

sideration. It was contrary to the previous legislation of the Province. Referring to the University of Toronto, he said that he thought it was a noble idea of the honoured Robert Baldwin that he took away from one denomination the endowment and applied it for the general education of the people. The step taken in 1853, when the University acquired further and distinct functions, was a great advance. It was to be regretted that colleges did not recognize the broad basis on which the University was founded. The principle or policy upon which the University of Toronto had been founded, or on which it was desirable that it should be maintained, was on its trial in this Bill. He thought that if the learned and opulent body applying for university powers would cast in their lot with the University, it might induce other bodies to affiliate themselves with the University, and tend to promote the purpose for which the University was established. He thought that the intention of the hon. the Minister of Education would not be fulfilled by his proposed amendment. He himself would not be inclined to question the manner in which the proposed university would be conducted. He imagined that the House would grant him, in the event of this Bill passing, like privileges were he to ask them for, say, the Baptist College at Woodstock. Of course it was to the interest of denominations to have their own universities, but their higher interests would be served by maintaining such a university as that of Toronto. He therefore moved, seconded by the hon. member for Stormont, "That the order be discharged, and that the Bill be referred back to Committee of the Whole House, with instructions to amend the same by striking out 'university powers' in the preamble and in the first section and the whole of the seventh and eighth sections; and by striking out 'university' in the title of the Bill and substituting 'college.'"

Mr. BETHUNE was astonished that the Government did not oppose this Bill. The University of Toronto was a main feature in the national system of education, and already the Church of England had a University College in the Province. Where was this matter to stop? Was it to stop only when the value of the university degree was destroyed? He sympathised with the persons applying for the powers of the Bill, but he could not consent to the sacrifice of the most vital part of our education. Would anyone say that there was any comparison in the value of Albert College degrees and University of Toronto degrees, though the curriculum was equally high? The Presbyterians would never have asked for university powers for Queen's College had there been a Provincial University. He asked the House to look at Trinity College and say if it had been a success. He would prefer to see the University of Toronto taken to London than give every town in the Province such powers. He would rather consent to have the Examining Board go to London and confer the degrees there, but one thing he must and would maintain as necessary—that the value of degrees be kept up here. In the provision of the Bill that the standard should be as high in London as in Toronto he saw only a reason that the examining should be undertaken by the same body. He was anxious that Queen's and other Colleges should give up their charters, and that students from all parts should come and stand upon the same ground in competing for degrees. If there were any religious tests there might be a reason for trying to accommodate the body applying for these powers. He considered that by the university powers of these isolated colleges being surrendered, the value of degrees would be raised and the colleges themselves benefitted. If these powers were granted, the difficulty would be made insuperable of taking away these separate powers and concentrating the granting of degrees in one university.

Mr. CLARKE (Norfolk) was convinced that there should be but one standard of university education, which should be concentrated in the grand national university. If one denomination had university powers why should not all denominations have them? He deprecated the depreciatory remarks of the preceding speaker in reference to the Albert College. As a solution

of the university difficulty he suggested the establishment of a Committee analogous to the Central Education Committee, which should have the sole power of holding examinations in the Province.

Mr. BARR felt that with the amendments proposed by the Minister of Education the necessary safeguard was provided, and that the House could on just grounds proceed to confer the powers asked in the Bill. As there was no prospect of the university powers being taken from the other colleges, he could see no object in withholding the powers sought for by the west.

Mr. MACDOUGALL (Simcoe) remembered the early struggles in connection with the establishment of our Provincial University system, and he believed the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Bethune) had entirely misconceived the intentions of the Reformers of those days. King's College was then under the control of the English Church, and was regarded by the people as a monopoly; and he had a vivid recollection, as a young Reformer, of assisting to destroy that monopoly; but in doing that the Reformers had no intention of creating another monopoly. The hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. Sinclair) imagined that he was defending Reform principles in advocating this system of University exclusiveness. He (Mr. Macdougall) repudiated, on behalf of the honest Reformers of the country, any such idea. (Laughter.) What were hon. members objecting to? Simply the right of the people to spend their own money. It was said that the degrees of the smaller universities were inferior. What of that?—the people were satisfied with them. The existence of different denominations in this country excited, he contended, the benevolence and liberality of the people adhering to them, and the tendency of the people in Canada to thus separate into different denominations was not to be despised. The University of Toronto was merely an examining body; it did not provide any academical instruction, and he could not see what returns the Senate made for the expenditure the people were called upon to make for that institution.

Mr. HODGINS denied the representations of the feelings of the early Reformers, as made by the hon. member for South Simcoe. The contest of the early Reformers in the matter of University education was a contest of the people against a monopoly of a Church. (Hear, hear.) Just as we had decided that in our Public and High School systems there should be no sectarian feelings, but that the people should conduct them as they pleased, so also should our University system be. It was founded on the same basis, governed by the same principles, and conducted by the same rules as our school system, and it was the duty of the House to maintain the non-denominational character of our educational system. (Hear, hear.) Were we going to destroy our non-denominational university system—the pride, the glory, and the boast of this country—by giving sectarian institutions the power to confer degrees, and to give an official status to those who would become High School teachers or who would present themselves for examination before the Law Society or other professional bodies? This question was to a great extent one of public policy, and he regretted that the Government had not considered it their duty to have a policy on the subject similar to that which they had with regard to our Public School system. He knew the large sympathy, the liberal feeling, and the high character of the distinguished prelate who was specially interesting himself in this institution; but, though his sympathies in regard to Church matters went with that distinguished prelate, he was bound to do his duty to the public in giving his influence in favour of the maintenance of our national system of education in its present efficiency. He therefore intended voting for the amendment of the hon. member for North Bruce.

Mr. CAMERON said that he must support the amendment proposed, as it tended to support the national University. While Reform principles did not much matter to him, he would in this matter rather support the Reformers of the present day than the Reformers of the by-gone time who sat beside him. (Loud cheers and laughter.)