colleges are given for the encouragement of Classical Literature,—a branch of learning quite at a discount with Mr. *Langton*, and Dr. *Wilson*.

Mr. *Langton*, quoting the Report of the Royal Cambridge University Commissioners, says, "It appears that at Cambridge, including the Colleges and the University, there are about 645 scholarships, or one to two students." Now, he could not have but known that of these 645 scholarships, only nineteen of them were University Scholarships, not one of them founded out of Public Funds, and all of them in past times by individual beneficence. As abuses have arisen in connection with the Trusts and the application of the funds arising from them, the Royal Commissioners recommend the interposition of Public Authority to correct such abuses, and secure a better application of the income of such gifts and legacies, under the direction, not of the University, but of the Colleges, to which the gifts and legacies belong. Now, it is scholarships thus created, and thus controlled, that Mr. *Langton* adduces as authority for the system of scholarships established by the Senate at Toronto, out of the University endowment. Nothing can be more unfair and fallacious than such quotations and references, without any intimation whatever as to the origin, character and relations of the scholarships, but with the assumption throughout that the scholarships referred to were analogous in those respects to the scholarships of the Toronto University.

Then Mr. *Langton* refers to scholarships at Oxford in the same strain, remarking that "at Oxford the information is more precise in some respects, and more capable of comparison with ourselves, as the number of undergraduates holding scholarships is given, as well as the total cost." Now, from the evidence of the Reverend Mr. *Ambery*, and as may be seen by the *Oxford Calendar*, which I have here, the University Scholarships of Arts, Law, Hebrew, Sanscrit, &c., do not exceed twenty-three—not one of them founded by the State, but every one of them by private benefactions under special regulations. All the other scholarships are *College* (not University) Scholarships, founded by individuals during the last few centuries, controlled by each College as a trust, according to the terms of the will or gift in each case. These are the scholarships to which Mr. *Langton* refers, and it is to the improved management and distribution of the funds arising from those private benefactions to the several Colleges, that the Royal Commissioners refer in their recommendations. But all Mr. *Langton's* references and quotations convey the impression that these College Scholarships and Fellowships founded by private individuals, are analogous to the Toronto University Scholarships created out of a public endowment. The Royal Commissioners, referring to these scholarships, say: "We have shown that the original object of Foundations was to support poor Students in their education at the University;" and they head the very section from which Mr. *Langton* makes his extracts in the following words, expressive of the nature and object of the scholarships: "*Application of COLLEGE Revenues to stimulate and reward those who have not yet entered the University.*" The scholarships at Oxford, therefore, are essentially different in their origin, objects, relations and control, from the scholarships established by the Senate of Toronto; and Mr. *Langton's* quotations and their applications have not been fair to the Committee, any more than they are fair to the public.

I will next notice Mr. *Langton's* statements, endorsed by Dr. *Wilson*, in regard to *options*, or the choice by students of one or more branches of study to the neglect of others. The following is the system of options established at Toronto University College as early as the end of the first year, as given in the Calendar for 1859-60: "Candidates for honors in any department, who have also in the *first year* obtained University first-class honors, *either in Greek, or Latin, or Mathematics, or in both Modern Languages and Natural Sciences*, are not *required* to take *any* branch in which they have *passed the University examination the first year*; but such candidates having been only examined in pure Mathematics in the first year, must also take applied Mathematics the second year." Here it will be seen that if a student obtains first-class honors in any one of these subjects at the end of the first year, and only passes the ordinary or pass-examination in the others, he may thenceforward omit them; for a student becomes a first-class honor-man by taking first class honors in one subject only. Thus a student may take a degree, even in honors, with but one year's pass course of study in Classics and Mathematics; and that when, as Mr. *Langton* has admitted in his Memorial to the Legislature, the standard of examination at the end of the first year is only equal to the examination for Matriculation in former years. And this emasculated and sham system of Collegiate education, Mr. *Langton* tells you has the sanction of the example of the English and Irish Universities! In the last part of my evidence at my first examination (page 41), I quoted the report of the Queen's College Commissioners, that no options whatever are allowed by the Queen's University in the examination for B. A., in the four subjects of the Latin Language and Literature, the Greek Language and Literature, and a Modern Foreign Language, and Mathematics. Yet, in the face of this express language of the Report which I have quoted, Mr. *Langton* represents the Queen's University in Ireland as permitting a different system! He says I have partially quoted the Report, that on the

page next to that from which I quoted, the Commissioners recommended a change. But, Sir, the Commissioners objected to the system of options proposed to them, and recommended a two-fold examination for a degree—the one embracing the subjects of the first two years' course at the end of two years, and those of the last year's course at the end of that year; and this change in the time and number of the University examinations was recommended with the express view of preventing the system of options in the four essential branches prescribed: for the Commissioners say—"We believe that a *general education* forms the soundest basis on which pre-eminent merit in particular branches of Literature and Science can rest."

\* \* \* "With the view of securing the proficiency of the Student *in all subjects*, and at the same time lightening the burden on the Student, who is now obliged to keep up his knowledge in the compulsory as well as optional group to the end of the third year, it has been suggested that a final examination should take place in some of the subjects by University Examiners, within the College walls, at some period before the conclusion of the course. We are of opinion that *after the second year*, there should be an examination in *all the subjects studied in the first two years*, and that it should be final in regard to all subjects *not included* in the group selected by the student for the A. B. examination." (pp. 19, 20). The object of the Royal Commissioners, therefore, even in a high and very severe course of Collegiate studies, was to prevent any optional studies during the first two of a three years' course of study—to allow optional studies but one year; whereas in the Toronto University system, optional studies are allowed *three years* out of four. During *two-thirds* of the course of studies in the Queen's Colleges in Ireland, there is *no option or interruption whatever* in the studies of Latin, Greek, and Mathematics; in Toronto University, options are allowed in either or all of those studies during *three-fourths* of the course.

Next Mr. Langton refers to the London University; but here though the degree of B. A. has been divided into two, namely, a First B. A. and a Second B. A., the latter being equal to the B. A. under the former system; there is no option whatever in the subjects of either of the two examinations; and the subjects of the two examinations include the Latin and Greek languages and literature, Mathematics, Logic and Moral Philosophy, besides other subjects, as may be here seen in the last Calendar of the London University.

Then Mr. Langton also appeals to and quotes largely from the Reports of the Cambridge University Commissioners; but his own quotations refute his conclusions; for the Royal Commissioners recommend (what was not allowed before), that some choice of studies be allowed to students during the last *four terms* out of the *nine terms* of actual residence and study; that is from the *latter part of the second year* (there being three terms in a year at Cambridge,) a choice of studies under certain guards and restrictions be allowed to students; but then only after passing the "previous examination." which Provost Whitaker states in his evidence to have been made equal to the former examination for B. A., at Cambridge. And yet Mr. Langton coolly adduces such recommendations to sanction optional studies in the Toronto University, at the end of the *first year*, and that without any such previous examination as the one required at Cambridge.

Mr. Langton also appeals to the recommendations of the Oxford University Commissioners; but they are more completely against him than those (as I have just shewn,) of the Cambridge University Commissioners. Mr. Langton quotes the Oxford Commissioners, as recommending a choice of studies to be allowed to students during the *latter part* of the course; but he adroitly avoids saying, or quoting any passage, by which the Committee might judge as to how long a time was meant by "the *latter part* of the course." Now the very heading of the recom-

mendations from which Mr. *Langton* has quoted, is as follows:—"Liberty of choice in subjects of study during the last year." Had Mr. *Langton* quoted these words, it would have made the fallacy of his argument transparent in a moment. Out of a four years' course of study at Oxford, the Commissioners recommend that there may be liberty of choice in subjects of study during the last year of the four; while Mr. *Langton's* system establishes it three years out of the four!

Thus do the authorities, professedly quoted by Mr. *Langton*, condemn in every instance his wretched system of options, and sanction the views which we have maintained, that optional studies should only be permitted to a limited extent during the latter part of the Collegiate course—that allowing a choice of studies at the end of the first year of a Collegiate course, is as injurious to a thorough University education, as allowing a child at school, at the end of his first year, to choose his studies, would be fatal to a thorough elementary education.

The Committee adjourned.

Thursday, April 26, 1860.

#### COMMITTEE MET.

*Present:*

The Honorable MALCOLM CAMERON, Chairman,  
 " Mr. CAYLEY,  
 " " Attorney General MACDONALD,  
 " " FOLEY,  
 " " ROBLIN,  
 " SIMPSON,  
 " McCANN,  
 " WILSON.

The Reverend Messrs. *Ryerson*, *Stinson*, *Nelles* and *Poole* were in attendance.

*John Langton*, Esquire, and Professor *Wilson* of University of Toronto, were in attendance.

The Reverend Mr. *Ryerson* continued his statement in reply to Messrs. *Langton* and *Wilson*, as follows:

In resuming the observations which I was making yesterday, I may remark that a large portion of my reply was not in answer to what is contained in Dr. *Wilson's* written statement, which may be read in a little more than half an hour; his speech occupied considerably more than two hours, and nearly all the points to which I referred were mentioned in his speech as delivered, but which he has not incorporated in his written statement. They were designed for the Committee, it appears; not for the country at large. How far such a course is fair or manly, I leave others to judge. On the other hand, there is much in the written statement of Mr. *Langton* which was not contained in his speech. To that I have no objection. In view of what may possibly occur hereafter, and to justify myself in the eyes of the Committee, my friends and the country, I make these explanatory remarks. I omitted one or two points connected with the topics to which I alluded yesterday; one was in regard to the standard of Matriculation. It is admitted on all hands that the standard of Matriculation at Toronto University has been much lowered, and, I think I have shewn, not for the reason assigned: it has been reduced considerably lower than that of other University Colleges, and one reason given (which I omitted to notice yesterday) was the incompetency of the Grammar

Schools to give that preparatory education necessary for Matriculation at the University according to the former standard. This objection has been repeated by all who have spoken on the other side of the question, in various forms, and with various degrees of impressiveness. Now, Sir, perhaps no one knows better than I do the position of our Grammar Schools, how much they stand below the standard to which I would wish them elevated, or the inconvenient and undesirable circumstances in which the Masters of many of them are placed. But it is one thing for the Masters of Grammar Schools to be in poor circumstances, and quite another thing for these Masters to be incompetent. It is possible that there may be competency combined with poverty—competency on the part of the Master, combined with a deficiency of materials within the Schools, and a want of resources to place them in that position which the generosity and judgment of the Trustees would desire, had they the power to do so. When the statement is made to you, that the intention of the reduction of the Matriculation standard was to prevent a monopoly in behalf of Upper Canada College, I ask what is the plea for the existence of Upper Canada College, except that it was designed as an Institution for the Province? What is the reason for its existence at this day except that it was intended especially as a feeder to the Provincial University College; that it was designed to take up our youth at a stage when they had advanced beyond the competency of ordinary Grammar Schools, and gather them there for the special purpose of preparation for the Provincial University? Why else is it that £5000 or £6000 per annum has been given to Upper Canada College, and from £50 to £200 only to each of the Grammar Schools, except that the College had work to do superior to that of the Grammar Schools? That College was established for Upper Canada, not for Toronto, else its endowment should be abolished to-morrow, since Toronto is as well able to support its own Grammar School as any city or town in the Province. The policy of the Senate of the University should have been to send young men to Upper Canada College, to prepare them there for admission to the University. In the face of its endowment, in the presence of the past facts in the history of that institution, of the recommendations of past years as to its sufficiency, of its being placed—not under the direction of an ordinary local board of trustees, but of a Provincial Senate; in the face of all this it is strange these gentlemen should plead that they reduced the standard of Matriculation in the University, in order not to give Upper Canada College an advantage over other Grammar Schools. Can anything be more inconsistent or absurd, more contrary to facts, more opposed to the very nature of things? Sir, I repeat, if it is not the design of Upper Canada College, by its large endowment, to accomplish the purpose of which I speak, it ought not to exist for a day, and the other portions of Upper Canada ought to claim that the revenues now set apart for the support of that Institution be distributed among the various Grammar Schools of the Province. Sir, this very plea of Mr. *Langton* and Dr. *Wilson*, is the death knell of Upper Canada College. But what are the facts in regard to the Grammar Schools? Look over the masterships of the Grammar Schools of the country, and wonder how men can have the face to make assertions of this description. If you begin at Cornwall you will there find one of the most accomplished young men of the country, whose mind is as energetic as it is finely cultivated, the Rev. Mr. *Davies*, a Trinity College man. Is Mr. *Barron*, of Cobourg, unfit to train up young men to be teachers? Is the Master of Kingston Grammar School incompetent? Is the master of the Grammar School of Brockville incompetent? Is that most accomplished and most able master of Barrie Grammar School, incompetent, who has competed successfully with Upper Canada College itself in regard to both scholars and honors. I will ask whether the Master of Galt Grammar School, a graduate of Toronto Universi-

ty, who was distinguished as a teacher in Hamilton Grammar School before he went to the University, and has also I believe, distanced Upper Canada College in the number of his pupils who have taken honors in University competition, is incompetent. Is the accomplished Master connected with the school at Hamilton, which even though it is called a Union Grammar School, is one of the best in that part of the country, an incompetent man? Is the Master of the London Grammar School, Mr. Bayley, who has sent up scholars who have taken honors in old King's College, unfit to teach? Is the Rev. Mr. Mulholland, now Head Master of the Grammar School at Simcoe, incompetent to teach youth anything higher than a little Sallust and a little Xenophon? Is Dr. Howe, Master of the Toronto Grammar School, incompetent; or Mr. Marling, of New Market Grammar School; or Mr. Phillips, Master of the St. Catharines Grammar School, one of the first and most numerously attended Grammar Schools in Upper Canada. Sir, I might extend this enumeration a long while; for the masters of no less than 42 out of the 75 Grammar Schools, are graduates of British and Canadian Colleges; and several of those who teach under Provincial certificates, are competent and able teachers. Sir, the plea of Mr. *Langton* and Dr. *Wilson*, as to the incompetency of the Grammar Schools, is an unjust and groundless imputation upon the qualifications of a great majority of the masters of Grammar Schools in Upper Canada; for however poor may be the accommodation of Grammar Schools in some places, and however inadequate the salaries paid, it is clear that their masters generally are competent to train our boys up to any standard of Matriculation a Provincial University might require. The reason given for the reduction is a mere pretext, contradicted on the one hand by the consideration of the objects for which Upper Canada College was founded, and on the other by the competency of the masters of the Grammar Schools in various parts of the Province. It is for the want of those who wish to pursue a course of University study, that men have not come up to enrol themselves on the University books; and perhaps another reason is in the unwillingness of some to go up to Toronto. Every effort has been made by offering prizes and Scholarships, by abolishing fees, by the reduction of standards, to increase the number of students, and as if that were not enough, these gentlemen have attached to the University a Tutor, whose special work it is to assist the maimed, the halt, and I had almost said the blind. Is it, I ask, for the interest of the several localities of the country, for the interest of Grammar Schools themselves, or for that of University Education, to take off what Mr. *Langton* admits to be a year's work from the Grammar Schools, and tack it on to University College by the assistance of a Tutor, with the duty assigned to him of coaching those who come up from the country to enter the University, even according to its present reduced standard.

Another subject to which I alluded yesterday, but in connection with which I overlooked one or two topics, is that of Scholarships. But before adverting to this topic, allow me to notice Mr. *Langton's* statement that I had myself gone home to England and selected persons as teachers who proved not to be qualified. He speaks of "two men, graduates of British Universities, selected by me for the Normal and Model Schools, who, upon trial, proved inefficient." Now, Sir, had I made a mistake of the kind here made by Mr. *Langton*, you would have seen again enacted in regard to myself, the same spectacle that took place once at Toronto in the case of a gentleman now present (Mr. *Cayley*.) I should have been cross-examined, shown to have been in error, and then held up as stating what was contrary to fact. Now, one of these persons was a graduate of the University of Queen's College in Ireland—and I may here remark parenthetically, there were candidates from Belfast College also, and as proofs of their standing, they forwarded me the Calendar of Belfast College. This is how I came to have that Calendar, and not those of the other Queen's Colleges at Cork and Galway;

why I spoke of the standard of admission there as being higher than at Toronto, which Mr. *Langton* has admitted, but on which he accused me of having unfairly selected one from among three—because it suited my argument best,—the other was not a graduate of any University, but a student in the School of Arts and Science in London, and I wished to get a master to teach drawing according to the system pursued there. Mr. *Langton* says these gentlemen were dismissed—but what had been the condition of their appointment? The system adopted in appointing all Masters and Teachers of the Normal and Model Schools, even Mr. *Orniston*, Mr. *Ambery*, and others, has, in every case, been a six months' probation, after which, if they did not succeed in performing their duties efficiently, their services were dispensed with, and if they came from England, the expenses of their passage home were paid. If the same prudent course had been pursued in regard to certain other Professors, it would, perhaps, have been better for the country. Now, the first of these young men (an excellent person) possessed great clearness of perception, and power of language to express his views, but he failed for two reasons—he could not command the interest of, nor efficiently govern large classes. Therefore, after trial, it was found he could not succeed in this particular work. The other person was in every way competent to teach, but attended no public worship, and became known as a sceptic, and exhibited lightness of character and indifference to the progress of his classes, and therefore, we thought it best to dispense with his services; and we have now selected a gentleman (Mr. *Coulton*) to fill the situation, who was educated in the School of Arts and Manufacturing Industry in Paris, and afterwards obtained the rank of Civil Engineer, and who manages his department most efficiently. These are the only two mistakes which have been made in the difficult task of selecting Masters and Teachers for the Provincial Normal and three Model Schools, and such has been the provision made for remedying them. I may add, that had not such precautions been taken, the Normal School would have been permanently maimed in two of its essential departments.

Reverting now to the question of Scholarships, I beg to notice for a moment, what has been stated by Mr. *Langton* and Dr. *Wilson*, that students from all Colleges can compete for them. Apart from the answers given by Dr. *Cook* and *Provost Whitaker*, to this show of liberality, I may remark, that these Scholarships are for what are called *honor* subjects—subjects not included in the ordinary collegiate curriculum, but additional subjects, and for the study of which, students are allowed, in the exercise of *options*, to omit other studies which the other Colleges consider essential to the completeness of an University education. To allow students to neglect several ordinary subjects, and devote themselves chiefly to one subject, in order to obtain a Scholarship of £30, is like pugilists neglecting ordinary and lawful avocations to train themselves for a contest, involving a larger or smaller sum of money. Thus, the Toronto system of Scholarships, is not only unjust to ordinary Students, by having half the time of the Professors, which should be devoted to them, employed in training the candidate for the contest, but also mars the harmony and efficiency of the system of mental study and discipline, necessary to intellectual development, and a complete liberal education, while it is an ingenious scheme for building up University College alone.

I here take occasion to remark upon a term which appears to have given Dr. *Wilson* great offence, and the use of which, I regret, since so much ado has been made about it, and as I intended no offence. It is the term “family compact.” It is very well known that the term was used in a conventional sense, and which may apply to a College family, as well as a political family, and that conventional sense, I may define, for insertion in the first dictionary of Canadianisms, as “a small party of gentlemen in Toronto, having, among others, two special objects in view; the one being their own convenience and interests, and the other, those of

their locality, regarding the interests of others, and of other localities, as matters of very secondary consideration." How far the interests of the College family have been consulted, I need not further remark; and I have shown, in a statement to which neither Mr. *Langton* nor Dr. *Wilson* has ventured to refer, that the Professors of the College family at Toronto, have consulted their convenience, by giving themselves two months less work each year, and twelve hours less work each week of that short year, than have the Professors of Harvard College.

Now, Sir, as to the next topic, on which I made some observations yesterday, that of Options. I will not now, as I did not previously, enter into the general question; but I beg to repeat, that all the authorities quoted on that subject, fail to prove, as it was endeavored to prove, that the Options in other countries, are equal to those allowed in the University of Toronto. I shewed before, that no Options were admitted at Cambridge, until after the 5th term. At Cambridge, there are now nine terms to be kept out of the twelve, instead of ten as formerly. Her Majesty's Commissioners recommend raising the standard of the examination at the end of the 5th term, called the "Previous Examination," as Professor *Whitaker* testified, and admitting Students from that time, to choose Options. That recommendation has induced Mr. *Langton* to justify options being introduced here the end of the first year, while there, it will be seen, they only commence in the latter part of the second, after the standard to which students must have attained at that period has been advanced, to what Provost *Whitaker* regards as equal to the former standard for B. A. at Cambridge in Mr. *Langton's* time. There, in four out of the nine terms options are permitted, while in Toronto they are allowed six terms out of eight! Then, sir, in regard to London University, I have shewn that in every single degree, except that of M. A., no options at all are permitted. As to Oxford, I have shown that the "Liberty of choice in subjects of study during the *last year*" of four was what the Royal Commissioners recommended, and not the last three years of four, as has been established in Toronto. Mr. *Langton* incorrectly represents the "Intermediate Examination" at Oxford as the first examination. The Commissioners in their Report, from which Mr. *Langton* quotes, set it down as "The Second or Intermediate Examination;" and Professor *Ambery* considers this examination at Oxford as not only above the ordinary degree examination, but nearly equal to the honor degree examination at Toronto; and it is only after that Second or Intermediate Examination, that the Royal Commissioners permit the options mentioned by Mr. *Langton*. The recommendations of the Oxford Commissioners would not permit any Options in Toronto, until after the Students had passed their ordinary fourth year's examination for the degree of B. A.; yet Mr. *Langton* adduces such recommendations to justify the adoption of a system of Options at the end of the first year.

Having thus referred to the British Institutions, I may remark that on this side of the Atlantic, in places where there are practical men, not "old Oxford relics," I allude to Yale and Harvard, the system of options is permitted to a very limited extent indeed. Yale only permits options in classics in *two* out of the whole *twelve* terms of its course, and that only when the student wishes to take the higher Mathematics, but does not permit any options in Mathematics. At Harvard options in Mathematics do not commence until the third year, and in classics not until the fourth year.

Having now discussed these topics in reply to Mr. *Langton* and Dr. *Wilson*, I may remark that if we have a College education at all in Upper Canada it should be a good one. It is not worth while putting the country to the expense of a Collegiate education that only advances a couple of steps beyond the Grammar

School course. It is not just to the country or its future that we should have such a system, unless it is characterized by a thoroughness, a comprehensiveness, a practical character, that can stand some comparison with that of other countries. I submit that the youth of Upper Canada are not deficient in intellect—though Dr. *Wilson* seemed to think it absurd that we should look as highly as Oxford, where education costs at least \$750 a year, and where the English nobility are educated. Just as if money or title conferred intellect, as if a poor untitled Canadian may not, with the aid of competent and diligent Professors, equal in scholarship and science the wealthy titled Englishman! Sir, the University education for which all Upper Canada has been taxed ought to be a real University education, not a mock imitation of it. We want our sons better educated than their fathers—educated so that they can stand on an equality with the educated men of any country. Our aim should be to elevate the standard of education in all the Colleges, as well as schools; but how can that be accomplished when the only endowed University of the country sets the example of the downward instead of the upward course?

Mr. *Langton* and Dr. *Wilson* have both attempted to show that Victoria College has had three representatives in the Senate of the Toronto University, while University College has only four—that Dr. *Barrett*, of the Medical Faculty of Victoria College, Mr. *Nelles* and myself are members of the Senate. None can be more sensible than themselves of the fallacy of their statement and argument. Dr. *Workman*, President of the Toronto School of Medicine, (which was affiliated to the Toronto University early in 1854,) entered the Senate as such. To him Dr. *Barrett* succeeded. In 1856, the Toronto School of Medicine became the Medical Faculty of Victoria College, but retained its affiliated relation to Toronto University, and as the President of that affiliated Institution, and not as Head of the Medical Faculty of Victoria College, Dr. *Barrett* held his place as member of the Senate. Soon after, Dr. *Barrett* and a majority of the Corporation of the Toronto School of Medicine withdrew from all connexion with Victoria College, became very hostile to it; but retaining their School as an affiliated Institution of the Toronto University, and as the Head of such affiliated Institution, Dr. *Barrett* holds his seat and has acted for years as member of the Senate. Yet in the presence of these facts, Dr. *Wilson* and Mr. *Langton* represent him as holding his seat in the Senate as a representative of Victoria College! Then as to myself, I am a member of the Senate simply as Chief Superintendent of Education of Upper Canada, though I happen to be a Trustee of, and a subscriber to Victoria College. But the fallacy of their statement becomes still more palpable from the fact, that the four Professors of University College are salaried officers on the funds of the University, while no member of any other College receives a farthing from them—not even his expenses if he should go to Toronto to attend meetings of the Senate.

I will now advert briefly to another subject on which Dr. *Wilson* dwelt at great length—that of Denominational Colleges. I may ask what Denominational Colleges have to do with the defence of University College—the professed object of Dr. *Wilson's* mission to Quebec? Was he deputed to attack Denominational Colleges, or to appear in behalf of University College? Mr. *Langton* admits, indeed, that Denominational Colleges may do some good; but the whole scope of Dr. *Wilson's* remarks is to the effect that Denominational Colleges are a sort of social evil, and that it would be better for the country if they did not exist. He declares it “totally at variance with facts to say,” as the Wesleyan Memorial stated, that “the experience of all Protestant countries shows that it is, and has been, as much the province of a religious persuasion to establish a College, as it is for a School

Municipality to establish a School.' I showed in my remarks yesterday how contrary to facts was Dr. *Wilson's* statement that the Collegiate Education in England in connexion with the London University was non-denominational. In refutation of his present statement, I may appeal to the Protestant country of Scotland, in which, according to his own admission and statement, the system of Collegiate education was under both denominational tests and control until since 1854. He refers to *four* Colleges in England, at Hull, Cheltenham, Wakefield and Manchester, which he says have been established by voluntary effort, and are non-denominational; but why did he omit the upwards of *thirty* Denominational Colleges established and endowed by voluntary effort in England, and which are affiliated to the London University? Every schoolboy knows that the history of each Protestant denomination in England, has been marked by the establishment of one or more Collegiate Institutions, and within the last few years to a greater extent than at any former period. And Dr. *Wilson* himself being witness, the forty-two Colleges at Oxford and Cambridge are under denominational control, although tests for students have been abolished. Then to turn to Protestant America, is there a single denomination in the United States, which has not put forth its most vigorous efforts to establish denominational institutions? In the Almanacs of that country you may see lists, almost without number, of their denominational Colleges. Yet Dr. *Wilson*, in the face of these facts, denies that the history of Protestant countries shows, that it is the province of denominations to establish Colleges at all!

It is also objected by both Mr. *Langton* and Dr. *Wilson*, that denominational Colleges are opposed to the system of Common and Grammar Schools. Perhaps I understand that system as well as these gentlemen; and I may observe, that in forming the system of Common and Grammar Schools, I regarded denominational Colleges, as a necessary supplement to them, and as essential to the completeness and efficiency of the system of public instruction in Upper Canada, and as much an essential part of it, as the Common and Grammar Schools themselves. I will not detain you by arguing this point; but I will append extracts of a letter which I addressed to the Hon. F. Hincks, on the subject, in July, 1852, and in which I discussed, at length, the connexion between the system of Common and Grammar Schools and denominational Colleges. In refutation of the assertion that the advocacy of denominational Colleges involves the advocacy of denominational Common Schools, I remark that the most earnest supporters of the non-denominational Schools, are the warmest advocates of denominational Colleges. I would ask whether I have ever been in favor of establishing denominational Schools in the country? I ask whether the Wesleyan Conference, which now stands prominently before you, as having originated the investigation, ever demanded them, or whether it has not expressed its views on the subject in past years, or if its practice, in permitting one of its members to construct a non-denominational system, and carry it on from that day to the present, is not an indication of its views? Do not the Presbyterians of the Church of Scotland hold similar ground? Has not the feeling of the great body of the Church of England too—for only a small portion of it has advocated separate schools—been in favor of supporting liberally our present system of Common and Grammar Schools?

I now come to another point. It has been stated as an objection, that under the system we advocate there would be a contemptibly small number of Students attending the different Colleges, and that that would be a great disadvantage. It has been pressed on the Committee, that, to get a large number of Students, we must have but one Collegiate institution. Now here again, what are the facts? In this very Report of the English University Commissioners by Heywood, you find a list of

the Students who entered both at Cambridge and Oxford, from '45 to '49: no returns having appeared since then. I will take the list of Students who entered these old Colleges in the latter year, as mentioned in Heywood, p. 517. At Cambridge there were,

|                   |   |   |   |   |   |   |     |
|-------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|
| At St. Peter's    | - | - | - | - | - | - | 21  |
| At Clare Hall     | - | - | - | - | - | - | 19  |
| At Pembroke       | - | - | - | - | - | - | 10  |
| At Caius          | - | - | - | - | - | - | 26  |
| At Trinity Hall   | - | - | - | - | - | - | 10  |
| At Corpus Christi | - | - | - | - | - | - | 24  |
| At King's         | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4   |
| At Queen's        | - | - | - | - | - | - | 36  |
| At Jesus          | - | - | - | - | - | - | 23  |
| At Christ's       | - | - | - | - | - | - | 20  |
| At St. John's     | - | - | - | - | - | - | 97  |
| At Magdalen       | - | - | - | - | - | - | 21  |
| At Trinity        | - | - | - | - | - | - | 151 |
| At Emmanuel       | - | - | - | - | - | - | 25  |
| At Sidney         | - | - | - | - | - | - | 8   |
| At Downing        | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4   |

---

499.

The average number entering at the Colleges at Cambridge is, then, 31 students to each. And have not some of the infant denominational Colleges in this new country already more students entered than several of the old Colleges at Cambridge? Then let us look at Oxford. There the number entered in the last year of which we have the return was:—

|                           |   |   |   |   |   |   |     |
|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|
| At University College     | - | - | - | - | - | - | 21  |
| At Balliol College        | - | - | - | - | - | - | 26  |
| At Merton College         | - | - | - | - | - | - | 12  |
| At Exeter College         | - | - | - | - | - | - | 43  |
| At Oriel College          | - | - | - | - | - | - | 18  |
| At Queen's College        | - | - | - | - | - | - | 28  |
| At New College            | - | - | - | - | - | - | 58  |
| At Lincoln College        | - | - | - | - | - | - | 16  |
| At All Souls' College     | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1   |
| At Magdalene College      | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2   |
| At Brasenose College      | - | - | - | - | - | - | 26  |
| At Corpus Christi College | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6   |
| At Christ Church          | - | - | - | - | - | - | 46  |
| At Trinity College        | - | - | - | - | - | - | 27  |
| At St. John's College     | - | - | - | - | - | - | 15  |
| At Jesus College          | - | - | - | - | - | - | 17  |
| At Wadham                 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 26  |
| At Pembroke               | - | - | - | - | - | - | 26  |
| At Worcester              | - | - | - | - | - | - | 33  |
| At St. Alban Hall         | - | - | - | - | - | - | "   |
| At St. Edmund Hall        | - | - | - | - | - | - | 7   |
| At St. Mary's Hall        | - | - | - | - | - | - | 11  |
| At New Inn Hall           | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1   |
| At Magdelene Hall         | - | - | - | - | - | - | 27  |
| Total                     | - | - | - | - | - | - | 440 |

The average number entered at each College there is 182. It is known that many more students enter a College than graduate. Victoria College this very year has a graduating class of *fourteen* young men, who have gone through their four years' course of study, besides nearly fifty undergraduates of one, two, or three years standing, and some 200 pupils in the Preparatory School. Yet we are told that by multiplying our Colleges we shall reduce the number of our students to an extent altogether without precedent in any country! If twenty students are in a class—we know that the students in a College are divided into four classes—are they not as many as one Tutor can well do justice to? Can one Tutor do more than properly attend to them? In his "ephemeral" article, Dr. *Wilson* said Professors should be as nearly as possible like the Tutors at Oxford and Cambridge. I think, then, the objections as to the smaller numbers that would be brought together in Denominational Colleges are entirely answered.

Sir, there are two or three qualities which Denominational Colleges possess to which I call attention. I speak from personal knowledge of one of them. They have a heart—a heart that feels as well as a head that thinks—they have a Christian heart, actuated by Christian feelings, motives, principles. They have a Canadian heart, all their sympathies, throughout the whole course of their training, being with the country. In the conversations and discussions of students and teachers, their illustrations are drawn as far as possible from "this Canada of ours," and when the students emerge into active life they feel that the land is theirs, they respect and love it as their home, and regard their fellow-countrymen as their brethren and equals. This is a very important consideration in forming the elements of character in this country.

On the score of their economy, too, the denominational colleges should attract attention; for they educate as many students for £2,000 as University College does for three times that sum.

Again, is it not all important for every statesman, christian and patriot to do all in his power to develope voluntary effort in the country, since voluntary effort in regard to everything that trains the heart of man, is the mainspring of our social progress. When the system of higher education is so framed as to require the exercise of this feeling—when no denomination can receive anything until its thoughts, feelings, sympathies are drawn forth and evinced by large contributions for the erection of buildings and the payment of Professors—then, I say, we have an important element to draw out what is good among us. But when there is no such feeling, when our Collegiate Institution lives wholly upon the public, and no man connected with it has any higher interest than to get what he can, then I say, you have an element of decay. We are, for the most part, a voluntary people. We should encourage voluntary effort by the supplementary aid of the State, but it should be given on the principle of equal justice to all; and it is curious to see the leaders of the voluntaries on other subjects become in this case the leaders of those who would depend upon the State for everything.

Dr. *Wilson* the other day referred to the Common and Grammar Schools of the country as being non-denominational, and said, non-denominational Colleges were essential to the harmony of the system. Sir, under our common school system, children are under the care or the orders of their parents for sixteen hours every day, besides the whole of each Sunday, and thus every possible facility is afforded for religious instruction. In the Grammar Schools there is, to a certain extent, as I have admitted, a defect in this particular, but they are only week-day boarding schools, at most, and parents can generally find some acquaintance in the neighborhood to pay attention to their children. In the Normal School, Toronto, which is for the purpose of training

teachers, seldom extending over a period of ten months, the students are required to attend religious instruction one hour a week under their own ministers, and are as imperatively required to attend that class as any other. And, granting that a defect exists in the Grammar Schools, that the primary education does not afford sufficient opportunities for religious instruction, is it not all the more important, as every good parent must feel, that religious instruction should be afterwards given to that part of our youth who are to give character and heart to, and to be the leaders of our country? When our sons go away from immediate parental and pastoral authority to train their minds for becoming the instructors and guides, if not the rulers of the Province in future years, is it not most important that every possible care should be taken to give them every facility for obtaining religious instruction to form their character? If there is a defect in our Grammar Schools, it is a reason for remedying it at our Colleges.

Having made these remarks, I will now revert to my own system, my own plan, which I respectfully submit to the serious attention of the Committee. Sir, Dr. *Wilson* made himself merry, and thought to amuse the Committee, by a reference to an expression of mine, used in a letter written by me several years since, that I had meditated my system of Public Instruction for this country—(for I contemplated the whole system from the primary school to the University)—on some of the highest mountains in Europe, and said, using a very elegant expression, it must therefore be rather “windy.” I leave it to the country to judge of the windiness of the gentleman who has assailed me; but a person of his pretensions to literature and philosophy might have known, that there have been those who have risen high in their intellectual attainments, and left monuments rather more enduring than essays on Indian pipes and tobacco, profusely illustrated in the *Canadian Journal*, who have sought their inspirations in the higher elevations of their country. No one can have read the history of Greece or Scotland, or the Northern and Western parts of England, without knowing that, from elevated and secluded places, some of the finest inspirations of genius have emanated which have ever been conceived by the mind of man. There are mountains in Europe where the recluse may stand and see beneath him curling clouds, and roaring tempests spending their strength, while he is in a calm untroubled atmosphere, on the summit of a mountain of which it may be said,

“ Though round his breast the rolling clouds are spread,  
“ Eternal sunshine settles on his head,”

And I ask whether it was unphilosophical for an individual who had examined the educational systems of various countries, and who was crossing the Alps, to retire to a mountain solitude, and there, in the abode of that “eternal sunshine,” and in the presence of Him who is the fountain of light, to contemplate a system which was to diffuse intellectual and moral light throughout his native country, to survey the condition of that country as a whole, apart from its political and religious dissensions, and ask what system could be devised to enable it to take its position among the civilized nations of the world? How much better to be in such a position than to be enveloped in a Scotch fog, like that with which we were visited for two or three hours the other day!

In regard to the university and collegiate system which I would suggest, I have nothing (after eight years' further deliberation and experience) to add to or modify (unless in regard to Provincial Schools of Law and Medicine) what I meditated in Europe in 1845, and submitted to the Hon. Mr. Hincks in July, 1852. In that plan, I proposed to provide professorships in the various branches of science and literature after the examples of the French and English Universities, and to transfer the present professorships of English Literature and Natural History to the

University proper, instead of their being attached to a College. I proposed the constitution of the University, the erection of the building, the endowment of professorships and colleges, including the denominational colleges, in connection with our Common School system, at an expense within the Income of the University Endowment without infringing upon the principle. I will append to my present observations extracts from the Letter referred to, containing an outline of the whole system, together with reasons for, and expected advantages of it, and leave the Committee to judge whether the plan suggested by me in 1852, and which I beg to suggest again, would not have effected an immense saving in the expenditure of the University Funds, greatly improved and extended collegiate education in the country, and consolidated in one harmonious whole our entire system of public instruction, from the primary school up to the University?

Thus submitting my plan to the consideration of the Committee, I beg to remark for a moment on two points incidentally connected with the subject. Dr. *Wilson* seemed displeased that I should compare his lectures on the English Language and Literature with the teachings of the Grammar School, and consoled himself, and sought to amuse the Committee with the idea that I did not know the difference between the lectures of a College Professor and the teachings of a Grammar School master. I only judged of the character of Dr. *Wilson's* lectures on English Literature by his text-book, which is the same as that used in the Grammar Schools; and I presume there are not a few masters of Grammar Schools who are quite as competent to teach the English language and literature as Dr. *Wilson* himself. At the same time I am not insensible that the English language should be differently taught in the Grammar School and the College. In the former it should be taught, if I may use the expression, synthetically—beginning with the elements of words, putting them together, tracing them up to their Latin and Greek origin, or other foreign origin, as streams to their fountains, and then combining, arranging and applying them to practical purposes according to the philosophy of language. In the professorial chair, the analytic method should be adopted, and the process should commence with the languages of Greece and Rome, the words and literature of which should be traced downward and pursued in all their intricate and various interminglings with our own language and literature, forming its very warp and woof. This, I submit, is the true method of studying the English language and literature in connection with collegiate education; and this is doubtless the philosophy of Dr. *Cook's* view, when he said the other day that he would like to have both a Greek and Latin Professor, who would teach Greek and Latin, not in the style of the Grammar School, but in the spirit of a sound philology, exhibiting the words, the imagery, the philosophy, the literature, the very spirit of Greece and Rome in most that is refined, noble, elegant and beautiful in our own language and literature. It was in this way that the Burkes and Peels, and Macaulays and Gladstones, studied the English language and literature at college, and not by attending such lectures as Dr. *Wilson's*, or studying his chosen text-book, *Spaulding's English Literature*—the standard text-book of seminaries for young ladies as well as of Grammar Schools. Dr. *Wilson* will now understand why I attach little value to his professorship in University College, and whether I can distinguish between the appropriate teachings of the Grammar School and the College. The professor who serves as the electric telegraph to communicate to his students the very mind of the ancient world in the developments of their own language and literature, is a better teacher of the English language and literature than another professor who teaches English Literature from *Spaulding's Compend* and the English Language from *Craik's Outlines*.

Another remark I beg to make, relates to the expense of University buildings. It has been said that I was present at the Senate in March 1854, when Chief Justice Draper prepared an address to the Governor General for a grant to erect the buildings of the University. I may have been present, though I have no recollection of it, nor of the contents of the address referred to; but if I were present, it must have been then that I made the suggestion, as the only suitable occasion for such a suggestion, which the Hon. Mr. *Morrison*, who only attended the Senate two or three times, recollects having been made—namely, that Upper Canada College buildings be applied to the use of University College, and the Masters be appointed to Master-ships of Grammar Schools, with such allowance from the Upper Canada College endowment as would secure them against personal loss from the discontinuance of that institution, and the application of its revenues to augment the Grammar School Fund. At all events, my letter to Mr. *Hincks*, July, 1852, when I proposed the sum of £6,000 for the erection of a University building, shows that my views were more economical at that time than even now. It may at first thought appear strange in these days of large expenditures, how so small a sum should be sufficient for such a purpose; but it will not appear so strange if we consider the true objects of the University, and that the Queen's University in Ireland has no separate building, has only a Secretary with a salary of £350, with "Incidentals, Office Expenses, Postage, Messengers, Advertisements, &c.," amounting to £180, and "Exhibitions, Prizes and Medals," amounting to £475: in all for Office Charges, £1,005; nor will the sum I proposed appear small even for a building accommodating the several Professorships and Lectureships I suggested, when you consider how plain and inexpensive and variously used are the lecture-rooms of Professors in the Universities at Leipsic, Halle, Bonn, (where Prince *Albert* was educated), and in Paris, at the Sorbonne, and the College de France, where I have attended lectures, by *Dupret's*, *Michelet*, *Girardin*, *Michel Chevalier* and others, including *Arago* at the Observatoire, with *Humboldt* for a regular auditor. The lecture-room or theatre for lectures in Chemistry and Natural Philosophy was large, as were those for the popular lectures in History and French Literature and Eloquence, but with no other furniture than forms or straw-bottom chairs. I have heard *Leverrier*, the famous mathematician and astronomer, lecture in a room not more than twice as large as this Committee room, and with furniture not costing half as much; and in the same room I have heard lectures in Mineralogy and Geology. I have heard no less than six different Professors in as many different courses in the same lecture-room, lecturing different hours of the day and on different days in the week. The great men of Europe give greatness to the plain and unpretending places whence they pour forth the treasures of profound learning and mighty intellect; but Dr. *Wilson*, as the representative of Toronto University College, insists upon "stone and marble" magnificence as essential to a great people, and, of course, to great Professors and great lectures in "this Canada of ours;" and thus are our University Funds frittered away by hundreds of thousands of dollars upon the "material and the inanimate at the expense of the intellectual and the moral." Mr. *Langton* thought that some \$1,800 was not too large a sum for the ceremonial of laying the top stone of the University buildings. The Governor General, Lord *Elgin*, laid the corner-stone of the Normal School buildings in the presence of the Members of both Houses of the Legislature, and the ceremony cost just £20, and that for scaffolding; and Sir *John B. Robinson* opened the building when finished, with a noble address, in the presence of a large assembly, and the ceremony cost the expense of gas to illuminate the edifice.

In concluding my remarks, I submit that the question for the decision of the Committee is not my merits or demerits, although the latter have been brought before you day after day at great length, in various forms, and with various ability

Nor do I think the merits or details of the proceedings of the petitioners, who have been so severely reflected upon, are the grave subjects of your deliberation and decision. The great question, I submit, which demands your attention, is, What should be done to correct the acknowledged evils of the past, and make legal and effectual provision for a system of liberal education in Upper Canada? Sir, the very advocates of the present system have conceded nearly all that has been urged, nearly all that has been complained of or demanded, except they still insist upon the monopoly of the money. They have conceded that the Senate is not properly constituted. They have conceded that they have reduced the *curriculum*. They admit that the Professors ought not to be the examiners of their own students, but justify the practice in their case on the ground of circumstances of necessity. They have admitted that there are needless Professorships in University College. They admit that expenses may be reduced; and Mr. *Langton* says that some of them have already been cut down.

Then, Sir, I would ask whether respect is not due to the sentiments of large religious bodies in this country, and whether the statesman and patriot should not take into consideration the feelings of people who constitute a large portion of the christianity of the Province? No one can conceive the progress which the agitation of this question has already made in Upper Canada, its influence on the people, the strength of public sentiment it evokes. When the agitation commenced, a few months ago, it was said "Oh, it is only the doings of a few Methodist Preachers; and will soon die a natural death." But what are the facts? Why, that 16 district conventions and 250 quarter meetings, of the official laity of the Wesleyan Church, with but one exception, in the County of Prince Edward, and then, by a mere accident, have all supported the views which have been submitted for your consideration this day. There always have been and always will be exceptions in such cases; but such unity never existed in the religious body on any public question at any former time, although it was said the agitators were only a small portion of the preachers, with whom the Wesleyan body at large did not sympathize. That statement you see was a great mistake; while you find that the Presbyterians of the Church of Scotland, and a large portion of the Church of England, concur in the views of the Wesleyan body. And, Sir, this is only the commencement. If the discussions of the past year should continue for another, there will be a body of feeling in Upper Canada such as there has not been on any subject since the agitation of the Clergy Reserve question—merely from the fact that this subject goes home to the consciences and the religious feelings of the people of the country, the best and holiest feelings of fathers and mothers throughout the land: I ask whether the decision of this Committee should not give equal justice to all parties and classes in the community, according to their works? The sentiment of our country has ever been against monopolies. Even the gentlemen of the Toronto University say they wished to prevent Upper Canada College from becoming a monopoly. Sir, there may be a non-denominational as well as a denominational monopoly, and equally hateful to the country, destitute, as it must be, of all the ties and aspirations which religious feelings create.

Among the several denominations in the land, some have expressed their views in favor of a non-denominational College. I do not go so far as Dr. *Cook*, regarding a non-denominational College only as "objectionable." I admit that there ought to be a non-denominational College. Sir, let those people have one, and if they do not want to pay for it themselves, let the institution now established be perpetuated and supported for them; but at the same time, let the views and feelings of other classes of our fellow-citizens be consulted, who do not rely upon the State for everything, but who erect their own buildings, defray a

large portion of their expenses, and prove by liberal subscriptions the sincerity of their professions, while the non-denominational people contribute not one cent towards the erection or support of their College. I ask if the State is to ignore the former and exclusively patronize the latter? Are the Wesleyan people especially to stand impugned and impeached in the presence of the representatives of the country as the friends of ignorance, or the prompters of social evil, when, prior to all other efforts of the kind, they commenced, in 1832, to erect a College building which is respectable at the present day? Sir, no one can conceive the labors and efforts requisite to establish such an institution, and so much needed at that day; no one can conceive the difficulties encountered in obtaining a Royal Charter for it in 1836; and the mortifications and hardships in soliciting donations and subscriptions in England to the amount of \$25,000; and few can estimate the blessings the College has conferred upon the country in educating and largely forming the character of some thousands of Canadian youths; nearly all of whom have illustrated the benefits of a religious and liberal institution of learning, and a considerable number of them have risen to distinction in different professions and employments. In the presence of such facts, and of the past of this country, I ask if the Wesleyan body are to be impugned as they have been by Dr. *Wilson*, and are they to be repelled rather than respected by their country's representatives? Are they to be treated thus, not by those who have borne the burden and heat of the day during the infancy and growth of our Canadian life and civilization, but by those who only come here for the sake of the salaries they enjoy?

In the last place, I submit that the Committee should look to the establishment of a system possessing the elements of unity, comprehensiveness, solidity, economy, and permanence. It is only in the union and comprehension of all classes of the community, you have a guarantee for the solidity and the permanence of your institutions.

One thing more. It is perfectly well known to the Committee, that its time for the last four or five days has been occupied, not in the investigation of these principles, but by attempts to destroy what is dearer to me than life, in order to crush the cause with which I am identified; and a scene has been enacted here, somewhat resembling that which took place in a certain Committee room, at Toronto, in regard to a certain Inspector General. Every single forgetfulness or omission of mine, has been magnified and tortured in every possible way, to destroy my reputation for integrity and my standing in the Country. A newspaper in Toronto, whose editor-in-chief is a man of very great notoriety, has said since the commencement of this inquiry that, in my early days, I made mercenary approaches to another church, but was indignantly repelled, and hence my present position. I showed the other day, that I might have occupied the place of Vice Chancellor of the University which Mr. *Langton* now holds, had I desired (and the proposal was made to me after my return from Europe, in 1856,) and I have similar records to prove that in 1825, after the commencement of my Wesleyan Ministry, I had the authoritative offer of admission to the Ministry of the Church of England. My objection, and my sole objection was, that my early religious principles and feelings were wholly owing to the instrumentality of the Methodist people, and I had been Providentially called to labor among them; not that I did not love the Church of England. Those were "saddlebag days," and I used to carry in my saddlebags two books, to which I am more indebted than to any other two books in the English language, except the Holy Scriptures, namely, the Prayer-Book and the Homilies of the Church of England. At this very day, Sir, though I have often opposed the exclusive assumptions of some members of

the Church of England, I only love it less than the Church with which I am immediately associated.

I have been charged with being the leader of the present movement. I am entitled to no such honor. If I have written a line, it has been as the amanuensis of my ecclesiastical superiors; if I have done anything, it has been in compliance with the wishes of those whom I love and honor, and my attachment to the Wesleyan body, and the associations and doings of my early years, have been appealed to, as a ground of claim for my humble aid in connection with this movement. Sir, the Wesleyan people, plain and humble as they were, did me good in my youth, and I will not abandon them in my old age.

I have only further to add, that whatever may be my shortcomings, and even sins, I can say with truth that I love my country; that by habit of thought, by association, by every possible sympathy I could awaken in my breast, I have sought to increase my affection for my native land. I have endeavoured to invest it with a sort of personality, to place it before me as an individual, beautiful in its proportions, as well as vigorous in all the elements of its constitution, and losing sight of all distinctions of classes, sects and parties, to ask myself, in the presence of that Being before whom I shall shortly stand, what I could do most for my country's welfare, how I could contribute most to found a system of education that would give to Canada, when I should be no more, a career of splendour which will make its people proud of it. I may adopt the words of a poet—though they be not very poetical:—

"Sweet place of my kindred, blest land of my birth,

"The fairest, the purest, the dearest on earth;

"Where'er I may roam, where'er I may be,

"My spirit instinctively turns unto thee."

Whatever may have been the course of proceeding adopted towards me in this inquiry, I bear enmity to no man; and whatever may be the result of this investigation, and the decision of the Committee, I hope that during the few years I have to live, I shall act consistently with the past, and still endeavour to build up a country that will be distinguished in its religious, social, moral, educational, and even political institutions and character; to assist in erecting a structure of intellectual progress and power, on which future ages may look back with respect and gratitude, and thus to help, in some humble degree, to place our beloved Canada among the foremost nations of the earth.

*Document accompanying Dr. Ryerson's Reply to Mr. Langton and Dr. Wilson, being extracts of a letter addressed by him to the Hon. F. Hincks, containing a plan of a Provincial University, including denominational Colleges, in connexion with our present Common School System.*

TORONTO, 22nd July, 1852.

DEAR SIR,—According to promise I now proceed to state in writing the result of my observations and reflections on that part of the system of public instruction in Upper Canada, which relates to a Provincial University, and to University Colleges.

In order to prevent any misapprehension of the views and suggestions I venture to submit, I beg to make a few preliminary remarks.

*Light in which the question should be viewed.*

I have always been accustomed to contemplate and discuss public questions in a provincial, rather than a denominational point of view, in reference to their bearing upon the condition and interests of the country at large, and not upon those of particular religious persuasions, as distinct from public interests, or upon the interests of any one religious persuasion more than those of another. And this I think is

the true difference between a mere sectarian and patriot; between considering the institutions and legislation and government of a country in a sectarian or patriotic spirit. The one places his sect above his country, and supports or opposes every public law or measure of government just as it may or may not promote the interests of his own sect, irrespective of public interests, and in rivalry with those of other sects; the other views the well-being of the country as the great end to be proposed and pursued, and the sects as among the instrumentalities tributary to that end. Some, indeed, have gone to the extreme of viewing all the religious persuasions as evils to be dreaded and as far as possible proscribed, rather than as distinct agencies more or less promotive of morality and virtue, and their rivalships tending to stimulate to greater activity, and, therefore, as a whole, more beneficial than injurious.

*Regard to the state and religious character of the country.*

My second preliminary remark is, that as the educational as well as other institutions of a country, must have reference to, and be greatly modified by its social state and character; so in the collegiate, as well as elementary department of Public Instruction, the religious persuasions of the country cannot be disregarded, as they form some of the most powerful and important of the social elements which enter into the constitution of the moral and intellectual character of the people of the country. In Upper Canada, the number of persons who would theoretically or practically exclude christianity in all its forms as an assential element in the education of the country, is exceedingly small; and to base any of our educational institutions upon the sentiment of such persons, will inevitably ensure their abandonment and rejection by the people at large. A system of education, whether collegiate or elementary, which ignores the religious sentiments of a people, cannot prosper or long exist among them except by coercion. \* \* \* \*

*Defect, as to religious instruction and oversight.*

Then there is the fact—and a painful fact it is—that whether a student keeps or violates the Sabbath—attends worship or frequents taverns—is virtuous or vicious—is no matter of concern in the University; in respect to the oversight of which each student may say, as if he were in the land of pagan darkness and death, “no man careth for my soul.” I do not think this need be so, constituted as the University now is; it is not so in the administration of the Provincial Normal School. But it is certain, that few parents in Upper Canada, would entrust their sons from home, and during the most eventful years of their educational training, under the care of any institution whose authority and oversight never extended to those principles, habits and dispositions, without which the best educated man is but an accomplished knave, and a curse rather than a blessing to a community.

*Experiments of the present system.*

If an examination was instituted, it would also be found that comparing the annual expenditure of University funds, with the annual number of University graduates, more than twice as large a sum has been expended, as would have been required to send each of the graduates to the best University in America or Europe, and pay all the expenses of his journeys, residence, books, lectures, clothing, &c., &c.

*No reason for continuing such a system.*

Under these circumstances, I see no economical or public grounds on which the present system of University expenditure and instruction can be justified; nor do I think the public feeling, when the subject comes to be discussed, will suffer such an application, or rather waste of the most splendid University endowment in America, to be perpetuated. As now expended, this endowment is injurious rather

than advantageous to all the leading religious persuasions of the Province; and self-defence, as well as other considerations, will prompt them to unite with that portion of the people who deem no State University endowment necessary, to abolish it altogether, and apply the proceeds to purposes of common education.

*The question to be considered.*

The question then arises, in what way can the University endowment be applied, so as to render it most useful to the country at large, and so as to interest all classes in perpetuating it inviolate for the purposes originally contemplated, by their deriving manifest advantages from its application.

*Recognition of the principle of religious instruction and oversight essential.*

The first step to a consummation so devoutly to be wished is, that the system of University education to which the endowment should be inviolably applied, should be such as will receive the approval and support of the great body of the people, especially of the better educated classes. This can only be done by the recognition of a principle regarded as important and vital by more than nine-tenths of the people—namely, religious instruction and oversight forming an essential part of the education of the youth of the country. I believe that no attempt to deny, to contract, or to evade the recognition and application of this principle, can succeed, in respect to either Common School or University Education. I lay it down then as a fundamental principle, that religious instruction must form a part of the education of the youth of our country, and that that religious instruction must be given by the several religious persuasions to their youth respectively. The Common Schools are, as a general rule, brought within an hour's walk of each family in the land; and therefore the oversight and duties of the parents and pastors of the children attending these schools, are not, in the least, suspended or interfered with. The constitution or order of discipline and liturgy of each religious persuasion, enjoins upon its clergy and members to teach their children the summary of religious faith and practice required to be taught to the children of the members of each persuasion. To require, therefore, any sort of denominational teaching in Common Day Schools, is not only a work of supererogation, but a direct interference with the liturgical or disciplinary codes and functions of each religious persuasion, and providing by law for the neglect of clerical and parental duties, by transferring those duties to the Common School teacher, and thus sanctioning immoralities in pastors and parents which must, in a high degree, be injurious to the interests of public morals. The cry for denominational day schools that has been raised by two or three ecclesiastics in Upper Canada, is as senseless as it is unpatriotic and selfish. It is a barefaced demand that the school master shall do the work of the clergyman, and that the State shall pay him for it; a scheme under which the expenses of educating the whole people would be multiplied many fold, and under which a large portion of the poor youth of the country would be left without any means of education upon terms within reach of the pecuniary resources of their parents, unless at the expense of their religious faith. Economy as well as patriotism requires the schools for all to be open to all upon equal terms, and upon principles common to all—leaving to each religious persuasion the performance of its own recognized and appropriate duties in the religious teaching of its own youth. In such schools, the children can be with the teacher only from nine o'clock in the morning until four o'clock in the afternoon of five or six days in the week; while during each morning and evening, and the whole of each Sabbath, they are with their parents or pastors—and these are the portions of time which usage and ecclesiastical laws prescribe for religious studies and instruction, and for which the teacher, who only sees the children during six or seven of the working hours of each secular day of the week, ought not to be held responsible,

and with which he cannot be burthened to the advantage of the children, or without criminal neglect on the part of their parents and pastors. I cannot therefore conceive that it is the duty of the Government to provide denominational teaching to the pupils in the common day schools, any more than it is its duty to provide for their daily food and raiment, or a place of worship and preaching for them on the Sabbath.

*How this principle is to be applied in Academics and Colleges, and first reason for Public Aid to such Institutions.*

But in respect to Academies and Colleges the case is different. They are institutions which cannot be brought within an hour's walk of but very few of those who wish and are able to resort to them. Youth, in order to attend such institutions, must, as a general rule, leave their homes, and be taken from the daily oversight and instructions of their parents and pastors. During this part and period of their education, the duties of parental and pastoral care and instruction must be suspended, or provision must be made in connection with the Academies and Colleges for such oversight and instruction. Youth attending such Institutions, are at an age when they are most exposed to temptation—most need the best counsels in religion and morals—are pursuing studies which most involve the principles of human action, and the duties and relations of human life. At such a period and under such circumstances, youth need the exercise of all that is tender and vigilant in parental affection, and all that is wise in pastoral oversight; yet they are far removed both from their parents and pastors. Hence what is supplied by the parent and pastor at home, must be provided in connection with the Academy and College abroad. And therefore the same reason which condemns the establishment of denominational common schools, justifies the establishment of denominational Academies and Colleges, in connection with which the duties of the parent and the pastor can be best discharged. It is therefore absurd to suppose, as some have contended, that if we discountenance denominational common schools, we must condemn denominational Academies and Colleges. There are scarcely as many persons in Upper Canada in favor of the former, as would form a considerable party in any one Church—especially in any Protestant Church—much less in the country at large; while the great majority of the country are supporters of the latter.

*Second reason for Public Aid to Denominational Colleges.*

Aiding denominational Colleges is also acting, in another respect, upon the principle on which aid is given to Common Schools, namely, local contributions to the same object. No aid is given to a denominational College until after a large outlay has been made by its projectors in the procuring of premises, erection or procuring of buildings, and the employment of professors and teachers—evidence of the intelligence, disposition and exertions of a large section of the community to establish and sustain such institution.

*Third reason for Public Aid to Denominational Colleges.*

There is another reason for public aid to denominational Colleges, based also upon the principle upon which aid is given to Common Schools and other literary institutions. It is that such aid is given for the advancement of science and literature alone. It is not proposed to endow or aid denominational Colleges for denominational purposes; but because such Colleges are the most efficient and available agencies for encouraging and extending the study of the higher branches of education in the country. It is not recommended to give Legislative aid to any Theological Seminaries, or for the support of theological professors in any of the denominational Colleges; nay, it may be proper and expedient to provide that in case any of the Colleges to which Legislative aid is given, have or shall have theo-

logical professors, no part of the aid thus given shall be expended in payment of the salaries of such professors, and that their salaries shall be provided for from sources independent of the literary funds of such Colleges.

*Fourth reason for public aid to denominational Colleges.*

This view of the subject appears to me to command itself with equal force on the ground of *economy*. Every person must admit the desirableness and importance of expending the University Education Fund to the best advantage; and I think few can deny or doubt that it has hitherto been expended to the least, or rather to the worst advantage. The number of professors in the Faculty of Arts—that is, in the College proper for the under graduates—has never exceeded four; and it has always been maintained that the duties of that Collegiate department of the University have been as efficiently performed as in any of the Colleges of the English Universities. As to the Faculty of Law and Medicine (there being one professor in the former, and seven in the latter,) they are mere appendages to the University, consuming its funds. Attendance on the lectures in either of these faculties, is not necessary to obtain the degree of Bachelor or Master of Arts; they exist for any young men who may be studying for either profession, and are not so numerously attended as other schools of Law and Medicine in Toronto, that receive no Legislative aid. I do not believe that the existence of the Faculties as now constituted, is of any advantage to the country, or is desired by the members generally of the Professions of Law and Medicine.

\* \* \* \* \*

*Objection that you are endowing sectarianism answered.*

This view appears to me so irresistibly conclusive, that I will not enlarge upon it; but will advert for a moment to two objections which may be made to the proposed system of aiding denominational colleges. The one objection is, that you are thereby endowing sectarianism. This oft-repeated objection, is only a superficial fallacy—a fallacy consisting of a mere play upon words. Now to endow sectarianism is a very different thing from aiding sectarians to do what is promotive of the interests of all classes of society. If a legislative grant were made to a benevolent society of the Church of England, or Rome, or the Presbyterian, Wesleyan, or Baptist Church, to relieve sick and pauper immigrants, would it be endowing sectarianism, or employing the already organized agency of a sect to promote a public object? The grants to denominational colleges are not to support those who are preaching sectarianism, and for the purpose of teaching it; but supporting those who indeed hold and act upon the doctrines of some sect, yet supporting them as teachers of the English and other languages, Mathematics, Philosophy, &c., in which there is no religious, nor political sectarianism. It is true the religious persuasion whose college may be thus aided, may and probably will derive advantage from any contribution or grant which may increase its efficiency; but that advantage is chiefly indirect and remote. So may a religious body derive some advantage from any College which affords facilities for the education of its youth, or from a government and laws which facilitate its labors. There are also two facts involved in the question which cannot be overlooked; the one is, that the denomination whose College may be added, has largely contributed to the same object, and assumes all the responsibility and labor of carrying it into effect. The second is, that the religious sects are the only actual and probable agencies in inculcating and maintaining the christian morals of the country, and without which the country would be without the first elements of civilization and in a state of anarchy if not barbarism. These facts the objector cannot deny, though he may seek to suppress them. The real question for the consideration of the statesman and philanthropist is, in what way can each thousand pounds, or each pound of the University Fund,

be made instrumental in educating the largest number of youth in the higher branches of education, with the best preventatives against impairing or endangering their morals? This is the great object with which the statesman has to do; and if in promoting this object in the most efficient and economical manner for the general welfare, some advantage should fall to the agency employed, it remains for the objector to show that such incidental advantage, for so great a public benefit, and so much labor, would be a calamity to be dreaded.

*Second objection, that denominational Colleges will become too numerous, answered.*

A second objection which may be made to aiding denominational Colleges is, that they may become too numerous, and that each denomination does not possess such Colleges and would not therefore be included in such a system. To the first part of this objection I reply, that there is no danger of institutions becoming more numerous than the wants of the country may require, the establishment of which insolves the vigorous and combined exertion of so much intelligence, resources, and voluntary benevolence; and should such Colleges become more numerous than could be aided to the amount now proposed to be given to each of the denominational Colleges, the aggregate amount set apart annually for that purpose could be easily adjusted and distributed upon the principles of equity and fairness. In regard to the fact that, all the denominations have not Colleges, I remark that it is more than probable they all never will have Colleges; but it is certain that the views and feelings of a greater proportion of the population will be met by means of several Colleges rather than be one alone. A Presbyterian College, or at least two such Colleges, must certainly meet the doctrinal sentiments and religious experience of all sections of Calvinists, and a Methodist College those of all sections of Methodists. To the Methodist College already established, I know that students from the several sections of Methodists in the country, have resorted, and some of them candidates for the ministry in their own section or body, and have pursued their studies there with satisfaction and success. On this point, I may also make two additional remarks: 1. The greater part of those members of religious persuasions not having Colleges of their own, who wish to send sons to college, would much rather send them to a college under the auspices of another religious persuasion than their own, yet pervaded by a christian spirit and exercising religious care over its students, than to send them to a college under no religious superintendence and exercising no care in regard to the religious principles and morals of its students. 2. In each of the denominational Colleges, I believe no religious test is required in the admission of students. I know the Charter of Victoria College forbids the application of any religious test on the admission of any student: and the authority of the College has been as sedulously exerted in requiring those students who were members of some other Church than that of the College, to attend the worship of their own Church, as in requiring the attendance of Methodists at the worship of their Church.

*A non-denominational College for those denominations and classes who desire it.*

Should it be objected, that there is a considerable portion of the people of the country, who are opposed to sending their children to any denominational College whatever, I reply that I do not propose to abolish the collegiate department of the Toronto University, but to continue the experiment with an endowment of twice as large a sum as it has been proposed to grant to each of the denominational Colleges. While, therefore, the views and wishes of this class of persons are liberally met, they cannot complain, except in the spirit of the most illiberal tyranny, if the views and wishes of others of stronger religious convictions than themselves, are also, in some measure, consulted.

Should the foregoing suggestions be approved, the Funds of the University will be maintained inviolate for the purposes originally contemplated, and I think practical effect will be given to the views and wishes of nine-tenths, if not nineteen-twentieths of the people of Upper Canada, while the facilities and interests of the higher branches of education will be greatly extended.

Now as to the means by which I would promote these results, I venture to submit the following suggestions as to the outline of the plan.

*Suggestion—First, the management of the Endowment.*

1. I would make the Crown the trustee of the magnificent endowment, instead of an irresponsible Corporation, and I would transfer the sale and management of the lands to the Crown Land Department, and let the investments of the proceeds of sales be made under the authority of the Crown. I have no doubt but that the management of the present University Endowment is honest and judicious: but it costs to the fund, in my opinion, at least a thousand pounds per annum more than it would, were it managed as are the Grammar School lands. \* \*

*Second—a Provincial University; how constituted; current expenses of it; Professorships in it; expense of buildings; estimated expense of building under Mr. Baldwin's Government.*

2. I would propose further to maintain and give effect to the idea which has been vaguely though popularly held, namely, the idea of a *Provincial University*, sustaining a common relation to all the Colleges of the country, and providing instruction in subjects and branches of science and literature which do not come within the undergraduate curriculum in any College. I would suggest the establishment of an institution to be designed "The University of Upper Canada," the Council or supreme authority of which should be designated "The Regents of the University of Upper Canada," consisting of, say the President or Principal and one Professor of each College (to be chosen by the authorities of such College), and twelve persons appointed by the Crown, three of whom shall retire annually, and be re-appointed, and their places filled by others, at the pleasure of the Crown. I think that at present about £3000 per annum of the University Endowment should be placed at the disposal of the Regents, of which at least £1000 per annum should be expended by them in the purchase of books, specimens and objects of various kinds, suitable for a University Library and Museum. I would transfer to this University the library and museum of the present Toronto University. I would connect with this University such Professorships as those of Ancient and Modern Philosophy and Literature, General History, Natural History, Astronomy, Political Economy, Civil Engineering, Agriculture, &c. I would make the Library and Lectures free to the Professors, Graduates, and Undergraduates of all the incorporated colleges, and perhaps to the members and students of the professions generally, according to prescribed regulations. I would have the lectures easily accessible if not free to the public. The building for such University would consist of four or six lecture rooms or theatres, a library and museum. Two or more of the courses of lectures could be delivered in the same lecture room, as they are in Paris. Sometimes five or six courses of lectures are there delivered in the same room. A janitor is sufficient for the care of such a building; and one librarian would be sufficient for the library and museum. The cost of such a building need not exceed £6,000. But excellent accommodation at little expense can, in the meantime, be obtained for the professional lectures. Plans have been prepared and tenders have been made, but not yet accepted, for the erection of Toronto University buildings, at an estimated expense of about £20,000; but the present building is ample to accommodate all the undergraduates attending or likely to attend the College for many years.

### *Tenure of Professorships.*

I would make the appointments or the elections of professors periodical, at least to some of the professorships, as is the case in several of the University professorships at Oxford and Cambridge. As the duties of a professorship would consist of a limited number of lectures during certain months of the year, and would be an honorary distinction, I would not have the salaries large.

### *Powers of the University.*

I would authorize the Regents of the University of Upper Canada, to establish, with the approval of the Governor General, professorships in any department of science and literature; to appoint and remove professors and other officers, and determine their duties and the amount of their remuneration; and to appoint from time to time an inspector or inspectors to visit and report annually upon the state of the Colleges and Grammar schools receiving public aid; to possess and exercise, by a committee or otherwise, all the powers in regard to the Normal School, text and library books and regulations for Common Schools, that are now exercised by "the Council of Public Instruction," and all the powers which were proposed to be given to that body by the Grammar School Bill of 1850 in regard to Grammar Schools; to determine the standard and conditions of conferring degrees in the arts and sciences; to appoint examiners to examine, and to confer degrees on candidates presenting themselves, according to conditions prescribed, from any of the incorporated colleges in Upper Canada, so that if the degrees of any of these colleges should be of little value, there would be a remedy for the evil, and meritorious men would be able to obtain the distinctions to which they might be entitled.

I think there can be no comparison between the influence upon literature and science of a number of professors in a University thus constituted, and that of the same number of professors and at the same expense attached to the present Toronto University (College), attended by some score of undergraduates, not one of whom might attend any of the lectures referred to; nor do I think the importance of such a body as the proposed Regents can easily be over-rated in giving weight, unity, symmetry, and appropriateness to every part of our system of public instruction.

### *Provincial School of Law.*

3. Though it may be said, and said popularly, that the legal and medical professions should provide for their own professional education as well as the profession of theology; yet I would be in favour of granting from the University Fund some £500 or more per annum to the Law Society, for the employment of Law lecturers. As that society is incorporated, determines the condition of admission to the study of the profession, prescribes regulations for students at law, and then prescribes the standard and examination for their admission as Barristers, I think it would be appropriate for the authorities of the Society to prescribe a course of studies and a course of lectures for the students, appoint lecturers, and require such courses to be delivered during terms, to be attended by all students at law, who should be examined in the subjects of such lectures, as well as in the books required to be read. It appears to me that such a system in the Law Department is simple and feasible, and that if carried into effect, it would exert a salutary influence upon the whole legal profession in Upper Canada—very different from having one Professor of Law in the Toronto University, lecturing betimes to some half dozen students, but not recognized in any way by the Incorporated Law Society of Upper Canada.

### *Provincial—School of Medicine.*

4. Should the medical profession of Upper Canada be incorporated in a manner similar to that in which the legal profession has been incorporated, I think

£750 or £1,000 of the University endowment, and the present medical lecture rooms of the Toronto University, might be placed at the disposal of such Medical Society, for the employment of lecturers and other purposes in the interest of the Medical profession and Medical science of Upper Canada.

*The system when and where devised.*

Such are the general suggestions, without entering into and indeed omitting details, I venture to submit on this grave and comprehensive subject—suggestions, however, the most important of which I meditated on some of the highest mountains in Europe several years ago, and which I embodied in substance in my Report on a system of public elementary education in Upper Canada, pp. 9, 130—135, first published in 1846, but which I have long despaired of seeing carried into effect, and therefore consigned to oblivion.

*At what expense carried into effect.*

The whole of what I have proposed, it will be recollected, may be carried into effect within the present annual income of the Toronto University, and which is expended on that institution alone.

In conclusion I may remark : that the plan I have proposed appears to me to possess among others the following advantages.

*Advantages of the system proposed.*

1. It will give the fullest practical effect to the theory long advocated of a Provincial University.

2. It will continue to those who desire it, the privilege of a “ non-sectarian college.”

3. It will satisfy the wishes of those largest sections of the community who insist upon denominational colleges ; and it will efficiently aid those colleges without “ endowing sectarianism.”

4. It will secure the integrity of the University Endowment, and provide for a much more economical and efficient application of it than that which is now made.

5. It will associate with the higher education of youth those religious and moral influences, restraints and aids, which are the great agents and best guarantees of the virtues and morals of the country.

6. It will give harmony and completeness to our whole system of Public Instruction, and bring into operation new and powerful agents and influences for the advancement and extension of the higher branches of general science and literature.

7. It will secure the important desideratum of placing at the disposal of the Crown a large and rapidly increasing fund, which may be applied from time to time, (perhaps most satisfactorily and judiciously on the recommendation of the Regents of the University of Upper Canada,) as the wants and interests of the country shall require—increasing the facilities of Collegiate education, as well as promoting the extension of practical science and the diffusion of general literature.

I should feel it needful to apologize for the great length of this communication, were I not satisfied from your own great experience, that you are fully sensible of the impossibility of presenting within narrow limits anything like a clear and impressive exposition of topics so intricate, numerous and important, as those which have entered into the system submitted to your consideration.

I remain, dear Sir,

Your obedient servant,

E. RYERSON

The Hon. FRANCIS HINCKS, &c., &c., Quebec.

The Chairman read the following letter from Hon. Mr. *Christie* :

QUEBEC, 25th April, 1860.

MY DEAR SIR,—Having learned that some misunderstanding exists as to the time when the proposition to elect Dr. *Ryerson* to the Vice-Chancellorship of the University of Toronto, was made by myself and others, you will oblige me by stating that this took place very soon after the present University Act became law.

I remain,

My Dear Sir,

Yours very truly,

DAVID CHRISTIE.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON,  
Chairman University Committee.

Professor *Wilson* put in a supplementary statement as follows :

Appearing before this Committee, as I now do,—in the unexpected absence of the President of University College,—with all the responsibility which attaches to the sole representative of that Institution, I should fail in my duty to my colleagues, and to the College to which I have the honour to belong, if I permitted any personal feeling to interfere with my treatment of the real question in hand.

Notwithstanding the fact that this Committee has been named in accordance with the Memorial of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference, it is impossible, from the evidence already submitted, to overlook the fact that the real impugner of the University and College, is the Rev. Dr. *Ryerson*. The representatives of Victoria and Queen's Colleges have indeed advocated a redistribution and division of the endowment ; but the charges against the educational system, and the award of honors, prizes, and degrees, in the University and College, have been advanced solely on his authority. On obtaining permission to address you, accordingly, in opening the case for the defence, on behalf of University College, I felt it to be my duty to show to the Committee that, neither by previous education, by special training or experience, nor by fidelity to the trust imposed in him as a member of Senate of the University, does Dr. *Ryerson* merit the confidence of this Committee, or of the Province, as a fit adviser on a system of University education. The Committee has since listened to a lengthened personal attack upon me, and my qualifications for the Chair I occupy in University College, as well as to an elaborate statement, professedly on the general question. The whole, as I am now informed, is to be given in evidence, and I am compelled to reply to it at the last moment, from memory, and without access to the written statement. As to the personal attack, I leave it to refute itself. I hold my appointment by Commission from the Crown, and during pleasure. If I am incompetent, or fail in my duty, His Excellency has full power and right to dismiss me ; but any incompetence on my part could in no degree affect the general question. It will, however, sufficiently illustrate the value of Dr. *Ryerson's* opinions on any question in which his prejudices are enlisted, when you bear in remembrance that the person he now so disparages, is the very same Professor *Wilson* whom he quotes in an earlier page of this evidence, as the first of "*several eminent individuals*," whose opinions on education he specially commends to your notice.

But waiving further reference to myself, I must be permitted to say, that the Province having selected men of acknowledged eminence in various departments of Collegiate education, it may naturally look to them with some confidence for advice in determining on a course of study best fitted for the educational wants of the Province. The present staff of Professors in University College, includes representatives of the chief Universities of Great Britain ;—in its Classical Professor, one who took the highest honors at Trinity College, Dublin ;—in its Professor of

Metaphysics, a graduate of Oxford, familiar alike with its system and its training; in its Mathematical Professor, one who not only attained a high rank among the Cambridge Wranglers of his year, but was also a Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge;—in its Professor of Chemistry, a pupil of the great Mitscherlich, and whose studies were completed in the famed University of Berlin;—in its Professor of Natural History, one who resigned for his present duties the Corresponding Chair in Queen's College, Cork; and in its Professor of Mineralogy and Geology, one who previously occupied the Chair of Mineralogy in University College, London, and won for himself a European reputation in his favorite branch of science.

If any Professor of University College is unfit for his responsible duties, let him be replaced by one more worthy of the trust. The Province, by the very liberality of its provision for higher education, acquires the right to be satisfied with none but the best talent. But if the Professors are worthy of their present chairs, the Province cannot refuse to be advised by them relative to the course of study best fitted for this Province. The idea that such a body of men, uniting such varied University experience, should deliberately combine to lower the standard of education, is surely too extravagant to find credence from any intelligent and well-educated mind. It is difficult indeed to imagine where the Province can look for advice on the subjects appealed to this Committee, if an efficient staff of Professors really exists, and yet such are declared unworthy of confidence.

Until, therefore, it shall have been decided by the competent authorities that the Professors of University College are unworthy of their chairs, they have a right to assume that they have the confidence of the Government and the country; and they will not shrink from the duty they owe to the Province of advising in reference to the details of a general system of superior education.

Much labour has been expended in misstatements on the subject of OPTIONS; whereby, after a certain point has been obtained, the final course of study is to some extent determined by the student's own choice. Let me say, once for all, that options have been introduced into the University scheme, in full accordance with the practice of the foremost Universities of Europe, and especially of the University of London, which has been prescribed as the model for that of Toronto;—as the only means of adopting higher education to the practical requirements of a new country like Canada. By means of these a youth, after two years of Collegiate study, is permitted to select his later studies with a special view to his final destination in life.

In order to meet the arguments which have been adduced against the system adopted by the University of Toronto, Mr. *Langton* has produced in evidence,—the recommendations of the Commissioners of Oxford and Cambridge;—the practice of the Universities of London and Ireland, &c.,—and evidence having thus been produced, I may now be permitted to add, in explanation, that the Senate have devised, in this very scheme of options, a system of study whereby the youth of this Province may acquire those higher branches of education best calculated to fit them for becoming intelligent and useful members of the community. In Canada, at least, education must be practical. It may be all very well for certain Oxford men, and their indiscriminating admirers, to maintain that the highest aim of a perfect collegiate training consists in the mastery of classical learning, but the Scholarship of Oxford, if forced without restriction or choice, on the youth of Canada, would, in most cases, prove of comparatively little practical avail. Nevertheless, let me not be misunderstood. I have freely admitted that the standard of Matriculation, or the entrance examination, has been lowered; but I have not admitted, and I do most positively deny, *that the standard of education has been lowered.* A student who goes through the whole classical course of the University,

will compare favorably with a graduate of equal ability in any other University in the British Empire; and if, in the exercise of options, he abandons Classics at the prescribed point in his course, he can only do so, in order to take in lieu of Classics, the defined substitutes of Modern Languages, Natural Sciences, or Mathematics, which will no less thoroughly train his mind, and in many cases will supply him with far more useful acquirements for the course he is to pursue. The English Universities under their old rigid system turned out a class of educated men; but the Scottish University system, by the very laxness which left the student's choice of studies so much to himself, as practically to amount to a comprehensive system of options, has made *an educated people*; and the latter I conceive is what Canada desires.

But besides the ordinary course of study to which I have hitherto referred, the University of Toronto has provided a system of Honor Work, designed to stimulate the student in the pursuit of special subjects to their highest degree; and to such it still further extends the indispensable privilege of dropping those studies,—already sufficiently mastered,—which do not necessarily accord with these special aims. It is an instructive commentary on the charges brought against the University scheme, both in its honor work and options, that while Dr. *Ryerson* has latterly given these his unqualified censure,—nevertheless, in his scheme for Grammar-school Scholarships,—submitted to the Senate, 9th April, 1857, and printed in evidence,—he actually proposed to found such *with no further requirement than one year's attendance at College*—an option as to all further studies whatsoever, which certainly surpasses every scheme of optional study ever devised.

In the statements put in by the Vice-Chancellor and myself, we have, I trust, satisfactorily repelled every charge that militated against the Institutions for which we appear. Only one further point seems to require attention. Referring to the system of Honors and Scholarships, Dr. *Ryerson* has spoken of one-half of the time of the Professors of University College, being taken up with teaching the Honor Men, who in an English University employ their own tutors. The charge in reality amounts to this: that by its liberal endowments for the highest departments of education, at the Provincial College the son of the humblest Canadian peasant may enjoy precisely the same advantages as the son of the wealthiest nobleman in England does at the aristocratic and exclusive University of Oxford.

DANIEL WILSON.

Quebec, 26th April, 1860.

Mr. *Langton* put in the following as his final statement:—

I can acquit myself of having given rise to any of the personalities which have unfortunately been introduced into the present investigation. The petitioners have brought forward certain arguments against the present constitution and management of the University, which I have met, with what success it is for the committee to judge. They have also adduced certain statements of fact and figures, to the accuracy of which I have demurred, but I have stated my objections as temperately as is consistent with my distinct denial of their truth. No attempt has been made to impugn the correctness of the figures I have given. I allude principally to my statements as to the comparative cost of our Professorships, Examinations and Scholarships, as compared with those of other Universities; but Dr. *Ryerson* has accused me of misleading the Committee on this latter point by confounding together University and College Scholarships. A reference to my evidence will show that I have in all cases, where instituting the comparison, shown the distinction in this respect, and have argued that our system of University Scholarships is much more liberal and more calculated to promote the end for

which they were established, than when they are exclusively connected with a particular college.

In answer to the objections adduced against our system of options as unprecedented and injurious, I have shown by a reference to the course prescribed in other Universities, and to the recommendations of the Royal Commissioners, that we are supported by the example of those whom we may well take as our models, in arranging a scheme by which an extended course of study may be combined with a thorough mastery of the special branches selected by the student. Here also Dr. Ryerson has attempted to show that, in quoting from the Commissioners on the Queen's University, Ireland, I have misrepresented their recommendations. But the passages which I have requested the Clerk to read at the table, show that the subjects which they recommended should not be required from all students after the second year, embrace, as I stated, Classics, Mathematics and Modern Languages.

There is another part of my argument, which is more a question of opinion than of fact, viz., the relative standard required by us, and by other Universities. It will be admitted that the full course in each department, including Honor Work, is with us a high standard, and we have had students who would have distinguished themselves in any University, but it never was argued, and it would be absurd to suppose that our students, as a rule, could compare with the picked men of Great Britain. What I have argued is this: (1) That we have wisely lowered the matriculation examination, which was too high; but that even now it is as high as it has been thought prudent to insist upon at home, being rather above that at London and Cork, and the only equivalent examination at Cambridge, though rather below that at Belfast, and the only equivalent examination at Oxford; (2) That the standard for a common degree is as high as in the British Universities; and (3) That the stage at which we permit students to branch off into the special department each may select, is very similar to that already established in the same Universities, or strongly recommended by the Royal Commissioners. The relative difficulty of the subjects proposed for examination is, as I have stated, a matter of opinion, and can only be judged of by a scholar, and I therefore desire upon this point to take the evidence of a gentleman unconnected with the University, whose ability to speak upon the subject is well known to the Committee.

*E. A. Meredith*, Esquire, appeared agreeable to request of the Committee and was Examined.

Questions submitted by Mr. *Langton* and put.

(By the Chairmen.)

*Ques. 521.* Are you a graduate of Trinity College, Dublin?—I am.

*Ques. 522.* Did you obtain honors in that University?—Yes, I obtained honors in the University at almost all the examinations of the undergraduate course, both in Classics and Mathematics, also a scholarship in Classics, and a medal in Science at the Degree Examination, besides some other honors.

*Ques. 523.* Are you well acquainted with the subject of University education?—I have some acquaintance with the subject, having been 7 years in the University of Dublin, and having had some connection with the University in this country.

*Ques. 524.* Have you compared the Matriculation Examination of the University of Toronto, with those prescribed in other Universities, and what is your opinion of their comparative standards?—I have compared it with the Matriculation Examinations at Cambridge, London, Cork, Belfast and Dublin. It seems to me to be about equal to Cambridge, rather greater than London, greater than Cork, less than Belfast, and less than Dublin.

*Ques. 525.* Have you compared the examinations for Responsions at Oxford, with the examinations prescribed in the University of Toronto?—Yes.

*Ques. 526.* Would you consider that a student who could pass the examinations in Classics, up to the second year inclusive in Toronto, had been as severely tested as one who had passed the Oxford Responsions?—Assuming the examinations equally strict, I think the test is quite as severe.

*Ques. 227.* Have you compared the subjects of the previous examinations at Cambridge, the first in the University, held in the middle of the second year, with those for Matriculation, and the first year in the University of Toronto, and do you think that a student who has passed the two latter has been as severely tested as one who has passed the former?—Yes; on the same supposition as in my previous answer.

*Ques. 528.* Do you believe that it is more advisable to have a uniform and united course of study for all students, or a course embracing a wider range of subjects with a liberty of choice?—I am decidedly in favor of a wider extension of subjects, and liberty of choice. It seems to me that under the latter system, the aggregate amount of information obtained by students of a University would clearly be much larger.

*Ques. 529.* Do you think that Latin, Greek and Mathematics should be the leading subjects of study in a University course, and what other subjects would you recommend to be introduced?—I think they ought to be the leading subjects, but many other subjects of very great importance should in my opinion be introduced, such as Natural Sciences, English History and Literature Political Economy, Law, Medicine and Modern languages. Also Mental and Moral Philosophy.

*Ques. 530.* Are you aware what the tendency has been in this respect in the British Universities?—I think in all the British Universities they have, within the last few years very greatly extended the course, and also introduced the system of options. They have done so in Cambridge, Oxford, and Dublin, also in the Queen's University.

*Ques. 531.* Are you acquainted with the organisation of the Professorial staff in University College, and do you think there are too great a number of chairs as compared with the practice of British Universities?—I do not think there are too many chairs; I should be inclined to introduce, if possible a chair of Political Economy, the ordinary chairs of Law and Medicine, and a chair of Civil Engineering.

*Ques. 532.* Do you know what the salaries of the Professors in the University of Toronto are, and do you think they are too great or too small?—I do not think the salaries are too large. I believe they are not more than enough to secure the services of really competent men, which seems to me the true test of their sufficiency.

*Ques. 533.* Do you think it a wise policy to have a liberal foundation of scholarships in a University?—I do. It seems to me that in this country it is even more desirable than in Great Britain. The objects of scholarships, I take it, are two, first to afford the poorer classes of students the opportunity of obtaining a University education; then to stimulate and reward exertion. In this country the proportion of poor students is greater than at home, and the desire for literary distinction is perhaps less.

*Ques. 534.* Do you think that sholarships should be open to free competition, or that they should be limited to any particular College or class?—Open to free competition.

*Ques. 535.* Do you think that a scholarship when gained should be held for a limited term of years or that it should be competed for annually?—I am inclined to think that as a general rule it would be wise to have them competed for annually. In Dublin University the principal scholarship is held for five years, and it is often found that a man after gaining it remained the rest of the time perfectly idle, making no exertion to obtain distinctions during the rest of his course.

*Ques. 536.* Do you think that 61 scholarships of thirty pounds a year in all the faculties as established in the University of Toronto, is too great a number or too large an amount, taking into consideration that they are only tenable for one year, and that the number of students examined has already increased from 76 in 1856 to 196 in 1860?—I am not prepared to answer that question positively. The number appears to me to be large, but it is probably not larger than the number in some Universities at home.

Question submitted by *Mr. Nelles*, and put—

[*By the Chairman.*]

*Ques. 537.* State the subjects of matriculation examination in each of the Universities and Colleges referred to in your Answer to Question No. 524?—The following are the subjects for the ordinary or pass Matriculation Examination in the Universities mentioned, namely:—

| Name of University or College. | Subject of Matriculation Examination.  |  |  |  |
|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
|                                | Greek.   | Latin.   | Latin Composition.                         | Other Subjects.  |
| University of Toronto.         | Xenophon Anabasis Book I.  | Sallust, Catilina, Virgil, Æneid, Book II.             | Translation from English into Latin Prose. | Elements of Mathematics, History, and Geography.   |
| 2. " Cambridge                 | *Xenophon, Anabasis last Book, Gospel of St. Mathew.                               | Virgil Æneid, Book VI.                                 | No Composition.                            | Elements of Mathematics, Paley's Evidence and History.                                   |
| 3. " London.                   | Xenophon, one Book.  | Horace, 2 Books of the Odes.                           | No Composition.                            | Elements of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy; History and Geography, French or German. |
| 4. Trinity College, Dublin.    | *Homer Iliad, Books I, II, III, New Testament, 4 Gospels and Acts of the Apostles. | Virgil Æneid, Books I, II, III, IV. Horace Odes.       | Latin Composition.                         | English Composition & Arithmetic.  |
| 5. Queens' College, Cork.      | Xenophon Anabasis Book I.  | Virgil Æneid, B. I                                     | Retranslation into Latin of parts of Cæsar | Elements of Mathematics.   |
| 6. Queens' College, Belfast.   | *Homer Iliad, 2 Books, Xenophon Anabasis 2 Books.                                  | Virgil Æneid,—Books I, II, III, IV. Livy, Books I, II. | do do do.                                  | Elements of Mathematics, History and Geography.  |

\* These Books are taken from a list of authors, out of which the Candidate is allowed to make his selection, or from which a selection is made by the College authorities during the preceding year.

The Hon. Jos. C. Morrison, further Examined :—

Questions submitted by Mr. Langton, and put—

[By the Committee.]

*Ques. 538.* Had you any conversation with Dr. *Wilson*, and did you tell him that Dr. *Ryerson* was present when the address for the building was carried, and that Dr. *Ryerson* offered no opposition to it?—Dr. *Wilson*, in a conversation respecting the appropriation made for the University Buildings, asked me whether, on the occasion of the proposition of the address to His Excellency, by Chief Justice *Draper*, seconded by myself (in 1854), any objection had been made by Dr. *Ryerson*, who was stated to be present. I told Dr. *Wilson*, that in my recollections no objection was made to the appropriation by any member of the Senate, and that if Dr. *Ryerson* had opposed it, I thought I should have remembered it.

CONCLUDING STATEMENT of the Reverend S. S. Nelles, M. A., President of the University of Victoria College.

In availing myself of the permission of the Committee to put in a closing paper on behalf of the Petitioners, I only think it necessary to notice some of the objections of Dr. *Wilson* against the claims of the denominational Colleges—more particularly his criticism of my own evidence.

It is denied that Victoria College is non-sectarian, and its denominational supervision is pronounced to be even a more *exclusive* basis than that of religious tests. This is certainly very different from the common opinion, and very different from the view of the Royal Sovereign who granted our Charter, in which Charter religious tests are expressly prohibited.

As regards the Professors, the selection is indeed left to the discretion of the Governing Board, but we may appeal to the history of the past twenty-five years to show that this discretion has been exercised in no illiberal spirit, as appears from the appointment at different times of Professors and Teachers of other Churches than our own. The proportion of Wesleyan Teachers has not been greater than that of Wesleyan students and Wesleyan contributions to the College funds. And whatever may be said to the contrary, the *ex-officio* connection with the Board of five members of the Government, affords the Government at least the means of powerful influence in the Board, and the means of checking any abuse that may arise. If they seldom attend, it is not the fault of the Wesleyan Conference. Their very non-attendance is a proof that no sectarian abuses have ever called for their interposition.

Another reason alleged by Dr. *Wilson* for refusing Victoria College a share of the endowment, is the difficulty of our imposing religious exercises upon students of the Roman Catholic and some other Churches, a difficulty which he considers as great in Victoria as in University College. We answer that if the difficulty of common religious worship be the same in both institutions, then this reason for withholding state aid applies as much to the one as to the other, and the logical inference would be that *neither should be endowed*. Dr. *Wilson* will say that he intended to retort the objection made by us as to the impracticability of common or united religious exercises in University College; but he forgets that *we* do not urge that objection as a reason for not giving legislative aid to University College, but as a reason why the denominations should be allowed to have their separate endowed Colleges. We oppose, not the endowment of University College, but the exclusion of the other Colleges. The *one-College* scheme is beset with difficulties on religious grounds, because all the sects are to be combined together; those

difficulties cannot be retorted on the denominational system, because it does not attempt to combine all the sects in one College, but allows them separate Colleges. University College claims a monopoly; it is a poor defence of that monopoly to say that she is no better than the rest,—not more liberal or comprehensive,—not more capable of providing for sectarian differences than Victoria College alone, and far less capable than the several denominational Colleges together. We do not expect fully to meet the wants of all parties in Victoria College, and yet it remains true that our College is established on such a liberal basis, and conducted in such a liberal, non-sectarian spirit, that, after educating for a quarter of a century many young men of various creeds, we have never yet been accused by any parent or student of an attempt to proselytise. This is a sufficient reply to those who would unjustly brand us with the epithet “sectarian,” in its narrow, offensive sense; but if Victoria College were infinitely less sectarian than she is, this would not give her that exclusive claim to legislative aid which is set up by University College. There is a wide difference between claiming *part* of an endowment and the *whole* of it; as much as between defending our own rights and trampling on the rights of others.

Another ground on which *Dr. Wilson* considers Victoria College “sectarian” and therefore to be excluded from public aid, is the fact that candidates for the Wesleyan Ministry, in some instances, pursue their classical and scientific studies in that institution. Our evidence shows that they do not receive instruction in Theology, and no evidence to the contrary of this has been adduced. I leave it to any candid mind to say whether it be a just and reasonable condition to legislative assistance, that candidates for the Christian ministry (Wesleyan or other), shall be debarred access to our lectures in Latin, Greek, or General Science. If so, the same principle must apply to the other Colleges, including of course University College herself, and we must end in excluding all candidates for the Christian ministry from the higher education of the land. I am ashamed to discuss so absurd and shocking a principle, but it will be soon enough to apply it to Victoria College, after University College herself has undergone the necessary purgation from this kind of sectarian element. Half of the students of University College may be [in this sense] trained for the Ministry; it cannot be denied that there is a large number of this class in attendance, and that too while actually connected with the Theological Schools in close proximity. There is only this difference that the candidates in Victoria, *pay* for their instruction in Science, while the Divinity students of Knox’s College, and the other divinity Halls, may be instructed in University College free of tuition fees, and wholly at the public expense.

*Dr. Wilson’s* reference to the collection mentioned in the Minutes of the Conference does not help his argument, but only proves that not the College funds (as he intimates) but voluntary contributions are the source of aid to those needy young men whom Conference chooses to assist in acquiring an education, and that a special collection is made for this specific object. In fact the Bursar of the College is not allowed to exempt any Conference candidate from the usual College dues, but is required to draw the amount of such accounts from the Treasurer of a particular charity fund. This certainly is a curious plea for withholding legislative aid from the College itself.

I notice next *Dr. Wilson’s* quotations from my official reports. These quotations simply show that we regard Victoria College as an important interest of the Wesleyan community. This we have always avowed; we avow it now before this Committee. If we had no interests at stake we should not be here to press our claims. The education of our youth is vitally dear to us. We cannot, it is true, separate that education from our growth and influence as a religious body; but our growth and influence by means of education is not a thing to be deprecated by the State; most certainly not a reason for depriving us of our rights as citizens.

It is stated in the report referred to, that "without our College we shall either lose our youth or retain them in a condition of intellectual and social inferiority." *Dr. Wilson* thinks it no part of the duty of the State to aid in preventing such a result. I answer that as regards the religious protection of the young, that belongs more particularly to the Church to which the report was addressed, but to the State on the other hand it belongs to provide intellectual culture, and as much as possible in harmony with religious culture. It is the duty of the State either to educate none, or so to adjust its system of education that no class, of whatever creed, may be kept aloof from the wholesome influence of science. Nor will a legislator who believes that Christianity is the best friend of civilization, think it ever beyond his province to amend any laws that may tend to weaken or depress those great religious bodies in which Christianity is represented, and through which it is propagated.

We appeal to the people to sustain the denominational Colleges as helps in Christianising the country; we appeal to the Legislature to sustain those Colleges as schools of science. *Dr. Wilson* thinks the former appeal a reason for resisting the latter; he would grant the Legislative aid, only for the encouragement thus afforded to religion. What is this but to proscribe religion? What is it but to cast her out as evil, and from those very institutions where she is most needed? What is it but an unguarded admission that University College does not promote the religion of the land, and a resting of the defence of her monopoly on that very ground? The logic of such argumentation is hardly Christian. If the denominational Colleges be worthy of legislative support as Seminaries of learning, they are not the less worthy, but the more so, from their alliance with Christianity. Any strength or influence which the Christianity of the country may acquire in this way, she will repay a thousand fold both in material and moral wealth. We trust that the FREE and other Churches will equally repay the State for any strength or influence that may accrue to them from the education of their youth in the richly endowed College at Toronto.

In closing this paper, I crave the privilege of directing the attention of the Committee to two or three considerations of a *practical* nature.

The first is the fact that, whether right or wrong, there is a strong and general preference for denominational Colleges among several, if not all the great religious bodies of the country. Even those who give in to the plan of non-denominational Colleges, do so for the most part from *expediency* rather than from conviction.—Several of the leading communities, such as the Church of England, the Church of Scotland, and the Wesleyan Methodists, have so taken their position that they are not likely to retrace their steps. Any system of Collegiate education, therefore, that fails to include the denominational Colleges, must be a source of constant irritation and discontent to considerable portions of the people. This discontent will be especially felt by the Clergy of these Churches, and will with honest zeal be ceaselessly kept alive among the laity. It may be called "sectarianism," but it will remain, for nothing dies so hard as sectarianism, especially when it is in the right. It is a serious question for the Legislature to consider, whether under such circumstances the University of Toronto can ever become truly national without some plan of compromise and consequent affiliation; and whether it is wise to keep up this constant antagonism between the Churches of the land and its endowed University.

Another consideration is the fact, that as these denominational Colleges, whether endowed or not, will continue their operations, a large number, perhaps the majority, of our youth going to College will repair to these institutions. Such as

these institutions are, such will be the education of these young men. The benefits of the great University will never reach them, nor the country through them. We may proclaim its excellence and "nationality;" its excellence and nationality will be thrown away upon those who are educated somewhere else. The only national system will be that which the nation accepts. If the poverty of the denominational Colleges renders them "petty"—as their enemies choose to style them—then to leave them poor will be to stamp that *pettiness* on the minds of hundreds and thousands of the educated men of the country. It is submitted whether the State should not afford the best means of culture to those institutions that are so likely to have the responsibility of the work. I will only mention, further, that to withhold an endowment to these denominational Colleges, is in all probability to perpetuate the present system of Parliamentary Grants. For such grants we cannot but feel thankful, as they save our institutions from even deeper embarrassment than that under which they now labor; but every one will allow that if there be any evil in giving State aid to denominational Colleges, the evil is much greater when the aid is rendered in the present form than if furnished by fixed Statute. Those who would put an end to the suspicion of pledges and improper understandings between the Churches and the Governments of the day—those who would have a horror of clerical politicians, will be the foremost to bestow a permanent endowment upon the denominational Colleges. This certainly would be one important step toward the mutual independence both of the ministers of the Cabinet and the ministers of the Gospel.

We only ask the means of educating our youth in a way we deem essential for them and for the country; we are prepared to accept any reasonable scheme for this end, but the *great and patriotic object itself we will never abandon.*

S. S. NELLES, M. A.,

President of

The University of Victoria College.

The Reverend Dr. Cook appeared and handed in his reply to the following question :

[*By the Chairman.*]

*Ques. 539.* Have you anything more to say on the subjects which have occupied the attention of this Committee?—I have listened attentively to the evidence given to this Committee, and have seen no reason to change the views expressed in my printed statement. In several of these the representatives of the University, and University College, have concurred. They are willing that the Senate should be constituted in a more satisfactory way. They are willing, as soon as it is practicable, that the Examiners for University honours should not be appointed from the Professors. They would give every facility to students from other Colleges to compete for University scholarships, and they admit the inutility of several of the Chairs now established in University College.

And though they do not admit it, I think the Committee will still have doubts, whether the law, as it stands, warranted the erection of a new building; whether a less expensive building would not have been more suitable, in the circumstances of this Province; whether the expenses of the Bursar's Office are not preposterously large; whether there would not have been a more judicious and economical expenditure, if the University and University College had been limited to a particular sum, instead of being allowed, as under the law, to defray their expenses, before any surplus could accrue for the general advancement of Academical education. The wonder to me is, that under the existing law, there ever was any surplus.

That there has been any, it seems to me, must have been accidental rather than otherwise.

But the question is, should anything be done now, and if anything, what? Of course one's views are modified by hearing and taking into account the views of others, and I think a plan might be suggested which would extend the amount, and raise the character of Acadamical education in this Province, free from some of the objections which have been raised to the plan already stated, and which, it should seem, need not be very unsatisfactory to any party. I hold, in common with all who have spoken, the necessity and advantage of a Provincial University, with a properly instituted Senate. I think there is not much difference of opinion, as to the advantage of having several colleges competing with one another, in the education of the youth of the Province. I think, if satisfaction can be given to the various religious dominions of the Province, in this matter of collegiate instruction, without detriment to the general interest, it should be considered an advantage, even by those who do not share in the views and scruples which some have expressed, and this is perhaps not so difficult, as may at first appear. With the exception of the Episcopalians, the Presbyterians of the Church of Scotland, the Methodists, and Roman Catholics, other bodies have approved of the present arrangement, nor has any other body what can be called a University. Let the annual allowance to University College be fixed, so liberally, as not to give any just cause of discontent to those who approve, and are satisfied with the present constitution, and let this be made over to it absolutely. Let a certain fixed annual grant from the Endowment Fund, be given to the Colleges of the three first named bodies, and a sum equal to what each of them receives, to the two Colleges of the last, on condition of their becoming affiliated to the University, and holding their University powers in abeyance, except in Divinity. And let the remainder of the endowment belong to the University, for its special objects, and for the advancement of education in all the affiliated Colleges. It appears to me, that without crippling University, or University College, this scheme would render the other Colleges more efficient, and give to the University, the important power of regulating and controlling the education of them all, bringing up any one of them that may be deficient, to its own standard, and from time to time, as circumstances admit, raising that standard.

*Ordered,* That the Bursar's Statements for the years 1858 and 1859 be printed for the use of the Committee,

*(For Statements see Appendix.)*

Committee then adjourned (until the Evidence and Proceedings be printed) to the call of the Chair.

*The session closed before any  
Report was adopted and thus  
closed this evening.*

*B. H. J.*

---

---

**A P P E N D I X .**

---

---



Free Copy

W. H. Johnson

---

---

UPPER CANADA COLLEGE.

---

*The Bursar's Statement of Cash Transactions for  
the Year ending 31st December,*

1858.

---

---

UPPER CANADA COLLEGE.

The Bursar's Statement of the Number of Acres of Land Sold from the period of the Original Endowment to the 31st December 1858; showing the Total Amount of Sales, Amount Received, and Amount Unpaid; Also, the Average Price per Acre.

| ORIGINAL ENDOWMENT.                     | No. of Acres. | Acres Sold.       | Acres Unsold.     | Amount of Sales.     |                      | Amount received.     |      | Amount unpaid. |      | REMARKS.   |
|---|---------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|------|----------------|------|--|
|   |               |                   |                   | \$                   | cts.                 | \$                   | cts. | \$             | cts. |  |
| As per Return, 31st December, 1857..... | 63799½        | 46771 2-10<br>137 | 17028 3-10<br>137 | 248001 08<br>1365 00 | 121503 56<br>4820 00 | 126497 52<br>3455 00 |      |                |      | Sales during 1858.   |
| DEDUCT—Loss on Sale No. 449.....        | 179 Acres     |                   |                   |                      |                      |                      |      |                |      |  |
| do do 219.....                          | 15 "          | 15                |                   | 62 52                |                      | 62 52                |      |                |      | Sold in 1858.<br>Included in Return of Lands Sold to<br>31st December, 1857. |
|   | 63605½        | 46893 2-10        | 16712 3-10        | 249303 56            | 126323 56            | 122880 00            |      |                |      |  |
|   |               |                   |                   |                      |                      |                      |      |                |      |  |
|   |               |                   |                   | 30123 00             | 13453 28             | 16669 72             |      |                |      |  |
|   |               |                   |                   | 279426 56            | 139776 64            | 138649 72            |      |                |      | Average Price per Acre, \$5 95.  |

Block A, City of Toronto, called Russell Square, is also part of the Endowment; it contains 9 Acres and is the site of the College Buildings; Also, Block D, in the said City, containing 5½ Acres, and divided into 46 Building Lots, of which 42 have been sold.....

BURSAR'S OFFICE,  
Toronto, 31st December, 1858.

DAVID BUCHAN,  
Bursar.

No 2.—UPPER CANADA COLLEGE.—Statement of the Capital Invested and the Amount Expended, on Account of the College, from its Commencement to the 31st December, 1858.

|   | \$        | cts.      |
|---|-----------|-----------|
| Capital Invested to 31st December, 1857, as shown in Return to Parliament of that date..... |           | 158800 38 |
| Capital Invested to 31st December, 1858, as shown in Account No. 4.....                     | 645 60    |           |
| Do. do. in Building Bursar's Office, as shewn in Account No. 6.....                         | 2320 00   |           |
| Do. do. in Building Porter's Lodge, as shewn in Account No. 7.....                          | 1133 90   |           |
| Do. do. in Furniture, as per Account No. 5.....   | 50 40     |           |
| Less—Investments Returned, as per Account No. 1.....  |           | 160743 02 |
| Amount Expended to 31st December, 1857, as shown in Return to Parliament of that date.....  | 518537 03 |           |
| Amount Expended during the year ended 31st December, 1858, as per Account No. 2.....        | 31817 29  |           |
|   |           | 711097 34 |

DAVID BUCHAN,  
*Bursar.*

BURSAR'S OFFICE,  
Toronto, 31st December, 1858.

No. 1.—UPPER CANADA COLLEGE.—The Bursar's Statement of Receipts and Expenditure on account of "the Permanent Fund," for the year ended 31st December, 1858.

| R E C E I P T S.   | \$   | c t s. | E X P E N D I T U R E.  | \$ | c t s.  |
|--|------|--------|---|----|---------|
| To amount received on account of Purchase Money.....   | 4675 | 48     | By Balance, 31st December, 1857.....  |    | 455 91  |
| Do do do Investments returned.....   | 2207 | 26     | By amount appropriated, by Order in Council, for building a Porter's Lodge at Upper Canada College..... |    | 1200 00 |
| To Do of overcharge of Interest on 22nd May, 1856, on S. ½ Lot 4, 1, Montague, allowed on account of Purchase Money..... | 13   | 52     | By Balance, 31st December, 1858.....  |    | 5300 00 |
| Balance, 31st December, 1858.....  |      |        |   | \$ | 6956 26 |
|  | 6956 | 26     |   |    |         |
|  | 5300 | 00     |   |    |         |

DAVID BUCHAN,  
*Bursar.*

BURSAR'S OFFICE,  
Toronto, 31st December, 1858.





No. 2.—UPPER CANADA COLLEGE.—The Bursar's Statement of Receipts and Expenditure, on account of the "Income Fund," for the year ended 31st December, 1858.

| RECEIPTS. |      | EXPENDITURE.                 |                                |
|-----------|------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| \$        | cts. | TO WHOM PAID.                | SERVICE.                       |
| 30955     | 09   | <i>Am't brought forward.</i> |                                |
|           |      |                              | <i>Amount brought forward.</i> |
|           |      |                              | <i>Insurances.</i>             |
| Novr. 2   |      | The Phoenix Ass. Co.         | Renewal Premium                |
| Janry. 11 |      | do do                        | do                             |
| Janry. 26 |      | The Royal do                 | do                             |
|           |      |                              | 202 50                         |
|           |      |                              | 62 50                          |
|           |      |                              | 70 00                          |
|           |      |                              | 70 00                          |
|           |      |                              | 202 50                         |
|           |      |                              | 481 59                         |
|           |      |                              | 332 70                         |
|           |      |                              | 814 29                         |
|           |      |                              | 21 00                          |
|           |      |                              | 21 00                          |
|           |      |                              | 42 00                          |
|           |      |                              | 42 16                          |
|           |      |                              | 119 00                         |
|           |      |                              | 2 78                           |
|           |      |                              | 163 94                         |
|           |      |                              | 1790 90                        |
|           |      |                              | 191 45                         |
|           |      |                              | 21 00                          |
|           |      |                              | 20121 53                       |

| EXPENDITURE. |                          | RECEIPTS.                                  |          |
|--------------|--------------------------|--|----------|
| Date.        | TO WHOM PAID.            | SERVICE.                                   | \$       |
| Oct. 13      | Sam'l. Lee.              | Account Coloring Walls, &c.                | 33 25    |
| Jan. 12      | Post Office.             | Postage                                    | 10 00    |
|              | do                       | Rent of Box                                | 3 00     |
|              | do                       | Postage                                    | 5 00     |
| Oct. 13      | Henry Lewis.             | Repairing Locks.                           | 18 00    |
|              | Thomas Hayworth.         | Padlock                                    | 2 50     |
| Nov. 2       | Michael Green.           | Cutting wood                               | 1 75     |
| Jan. 14      | MacLear & Co             | Stationery                                 | 11 12    |
| do 12        | Piper & Brother          | Putting up stoves, &c.                     | 32 07    |
| Nov. 24      | J. Hazlett               | Work on lawn                               | 1 60     |
| Sept. 11     | do                       | do   | 21 80    |
|              |                          | do   | 18 60    |
| Jan. 30      | J. Lovell                | Canada Directory                           | 40 40    |
| Nov. 26      | Mrs Redfield             | Natural History Chart                      | 5 00     |
| Dec. 31      | J. Nolan                 | Removing Porter's Furniture                | 10 00    |
| do do        | Gas. Company             | Gas Fittings (Dr. Cannon's)                | 3 00     |
| do do        | Allan Cameron            | Fees on taking affidavits                  | 61 31    |
| Sept. 17     | John Shea                | Account levelling Grounds                  | 1 60     |
| do 20        | John McGee               | Stoves, Pipes, &c.                         | 240 00   |
| Apl. 27      | do                       | do   | 229 82   |
|              |                          | do   | 255 72   |
| July 7       | Angus Dallas             | Rattan Canes                               | 485 54   |
| Sept. 11     | Dr. Connon               | Account Outfit and Passage                 | 4 88     |
|              | Fulton, Michie & Co.     | Brooms                                     | 250 00   |
|              | Holland & Co.            | Cash Box                                   | 3 60     |
| Jan. 8       | J. McKenzie              | Labor at Gymnasium                         | 2 50     |
|              | Boyd & Arthurs           | Rope                                       | 3 00     |
|              | David Alderdice          | Paid by him for Labor on Grounds           | 1 50     |
|              | Do.                      | Usual Allowance                            | 2 00     |
|              | Dr. Barrett              | Paid by him for Labor on Grounds           | 20 00    |
|              |                          | do   | 7 25     |
|              |                          | <i>Resident School House.</i>              | 1454 32  |
|              | Dr. Barrett              | Twelve Month's Salary as Superintendent    | 400 00   |
|              | Do.                      | Share of Board Dues                        | 558 75   |
|              | Do.                      | Paid him Ac. Maintenance of Boarding House | 958 75   |
|              | Rev. Mr. Stennett, M. A. | Principal, his share of Board Dues         | 5500 00  |
|              |                          | <i>Incidental Expenses, R. S. H.</i>       | 558 75   |
|              | John Ritchey             | Account, Repairs                           | 41 92    |
|              | Henry Lewis              | Repairing Iron Bedsteads                   | 34 05    |
|              | John McGee               | Stoves, Pipes, &c.                         | 275 00   |
|              | Jacques & Hay            | Fittings                                   | 199 80   |
|              |                          | <i>Amount carried forward.</i>             | 7317 40  |
|              |                          |  | 24589 40 |
|              |                          |  | 30955 09 |

| RECEIPTS.                        |       | EXPENDITURE.               |  |  |        | \$   | cts. | \$         | cts. |
|----------------------------------|-------|----------------------------|--|--|--------|------|------|------------|------|
|                                  | Date. | To whom Paid.              | Service.   |  | \$     | cts. | \$   | cts.       |      |
| Am't brought forward             |       |                            | Amount brought forward.....  |  | 550    | 77   | 7317 | 40         |      |
|                                  |       | Cumming & Wolls.....       | Incidental Expenses R. S. H.—Continued.  |  |        |      |      |            |      |
|                                  |       | W. H. Pim .....            | Plumbing, &c.....  |  | 67     | 59   |      |            |      |
|                                  |       | Gas Company.....           | Carpenters' Work.....  |  | 166    | 00   |      |            |      |
|                                  |       | Metropolitan Water Co..... | Gas Fittings.....  |  | 246    | 53   |      |            |      |
|                                  |       |                            | Am't. of Account Water Pipes, &c.....  |  | 128    | 96   | 1159 | 85         |      |
|                                  |       |                            | Interest Returned.   |  |        |      |      |            |      |
|                                  |       | D. E. Strathy.....         | Amount returned to him, quantity of land sold to him being reduced. ....   |  |        |      |      |            |      |
|                                  |       |                            | Permanent Fund Account, No. 1.   |  |        |      |      |            |      |
|                                  |       |                            | Amount credited this Account being an over-charge of interest on 22nd May, 1856, on Lot 4, 1st Con. Montagu, S. E. ¼ allowed account purchase money..... |  |        |      |      |            |      |
| Balance, 31 December, 1858 ..... |       |                            | Balance, 31st December, 1858.....  |  |        |      |      |            |      |
| TOTAL.....                       |       |                            |  |  | \$2184 | 76   |      |            |      |
|                                  |       |                            |  |  |        |      |      | \$33139 55 |      |

✓kt.

BURSAE'S OFFICE,  
Toronto, 31st December, 1858.

DAVID BUCHAN,  
Bursar.

No. 3.—UPPER CANADA COLLEGE.—The Bursar's Statement of Receipts and Appropriations, on account of Monies in Deposit, for the year ended 31st December, 1858.

| RECEIPTS.                            | \$  | cts. | APPROPRIATIONS.                      | \$     | cts. |
|--------------------------------------|-----|------|--------------------------------------|--------|------|
| To Balance, 31st December, 1857..... | 82  | 00   | By Amount placed to account.....     | 82     | 00   |
| To Amount placed in deposit .....    | 71  | 00   | do returned to D. B. Strathy .....   | 68     | 00   |
|                                      |     |      | By Balance, 31st December, 1858..... | 3      | 00   |
|                                      | 153 | 00   |                                      | \$ 153 | 00   |

Balance, 31st December, 1858.....\$3 00

DAVID BUCHAN, Bursar.

BURSAR'S OFFICE, Toronto, 31st December, 1858.

No. 4.—UPPER CANADA COLLEGE.—The Bursar's Statement of Receipts and Expenditure on account of the Building Appropriation for the year ended 31st December, 1858.

| RECEIPTS.                            | \$     | cts. | EXPENDITURE.  | \$     | cts. |
|--------------------------------------|--------|------|---|--------|------|
| To Balance, 31st December, 1857..... | 657    | 16   | By Amount paid to Henry Goodwin for superintending <del>Building</del> Gymnasium .....  | 40     | 00   |
|                                      |        |      | do W. H. Pim, account contract do do .....  | 404    | 97   |
|                                      |        |      | do do Cumberland & Storm, Balance of account, Commission as Architects for superintending various works under this Appropriation..... | 140    | 63   |
|                                      |        |      | By Balance, 31st December, 1858.....  | 11     | 56   |
|                                      | \$ 657 | 61   |   | \$ 657 | 16   |

Balance, 31st December, 1858.....\$11 56

DAVID BUCHAN, Bursar.

BURSAR'S OFFICE, Toronto, 31st December, 1858.

27-2-11

No. 5.—UPPER CANADA COLLEGE.—The Bursar's Statement of Receipts and Expenditure, on account of the Boarding House Appropriation for the year ended 31st December, 1858.

| RECEIPTS.                                      | \$ cts. | EXPENDITURE.   | \$ cts. |
|--|---------|--|---------|
| To amount of Balance, 31st December, 1857..... | 50 40   | By account paid Jacques & Hay, for Furniture, (being part of account amounting to \$226 60, the Balance being charged to Income Fund, No. 2.)..... | 50 40   |
|  | \$      |  | 50 40   |
|  |         |  | \$      |

BURSAR'S OFFICE,  
Toronto, 31st December, 1858.

DAVID BUCHAN,  
Bursar.

No. 6.—UPPER CANADA COLLEGE.—The Bursar's Statement of Receipts and Expenditure, on account of the Bursar's Office Appropriation for the year 1858.

| RECEIPTS.                            | \$ cts. | EXPENDITURE.  | \$ cts. |
|--------------------------------------|---------|---|---------|
| To Balance, 31st December, 1857..... | 2200 00 | By amount paid W. H. Pim, account contract.....       | 1400 00 |
|                                      |         | “ “ Thomas Snarr, “.....                              | 873 20  |
|                                      |         | “ “ Cumberland & Storm, Commission as Architects..... | 36 80   |
|                                      | \$      |   | 2320 00 |
|                                      |         |   | \$      |

BURSAR'S OFFICE,  
Toronto, 31st December, 1858.

DAVID BUCHAN,  
Bursar.

No. 7.—UPPER CANADA COLLEGE.—The Bursar's Statement of Receipts and Expenditure, on account of the Porter's Lodge Appropriation, for the year ended 31st December, 1858.

| RECEIPTS.  | \$ cts. | EXPENDITURE.   | \$ cts. |
|--|---------|--|---------|
| To amount appropriated from Permanent Fund by order in council, for Building a Porter's Lodge at Upper Canada College..... | 1200 00 | By amount paid to W. H. Pinn, account contract ..... | 429 90  |
|  |         | do do Thomas Snaar do .....                          | 704 00  |
|  |         | do Balance, 31st December, 1858 .....                | 66 10   |
|  | 1200 00 |  | 1200 00 |

Balance, 31st December, 1858.....\$66 10

DAVID BUCHAN,  
Bursar.

BURSA'S OFFICE,  
Toronto, 31st December, 1858.

## UPPER CANADA COLLEGE.

Estimate of Income for the year 1859.

|  | \$     | cts.     |
|--|--------|----------|
| Interest on Balances due on Sales of Land :—             |        |          |
| Farm Lots.....   | 7422   | 00       |
| City Lots.....   | 763    | 00       |
| Interest on Debentures.....                              | 2028   | 00       |
| Interest on Loans.....                                   | 1733   | 00       |
| Interest on Bank Balances.....                           | 100    | 00       |
| Fees on Transfers of Land.....                           | 50     | 00       |
| Rent from Leased Lots.....                               | 250    | 00       |
| *Tuition Fees.....                                       | 7000   | 00       |
| Legislative Grant.....                                   | 4444   | 00       |
|  | \$     | 23790 00 |
| Less—Balance at debit of Income Fund, 1858.....          | \$2184 | 00       |
| Share of Joint Management for 1858, not yet charged..... | 1888   | 00       |
|  | \$     | 19718 00 |

\* Board Dues are not Estimated.

DAVID BUCHAN,  
*Bursar.*

BURSAR'S OFFICE,  
Toronto, 31st December, 1858.

---

---

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.

---

*The Bursar's Statement of Cash Transactions for  
the Year ending 31st December,*

1858.

---

---

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.

The Bursar's Statement of the number of acres of land sold from the period of the Original Endowment to 31st December, 1858; shewing the total amount of sales, amount received and amount unpaid, also the average price per acre.

| Original Endowment.                        | No. of Acres. | Acres sold. | Acres unsold. | Amount of Sales. | Amount received. | Amount unpaid. |
|--|---------------|-------------|---------------|------------------|------------------|----------------|
|  |               |             |               | \$ cts.          | \$ cts.          | \$ cts.        |
| Original Endowment ..... 226027 1/2 acres. |               |             |               |                  |                  |                |
| Endowment as per Return, 31st Dec., 1857.. | 226047 1/2    | 197665 2-34 | 28381 3-6     | 1294624 80       | 906136 19        | 388488 61      |
|  |               | 16230-00    | 1623 0-0      | 10792 00         | 24114 23         | 13322 23       |
|  | 20            | 199288 2-34 | 26758 3-6     | 1305416 80       | 930250 42        | 375168 38      |
|  |               | .....       | 20 0-0        | .....            | .....            | .....          |
|  |               | 199288 2-34 | 26738 3-6     | 1305416 80       | 930250 42        | 375168 38      |
|  |               | .....       | .....         | .....            | 47 10            | 47 10          |
|  | 226027 1/2    | 199288 2-34 | 26738 3-6     | 1305416 80       | 930297 52        | 375119 28      |

Sales during 1858.

Deficiency in sale No. 1288.

Over charge of interest allowed on account of Principal.

Average price per acre, \$6 75cts.

DAVID BUCHAN,  
Bursar.

BURSAR'S OFFICE,  
Toronto, 31st December, 1858.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO—Statement of the Capital invested and the Amount expended on account of the University, from its commencement to 31st December, 1858.

|   | \$          | cts.       |
|---|-------------|------------|
| Capital invested to 31st December, 1857, as shewn in Return to Parliament ..... |             | 1020327 50 |
| Cash invested in Buildings, as per account No. 7.....                           | \$117103 38 |            |
| do on account of the Museum, as per account No. 5 .....                         | 4588 84     |            |
| do on account of Library, as per account No. 6 .....                            | 11170 07    |            |
|   |             | 132862 29  |
|   | \$          | 1153189 79 |
| Less—Amount of Investments returned, as per account No. 1.....                  |             | 98211 44   |
|   | \$          | 1054978 35 |
| Amount expended to 31st December, 1857, as shewn in Return to Parliament.....   | \$753122 43 |            |
| Amount expended to 31st December, 1858, as shewn in account No. 2.....          | 57182 67    |            |
|   |             | 810305 10  |
|   | \$          | 1865283 45 |

DAVID BUCHAN,

*Bursar.*

BURSAR'S OFFICE,

Toronto, 31st December, 1858.

No. 1.—UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.—The Bursar's Statement of Receipts and Expenditure, on account of "The Permanent Fund," for the year ending 31st December, 1858.

| R E C E I P T S.  | \$     | c t s. | E X P E N D I T U R E.   | \$     | c t s. |
|---|--------|--------|--|--------|--------|
| Amount received on account of Purchase money .....  | 24114  | 23     | Balance, 31st December, 1857 .....   | 27505  | 18     |
| do do Investments returned, including Debentures to the amount of \$84,000 redeemed by Government ..... | 98211  | 44     | Amount expended on account of Building Appropriation, as per Account No. 7 ..... | 117103 | 38     |
| Balance, 31st December, 1858 .....  | 22282  | 89     |  |        |        |
| \$  | 144608 | 56     |  | 144608 | 56     |

Balance, 31st December, 1858 ..... \$2282 89

DAVID BUCHAN,  
*Bursar.*

BURSAR'S OFFICE,  
Toronto, 31st December, 1858.

No. 2.—UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.—The Bursar's Statement of Receipts and Expenditure on account of the "Income Fund," for the year ending 31st December, 1858.

| RECEIPTS.   | \$ cts.    | Date.       | EXPENDITURE.             |                         | \$ cts. | \$ cts. | \$ cts.   | \$ cts. |
|---|------------|-------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|---------|---------|-----------|---------|
|   |            |             | To whom paid.            | Service.                |         |         |           |         |
| Interest on Investments.....  | 36529 66   |             |                          |                         |         |         |           |         |
| Do on Purchase Money.....   | 17091 36   |             |                          |                         |         |         |           |         |
| Rent of Leased Lots.....  | 1822 95    |             |                          |                         |         |         |           |         |
| Fees on Transfers.....  | 190 00     |             |                          |                         |         |         | 7669 91   |         |
| Law costs returned.....   | 5 00       |             |                          |                         |         |         |           |         |
| Postage do.....   | 0 52       | Jan. 8...   | Maclear & Co.....        | Stationery.....         | 61 53   |         |           |         |
|   |            | July 8...   | do.....                  | do.....                 | 130 00  |         | 191 53    |         |
| Share of Joint Expenditure for 1857 received from Upper Canada College..... | 1790 90    | Jan. 4...   | Mrs. Morrow.....         | Cleaning Office.....    | 12 00   |         |           |         |
|   |            | Jan. 18...  | do.....                  | do.....                 | 12 00   |         | 24 00     |         |
|   |            | do 23...    | James Stewart.....       | Cordwood.....           | 2 00    |         | 55 62     |         |
|   |            | Oct. 5...   | Beckett & Co.....        | Sundries.....           | 0 78    |         |           |         |
|   |            | Mar. 31...  | do.....                  | do.....                 | 13 15   |         | 2 78      |         |
|   |            | June 30...  | James Leslie.....        | Postage.....            | 6 27    |         |           |         |
|   |            | Sept. 30... | do.....                  | do.....                 | 5 36    |         |           |         |
|   |            | Dec. 31...  | do.....                  | do.....                 | 5 03    |         |           |         |
|   |            | Jan. 7...   | James Beirn.....         | Stationery.....         | 20 81   |         |           |         |
|   |            | do 14...    | Wyllie & Murray.....     | Cotton for dusting..... | 3 00    |         |           |         |
|   |            | do 21...    | Riddout Bros. & Co.....  | Hardware.....           | 1 10    |         |           |         |
|   |            | do 27...    | do.....                  | do.....                 | 0 38    |         |           |         |
|   |            | July 22...  | Fulton, Michie & Co..... | Candles.....            | 2 41    |         | 2 79      |         |
|   |            |             | Henry Rowsell.....       | Stationery.....         | 1 20    |         | 1 20      |         |
|   |            |             | do.....                  | do.....                 | 0 88    |         | 2 58      |         |
| Carried Forward.....  | \$57530 39 |             |                          | Carried Forward.....    | \$..... |         | \$7669 91 |         |

| RECEIPTS.                    | cts.     | EXPENDITURE.                |   | \$     | cts. | \$      | cts. | \$ | cts. |
|------------------------------|----------|-----------------------------|---|--------|------|---------|------|----|------|
|                              |          | TO WHOM PAID.               | SERVICE.                                    |        |      |         |      |    |      |
| <i>Am't brought forward.</i> | 57530 39 |                             | <i>Amount brought forward.....</i>          | 314 41 |      | 7669 01 |      |    |      |
|                              |          |                             | <i>Incidental expenses Continued.</i>       |        |      |         |      |    |      |
|                              |          | W. H. Pim.....              | Carpentering Work.....                      | 7 25   |      |         |      |    |      |
|                              |          | Wm. Richardson.....         | Cutting Wood.....                           | 12 00  |      |         |      |    |      |
| March 29...                  |          | R. Hudson.....              | Sweeping Hues.....                          | 0 20   |      |         |      |    |      |
| Jan. 8...                    |          | Piper Brothers.....         | Stove pipes, &c.....                        | 11 06  |      |         |      |    |      |
|                              |          | James Morrow.....           | Repairing clock.....                        | 0 75   |      |         |      |    |      |
| Nov. 8...                    |          | Estate of Cheney, & Co..... | A coal-grate.....                           | 22 50  |      |         |      |    |      |
| Apr. 14...                   |          | William Morrow.....         | Sundries.....                               | 0 83   |      |         |      |    |      |
|                              |          | do.....                     | do.....                                     | 1 42   |      |         |      |    |      |
| Oct. 17...                   |          | do.....                     | do.....                                     | 0 50   |      |         |      |    |      |
|                              |          | Royal Insurance Co.....     | Premium.....                                | 26 75  |      |         |      |    |      |
| July 15...                   |          | Water Company.....          | For water.....                              | 4 50   |      |         |      |    |      |
| "                            |          | do.....                     | do.....                                     | 5 83   |      |         |      |    |      |
| 22...                        |          | A. Dallas.....              | Whiske, &c.....                             | 1 35   |      |         |      |    |      |
| Sept. 1...                   |          | do.....                     | Dusters.....                                | 1 74   |      |         |      |    |      |
| July 1...                    |          | Joseph Woodruff.....        | Rent of office to 1st July, '38             | 3 10   |      |         |      |    |      |
| Nov 8...                     |          | Borst & Co.....             | Coal.....                                   | 250 00 |      |         |      |    |      |
| Dec. 31...                   |          | Ritchey & Harris.....       | Stoves, repairs, pipes, &c.....             | 74 50  |      |         |      |    |      |
| Oct. 9...                    |          | J. Atkins.....              | Cordwood.....                               | 52 55  |      |         |      |    |      |
| "                            |          | J. Thompson.....            | Punch.....                                  | 17 00  |      |         |      |    |      |
| Dec. 20...                   |          | Jas. Black.....             | Cutting wood.....                           | 1 00   |      |         |      |    |      |
| "                            |          | R. B. Richards.....         | Ice.....                                    | 9 13   |      |         |      |    |      |
|                              |          |                             | <i>Expenses Attendant on Removal.</i>       | 7 00   |      |         |      |    |      |
| Dec. 22...                   |          | John Morrow.....            | Making door, &c.....                        | 22 25  |      |         |      |    |      |
| "                            |          | James Morrow.....           | Boxing stairs and assisting at removal..... | 12 00  |      |         |      |    |      |
| Aug. 10...                   |          | Wm. Fahey.....              | Removing office furniture.....              | 44 00  |      |         |      |    |      |
| July 17...                   |          | R. Sheppard.....            | Fixing grates.....                          | 16 25  |      |         |      |    |      |
| "                            |          | The "Colonist,".....        | Advertising removal.....                    | 1 00   |      |         |      |    |      |
|                              |          |                             |   |        |      | 823 18  |      |    |      |

|            |  |                             |   |         |  |  |  |  |  |
|------------|--|-----------------------------|---|---------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Oct. 13... |  | Henry Lewis.....            | Hanging bells, &c.....  | 17 87   |  |  |  |  |  |
| "          |  | W. H. Pim.....              | Extras, fitting up office, &c.....  | 208 00  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nov. 11... |  | Cumming & Wells.....        | Laying on water-pipes, &c.....  | 49 20   |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  | The City Chamberlain.....   | Making drain.....   | 21 45   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nov. 12... |  | George Leslie.....          | Ornamental Trees.....   | 15 00   |  |  |  |  |  |
| "          |  | R. Campbell & Co.....       | Oil Cloth, &c.....  | 18 87   |  |  |  |  |  |
| "          |  | Thomas McGee.....           | Extra Planking.....   | 10 00   |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  | J. Carruthers.....          | Drain.....  | 7 68    |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             | <i>Salaries—University.</i>   |         |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  | John Langton.....           | Vice Chancellor, 1 year's Salary.....                                     | 800 00  |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  | Rev. A. Lortimer.....       | Librarian, 1 year's Salary.....   | 1200 00 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  | J. H. Morris.....           | Registrar, do.....  | 750 00  |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  | Daniel Arris.....           | Beutel do.....  | 160 00  |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  | W. P. Newton.....           | Messenger to Senate.....  | 199 92  |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             | <i>Salaries—University College.</i>                                       |         |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  | Rev. J. McCaul, LL.D.....   | President and Professor of Classical Literature, 3 months salary.....     | 760 00  |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             | Allowance for House Rent.....   | 60 00   |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             | 9 months salary @ \$4000 per annum.....                                   | 3600 00 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             | 15 months arrears of increased salary @ \$720 per annum, as per O. C..... | 1080 00 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  | H. H. Croft, D.C.L.....     | Prof. of Chemistry, 9 mos. salary (including.....)                        | 4720 00 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             | for house rent) \$2280 do   |         |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             | 3 months salary at increased rate of \$2600 per annum as O. C.....        | 780 00  |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  | Rev. James Beaven, D.D..... | Prof. of Metaphysics, the same  | 2360 00 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             | <i>Amount carried forward...</i>  | 2360 00 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 9440 00 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 443 27  |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 8936 36 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 8936 36 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 8936 36 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 8936 36 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 8936 36 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 8936 36 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 8936 36 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 8936 36 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 8936 36 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 8936 36 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 8936 36 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 8936 36 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 8936 36 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 8936 36 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 8936 36 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 8936 36 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 8936 36 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 8936 36 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 8936 36 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 8936 36 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 8936 36 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 8936 36 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 8936 36 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 8936 36 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 8936 36 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 8936 36 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 8936 36 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 8936 36 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 8936 36 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 8936 36 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 8936 36 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 8936 36 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 8936 36 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 8936 36 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 8936 36 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 8936 36 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 8936 36 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 8936 36 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 8936 36 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   | 3109 92 |  |  |  |  |  |
|            |  |                             |   |         |  |  |  |  |  |









No. 2.—Continued.

| RECEIPTS.                    | \$ cts.  | Date.                    | EXPENDITURE.  |  | \$ cts. | \$ cts.    | \$ cts.  | University. | University College. |
|------------------------------|----------|--------------------------|---|--|---------|------------|----------|-------------|---------------------|
|                              |          |                          | To Whom Paid.   | Service.                                 |         |            |          |             |                     |
| <i>Am't brought forward.</i> | 57530 39 |                          |   |  | 1936 66 | 58851 95   | 15254 09 | 29832 40    |                     |
|                              |          |                          | <i>Amount brought forward...</i>                          |  |         |            |          |             |                     |
|                              |          |                          | <i>Incidental Expenses.—Con.</i>                          |  |         |            |          |             |                     |
|                              |          |                          | Augustus Fell.....  | Making Drawing of Ancient Tombstone..... | 14 00   |            |          | 14 00       |                     |
|                              |          | Jan'y, 23...             | Alan Cameron.....   | Fees on Affidavits.....                  | 6 40    |            |          | 4 85        |                     |
|                              |          | Sept. 2 <sup>d</sup> ... | Wyllie & Murray.....                                      | Oilcloth, &c.....                        | 10 85   |            | 6 00     |             |                     |
|                              |          |                          | do.   | Scarlet Baize.....                       | 4 00    | 1071 91    | 4 00     |             |                     |
|                              |          |                          |   | <i>Grounds.</i>                          |         |            |          |             |                     |
|                              |          |                          | Bal. at Debit of Account No. 8 chargeable to this fund... |  |         | 1358 81    |          |             |                     |
| Bal'ce, 22nd Dec, '58        | 437 81   |                          |   | Balance 31st December, 1857              |         | 785 53     |          |             |                     |
|                              | 57968 20 |                          |   | Balance 31st December, 1858...           |         | \$57968 20 | 15264 09 | 29850 34    |                     |
|                              |          |                          |   |  |         | \$437 81   |          |             |                     |

DAVID BUCHAN,  
*Bursar.*

BURSAR'S OFFICE,  
Toronto, 31st December, 1858.

No. 3.—UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.—The Bursar's Statement of Receipts and Appropriation of "Monies in Deposit" for the Year ending 31st December, 1858.

| RECEIPTS.                        | \$   | cts. | APPROPRIATION.  | \$   | cts. |
|----------------------------------|------|------|---|------|------|
| Balance 31st December, 1857..... | 4681 | 85   | Amount of Deposits placed to Account and returned.....  | 320  | 55   |
| Amount received in Deposit.....  | 263  | 00   | Amount paid to Account of Upper Canada College Income Fund, as per direction of Senate, communicated 21st June, 1858..... | 1000 | 00   |
|                                  |      |      | Balance 31st December, 1858.....  | 3024 | 30   |
| Balance 31st December, 1858..... | \$   | 4944 |   | \$   | 4944 |
|                                  | 3024 | 30   |   |      |      |

DAVID BUCHAN,  
*Bursar.*

BURSAR'S OFFICE,  
Toronto, 31st December, 1858.

No. 4.—UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.—The Bursar's Statement of Receipts and Expenditure on account of the "Observatory," for the year ending 31st December, 1858.

| RECEIPTS.                                       | \$     | cts | Date.         | EXPENDITURE.              |   | \$  | cts. | \$   | cts. |
|---|--------|-----|---------------|---------------------------|---|-----|------|------|------|
|   |        |     |               | To whom Paid.             | Service.  |     |      |      |      |
| Amount of Warrants on the Receiver-General..... | \$4800 | 00  |               |                           |   |     |      |      |      |
|   |        |     |               | Professor Kingston, M. A. | Director, 12 months Salary.....                   |     |      | 1360 | 00   |
|   |        |     |               | James Walker.....         | Observer, do do.....                              |     |      | 540  | 00   |
|   |        |     |               | Thomas Menzies.....       | do do do.....                                     |     |      | 540  | 00   |
|   |        |     |               | W. A. Stewart.....        | do do do.....                                     |     |      | 540  | 00   |
|   |        |     |               | W. F. Davison.....        | Computer do do.....                               |     |      | 399  | 97   |
|   |        |     |               | H. A. Daney.....          | Attendant, do do.....                             |     |      | 300  | 00   |
|   |        |     |               |                           | <i>Incidental Expenses.</i>                       |     |      |      |      |
|   |        |     | Jan. 5.....   | Professor Kingston.....   | Petty expenses paid by him.....                   | 34  | 94   |      |      |
|   |        |     | Jan. 13.....  | do do.....                | Bill on England, for purchase of Instruments..... | 247 | 74   |      |      |
|   |        |     | Sept. 10..... | do do.....                | Sundry accounts paid by him.....                  | 38  | 75   |      |      |
|   |        |     | Dec. 20.....  | do do.....                | do do do.....                                     | 43  | 85   |      |      |
|   |        |     | Jan. 5.....   | Jn. C. Thompson.....      | Candles, Oils, &c.....                            | 51  | 10   | 365  | 40   |
|   |        |     | July 26.....  | do do.....                | do do.....  | 62  | 20   |      |      |
|   |        |     | Dec. 13.....  | do do.....                | do do.....  | 119 | 30   | 232  | 60   |
|   |        |     | Feby. 1.....  | Henry Rowsell.....        | Stationery, &c.....                               | 102 | 05   |      |      |
|   |        |     | Dec. ....18   | do do.....                | do.....   | 12  | 89   | 114  | 94   |
|   |        |     | Feby. 5.....  | Choney & Co.....          | Sundries.....                                     |     |      | 1    | 00   |
|   |        |     | Jan. 7.....   | John Cass.....            | Door Lock, Hinges, &c.....                        |     |      | 6    | 00   |
|   |        |     | Jan. 14.....  | Wyllie & Murray.....      | Boards, &c.....                                   |     |      | 7    | 53   |
|   |        |     | Jan. 16.....  | Angus Dallas.....         | Maps, &c.....                                     |     |      | 3    | 64   |
|   |        |     | Feby. 27..... | Richard Cathbert.....     | Binding Books.....                                |     |      | 21   | 75   |
|   |        |     | Jan. 30.....  | J. Beckett & Co.....      | Chemicals, &c.....                                |     |      | 5    | 90   |
|   |        |     | Oct. 5.....   | do do.....                | ".....  |     |      | 5    | 03   |

3679 97

|              |                              |                              |     |           |
|--------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|-----|-----------|
| July 20..... | J. E. Fell.....              | Two panes Plate Glass.....   | 3   | 00        |
| Aug. 3.....  | J. G. Joseph & Co.....       | Repairing Chronometer.....   | 3   | 00        |
| Aug. 4.....  | Estate of Charles March..... | Painting, &c.....            | 12  | 82        |
| Aug. 9.....  | Ridout Bros. & Co.....       | Stove Pipe Nails, &c.....    | 3   | 92        |
| Dec. 18..... | do do.....                   | do do.....                   | 24  | 04        |
| Aug. 21..... | H. G. Booth.....             | Charcoal, Pipe, &c.....      | 27  | 96        |
| Aug. 4.....  | J. Ferguson.....             | Labour.....                  | 2   | 90        |
| Aug. 7.....  | J. G. Beard.....             | Coal.....                    | 5   | 25        |
| Oct. 7.....  | Jas. Stewart.....            | Cordwood.....                | 34  | 75        |
| Oct. 14..... | J. W. Drummond.....          | Lumber.....                  | 110 | 69        |
| Dec. 15..... | A. H. Armour & Co.....       | Journals.....                | 3   | 00        |
| Dec. 17..... | T. Iredale & Co.....         | Candlesticks &c.....         | 12  | 50        |
| Dec. 23..... | D. G. Carnegie.....          | Repairing Timepiece.....     | 2   | 00        |
| Dec. 23..... | H. Piper & Bros.....         | Lamp, Oil, &c.....           | 2   | 55        |
| Dec. 30..... | J. Kay.....                  | Brass Castings.....          | 0   | 60        |
| Aug. 24..... | Ridout Bros & Co.....        | 3 Chain Pumps, &c.....       | 57  | 93        |
|              |                              | Balance 31st Dec., 1858..... |     |           |
|              |                              |                              |     | 1058 51   |
|              |                              |                              |     | \$4738 48 |
|              |                              |                              |     | 61 52     |
|              |                              |                              |     | \$4800 00 |

Balance 31st Dec., 1858,.....\$61 2.

DAVID BUCHAN,  
Bursar.

BURSAR'S OFFICE,  
Toronto, 31st December, 1858.

No. 5.—UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO,—The Bursar's Statement of Receipts and Expenditure, on account of the "Museum Appropriation," for the year ending, 31st December, 1858.

| RECEIPTS.                        | \$ cts. | Date.         | EXPENDITURE.               |   | \$ cts. | \$ cts. |
|----------------------------------|---------|---------------|----------------------------|---|---------|---------|
|                                  |         |               | To whom Paid.              | Service.  |         |         |
| To Balance, 31st December, 1857. | 8379 20 |               |                            |   |         |         |
|                                  |         | Jan'y. 22...  | Jaques & Hay.....          | Pine cases, Glass doors, &c.....  |         | 43 50   |
|                                  |         | April 16...   | do                         | Sundries .....  |         | 165 00  |
|                                  |         | Feb'y. 1...   | Henry Rowsell.....         | Printing paper .....  |         | 201 00  |
|                                  |         | March 1...    | L. Lequeroux.....          | Specimens .....   |         | 1 00    |
|                                  |         |               | Bank of Upper Canada ..... | Charge for draft.....   |         | 202 00  |
|                                  |         | July 3...     | Express Company .....      | Charges .....   |         | 13 25   |
|                                  |         | July 12...    | do                         | do .....  |         | 1 50    |
|                                  |         | March 8...    | Professor Croft .....      | Paid by him to A. F. Potter, for Telegraph model, &c .....  | 8 50    |         |
|                                  |         |               | do                         | W. Bolton, Surgical Instruments.....  | 65 00   |         |
|                                  |         |               | do                         | Draft on London, England, for £500 sig., to purchase various things, as per order of Vice Chancellor..... |         | 73 50   |
|                                  |         |               | do                         | Charges on two cases paid by him.....   |         | 2500 00 |
|                                  |         |               | do                         | Carriage of goods paid by him.....  |         | 3 50    |
|                                  |         |               |                            |   |         | 126 54  |
|                                  |         | Jan'y. 8...   | M. A. Couper.....          | Specimens .....   |         | 8 25    |
|                                  |         | do 11...      | do                         | do .....  |         | 4 00    |
|                                  |         | Feb'y. 2...   | do                         | do .....  |         | 3 52    |
|                                  |         | May 26...     | do                         | do .....  |         | 9 50    |
|                                  |         | June 7...     | do                         | do .....  |         | 15 25   |
|                                  |         | April 21...   | do                         | do .....  |         | 3 00    |
|                                  |         | May 10...     | do                         | do .....  |         | 12 50   |
|                                  |         | June 14...    | do                         | do .....  |         | 16 50   |
|                                  |         | July 1...     | do                         | do .....  |         | 8 50    |
|                                  |         | " 12...       | do                         | do .....  |         | 7 50    |
|                                  |         | " 20...       | do                         | do .....  |         | 12 00   |
|                                  |         | " 26...       | do                         | do .....  |         | 12 00   |
|                                  |         | October 26... | do                         | do .....  |         | 21 00   |
|                                  |         | Novr. 5...    | do                         | do .....  |         | 10 00   |
|                                  |         | " 22...       | do                         | do .....  |         | 4 00    |
|                                  |         | " 30...       | do                         | do .....  |         | 3 00    |
|                                  |         |               |                            |   |         | 2703 84 |

|              |                                  |   |  |  |  |         |
|--------------|----------------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------|
| August 2...  | do                               |   |  |  |  | 8 75    |
| " 16...      | do                               |   |  |  |  | 9 50    |
| January 8... | Professor Hincks .....           | Express charges paid by him.....  |  |  |  |         |
| " 13...      | Lyman & Co .....                 | Paper boxes .....   |  |  |  |         |
| April 30...  | S. W. Passmore.....              | Specimens .....   |  |  |  | 18 00   |
| Sept'r. 2... | do                               | do .....  |  |  |  | 30 00   |
| July 13...   | do                               | do .....  |  |  |  | 23 50   |
| Decr. 1...   | do                               | do .....  |  |  |  | 29 00   |
|              |                                  |   |  |  |  | 52 50   |
| Jan'y. 18... | A. T. Potter.....                | Gariometer .....  |  |  |  |         |
| Feb'y. 12... | Sam'l. Herring.....              | Specimens .....   |  |  |  | 3 00    |
| March 26...  | do                               | do .....  |  |  |  | 12 00   |
| May 14...    | do                               | do .....  |  |  |  | 28 00   |
| June 25...   | do                               | do .....  |  |  |  | 20 00   |
| July 30...   | do                               | do .....  |  |  |  | 43 00   |
| Novr. 8...   | do                               | do .....  |  |  |  | 9 00    |
| Decr. 17...  | do                               | do .....  |  |  |  | 20 00   |
|              |                                  |   |  |  |  | 50 00   |
| Feb'y. 27... | Professor Chapman .....          | Express charges paid by him.....  |  |  |  | 28 00   |
|              | do                               | Draft on London (England) for £80 sig., to purchase specimens, per order of V. Chancellor ..... |  |  |  | 5 00    |
|              | do                               | Account Geological Department.....  |  |  |  | 400 00  |
|              | do                               | do .....  |  |  |  | 25 50   |
|              | do                               | Paper boxes purchased by him.....   |  |  |  | 13 50   |
| April 1...   | Simpson, Maule & Co .....        | Balance of Account for Chemicals.....   |  |  |  | 6 00    |
| May 21...    | Col. the Brm. de Rottenburg..... | Achromatic Telescope .....  |  |  |  | 450 00  |
| Novr. 25...  | W. Glen.....                     | Microscopic objects .....   |  |  |  | 83 71   |
| June 14...   | Mrs. Ridfield.....               | Chart of Natural History.....   |  |  |  | 260 00  |
| August 28... | Parkes Bros.....                 | Stands .....  |  |  |  | 15 00   |
| Decr. 13...  | do                               | do .....  |  |  |  | 10 00   |
|              | do                               | do .....  |  |  |  | 4 50    |
|              | Louis Saeman .....               | do .....  |  |  |  | 5 20    |
|              |                                  | For specimens.....  |  |  |  | 6 70    |
|              |                                  |   |  |  |  | 16 40   |
|              |                                  |   |  |  |  | 49 00   |
|              |                                  |   |  |  |  | 4588 84 |
|              |                                  | Balance, 31st December, 1858.....   |  |  |  | 3790 36 |
|              |                                  |   |  |  |  | 8379 20 |

BURSAR'S OFFICE,  
Toronto, 31 December, 1858.

DAVID BUCHAN,  
Bursar,

No. 6.—UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO—The Bursar's Statement of Receipts and Expenditure, on account of the "Library Appropriation," for the year ending 31st December, 1858.

| R E C E I P T S .                           | \$       | E X P E N D I T U R E . |                           | \$   | \$      | \$    | \$       |
|---|----------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--|---------|-------|----------|
|   |          | To whom Paid.           | Service.                  |  |         |       |          |
| Amount of Balance, 31st December, 1857..... | 18587 00 | Jan. 7.....             | Bank of Upper Canada ...  | Amount paid through the said Bank to E. G. Allen, of London (England), on account of Books forwarded by him for Library, and expenses thereon to New York..... | 900 00  |       |          |
|   |          | " 26.....               | do                        | do   | 375 00  |       |          |
|   |          | April 16.....           | do                        | do   | 2000 00 |       | 1275 00  |
|   |          | March 27.....           | do                        | do   | 1400 00 |       |          |
|   |          | June 29.....            | do                        | do   | 1455 62 |       |          |
|   |          | July 6.....             | do                        | do   | 867 56  |       | 4855 62  |
|   |          | Aug. 13.....            | do                        | do   | 465 98  |       |          |
|   |          | Sept. 9.....            | do                        | do   | 426 75  |       |          |
|   |          | " 30.....               | do                        | do   | 857 62  |       |          |
|   |          | Oct. 18.....            | do                        | do   | 491 92  |       | 2618 91  |
|   |          | Nov. 13.....            | do                        | do   | 449 60  |       |          |
|   |          | Dec. 10.....            | do                        | do   | 311 31  |       |          |
|   |          | Feb. 1.....             | R. H. Leatham .....       | Charge on Books from New York  |         |       | 10002 36 |
|   |          | April 17.....           | do                        | do   |         | 31 79 |          |
|   |          | June .....              | do                        | do   |         | 27 33 |          |
|   |          | July 22.....            | do                        | do   |         | 35 35 |          |
|   |          | Sept. 8.....            | do                        | do   |         | 53 12 |          |
|   |          | " 23.....               | do                        | do   |         | 12 50 |          |
|   |          | Oct. 18.....            | do                        | do   |         | 11 88 |          |
|   |          | Nov. 22.....            | do                        | do   |         | 20 90 |          |
|   |          | Dec. 23.....            | do                        | do   |         | 26 63 |          |
|   |          |                         | do                        | do   |         | 17 45 |          |
|   |          | Feb. 1.....             | Bank of Upper Canada..... | Charges for drafts for above payments  |         | 1 93  |          |
|   |          |                         | Rev. A. Lorimer .....     | On account of Petty Exps., per order of Vice-Chancellor .....  |         | 40 00 | 238 88   |

|               |                            |                                      |    |    |        |  |          |
|---------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|----|----|--------|--|----------|
| April 30..... | do                         | do                                   | do | do | 40 00  |  |          |
| July 12.....  | do                         | do                                   | do | do | 60 00  |  |          |
| Nov. 15.....  | do                         | do                                   | do | do | 60 00  |  | 200 00   |
| Feb. 2.....   | H. Baillière .....         | Books                                |    |    | 10 58  |  |          |
| March 12..... | do                         | do                                   |    |    | 27 00  |  |          |
| Dec. 23.....  | do                         | do                                   |    |    | 3 60   |  |          |
|               | Bank of Upper Canada ..... | Charge for draft for the above ..... |    |    | 0 75   |  | 41 93    |
| March 24..... | A. H. Armour & Co .....    | Books                                |    |    | 24 00  |  |          |
| Sept. 6.....  | do                         | do                                   |    |    | 3 85   |  | 27 85    |
| Feb. 3.....   | J. C. Geikie .....         | do                                   |    |    | 7 50   |  |          |
| March 25..... | do                         | do                                   |    |    | 25 50  |  |          |
| Aug. 3.....   | do                         | do                                   |    |    | 34 50  |  |          |
| Nov. 6.....   | do                         | do                                   |    |    | 7 50   |  | 75 00    |
| Feb. 25.....  | C. J. Price & Co.....      | do                                   |    |    | 111 00 |  |          |
|               | do                         | do                                   |    |    | 54 26  |  |          |
|               | Bank of Upper Canada.....  | Charge for draft for the above ..... |    |    | 1 61   |  | 166 87   |
| April 12..... | R. H. Browne.....          | Books                                |    |    | 19 25  |  |          |
|               | Bank of Upper Canada ..... | Charge for draft.....                |    |    | 0 25   |  | 19 50    |
| July 5.....   | Wiley & Halshed.....       | Books                                |    |    | 93 50  |  |          |
| Sept. 23..... | do                         | do                                   |    |    | 75 50  |  |          |
|               | Bank of Upper Canada.....  | Charge for drafts.....               |    |    | 1 56   |  | 170 56   |
| July 27.....  | Virtue, Emmins & Co.....   | Art Journal.....                     |    |    | 124 00 |  | 4 50     |
| Sept. 8.....  | W. Spragg & Gates.....     | Books.....                           |    |    | 1 00   |  | 125 00   |
|               | Bank of Upper Canada.....  | Draft for do .....                   |    |    |        |  | 97 62    |
| Oct. 30.....  | Brown, Bros .....          | Binding Books.....                   |    |    |        |  | 11170 07 |
|               |                            | Balance, 31st December, 1858.        |    |    |        |  | 7416 93  |
|               | \$                         |                                      |    |    |        |  | 18587 00 |

Balance, 31st December, 1858 \$ 7416 93

DAVID BUCHAN,  
Bursar.

BURSAR'S OFFICE,  
Toronto, 31st December, 1858.

No. 7.—UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.—The Bursar's Statement of Receipts and Expenditure, on account of the "Building Appropriation Fund," for the year ending 31st December, 1858.

| RECEIPTS.                            | \$      | cts. | EXPENDITURE.                           |          | \$    | cts. | \$    | cts.   |
|--------------------------------------|---------|------|--|----------|-------|------|-------|--------|
|                                      |         |      | To whom paid.                          | Service. |       |      |       |        |
| Amt. appro. from Permanent Fund      | 117,103 | 38   |  |          |       |      |       |        |
| Feb. 25... Worthington Bros., .....  |         |      | On Account, Contracts.....             |          | 5068  | 00   |       |        |
| March 4... do .....                  |         |      | do .....                               |          | 4592  | 00   |       |        |
| do 22... do .....                    |         |      | do .....                               |          | 4100  | 00   | 13760 | 00     |
| April 9... do .....                  |         |      | do .....                               |          | 2200  | 00   |       |        |
| do 16... do .....                    |         |      | do .....                               |          | 896   | 00   |       |        |
| May 13... do .....                   |         |      | do .....                               |          | 4223  | 00   |       |        |
| do 21... do .....                    |         |      | do .....                               |          | 360   | 00   |       |        |
| June 11... do .....                  |         |      | do .....                               |          | 4816  | 00   |       |        |
| do 25... do .....                    |         |      | do .....                               |          | 3000  | 00   | 15495 | 00     |
| July 9... do .....                   |         |      | do .....                               |          | 10580 | 00   |       |        |
| August 3... do .....                 |         |      | do .....                               |          | 4000  | 00   |       |        |
| do 5... do .....                     |         |      | do .....                               |          | 13442 | 50   |       |        |
| do 24... do .....                    |         |      | do .....                               |          | 4000  | 00   |       |        |
| Sept. 9... do .....                  |         |      | do .....                               |          | 10225 | 00   |       |        |
| do 17... do .....                    |         |      | do .....                               |          | 3000  | 00   | 45247 | 50     |
| Oct. 11... do .....                  |         |      | do .....                               |          | 10800 | 00   |       |        |
| do 20... do .....                    |         |      | do .....                               |          | 4012  | 00   |       |        |
| Nov. 12... do .....                  |         |      | do .....                               |          | 9956  | 75   |       |        |
| Dec. 9... do .....                   |         |      | do .....                               |          | 6816  | 00   |       |        |
| do 31... John Morris .....           |         |      | Clerk of Works, 12 months' salary..... |          | 600   | 00   | 31384 | 75     |
| Jan. 18... Cumberland & Storm.....   |         |      | Commission as Architects.....          |          | 400   | 00   |       |        |
| March 11... do .....                 |         |      | do .....                               |          |       |      | 1000  | 00     |
| April 1... do .....                  |         |      | do .....                               |          |       |      | 1000  | 00     |
| July 14... do .....                  |         |      | do .....                               |          | 500   | 00   |       |        |
| August 5... do .....                 |         |      | do .....                               |          | 500   | 00   |       |        |
| Oct. 5... do .....                   |         |      | do .....                               |          | 600   | 00   | 1000  | 00     |
| Nov. 1... do .....                   |         |      | do .....                               |          | 400   | 00   |       |        |
| Dec. 22... do .....                  |         |      | do .....                               |          | 600   | 00   |       |        |
| Jan. 11... McCausland & Bullock..... |         |      | On Account, Contract.....              |          | 60    | 00   | 1600  | 00     |
|                                      |         |      |  |          |       |      |       | 4600   |
|                                      |         |      |  |          |       |      |       | 105887 |
|                                      |         |      |  |          |       |      |       | 960    |
|                                      |         |      |  |          |       |      |       | 00     |

|                                   |  |  |  |  |     |    |      |           |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|-----|----|------|-----------|
| March 6... do .....               |  |  | do .....                                 |  | 26  | 65 |      |           |
| August 5... do .....              |  |  | do .....                                 |  |     |    | 86   | 65        |
| Nov. 10... do .....               |  |  | do .....                                 |  | 748 | 00 | 100  | 00        |
| Dec. 3... do .....                |  |  | do .....                                 |  | 600 | 00 | 1348 | 00        |
| May 12... Joseph Sheard.....      |  |  | Costs of Arbitration .....               |  |     |    |      | 65        |
| do 22... Ridout, Bros. & Co.....  |  |  | Hardware.....                            |  |     |    |      | 46        |
| Nov. 9... Wm. Midford .....       |  |  | Account of Contract .....                |  |     |    |      | 56        |
| Dec. 3... do .....                |  |  | do .....                                 |  |     |    |      | 218       |
| Sept. 9... Henry Rowsell .....    |  |  | Stationery .....                         |  |     |    |      | 41        |
| Nov. 12... T. D. Harris & Co..... |  |  | On account of a Bell .....               |  |     |    |      | 08        |
| do 23... Alexander Hamilton ..... |  |  | do Painting.....                         |  |     |    |      | 1740      |
| Oct. 13... The Registrar .....    |  |  | On account Celebration Expenses on ..... |  |     |    |      | 34        |
| do 23... do .....                 |  |  | laying the Topmost Stone of Uni- .....   |  |     |    |      | 424       |
| Nov. 24... do .....               |  |  | versity Buildings.....                   |  |     |    |      | 00        |
|                                   |  |  | do .....                                 |  |     |    |      | 1680      |
|                                   |  |  | do .....                                 |  |     |    |      | 00        |
|                                   |  |  |  |  |     |    |      | 580       |
|                                   |  |  |  |  |     |    |      | 00        |
|                                   |  |  |  |  |     |    |      | \$117,103 |
|                                   |  |  |  |  |     |    |      | 38        |

BURSAR'S OFFICE,  
Toronto, 31st December, 1858.

DAVID BUCHAN,  
*Bursar.*

No. 8.—UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.—The Bursar's Statement of Receipts and Expenditure on Account of "the Grounds Appropriation," for the Year ending 31st December, 1858.

| R E C E I P T S.   | \$     | cts. | Date.   | EXPENDITURE.  |  | \$  | cts.                      | \$ | cts.                             |
|--|--------|------|---|---|--|-----|---------------------------|----|----------------------------------|
|  |        |      |   | To whom Paid.   | Service.   |     |                           |    |                                  |
| Amount received from Professor Buckland on account of Pasturage..... | 24     | 00   | Jan. 7.<br>" 14.<br>May 4.<br>June 11.<br>Sept. 22. | W. H. Pinn.<br>Professor Buckland.<br>"<br>"<br>"               | On Account Special Contract<br>Grounds, Order V. C.<br>"<br>"<br>"                               | 167 | 00<br>200<br>200<br>100   |    | 52 23                            |
|  |        |      | Jan. 14.<br>" 14.<br>Sept. 22.                      | James Fleming<br>"<br>George Lesslie.                           | " Trees<br>"<br>"  |     | 30 56<br>161 50<br>119 70 |    | 667 00                           |
|  | 1358   | 81   | Jan. 15.<br>"<br>4.                                 | William Mundie<br>The "Globe"<br>C. Partridge.<br>C. T. Gilmour | Design for Grounds<br>Advertising<br>Lumber for Fences<br>Deputy Superintendent, 5 months salary |     |                           |    | 311 76<br>80 62<br>1 00<br>95 20 |
|  |        |      | Nov. 22.  | Edwin Taylor.   | On Account Grounds, order of V. C.   |     |                           |    | 125 00<br>50 00                  |
|  | \$1358 | 81   |   |   |  |     |                           |    | \$1382 81                        |

Balance 31st December, 1858, charged to Income Fund in Account No. 2,.....

DAVID BUCHAN,  
*Bursar.*

BURSAR'S OFFICE,  
Toronto, 31st December, 1858.

No. 9.—UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.—The Bursar's Statement of Receipts and Expenditure, on account of the Appropriation Fund for the year ending, 31st December, 1858.

| RECEIPTS.   | \$   | cts. | EXPENDITURE.                      | \$   | cts. |
|---|------|------|-----------------------------------|------|------|
| Balance, 21st December, 1857, being the residue of Appropriation, for the improvement of the Port Hope and Port Stanley properties..... | 2287 | 81   | Balance, 21st December, 1858..... | 2287 | 81   |
|   | 2287 | 81   |                                   | 2287 | 81   |

DAVID BUCHAN, Bursar.

BURSAR'S OFFICE, Toronto, 31st December, 1858.

No. 10.—UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.—The Bursar's Statement of Receipts and Expenditure, on account of the "Surplus Income Fund," for the year ending, 31st December, 1858.

| RECEIPTS.                         | \$    | cts. | EXPENDITURE.                      | \$    | cts. |
|-----------------------------------|-------|------|-----------------------------------|-------|------|
| Balance, 31st December, 1857..... | 21691 | 95   | Balance, 31st December, 1858..... | 21691 | 95   |
|                                   | 21691 | 95   |                                   | 21691 | 95   |

DAVID BUCHAN, Bursar.

BURSAR'S OFFICE, Toronto, 31st December, 1858

---



---

 UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO—Estimate of Income for the year 1859.
 

---



---

|                                       | \$    | cts.       |
|---------------------------------------|-------|------------|
| Interest on Balances :—               |       |            |
| General Sales.....                    | 19293 | 00         |
| Port Hope Property .....              | 4211  | 00         |
| Garrison Reserve Property .....       | 376   | 00         |
| Hamilton Property.....                | 1346  | 00         |
| Bidout purchase .....                 | 109   | 00         |
| Ground Rent, Bay Street property..... | \$258 | 00         |
| do    Leatham property.....           | 280   | 00         |
|                                       | 538   | 00         |
| Interest on Debentures.....           | 22995 | 00         |
| do    on Mortgages .....              | 4518  | 00         |
| Dividends on Bank Stock .....         | 114   | 00         |
| Interest on Bank Balances .....       | 500   | 00         |
| Rent of Leased Lots.....              | 2600  | 00         |
| Fees on Transfers .....               | 100   | 00         |
|                                       | \$    | * 56700 00 |

---

DAVID BUCHAN,  
*Bursar.*

BURSAR'S OFFICE,  
Toronto, 31st December, 1858.

---

\* NOTE.—The calculations for the above Estimate are founded on the Balances struck on 31st December, ———, but as there remained at that date \$78,741 to be expended on the new Building, and which will be all required before the close of the year, the Estimate should be diminished by the amount of Interest lost. As I do not know at what dates and in what amounts the money will be required, I cannot estimate the loss of Income thence arising, but unless I am able materially to increase the Permanent Fund by sales of land (which is not to be expected in such times as the present), the Income of 1860 will not be more than, say.....\$52,000 00

---

---

**UPPER CANADA COLLEGE.**

---

*The Bursar's Statement of Cash Transactions and  
Lands Sold for the Year ending 31st December,  
1859.*

---

UPPER CANADA COLLEGE.

STATEMENT of the Number of Acres of Land which have been Sold from the period of the Original Endowment to the 31st December, 1859; shewing the Total Amount of Sales, Amount Received, Amount Unpaid; Also, the Average Price per Acre.

| ORIGINAL ENDOWMENT.   | No. of Acres. | Acres Sold.  | Acres Unsold. | Amount of Sales.                        | Amount received      | Amount unpaid.       | REMARKS.   |
|---|---------------|--|---------------|---|----------------------|----------------------|--|
| A, per Return, to 31st December, 1858.....  | 63268         |  |               | \$ cts.<br>249303 56                    | \$ cts.<br>126323 56 | \$ cts.<br>122980 00 | Sales to 31st March, 1859.<br>do do 30th June, do<br>do do do Sept. do<br>do do 31st Dec. do |
|   | 63605½        | 46893 0-32<br>100 0-00<br>103 0-00<br>300 0-00<br>572 2-00 | 16712 1-08    | 1000 00<br>700 00<br>2400 00<br>6855 00 | 7275 13              | 3509 87              |  |
|   | 63605½<br>100 | 48265 2-32<br>100 0-00                                     | 15339 3-08    | 260088 56<br>300 00                     | 135568 69<br>60 00   | 126489 87<br>240 00  | Sale 103 not included in the Patent.   |
|   | 63505½<br>8   | 48165 2-32<br>8  | 15339 3-08    | 259788 56<br>40 00                      | 135568 69<br>16 52   | 126249 87<br>23 48   | Sale 209, quantity of land deficient.  |
|   | 63497½        | 48157 2-32   | 15339 3-08    | 259748 56                               | 135522 17<br>57 83   | 126226 39<br>57 83   | Sale 274, Re-appropriation account, N3<br>19, 2 Caradoc.                                     |
|   | 30            | 30   |               | 150 00                                  | 150 00               |                      | Sale 197, quantity of land deficient.  |
|   | 63467½<br>14  | 48127 2-32<br>14   | 15339 3-08    | 259598 56<br>56 00                      | 13334 34<br>7 00     | 126284 22<br>63 00   |  |
|   | 63452½<br>14  | 48113 2-32<br>14   | 15339 3-08    | 259542 56<br>56 00                      | 133321 34<br>1 14    | 126221 22<br>57 14   | Sale 423, do do do<br>Sale 435, do do do   |
|   | 63439½        | 48099 2-32   | 15339 3-08    | 259486 56                               | 133323 48            | 126164 08            | Average Price per Acre, \$5 39.  |
| Block D. City of Toronto, is also part of the Endowment containing 5½ Acres, divided into Building Lots, —Also Block A. in the said City, called Russell Square, containing 9 acres, which Block is the site of the College Buildings, Block D. is divided into 46 Building Lots, of which 41 have been sold and 4 Decided to the Trustees of the Toronto Grammar School, Free..... |               |  |               | 30123 00<br>1600 00                     | 13463 28<br>.....    | 16669 72<br>1600 00  | Sale cancelled, Lot 2, corner Church St.   |
|   |               |  |               | 28523 00                                | 13463 29             | 15069 72             |  |

DAVID BUCHAN, *Bursar.*

JOHN LANGTON, *Auditor.*

BURSAR'S OFFICE, Toronto, 31st December, 1859.

UPPER CANADA COLLEGE.—Statement of the Capital Invested and the Amount Expended, on Account of the College, from its Commencement to the 31st December, 1859.

|   | \$  | cts. | \$ | cts. |
|---|-----|------|----|------|
| Capital Invested to 31st December, 1853, as shown in Return to Parliament of that date..... | 160 | 743  | 02 |      |
| Less—Investments Returned, as per Account No. 1.....  | 289 | 1    | 04 |      |
|   | 157 | 851  | 98 |      |
| Amount Expended to 31st December, 1858, as shown in Return to Parliament of that date.....  | 550 | 354  | 32 |      |
| Amount Expended to 31st December, 1859, as shown in Account No. 2 .....                     | 30  | 582  | 52 |      |
|   | 788 | 788  | 82 |      |

DAVID BUCHAN,  
*Bursar.*

BURSAR'S OFFICE,  
Toronto, 31st December, 1859.

JOHN LANGTON, Auditor

No. 1.—UPPER CANADA COLLEGE.—The Bursar's Statement of Receipts and Expenditure on account of "the Permanent Fund," for the year ending 31st December, 1859.

| R E C E I P T S.   | \$   | cts.  | E X P E N D I T U R E.   | \$   | cts.  |
|--|------|-------|--|------|-------|
| To Balance, 31st December, 1859.....                                 | 5300 | 35    | By amount of Loan repaid the University of Toronto.....  | 6000 | 00    |
| To amount received on account of Purchase Money.....                 | 7275 | 13    | By re-appropriation as Interest instead of Principal account, Lot 19, 2nd Range S.S.W. Road, Caradoc .....                               | 57   | 83    |
| Do do Loans returned.....  | 2891 | 04    | By amount returned to Archibald Elliot, account, Lot 2, 7th Concession Wolford, account purchase money, quantity of land being deficient | 150  | 00    |
| To Balance of Building Appropriation, account No. 4, transferred ... | 11   | 56    | By amount returned to William Petherwick, account E $\frac{1}{2}$ 20, 9 Con-<br>cession Seymour do do .....                              | 16   | 52    |
|  |      |       | By Balance, 31st December, 1859.....   | 9253 | 73    |
| Balance, 31st December, 1859.....                                    | \$   | 15478 | 08   | \$   | 15478 |
|  |      | 9253  | 73   |      | 08    |

DAVID BUCHAN,  
*Bursar.*

BURSAR'S OFFICE,  
Toronto, 31st December, 1859.

JOHN LANGTON, *Auditor.*

No. 2.—UPPER CANADA COLLEGE.—The Bursar's Statement of Receipts and Expenditure on account of the "Income Fund," for the year ending 31st December, 1859.

| RECEIPTS.  |  | \$      | cts. | Date. | EXPENDITURE.                 |   | \$   | cts. | \$    | cts. |
|--|--|---------|------|-------|------------------------------|---|------|------|-------|------|
|  |  |         |      |       | TO WHOM PAID.                | SERVICE.  |      |      |       |      |
| To amount of Interest on Purchase Money.   |  | 4916    | 65   |       |                              | Balance, 31 December, 1857.....   |      |      | 2184  | 66   |
| Do do Loans.....   |  | 1723    | 63   |       |                              | Salaries.   |      |      |       |      |
| Do do Debentures.....  |  | 2088    | 00   |       | Rev. W. Stonnett, M. A.....  | Principal, 12 months' Salary.....   | 2400 | 00   |       |      |
| Do do Bank Balances.....   |  | 160     | 80   |       | do                           | Proportion of Fees.....   | 220  | 84   | 2620  | 84   |
| Do do Tuition Fees.....  |  | 6109    | 90   |       | Rev. H. Scadding, D. D.....  | First Classical Master, 12 months' Salary.....  | 1336 | 00   |       |      |
| Do do Board Dues.....  |  | 5804    | 00   |       | do                           | Proportion of Fees.....   | 220  | 84   |       |      |
| Do do received from Dr. Barrett being his Share of Expenses of Boarding House, for the years 1858 and 1859, at \$400 per annum.. |  | 800     | 00   |       | Wm. Wedd, M. A.....          | Second Classical Master, do do do.....  |      |      | 1020  | 84   |
| Instruments (Deeds Transfer, &c) returned.....   |  | 65      | 90   |       | G. M. Evans, M. A.....       | Third do do do do.....  |      |      | 1020  | 84   |
| Do do Taxes returned.....  |  | 14      | 41   |       | James Brown, M. A.....       | Mathematical do do do.....  |      |      | 1020  | 84   |
| Leased Lots.....   |  | 426     | 00   |       | C. W. Cannon, L. L. D.....   | English Classical Master, 12 months' do.....  | 1200 | 00   |       |      |
| Do do Law Costs returned.....  |  | 83      | 00   |       | do                           | Proportion of Fees.....   | 220  | 84   | 1420  | 84   |
| Do do Postage returned.....  |  | 0       | 15   |       | M. Barrett, M. A., M. D..... | First English do do do do.....  | 800  | 00   |       |      |
| Amount car'd forward.  |  | \$22192 | 44   |       | do                           | Proportion of Fees.....   | 220  | 84   |       |      |
|  |  |         |      |       | C. J. Thompson.....          | Second English Master, 12 months' do do do.....   |      |      | 1020  | 84   |
|  |  |         |      |       | John Dodd.....               | do do do do do do.....  |      |      | 1020  | 84   |
|  |  |         |      |       | Rev. E. Schluter.....        | Commercial do do do do do.....  |      |      | 1020  | 84   |
|  |  |         |      |       | do                           | French do do do do do.....  |      |      | 25    | 00   |
|  |  |         |      |       | Henry Haacke.....            | German do 3 months' Salary.....   |      |      | 150   | 00   |
|  |  |         |      |       | do                           | do 9 do do.....   |      |      |       |      |
|  |  |         |      |       | Rev. T. B. Tisdell.....      | Assistant Master Preparatory Form, Salary from 1st November, 1858 to 30th Sept, 1859..... |      |      | 366   | 66   |
|  |  |         |      |       | David Aldericio.....         | Porter, 12 months' Salary.....  |      |      | 360   | 00   |
|  |  |         |      |       |                              | Amount carried forward.....   |      |      |       |      |
|  |  |         |      |       |                              |   |      |      | 17438 | 72   |



No. 2.—UPPER CANADA COLLEGE.—The Bursar's Statement of Receipts and Expenditure, on account of the "Income Fund," for the year ended 31st December, 1858.

| RECEIPTS.               |          | EXPENDITURE.                       |  |         |          |
|-------------------------|----------|------------------------------------|--|---------|----------|
| \$                      | cts.     | TO WHOM PAID.                      | SERVICE.                                     | \$      | cts.     |
| Amount brought forward. |          |                                    | Amount brought forward.                      |         | 20427 19 |
|                         | 26694 69 |                                    | <i>Insurances.</i>                           |         |          |
| Jan.                    | 6.....   | Phoenix Ince. Company.....         | Renewal premium.....                         | 70 00   |          |
| "                       | ".....   | Royal do.....                      | Do.....                                      | 70 00   |          |
| Feb.                    | 10.....  | W. J. Mills.....                   | <i>Taxes.</i>                                |         | 140 00   |
| May,                    | 26.....  | Henry Groff, Treasurer.....        | Amount of back Taxes paid by him on S. & Lot |         |          |
| Sept.                   | 12.....  | Sheriff of Prescott & Russell..... | 6, 1 Range, S. L. N. Road, Caradoc and       |         |          |
| "                       | 15.....  | Treasurer of Northumber-           | now returned to him having accrued           | 19 07   |          |
| Oct.                    | 31.....  | land and Durham.....               | On Lot S, 11 Con., Walsingham.....           | 138 66  |          |
|                         |          |                                    | " Lots 28 and 30, 5 Con., Cambridge.....     | 40 80   |          |
|                         |          |                                    | " Lands in Seymour.....                      | 1741 79 | 1940 32  |
| Jan.                    | 12.....  | E. L. De St. Remy.....             | <i>Gratuity.</i>                             |         |          |
| "                       | ".....   |                                    | On his resignation of the French Mastership  |         |          |
| April                   | 15.....  |                                    | per order in Council.....                    |         | 800 00   |
| Oct.                    | 31.....  | J. G. Beard & Sons.....            | <i>Fuel.</i>                                 |         |          |
|                         |          | Do.....                            | Amount of account for coal.....              | 80 17   |          |
|                         |          | Do.....                            | do.....                                      | 84 37   |          |
|                         |          | Do.....                            | do.....                                      | 26 37   |          |
|                         |          | D. Alderice.....                   | For coke.....                                | 69 50   |          |
|                         |          | Do.....                            | Do.....                                      | 2 06    | 260 41   |
|                         |          |                                    | Do.....                                      | 3 50    | 6 16     |

|        |         |                             |                                    |        |            |
|--------|---------|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|--------|------------|
| May    | 12..... | J. Shedden & Co.....        | <i>Cordwood.</i>                   | 16 00  |            |
| Dec.   | 14..... | James Stewart.....          | Do.....                            | 88 00  | 370 57     |
| June   | 9.....  | Geo. Boomer, Solicitor..... | <i>Law Costs.</i>                  |        |            |
|        |         |                             | Amount of account.....             |        | 55 60      |
| July   | 8.....  | W. H. Pim.....              | <i>Share of Joint Management</i>   |        |            |
| July   | 16..... | Wm. Mowlds.....             | For the year 1858.....             |        | 1688 00    |
|        |         |                             | <i>Repairs.</i>                    |        |            |
|        |         |                             | Amount of account.....             | 64 81  |            |
|        |         |                             | do.....                            | 29 99  | 94 80      |
|        |         |                             | <i>Incidental Expenses.</i>        |        |            |
| Janry. | 22..... | John Hazlett.....           | Clearing away snow.....            | 6 00   |            |
| March  | 4.....  | Do.....                     | Do.....                            | 1 60   |            |
| July   | 11..... | Do.....                     | Labor on grounds.....              | 16 80  |            |
| Janry. | 31..... | Fulton, Michie, & Co.....   | Brooms.....                        | 2 30   |            |
| August | 19..... | Do.....                     | Do.....                            | 1 76   |            |
| Feb.   | 4.....  | Post Office.....            | Postage.....                       |        |            |
| Feb.   | 5.....  | Saml. Lee.....              | Glazing.....                       |        | 4 05       |
| do     | 12..... | Wm. McNaughton.....         | Clearing away Snow.....            | 10 00  |            |
| May    | 4.....  | Michael Green.....          | Cutting wood.....                  | 10 00  |            |
|        |         | do.....                     | do.....                            | 8 20   |            |
|        |         |                             | do.....                            | 3 60   |            |
| March  | 2.....  | Lawrence Green.....         | Clearing away snow.....            | 11 80  |            |
| Jan.   | 17..... | Wm. Burgess.....            | Removing Nuisance.....             | 3 50   |            |
| do     | 18..... | J. R. Armstrong.....        | Stoves, Pipes, &c.....             | 39 00  |            |
| Aprl.  | 1.....  | C. J. Thompson.....         | Sandries.....                      | 137 55 |            |
| do     | 26..... | James Long.....             | Work on lawn.....                  | 1 75   |            |
| May    | 11..... | David Alderice.....         | To pay two Laborers.....           | 1 00   |            |
| June   | 3.....  | R. West.....                | Labor on Grounds.....              | 2 00   |            |
| July   | 9.....  | do.....                     | do.....                            | 15 50  |            |
| Sept.  | 7.....  | do.....                     | do.....                            | 5 00   |            |
| June   | 13..... | W. Rogers.....              | Clearing Stoves, Pipes, &c.....    | 22 50  |            |
| Aprl.  | 29..... | J. Nolan.....               | Labor on Grounds-leveling, &c..... | 18 22  |            |
|        |         |                             | Amount carried forward.....        | 79 95  |            |
|        |         |                             |                                    |        | \$25710 28 |

Amount carried forward.

| RECEIPTS.                    |          | EXPENDITURE. |                            |   |         |
|------------------------------|----------|--------------|----------------------------|---|---------|
|                              | \$ cts.  | Date.        | To whom Paid.              | Service.  | \$ cts. |
| <i>Am't brought forward.</i> | 26694 69 |              |                            | <i>Amount brought forward.</i>  | 375 52  |
|                              |          |              |                            | <i>Incidental Expenses.—Continued.</i>  |         |
|                              |          | Dec. 31      | Postage Post Office Order. | Paid to remit Taxes to Sheriff of Prescott and Russell, on lots in Cambridge. | 0 50    |
|                              |          | July 21      | Allan Cameron              | Commissioners' fees on taking affidavits.                                     | 1 40    |
|                              |          | Aug. 17      | J. A. Simmers.             | Seeds for grounds (Grass, &c.)  | 8 55    |
|                              |          | Sept. 10     | J. Larnounth.              | Labor on Grounds.   | 3 75    |
|                              |          | Nov. 12      | do                         | do  | 4 50    |
|                              |          | do           | do                         | do  | 6 75    |
|                              |          | do           | do                         | Cutting wood.   | 4 80    |
|                              |          | do           | do                         | do  | 5 40    |
|                              |          | Dec. 23      | do                         | Clearing away snow.   | 4 55    |
|                              |          | do 13        | James Collins              | Ink.  | 29 75   |
|                              |          | Nov. 21      | Charles Rot.               | Clearing away snow.   | 0 75    |
|                              |          |              |                            |   | 2 06    |
|                              |          |              |                            | <i>Resident School House.</i>   |         |
|                              |          |              | Dr. Barrott.               | Account Supplies.   | 5200 00 |
|                              |          |              | do                         | Salary as Superintendent.   | 400 00  |
|                              |          |              | do                         | Commission on Board Fees.   | 436 80  |
|                              |          |              | Rev. Wm. Stennett          | do  | 436 80  |
|                              |          |              | Phoenix Insurance Co.      | Premium of Insurance on Boarding House.                                       | 873 60  |
|                              |          |              |                            | <i>Amounts Returned.</i>  | 62 50   |
|                              |          |              | To Archibald Elliot        | Account Lot 2, 7th con. Wolford, on account                                   |         |
|                              |          |              |                            |   | 418 86  |
|                              |          |              |                            |   | 6536 10 |

|                            |            |  |  |  |            |
|----------------------------|------------|--|--|--|------------|
| Balance, 31 December, 1859 | 6072 29    |  |  |  |            |
| TOTAL                      | \$32766 98 |  |  |  |            |
|                            |            |  |  |  | 73 39      |
|                            |            |  |  |  | 22 35      |
|                            |            |  |  |  | 95 74      |
|                            |            |  |  |  | \$32766 98 |

Balance, 31st Dec, 1859..... \$6072 29

DAVID BUCHAN,  
*Bursar.*

BURSAR'S OFFICE,  
Toronto, 31st December, 1859.

JOHN LANGTON, *Auditor.*

No. 3.—UPPER CANADA COLLEGE.—The Bursar's Statement of Receipts and Appropriations of "Monies in Deposit," for the year ending 31st December, 1859.

| RECEIPTS.                           | \$ cts. | APPROPRIATIONS.                     | \$ cts. |
|-------------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------------|---------|
| To Balance 31st December, 1858..... | 3 00    | By amount placed to account.....    | 149 00  |
| To amount placed in Deposit.....    | 151 00  | By do .....                         | 3 00    |
| \$                                  | 154 00  | By Balance 31st December, 1859..... | 2 00    |
|                                     |         | \$                                  | 154 00  |
| Balance 31st December, 1859.....    | \$ 2 00 |                                     |         |

DAVID BUCHAN,  
*Bursar.*

BURSAR'S OFFICE,  
Toronto, 31st December, 1859

JOHN LANGTON, *Auditor.*

No. 4.—UPPER CANADA COLLEGE.—The Bursar's Statement of Receipts and Expenditure, on account of "the Building Appropriation," for the year ending 31st December, 1859.

| RECEIPTS.                            | \$ cts. | EXPENDITURE.  | \$ cts. |
|--------------------------------------|---------|---|---------|
| To Balance, 31st December, 1858..... | 11 56   | By amount transferred to Permanent Fund Account No. 1 ..... | 11 56   |
|                                      |         | \$  | 11 56   |

DAVID BUCHAN,  
*Bursar.*

BURSAR'S OFFICE,  
Toronto, 31st December, 1859.

JOHN LANGTON, *Auditor.*





---

---

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.

---

*The Bursar's Statements of Cash Transactions and  
Lands Sold, for the Year ended 31st December,*

1859.

---

---

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.

STATEMENT of the number of acres of land sold from the period of the Original Endowment to the 31st December, 1859; shewing the total amount of sales, amount received, and amount unpaid, also the average price per acre.

| Original Endowment.                  | No. of Acres.  |  | Acres sold.  |  | Acres unsold.        |  | Amount of Sales.                                       |      | Amount received.   |      | Amount unpaid.      |      | Remarks.  |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|--|--|--|----------------------|--|--|------|--------------------|------|---------------------|------|---|
|                                      |                |  | A. R. P.   |  | A. R. P.             |  | \$   | cts. | \$                 | cts. | \$                  | cts. |   |
| As per R turn, 31st Dec., 1858 ..... | 226201         |  | A. R. P.   |  | A. R. P.             |  |  |      |                    |      |                     |      |   |
|                                      | 226027½        |  | 199288 2 34<br>102 2 0<br>300 0 0<br>664 0 0<br>1528 2 0 |  | 26738 3 6            |  | 1305416 80<br>650 00<br>1700 00<br>4556 00<br>10029 50 |      | 930297 52          |      | 375119 23           |      | To 31st March, 1859.<br>do 30th June, do<br>do 30th Sept., do<br>do 31st Dec., do |
|                                      | 226027½<br>10  |  | 201883 2 34<br>10 0 0                                    |  | 24143 3 6            |  | 1322352 30<br>146 14                                   |      | 957425 41          |      | 364926 89<br>146 14 |      | Sale 1200, loss on Survey.  |
|                                      | 226017½<br>32  |  | 201873 2 34<br>32 0 0                                    |  | 24143 3 6            |  | 1322200 16<br>445 51                                   |      | 957425 41<br>7 73  |      | 364780 75<br>453 24 |      | Sale 1698, loss on Survey.  |
|                                      | 225985½        |  | 201841 2 34  |  | 24143 3 6            |  | 1321760 65   |      | 957433 14<br>14 42 |      | 364327 51<br>14 42  |      | Sale 1240, Interest overpaid re-appropriation.                                    |
|                                      | 123            |  | 123 0 0  |  |                      |  |  |      | 957447 56<br>58 83 |      | 364313 09<br>58 83  |      | do 1536 re-appropriation of payment.  |
|                                      | 226108½<br>106 |  | 201964 2 34<br>106 0 0                                   |  | 24143 3 6<br>106 0 0 |  |  |      | 957388 73<br>43 30 |      | 364371 92<br>43 30  |      | do 1802, re-appropriation of payment.   |
|                                      | 226002½        |  | 201964 2 34  |  | 24037 3 6            |  | 615 00   |      | 957345 43<br>61 50 |      | 364415 22<br>553 50 |      | do 1650, gain on Survey.  |
|                                      | 226002½        |  | 201964 2 34  |  | 24037 3 6            |  | 1322375 65   |      | 957406 93          |      | 364968 72           |      | do 1835, loss on Survey.  |
|                                      |                |  |  |  |                      |  | 1322375 65   |      | 957406 93<br>47 10 |      | 364968 72<br>47 10  |      | do 1206, re-appropriation.  |
|                                      |                |  |  |  |                      |  | 1322375 65   |      | 957359 83          |      | 365015 32           |      | Average price per acre, \$6.54cts.  |

JOHN LANGTON, Auditor.

BURSAR'S OFFICE, Toronto, 31st December, 1859.

DAVID BUCHAN, Bursar.

UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES AT TORONTO.—STATEMENT of Capital Invested and amount expended on account of the University, from its commencement to the 31st December, 1859.

|   | \$ cts.    | \$ cts.      |
|---|------------|--------------|
| Capital Invested to 31st December, 1858, as shewn in Return to Parliament to that date..... |            | 1054978 35   |
| Capital Invested in Building, as per account No. 7.....                                     | 71961 41   |              |
| do do do Museum, do do do 5.....  | 430 11     |              |
| do do do Library, do do do 6.....   | 6674 45    |              |
| do do do Museum fittings, do do do 11.....  | 3270 00    |              |
|   |            | 82335 97     |
| Less amount of Investments returned, as per account No. 1.....                              |            | 1137314 32   |
| Invested Property.....  | 609 65     |              |
| Loans returned.....   | 6715 46    |              |
| Debentures redeemed.....  | 12260 13   |              |
|   |            | 19585 24     |
|   |            | 1117729 08   |
| Amount expended to 31st December, 1858, as shewn in Return to Parliament of that date.....  | \$10305 10 |              |
| Amount expended to 31st December, 1859, as shewn in account No. 2, Income Fund.....         | 72622 67   |              |
|   |            | 882927 77    |
|   |            | \$2000656 85 |

DAVID BUCHAN,  
*Bursar.*

JOHN LANGTON,  
*Auditor.*

BURSAR'S OFFICE,

Toronto, 31st December, 1859.

No. 1.—UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.—The Bursar's Statement of Receipts and Expenditure, on account of "The Permanent Fund," for the year ended 31st December, 1859.

| RECEIPTS.   |       | EXPENDITURE. |  |       |    |
|---|-------|--------------|--|-------|----|
|   | \$    | cts.         | \$   | cts.  |    |
| To Amount received on account of Purchase money .....   | 27127 | 89           | Balance, 31st December, 1858 .....   | 22282 | 89 |
| To do do do Invested property returned, .....   | 609   | 65           | By Amount expended on account of Building, as per Account No. 7 .....  | 71961 | 41 |
| To do do do Loans returned, .....   | 6715  | 46           | By do appropriated by Resolution of Senate for Museum Fittings (See Account No. 12.) .....   | 3800  | 00 |
| To do do do Debentures redeemed .....   | 12260 | 13           | By reappropriation of Deposit of 4th October, 1858, on account of R <sup>3</sup> lot 6, North of Erb's Road, Wilmet, as Interest instead of Purchase Money ..... | 58    | 83 |
| To re-appropriation as purchase money instead of interest of a payment account part of Gore, G. Hallowell, quantity of land being deficient ..... | 7     | 73           | By do of payments of 12th Jan. and 5th Feb., 1859, on account of lot 19, 4 Con. Loebiel do .....   | 43    | 30 |
| To do account lot 3, 1 Con. Clarence do do .....  | 14    | 42           | By do of do do 30th October, 1857, on account of S <sup>3</sup> E <sup>3</sup> lot 3, 1 Con. Uxbridge do .....   | 47    | 10 |
| Balance, 31st December, 1859 .....  | 51458 | 25           |  |       |    |
|   | 98193 | 53           |  |       |    |
|   | \$    |              |  | \$    |    |

Balance, 31st December, 1859 .....\$51458 25

JOHN LANGTON,

Auditor.

DAVID BUCHAN,

Bursar.

BURSAR'S OFFICE,

Toronto, 31st December, 1859.

No. 2.—UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES AT TORONTO.—The Bursar's Statement of Receipts and Expenditure on account of the "Income Fund," for the year ending 31st December, 1889, showing the total amount of Receipts and Expenditure on account of the University and Colleges at Toronto generally, and the amount Expended on account of the University of Toronto and University College separately.

| RECEIPTS.   | \$ cts.  | Date.        | EXPENDITURE.        |   | \$ cts. | \$ cts. | \$ cts. | University. | University College. |
|---|----------|--------------|---------------------|---|---------|---------|---------|-------------|---------------------|
|   |          |              | To whom paid.       | Service.                                    |         |         |         |             |                     |
| To interest on Purchase money.....                    | 17440 18 |              |                     | Balance 31 December, 1888.....              |         | 437 81  |         |             |                     |
| " do Loans.....                                       | 4956 98  |              |                     | Bursar's Office.                            |         |         |         |             |                     |
| " do Debentures.....                                  | 23479 24 |              |                     | Salaries.                                   |         |         |         |             |                     |
| " Fees on Instruments.....                            | 236 00   |              | David Buchan.....   | Bursar, 12 months' salary.....              | 2240 00 |         |         |             |                     |
| " Rent of leased Lots.....                            | 2032 50  |              |                     | Chairman of the Board of Endowment, do..... | 400 00  |         |         |             |                     |
| " Dividend on Bank Stock.....                         | 134 50   |              | Allan Cameron.....  | Cashier, 12 months' salary.....             | 1840 00 |         |         |             |                     |
| " Interest on Bank Balances.....                      | 311 31   |              | M. Drummond.....    | Book-keeper do.....                         | 1440 00 |         |         |             |                     |
| " Interest on invested property.....                  | 2344 95  |              | James Nation.....   | Assistant Clerk do.....                     | 1000 00 |         |         |             |                     |
| " Interest on Law Costs repaid.....                   | 7 50     |              | J. E. B. Smith..... | do Book-keeper do.....                      | 750 00  |         |         |             |                     |
| " Matriculation fees..... \$216 00                    |          | Jan. 10..... | Wm. Morrow.....     | do Messenger do.....                        | 400 00  | 7070 00 |         |             |                     |
| " Ad Exundum..... 10 00                               |          | July 8.....  |                     | Stationery.                                 |         |         |         |             |                     |
| " Law Costs repaid..... 119 42                        |          | Jan. 10..... | Maclenn & Co.....   | Amount of account for six months.....       | 75 73   |         |         |             |                     |
| " Taxes do..... 16 20                                 |          | July 8.....  | Do.....             | Do.....                                     | 106 25  | 181 98  |         |             |                     |
| " Postage do..... 70                                  |          | Nov. 23..... | Borst & Co.....     | Fuel.                                       | 87 50   |         |         |             |                     |
| " Insurance premium returned..... 50 00               |          | Jan. 5.....  | Thomas Tinning..... | Amount of account for coals.                |         |         |         |             |                     |
| " Scholarship allowance repaid (T. Millar)..... 60 00 |          | Dec. 27..... | Do.....             | Do do Cordwood \$4 75                       | 0 75    |         |         |             |                     |
|   |          | April 6..... | James Stewart.....  | Do do do.....                               | 22 50   |         |         |             |                     |
|   |          |              | Wm. Morrow.....     | Paid for Pine Wood.....                     | 5 50    | 123 25  |         |             |                     |

| RECEIPTS.   | \$ cts. | EXPENDITURE.        |   | \$ cts. | \$ cts. | University College. \$ cts. |
|---|---------|---------------------|---|---------|---------|-----------------------------|
|   |         | TO WHOM PAID.       | SERVICE.  |         |         |                             |
| "Share of Joint Management for the year 1888 received from Upper Canada College...."                    | 1888 00 | D. G. Carnegie..... | Repairing Clock.....  | 0 63    |         |                             |
| "Reappropriations as interest instead of Purchase Money Account R. 3. Lot 6. A. Erbs Road, Wilmot....." | 58 83   | P. Hooper & Co..... | Sundries.....   | 1 62    |         |                             |
| Account Lot 19, 4 Lochiel.....  | 43 30   | Wm. Morrow.....     | Wash-tub, \$1 62; Char- mois Skin, 75c.....   | 5 49    | 27 25   |                             |
| Account S. 3, E. 3, 3, 1, Uxbridge.....   | 47 10   | Post Office.....    | Postage to 30th Nov., 12 months   | 29 41   |         |                             |
|   |         | R. B. Richards..... | Ice.....  | 7 00    |         |                             |
|   |         | Water Company.....  | Supply of Water, 12 months....  | 20 00   |         |                             |
|   |         | William Morrow..... | Soap, \$1; Candles, \$1; Mucilage, 30 cents; Cartage, 25 cents; Charcoal, 50 cents .. | 3 05    |         |                             |
|   |         | George Brown.....   | Subscription to "Globe".....  | 6 00    |         |                             |
|   |         | James Deaty.....    | do do to "Leader", \$5  |         |         |                             |
|   |         | do.....             | Advertising removal of Office in do.....\$2   |         |         |                             |
|   |         | May 8....           |   |         |         |                             |
|   |         | R. Kennedy.....     | Repairing wheel barrow.....   | 7 00    |         |                             |
|   |         | July 19....         | Hewitt & Co.....  | 0 75    |         |                             |
|   |         | Jan. 27....         | Fulton Michie & Co.....   | 3 54    |         |                             |
|   |         | Dec. 13....         | James Collins.....  | 3 73    |         |                             |
|   |         | Jan. 27....         | Ridout Bros. & Co.....  | 0 38    |         |                             |
|   |         | Aug. 11....         | Knife Grinder.....  | 3 37    |         |                             |
|   |         | Dec. 31....         | Joseph Black.....   | 0 20    |         |                             |
|   |         | "                   | Mrs. Morrow.....  | 18 25   |         |                             |
|   |         | "                   | Newspaper Boy.....  | 36 00   |         |                             |
|   |         | Feb. 25....         | John Thornton.....  | 0 24    |         |                             |
|   |         |                     | Eyelets.....  | 0 50    |         |                             |

|              |                             |  |         |         |          |         |
|--------------|-----------------------------|--|---------|---------|----------|---------|
| Aug 15....   | Henry Lewis.....            | Repairing locks.....   | 2 63    |         |          |         |
| July 7....   | John Tracy.....             | Sweeping flues.....  | 1 25    |         |          |         |
| May 14....   | Wyllie & Murrey.....        | Carpentering.....  | 4 50    |         |          |         |
| June 22....  | Alexander Hamilton.....     | Toweling.....  | 3 62    |         |          |         |
|              | George Leslie.....          | Lettering in Gold.....   | 3 50    |         |          |         |
|              |                             | Trees.....   | 3 50    | 166 16  |          |         |
| April 30.... | Royal Insurance Co'y.....   | Insurance.   |         | 19 25   |          |         |
|              |                             | Premium per \$3,000.....   |         |         | \$186 89 |         |
|              |                             | Salaries—University.   |         |         |          |         |
|              | John Langton, M.A.....      | Vice Chancellor, 12 months.  | 800 00  |         |          |         |
|              | Rev. A. Lorimer, B.A.....   | Librarian, do.....   | 1200 00 |         |          |         |
|              | James H. Morris, M.A.....   | Ex-Registrar, 6 months Salary  | 375 00  |         |          |         |
|              | Thomas Moss, M.A.....       | Registrar, do.....   | 375 00  |         |          |         |
|              | Daniel Orris.....           | Bedel 1 months do.....   | 26 67   |         |          |         |
|              | W. P. Newton.....           | Messenger to Senate, 12 months do.....   | 200 00  |         |          |         |
|              | Alexander Brown.....        | Attendant in Library, 1 months do.....   | 13 33   |         |          |         |
|              | Larratt W. Smith, D.C.L.    | Ex-Registrar and Secretary to convocation, unsettled claim for compensation, for services rendered as above, and now paid by order of the Senate.... | 36 00   |         |          |         |
|              |                             | Salaries—University College.   |         | 3026 00 |          | 3026 00 |
|              | Rev. J. McCaul, L.L.D.....  | President and Professor of Classical Literature 12 mos. Salary.....  | 4000 00 |         |          |         |
|              | Rev. James Beaven, D.D..... | Professor of Metaphysics, do....   | 2600 00 |         |          |         |
|              | H. H. Croft, D.C.L.....     | do do Chemistry do....   | 2600 00 |         |          |         |
|              | J. E. Cherriman, M.A.....   | do do Natural Philosophy, do.....  | 2200 00 |         |          |         |
|              | Daniel Wilson, L.L.D.....   | do do History and English Literature, do.....  | 2200 00 |         |          |         |
|              | Rev. W. Hincks, F.L.S.....  | do do Natural History do....   | 2200 00 |         |          |         |
|              | E. J. Chapman.....          | do do Geology do.....  | 2200 00 |         |          |         |
|              | James Fornori, L.L.D.....   | do do Modern Languages, do.....  | 2200 00 |         |          |         |
|              | Geo. Buckland.....          | do do Agriculture, do....  | 1200 00 |         |          |         |
|              | do do.....                  | Dean of Residence, 3 mos. do..   | 200 00  |         |          |         |

| RECEIPTS. | \$ cts. | Date. | EXPENDITURE.               |  | \$ cts. | \$ cts.  | \$ cts.  | University. | University College. |
|-----------|---------|-------|----------------------------|--|---------|----------|----------|-------------|---------------------|
|           |         |       | To whom paid.              | Service.   |         |          |          |             |                     |
|           |         |       |                            | <i>Salaries.—Univ'ly Coll.—Con.</i>  |         |          |          |             |                     |
|           |         |       | Geo. F. Kingston, M.A.     | Professor of Meteorology, 12 months do.  | 680 00  |          |          |             |                     |
|           |         |       | J. M. Hirschfelder         | Lecturer on Oriental Languages, do.  | 1200 00 |          |          |             |                     |
|           |         |       | Revd. A. Wickson, M.A.     | Classical Tutor and Registrar University College, do.  | 1000 00 |          |          |             |                     |
|           |         |       | Daniel Orris               | Steward, two month's salary  | 83 34   | 21180 00 |          |             | 21180 00            |
|           |         |       | Widow of the late D. Orris | Allowance paid to her by order in Council, (being his salary for six months as Betel and Steward) in consideration of his long and faithful services | 330 00  |          |          |             |                     |
|           |         |       | Mrs. A. E. Orris           | Housekeeper, four month's salary at \$8, \$32, one month's board \$20  | 52 00   |          |          |             |                     |
|           |         |       | Thomas C. Joy              | Bedel, (acting) 3 month's and 19 days salary, at \$320 per annum, \$96 65.   | 96 65   |          |          |             |                     |
|           |         |       | Mrs. T. C. Joy             | Cook, three month's salary   | 18 00   |          |          |             |                     |
|           |         |       | Thomas C. Joy              | Board for himself and wife 3 weeks and 11 days.  | 12 50   |          |          |             |                     |
|           |         |       | Frank Somers               | Gatekeeper, per 3 month's and 19 days salary, \$43 60; board 3 weeks and 11 days, \$11 43  | 55 03   |          |          |             |                     |
|           |         |       | James Coady                | Servant, twelve months salary  | 425 00  |          |          |             |                     |
|           |         |       | Christopher Drew           | Do do do do  | 425 00  |          |          |             |                     |
|           |         |       | James Patterson            | Do do do do  | 425 00  |          |          |             |                     |
|           |         |       | Doodes King                | Do do do do  | 425 00  |          |          |             |                     |
|           |         |       | Thomas Nelson              | Do do do do  | 350 00  |          |          |             |                     |
|           |         |       | Peter Miller               | Do do do do  | 350 00  |          |          |             |                     |
|           |         |       | Robert Keown               | Woodcutler and Labourer  | 350 00  | 3397 52  | 30903 52 |             | 3397 52             |

|  |  | Examiners.               |                  | Scholarships.  |         |
|--|--|--------------------------|------------------|----------------|---------|
|  |  | Seeker Brough            | .....            | One Instalment | 40 00   |
|  |  | Adam Crooks, M. A.       | .....            | do do          | 40 00   |
|  |  | Dr. Bethune              | .....            | do do          | 40 00   |
|  |  | Dr. Richardson           | .....            | do do          | 40 00   |
|  |  | Dr. Gwynne               | .....            | do do          | 40 00   |
|  |  | Dr. Reynolds             | .....            | do do          | 40 00   |
|  |  | Revd. Dr. McGill, L.L.D. | .....            | do do          | 40 00   |
|  |  | Wm. Wedd, M. A.          | .....            | do do          | 40 00   |
|  |  | J. B. Cherriman, M. A.   | .....            | do do          | 40 00   |
|  |  | Revd. Mr. Senkler        | .....            | do do          | 40 00   |
|  |  | Daniel Wilson L.L.D.     | .....            | do do          | 40 00   |
|  |  | G. R. Cockburn, M.A.     | .....            | do do          | 40 00   |
|  |  | James Forneri, L.L.D.    | .....            | do do          | 40 00   |
|  |  | Henry Hancke             | .....            | do do          | 40 00   |
|  |  | H. H. Croft, D.C.L.      | .....            | do do          | 40 00   |
|  |  | E. J. Chapman            | .....            | do do          | 40 00   |
|  |  | Revd. Wm. Hincks, F.L.S. | .....            | do do          | 40 00   |
|  |  | William Craigie, M.D.    | .....            | do do          | 40 00   |
|  |  | Revd. James Bevan, D.D.  | .....            | do do          | 40 00   |
|  |  | Revd. S. S. Nelles       | .....            | do do          | 40 00   |
|  |  | Revd. Dr. Taylor         | .....            | do do          | 40 00   |
|  |  | J. M. Hirschfelder       | .....            | do do          | 40 00   |
|  |  | W. Reeve                 | .....            | do do          | 40 00   |
|  |  | J. B. Ross               | .....            | do do          | 40 00   |
|  |  | J. Fisher                | .....            | do do          | 40 00   |
|  |  | J. Munro Gibson          | .....            | do do          | 40 00   |
|  |  | D. B. McCool             | .....            | do do          | 40 00   |
|  |  | N. McNish                | .....            | do do          | 40 00   |
|  |  | T. W. Wright             | .....            | do do          | 40 00   |
|  |  | A. M. Lafferty           | .....            | do do          | 40 00   |
|  |  | E. Frisby                | .....            | do do          | 40 00   |
|  |  | J. D. Ledyard            | .....            | do do          | 40 00   |
|  |  | W. Thompson              | .....            | do do          | 40 00   |
|  |  | G. Kilpatrick            | .....            | do do          | 40 00   |
|  |  | M. Gavilar               | .....            | do do          | 40 00   |
|  |  | E. C. Forneri            | .....            | do do          | 40 00   |
|  |  | D. Thorburn              | .....            | do do          | 40 00   |
|  |  | A. P. Millor             | .....            | do do          | 40 00   |
|  |  |                          | Two of \$40 each |                | 600 00  |
|  |  |                          |                  |                |         |
|  |  |                          |                  | 1760 00        | 1760 00 |







| RECEIPTS. |      | EXPENDITURE. |                         | \$   | cts. | \$   | cts. | \$   | cts. | University | College,    |
|-----------|------|--------------|-------------------------|--|------|------|------|------|------|------------|-------------|
| \$        | cts. | Date.        | To Whom Paid.           | Service.   | \$   | cts. | \$   | cts. | \$   | cts.       | University. |
|           |      |              |                         | <i>Incidental Expenses.—Cont.</i>                                  |      |      |      |      |      |            |             |
|           |      | Feb'y. 14.   | The Registrar           | Postage and Disbursements  | 45   | 92   |      |      |      |            |             |
|           |      | July 5.      | do                      | do   | 10   | 44   |      |      |      |            |             |
|           |      | July 27.     | do                      | do   | 10   | 00   |      |      |      |            |             |
|           |      | Sep. 30.     | J. Ellis                | Parchment, Engraving, &c.  | 66   | 36   |      |      |      |            | 66 36       |
|           |      | Jan'y. 7.    | John Scott & Co         | Brooms   | 78   | 95   |      |      |      |            | 78 95       |
|           |      | Nov. 30.     | Post Office             | One Year's Postage University                                      | 3    | 00   |      |      |      |            | 3 00        |
|           |      | Jan. 12.     | Armstrong, Himo & Beere | Collego  | 84   | 60   |      |      |      |            | 84 00       |
|           |      |              | do                      | One hundred Photographs of University buildings, and mounting same | 17   | 00   |      |      |      |            | 17 00       |
|           |      |              | do                      | Photographs of distinguished Graduates                             | 24   | 00   |      |      |      |            | 24 00       |
|           |      | July 26.     | Canadian Naturalist     | Subscription thereto   | 41   | 60   |      |      |      |            | 41 60       |
|           |      | Jan'y. 18.   | Peter Miller            | Sharpening Saws  | 3    | 00   |      |      |      |            | 3 00        |
|           |      | June 27.     | do                      | do   | 4    | 00   |      |      |      |            | 4 00        |
|           |      | Jan'y. 18.   | Daniel Orris            | Cleaning buildings   | 3    | 50   |      |      |      |            | 3 50        |
|           |      | July 1.      | Mrs. McDonald           | do   | 00   | 75   |      |      |      |            | 00 75       |
|           |      | Octr. 4.     | T. C. Joy               | do   | 23   | 25   |      |      |      |            | 23 25       |
|           |      | April 9.     | C. Drew                 | Washing Towels   | 9    | 00   |      |      |      |            | 9 00        |
|           |      | April 27.    | Thomas Nelson           | do   | 3    | 50   |      |      |      |            | 3 50        |
|           |      | Jan'y. 19.   | H. G. Booth             | Repairing Gasometer  | 12   | 50   |      |      |      |            | 12 50       |
|           |      | May 6.       | J. Hudson               | Sweeping Flues   | 00   | 75   |      |      |      |            | 00 75       |
|           |      | Dec. 23.     | Mrs. Fitzpatrick        | Usual allowance by Resolution of Senate                            | 2    | 00   |      |      |      |            | 2 00        |
|           |      | May 27.      | Thomas Upton            | Office File  | 96   | 00   |      |      |      |            | 96 00       |
|           |      |              |                         |  | 9    | 00   |      |      |      |            | 9 00        |

|                          |                          |   |       |       |    |  |  |  |  |  |        |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|-------|-------|----|--|--|--|--|--|--------|
| May, 27.                 | J. W. Miller             | Repairing Clock   | 4     | 12    |    |  |  |  |  |  | 4 12   |
| Jan., 29.                | A. F. Potter             | do Instruments  | 2     | 00    |    |  |  |  |  |  | 2 00   |
| Sep., 1.                 | John Morris              | Obtaining specimens of Marble                                 | 5     | 00    |    |  |  |  |  |  | 5 00   |
| June, 3.                 | do                       | Clearing Convocation Hall                                     | 26    | 00    |    |  |  |  |  |  | 26 00  |
| Dec., 10.                | do                       | Preparations for Convocation                                  | 50    | 00    |    |  |  |  |  |  | 50 00  |
|                          | do                       | Paid for Ringing Bell   | 2     | 50    |    |  |  |  |  |  | 2 50   |
| Feb., 5.                 | Prof. Croft              | Do. for Lamp  | 83    | 50    |    |  |  |  |  |  | 83 50  |
| do 10.                   | Fulton Michie & Co.      | Candles   | 1     | 50    |    |  |  |  |  |  | 1 50   |
| May, 31.                 | J. Jackson               | do  | 11    | 25    |    |  |  |  |  |  | 11 25  |
| June, 10.                | M. Keating               | Eastward  | 13    | 25    |    |  |  |  |  |  | 13 25  |
| Aug., 10.                | Thomas Wheeler           | Services at Convocation                                       | 8     | 75    |    |  |  |  |  |  | 8 75   |
| Nov., 11.                | do                       | Engraving and Stamping Eny.                                   | 10    | 00    |    |  |  |  |  |  | 10 00  |
|                          | do                       | Parchment, Diplomas, &c.                                      | 8     | 75    |    |  |  |  |  |  | 8 75   |
|                          | do                       | Buildings for Insurance Comp.                                 | 59    | 25    |    |  |  |  |  |  | 59 25  |
| Sep., 13.                | Cab hire Inspecting      |   | 68    | 00    |    |  |  |  |  |  | 68 00  |
| Nov., 18.                | Rev. Dr. McCaul, L.L.D.  | For City Disbursements  | 200   | 00    |    |  |  |  |  |  | 200 00 |
| Dec., 31.                | David Alderice           | do his attendance on the Senate                               | 50    | 00    |    |  |  |  |  |  | 50 00  |
| Nov., 1.                 | S. McFadyen              | Night Watchman  | 35    | 00    |    |  |  |  |  |  | 35 00  |
| do 10.                   | Depart. Pub. Instruction | Crayons, &c.  | 3     | 75    |    |  |  |  |  |  | 3 75   |
| Dec., 19.                | James Dinour             | Removing Library  | 13    | 50    |    |  |  |  |  |  | 13 50  |
| do 31.                   | Alan Cameron             | Fees on taking affd. for the year                             | 8     | 80    |    |  |  |  |  |  | 8 80   |
| do do.                   | Colonial Bank Bills      | \$4.00 and a spurious Gold Dollar in the hands of the Cashier | 5     | 00    |    |  |  |  |  |  | 5 00   |
| Balance 31st Dec. 1850   |                          |   | 19007 | 17    |    |  |  |  |  |  |        |
|                          |                          |   | 73060 | 48    |    |  |  |  |  |  |        |
| Balance, 31st Dec., 1850 |                          |   | \$    | 1313  | 54 |  |  |  |  |  |        |
|                          |                          |   |       | 73060 | 48 |  |  |  |  |  |        |
|                          |                          |   |       | 14338 | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |        |
|                          |                          |   |       | 37193 | 53 |  |  |  |  |  |        |

\$ 19007 17

BURSAR'S OFFICE,  
Toronto 31st December, 1859.

JOHN LANGTON,  
Auditor.

DAVID BUCHAN,  
Bursar.

No. 3.—UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.—The Bursar's Statement of Receipts and Appropriation of "Monies in Deposit" for the Year ended 31st December, 1859.

| RECEIPTS.                           | \$ cts.    | APPROPRIATION.                             | \$ cts.    |
|-------------------------------------|------------|--|------------|
| To Balance 31st December, 1858..... | 3024 30    | By Amount returned to Miles McMillan ..... | 113 00     |
| To Amount received in Deposit.....  | 1014 88    | do do placed to account.....               | 288 00     |
|                                     |            | do Balance 31st December, 1858 .....       | 3638 18    |
|                                     | \$ 4039 18 |  | \$ 4039 18 |
| Balance 31st December, 1859.....    | 3638 18    |  |            |

JOHN LANGTON,  
*Auditor,*

DAVID BUCHAN,  
*Bursar.*

BURSAR'S OFFICE,  
Toronto, 31st December, 1859.



(No. 4 Continued.)

| RECEIPTS. |  | EXPENDITURE.    |                               |  | \$ cts.            | \$ cts. | \$ cts.   | \$ cts. |
|-----------|--|-----------------|-------------------------------|--|--------------------|---------|-----------|---------|
|           |  | Date.           | To whom paid.                 | Service.                               |                    |         |           |         |
|           |  | Jan. 31...      | J. Beckett & Co.....          | <i>Incidental Expenses.</i>            |                    |         |           |         |
|           |  | Sept. 30...     | do .....                      |  | Chemicals, &c..... | 5 61    |           |         |
|           |  | Jan. Feby. 4... | Wyllie & Murray.....          | Linen.....                             | 5 59               |         |           |         |
|           |  | 1...            | Linton & Bros.....            | Brooms.....                            | 1 22               | 11 20   |           |         |
|           |  |                 | do .....                      | do .....                               | 2 40               | 00 60   |           |         |
|           |  | Feby. 14...     | Colonist .....                | Advertising .....                      |                    | 3 62    |           |         |
|           |  | April 19...     | T. Fredale & Co.....          | Freezing Apparatus.....                |                    | 3 15    |           |         |
|           |  | 20...           | H. Piper & Bros .....         | Sundry Tinsmiths work.....             |                    | 8 00    |           |         |
|           |  | April 3...      | A. K. Hooper .....            | Two Bench Screws.....                  |                    | 8 44    |           |         |
|           |  | July 8...       | J. C. Thompson.....           | Candles, Oil, &c.....                  | 68 39              | 3 00    |           |         |
|           |  | Decr. 28...     | do .....                      | do .....                               | 121 75             |         |           |         |
|           |  | Oct. 26...      | R. Kennedy.....               | Ladder.....                            |                    | 103 34  |           |         |
|           |  |                 | Toronto Times.....            | Advertising .....                      |                    | 39 84   |           |         |
|           |  | Nov. 21...      | W. Briscoe .....              | Wheel Barrows.....                     |                    | 2 00    |           |         |
|           |  | Decr. 23...     | J. R. Armstrong & Co.....     | Grates .....                           |                    | 5 00    |           |         |
|           |  |                 | J. W. Drummond.....           | Lumber .....                           | 10 22              | 32 00   |           |         |
|           |  | Dec. 23...      | do .....                      | do .....                               | 13 77              |         |           |         |
|           |  | Dec. 29...      | D. G. Carnegie .....          | Repairing Timepiece.....               |                    | 23 90   |           |         |
|           |  | Aug. 8...       | Ridout Bros & Co .....        | Hardware.....                          |                    | 6 00    |           |         |
|           |  |                 | G. F. Kingston, Director..... | Sundry small accounts paid by him..... |                    | 9 94    |           |         |
|           |  |                 |                               |  |                    | 136 04  |           |         |
|           |  |                 |                               | Balance 31st Dec., 1858.....           |                    |         | 486 10    |         |
|           |  |                 |                               |  |                    |         | \$4452 54 |         |
|           |  |                 |                               |  |                    |         | 408 98    |         |
|           |  |                 |                               |  |                    |         | \$4861 52 |         |

Balance 31st Dec., 1859 ..... \$408 98

BURSAR'S OFFICE, Toronto, 31st December, 1859.

JOHN LANGTON,  
Auditor.

DAVID BUCHAN, Bursar.

No. 5.—UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.—The Bursar's Statement of Receipts and Expenditure, on account of the "Museum Appropriation," for the year ending, 31st December, 1859.

| RECEIPTS.   | \$ cts. | Date.      | EXPENDITURE.             |                                      | \$ cts. | \$ cts. | \$ cts.   |
|---|---------|------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------|---------|-----------|
|   |         |            | To whom Paid.            | Service.                             |         |         |           |
| To Balance, 31st December, 1858.                            | 3790 36 | Feb'y. 7   | W. Pamphlin.....         | Specimens Natural History.....       |         |         | 17 88     |
| To Amount charged to Grounds,<br>(see Account No. 8.) ..... | 189 69  | Feb'y. 27  | S. Herring.....          | do                                   |         |         | 66 00     |
|   |         | Jany. 5    | Mrs. M. A. Couper.....   | do                                   |         |         | 3 00      |
|   |         | May 7      | Professor Croft.....     | Sundries.....                        |         |         | 13 77     |
|   |         | June 13    | T. Upton.....            | Carriage of Specimens.....           |         |         | 25 57     |
|   |         | March 21   | St. George Scarlett..... | Specimens of Native Gold.....        |         |         | 65 00     |
|   |         | July 4     | Alex Hamilton.....       | Glass.....                           |         |         | 6 62      |
|   |         | October 6  | Professor Hincks.....    | Charges on Specimens.....            |         | 13 60   |           |
|   |         |            | do                       | Specimens.....                       |         | 4 50    |           |
|   |         | Sep. 30    | E. Hooper & Co.....      | Gum Shellac.....                     |         |         | 18 10     |
|   |         | October 10 | S. W. Fasmore.....       | Specimens Natural History.....       |         |         | 00 17     |
|   |         | October 10 | Patrick Freeland.....    | Microscope (Nat. Philosophy Depart.) |         |         | 23 00     |
|   |         |            |                          | Balance 31st December, 1859.....     |         |         | 181 00    |
|   | 3980 05 |            |                          |                                      |         |         | 430 11    |
|   |         |            |                          |                                      |         |         | 3549 94   |
| Balance, 31st December, 1859.....\$                         | 3649 94 |            |                          |                                      |         |         | \$3980 05 |

DAVID BUCHAN,  
*Bursar.*

JOHN LANGTON,  
*Auditor.*

BURSAR'S OFFICE,  
Toronto, 31st December, 1859.





No. 7.—(Continued.)

| RECEIPTS. | \$ | cts. | Date.      | EXPENDITURE.              |  | \$      | cts.    | \$      | cts.     |
|-----------|----|------|------------|---------------------------|--|---------|---------|---------|----------|
|           |    |      |            | To whom paid.             | Service.   |         |         |         |          |
|           |    |      |            |                           |  |         |         |         |          |
|           |    |      | July 11... | Thomson, Keith & Co ..... | Account, Steam Heating apparatus .....                 | 2097 10 |         |         |          |
|           |    |      | do 29...   | do .....                  | do .....   | 2040 00 |         |         |          |
|           |    |      | Sept. 1... | do .....                  | do .....   | 2040 00 | 6197 10 |         |          |
|           |    |      | Oct. 4...  | do .....                  | do .....   | 2040 00 |         |         |          |
|           |    |      | Nov. 16... | do .....                  | do .....   | 1000 00 |         | 3040 00 |          |
|           |    |      | Sept. 5... | Henry Rowsell .....       | Printing, Stationery, &c.....                          |         |         |         | 9217 10  |
|           |    |      | Oct. 27... | W. H. Pim.....            | Fittings in Kitchen and Dining Hall,<br>Fence, &c..... |         |         |         | 41 50    |
|           |    |      |            |                           |  |         |         |         | 600 00   |
|           |    |      |            |                           |  |         |         |         | 71961 41 |

DAVID BUCHAN, *Bursar.*

BURSAR'S OFFICE,  
Toronto, 31st December, 1859.

JOHN LANGTON, *Auditor.*

No. 8.—UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.—The Bursar's Statement of Receipts and Expenditure on Account of "the Grounds Appropriation," for the Year ended 31st December, 1859.

| R E C E I P T S.  |           | EXPENDITURE.  |                           | \$  | cts.    | \$ | cts. | \$      | cts.      |
|---|-----------|---------------|---------------------------|---|---------|----|------|---------|-----------|
| To Amount received from Professor Buckland, being amount received by him for pasturage of cows on University grounds. |           | To whom Paid. | Service.                  |   |         |    |      |         |           |
|   | \$        | Date.         |                           |   |         |    |      |         |           |
|   | cts.      |               |                           |   |         |    |      |         |           |
|   | 71 20     | Feb. 14.....  | John Goodall.....         | Stone and gravel.....   | 100 00  |    |      | 100 00  |           |
|   |           | March 10..... | Do.....                   | Do.....   | 100 00  |    |      | 100 00  |           |
|   |           | April 12..... | Do.....                   | Do.....   | 345 60  |    |      | 345 60  |           |
|   |           | June 6.....   | Do.....                   | Do.....   | 228 27  |    |      | 228 27  |           |
|   |           | Oct.....      | Do.....                   | Do.....   | 186 00  |    |      | 186 00  |           |
|   |           | " 11.....     | Do.....                   | Do.....   | 229 00  |    |      | 229 00  |           |
|   |           | Feb. 18.....  | Prof. Buckland.....       | Account Labor on grounds, &c.....   | 363 02  |    |      | 363 02  | 1188 87   |
|   |           | April 11..... | Do.....                   | Do.....   | 100 00  |    |      | 100 00  |           |
|   |           | Feb. 19.....  | James Fleming.....        | Trees.....  | 83 40   |    |      | 83 40   | 463 02    |
|   |           | Aug. 18.....  | Do.....                   | Do.....   | 107 85  |    |      | 107 85  |           |
|   |           | May. 25.....  | W. Briscoe.....           | Repairing roller.....   | 191 25  |    |      | 191 25  |           |
|   |           | ".....        | Rice Lewis & Son.....     | Rakes, &c.....  | 22 83   |    |      | 22 83   |           |
|   |           | July 11.....  | Fleming & Schreiber.....  | Repairing Plans.....  | 28 58   |    |      | 28 58   |           |
|   |           | Sept. 12..... | Worthington Bros.....     | Drainage.....   | 139 00  |    |      | 139 00  |           |
|   |           | Dec. 9.....   | Do.....                   | Drain, Tiles, Lumber, &c.....   | 342 50  |    |      | 342 50  |           |
|   |           | ".....        | Do.....                   | Do.....   | 117 10  |    |      | 117 10  |           |
|   |           | Oct. 4.....   | Jacques & Hay.....        | Fences, &c.....   | 459 60  |    |      | 459 60  |           |
|   |           | June 30.....  | Michael Smith.....        | Cattle founded in error.....  | 82 56   |    |      | 82 56   |           |
|   |           | Sept. 30..... | Edwin Taylor.....         | Acct labor during quarter on'd this date.....   | 7 00    |    |      | 7 00    |           |
|   |           | Dec. 31.....  | Do.....                   | Do.....   | 1160 00 |    |      | 1160 00 |           |
|   |           |               | Do.....                   | Do.....   | 1350 00 |    |      | 1350 00 |           |
|   |           |               | Museum Appropriation..... | (Account No. 5) credited this amount which formed part of a sum of £500 Sterling, given to Prof. Croft 17 June 1858, with which to make purchases in England, and which was charged to Museum Appropriation, while this amount was expended by him on account Grounds for Handles, extrinuts, and carriages from Liverpool..... | 945 00  |    |      | 945 00  | 3565 00   |
| " Balance carried to Income Fund, Account No. 2.....  | \$        |               |                           |   |         |    |      |         |           |
|   | cts.      |               |                           |   |         |    |      |         |           |
|   | 6256 20   |               |                           |   |         |    |      |         | 189 09    |
|   | \$6327 40 |               |                           |   |         |    |      |         | \$6327 40 |

BURSAR'S OFFICE,  
Toronto, 31st December, 1859.

JOHN LANGTON,  
Auditor.

DAVID BUCHAN,  
Bursar.

No. 9.—UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.—The Bursar's Statement of Receipts and Expenditure on account of "The Appropriation Fund," for the year ended 31st December, 1859.

| RECEIPTS.  | EXPENDITURE. |      |
|--|--------------|------|
|  | \$           | cts. |
| To Balance of amount appropriated by resolution of Senaté for the improvement of Port Hope and Port Stanley Properties ..... | 2287         | 81   |
|  | \$ 2287      | 81   |
| Balance, 31st December, 1859.....\$2287 81   |              |      |

BURSAR'S OFFICE, Toronto, 31st December, 1859.

JOHN LANGTON, Auditor.

DAVID BUCHAN, Bursar.

No. 10.—UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.—The Bursar's Statement of Receipts and Expenditure on account of "The Surplus Income Fund" for the year 1859.

| RECEIPTS.   | EXPENDITURE. |      |
|---|--------------|------|
|   | \$           | cts. |
| To Balance, 31st December, 1858.....                    | 21691        | 95   |
| To Amount of Loan returned by Upper Canada College..... | 6000         | 00   |
|   | \$ 27691     | 95   |
| Balance, 31st December, 1858.....\$27591 95             |              |      |

BURSAR'S OFFICE, Toronto, 31st December, 1859.

JOHN LANGTON, Auditor.

DAVID BUCHAN, Bursar.

No. 11.—UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO—The Bursar's Statement of Receipts and Expenditure on account of the "Museum Fittings Appropriation," for the year 1859.

| R E C E I P T S.   | \$ cts. | Date.         | E X P E N D I T U R E. |                            | \$ cts. | \$ cts. | \$ cts. |
|--|---------|---------------|------------------------|----------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
|  |         |               | To whom Paid.          | Service.                   |         |         |         |
| To amount appropriated by Resolution of Senate for Museum Fittings—from the Appropriation of \$80,000 made by Order in Council, from Permanent Fund "for the purposes of a Library and Museum" | 3800 00 | May 17.....   | Jaques & Hay .....     | On account of Contract...  | .....   | .....   | 170 00  |
|  |         | June 10.....  | do .....               | do .....                   | .....   | .....   | 550 00  |
|  |         | July 8.....   | do .....               | do .....                   | .....   | .....   | 650 00  |
|  |         | Sept. 14..... | do .....               | do .....                   | .....   | .....   | 900 00  |
|  |         | Aug. 3.....   | do .....               | do .....                   | .....   | .....   | 1000 00 |
|  |         |               |                        | Balance, 31st Dec., 1859.. | .....   | \$      | 3270 00 |
|  | \$      |               |                        |                            |         |         | 530 00  |
|  | 3800 00 |               |                        |                            |         |         | 3800 00 |

Balance, 31st December, 1859.....\$ 530 00

JOHN LANGTON,  
*Auditor.*

DAVID BUCHAN,  
*Bursar.*

BURSAR'S OFFICE,  
Toronto, 31st December, 1859.

No. 12.—UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.—The Bursar's Statement of Receipts and Expenditure on account of "The Director's Residence Appropriation," for the year 1859.

| Receipts.  | \$ cts.    | Date.   | EXPENDITURE.   |  | \$ cts.   | \$ cts. | \$ cts. |
|--|------------|---|--|--|---|---------|---------|
|  |            |   | To whom Paid.  | Service.   |   |         |         |
| To amount appropriated from the Income Fund (account No. 2.) by Resolution of Senate for building a Residence for the Director of the Observatory..... | 4340 00    | April 15...<br>May 27...<br>Sept. 12...<br>April 28...<br>June 10...<br>August 10...<br>Sept. 13...<br>" "<br>Sept. 20... | Thomas Sharr...<br>Do<br>Do<br>Geo. Carroll...<br>Do<br>Do<br>Do<br>Do<br>Cumberland & Storm...<br>George Carroll...<br>F. French..... | Account of contract...<br>Do<br>Do<br>Account of contract...<br>Do<br>Do<br>Do<br>Do<br>Services as Architects...<br>Chain Pump...<br>Carpenters' work.....<br>Balance, 31st December, 1859..... | 600 00<br>600 00<br>699 04<br>724 00<br>620 00<br>423 45<br>354 68<br>2122 13<br>201 00<br>16 00<br>10 00<br>4248 17<br>91 83 | 1899 04 |         |
|  | \$ 4340 00 |   |  |  |   | 4340 00 |         |

Balance, 31 December, 1859, \$91 83.

BURSAR'S OFFICE,  
Toronto, 31 December, 1859.

JOHN LANGTON,  
Auditor.

DAVID BUCHAN,  
Bursar.