

This was the first attempt that had been made to interfere with the province of the national University, and he thought that the Government should not support it. Were he the leader of the Government this day he would declare that he was hostile to this first assault upon our national education. He would declare such a Bill to be against the good of the people, and were his supporters to go against him he would resign. The usefulness of our national University would by these means be impaired, and it might as well be swept away. Its endowment would have to be divided among denominational colleges. As an adherent of the Church of England he thought that this Bill was as good as it could be. He did not disregard the provision made for the carrying on the University. The hon. member for South Simcoe did not attach much importance to the power of conferring degrees. True, the Bill itself was evidence enough of the importance attached to this power by the applicants for the powers. The concentration of degree-conferring power in Toronto would produce a wholesome rivalry among denominational colleges for these degrees. He did not attach much importance to the \$100,000 capital. Smaller denominations might not have the requisite wealth to give such a guarantee as this, but was that any reason why they should be denied the power of conferring degrees? This Bill, if such powers were to be granted, was as good as could be desired, but with the safeguards so called was just as insidious as without them in destroying our national education.

Mr. WIDDIFIELD would be prepared to support any Minister who would mature a scheme to secure the surrender of the powers held by the denominational colleges, but he could not, under the existing circumstances, oppose the present Bill.

Mr. DAWSON could not help thinking that the University of Toronto was something of a monopoly. He did not see that the value of Toronto degrees would be depreciated by the granting of the power to London. He resented the sneer of an hon. member on the Scotch Universities. He would support the Bill.

Mr. GRAHAM approved the conduct of the Government in leaving this question open, and would give this Bill his most hearty support.

Mr. HARKIN was surprised that the Government had no policy upon this question, and were satisfied to drift with the tide. He regarded this Bill as the thin edge of a wedge that was calculated to destroy our national University. He complained of the evil of denominational degrees, and said that no man having the interests of education at heart would sanction the further spread of the evil. He had waited for a declaration of policy from the hon. the Minister of Education on this point, whether or not they were inclined to do away with the degree conferring power held by these sectarian colleges. He supported the idea of having an examining board. Those who had more interest in promoting national education than in accommodating hon. gentlemen desiring this power, would vote against the Bill. If they went on increasing denominational colleges, the House would soon be controlled by them, and the result for education would be that instead of having a degree respected at home and abroad, they would have degrees respected nowhere. Therefore he supported the amendment.

Mr. LAUDER said that since the granting of powers to Albert College there had been no movement to disendow University College; indeed, since then the feeling against the latter college had almost died away. If a University degree were so valuable people would go to the University for it, and if a degree from another college served equally well, those desiring it would go for it.

Mr. GIBSON said that when the University College had been established the idea of the country at any rate was, that they had done with denominational colleges. Because others had this evil power, it was no reason why they should help to perpetuate it. He did not see how a college was going to be maintained on \$100,000. It should have been four times that amount. He did not see how men of learn-

ing were going to be got for the interest on that money. He would be willing to give a money consideration to get these denominational colleges to surrender their powers. The hon. member for London said that 700,000 people were wanting this University, but he (the speaker) failed to see any evidence of this. He was sorry to go against the Minister of Education on this matter, but he as well as that Minister was all for a higher education. Most likely Knox College would apply for powers next year if this were granted. The next thing coming up would be the question of endowing these denominational colleges.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex) said that while in favour of a national university, he was against any invidious distinction being made by refusing this body the powers applied for when there were six other bodies enjoying this privilege. The better time when all degree conferring power would be concentrated in one body was a long time coming, and he was prepared to support the Bill as there was no sign of any such consummation being arrived at. The money capital and number of professors mentioned were not finite, and both might be increased. He approved of the liberal terms of the Bill, so would support the Bill.

Mr. MOWAT confessed that he had considerable difficulty in arriving at a conclusion on this question. The Government had been taunted by the Opposition with having no policy in regard to it; but they should remember that the Opposition had no policy in regard to it either. (Hear, hear.) Four of their leaders had spoken on the subject, two being in favour of, and two against, the Bill. The question was undoubtedly one of great difficulty, and he did not wonder that all parties were divided on it. On the present occasion it so happened that he would vote along with the hon. member for South Simcoe, but for reasons entirely different from those of that gentleman. The hon. member was very hostile to the idea of a great national university, but, so far from having any such feeling, his colleagues and himself were strongly attached to that institution. They regarded the University of Toronto as the pride of the educational system of this country, from which the country had derived great advantages, and every year added to its value to the people of this Province. The Minister of Education was a graduate of that University, and no measure which could have the effect of lessening its influence for good would be supported by him. They would all like to have only one degree-granting body; but no one suggested that there should be only one teaching body—that there should be no local colleges. They were all convinced that these were desirable. Looking at the present Bill, they could not exclude from their minds the fact that there were now several local colleges in the country. If the Government were prepared to say that they had some practical scheme by which the university powers of all these colleges should be taken away, the matter would occupy an entirely different position from what it did now. But when they had no such scheme to which they could hope to receive the sanction of the House, the question arose, could they in justice, after having granted university powers to several colleges in the east, refuse these same powers to this university in the west? In view of these facts, he had not considered it right to oppose the present Bill. He could not accept the statement that this institution would injure University College. It would be of considerable educational value to the western part of the Province—(hear, hear.)—and no appreciable harm, he believed, would result to University College from it. If any such scheme as he had hinted became matured, they would find, he thought, that this institution would agree to it. (Cheers.)

[CONTINUED ON THE FOURTH PAGE.]