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ABSTRACT


by

George Terence Smith


The central purpose of this thesis is to recount the historical movement towards a federated provincial university in Ontario from the perspectives of the three Christian denominations whose university colleges federated with the provincial university under the Federation Act of 1887 to constitute what is today the University of Toronto. The history of higher education in nineteenth century Ontario is, in essence, the history of a number of denominational colleges which would, or would not, seek to federate or affiliate with the government-supported provincial university to form what today we would refer to as a system of provincial higher education. All of these denominational colleges were founded in isolation from the provincial university, and were founded in order to provide a suitable environment for the higher education of the students of their particular
Christian denominations. Three of these Colleges—Victoria, St. Michael's, and Trinity, representing the Methodist, Roman Catholic, and Anglican denominations, respectively—eventually federated with the provincial university in Toronto. The history of these three denominational colleges, and the history of the provincial university in Toronto, is the concern of this thesis.

The methodology employed in the thesis is relatively consistent in chapters two through six—the main body of the thesis. In general—chapter six is an exception—each chapter contains four thematic headings: the religious and social background that is necessary to situate the particular institution in question (King's College—the precursor to the University of Toronto, Victoria College, St. Michael's College, Trinity College) in its proper context; the founding of the particular institution; the period in each institution's early history when it operated in isolation from other colleges, and from the ideas of federation or affiliation; and the role that each institution played in the "University Question."

In chapter six, after examining the influences that were external to higher education in Ontario, but which contributed to the movement towards federation, we return to the three colleges to trace their progress, and eventual acceptance of the terms of the 1887 Federation Act, by which they all federated with the University of Toronto. Chapter six concludes the thesis, with special reference to the University Act of 1906, by which the federation was to be enshrined at the University of Toronto.
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CHAPTER ONE

FEDERATION AND FULLNESS: AN INTRODUCTION

Do you remember when we used to read those books on Psychology and Psychiatry and how we used to talk about split personalities...Well, think of this big university as a sick personality called George: Pious George goes to St. Michael's, Laughing Cynical George goes to University College, Complacent and Comfortable George goes to Trinity, Evangelical George goes to Victoria, and Dumb Practical George goes to the School of Practical Science; and not all the scientists in the medical school can ever put George together so that he can come into the sunlight as one real personality.¹

These are the words of student Arthur Tyndall, the creation of Morley Callaghan in his novel, The Varsity Story. In this excerpt from the novel, Tyndall is writing to his fiance after being a freshman at the University of Toronto for only a few weeks. By the end of the novel, with Tyndall firmly established at the University after a career of over twenty years—the last years as Warden of Hart House—he speaks of the same subject: "I'm still convinced that the separate colleges, the different schools, are there making some kind of pattern," says Tyndall. He continues:

It's there like a giant crystal...I'll go on thinking the different colleges and the different kinds of learning are all facets of the one crystal. I could only see one facet at a time, but I think each facet is an aspect of the truth, and those separate facets can glisten and shine and perhaps, if you are poets or philosophers, give you a

The development in characterization that is at the heart of Callaghan's novel, and that is revealed by the character Tyndall, is really a development in his perception of the University. At first sight, the University of Toronto appeared to Tyndall as a collection of disparate and diverging entities trying hopelessly to form some sort of united and common institution. Years later, when the student had matured into an adult, when the learner had become the teacher, the same University appeared as a complex and mysterious "crystal"—unified and integrated—with each constituent element contributing indispensably to the whole.

The evolution of perception that is revealed by Tyndall parallels the historical development that this thesis captures in its account of the early history of the University of Toronto. The objective of this thesis is to trace the historical development that occurred at the University of Toronto in its early years, from the perspective of the three denominational colleges that eventually federated with the University to form the nucleus of what is today the federated University of Toronto. The thesis focuses on the challenges and obstacles that the three colleges—Victoria, Trinity, and St. Michael's—faced as the centres of higher learning for three different Christian denominations, and therefore for three different philosophical traditions, and for three different theological traditions, and for the three different political traditions..., and so on. At the centre of this history is the "University Question." And while others have examined the

\[2 \text{ Ibid., p.171.}\]
University Question from the political perspective, this thesis will look at the University Question through the eyes of those whose responsibility it was to determine the future of their colleges for the welfare of their particular denominations.

This is not to say that this is the first examination of the University Question from a religious, rather than a political, perspective. In fact, such an examination has been undertaken by a leading historian of religion in Canada: Professor John Moir. In a seminal book in the field, Moir identifies "two antithetical tendencies" at the centre of the University Question. One such tendency is termed by Moir "centrifugal denominationalism," and can be seen in the Anglican attempt to assert their established status as the church of those whose task in Upper Canada was to govern. The other tendency he terms "centripetal nationalism," which can be seen in the Methodist determination to place all denominations outside the political arena, and to assert the equality of all Christian religious denominations under the law. Moir's exposition of this thesis—the conflict between centrifugal denominationalism and centripetal nationalism—provides the historian with the fundamental background that is necessary to understand the religious history of the University Question; yet, at

---


the same time, it does not detail this history from the context of the colleges themselves. That is the special concern of this thesis. This thesis accepts Moir's important contribution as its foundation, but it explores the conflict between centrifugal denominationalism and centripetal nationalism from inside the colleges themselves, as opposed to outside, which is Moir's approach, and which is the approach employed by the later, but no less important work of A. B. McKillop: Matters of Mind: The University in Ontario, 1791-1951.

McKillop has successfully undertaken a massive project: a scholarly and perceptive study of the establishment and growth of the university in Ontario from its modest beginning to the eve of the massive expansion of higher education in the 1950s and 1960s. And he accepts as a premise of his work Moir's thesis that while the universities and colleges of nineteenth century Ontario were founded for different reasons and according to different circumstances, they were all founded in the midst of powerful denominational forces that were at times in conflict with one another. He also accepts the premise, well established by Moir, that all university and college founders in nineteenth century Ontario saw as their purpose the preservation of a social order that had been transplanted from Britain. Because of the breadth of McKillop's study, he cannot permit himself the

---


4 This premise certainly captures the mindset of Methodist, Presbyterian, and Anglican university founders, and the institutions they founded. It falters though, when it is applied to the founding of Roman Catholic colleges in Ontario. The purpose of the French founders of St. Michael's College was to establish and conduct an institution offering Roman Catholics higher education, and thereby to enable poor Irish immigrants to transcend their limited social and economic situation. There was no notion of participating in the strengthening of the Empire, as there certainly was, for instance, at Trinity College in the second half of
leisure of a close examination of each of the denominational colleges that led to the University of Toronto Federation Act in 1887, a University that holds, according to McKillop, "...a special place in the universe of separate existence but collective understanding." That is the specific concern of this work: through an examination of the founding of Victoria, St. Michael's, and Trinity, and through a study of the ethos that was particular to each of these institutions in light of their respective Methodist, Roman Catholic, and Anglican heritage, this thesis will show how each college approached the road to federation, and how each travelled down it, pausing at times to consider getting off, only to be renewed in its determination to continue the journey. Excellent historical studies are available of each of these Christian denominations in nineteenth century Ontario, but there is yet to be undertaken any integrated study of the three denominations as their colleges moved towards participation in a federated provincial university: this is the contribution of this study.

There are three areas of historical research which pertain to the subject of the movement of the three denominational colleges towards federation with the University of Toronto. The first is the body of research that might be called "thematic studies of the University Question." Moir and McKillop, as well as the dissertations listed above, have made the most important contributions to this area.

---

7 McKillop, Matters of Mind, p.xix.
The second area is that of institutional histories of colleges and universities. Only three years ago, Canadian historian Douglas Owram wrote in a bibliographical study of Canadian history, "Surprisingly, there is no study of the University of Toronto as yet." So began a very brief—three pages—summary of the state of historical publications in the area of Canadian institutional history, or what Owram calls "The University World." Owram also states that, until fairly recently, histories of Canadian universities tended to be "fairly superficial chronicles of the 'highlights' of an institution." The same argument is made by Paul Axelrod and John G. Reid in the preface of their edited book of essays on the Social History of Higher Education. They write that educational history has for too long been "the domain of boosters and builders, preoccupied with administrative evolution and antiquarian detail." While this thesis is not a history of the University of Toronto, it does attempt to present, for the first time, an account of one very important facet of that University's history: the religious and political background to the University's federated form of university.

---


9 Ibid.


11 Serious historians have been daunted by the prospects of beginning a history of the University of Toronto; no doubt because of the enormous task that would be involved by attempting such a history of what is now a sprawling University. There is evidence to suggest that consideration was given to a comprehensive history: in the University of Toronto Archives, there are several boxes of documents and notes compiled by University of Toronto historian Gerald Craig; these suggest that he was, before his death, considering undertaking a history of the University. This is confirmed by Educational Historian Dr. Willard Brehaut, until his retirement Professor in the History and Philosophy Department of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, who recalls discussing this possible history with Dr. Craig.
polity. To situate this thesis within this second body of historical literature—institutional histories relating to the University of Toronto—is not an extensive task.

The limited portion of Canadian educational research that comes under the heading of institutional histories of English-speaking universities is a body of research that straddles both mainstream history and the history of education. It is also a body of research that covers a vast period of time in terms of Canadian history: from W. J. Alexander's edited history of The University of Toronto and its Colleges, published in 1906, to Stanley B. Frost's two-volume history of McGill University published in the early 1980's. And within this body of research is to be found a vast range of quality—from forgotten antiquarian accounts of Canadian universities which are celebrationist in tone and apologetic in theme; to erudite, insightful studies that deepen the reader's understanding of the dominant issues and themes in Canadian intellectual and social history. One might expect that the University of Toronto, because of its pre-eminent position as one of the country's leading research-intensive universities, would have

---


produced a body of research relating to its own history that would be exemplary. It has not. This obvious absence of a comprehensive and distinguished institutional history of the University of Toronto is mollified only by the existence of one book that is indirectly, but profoundly, related to its history: C. B. Sissons' history of Victoria University. Sissons' history is simply one of the finest Canadian institutional histories ever undertaken.

As stated above, the University of Toronto possesses no contemporary or comprehensive institutional history. There were early attempts, when the size and complexity of the University made such an undertaking realistic. The only two attempts were completed before 1922. The first was the above mentioned contributed history entitled *The University of Toronto and its Colleges*, published

---


16 To make such an assertion requires the acceptance of a set of criteria by which to evaluate an institutional history. I would propose five criteria by which to evaluate such institutional histories. The first criterion is authorship. The diversity of sources employed, the way they are used to convey useful information, accurate bibliographical and archival information about such sources—these are the calling cards of scholars trained in historical methodology. Who wrote a particular university history, the discipline in which that person was trained, and their relationship to the university in question, are all important issues according to this first criterion. The second criterion refers to context and asks the question, "To what extent does this institutional history situate the university in the context of the social, cultural, religious, and political life of the society of which it is a part"? The third criterion pertains to the sources used by the author to construct his or her historical account. University histories which do not include complete and thorough references, extensive bibliographies, or annotated notes on sources are inadequate in that they make it impossible for other researchers to develop and build upon the work that has already been undertaken. A fourth criterion is how well a particular institutional history deals with the topic of students and student life, an element of social history often neglected in this field. The fifth and final criterion concerns curriculum. If institutional histories are to contribute to the wider field of Canadian intellectual history, then scholars must give evidence that they have undertaken considerable research in the area of curriculum development. And this research must go beyond the mere listing of courses as they appear in college calendars. In nineteenth century Ontario most institutions of higher learning were denominational colleges focusing on liberal arts courses and theology. How the curriculum of these colleges developed as they grew, the evolution of science education, and the growth in professional and graduate programs, are all issues that a good university history should examine in depth. Sissons' study of Victoria University fulfils these five criteria with considerable distinction when compared to other Canadian institutional histories.
in 1906. This is, despite its age and the varying quality of its chapter contents, an invaluable work. Not so much for its narrative history,17 but rather for its invaluable appendices, which the casual historian can only access elsewhere by visiting the archives of either the Province or the University of Toronto. The most important appendix item is the "Report of the Commission on the University of Toronto," undertaken in 1906.18 The rest of the chapters, especially those on the affiliated and denominational colleges, are of little use to any contemporary historian. The second institutional history is William Wallace's, History of the University of Toronto, completed in 1922. Despite its age, this is an important, if incomplete, resource.

The only other institutional history that pertains to the specific theme of this thesis is T. A. Reed's History of Trinity College. This was a centennial history that is less than enlightening, except for the extensive lists of alumni, or "old boys" who defined so much of that College's early history. But it is of very limited use as an historical resource. St. Michael's College has no institutional history, a project that will likely be undertaken for its one hundred and fiftieth anniversary in 2002. In the meantime, its only partly classified archives is the only resource for historians of the nineteenth century.

17 The most important chapters of this work, on the early history of King's College and its heir, the University of Toronto as it existed under the successive legislative acts of the late 1840's and early 1850's, are reproduced elsewhere, and in a more refined version in a long submission of Burwash to the Royal Society of Canada. See Nathanael Burwash, "A Review of the Founding and Development of the University of Toronto as a Provincial Institution, in Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada, Section II, Vol. II, 1905, pp.37-94.

The third area of historical research that pertains to this thesis is, of course, the history of religion. Within this area, the most important body of work is undoubtedly the series entitled "McGill-Queen's Studies in the History of Religion." The twenty volumes that have been produced in this invaluable series include no less than six volumes which deal with some particular aspect of this thesis.19 Also of importance are the individual studies of Methodism, Roman Catholicism, and Anglicanism in nineteenth century Ontario, and which are noted in the individual chapters.

Within these three areas of historical research—thematic studies of the University Question, institutional histories, and the history of religion in Ontario—are to be found the elements of the history of the movement towards federation from the perspective of the denominational colleges. This thesis brings together these elements into an unique whole. Just as the federated University of Toronto was, in 1887, to bring together in federation a number of colleges each of which could not accomplish alone what they could accomplish together, so this thesis brings together the three areas of historical research listed above to tell a story that is incomplete if one is missing. An institutional history of a nineteenth

---

century college in Ontario that does not include an account of the theological foundations of the denomination which founded the college (and none of them does), is inadequate. Studies in the history of religion in nineteenth century Ontario which focus exclusively on one denomination, while leaving unexamined the encounters between various denominations (and most do) are equally inadequate. The chapters below will provide institutional histories of three colleges in their early years, situated in their respective theological contexts, and will also trace the encounters between Methodist, Roman Catholic, and Anglican denominations in one of the most interesting arenas of nineteenth century Ontario history: the University of Toronto.

"Federation and Fullness": the title implies something that is very important in this study, and needs to be examined briefly in this introduction. University federation is a distinctly Canadian creation. There is nothing like it in the United States. The closest approach is to be found in the universities of Oxford and Cambridge with their constituent colleges, though the parallel is not very close; nor were these the historical exemplars. In Ontario, ideas that originated in different British universities, including the University of London, took shape under the pressure of local necessities to produce federation as it now exists at the University of Toronto. The essential attribute of university federation is a co-ordination of colleges, each preserving its own freedom and character, within and under the limitations set by the University. These limits are in the main the standards required for the degree of Bachelor of Arts which, for the
fifty years following the 1887 Federation Act, were determined by the University Faculty of Arts and the Senate. The object of the college in federation is to preserve within the University a community which will perpetuate the definite ideals of the denomination to which it belongs.²⁰ Coming from the community of his own college, the undergraduate in Arts receives instruction, along with those from other colleges, in the university subjects such as history, economics, and the sciences, for which expensive library and laboratory equipment is required. He shares in the larger life of the University, his interests are broadened, his sympathies enlarged, but the most important element in his education may be the spirit which he receives in his own college—his most intimate academic home. In this respect the federated colleges of the University of Toronto fulfil a similar function to those of Oxford and Cambridge, in that they are the hearths of the humanities and the chief sources of literary interest; while the University, with its modern facilities, is the centre of scientific inspiration and the foster-parent of research. In this integrated educational environment is to be found the "fullness" of the undergraduate experience.

But it is important to emphasize the unique character and contribution of Canadian university federation, which allows for the partnership between a secular, government-supported institution and denominational colleges. Such cooperation would have been impossible in the United States. True, during the first half of the nineteenth century, virtually all American higher education was

²⁰ As will be seen below, the exception to this rule is University College, where the ideals are those of a college founded to be non-denominational.
operated by Christian denominations. The Presidents of most colleges, including the predecessors of many of the great universities like Yale, Princeton, Michigan, and Illinois, were Protestant clergymen. Like the colleges and universities that emerged after the Civil War, most of them still had compulsory chapel. Even Harvard did not drop compulsory chapel until 1886. During the same era, John D. Rockefeller contributed many of his millions to create a great Baptist university, the University of Chicago. Yale at the time was a centre for the integration of advanced scholarship and evangelical piety, and Princeton University always had clergymen as president until 1902. But the response of American higher education to the advancement and proliferation of the sciences in the second half of the nineteenth century was entirely different from the responses of Canadian higher education. Instead of relegating the sciences to the responsibility of the government-supported university, while allowing the denominational colleges to continue teaching in the Arts, as was the case in Ontario, the American response was the complete secularization of the University. A Kantian distinction between the realm of faith and the realm of science was imposed upon the academy, and all the disciplines came under its influence. The professionalization of the disciplines was associated with separating them from explicitly religious considerations. The churches, whether Catholic or Protestant, were invited to disinvest themselves of their role in higher education. Their influence thereafter was confined to a few "religious" institutions, where the German university model for advanced study, which was adopted by the
As stated above, the central purpose of this thesis is to approach the historical movement toward a federated provincial university in Ontario from the perspectives of the three Christian denominations whose university colleges federated with the provincial university to constitute what is today the University of Toronto. The methodology employed is relatively consistent in chapters two through six—the main body of the thesis. In general—chapter six is an exception—each chapter contains four thematic headings: the religious and social background that is necessary to situate the particular institution in question (King's College—the precursor to the University of Toronto, Victoria College, St. Michael's College, Trinity College) in its proper context; the founding of the particular institution; the period in each institution's early history when it operated in isolation from other colleges, and from the ideas of federation or affiliation; and the role that

---


22 The distinction between these two terms—federation and affiliation—will be important in the following pages. In the context of the University of Toronto, the federation of a college or an university with the University of Toronto implies the acceptance by the college or university of certain terms: that it would hold its degree-granting powers, except the power to grant degrees in theology, in abeyance; that its undergraduate students would study towards degrees that would be granted by the University of Toronto; that certain courses towards these degrees would be taught by the college at its expense, and other courses would be taught by the University of Toronto at no cost to the college; and that the University of Toronto would grant a seat or seats on its Senate to representatives of the federating college or university. Affiliation, on the other hand, implied a formal relationship between the college and the University, but did not imply acceptance of the foregoing terms; the terms of affiliation were discussed in terms of the unique needs and situation of a college that was seeking affiliation. For instance, the terms that were accepted by St. Michael's College and Knox College, upon their affiliation with the University of Toronto in 1881 and 1885, respectively, were quite different. In present day terms, there are three universities that are "federated" with
each institution played in the "University Question." In chapter six, after examining the influences that were external to higher education in Ontario, but which contributed to the movement towards federation, we return to the three colleges to trace their progress, and eventual acceptance of the terms of the 1887 Federation Act, by which they all federated with the University of Toronto.

Chapter six concludes the thesis, with special reference to the University Act of 1906, by which the federation was to be enshrined at the University of Toronto.

A short note about chapter two, which sets the stage for the examination of the individual perspectives of the three denominations. Its immediate objective is to approach the historical development of the University of Toronto not from any particular perspective, but rather from above—from a bird's-eye view. This involves situating the deliberations, negotiations, and communications which surrounded the University's early history in their proper contexts; it entails the objective identification of the social, religious, and political milieux in which the University's history was played out. The founding of King's College is then detailed, once again paralleling the structure of the chapters which follow.

Classes at King's College began in 1843, and so this date marks the transition to the next stage of the chapter, when the movement that would lead to serious legislative attempts to create and endow a truly provincial university had its
origins. The passing of Robert Baldwin's University Bill in 1850, which gave birth to the constitutional structure of the University of Toronto as we know it today, serves as the beginning of the next major period or stage of the University's development, and this section covers the period until the termination of the legislative grants to the denominational colleges in 1868. That latter event offers itself as an obvious point of departure, and so it will mark the end of Chapter Two. For it was the termination of government grants which forced the denominational colleges to turn in upon themselves, to examine the possibility of their respective futures, to see what they could be, and, more importantly, what they could never be, unless they moved towards federation.
CHAPTER TWO


Religious and Social Background.

Growth in population and economic advance were the two most important factors that allowed Upper Canada to move beyond the simple pioneer society which marked the first generation of its history. During the decade of Sir Peregrine Maitland's administration as Lieutenant-Governor (1818-1828), a colonial infrastructure was established that exploited Upper Canada's superb natural resources, and employed the talents of a nucleus of skilled, hard-working settlers. Essential works of public improvement, especially canals and roads, were planned and pushed forward. And, for the first time, banking facilities were provided that allowed for more diversified economic activity.

Directing and promoting this growth was a group of like-minded men known as the "Family Compact." While not necessarily related to one another,

these men shared a common vision: that the pioneer North American community was and must remain an integral part of the far-reaching British Empire.³ The members of the Compact were the leading members of the administration: executive councillors, senior officials, and certain members of the judiciary. Some of them were of the second generation of Loyalist families; others were men, or sons of men, who had come out from Great Britain, usually before the end of the eighteenth century. Among this latter group was the Reverend John Strachan. A leading protagonist in any account of Upper Canada's political, religious, and educational history, Strachan was named, in 1815, an honourary member of the province's Executive Council, a regular member in 1817, and a member of the Legislative Council in 1820.⁴

Members of the Family Compact were committed to more than just a common sense of British nationality, albeit an overseas version of nationality. They also held an open contempt for the rising tide of democracy, especially rampant south of their border. Their understanding of a balanced constitution involved a triumvirate of governmental bodies: the personal representative of the Crown—the Lieutenant-Governor; his appointed executive—the Legislative Council, whose members were to sit for life; and a representative element—the

---


³ See Robert E. Sanders, "What was the Family Compact?", Ontario History, 49, (1957), pp.173-178.

⁴ G. W. Spragge, "Dr. Strachan's Motives for Becoming a Legislative Councillor," Canadian Historical Review, XIX, (1938), pp.397-402.
Legislative Assembly, whose elected members were to sit for a maximum of four years. Government did not derive its authority from the consent of the governed, but from the King, from history, and from religion. This shared conviction led to efforts by members of the Compact to ensure that the Church of England enjoyed the position and privileges of church establishment, and to give that Church a leading role in education, especially in the proposed provincial university.\(^5\)

Such efforts were met with considerable opposition. The Legislative Assembly, for example, as the democratic organ of the provincial government, attempted to represent the majority of the province's inhabitants who were not Anglican,\(^6\) and who felt that "the lands set apart in the Province, for the maintenance and support of a Protestant Clergy, ought not to be enjoyed by any one denomination of Protestants."\(^7\)

It is from this background of religious and political conflict that the

---


\(^6\) It is difficult to be precise about denominational demography in Upper Canada until 1842--the date of the first comprehensive census. At that time, out of a population of approximately 490,000, there were approximately 108,000 members of the Church of England; 78,000 of the Church of Scotland; 75,000 Methodists, 65,000 Roman Catholics; 66,000 of other Christian denominations; and 80,000 not known. See First Report of the Secretary of the Board of Registration and Statistics on the Census of the Canadas, for 1841-42, (Quebec: Printed by John Lovell, 1843), p.xxi. We can, though, be relatively certain that during the period in question--leading up to 1827--members of the Church of England only represented about one third of the total population of Upper Canada. This rough estimate is supported by an Ecclesiastical Chart prepared in 1828 by a Committee of the House of Assembly, which indicates the number of Methodist preachers to be 117, and the corresponding number of Episcopalian preachers to be 31. Cited in [John Macara], The Origin, History, and Management of the University of King's College, Toronto, (Toronto: Printed by George Brown, 1844), p.22.

history of the University of Toronto emerges. The issues that combined to lead to the complex political controversy known as the "University Question," or, as Egerton Ryerson was to label it, the "question of questions in Upper Canada," have their basis in one fundamental question that was at the heart of Upper Canadian politics during the 1820's: was the Church of England the established church of Upper Canada? The answer to this question had the potential to shape virtually every facet of provincial life, and would be especially relevant to the founding of a provincial university.

If the Church of England was to be regarded as the established church of the colony, then it would be naturally considered the mother church of any provincial university. Higher education would then be developed in a religious context, with prescriptive regulations governing the religious practices of administrators, faculty, and students. But if it was not deemed the established church, then it would be expected that provisions would be made for the establishment of other denominational institutions, or at least for the just and equal distribution of any endowment provided for a provincial university. It is an indication of John Strachan's commitment to justice that he would attempt to hold, in a sort of balanced tension, what were seen by many of his fellow

---

8 *Christian Guardian*, March 27, 1844.

churchmen to be two conflicting principles: that the Church of England was, indeed, the established church of Upper Canada, but that all denominations were to have equal access to any provincial university.

It is difficult to propose a definitive answer to the question of whether or not the Church of England was deemed to be the established church of Upper Canada. It is not illogical to contend, as many do, that the Constitutional Act of 1791, which provided for the proportion of one-seventh of the land as a reservation for the Protestant clergy, when referring to such "Protestant Clergy," referred only to the clergy of the Church of England—thus rendering the Church of England the sole established church of the province. But it can also be argued that endowments, or property, or even a share in the government of the province, do not necessarily imply establishment. A church is only established if its beliefs, doctrine, discipline, and forms of worship, have been established as the official ones of the state. And that was certainly not the case of the Church of England in Upper Canada.

Whether the Church of England was, or was not, the established church of Upper Canada did in no way deter its leading clergymen, as well as government leaders, from consistently regarding it as such. And no one advocated the need for an established church—resolutely supported by the state—more than John Strachan. To ensure that the Church of England was accepted as the established

---

10 For this traditional argument, see Wilson, The Clergy Reserves, pp. 14-17.

11 For this argument, see Young, "A Fallacy in Canadian History."
church required a strategy that would have to be carefully implemented. And for Strachan, the first principle of such a strategy was the church-controlled education of the youth, the effective administration of which would serve as the true foundation of Anglican establishment. It is likely that Strachan's unquestioning conviction that the church must be responsible for education, and that knowledge of the natural order can never be separated from the knowledge of God, was more the result of his Scottish heritage than anything else. In Scotland, Strachan had been trained in the tradition of John Knox, whose educational philosophy was theocentric, but at the same time much more democratic than the elitist educational system of eighteenth century England.\footnote{George W. Spragge, "John Strachan's Contribution to Education, 1800-1823," \textit{The Canadian Historical Review}, XXII, (June, 1941), pp.155-156.}

In the latter half of 1815, Strachan submitted to the House of Assembly an elaborate scheme for the establishment of an educational system in Upper Canada. Besides providing for primary and secondary education, Strachan's report called for the establishment of a "University where the arts and Sciences may be taught to the Youth of all denominations."\footnote{George W. Spragge, ed., \textit{The John Strachan Letter Book, 1812-1834}, (Toronto: Ontario Historical Society, 1946), Report on Education, Feb. 26, 1815, p.29.} What is most interesting, at this stage, about Strachan's proposed university, is that members of all denominations were to be allowed access. Strachan was not only concerned with the education of the sons of the wealthy and prominent members of the Family Compact. Moreover, this commitment to impose no religious tests upon any
student taking a degree must be seen in the light of the fact that Strachan, and other members of the Anglican establishment, regularly found themselves in open conflict with other denominations.

The Church of Scotland in Upper Canada, for instance, whose leadership made claims upon the Clergy Reserves, argued that the province had been acquired after the Act of Union of 1797, and therefore belonged not to England but to Great Britain, which had two religious establishments. In response to this claim, Law Officers of the Crown wrote, in November of 1819, to Lord Bathurst--British Secretary of State for War and the Colonies—that they were of the opinion that "the provisions...made for the support and maintenance of a Protestant clergy, are not confined to the clergy of the Church of England, but may be extended also to the clergy of the Church of Scotland, if there are any such settled in Canada." Strachan, of course, was bitterly opposed to any suggestion that the Church of England was not the sole proprietor of the Reserves. While willing to matriculate students of other Protestant denominations, Strachan was determined that this admission would be due to his generous and tolerant principles, not to any legitimate claim made by churches who opposed Anglican establishment.

The Methodists—second in numbers only to members of the Church of England—were also held under suspicion by the leadership of the Family

---

Compact, who saw in their growing numbers an increasing threat to their exclusive claim to the Clergy Reserves. To the clergy of the Church of England, the Methodist preachers were itinerant, uneducated, and brought with them from America the abhorrent notion that the state was purely secular, and should be without religious affiliation.

There were, then, a number of bases for the considerable antagonisms between the Church of England's Family Compact and the leadership of other Christian denominations. By and large, such feelings can be traced to a certain uncertainty which Strachan shared with other Anglican leaders about the legitimacy of their claim to hold all rights to the Clergy Reserves. And yet, in Strachan's Report on Education, there is every indication that he was committed to the principle that the provincial university (as well as primary and secondary schools) be a place of learning for all Christians, regardless of their denomination. While this university was to be governed and administered by the Church of England, it was to benefit all, rich and poor, Anglican and Methodist.\(^{15}\)

It was impossible for Strachan to see, during the 1820's, that his proposed university would be a wellspring of political and religious tension until the end of the century. With historical hindsight, though, it is quite impossible to view the evolution and development of the University of Toronto without seeing its early

\(^{15}\) A remarkably similar commitment was to be found, during these years, in England. In 1829, London University was founded to serve the needs of those who, because they were not members of the Church of England and wealthy, were unable to attend Oxford or Cambridge. London University, eventually to become the University of London, was to play a significant role in the evolving history of the University of Toronto, as will become clear in this chapter.
years as being rooted deeply in a number of political and religious conflicts. The just distribution of the Clergy Reserves, and the right of denominations other than the Church of England to govern and administer their own institutions of higher learning, are issues which must ground any understanding of the history of higher education in Ontario in the nineteenth century.

The Founding of King's College, 1827-1843.

There were a number of issues that were prominent during this early history of King's College, but none more so than the issue of whether the patrimony granted to King's belonged to one college controlled by a single denomination, or whether it was intended for a provincial institution free from any sectarian association. Virtually every aspect of the public debate that surrounded the founding of King's College was related to this issue.

In July, 1819, Strachan informed readers of his newspaper, the Christian Recorder, that his vision for a university in Upper Canada was based on the very liberal ideal that "...all denominations of Christians may be enabled, without any sacrifice of conscience or of feeling, to attend the prelections of the different Professors."16 In the years that followed, his efforts to found a university were delayed by two factors. The first was Lieutenant-Governor Maitland's insistence

that something be accomplished immediately for elementary education. The other factor was the determination of the British Government to start a college or a larger seminary at Montreal, and to appoint resident masters at Quebec and Kingston.\textsuperscript{17} As a result, from 1820 to 1826, very little of importance transpired regarding the projected university for Upper Canada. Remarkably, there is only scant mention of it in any of Strachan's correspondence during this period. But Lieutenant-Governor Maitland remained constant in his efforts to help Strachan open a university in Upper Canada. In the spring of 1826, Maitland sent Strachan to London to at least attempt to obtain a royal charter. Now the Archdeacon of York, Strachan carried with him a draft of the charter that he sought for his college.

Strachan's draft was a simple document and concerned only the fundamental elements of the proposed university's administration. The president, he suggested, should be an Anglican cleric, while the governing council would be composed of those professors who were members of the Church of England and who would subscribe to the Thirty-Nine Articles.\textsuperscript{18} This would not, technically, preclude the appointment of those who adhered to other denominations to faculty professorships as long as they did not serve on the governing council.


\textsuperscript{18} The Thirty-Nine Articles constitute a series of statements of Anglican belief. Originally proposed as Ten Articles by Henry VIII in 1536, they were later expanded to Forty-Two Articles by Archbishop Thomas Cranmer in 1553, and finally canonized as Thirty-Nine Articles by a Convocation of the Church of England in 1563. Wholehearted acceptance of the Thirty Nine Articles was demanded of every ordained cleric and, until 1871, of every graduate of Oxford and Cambridge.
Furthermore, and of most importance, Strachan's charter recommended that there be no religious tests for any of the university's students, except those studying for Anglican orders.

Strachan was received in England by Lord Bathurst, the Colonial Secretary, and Dr. Charles Manners-Sutton, the Archbishop of Canterbury. They found his proposals altogether too liberal for their conservative tastes. Remarkably, though, they were eventually to agree to Strachan's provisions, providing that Strachan, as Archdeacon of York, hold, *ex officio*, the presidency of the college.\(^\text{19}\) As Strachan was to state at the eventual opening of King's in 1843, the charter was not easily settled: "It was considered, not only the most open charter that had ever been granted, but the most liberal that could be framed on constitutional principles."\(^\text{20}\)

Altogether, the negotiations that led to the royal charter were to last from April, 1826, until March, 1827. The charter passed the Great Seal on March 22, 1827, and from this date the University of Toronto marks its foundation, although no classes would be held until 1843. In its final form, the charter stipulated that the Bishop of Quebec was to be the Visitor of the new university, the Archdeacon

\(^{19}\) Strachan was eventually to have the charter printed in London under the title *The Charter of the University of King's College at York in Upper Canada,* (London: Printed by R. Gilbert, 1827).

of York the President ex officio, and the Lieutenant-Governor its Chancellor.\textsuperscript{21} The College Council was to consist of these dignitaries, and seven professors, who "shall be members of the Established United Church of England and Ireland, and shall previously to their admission into the said College Council, severally sign and subscribe to the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion as declared and set forth in the Book of Common Prayer."\textsuperscript{22} Strachan also managed to secure in the charter a clause of religious toleration that was mindful of the diversity of creeds in the province, so that "...no religious test or qualification [would] be required of, or appointed for, any persons admitted or matriculated as scholars."\textsuperscript{23}

Strachan must have returned from England well satisfied with his achievement. Adequate and immediate financing had been arranged—the request made by Lieutenant-Governor Maitland in 1825 for the exchange of the original, unproductive, university lands for the now more valuable Crown Reserves, was granted when the charter was passed.\textsuperscript{24} The provisions of the royal charter envisaged expansion in all the intellectual disciplines, and the potential for the growth in value of the land grant was likely to render this financially feasible. And the liberality of the charter, exempting conformity to all religious tests for all

\begin{footnotes}
\item[21] The Charter of the University of King's College, pp.5-6.
\item[22] Ibid., p.9.
\item[23] Ibid., p.21.
\item[24] This involved an exchange of 450,000 acres of land that had been set aside for the provincial university, for 225,944 acres of Crown Reserves. See "Exchange of the Original University Lands for Crown Reserves, 1822-1827," in D.H.E., Vol. I, pp.203-205. Strachan also managed to negotiate an annual payment of 1,000 pounds to the university from the Canada Company.
\end{footnotes}
but members of the College Council and those studying for holy orders, would open the institution to citizens of the province of all Protestant denominations. At least that was Strachan's hope.

It seemed as if the University of King's College was born. In November, 1827, a College Council was appointed and began its work. In the spring of 1828, the Council purchased land for the University, the site on which the University of Toronto and the Ontario legislative buildings are now situated in Queen's Park. And yet, within a matter of months, King's College would be in grave danger.

Opposition to the proposed university was, from the beginning, both political and denominational, and was based on the exclusively Anglican tenor of the charter, despite its being the most liberal ever granted by the Crown. In this early controversy, the Methodists were the protagonists. Egerton Ryerson—who would eventually emerge as the leading architect and exponent of Ontario's public school system, as well as the first President of Victoria College—assumed the leadership of those opposed to King's by publishing in the Upper Canada Herald a series of letters that he had sent to Strachan concerning the charter. "Why, Ryerson asks Strachan,

> should the Church of England have the control of a University with an endowment of 1000 pounds per annum, for 16 years, and 225,944 acres of land in the Province, to the exclusion of all other denominations, who, our Provincial Parliament says, "are equally conscientious and deserving and equally loyal"?^25

For Ryerson, it was not a question of who would have access to the

---

University. It was a question of who would control the University. With a keen political sense that the charter of King's was both unpopular and unrealistic, the new Lieutenant-Governor, Sir John Colborne, acted swiftly in conveying information to Westminster. On January 17, 1829, the Speaker of the House of Assembly announced that Lieutenant-Governor Colborne had received confirmation from the Colonial Office that the King's College endowment had been withdrawn, and that the university was now, effectively, in abeyance.26

In this early demise of King's is to be found the beginnings, or at least the seeds, of the "University Question." Whatever their merits, Strachan's arrangements for King's College seemed too ostentatiously Anglican for the tastes of the popularly elected Legislative Assembly. Within that body, the controversy over the university broke forth with fury. In February, 1828, the Assembly struck a committee of enquiry into the affairs of King's College. The committee's objections were twofold, the first striking at the heart of Archdeacon Strachan's integrity.

The first objection concerned Strachan's publication, while he was in England, of two documents whose purpose was to support his procurement of both a royal charter and financial contributions from the upper class. The first document was his infamous "Table of the Religious State of Upper Canada as it Respects the Established Church." In order to support his claim for the need of an Anglican university in Upper Canada, Strachan produced a statistical chart

that was less than honest. In fact, he implied through his figures that adherents to
the Church of England were a majority in Upper Canada, and that its ministers
outnumbered those of any other denomination by at least half. This was
absolutely false, and Strachan knew it to be so.²⁷

The second document also compromised his more serious intentions for the
university. His pamphlet, "An Appeal to the Friends of Religion and Literature in
Behalf of the University of Upper Canada," was a blatant—and again less than
honest—attempt to secure financial contributions for King's College. Reasoning
that an Anglican college was more likely to attract support in England than one
open to all denominations, Strachan informed his readers that his proposed
university would "...be essentially a Missionary College, and will have to furnish a
greater number of candidates for Holy Orders than for any other profession."²⁸
Describing the university as a "Missionary College" was to imply that it was to be
something that Strachan never intended it to be, and suggested that it would be
more under the control of Anglican churchmen than Strachan's original
submission to the Colonial Office indicated. These documents do not reveal
Strachan at his best, and are stains upon an otherwise distinguished record. To be

²⁷ Compare Strachan's figures in "Table of the Religious State of Upper Canada as it Respects the Established
Church," in D.H.E., Vol. I, pp.218-221, with the apparently more honest and reliable "Abstract of Ecclesiastical
Chart prepared by the Committee of the House of Assembly," as cited in [John Macara], The Origin, History,
and Management of the University of King's College, Toronto, pp.22. Strachan claims there to be "20 to 30"
Methodist preachers in Upper Canada in 1827. The Committee of the Assembly counts 117 during the same
time.

²⁸ John Strachan, An Appeal to the Friends of Religion and Literature in Behalf of a University of Upper
sure, he did obtain his charter, but only at the price of provoking hostile criticism of King's from a wide variety of political and religious groups in Upper Canada.\textsuperscript{29} One can only wonder why Strachan was under the impression that his published submissions would not eventually find their way back to York and the rest of the province and be used by his political enemies.

The second objection, or set of objections, of the House of Assembly, went beyond Strachan's "apparent deceit," and concerned the King's College charter. The committee struck to examine the charter had, essentially, four objections. The sentiments underlying these objections, and the tone in which they were presented, are revealed in the following excerpt. King's College "should not," they wrote,

be a school of political or sectarian views. It should have about it no appearance of a spirit of partiality or exclusion. Its portals should be open to all, and upon none who enter should any influence be exerted to attach them to any particular creed or church...Most deeply, therefore, is it to be lamented that the principles of the charter are calculated to defeat its usefulness, and confine to a favoured few all its advantages.\textsuperscript{30}

In particular, the committee's objections to the charter may be summed up as follows: First, the charter made the Anglican bishop of the diocese the Visitor, thus placing in his hands the judicial control of the College. Second, the charter required that the Archdeacon of York be, \textit{ex officio}, President of the College.

Third, the charter placed the executive government of the University in the hands

\textsuperscript{29} For a sample of this criticism, see, The House of Assembly, \textit{Report of the Select Committee to which was referred the Petition of Bulkley Waters, and Others, entitled The Petition of Christians of all Denominations in Upper Canada; and other Petitions on the Same Subject; and the petition of E. W. Armstrong & Others}, Ordered, by the House of Assembly, to be Printed, March, 1828, (York, 1828), pp.3-5.

\textsuperscript{30} \textit{Ibid.}, pp.4-5.
of a Council, members of which were required to subscribe to the Thirty Nine Articles. And fourth, it restricted degrees in divinity to persons in holy orders in the Church of England, thus excluding not only the clergy of the Church of Scotland, but of other denominations as well.\textsuperscript{31}

The Committee of the Assembly had set themselves firmly against Strachan, and thereby initiated an agitation that would prove to be protracted and bitter. In addition to making a report, the Committee drafted an address to His Majesty, King George III, representing their concern "that the charter contains provisions which are calculated to render this institution subservient to the particular interests of the Church of England, and to exclude from its offices and honours all who do not belong to it," and praying that he would cause "the present charter to be cancelled, and one granted free from these objections."\textsuperscript{32}

The address, which was adopted by the Assembly on March 20, 1828, was forwarded to Lieutenant-Governor Maitland, to the King, and a Select Committee of the British House of Commons was appointed to inquire into the matter.

The House of Commons committee subsequently issued a report that revealed the growing awareness within the Whig Government of the fact that the

\textsuperscript{31} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{32} Ibid., p.5. It should be said that the Select Committee took pains to be as thorough as possible before submitting their address to the King. In all, they interviewed 52 witnesses, including Strachan, Ryerson, all members of the House of Assembly, and most of the Legislative Council. There was not much support for King's. When Dr. Dunlop, the respected Warden of the Canada Company, was asked whether Strachan's proposed University would be well received, he relied, "It is only better than no University at all; because, being an appendage of the Church of England, whose avowed object is proselytism, other denominations will look upon it with jealousy and distrust,...", Ibid., p.27.
great majority of Protestants in North American colonies were not members of
the Church of England, and their willingness to allow for the liberalization of
colonial universities so that all denominations would be provided with relatively
easy access. The parliamentary report recommended that the charter of King's
be changed; that two professors of theology be appointed, one of the Church of
England, and the other of the Church of Scotland; that no religious tests
whatsoever should be required of the President, professors, or others connected
with the College; and that professors, except those in theology, should be required
"to sign a declaration that as far as it is necessary to advert in their lectures to
religious subjects, they would distinctly recognize the truth of Christian
Revelation, but would abstain altogether from indicating particular doctrines." These recommendations might address satisfactorily the issue of exclusivity, by
abolishing restrictive oaths and opening the senior offices to non-Anglicans; but
they still did not address the important issue of control. Nothing in these
recommendations would assure the non-Anglicans of control over the university
or control over its public funds. Much work had yet to be done to ensure a just
policy with regard to the University.

The House of Commons report had come from a new government. Earlier
in 1828, the Tory party had been defeated in England, and the Whigs formed a

33 See Helen Taft Manning, "The Colonial Policy of the Whig Ministers, 1830-37," in The Canadian Historical

34 "Report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons relating to the Charter of King's College. 22
government that would be much more sympathetic towards the wishes of the House of Assembly, which it had come to realize was a fair index of public opinion in Upper Canada. King's College had now become a political issue, but it was not merely a conflict between the representative House of Assembly and the self-appointed leadership of the Family Compact who dominated the Legislative Council. It was also a conflict between Methodists and members of the Church of Scotland on the one hand, and Anglicans on the other; between denominations who considered themselves entitled, by virtue of their numbers, to the benefits of any institution supported by the sale of public lands, and another denomination who considered their church, like the Crown itself, to hold certain privileges, among them the right to administer any public institution, by virtue of Upper Canada's colonial relationship to the mother country where their Church exercised the exclusive rights of an Established Church.

When Sir John Colborne succeeded Sir Peregrine Maitland as Lieutenant-Governor in the fall of 1828, he received from Sir George Murray, the Colonial Secretary, a dispatch informing him of his government's desire that a new charter be proposed for King's.35 But Colborne did not, immediately, convey this message to either the Legislative Council or the House of Assembly—even when expressly asked to do so. Colborne's reticence no doubt was the result of his inclination to favour Strachan's position, but it was also due to his concern that local district schools had not yet produced a sufficient number of scholars for university

entrance, thus making it more profitable to open a grammar school at York that would increase future enrolment. This he did; Upper Canada College was opened in 1829 on the model of Elizabeth College, Guernsey, one of the Channel Islands—Colborne's last post as Governor General.36

The opening and operation of King's College was, at this stage, far from certain. But this did not deter Strachan either from establishing a College Council, or from selling university lands to purchase property in York on which buildings would be erected. In response to these bold initiatives, the House of Assembly, during the session of 1830, presented an address to the Lieutenant-Governor requesting that a statement of receipts and expenditures of King's College be laid before the House.37 An indignant College Council questioned the right of the Assembly to request such information, and replied with vague and inaccurate figures. In the same year the British House of Commons made a similar request, but in this case, too, a very general and incomplete return was made. While these exchanges were made under the pretence of financial accountability, they only thinly disguised the real issues: who was to control, and who was to attend, King's College.

The House of Assembly realized that it was inappropriate for the province to hold a royal charter for a university which, in three years, had failed to begin

36 In time, Upper Canada College was to attract as much criticism as King's College, and for the same reasons. Because of its extensive association with the Church of England, it led, at least indirectly, to the founding of the Upper Canada Academy by the Methodists, in 1830, at Cobourg, and to the founding of Queen's College, by the Church of Scotland, in 1842, at Kingston.

operating. They attempted to bring matters to a just solution by appointing a
Select Committee to inquire into the disposition of the original grant of lands for
educational purposes. Upon reception of the Committee's report early in 1831, the
House adopted resolutions for an address to His Majesty the King. It was
resolved,

That while this House fully appreciates His Majesty's gracious intention in granting a
Royal Charter for the establishment of a University in this province, we most humbly
beg leave to represent that, as the great Majority of His Majesty's subjects in this
province are not members of the Church of England, we regret that the University
charter contains provisions which are calculated to exclude from its principal offices
and honours all who do not belong to that Church...That, therefore,...His Majesty will
be graciously pleased to cause the charter of King's College to be cancelled, and to
grant another free from the objections to which our duty to the people of this
province has induced us to advert. 38

Within six months, the Colonial Secretary, Lord Goderich, responded on
behalf of the British government. He proposed a settlement of the university
problem: Upper Canada College would become a university with a provincial
constitution, and the Council of King's College would be required to surrender
their charter and the endowment of lands. 39 It is not difficult to imagine the
response of Strachan or his College Council. In a letter to one of his confidants,
he writes that he had "...told Sir John [Colborne] that [he] would perish on the
scaffold rather than give up the Reserves or the College Charter." 40

A statement of this nature might seem to imply a certain unreasonable


39 "Despatch from Lord Goderich in Regard to the Charter of King's College, 2 November, 1831," in D.H.E.,

intransigence, and might well lead the historian to conclude that Strachan was inclined toward a certain level of demagoguery—especially with regard to the Anglican claim on King's. But any critique of Strachan's educational policies that implies that he was committed to the creation of an entirely exclusive Anglican college must take into account certain factors. First, the charter obtained by Strachan for King's College in 1827 was remarkably liberal, considering the absolute proscription of all dissenters and Roman Catholics from higher education which then existed in England. And second, the changes that Strachan seemed to be consistently willing to make to the original charter are indisputable evidence of his conscious attempt to reduce clerical influence—particularly from Anglicans—that King's might better claim the widest possible support from the religiously heterogeneous population of the province.

The College Council quite simply refused to surrender either the charter or the endowment, as Lord Goderich had requested. This resulted in the rather ironic situation of a group of men, who posed as supremely loyal subjects of His Majesty, now refusing absolutely to comply with a request of the Imperial Government, even when pressed to do so by His Majesty's representative. Once again, Strachan's willingness to modify the charter for higher purposes was evident, and he convinced the Council to propose the following compromise to the Assembly: that the Court of King's Bench shall be the Visitor instead of the Bishop of Quebec; that the President of the College, upon any future vacancy, be any clergyman of the Church of England; that members of the Council need not
be members of the Church of England; and that the conditions governing degrees in divinity be controlled by the Council.\footnote{Proceedings of the King's College Council, 21 March, 1832, in D.H.E., Vol. III, p.34.}

The modifications did not render the charter acceptable to the Assembly, and so the antagonism continued. That the Methodist majority in the Assembly was unwilling to compromise on the university charter is not entirely surprising given the degree of ill-feeling for Strachan and Sir John Colborne. In a nasty exchange between Colborne and Egerton Ryerson, Lieutenant-Governor Colborne attributed Methodist opposition to King's to the fact that they had "...neither experience nor judgement to appreciate the values or advantages of a liberal education." In reply, Ryerson admitted the limited university experience of Methodist preachers, but reminded Colborne that "...no Ministry in the Province is more successful than that of the Methodists; nor are any congregations larger, or more numerous, or more intelligent."\footnote{Both quotations cited in C. B. Sissons, Egerton Ryerson: His Life and Letters, Vol. I, (Toronto: Clarke, Irwin & Company, 1937), p.146, and pp. 149-150, respectively. This claim—that Methodist clergy were less than well educated—was a fairly standard charge made by Anglicans during these years and led to considerable antagonism. The Presbyterian lawyer John Macara, in 1844, was to recall one of Dr. Strachan’s “slanderous effusions.” Strachan had preached at the Bishop of Quebec’s funeral, and had opined that Methodist clergymen were "...uneducated itinerant preachers, who,...betake themselves to preach the Gospel from idleness, or a zeal without knowledge, by which they are induced to teach what they do not know, and which, from their pride, they disdain to learn." See [Macara], The Origin, History, and Management of the University of King's College, p.14.}

In 1834, a general election was held in Upper Canada which resulted in the Reform Party, with a large majority, being returned to the House of Assembly. The first session of the new legislature was held in 1835 and, as might be expected, the Assembly passed a bill to amend the King's College charter.
Virtually every aspect of the university's government was to be placed under the control of the Assembly, and all religious tests were to be removed. Quite promptly, the Legislative Council rejected the bill, on the grounds that the University should be governed according to the principles of religion, and that such amendments to the charter would subject the University to political subterfuge.

From April, 1835, to November, 1836, political unrest made it impossible for the two branches of the legislature to work in harmony, and the legislative work of the provincial government came to a halt. The Assembly again passed the King's College Charter Amendment Bill, and again the Legislative Council rejected it. The new Lieutenant-Governor, Sir Francis Bond Head, dissolved the Assembly. In November of 1836, a newly elected Assembly referred the question of amending the King's charter to a Select Committee. A bill embodying the recommendations made in the report of this committee was passed early in 1837, and was sent up for the concurrence of the Legislative Council. The Legislative Council appointed its own committee, whose members prepared a long and thorough report clarifying the history of the whole question from the perspective of those who favoured a university under the firm control of the established Church. It also questioned the right of a provincial legislature to amend a royal charter. Notwithstanding, the upper house reluctantly consented to the Assembly's

---


adoption of the bill. "An Act to Amend the Charter of the University of King's College" received Royal Assent on March 4, 1837. The Act dealt with the four provisions that had been under contention for ten years and which would now require: that the Judge of the Court of King's Bench would be the Visitor instead of the Bishop of Quebec; that the President and his successors would be appointed by the Crown, without the requirement that he be a cleric; that the College Council would now consist of twelve members, as opposed to the original seven; and, that such Council members, or any other Faculty members, would no longer be required to subscribe to the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England.  

It appeared, at least at first hearing, that these new concessions signified a major victory for the House of Assembly, and for those who had fought to disassociate King's from the Church of England. Indeed, the Legislative Council's report, which Hodgins believes was written by Strachan himself, was framed so as to give members of the Assembly the impression that they were about to win a well-fought victory with the passing of the amendment. In effect, though, little was to change, and Strachan knew it. He still retained the Presidency; the members of the College Council would, in all likelihood, continue to be members of the Church of England; and the Anglican chair in divinity was retained. Dr. Strachan proved himself to be an accomplished politician, as well as a


It seemed that King's College was ready to be put into operation. Strachan developed a comprehensive scheme for courses of study and organization. And preparations were made for the erection of buildings and for the beginning of classes. But just at this point, in May of 1837, the Rebellion broke out, and all proceedings involving King's were suspended. The College Council did not resume its meetings until March, 1838. And, at this point, a new controversy was to arise that would delay the opening even further. An investigation undertaken at the behest of the new Lieutenant-Governor, Sir George Arthur, revealed that the Bursar of King's College, Joseph Wells, had been incompetent as a bookkeeper, and that the sum of some thirteen thousand pounds was missing from College funds. Wells' immediate dismissal did not allay popular misgivings about this unfortunate episode and a further postponement was imposed upon Strachan's plans.

As a result of Lord Durham's historic report on Upper and Lower Canada that was placed before the British Parliament in February, 1839, the two provinces of Canada were united by the Act of Union which came into effect on February 10, 1841. The improved condition of the College's finances--there was


48 Despite the scandal the incident caused, it was to be to the ultimate benefit of the College. Eventually, it led to the adoption of a more effective system of bookkeeping with an annual auditing of accounts--reforms that were long overdue.

49 With the union of Upper and Lower Canada in 1841, the constituent parts of the new united Province of Canada were, technically, referred to as Canada West and Canada East. It would seem, though, that popular
an estimated annual investment income for 1842 of close to twelve thousand pounds—led Governor General Sir Charles Bagot to consent to plans for the construction of buildings. In order to expedite the opening of the College, arrangements were made for the temporary occupation of the old Parliament buildings, rendered vacant by the removal of the seat of government to Kingston.

On April 23, 1842, the cornerstone of the new university building was laid, with imposing ceremony. In the meantime, arrangements were being made for the starting of academic work in classics, belles lettres, mathematics, divinity, law, chemistry, and anatomy, with a staff of six professors, in addition to the President, Dr. Strachan. The formal opening took place on June 8, 1843, with an enrolment of seventy-six students.

Sixteen years after it had received its charter, the University of King's College was in operation. Bishop John Strachan—he had formally received his mitre in 1839—oversaw every aspect of the inauguration. But the institution was already living on borrowed time. The rejuvenated Reform group led by Robert Baldwin, a former student of Strachan's, was about to launch an assault on the

---


51 The Church, April 25, 1842.

52 The text of Strachan's inaugural address in Hodgins runs to ten single-spaced pages. It probably lasted well over an hour. See "Opening of King's College University on the 8th of June, 1843," in D.H.E., Vol. IV, pp.277-287.
University. The issue that was most contentious was the huge land endowment that King's effectively controlled. What was to come to be known as the "University Question" was, at least on the surface, this: Did the patrimony granted to King's College in 1827 belong to one college controlled by a single denomination, or was it intended for a provincial institution free from any sectarian control? This question, together with the religious and philosophical questions that lay beneath it, was to provoke a highly controversial and emotional debate, entered into by distinguished Canadians from church and state, as the University of Toronto moved into the next stage of its history.

Towards a Provincial University, 1843-1850.

While on the surface the "University Question" was an issue concerning the administration of endowed reserves, the foregoing historical account gives evidence to suggest that at a deeper and more meaningful level it was also an argument between religious denominations about the philosophy of higher education. Should higher education in the province of Upper Canada be developed in a religious context, with prescriptive regulations governing the religious affiliations of administrators and faculty? Should the Church of England be regarded as the established church of the colony and, therefore, the mother church of any provincial university? Should other denominational institutions of higher education be chartered that would similarly promote the interests of the Methodist Church, the Presbyterian Church, or the Roman Catholic Church?
Could such rival institutions make claim upon the endowment initially intended for a primarily Anglican institution? Should any institution of higher education supported by public lands and/or public revenues be equally accessible to persons of all religious persuasions?

These important questions were at the fore when the University of King’s College began instruction in 1843. It is important to note that, by 1843, there were three other denominational colleges in the province, two of which were eventually chartered as universities. Directly in response to the Anglican character of King’s, the Methodists had founded Upper Canada Academy, which received a royal charter from King William IV on 12 October, 1836; in 1841, an act of the provincial legislature changed its name to Victoria College.\(^5^3\) In 1841, the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada, in connection with the "Kirk" of Scotland, secured a royal charter from Queen Victoria, together with permission for the use of her royal title in the university’s name. Queen’s College, at Kingston, was thus founded and modelled after the universities of Scotland—not for the purposes of religious confession, but rather for the maintenance of equal educational and religious rights for all.\(^5^4\) The third institution to be founded during this period was Regiopolis College at Kingston. While the Roman

\(^5^3\) See below, Chapter Two.

\(^5^4\) For the charter of Queen’s, see “Copy of the Royal Charter of Queen’s College, Kingston, Dated the 16th of October, 1841,” in D.H.E., Vol. IV, pp.84-88. And for its early history, see D. D. Calvin, Queen’s University at Kingston: The First Century of a Scottish-Canadian Foundation, 1841-1941, (Kingston: The Trustees of the University, 1941); and, Hilda Nearby, Queen’s University, Vol. I, 1841-1917: And Not to Yield, (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1978).
Catholics were much less vocal in their dissatisfaction with the King's College monopoly of the university endowment, as only befitted their situation as a barely tolerated minority in an otherwise Protestant province, they were nonetheless determined to exercise what they saw to be not only their right, but their responsibility—the liberal and religious education of their youth. Accordingly, on 4 March, 1837, "an Act to incorporate certain persons therein named, as a Board of Trustees, for the erection, superintending and management of a Roman Catholic College at Kingston, to be known by the name of a College of Regiopolis and for other purposes therein mentioned," was approved. The Act specifically provided for the erection, use, and support of a Roman Catholic Seminary and, at this stage, seemed to restrict the institution to the preparation of the Roman Catholic clergy.

As mentioned above, when classes commenced at King's College in the autumn of 1843, instruction was offered in arts, divinity, law, and medicine. During 1842, faculty appointments had been made, including the Reverend Doctor John McCaul as Vice-President, who resigned as Principal of Upper Canada College upon assuming his new office. Routine and discipline followed the English collegiate pattern and this regimen was maintained with the opening,

55 Upper Canada, Provincial Statutes, 7 William IV, 1837, Chapter LVI.

56 Regiopolis encountered difficulty trying to operate without steady financial support from the province, and after termination of grants in 1869, ceased to function except as a secondary school.

also in 1843, of the residence in the partly built new building in Queen's Park.

The curriculum was similar to that of Trinity College, Dublin, of which McCaul and some of the other faculty members were graduates.\(^{58}\) And while the course of study was only three years in length, as opposed to four in Dublin, it did introduce the novelty of the study of chemistry in the first year. Nor were the academic standards at King's to be in any way compromised. In fact, before long, King's drew the criticism that it was only pupils from Upper Canada College who could qualify themselves for matriculation, thus increasing the already established charge of Anglican elitism.\(^{59}\)

While instruction was indeed under way in 1843, King's was, from the moment of its foundation, the target of the bitterest and most persistent attack by large sections of the people of Upper Canada. The amendments made to the College charter in 1837 had done little to change the Anglican ethos of King's. As far as the Methodists and Presbyterians were concerned, the Anglican bishop of Toronto was still President of the College, the Anglican members of the College Council were still in an overwhelming majority, almost all the professors were members of the Church of England, and so were twenty-two out of the twenty-six

\(^{58}\) For a full list of the original faculty and administration at King's, together with their successors until 1850, see Fasti Academicici: Annals of King's College, (Toronto: Henry Roswell, 1850).

\(^{59}\) Concerning academic standards at King's, we have the following interesting citation from eventual University of Toronto President Sir Daniel Wilson: "I hold in my hand the original matriculation examination of the University of Toronto, inherited from the old King's College, which,...would have been the most solemn farce educated men ever attempted to perpetrate in a new country. It actually requires a youth at his examination for admission to the University to have read Homer's Iliad, Xenophon, Lucian, Virgil, Ovid...to have gone in fact through nearly all the chief classics of ancient times." "Proceedings of the Select Committee, House of Assembly," in D.H.E., Vol. VI, p.213.
undergraduates.

There was scarcely a moment in King's short history, from 1843 on, when it was not in the arena of public controversy. To be sure, the less honourable motives of envy and greed played a role in the various attempts that were made to resolve the University Question. But more often than not, political and religious leaders, while publicly claiming to be interested only in the equitable distribution of public revenue, acted out of pure, unadulterated, denominational rivalry. During the life of King's College, three attempts were made in parliament to resolve the issues in contention, and these legislative efforts will be examined below. First, though, to support this claim that the University Question was, in the early years of its history, primarily a denominational issue rather than a political one, it will be necessary to examine the pamphlet warfare that evolved in response to the attempt to associate church and state in a university through crown endowment.

The first of these pamphlets was a series of articles originally printed in the Toronto Globe, and published anonymously in Toronto in 1844, under the title, The Origin, History, and Management of University of King's College, Toronto. The author of this pamphlet was John Macara, a young Scotsman who had been educated at the University of Edinburgh and had come to Toronto to study law. Macara's attack upon the Anglican establishment was, at times, vitriolic and extreme; nonetheless, it provided demographic statistics which gave an accurate picture of Methodist and Presbyterian presence and practice in the
Province during the years in question. Because of its wide distribution, it
probably left a deep impression. Macara left no doubt about his feelings for the
establishment of King's:

A fraud more disastrous to the people has not been perpetrated in the worst periods
of Provincial corruption, but the secrecy with which it was devised and executed,
effectively protected it from the opposition of the Legislature.  

These words reveal Macara's conviction that Strachan, together with other
members of the Family Compact, had the intention of securing exclusive rights to
the provincial endowment for higher education by means that were both
dishonest and unethical. Later in the pamphlet, Macara states his charge
blatantly and unashamedly, claiming that "the Grand Policy of the High Church
was to Episcopolize the Province by means of the University."  

This language, indeed this accusation, places the University Question unequivocally in the realm
of inter-denominational strife. This was not primarily a battle between political
parties, nor a contest between a sophisticated upper class, and an ill-educated,
agrarian, immigrant class. Macara was a Presbyterian, and in the name of his
Church he was making charges against the local leadership of the Church of
England, and hence by implication against what he regarded as the policy of the

Macara's publication was followed by another anonymous pamphlet in
1845, entitled Thoughts on the University Question, Respectfully Submitted to the

---

60 [Macara], The Origin, History, and Management of King's, p.11.

61 Ibid., p.23.
Members of Both Houses of the Legislature of Canada, By a Master of Arts.

Written by the Reverend Peter Campbell, Professor of Latin and Greek in the University of Queen's College at Kingston, and also a member of the Church of Scotland, it was a more balanced, but no less impassioned plea to address the inequities of the university issue. In systematic fashion, Campbell suggested that the Provincial Legislature had four possible options.  

It could allow King's to continue as it was constituted, eventually founding universities for those who were effectively excluded from it. This, thought Campbell was financially impractical. It could divide the endowment of King's among the various denominations interested in university education. Campbell predicted this would cause such bitter antagonism as to make any division of the endowment impossible. The Legislature could "expel the Theology and Worship of the Church of England from the University." This, reasoned Campbell, would result in the "reduction of the University to Infidelity." But in a fourth option Campbell saw hope:

Our Legislature may adopt the system of incorporating into the publicly endowed University, Colleges which will ensure the support of the University by every denomination in the land—which will induce them to commit their youth to it—which will provide for the youth, along with literary and scientific instruction of the highest order, the blessings of religious training...  

In these few words, written in 1845, are to be found the first principles of federation. Campbell identifies explicitly three of the four essential elements of

---

62 [Peter Campbell], *Thoughts on the University Question, Respectfully Submitted to the Members of Both Houses of the Legislature of Canada, By a Master of Arts*, (Kingston: Printed at the Chronicle and Gazette Office, 1845), pp.34-35.

63 *ibid.*, p.34.

64 *ibid.*, p.35.
what would eventually be the Toronto arrangement: the federation of
denominational colleges with a publicly endowed university; the widespread
educational benefits which accrue as a result of this federation (especially in
regard to scientific education); and the continuance of theological education as
the exclusive province of the individual denominational college. Implicit in
Campbell's fourth option, although not explicitly stated, is the all-important
principle that such federated denominational colleges would hold in abeyance
their chartered power to convey undergraduate or professional degrees, save
those in divinity.

In hindsight, Campbell's early identification of the essential features of
federation was quite remarkable. In March of 1842, Campbell, with Principal
Thomas Liddell, had begun teaching the first ten students enrolled at Queen's
College in Kingston. The first few months of Queen's existence as a teaching
college were extremely difficult for both Campbell and Liddell. They soon
realized that Upper Canada had simply too many colleges and not enough
students to fill them. There had to be some cooperation between the colleges, and
Campbell and Liddell even at one point considered a "united" University, with
King's teaching arts and the churches of England and Scotland having separate
chairs of theology. This willingness to share in the mission of higher education
with the publicly endowed University would have been quite compatible with
Campbell's position on critical events that were in the early 1840's taking place in
the Church of Scotland. In May of 1843, Dr. Thomas Chalmers had led two
hundred and two other commissioners out of the General Assembly of Scotland to found the Free Church, an event that came to be known as the Great Disruption. The issue was the relationship between Church and State; more particularly, whether or not the state, acting through its civil courts, had the right to dictate to the church in matters which the church regarded as spiritual. The members of the new Free Church were adamantly opposed to such intrusion.

Campbell remained a defender of the Established Church of Scotland, and in Upper Canada he emerged as the vigorous champion of the fight to maintain the Canadian Synod's relationship to that Established Church. His position, in direct opposition to those who supported the Free Church in Canada, allowed him to see the benefit, if not the necessity, of a marriage between the Presbyterian college of Queen's and the provincially-endowed King's. Supporters of the Free Church opposed any such marriage. The organization of the free Church in Scotland left many parishes vacant, and Campbell returned to his homeland to serve the parish of Caputh, while teaching Greek at King's College in Aberdeen. The Church of Scotland in Canada lost an able leader, and a man whose vision of the federation that would evolve in Toronto was extraordinary in its early accuracy.45

In response to Campbell's submission, another anonymous pamphlet was published in 1845 that was to present the case for King's College. Its author was

---

Reverend Doctor John McCaul, mentioned above as one of the architects of the King's curriculum, and in 1845 Vice-President and Pro Vice-Chancellor of the College. McCaul acknowledged certain weaknesses in the 1837 Act, and admitted to the fact that the College Council was made up entirely of Anglican membership. But McCaul's legal background also led him to remind his readers that the right to alter a Crown charter is a matter "...involving high constitutional principles," and that the creation of a new University, as was then being suggested by certain delegations from Queen's and Victoria eager to share in the King's endowment, was "...an act which unquestionably exceeds the powers of any legislative body, inasmuch as it is peculiar to royal prerogative." McCaul, like Campbell before him, had a proposal to make:

...to leave the endowment of King's untouched, and to provide endowments from the Crown lands, and residue of the Clergy Reserves, for the other universities at present existing, and also for those which may hereafter be established by royal charter.

In support of his proposal, McCaul makes clear that there are, to be sure, political and constitutional issues attached to the University Question. But more important are the financial and religious issues. That King's continue to maintain its endowment, and that it continue to enjoy its distinctive Anglican character, was absolutely critical. This would not preclude Victoria, or Queen's, from enjoying their own distinct religious character, but they would not do so at the expense of King's College.

---

66 [John McCaul], *The University Question Considered: By A Graduate*, (Toronto: H. & W. Roswell, 1845), pp.22 and 50.

67 Ibid., p.56.
The foregoing pamphlet literature provides an invaluable historical insight into the denominational rivalry that surrounded the University Question, and historians of this period have too often neglected it in favour of the more staid, but certainly less candid debates that are to be found in the journals of the Provincial Legislature. This is not to suggest that the University Question was not also a political issue; in fact, by 1843, it was at the very centre of the province's political arena. Sometime between 1837 and 1843, there emerged the idea that there be developed a single university in the province, into which all or some of the existing colleges would be incorporated in some fashion. Exactly when this idea was first proposed, or who first proposed it, is impossible to determine with any certainty. It has been suggested that the first reference to any sort of amalgamation came from the Honourable John Hamilton and F. A. Harper, financial agent of Queen's in May, 1842. Harper wrote to Hamilton of a "united University," with King's College teaching Arts and the Churches of England and Scotland having separate chairs of Divinity, essentially for the purposes of economy.68 It is quite possible that this is the first reference. There is no doubt, though, that the idea was firmly established when the Board of Trustees of Queen's College held a meeting on September 8, 1842, at which the university situation was discussed and several resolutions adopted which advocated the removal of Queen's to Toronto, its amalgamation with King's, and its continuance

---

in such a united university—which itself would be responsible for literary and scientific instruction—only as a department of theological instruction.69

Reverend Thomas Liddell, the Principal of Queen's, was possessed of sufficient political acumen to realize that any union between Queen's and King's would require the approval and support of both the King's College Council and the Governor-General's Executive Council,70 and would be greatly benefited by the support of the Methodists from Victoria. He knew also that such support and approval would be very difficult to attain, especially from the King's Council. The Queen's Board of Trustees appointed a Deputation of Commissioners and dispatched them to Toronto to negotiate the union, and Liddell himself initiated an extensive exchange of correspondence with Egerton Ryerson, who had been named President of Victoria College. The Commissioners soon discovered that while the Governor-General and his Executive Council were most interested in the idea of union, a majority of the King's College Council were opposed to the idea. Moreover, Strachan had flatly refused their request to lay the proposal formally before the College Council.71 As for Ryerson at Victoria, it would seem


70 It should be noted here that the constitutional machinery established under the Act of Union of 1841 was much the same as that in the two former Canadian provinces. There would again be a Legislative Council appointed for life, consisting of not less than twenty members; and a Legislative Assembly, of eighty-four, elected on wide freehold franchise. Above these two houses stood the Governor-General, who had the power to withhold assent to the bills that had passed both chambers or to reserve them for imperial judgement at Westminster before they could become law. The Governor-General would execute the laws and administer the province with the assistance of the Executive Council—composed of his chief advisors and administrators.

that his response was at best lukewarm. While his letters of reply to Liddell are unavailable, it can be deduced from Liddell's second and third letters, that Ryerson's reservations concerning Victoria's involvement in a union at Toronto were twofold: first, Victoria had invested a large amount of capital in the purchase of land and the construction of buildings (Queen's merely rented its buildings); and second, Victoria had no desire to cease functioning as a college of arts and science and become solely a divinity college.72

Into these early union negotiations entered Robert Baldwin, a devout Anglican and former student of Bishop Strachan, but one who had long disputed the Bishop's theories of church establishment.73 Considerably influenced by the Queen's College initiative, Baldwin introduced into the legislature a "University Bill" which contemplated the establishment of a "University of Toronto," to which the endowment of King's College would be transferred, and in which King's, Queen's, Victoria, and Regiopolis Colleges would be constituent members. A lengthy Bill of some 103 sections, its salient features can be summarized as follows:74

1. The university functions, powers, and privileges of King's College were now vested in the University of Toronto, which was to consist of the four Colleges

---


73 In 1843, Baldwin was serving, together with Lower Canada's Louis LaFontaine, as co-leader of the Reform Party, who then held a majority in the Legislative Assembly. Both Baldwin and LaFontaine also acted as unofficial leaders of the Governor-General's Executive Council.

74 The following summary is based on the original text of the Bill, in Baldwin's own hand, to be found among the Baldwin Papers, (Baldwin Room, Metropolitan Toronto Reference Library).
mentioned above.

2. The university powers and privileges conferred on these same Colleges by their charters were annulled.

3. No religious tests were to be applied to the professors or students, and there were to be no divinity professors within the University of Toronto.

4. The entire endowment was vested in the University of Toronto. Each College was to receive 500 pounds annually for four years.

Bishop Strachan's vehement opposition to the Bill is understandable; one wonders, though, whether its passing would "...destroy all that is pure and holy in morals and religion, and lead to greater corruption than anything adopted during the madness of the French Revolution."75 The Bill was to die shortly after its first reading. Two factors were responsible for its demise. First, Strachan retained William Draper—an eloquent Assembly member and Conservative spokesman—as counsel for King's and requested that he be heard at the bar of the House. Draper unnerved the Assembly by reminding them that any attempt to create a new corporation with university powers would infringe upon the prerogatives of the Crown.76 And second, also in November, 1843, the Baldwin-LaFontaine Ministry resigned after clashing with the new Governor-General, Sir Charles Metcalfe. Despite the failure of Baldwin's first initiative, it changed the course and nature of the University Question. Until his Bill, the primary issue was the matter of who would control the endowment. Now the fundamental issue was how

75 "Petition of Bishop Strachan Against the University Bill of 1843," D.H.E., Vol. V, p.27.

76 William Draper, Speech of the Hon. William W. H. Draper, Q.C., at the Bar of the Legislative Assembly of Canada, (Friday, November 24, 1843), in Defense of the Chartered Rights of the University of King's College, (Toronto: Herald Office, 1843), pp.6-7.
a new university would be constituted such that all would have full access to, and
equal share in, its many resources.

In the general election of 1844, the Conservatives carried a majority of
seats in the Legislative Assembly and William Draper became Premier and
Attorney-General. Despite Draper's opposition to the Baldwin Bill, he knew well
that the University Question would have to be addressed by his Ministry. Popular
opinion demanded reform. Front pages of political and denominational
newspapers, as early as the fall of 1843, show the extent to which the University
Question had become the defining feature of the political landscape. The Patriot,
the organ of the King's College Council, and its echo, the Church, denounced any
invasion upon the King's charter and endowment as sacrilege. The organs of the
Methodist position included the Banner, the British Colonist, and the more
objective Christian Guardian. And supporting the union proposals of Queen's
College was Kingston's Chronicle and Gazette.

Draper's response was to introduce into the Assembly three separate Bills
which successively enacted: the creation of a university, entitled the University of
Upper Canada; the cancellation of the University Act of 1837; and the vesting of
the endowment for the province's higher education in the same University of

77 See Patriot, Sept. 19, 1843; and Church, Oct. 13, 1843.

78 See British Colonist, Aug. 9, 1843; and Christian Guardian, Oct. 4, 11, and 18.

79 See Chronicle and Gazette, Dec. 20, 1843.
Upper Canada. Upon the surrender of their university powers, King's, Queen's, and Victoria were to become colleges of the University of Upper Canada. Moreover, permanent grants were to be made to these constituent colleges, not from any separate fund, but directly from the King's endowment. Draper's University Bill was defeated on its second reading when a motion for postponement divided the Conservative ranks. Nevertheless, it did signify a watershed in university reform in Upper Canada. For Draper's Bill was an attempt to make the university acceptable to all denominations. When it failed, it must have become clear to men like Baldwin that perhaps the only viable solution was the complete secularization of the university. This would have been an equally reprehensible notion for King's, Victoria, and Queen's, whose members could hardly contemplate the prospect of any form of education—least of all the highest—excluding the proper study of religion. But if the primary purpose of university reform was to reconcile the educational aspirations of Anglicans, Methodists, and Presbyterians, then it was becoming clear that it might be impossible to table legislation that could ever pass both Houses.

One further attempt at compromise was made before the complete secularization of the University. During the legislative session in July, 1847, John A. Macdonald, the new Conservative member of the Legislative Assembly from

---

80 The text of all three of Draper's bills is to be found in "Educational Proceedings of the Legislature of Canada," in D.H.E., Vol. V, pp.159-166.

81 It should be noted that there is no reference in Draper's University Bill to the Roman Catholics at Regiopolis, in Kingston.
Kingston and, like Strachan, a Scot, managed to secure the support of the Bishop for two University Bills. The first repealed the amendments to the charter of King's College made in 1837—the College would retain its site, its buildings, and its charter. The second transferred the King's endowment to a board composed of one government nominee, and one representative each from King's, Queen's, Victoria, and Regiopolis. The board was to administer the annual distribution of 3000 pounds to King's, and 1500 pounds each to Queen's, Victoria, and Regiopolis. It seemed at first that Macdonald's proposal might have a chance. It had Strachan's endorsement. The Methodist Christian Guardian praised it for its fairness, its defense of a Christian as opposed to a secular education, and its recognition of the rights of the denominational Colleges. Queen's was "content to acquiesce." And the Roman Catholics at Regiopolis, while remaining distinct and politic, seemed to assent to the Bill since it allowed for the Catholic instruction of their students.

But the vagaries and vicissitudes of Upper Canadian politics being what they were, all hope for an answer to the what one member of the Assembly was now referring to as the "vexata questio," soon evaporated. The King's College Council met and firmly denounced any sequestering of their endowment. And


83 Christian Guardian, July 21, 1847.


Strachan suddenly and inexplicably withdrew from his gentleman's agreement with Macdonald to support the Bills. Perhaps he was embarrassed by his Council's refusal to support the Macdonald compromise when he had done so publicly, and at considerable political risk. Perhaps Vice-President John McCaul convinced Strachan of his error. Whatever the reason, Macdonald withdrew his Bill before it even reached second reading.

In early 1848, an election was held and the Reform forces of Baldwin and Lafontaine were returned to power with a considerable majority. According to J. M. S. Careless, Draper's Conservative government was plagued by "...its own obvious weakness and internal quarrels,...[and] its failure, still, to settle the throbbing university question." Baldwin soon took the lead and convinced the King's College Council to appoint a Commission to inquire into, and report upon, the financial affairs of King's College and Upper Canada College. This was a carefully crafted political manoeuvre. Baldwin knew that even a superficial investigation would expose fiscal mismanagement of the worst kind. With such information made public, Baldwin could expect significant support for any legislation that he (of course) would table—legislation that would have as its purpose the final settlement of the University Question. While the final report was not laid before the Assembly until 1852, Baldwin made sure that the

86 For this interpretation, see John King, McCaul, Croft, Forneri: Personalities of Early Days, (Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada, 1914), p.61

Commission's interim reports were made as public as possible. The Commission was eventually to report that

The account books kept in the [King's] College office, were, from the very foundation, defective, confused, and totally unsuited to the requirements of a correct business establishment. 88

Taking considerable time in formulating his legislation, Baldwin finally introduced his University Bill on April 3, 1849. If passed, it would mark the death of King's College, and the complete secularization of the provincial university.

Baldwin's Bill called for the creation of the University of Toronto, which would be devoid of all denominational character, including chairs of divinity and any type of religious ceremonies or trappings. No member of the clergy, Anglican or otherwise, was eligible to be Chancellor or President. The chartered colleges of the province could affiliate as divinity halls, but they could give no instruction save in theology, and they were to receive nothing from the endowment. To give some semblance of participation, the denominational colleges could each appoint one member to the University's Senate, although one wonders what advantage such representation would provide for a college that had been excluded from any share in the provincial endowment for higher education. The collegiate system, based on the Oxbridge tradition, whereby students received instruction in their colleges, was repudiated in favour of the professorial system; henceforth, the

88 Final Report of the Commissioners of Inquiry into the Affairs of King's College University and Upper Canada College, (Quebec: Printed by Rollo Campbell, 1852), p.3.
University would teach and examine in all subjects except divinity.  

The extreme terms of Baldwin's Bill forced opponents of secularization to state their objections publicly and unequivocally. Heretofore, it had been possible for representatives of the denominational colleges to speak against university legislation by raising objections—in a diplomatic manner—to peripheral issues which prevented outright conflict with the government of the day. No more; now the officials of Victoria and Queen's had to state their case in the clearest terms possible.

For Victoria and Queen's, there were two fundamental issues. The first issue, and the one that is, more than any other, at the heart of the history of higher education in Ontario, is the conviction that religion in some form is an essential element of education and should not be excluded from the university. The editor of the Methodist Christian Guardian stated:

The whole basis of the bill is bad. It is founded upon principles subversive to the best interests of the Country,—principles alike repugnant to the religious feelings of the Canadian public, and to their sense of justice and good faith.  

For the Board of Trustees at Queen's, Baldwin's Bill would have the effect of destroying "...the connection which ought always to exist between Religion and Education." Given their traditional insistence upon controlling the education of their community's children and youth, one might expect the Roman Catholics...

---


90 Christian Guardian, April 25, 1849.

to be the loudest in this opposition to the secularization of higher education; on numerous occasions they had spoken in the most dramatic language of the evil inherent in any notion of education not grounded in the principles of religion. But the Catholics at Kingston were being politically astute. The authorities at Regiopolis had recently been petitioning the Legislative Assembly for an endowment for their College, and so there was a strange silence from Catholic leaders when the details of Baldwin's legislation reached Kingston.

The second fundamental issue that was forced to the fore by Baldwin's University Bill surrounded the principle of centralization. A university administrator today might examine the system of higher education in Upper Canada in the 1840's, and, using contemporary criteria, conclude that centralization was the only sensible course. But that would be to ignore the nature of the institutions under examination. University colleges during this period required a staff of about seven professors. The curriculum was fixed, involved no choice, and consisted of Classics, Mathematics, Philosophy, Chemistry, and Natural History. Tutors would be required for English and Modern Languages. To expand the college into a university required only the addition of three faculties--in Medicine, Law, and Theology. Tutorial methods were used for instruction, and so the college worked quite comfortably with about one hundred students. This relatively efficient unit meant that it was quite reasonable to envision, perhaps, four colleges in the province, each encouraged by healthy competition. This thinking led the Queen's Board to object to
concentrating the means of University education in one particular locality,—[so] that no generous rivalry is provided for between kindred institutions. Although some may think that a rich Endowment ensures efficiency, Your Petitioners are of opinion that such is not the case; that a richly endowed body,...is very seldom, if ever, efficient for the purposes in view.92

Secularization and centralization—these were the critical issues for the denominational colleges; it was for these issues that Queen's and Victoria would risk their very future.

And Baldwin's Bill would affect their future. In fact, for Queen's, it was the beginning of the end of their relationship with what would become the federated provincial university. Students and graduates of that University today would celebrate this moment in their history. For the Bill did pass. The political pressure that was placed upon members of the Legislative Assembly to obtain a final settlement to the University Question was enormous. Despite a number of motions for amendment, all of which were defeated, the Bill carried by a vote of forty-three to ten, and came into law on January 1, 1850. The University of King's College was dead; the University of Toronto was born.93

The University of Toronto in Isolation, 1850-1868.

The passing of Baldwin's University Act of 1849 provoked severe criticism

92 Ibid., p.128.

93 That the University of Toronto takes its date of foundation as 1827, as opposed to 1850, might be seen by purists as a liberty. King's College was not the University of Toronto; in fact, just about everything about it contradicted the principles upon which the University of Toronto was founded in 1850. The only feature that they even vaguely had in common is location—they were both situated somewhere between King Street and Queen's Park.
from the denominational colleges. As seen above, it secularized higher learning, it centralized the provincial provision of higher education, and it brought the provincial University in Toronto firmly under Government control. But remarkably, in broad terms, it established a pattern which has lasted to this day, and which allowed for the development of the federated form of university polity in Canada. The twofold principle: that public funds should be provided only to non-sectarian institutions; and, that if denominational colleges were to benefit in any way from public support, they could do so only as a result of affiliation with the state-supported university; was enshrined by Baldwin's Act. It is as much in force today as it was in 1850.

At the same time, Baldwin did not even come close to a final settlement of the University Question; such a settlement would not come for another thirty-seven years. For Victoria and Queen's, acceptance of Baldwin's scheme demanded that they surrender their charters—with no financial encouragement—only to become divinity halls. For the wider public, the Anglican monopoly on higher education had only given way to a "godless" and "infidel" institution; it was hard to know which was worse.94 Baldwin attempted to answer public concerns by tabling a Bill which would require the University to make provisions for the religious instruction of its students, under the direction of their own ministers, but without the University of Toronto being responsible for the costs of such bills.

---

94 The Christian Guardian, on February 27, 1850, was able to name at least nine newspapers which opposed Baldwin's University settlement.
instruction. While the Bill was passed, it did little to assuage the fears of those who saw in the new University of Toronto little else besides the dangerous forces of secularism.

Following the parliamentary session of 1851, Baldwin retired and was succeeded as Government Leader by the Honourable Francis Hincks. It fell to Hincks to carry on Baldwin's work of University reform. The daunting task that faced Hincks was to defend the principles of secular education and government control, and at the same time to devise some scheme whereby students of the various religious denominations could be educated in their own colleges while having full access to the scholarships and degrees of the provincial university. To accomplish this formidable task, Hincks and his government turned to the University of London—the university upon which the modern-day University of Toronto is based more than any other. The structural and constitutional changes that Hincks was to propose in legislation for the University of Toronto were based on the evolution of a university with a remarkably similar history.

In 1827, Oxford and Cambridge were the only two universities in England and the cost of being a student there was so prohibitive as to restrict entrance to only a small sector of society. And to social exclusiveness was added the still more serious prohibition of conformity to the Church of England by religious


tests. And the youth of other religious persuasions had to travel abroad for higher education. There was a need, therefore, for the establishment of higher educational institutions which could serve the needs of a wider segment of society. The poet Thomas Campbell, and Member of Parliament Lord Thomas Brougham had, by 1828, raised sufficient funds to buy a site in London's Gower Street and to start the erection thereon of the institution which is now called University College; its title then was "London University," though it was sometimes disparagingly referred to as the "Godless" college in Gower Street. (Baldwin's University of Toronto was, interestingly, often referred to as the "Godless" college on Queen's Park.) It was the University's firm intention to have no religious entrance requirements and to have no teaching of religion. The course of instruction was to include notable inventions. The teaching of English, the modern languages and the laboratory sciences distinguished London from both Oxford and Cambridge. Moreover, London University was to be for the middle class, an increasingly prosperous group in the period of enormous expansion in commercial and managerial occupations when London was the hub of the "workshop of the world."

That the new London University was meeting a need was evident from the founding of a rival institution which soon followed. Even before the University opened in 1828, a meeting was called by the Duke of Wellington and attended by an assembly of clerical nobility whose purpose was to found an institution that offered a progressive curriculum within a theologically orthodox framework.
Thus was created King's College—chartered in 1829 and opened in 1831. London now had two putative universities, one chartered but calling itself a College, the other unchartered, but calling itself a University.

At first there was no possibility of bringing together these two young institutions, so divergent as they were in their origin and outlook. Eventually, in 1836, a typically British compromise was reached whereby the responsibility for teaching remained with the two colleges—London University, now to be called "University College," and King's College—and a totally separate body, the University of London, was created to conduct the examination of, and to confer degrees upon, their students. And so was the federated system at the University of London born.

Using the London compromise as his model, Hincks introduced his University Bill during the fall session of 1852. The constitution of the reorganized University of Toronto would divest the University of the work of teaching, and relegate that function to the University's affiliated colleges. University College was created and became the first affiliated college; its purpose was to carry out the teaching function of the University as a non-denominational college. In effect, the University of Toronto now had only four functions: managing the endowment, enacting all university statutes, examining students, and conferring degrees. Other colleges in arts were permitted to affiliate with the University, and upon affiliation, they were to be granted representation on the Senate, and given the opportunity to have their students sit for examinations and compete for honours.
and scholarships in addition to being candidates for university degrees. Some financial inducement was offered to the affiliating colleges under a provision which stated that while the endowment was to be used to meet the costs of University College and the University, any annual surplus would be distributed to the denominational colleges that had affiliated.  

It took several months for Hincks to answer concerns that were expressed during debate on his Bill; in fact, the Bill would not pass until April of 1853. In the meantime, it became clear from the popular press that the University Question was alive and well in the hearts of politicians and editorialists alike. According to the Christian Guardian—the herald of the Methodist position—the University endowment could have been much more effectively employed "...by affording aid to separate colleges than by sinking the whole amount in the dead sea of one great university." And in a spurious tone, George Brown's Globe—originally an organ of the Reform Party, but now in open rebellion against Francis Hincks—rallied against the "...conspiracy of Dr. Strachan, Dr. McCaul, Dr. Ryerson and the other political priests, to get the money of the country into their hands...", so that they might support "...a dozen different half-fledged colleges, with half-bred clergymen as professors."  

Despite the clamour against Hincks' University Bill in the press, the Act

---


98 Christian Guardian, October 6, 1852.

99 Globe, October 7, 1852; and October 23, 1852.
was passed by the Legislative Assembly by a vote of fifty-seven to three. This overwhelming majority is probably evidence, more than anything else, of the pressure exacted upon members of the Assembly by their constituents to finally settle the University Question, once and for all. Furthermore, the results of this vote can only be an indication of the unwillingness of the majority of people of Upper Canada to divide the University endowment, or to allow it to be used for sectarian purposes. For, it must be borne in mind that even though the denominational colleges had failed to obtain a share of the University endowment, they had been receiving provincial grants all along. Victoria had received its first grant in 1842 of 450 pounds; by 1868 it would be receiving 5000 dollars annually.\textsuperscript{100} Queen's received its first annual grant in 1845, and by 1868, it too would be receiving 5000 dollars per annum.\textsuperscript{101}

What is surprising about the passing of the Hincks Acts is that there seemed to be little objection raised to the provision that surplus funds would be appropriated for the denominational colleges in lieu of a direct share of the University endowment. For it was precisely this measure that led the denominational colleges to scotch all ideas of affiliation, at least for the foreseeable future.

It should be noted here that references to "denominational colleges"

\textsuperscript{100} It should be noted here that in 1858 the Government of the Canadas began to issue Canadian dollars, on par with the American dollar, to replace pounds sterling. One pound was equal to approximately four dollars.

anytime after 1852 should be understood as including a number of institutions.
The colleges that we already know to be the main players on the road to
federation were, of course, Victoria and Queen's. By 1852, Regioplosis, which had
earlier been a candidate for affiliation, had failed to rise above the level of a
classical school, and so was no longer eligible for affiliation. Joining Victoria and
Queen's in 1852 was Trinity College, which Bishop Strachan had founded to
promote the convictions that he had embodied in the charter of King's College.
Also in 1852, St. Michael's College was founded in Toronto by the Roman
Catholic Basilian Fathers. While the Basilians were initially hesitant about
seeking any formal relationship with the University of Toronto, it was not long
before St. Michael's would be a leading participant in the federation arrangement.
While Victoria, Queen's, Trinity, and St. Michael's were the protagonists in the
history of federation, it would be a significant omission to imply that there were
no other players. During the decades of the forties and fifties, a number of other
colleges were established or incorporated in Upper Canada, and it was no doubt
the intention of their founders to avail themselves of the provisions of the 1853
University Act. Of these, Knox College deserves special mention. Founded in 1844
by the Free Presbyterian Church of Canada (after the disruption of the Church
of Scotland), it was to affiliate as a theological college of the University of
Toronto in 1885, and as a federated college in 1890. And while not a part of the
history of federation at the University of Toronto, mention should also be made of
two Catholic colleges which evolved into great universities: Bytown College,
founded in 1848 and destined to become the University of Ottawa; and
Assumption College, founded by the Basilian Fathers in 1855, and destined to
become the University of Windsor.

In the years that followed the passing of the Hincks University Act of 1853,
two issues emerged as critical for the denominational colleges. The first issue was
the application of Section LIV of the Act—noted above as provoking surprisingly
little criticism when initially proposed—which provided for surplus funds from the
University endowment to be distributed to the denominational colleges once
University College and the University of Toronto had been provided with the
funds necessary for their efficient operation.\(^{102}\) Not surprisingly, no such surplus
ever appeared. And when, in 1855, the considerable sum of 95,000 pounds was
appropriated from the University endowment for the erection of buildings to
house University College, it was impossible for the leaders of the denominational
colleges to do anything but cry foul. John Langton, who had succeeded John
McCaul as Vice-Chancellor of the University of Toronto, knew that the
denominational colleges coveted the endowment intended for his University and
its non-denominational college, and as long as most the income from that
endowment was invested in bricks and mortar, there would be no such thing as a
surplus.

The second issue that dominated the 1850's was the proper interpretation

of Sections XVII and XVIII of the Hincks Act. According to these, students of other colleges in Upper Canada could present themselves in Toronto to be examined for degrees to be conferred by the University of Toronto. Colleges that were qualified to present such students would become colleges affiliated with the University of Toronto, and such affiliation would afford them the privilege of holding a seat on the University's Senate. But these apparent concessions were quite meaningless. Representatives from the denominational colleges were given no expenses to travel to Senate meetings, and before long they ceased to attend. And while it might have been reasonable for a representative of Trinity to attend, it appears that they were unwilling to even consider the idea. Moreover, few students had any desire to travel to Toronto to sit examinations set by University College professors, when they were quite content with degrees from their own colleges. The irony of this situation was soon apparent to members of the University of Toronto Senate: members of rival universities could sit on their Senate, be privy to all their private affairs, and be required to do no more than send up the odd student for an examination.

The Hincks Act not only failed to bring Victoria, Queen's, and Trinity into the Provincial University, it also sharpened the already acrimonious and simmering hostility between University College and the three denominational universities. While the University Question ceased to be at the centre of provincial politics from 1853 to 1859, and while it was no longer the favourite subject of

---

103 Ibid., pp.120-121.
editorialists, it was, nonetheless, the all-consuming issue for those who were only just managing to keep their denominational colleges alive on ill-fed budgets. For the latter, the faculty of the secular University College was still largely the faculty of the former King's College, and King's College had been their bitter rival.

Perhaps the best insight into the true feelings of the various factions involved in the University Question during these years is to be found in a letter by University of Toronto Vice-Chancellor John Langton, to his brother William, on November 12, 1856. "The University [of Toronto]," he wrote,

...has hardly a friend in the country, and many enemies. The Church [of England] looks upon us as Godless, and perhaps would have no objection to a slice of the endowment. The Methodists, the next most powerful body with Ryerson at their head, make no secret of their hatred and their aspirations for a share of the money. The church of Rome profess to be friendly, but though some of our more active members of the Senate are catholic it is observable that we have never had one Catholic student. The Church of Scotland has a University of its own which is very poor and very inefficient, which may lead one to suspect how the wind blows though they are too cautious to express an opinion. The only powerful sect with us is the Free [Presbyterian] Church to which may be added some Baptists, Independents and other small fry.¹⁰⁴

Nor was the ill-feeling between University College and the denominational colleges diminished when it was realized that, in 1853, while the University of Toronto and University College enjoyed the entire provincial endowment for higher education, they were only educating sixty-three of the province's students in the Arts, while the denominational colleges together were educating one hundred and seven students.¹⁰⁵


It should be clear now that while the Hincks Act of 1853 provided the structure for federation, circumstances were such that it continued to remain a mere idea. Victoria and Queen's would simply not become a constituent college of the University of Toronto without also receiving a share of the University endowment, or as long as there was any possibility that such an arrangement would reduce them from church colleges to mere divinity halls. But their convictions did not deter them from continuing their campaign against the principle of applying the University endowment to an exclusively secular University. And so, at the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church that was held in Hamilton in June of 1859, the University Question was again issue number one. During the previous year, the "...failure of the harvest and the unexampled scarcity of money..." had called the very existence of Victoria in question. This, and other Methodist Conferences will be examined in greater detail in the following chapter. It will be sufficient to note that the 1859 Conference adopted and published eight resolutions which used the strongest of language. The favoured position of University College was, they claimed, "...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."107

The Conference resolutions led to yet another series of sharp exchanges in

---


107 Ibid., p.206.
the religious and civil press. With the public involved, the Methodists sought to involve both the Legislative Council and Assembly by presenting to them a Memorial (formal statement) prepared by Dr. Ryerson. Presented to the Legislature in March, 1860, its purpose was threefold: to make plain Methodist objections to the unjust situation of University College, to request that the Legislature formally inquire into the extravagant and wasteful expenditures of that same College, and to make application to secure an equitable division of the University endowment among the various colleges.108 Not wanting to miss whatever benefits might accrue from what they knew to be a strong and well-supported Memorial, the Queen's Board of Trustees petitioned the Legislative Assembly some two weeks later along the same general themes, but in less strident language.109

Faced with this pressure, the House of Assembly did something that governments of our day continue to do when faced with political bombshells: they referred the matter to a Select Committee. This Select Committee was a diverse group of nine men including such notables as John A. Macdonald and George Brown. The Committee met for four weeks during March and April of 1860, and its minutes contain the most extensive investigation and analysis of the University Question that is to be found in any single document.110 There were occasions


110 The proceedings of the committee take up some 207 pages in Hodgins. And they were subsequently published as Proceedings, With Evidence, of the Select Committee of the House of Assembly of the Memorial
during the proceedings when it was clear that the University Question had become less a matter of differing philosophies of higher education, and more a matter of a personal vendetta. Such as when George Brown, as part of his efforts to protect the interests of University College, accused Ryerson--who stood before him!—of having a bogus university degree (it was, to be sure, honoris causa), and therefore of meddling in affairs beyond his ability.111

Despite the nasty tone of much of the exchange, there was considerable reasoned argument, and most of it centred around two charges brought by the denominationalists. First, that exclusive advantages had been given to the University of Toronto and University College by allowing them to consume the entire annual appropriation of the endowment (contrary to Section LIV of the Hincks Act of 1853). And second, that there had been extravagance and waste in the administration of University College. It was difficult to answer the latter charge, but the defenders of the University did present convincing evidence in answer to the former charge. Daniel Wilson, professor of history and English literature and later President of University College, reminded the Committee that it was London University upon which the architects of the University of Toronto modelled their constitutions; and if London was their model, then the denominational colleges must realize that the success of that English University

was based on its affiliating colleges bringing to the University their own financial resources.\textsuperscript{112}

Despite the vast and extensive work done by the Committee, the government took no action based upon its proceedings—there was to be an election the following year, and the issue could cost too many votes. This did not mean that the University Question subsided. In one of the most important displays of denominational concern and interest, there was held, at Kingston, on March 6, 1861, what was called a "Great Public Meeting." The new President of Queen's, the Reverend William Leitch, proved to be a most eloquent spokesman, and placed the conflict within the context of a new country searching for a complete nationality. When the denominational colleges were properly supported and brought into one great provincial university, it would be a sign that "...purely local and selfish policy [had been] forced to give way to the national and patriotic.\textsuperscript{113}

The last thing that any government wants to hear about before a general election is the holding of public meetings for the purpose of discussing issues that are important to the electorate, and to which meetings members of the government are not invited. In what can hardly be called a coincidence, there

\textsuperscript{112} University Question: The Statements of John Langton, Esq., M.A., Vice-Chancellor of the University of Toronto; and Professor Daniel Wilson, LL.D., of University College, Toronto; With Notes and Extracts from the Evidence taken before the Committee of the Legislative Assembly on the University. (Toronto: Roswell & Ellis, 1860), p.56.

appeared soon after the Kingston meeting a proposal from John A. Macdonald to Egerton Ryerson. The proposal suggested that his Conservative government--he was then Attorney General--if returned to power in the forthcoming election, would appoint a University Commission whose members in large part Ryerson could recommend. Their purpose would be to inquire into the expenditure of funds at University College. Moreover, suggested Macdonald, he would also propose "10,000 pounds apiece for Victoria, Queen's and Trinity and a like sum to be divided among the R.C. Seminaries." And, if Ryerson wanted to inform his fellow Methodists about his proposal before the election, then that would be quite alright with Macdonald. In mid-July of 1861, Macdonald's Conservative forces won the election.

Accordingly, on October 28, 1861, Governor-General Lord Monck, as Visitor of the University of Toronto, appointed a Commission of three persons representing the Universities--Toronto, Victoria, and Queen's (Trinity remained cold to any suggestion of negotiations with the University of Toronto)--to make a careful investigation into the operations of the University of Toronto and University College, and to report thereon. Another extensive Report was sent to the Government at Quebec some seven months later. Its most notable proposals included the recommendation that University College and the denominational colleges affiliate with the University of Toronto and form a new entity called the

---

University of Upper Canada; and that $28,000 be apportioned for University College, which would thenceforth be known as King's College, while $10,000 would be provided for Queen's, Victoria, Trinity, and Regiopolis College.\footnote{115}

It seemed as if this was finally a solution that could be embraced by the denominational colleges, a solution which addressed all their concerns and which would allow them to fulfil their aspirations. And this was a solution proposed by a Commission which had as one of its three members the new Vice-Chancellor of the University of Toronto, John Paton. What more could be asked for? Perhaps, finally, a truly Provincial University would be born, one that would unite all peoples of Upper Canada in its support. But such high hopes came crashing down when, one week before the Report of the Commission was submitted, the Government resigned on the defeat of its Militia Bill. The Commission's Report was buried for six months until it was published in January of 1863, and when it was, the Senate of the University took up the matter and declared through a series of motions that Paton had acted beyond his authority in allowing such concessions. They would have none of it; the endowment would stay at their University, and the denominational colleges could do what they would.\footnote{116}

There the matter remained for several years, apart from continued pleas for help from the financially strapped denominationalists. The University

\footnote{115} "Report of the Commissioners Appointed to Enquire into the Expenditure of the Funds of the University of Toronto," in \textit{D.H.E.}, Vol. XVII, pp.76-104. Regiopolis is back on the scene in this Report; with substantial backing, it was thought the College could fulfil its chartered purpose as an institution of higher education.

Question receded into the background during the period preceding Confederation. In the new Dominion of Canada, education was to be the responsibility of the provinces. Ontario's first Premier, John Sandfield Macdonald, inherited from his namesake in Ottawa a problem that he would administer with great expediency. The Colleges were to be given notice that their grants would soon be terminated. And so they were. On February 21, 1868, a message was delivered to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario from the Lieutenant-Governor recommending that the Colleges receive one last grant each, "...but that it shall not be lawful to continue such Grants hereafter."\textsuperscript{117}

The termination of the denominational grants in 1868 meant that, for the time being, the road to federation was impassable. For the next fifteen years the denominational colleges turned inward; their struggles during these years, and such hopes that were kept alive for federation, will be studied in the following chapters—from their own perspectives. But before proceeding to the separate treatment of the colleges that were to federate and form the University of Toronto, mention must be made of a phenomenon that has heretofore been overlooked, but which would have the most profound consequences for the movement toward federation.

This phenomenon was the rise of science in the second half of the nineteenth century, a phenomenon that had already influenced university development in Germany, Britain, and the United States, and that now made its

way into Canada. The old sciences expanded and were subdivided, especially in the direction of the physical and biological sciences. Until 1870, the University of Toronto had required two science professors: one for natural history and geology, the other for physics, chemistry, and perhaps geology. Now it was possible that a half-dozen professors might be needed. And most importantly, the universities were faced with the enormous expenditure for the construction and upkeep of libraries and laboratories. Such expansion would be out of the question for the likes of Victoria or St. Michael's. And before long, the resources of the University of Toronto would no longer be adequate.

When the rise of science and its necessary expense was accompanied by a softening of denominational prejudices, by a change in religious environment that made differences in doctrinal expression more tolerable than in the earlier Victorian period, then it seemed inevitable that federation would be reconsidered. Indeed, it seemed inevitable that federation would be the only road to follow.
CHAPTER THREE

VICTORIA UNIVERSITY, 1831-1868.

Religious and Social Background.

In the preceding chapter, reference was made to a controversial sermon preached by then Rector of York, John Strachan, on the occasion of the death of Bishop Jacob Mountain, the Anglican Bishop of Quebec for over thirty years. Controversy ensued when the sermon was published and there entered into the public domain some of Strachan's less than flattering comments about the Methodist presence in Upper Canada. Also during this sermon, Strachan offered a unique, and revealing, interpretation of the province's history and demography.

There were, according to Strachan, three religious groups. At one extreme were the Roman Catholics. At the other end of the spectrum was a loosely defined group of "Protestant dissenters," the most favourable term that he could find for the Methodists. In between these "extravagant and dangerous extremes" was the
United Church of England and Ireland, and the Church of Scotland.¹

Strachan's sermon probably did little to contribute to ecumenical thought at the time, but it does provide a valuable insight into how members of the Church of England viewed Methodists and Roman Catholics. The contempt for Catholics was more instinctive than anything else. They were Papists, and their presence in Upper Canada only renewed antagonisms that extended back to Henry VIII. But the disdain that Anglicans tended to hold for the Methodists in the province was more nuanced. It reflected, among other things, an impression that there was a strain of anti-intellectualism in their tradition. And that impression was to lead to some considerable ill-feeling between the two denominations over the philosophy of higher education. The rancour was all the greater because of their shared religious history in pre-reformation times, and was no less between the Anglicans and the Methodists because they both had rejected the papacy. Moreover, in eighteenth century England, Wesleyan Methodism had grown out of the Anglican Establishment. Anglican prejudice and suspicion, no more nor less than the Catholic or Methodist variety, were in many ways at the heart of the University Question. There was an unwillingness on the part of many of the denominationalists to endeavour to understand the history, the theology, the tradition, and the educational philosophy of the other Christian denominations—important foundations which allowed each denomination to bring

a unique perspective to higher education, as well as to the concepts of society and the political order.

The unique contribution of the leading members of the Methodist Church to the educational history of Upper Canada is the immediate concern of this chapter. However, first we must digress to provide some background on Methodism itself. The origin of the Methodist Church itself can be traced, with some dramatic precision, to "a quarter to nine in the evening," on May 24, 1738, when John Wesley, experienced "conversion" at a religious meeting in Aldersgate Street, London. Wesley was an evangelical in the Church of England, but was deeply disturbed by the consequences of the bitter religious quarrels within that church during the seventeenth century: many bishops had been led to doctrinal indifference, many preachers advocated a grave piety devoid of emotionalism, and most of the working poor of England had been dispossessed by both church and crown.

While John Wesley cannot be described as one of the great Christian theologians, his writings do provide valuable insights into theological issues in their relation to religious experience.² He struggled deeply with, and ultimately accepted, the Protestant principle of justification by faith alone, but was equally

---

sure that justification must be followed by sanctification in this life. 3 Christian
perfection, or holiness, could be attained only by sincere and energetic
participation in the spiritual and moral life of the Christian community, as well
as a second definitive act of the Holy Spirit. In a sense, Wesley's interpretation of
the Christian gospel situated Methodism on a theological spectrum somewhere
between the Protestant and Catholic traditions. On the one hand, he held fast to
the Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith alone, while abandoning the
Calvinistic notion of predestination—Wesley was convinced that all Christians
play a part in determining their religious destiny; on the other hand, he was
devoted to the particularly hallowed Catholic notion that men and women grow
in holiness through individual and corporate means of grace. 4

Wesley saw his duty primarily in preaching this doctrine of holiness to
converts that they might be able to proceed towards the end of perfection. His
own conversion—on that spring evening in 1738—had resulted in an extraordinary
transformation. Wesley had evolved from being a mediocre preacher who
exercised little influence over others, to one who ministered with overwhelming
power and authority to a flock of increasing dimensions. In the words of one of
his most distinguished apologists, Wesley had been transformed into a minister

---

3 The complete corpus of Wesley's writings is to be found in the 26 volume edition undertaken in 1975 by the
Oxford University Press, and subsequently continued and completed by the Abingdon Press. For rich insights
into his doctrine of justification and sanctification, see Albert C. Outler, ed., The Works of John Wesley, Volume

4 For a fuller treatment of Weslayan Methodism's theological relationships with other Christian denominations—
especially Anglicanism and Roman Catholicism, see Maximin Piette, Wesley and the Evolution of Protestantism,
...called with the authority of a prophet to the dirty colliers who worked in the coal mines of Bristol, to the filthy rakes who hid in the dens of missionary tours—he covered on horseback some 225,000 miles and gave more than 40,000 sermons, and the unique organizational structure that he imposed upon the Methodist Church, formed the pillars of early Methodism. The first Methodist societies consisted of converts whose services were simple and fervently evangelical; they followed meticulously the rules of behaviour laid down by their leaders. The only significant dissension within the Methodist Connexion was the tendency for some to be drawn to London, and to the barbarous mobs who inhabited the wild moors of Northumberland.

Wesley's understanding of Christian salvation and holiness brought forth a highly emotional form of gospel preaching that was designed to produce dramatic conversions. Such meetings—which were preoccupied with conversion and the immediate experience of the Spirit of God—drew criticism from notable Anglican clerics, and were to upset the careful balance which Wesley had established between the evangelical and the ethical aspects of the Christian religion. But this understanding of conversion as a sudden, dramatic, and overwhelming experience of the redeeming Spirit of God, was to be at the heart of early Upper Canadian Methodism, and any treatment of Upper Canadian

---

5 Wesley organized his followers into basic units called Societies. Within each Society were Classes of twelve or more persons, under a leader who visited each member weekly, collected contributions, kept the ministry informed, and distributed "identification tickets" to members in good standing. The Societies were arranged according to geographic location; groupings of Societies were called Circuits. Circuits themselves were then organized into Districts. The aggregate of all the Societies, Circuits, and Districts under the authority of the Annual Conference formed the Methodist "Connexion."


7 In 1849, one Anglican cleric compared Methodist emotionalism with the worst excesses of Roman Catholicism: "...the whole conduct [Methodist services] is but a counterpart of the most wild fanaticism of the most abominable communion [i.e., Roman Catholic] in its corrupt ages." Wesley's reply is to be found as "A Letter to the Author of the Enthusiasm of Methodists and Papists Comap'd," in Gerald R. Cragg, ed., The Works of John Wesley, Volume 11: The Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion and Certain Related Other Letters, (Oxford: Oxford at the University Press, 1975), pp.361ff.
Methodism that failed to realize its importance would be deficient. Nor is this notion of conversion any less pertinent to the history of higher education in Upper Canada. For it was this emphasis on the fundamental importance of fervent religious experience that was to come into conflict with the rationalism of the Anglican Church, and that would lead Ryerson and others Methodists to see formal learning as useful and pleasing, but never able to replace the necessity of experiencing the transforming power of the spirit. This meeting of the Anglican and Methodist traditions in early nineteenth century Upper Canada will be examined in greater detail below, for in many ways it grounds the history of the federation movement; the story of the birth of Canadian Methodism, though, still remains to be told, albeit briefly.

Methodist missionaries arrived in North America as early as 1769, and this marked the formal extension of the Methodist Connexion to this continent. Fifteen years later, at a conference in Baltimore, the Methodist Episcopal Church in America was founded—an autonomous organization that acknowledged Wesley's primacy as their founder.  

Methodism was first established in Upper Canada by impulses from the United States in which the Loyalist element had an important but by no means exclusive part. By 1812, Methodist societies had been established in the Bay of Quinte and St. Lawrence region, and in the Niagara Peninsula. These societies

---

were connected with the Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in New York, but the War of 1812 created natural tensions for Upper Canadian Methodists, who were associated with the American conference, but who as loyalists felt bound to the British Wesleyan tradition. When British Wesleyan missionaries arrived in Upper Canada in 1814 to counteract the influence of their American Methodist brothers, there began the long conflict between British and American Methodism in Upper Canada, out of which was to emerge a truly Canadian church.

At all times during the first quarter of the nineteenth century, the American Methodist influence in Upper Canada was greater than that of the British Wesleyans. From the Methodist Episcopal Church in New York came a variety of preachers and administrators whose deficiencies in education were as notable as their zeal and self-sacrifice. Their teaching was generally in keeping with Wesley’s convictions, but not identical. These men had no affection for the Church of England, and their American affiliation often made them suspect to Upper Canadian Methodists who were working towards establishing their own independent identity. This independent status was eventually recognized by the American General Conference in 1828, and in that year the Methodist Episcopal Church of Upper Canada was born. Its American parentage was obvious: the young church championed the separation of church and state, it promoted the recognition of the constitutional rights of Upper Canadians, especially those outside of the Anglican communion, and worked for the establishment of a
comprehensive and popular system of primary and secondary education. In the process, Upper Canadian Methodists acquired a somewhat exaggerated reputation for political and social liberalism. To answer such charges, there appeared on November 21, 1829, the first number of the Christian Guardian, which was destined, during the following decade, to be the most influential and widely circulated newspaper in Upper Canada.9

As mentioned above, in order to situate the University Question in its proper historical context, some analysis must be undertaken of the complex relationship between the Methodist and Anglican churches in Upper Canada during the first half of the nineteenth century. Much of this relationship is exhibited in the frequently hostile exchanges of the two leading figures of early Upper Canada's religious and cultural history: John Strachan and Egerton Ryerson. But the relationship was much deeper than just a personality conflict; it was more than just a battle between a Scotsman who held a good university degree, and an Upper Canadian who did not. While both Strachan and Ryerson shared at least some common convictions--they both proclaimed their allegiance to the Protestant Reformation, and they both read the same Bible and drew many of the same conclusions from it--at heart this was a conflict between two

profoundly different theologies. The two traditions approached such fundamental concepts as heaven and earth, good and evil, and salvation and sin, from markedly different perspectives. Questions concerning the nature of God, and the proper relationship between God and humanity, were approached by Anglicans through an ordered, rational, and institutional apologetic. Methodists approached such questions through a personal and immediate experience with the spirit of a powerful and living God.

This recurring emphasis on religious experience in the Methodist tradition, and its inevitable conflict with the Anglican tendency toward presenting Christianity as a system of rational precepts, gave way to charges that Canadian Methodists would be unable to contribute to the advancement and dissemination of theology, and the other liberal disciplines studied at the university level: experience was considered detrimental to establishing the reality of God as transcending personal perspectives and individual moods and feelings. Such subjectivism had no place in higher learning.¹⁰

Instances of Anglican contempt for itinerant Methodist preachers in rural Upper Canada in the first decades of the nineteenth century have been cited in the previous chapter. It is not difficult to understand such apprehension. Early accounts of rural revival meetings indicate a certain physical and emotional excess that would prove very difficult for members of the Church of England to

¹⁰ This Methodist emphasis on religious experience has often been misrepresented, and such claims of anti-intellectualism are, more often than not, unfounded. For Wesley, religious experience was a complex phenomenon. See Theodore Runyon, "Wesley and 'Right Experience'," in Neil Semple, ed., Canadian Methodist Historical Society: Papers, Volume 7, (Toronto: Canadian Methodist Historical Society, 1989), pp.55-65.
accept as authentic, or even plausible. In a sermon that John Strachan preached in 1830, we see the typical Anglican response to Methodist accounts of impassioned conversion experiences:

It is to be feared, that many suppose that the blessings of heaven consist in certain raptures and extacies [sic] of which we can form no conception in our present state...But this is a great mistake—the foundation of our felicity in heaven is substantially the same as that which forms the foundation of the present world. Man can enjoy no true felicity while he remains the slave of unruly passions and appetites.

For Methodists, evangelical Protestant Christianity in the Wesleyan tradition had to infuse every aspect of religious and social life; in particular, it had to shape the moral and intellectual atmosphere of any educational institution. This would lead, inevitably, to profound cultural differences between what Westfall terms the culture of order and the culture of experience. The engagement between these two cultures would lead to the creation of Victoria University, the Methodist alternative for collegiate, and eventually university, education in Upper Canada. What is most interesting in this story, is that Victoria College was born out of an option for independence; and yet, as this thesis lays claim, its ultimate contribution to higher education in Canada was to

11 The most valuable source for such early accounts of the revivalist tradition, see John Carroll, Case and His Contemporaries; or the Canadian Itinerants Memorial, 5 Volumes, (Toronto: Samuel Rose, 1867-7). And for the authoritative contemporary account of this movement, see Phyllis D. Airhart, Serving the Present Age: Revivalism, Progressivism, and the Methodist Tradition in Canada, (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1992).


13 Ibid., especially pp.19-49.
be its willingness to return to the intellectual community which it was created to shun. Therein lies the remarkable phenomenon of the federated form of university polity.

The Founding of Victoria College, 1828-1841.

It has been noted above that the Methodist Episcopal Church of Upper Canada had been established in 1828, thereby dissolving the union with American Methodism. With evangelical intensity, Canadian Methodists were determined to have a church that was not merely technically independent but truly Canadian, and equal in zeal and effectiveness to the growing needs of the colony. Its members had to be defended against the insinuations, referred to earlier, that they were little better than disloyal and ignorant ranters; its principles and convictions—not only pertaining to Christianity, but also in relation to the equality of civil privilege—had to be forcefully explained and disseminated; and its youth, who were in increasing numbers travelling to the American Methodist seminaries, had to be given the opportunity for a Godly Canadian education. The issue of equality of privilege was exacerbated when Upper Canada College was established in 1829 as a grammar school effectively under Anglican auspices, and then endowed with a portion of the provincial school lands; Methodist leaders were now quite determined at least to explore the possibility of establishing an educational institution of their own at their next annual conference.

Thus it was that the Annual Conference of the Methodist Church in Upper
Canada, held near Ancaster in 1829, resolved:

That a Committee of Five be appointed to take into consideration the propriety of establishing a Seminary and drawing up a Petition to the next session of the Provincial Parliament for an act of incorporation.14

The report of this committee to the Annual Conference of the following year gave the clearest indication that the proposed Academy was a necessary response to at least two recent developments in education in the province: first, the determination of Bishop Strachan and his supporters to cling to the then liberalized charter of the still unopened King's College and to its endowment; and second, the anticipated creation of Queen's College under the auspices of ministers and laity of the Church of Scotland—an institution which would require all its trustees to be members of that Church and lay professors to subscribe to a declaration of faith approved by the Synod in Canada.15 Envisioning first a preparatory college, the Report stipulated that:

This Academy shall be purely a Literary Institution. No system of Theology shall be taught therein, but all students shall be free to embrace and pursue any religious creed, and attend any place of worship, their parents or guardians may direct.16

The Christian Guardian, together with its first editor Egerton Ryerson, wasted no time in coming to the support of the proposed institution. In an editorial in November of 1830, Ryerson denied that the object of the school was "...to compete

14 United Church Archives, Manuscript, Minutes of Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada, 1829, p.14.

15 In a Memorial to the House of Assembly submitted in January 1830, the Presbyterians made clear their desire to provide schools for those of their students who were excluded by the restrictions of Anglican establishment. See "Educational Proceedings of U.C. Legislature, 1830," in D.H.E., Vol. 1, pp.298-99.

16 United Church Archives, Manuscript, Minutes of Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada, 1830. p.35.
with any college which may be established in this Province; but [was] rather to be tributary to it, when one shall be established for the general benefit of the Province under the several branches of the Provincial Legislature." This was a thinly disguised indictment of King's, for as far as the Anglicans were concerned, such a college had been established to serve "the general benefit of the Province," and its name was King's College.

The other important resolution of the original committee directed that nine Trustees be appointed by the Conference, and in them was to be vested the management of all the property belonging to the institution. Also, five Visitors were to be chosen annually by the Conference, and these were to be associated with the trustees in appointing members of the teaching staff, fixing their salaries, framing regulations, prescribing the course of study, and dealing with "all other matters which relate to the proper regulation, government, discipline, and instruction of the students."  

At this early stage, there were two remaining issues which were critical: the choice of location for the College, and the raising of sufficient funds for the purchase of suitable property and the construction of buildings thereon. In regards to the former matter, yet another committee of the Annual Conference was created by election to vote on a site. Six nominations were put forward, and included York, Cobourg, Belleville, Kingston, and Brockville. Cobourg was

\[17 \text{ Christian Guardian, November 6, 1830.}\]

\[18 \text{ Minutes of Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1830, p.35.}\]
chosen supposedly because it was "one of the most beautiful, healthy, and flourishing villages in Upper Canada." It would not be unreasonable to suggest that it was equally due to that town being free of any of the sinful temptations that were to be found in the municipality of York.

It was in the raising of monies for the proposed Academy, which had by February of 1831 been given the title the "Upper Canada Academy," that the true genius of John Wesley's district and circuit organization became apparent in the Canadian context. Potential donors included itinerant preachers, farmers, merchants, and mechanics, none of whom was wealthy, and few of whom enjoyed a social status that might have been described in that day as "respectable." Collectors were distributed throughout the Methodist circuits in the province, each armed with subscription books detailing the constitution of the Academy and suggestions for payment. Subscriptions were made for sale and ranged in price from ten shillings to five pounds. A valuable historical resource was found when these original subscription books were rediscovered in 1930. These records indicate that of the seven to eight thousand pounds raised for the Academy, the largest cash subscription was thirty pounds, and the average was well less than a single pound. While this indicates that the campaign was broadly based, it was not without difficulties. Initial pledges were promising, but the subscription books give evidence that, in many cases, later instalments were not forthcoming.


Notwithstanding these difficulties, the corner stone of the Academy was laid with due flourish on June 7, 1832. The Christian Guardian recorded the proceedings, and the editor's account finishes with a boast that leaves no doubt that this was truly a Methodist endeavour:

We conclude with one passing observation in reference to the contractors and workmen: they are to a man British born subjects, and to this day not one glass of ardent spirits has been allowed, or will be permitted to be used from the beginning to the close of the building of the Academy.\(^2\)

Building commenced at Cobourg, but it was not until late in 1834 that completion was in sight. In the meantime, the insufficiency of funds was taking its toll, and plans were made in the summer of 1835 to deputize Egerton Ryerson as an agent of the Board of Trustees and dispatch him to England with a twofold purpose: to raise further funds for the project, and to secure for the Academy a royal charter. John Strachan had made a similar trip to England some thirteen years earlier and was successful to a great extent only in the latter endeavour. And it will be recalled that his accomplishments in that regard were clouded by his dishonest "Ecclesiastical Chart." Ryerson was confident that some funds could be raised in England. He had made a brief visit (his first) to England in 1833 in order to negotiate the union of Canadian Methodists—a union between the Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada and the British Wesleyan Missionary Society in British North America. During his visit he was able to raise just over one hundred pounds for the Academy, and to make inquiries concerning both faculty for the Academy, and future benefactors. He was less sure of his chances

\(^2\) Christian Guardian, June 10, 1832.
for success in obtaining a royal charter.

There were two considerable problems. The first was that the House of Assembly had refused second reading of a bill that would incorporate the Upper Canada Academy, after initially promising to do so.\(^2\) That the Colonial Office would be hesitant to act contrary to the provincial legislature was almost a certainty; so much so that Ryerson's successor as editor of the *Christian Guardian*, the Reverend Ephraim Evans, wrote to Ryerson in London, that he "...[entertained] not the slightest hope of being able to procure such a Charter as we would be justifiable in accepting."\(^3\) It was a tribute to Ryerson's unfailing efforts in lobbying Whitehall, throughout the winter of 1835 and 1836, that he was eventually to succeed in overcoming such a formidable obstacle and obtain his desired charter.

The second problem was that the Methodist Church, both in England and in the colonies, was a body of non-conformist ministers, and therefore unrecognized by British law. How could a royal charter be accorded to an ecclesiastical body not recognized by the Crown? Ryerson devised an exceptionally clever solution. Although the Methodist Conference in Upper Canada was unknown to British law, Methodist ministers in the province had been given a recognized status by the grant of legal authority for the solemnization of matrimony. Accordingly, Ryerson sought from the Crown a


charter to be entrusted to these legally recognized ministers for the establishment of an Academy, and for the election of trustees and visitors who would be a corporate body exercising responsibility for all the purposes of the college. When Crown officials were presented with this legal solution, Ryerson states that "...their scruples were at once removed, and they cordially acceded to my proposition to recognize our ministerial character."24

With that recognition secured, Ryerson continued his twofold work in London: raising funds, and providing the Colonial Secretary, Lord Glenelg, with well-reasoned, highly substantive, and dispassionate argumentation for the granting of a royal charter to the Academy. Based on his correspondence from London during the early years, it would seem that he was able to raise about 1200 pounds—nowhere near the amount that would be required to offset the expenses that had been incurred for the construction of the Academy's buildings.25

In his "Statement, Explanatory of the Objects and Purpose of the Upper Canada Academy,"26 Ryerson presented Lord Glenelg with four cogent arguments which, in essence, represent the most fundamental issues of the University Question. First, Ryerson recalls the royal charter, the two hundred and twenty-five thousand acres of Canada Company land, and the annual grant of one

24 Ibid., p.165.


thousand pounds for sixteen years, all of which had been bestowed upon the University of King's College. To these excesses had been added the proceeds from the sale of 66,000 acres of Crown land and 2000 pounds per annum grant that had been given to Upper Canada College. Second, the Colonial Secretary is reminded of the communication between His Majesty's government and the Lieutenant-Governor of Upper Canada in 1832, and which stipulated that the latter should "...forward to the very uttermost of [his] authority and influence any scheme for the extension of Education amongst the youth of the Province, and especially among the poorest and most destitute of their number." This mandate was hardly being carried out by Upper Canada College, whose students were primarily children of government officials and local gentry. Third, Ryerson establishes what Strachan had always wanted to deny: that the Methodist denomination was the most numerous body of Christians in the Province, and that they had as many congregations as both the Churches of England and Scotland. And finally, after offering a litany of accomplishments and contributions that Methodists had made to the welfare of all peoples in Upper Canada, Ryerson points out that they have never received any other pecuniary support than the voluntary contributions of their scattered congregations; whilst...considerably above one hundred thousand pounds have been expended by Government in supporting the clergy of the Church of England in Upper Canada, exclusive of the proceeds, past and prospective, of the Clergy Reserve Lands.\footnote{Ibid., p.250.}

When one considers the efforts of both Strachan and Ryerson in obtaining royal charters for their perspective institutions, one is struck by the fact
that Strachan faced nothing but support for further establishing the Anglican Church in Upper Canada, and yet resorted to devious tactics to achieve his ends; Ryerson faced nothing but opposition to his proposed "nonconformist" institution, and yet relied on well-supported argument and persuasion. The result of Ryerson's deft and steadfast labour was the Charter of the Upper Canada Academy, which passed the Great Seal on October 12, 1836, the first charter ever granted by the British government to a nonconformist body for an educational institution. In a milestone of Methodist history, the charter for the first time legally recognizes the "Wesleyan Methodist Church in our Upper Canada."²⁸

On June 18, 1836, there took place at Cobourg the formal opening of the Academy under the principalship of the Reverend Matthew Richey,²⁹ and with an attendance of one hundred and twenty students, of whom eighty were borders.³⁰ It was to operate for six years at the preparatory level. Students ranged in age from seven to the early twenties. Courses were given by the Principal and seven teachers in Mathematics, Latin, Greek, Rhetoric, Logic, and Intellectual and Moral Philosophy. And in one of the many contrasting features to Upper Canada College, there was in the Academy a "Female Department," where instruction was


²⁹ In his Case and His Contemporaries; or the Canadian Itinerants' Memorial, Vol. IV, p. 107, John Carroll describes Richey as possessing "an unusual fecundity of words, inclining to diffuseness and inflation." Richey was British; it was not uncommon for there to be some considerable tension between British and Canadian Methodists.

³⁰ Christian Guardian, June 29, 1836.
offered in English Education, French, Music, Drawing, and Embroidery.\textsuperscript{31}

Despite its promising commencement, the Upper Canada Academy was on the brink of financial disaster. While in London, Ryerson had impressed Lord Glenelg to the extent that, in April of 1837, the Colonial Secretary was to communicate to Lieutenant-Governor Sir Francis Bond Head his expectation that "...the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly of Upper Canada will, at once, recognize the propriety of this proceeding, the object of which is to carry out the spirit of the measure which has already met their concurrence."\textsuperscript{32} This, thought Ryerson, implied the application of an equitable grant. To be sure, the House of Assembly passed a bill, by a majority of thirty one to ten, authorising a loan (as opposed to a grant—there is evidence that Ryerson spoke of a "loan" but meant a "grant," while the Legislature spoke of a "loan" and meant a "loan") of 4,100 pounds for ten years. The Legislature Council responded to this bill by referring it to a Select Committee with a most interesting membership: four members of the Church of England, one Presbyterian, and one Roman Catholic. One cannot be surprised by the outcome. As Ryerson himself notes, the Legislative Council sent the bill back with the amendment that "...the Receiver General should not advance any of the money granted by the Act, unless he had


\textsuperscript{32} "A Despatch from the Colonial Minister, Relating to a Grant to the Upper Canada Academy," in \textit{D.H.E.}, Vol. III, p.104.

money in his hands, for which he had no other use." One wonders when any Receiver General of Ontario had money "for which he [or she] had no other use"!

After an indignant letter to the Colonial Secretary from Ryerson, in which the latter warned of the most serious embarrassment that would fall upon the Academy if funds were not forthcoming, Lord Glenelg directed Sir Francis Bond Head to "advance" the amount specified in the Act. Early in their 1838 session, The House of Assembly responded by advancing half of the stipulated amount—2,050 pounds—to the Academy, with the polite acknowledgement that the Methodists had succeeded in raising more money by voluntary contribution than had ever before been raised in the history of the province. The remaining amount would be held until the matter of whether the advance was a loan or a grant was resolved, "...a matter upon which the House abstains from offering an opinion."

The royal charter of 1836 had provided for the appointment of the Board of Trustees of the Academy by the Conference, thus establishing a pattern of governance which would endure without major change until 1925. The Academy was required to teach "the various branches of Literature and Science," on "Christian principles," and it was prohibited from imposing religious tests on prospective students. From the outset, therefore, the Academy could appoint

34 Egerton Ryerson, Petition of the Rev. Egerton Ryerson to the House of Assembly, together with a message from His Excellency the Lieut. Governor, and Correspondence between the Right Hon. Lord Glenelg, His Excellency, and Mr. Ryerson, Relative to the Upper Canada Academy, (Toronto: Printed by Order of the House of Assembly, Guardian Office, 1838), pp.3-21.


non-Methodists to its teaching staff, and it could (and did) enrol students who were not Methodists. These liberal conditions allowed the Upper Canada Academy to become the educational refuge of those who were, either by religion or economic class, excluded from other institutions. The school was on the verge of a great future. But two events would soon transpire which would enable the Upper Canada Academy to evolve, one day, into Victoria University. Had they not, there would probably still remain in Cobourg today, a very fine secondary school of Methodist origin, and housed in a building made famous by the artist W. H. Bartlett.³⁷

The first of the two events mentioned above was inevitable. Although the founding of the Upper Canada Academy was primarily the Methodist response to the exclusive and restrictive character of the Anglican Upper Canada College, developments at the university level throughout the province made the elevation of the Academy to a college of higher learning a natural progression. There were, in 1841, four educational charters in existence in the province: King's College dating from 1827, the Academy dating from 1836, the Roman Catholic College of Regiopolis at Kingston dating from 1837, and the Presbyterian University at Kingston, eventually to be Queen's, dating from 1840. Of these, the latter three sought enlargement or change before entering upon university work. The Upper

³⁷ In one of the finest examples of early nineteenth century Ontario sketching, the work “Coburg” [sic], by W. H. Bartlett, features a splendid panorama of Cobourg—and its domineering edifice, the Upper Canada Academy—from its harbour. The sketch was probably completed around 1840. Remarkably, the fine Georgian structure that was Victoria’s first home was to share the similar fate of the original home of King’s College: it became a provincial lunatic asylum.
Canada Academy and Regiopolis began as preparatory schools, Queen's as a college.

Accordingly, in July of 1841, after receiving a mandate from the Annual Conference, the Trustees of the Upper Canada Academy petitioned the Governor General, Lord Sydenham, and both Houses of Parliament, praying that the Academy might be incorporated as a College, with university powers, and also that it might receive an annual endowment of 1,000 pounds. Suitable legislation was tabled, and on August 27 an Act was passed that created "Victoria College," together with a Senate "with power and authority to confer the degrees of Bachelor, Master, and Doctor in the several Arts and Faculties." Three weeks later, another Act passed both Houses, and provided for a grant of 500 pounds to the Trustees of Victoria College—not the 1,000 that Ryerson had requested, but still a fair sum. For it was Ryerson's expectation that this grant was "...an aid which we trust will be increased and continue rapidly." At the time, Ryerson had no way of knowing how wrong he would prove to be.

The second event, referred to above as critical to the growth of Victoria College, came as a surprise to no one; Ryerson had almost single-handedly secured the College's future through his extraordinary efforts in London. On June


21, 1842, he was installed, reluctantly, as Principal of Victoria College on the occasion of its opening. 

Ryerson's "Inaugural Address on the Nature and Advantages of an English and Liberal Education" stands as a classic statement of Victorian educational philosophy—it was a speech that took an hour and a half to deliver and that outlined and justified the future curriculum of the College. He envisaged a curriculum in which the study of the classics would be given less emphasis than would be customary at King's College; English and the sciences were to be particularly fostered. Moral philosophy and theology would constitute the core of the student's program. "To employ our intellectual and moral powers according to the principles of reason and truth is the great end of our existence." This meant in practice that one should seek only that knowledge "which it concerns us to know"—that is, knowledge which illuminates "moral interests and relations." Knowledge should be sought in an atmosphere informed by theology: "the Bible is the common inheritance of Christendom; and its principles—unconnected with the dogmas or bias of sectarianism—should form a part of the education of all


41 The following month, he received from the Wesleyan University of Middletown, Connecticut, the honourary degree of Doctor of Divinity. See Ibid., p.305.

42 Egerton Ryerson, Inaugural Address on the Nature and Advantages of an English and Liberal Education; delivered by the Rev. Egerton Ryerson, at the Opening of Victoria College, June 21, 1842; With an account of the opening Services, Course of studies, terms, etc., in the College. (Toronto: By Order of the Board of Trustees and Visitors, Printed at the Guardian Office, 1842), p.17.
Christians. The "dogmas or bias of sectarianism" are, of course, a direct reference to what Ryerson felt was the intellectual climate of Strachan's King's College, and can only be understood in the context of the experiential Methodist theology discussed above, which viewed God as an active and interventionist power who continually transformed people, and through them, the world. The road to salvation was not through the intellect. Victoria's task was to transmit knowledge, and to mould the characters of its graduates on Christian lines, rather than to emphasize research or the development of the student's capacity to undertake critical inquiry.

What should be noted here is the fundamental ideological difference in Ryerson and Strachan's philosophy of higher education. Ryerson's concern that his students pursue only that knowledge which illuminates "moral interests and relations"—that is, which concerns the "method" of how a person lives his Christianity in relation to others—must be contrasted with Strachan's hope that King's College become a refuge where

...men, who [have] no taste for the cares or the broils of worldly pursuits, might retire from the troubles of public life, and aspire to greater perfection than even an ordinary intercourse with society will allow.  

Ryerson's understanding of the nature and purposes of a university was intensely North American with its Benthamite emphasis upon utility, and would also differ profoundly from the Roman Catholic intellectual tradition. To

\[43 \text{ Ibid., p.19.}\]

\[44 \text{ "Opening of King's College University," in D.H.E., Vol. IV, p.285.}\]
compare Ryerson's "Address on the Nature and Advantages of an English and Liberal Education" with John Henry Newman's *The Idea of a University*—written within thirty years of one another—is to observe two educational philosophies whose first principles are considerably different. Newman's lectures, which led to the founding of the National University of Ireland towards the end of the century, call for university students to pursue knowledge, but not knowledge in the sense of preparation for a vocation or profession, rather knowledge for its own sake, for its own enjoyment and reward; not even useful knowledge in the sense of making students better morally or religiously, but simply and only the cultivation of the intellect.\[45\]

The University Question, 1841-1850.

It is the story of this thesis that these three educational perspectives—Methodist, Anglican, and Roman Catholic—each acting in isolation for the better part of the nineteenth century, were eventually to join forces to constitute the federated University of Toronto. We know, though, that the road to federation was not an easy one, and that it was the product of resourcefulness and compromise. The previous chapter has recorded that early discussions between Doctor Liddell of Queen's and Doctor Ryerson, in 1843, represent the first concerted movement toward some form of provincial university. The

correspondence reveals the latter's hesitation to move toward any form of university consolidation in the province that would either compromise Victoria's substantial investment in land and buildings at Cobourg, or that might lead to the degeneration of Victoria into a mere divinity college. It was not until the introduction of Robert Baldwin's first University Bill, that Ryerson and the Board of Victoria began to contemplate seriously what might eventually be necessary as a result of financial exigencies.

It will be recalled that Baldwin's Bill invested the provincial endowment—until that time controlled by King's—in a newly created University of Toronto, which would consist of King's, Victoria, and other such colleges that might want to be incorporated in the University. Victoria's Board of Trustees forwarded to the Governor General a lengthy opinion on the merits, and other less positive features, of the Bill. It is notable only for its obfuscation: it seeks guarantees that the Board knew would not be forthcoming, and then, seemingly, agrees with the substance of the Bill. The true feelings of the Victoria Board toward Baldwin's Bill can be found, though, in a letter to the editor of the Christian Guardian from Ryerson. It offers a valuable insight into the Victoria position on what would come to be known as the University Question:

As a body, we gain nothing by the "University Bill," should it become a law; it only provides for the continuance of the small aid which the Parliament has already granted; whilst of course it takes away the University powers and privileges of Victoria College—making it a College in the University of Toronto. Our omission

46 See above, Chapter One, n.71.

therefore would be preferable... But such an omission would destroy the very character and objects of the Bill. As a provincial measure, it cannot fail to confer lasting honour upon the Government and unspeakable benefits upon the country. Viewing the measure in this light, the Board of Victoria College have consented to resign certain of their rights and privileges for the accomplishment of general objects so comprehensive and important.

And when it was learned that Bishop Strachan had violently denounced the Bill, the Methodist paper became even more enthusiastic, stating that "The University of King's College, at Toronto, in its present illegal and illiberal management, is a GRAND 'ERROR!.' THE HON. MR. BALDWIN'S BILL IS A GRAND CORRECTOR!" 49

It would be unfair to suggest that Victoria's support for the Baldwin Bill was motivated even significantly by that College's dislike for Strachan, King's College, and all that Anglican establishment stood for. The energies devoted, and the monies expended, on obtaining Victoria's charter, and erecting its building, were far too great to be compromised by jealousy and suspicion. It is more likely that Methodist leaders, in response to the proposed Bill, were acting out of an honest desire to support the "great plan" inspired by the union of the two Canadas in 1840. There was a certain prosperity and heightened sense of nationalism that followed upon that event, and it seems likely that Victoria's Board was motivated by an appropriate sense of patriotism. But the Bill was not to pass. Strachan's agent, William Draper, was too convincing at the Bar of the House; moreover, the Baldwin-La Fontaine Ministry resigned in November, 1843.


49 Ibid., Nov. 22, 1843.
It would be two years before another step was taken towards federation.

This next step was sponsored by Draper himself, now Premier and Attorney-General. With his experience representing the interests of King's College during the tabling of the Baldwin Bill, Draper was more than familiar with the political minefield that had to be crossed before a compromise could be reached on consolidation. To this end, he very cleverly initiated a correspondence with Ryerson, under the guise of seeking his "opinion and suggestion," but more truly with the intention of guaranteeing Ryerson that his political support would be acknowledged by the protection of Victoria's interests. Of greatest concern to the Board of Victoria during this period was the suggestion, being heard from certain members of the Parliament, that a solution to the University Question might require the complete secularization of the University of Toronto, to form a truly provincial university accessible to all. Thus Draper assured Ryerson:

I think that any plan which would provide for education merely,—without reference to any religious principle,—bad. I also think that it is much to be wished,—(for the good of the Country,) that, in making provision for the support of University Education, the tuition of those intended for the University of the different leading Religious Denominations, should not be lost sight of.\(^50\)

In responding to Draper's Bills—there were three bills pertaining to the proposed University of Upper Canada that he introduced in March, 1835—Ryerson, and the Victoria College Board, made clear what, exactly, they considered to be at stake for their College. Draper's legislation constituted a new University with member colleges receiving financial assistance based upon the

number of students registered. This was acceptable to Victoria. It required of all
professors a minimum test of religious faith in the Inspiration of the Scriptures
and the Doctrine of the Trinity. For Ryerson, who would not hear of higher
education that was not conducted upon Christian principles, this was the very
minimum, but acceptable. The real issue for Victoria was their removal to
Toronto. To support Draper's Bill, which called for such removal, they would
have to be handsomely rewarded. In a letter to the Governor General's Private
Secretary, Ryerson states that

...the Buildings of Victoria College are situated at Cobourg. It cannot, therefore,
derive any benefits to its pupils from its connection with the University situated at
Toronto. If its incorporation with the Toronto University be not accompanied with an
increase of pecuniary aid, the change in its relations will be one of sacrifice and loss,
in every respect. Should the Board be remunerated for the College Buildings at
Cobourg, so as to be able to erect a new establishment at Toronto, the case would be
different.51

Draper's three Bills, tabled together, were lost by the carrying of an amendment
to their second reading. The second attempt at the formation of a provincial
university had failed.

There were two groups in the House of Assembly—unlikely allies though
they were—whose negative votes combined to squash the plan during the spring of
1845. The first was a group of American-influenced Methodists who were
dedicated voluntarists: they considered that, even for education, no state grants
should be made to churches. These Methodists were represented by the short-
lived Toronto Periodical Journal. They thought that government aid had done

more harm than good to Victoria, which was strongest in her early days when money was forthcoming voluntarily. Now, the College took 500 pounds annually, and was looking for more, "While notwithstanding the members of the families of the ruling parties of [the Annual Methodist] Conference are fast settling together in Cobourg, to complete a kind of family compact system, shown most evidently by their diminished reliance on their people, and their increased dependence on the Government." The second faction within the House of Assembly that opposed Draper's legislation, were, not surprisingly, Anglicans, who were determined to retain control of King's, and her endowment. It is unlikely that there were two more diametrically opposed political factions in the province, but together they managed to defeat a significant amount of legislation.

Given that removal to Toronto was the real stumbling block for Victoria, it is not surprising that there appeared in the Christian Guardian a proposal for the creation of a Provincial University to which the colleges would surrender their examining powers, while retaining their present locations. This plan was modelled after the University of London (see above, Chapter Two), and foreshadowed the next legislative attempt to address the University Question by the Conservative Solicitor-General, Mr. John A. Macdonald.

Before Ryerson left the Principalship of Victoria for the position of Chief Superintendent of Education for Canada West (he had served as Assistant

52 Toronto Periodical Journal, April, 1845.

53 Christian Guardian, September 17, 1845.
Superintendent while acting as President of Victoria), he had set down, in a letter to the British Colonist newspaper of Toronto, the *sine qua non* of the Methodist position on the University Question. To support Macdonald's legislation, or any future attempts to resolve the question, would require the recognition of certain principles. Briefly stated, they are as follows: First, that there should be a Provincial University, furnishing the highest academic and professional education. Second, that the Provincial University should be established and conducted upon Christian principles, yet free from sectarian bias, or ascendency. Third, that there should be an intermediate class of Seminaries established by the various denominations for the purposes of educating their clergy, and such students who wish to prepare for university in a religious environment of learning. And finally, that the Government should endow both the Provincial University, and these Seminaries.\

A tall order, indeed, but Macdonald's University Bills of 1847 went the furthest yet in meeting Methodist aspirations. The revenue of the King's College endowment was to be appropriated, and divided among the province's denominational colleges, with Victoria receiving 1,500 pounds. Moreover, Victoria could remain in Cobourg while enjoying equal representation on the Board of the newly established University. And, it fully respected the rights of the denominational colleges to educate their students in light of Christian principles. Methodist support for Macdonald's legislation was unqualified, because of its

---

"comparative equality and liberality," and because it gave practical recognition to "the connexion of Science and Religion."\(^{55}\)

But by July 23rd, Macdonald had written to Victoria's new President, Reverend Alexander MacNab, informing him that the Opposition had united, together with some of his own Conservatives, to oppose the Bills, in order to place the University Question at the centre of the upcoming election.\(^ {56}\) Macdonald was forced to withdraw his legislation, and in the subsequent election his Conservative government was defeated. The University Question would be returned once more to the hands of Mr. Baldwin.

The University Act of 1849, sponsored by Baldwin, was to impose a devastating blow upon the denominational colleges. It will be recalled that the central idea of this Bill was the separation of the provincial university from all ecclesiastical influence and control. The subject of divinity was excluded from the university; all religious tests and exercises were done away with; it was forbidden to the government to appoint an ecclesiastic to the Senate, and such could not fill the office of Chancellor. The only privilege offered to the denominational colleges was the right to appoint one member of the Senate, and this privilege was offered only on condition of their being deprived at once and forever of the power to confer degrees except in divinity. Baldwin's ultimate goal was to see the extinction of all other denominational colleges as educational institutions, and their

\(^{55}\) Christian Guardian, July 21, 1847.

conversion into theological schools, and this was to be accomplished either by their voluntary surrender, or by the force of state-endowed competition. The editor of the Guardian, in no uncertain terms, spelled out the implications:

If the godless Colossus at Toronto adsorb all the University funds, there is little likelihood of a Legislature...granting from the Provincial funds any sum necessary to sustain the other Colleges...Should the present Bill become the law of the land, it [Victoria] must go down; and ten thousand pounds—the least of the evil—be sacrificed in the buildings and the grounds.57

Victoria College in Isolation, 1850-1868.

Baldwin's Act become law on January 1, 1850. This brought to an end a period of great uncertainty for Victoria; for six years they had sought a fair and equitable solution to their financial problem, and for as many years were they unsure about their future. And during this time, they were operating a University College and a Classical Academy based on the revenues from tuition—about one pound per term (which came as often in the form of beef as it did in sterling), and from an annual grant of only 500 pounds from the Legislature. With the passing of Baldwin's Act, Victoria was, quite simply, in a state of financial crisis. It came as no surprise when the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church submitted to the Legislative Assembly, a Memorial that requested an Act to allow for the removal of Victoria College to Toronto.58 The Act was passed on August 10, 1850, in light of the College's financial difficulties, and things looked dim for

57 Christian Guardian, April 18, 1849.

those at Victoria who feared what such a move might mean for Alma Mater.

Almost immediately, rumours started to circulate throughout the province's Methodist districts and circuits. Was the College to be discontinued? Was it to be converted into a purely theological institution? Was it to be formally affiliated to the new University of Toronto? To quell such fears the Board made a firm decision towards the end of August to remain in Cobourg for at least another year. Its members were aware of what a move to Toronto under the Baldwin scheme would mean: surrendering their power to grant degrees in Arts and Science, retaining only the right to confer degrees in Theology; the continuance of the College as a mere Academy, preparing students for University; and the devolution of the College into a sort of pastoral home for Methodists enrolled in the "real" University.

Given what Victoria would have to surrender to comply with the stipulations of the Baldwin Act, one wonders whether the only impediment to such a move was their concern about leaving their Cobourg property. The claim was made that real estate was the only issue. The Conference Executive stated, on Victoria's behalf, that the College was prepared to move "could a satisfactory disposal of our buildings at Cobourg be made, and new ones procured at Toronto." But it does not seem unfair to suggest, that there was never any

60 ibid., p.152.
61 James Musgrove and Enoch Wood, Address to the Members and Friends of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada in behalf of the College, (Toronto: Printed by Thomas H. Bentley, 1851), p.4.
serious consideration given to such a move as long as it was likely that Victoria would be reduced to a mere theological college. And the Baldwin Act would have meant exactly that.

The Hincks Bill of 1853, discussed in the previous chapter, was to be the last legislation, of real significance for the denominational colleges, to be tabled before the Federation Act of 1887. It will be recalled that it reorganized the University of Toronto according to the constitutional arrangement developed at the University of London, and created University College as the province’s non-denominational Arts College, leaving the University with the business of conferring degrees and examining. Moreover, it promised the denominational colleges any surplus of funds from the endowment not expended by the University or University College—a hollow promise at best. Victoria’s predicament with the passing of the Hincks Act remained unchanged: remain in Cobourg at great financial expense, or move to Toronto, thereby acquiring guarantee of revenues, but at the risk of losing its Methodist ethos.

Victoria’s history for the next fifteen years was dominated by financial strain. While the Hinck’s Act provided for its affiliation with the University of Toronto, Victoria withdrew from that University’s Senate when no funds were furnished to allow their students to travel to Toronto to sit for examinations. And while the Government increased the annual parliamentary grant to the denominational colleges from 500 pounds to 750 pounds—hardly a windfall—expenses at Cobourg were spiralling. In order to remain competitive with
University College, considerable expenditures were incurred; President Samuel Nelles was to report to the Christian Guardian in 1858 that the College debt was as much as 8,000 pounds. Nelles was an eloquent spokesman for the College's mission, and in his annual report of 1858, he made clear that the stakes were high. Methodists throughout the province had to realize that Victoria College was 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...without it, our Ministers will suffer both in numbers and efficiency...And to all this we have to add the melancholy statement, that our College, with its Halls full of Students, is in imminent danger of being closed for want of Funds.

At the Annual Methodist Conference at Hamilton in June, 1859, a resolution was passed that declared 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" was "grossly illiberal, partial, unjust and unpatriotic." Such charges provoked a bitter reaction in the press, especially from the Globe, and President Nelles had to respond. In so doing, he made clear that the denominational colleges had two specific charges that had to be addressed. The first concerned the fact that the University of Toronto, and University College, enjoyed the benefits of all the proceeds of the annual endowment, and at the expense of the outlying colleges:

We wish it to be distinctly understood that we are not opposed to the existence of one

---

62 Christian Guardian, Sept. 8, 1858.


Provincial University, provided that the University be properly constituted and administered. But we are opposed to the narrowing down of that University into one solitary College, and that College one that does not commend itself to the majority of the Christian people of this Province. We are willing that one secular College should remain and be handsomely endowed to meet the case of those who prefer that kind of Institution. We will, if necessary, consent to give it even the lion's share of the Endowment; but we are not willing that a part should swallow up the whole.65

The second charge was equally as serious. It implied that there had been extravagance and waste in the administration of University College; in the Victorian age, such charges were considered ungentlemanlike. Notwithstanding, Nelles turned his sights on the University's income:

Out of 16,000 pounds a year very good care is taken that there shall be no "Surplus," except for scholarships, new Buildings, and new Libraries. And yet, we are accused of "bad taste" in calling attention to this state of things. Doubtless tastes differ; but it is easy accounting for the sensitiveness of your learned Correspondent: the rich and well-fed are known to be delicate; hungry palates are not so nice.66

The University Question had thus become entirely public and considerably nasty. The story has already been told of how the House of Assembly dealt with the issue by referring it to a Select Committee. A great number of distinguished men appeared before that Committee, and if some accounts are to be believed it was not unemotional. According to a notice placed in the Quebec Morning Chronicle, on April 27, 1860, Ryerson's address enjoyed the following response:

...the speech of the Upper Canada Superintendent of Education merged pathetically toward the close into a flood of tears, quite affecting to behold. Stern legislators were found perceptibly and audibly blubbering, while the friends of the Reverend Speaker were altogether overcome.67

This may be journalistic hyperbole; given some of Ryerson's remarks to the


66 ibid., p.209.

67 Victoria University Archives, Quebec Morning Chronicle, April 27, 1860.
Committee, it is hard to imagine that there were many tears. In responding to University College President Daniel Wilson's patronizing statement to the Committee, cited in the previous chapter, Ryerson groups him with others "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."

And upon Wilson's alleged scholarship, Ryerson passes the following judgement:

"[he had]...devoted himself to disembowelling the cemeteries of Indian tribes, in seeking up the tomahawks, pipes, and tobacco which may be found there, and writing essays upon them."

Between 1860 and 1868, when all grants to the denominational colleges were terminated by Ontario's first Premier, John Sandfield Macdonald, little changed in the official positions of the major players in the University Question. The Commission appointed in 1861 to make recommendations concerning university reform published its report in 1863, and ultimately called for the strict implementation of the Hincks Act of 1853. The Senate of the University of Toronto responded predictably. In their reply to the report they opined that

whatever funds the Legislature may see fit to set apart, in aid of the colleges affiliated by the University Act [of 1853], exclusive of University College, should be divided into three equal parts...It is to be understood that this suggestion is not intended to interfere with the endowment of University College, it being the opinion of the Senate that University College has a first claim to a fixed endowment amply sufficient to its

---

68 University Question: The Rev. Dr. Ryerson's Defense of the Wesleyan Petitions to the Legislature, and of the Denominational Colleges as Part of our System of Public Instruction, In Reply to Dr. Wilson and Mr. Langton, Before a Select Committee of the Legislative Assembly, (Quebec: Printed by Thompson & Co., 1860), p.7.

69 Ibid., p.9.
support in its present state of efficiency.\textsuperscript{76}

Victoria's response to the report was equally as predictable. To the House of Assembly and Legislative Council they presented a Memorial praying

for such permanent aid to Victoria College as its usefulness and interests may fairly claim, and as will place it on something like equal footing, according to its works, in the publicly prescribed subjects of university education, with any other college of the University.\textsuperscript{77}

And there the University Question of Upper Canada remained until 1868 when Victoria was to receive its final legislative grant of 7,500 dollars. The outlying colleges were to be excluded from any share in the Provincial University endowment, and to be thrown completely upon voluntary resources. Victoria was to embark upon a new and important period of its history, which would culminate in its federation with the University of Toronto and its removal to Toronto. That story will be taken up in chapter six. What this chapter has established, is the depth of animosity, the profundity of difference in outlook, between Victoria College and the University of Toronto; animosity and differences that are all the more remarkable when seen in the light of the present day arrangement which is the federated University of Toronto.

\textsuperscript{76} "Reply of the Senate of the University of Toronto to the Questions on the Affiliation of Colleges," in \textit{D.H.E.}, Vol. XVII, p.77.

CHAPTER FOUR

ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE, 1852-1868.

Religious and Social Background.

The immigration of Anglophone Catholics to Canada was not driven by the missionary zeal that inspired French missionaries in their work of evangelization during the seventeenth and eighteenth century. After an unsuccessful attempt by Lord Baltimore in 1623 to found a religious refuge in Newfoundland with two priests, it would be several generations before the Catholic church would be tolerated in that colony so as to allow priests even to appear in public. Only towards the end of the eighteenth century did priests become available in the Maritimes. Prince Edward Island had no priests until 1775; several Irish priests were in Nova Scotia from 1786. In central Canada, English-speaking priests appeared more slowly. The demand for religion would have to grow out of the settlements themselves, and in consequence the Canadian Roman Catholic church would develop problems and characteristics that were
peculiarly its own.¹

The first Roman Catholic settlement in the Canadian colonies of any significance can be dated to 1804. In that year, Father Alexander Macdonnell, the first Catholic chaplain in the British army since the Reformation, and a veteran of the campaigns against the Irish rebels in 1798, brought a large number of Highland Catholics, mostly Macdonells who had served in the now disbanded Glengarry Fencible Regiment, to Glengarry County in Upper Canada, at the mouth of the Ottawa River. The Colonial Office provided 160,000 acres for these men and their families, and a salary of 50 pounds per annum for Macdonell, who reported that Upper Canada had only two wooden and one stone Catholic church when he arrived. By stressing the loyalty and devotion of his flock, Macdonell obtained over a thousand acres of rural and town lots for the future expansion of the Catholic church in the province. He assumed responsibility for all Catholics in Upper Canada, and so impressed his superiors that Bishop Plessis of Quebec made him Vicar General of Upper Canada and proceeded to appoint him bishop of the province whenever the diocese of Quebec could be divided.²

¹ The most significant study of these themes pertaining to the early history of the Catholic church in Canada is to be found in yet another important work of the McGill-Queen's Studies in the History of Religion, edited by G. A. Rawlyk: Terrence Murphy and Gerald Stortz, eds., Creed and Culture: The Place of English-Speaking Catholics in Canadian Society, 1750-1930, (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1991).

² It is not unreasonable to group Macdonell with Strachan and Ryerson in terms of the level of influence that he was to exercise on behalf of Catholics in Upper Canada. And while Macdonell was not to play the same role in the founding of St. Michael's as Strachan and Ryerson played in the founding of Trinity and Victoria—that role was to be assumed by Bishop de Charbonnel—he was at the very centre of Catholic life and politics in the province. For an extensive account of his activities, see J. E. Rea, Bishop Alexander Macdonell and the Politics of Upper Canada, (Toronto: Ontario Historical Society, 1974); and for his early life, Kathleen M. Toomey, Alexander Macdonell: The Scottish Years, 1762-1804, (Toronto:
While the dominating issue of Roman Catholic history in Upper Canada was to be Roman Catholic-Protestant relations, particularly in light of the former's socio-economic status, Catholics did enjoy certain favourable conditions when they first arrived as immigrants. Most notable of these was that they found, upon their arrival, a well-established French Canadian church. With the passing of the Quebec Act in 1774, Roman Catholics were not only guaranteed freedom of worship—something they did not enjoy in Scotland and Ireland, their priests had also been endowed. The Act stipulated that Roman Catholic clergy were to receive "their accustomed dues and rights."

Another favourable factor stemmed from their ability to ride on the coattails of the United Empire Loyalists who had secured for all members of the British Empire a haven free from American republicanism. Loyalty to the crown, at first, secured for Scottish and Irish settlers at least the right to legitimate representation. This representation was only increased after Macdonell and his Highland Catholics played a supportive role in the War of 1812. The elevation of Macdonell in 1824 as titular Bishop for Upper Canada—with a government salary of 400 pounds—indicated the degree of cultural separation from the French-Canadian church, and Macdonell's remarkable appointment to the Legislative Council of Upper Canada.

---

Council in 1831 marked this political recognition.

While there were virtually no English Roman Catholics in Upper Canada for the simple reason that Roman Catholicism had been almost entirely suppressed in England by the Reformation, Macdonell's diocese soon began to receive sizable numbers of Irish who introduced new traditions and attitudes that were eventually to cause real problems. Publicly, the Bishop always stressed the strong loyalty and conservatism of the church in his diocese. The truth though was that the Irish Catholics brought a strong liberal and anti-English political outlook, a reputation for individualism and violence. They also brought their own priests who caused Macdonell untold grief by their independent and undisciplined behaviour. Nevertheless, largely through his relationship with the government, Macdonell had built thirty-five churches and was maintaining twenty priests by 1838, whereas in 1804 he had only three churches and four priests.

What is of greatest concern at this juncture is to determine precisely the nature of (Anglophone) Roman Catholic-Protestant relations leading to the founding of St. Michael's College. As stated above, the eventual realization of a university federation of Protestant and Roman Catholic colleges is all the more remarkable in light of the history of these relations. The Irish Potato Famine of the 1840's was probably the most important historical phenomenon of North American Catholicism. The 1851 Census of Canada reported a Roman Catholic

---

population of 167,695; the 1841 Census had counted 65,203. Most of these Irish immigrants were the poorest of the poor, and as a result ill-educated, with few leaders who could attain prominence in political life. There was, therefore, a considerable reliance on only marginally better educated clergy to determine the attitudes of a now significant political interest group, until such time as an educated lay leadership could be developed.

The arrival of this large population of Catholics renewed an anti-papalism, rather than an anti-Catholicism, that had its roots in the Protestant Reformation. The national Protestant churches that rose in post-Reformation western Europe considered papal authority to be both an ecclesiastical and a political threat: such authority demanded a supranational loyalty that violated state interests. A second determining factor in Protestant-Catholic relations was the growth of the Evangelical movement among Protestants, which reshaped much of Protestantism into a voluntarist, militantly missionary force. The manifestation of this phenomenon was seen with the evolution of the Methodist Church in Canada. This led the evangelical movement to see in the Papacy a threat to individual freedom of expression and religion; papal policies were perceived to be directed towards re-establishing the church's authority and independence, both politically and in terms of internal discipline. The Vatican became a foreign power intent on regaining influence at the expense of the form of evangelical expression that was

---

5 “Comparative Growth of Denominations in Canada West Based on Censuses 1842, 1851, 1861,” in Moir, Church and State in Canada West, p. 185. It should be noted that these figures include the Catholic communities in Newfoundland and Nova Scotia.
treasured by liberal Protestants.

During the 1830's and 1840's, the Irish Catholic Press in Upper Canada attempted to assure the Protestant majority that theirs was a common cause, and that Catholics held no secret agenda for the future of the province. Charles Donlevy's The Mirror—the leading Catholic newspaper—campaigned for responsible government in Upper Canada, but was careful to assure both Catholic readers, and the inevitable Protestant audience, that papist forces were not behind the movement to separate from Britain.

The separation advocated is merely a separation of all internal or local government of this Province, from the Colonial Office. We utterly repudiate any further interference. That allegiance which the Province owes to the Mother Country, and which is due her, as from a child to a parent, must, and will be paid.

Because of such assurances, Canadian Protestants and Roman Catholics, until the 1840's, lived in relative harmony, and occasionally even boasted of their religious toleration. Thus, in a reference to the burning of an Ursaline nunnery by a Boston mob in 1834, a local poetaster advised the Upper Canada rebels of 1837 to go to the United States:

Where sacrilegious [sic] hands profane
Religion's consecrated fane,
The convent's smoking ruins stain
A soil unblessed like Canada.

With few exceptions, the average Catholic voter was an Irish Catholic. His opinions were voiced through the Irish Catholic press, the most important being Charles Donlevy's The Mirror, and J. G. Moylan's The Canadian Freeman, both published in Toronto. The Mirror was important in the 1830's, 1840's, and early 1850's, while The Canadian Freeman dominated the scene in the late 1850's and 1860's. The Freeman was devoted largely to religious interests, while The Mirror was almost exclusively a political paper, and gives a clear picture of leading Irish Catholic opinion.

The Mirror, July 14, 1838.

Until the massive wave of Irish immigration in the 1840's there is ample evidence in *The Mirror* of this harmony and toleration:

In Canada the Catholics have no such grievances [as in Ireland] on account of their religion, the nation does not hold them in degradation—they are qualified to fill any office of trust and honour, and sometimes [are] appointed.9

And from the Protestant perspective, evidence is found in Egerton Ryerson's public eulogy of Roman Catholic prelate Michael Power, which celebrated the deceased bishop's broad mindedness and dedication to the public good.10

But the Famine refugees who poured into Upper Canada in the late 1840's posed a threat to the political, economic, and social stability of a society that was ill-equipped to accommodate the needs of an impoverished underclass. Politically, the Catholic refugees threatened the existing order of the House of Assembly, for they could now exercise their franchise. Economically, they threatened the working class by their willingness to perform menial tasks for low wages. And socially, the immigrants brought with them a level of poverty, disease, alcoholism, violence, and lack of education, that strained the underdeveloped social programs that the Protestant establishment could only barely provide.11

The combination of anti-papalism and the tensions caused by the influx of the Famine refugees inevitably led to serious, and often violent conflicts. Almost annually, riots and occasional murders occurred on March 17 and July 12.

9 *The Mirror*, December 30, 1837.


During 1853, when a former Roman priest named Alessandro Gavazzi was lecturing against Papal Aggression throughout Quebec, twenty Protestants were killed when troops fired into a crowd dispersing after his lecture at Montreal. The Christian Guardian blamed the killings and the ensuing riots on "an ignorant and superstitious people, instigated by wicked and bigoted priests."\(^{12}\)

A less violent, but no less important conflict for the purposes of this thesis, surrounded the separate schools question.\(^{13}\) Section 19 of the 1850 Act, "An Act for the Better Establishment and Maintenance of Common Schools in Upper Canada," allowed for the provision of publicly funded separate schools for Protestants and Roman Catholics.\(^{14}\) The Examiner, the leading Protestant paper in the fight against both the Clergy Reserves and sectarian education, questioned the Catholic hierarchy's reluctance to accept a unified educational system:

> The true reason for resisting this general arrangement, however much the fact may be hid or denied, is to enable the priest to train and keep the youth in bondage to his dogmas, that in after life they may continue to be his slaves.\(^{15}\)

Nor did the Catholics escape the critical eye of the Methodist's Christian Guardian, which in 1852 was to offer a most remarkable commentary on the Roman Catholic priesthood, and which deserves to be cited:

> But great as may be the power of an individual [Roman Catholic] priest for good, it is

---

\(^{12}\) Christian Guardian, June 15, 1853.

\(^{13}\) The most comprehensive treatment of this issue from the Catholic perspective is to be found in Franklin Walker, Catholic Education and Politics in Upper Canada, Vols. I-III, (Toronto: English Catholic Education Association of Ontario & Catholic Education Foundation of Ontario, 1955, 1964, 1986).


\(^{15}\) The Examiner, August 16, 1850.
infinitely greater for evil. Sincere as may be an individual priest's desire for good in the great polity of which he is an agent, often a blind agent, the good itself is always necessarily a means of evil. I have had experience in the confessional from princes downward, and out of it, such as perhaps has fallen to the lot of no other living man, and my solemn conviction is, that celibate priesthood, organised like that of Rome, is in irreconcilable hostility with all great human interests.¹⁶

The Reformation reaction to the See of Rome, the massive immigration of Catholic famine refugees into Upper Canada, the Separate Schools question—all of these factors led to bitter and confrontational relations between Roman Catholics and Protestants leading up to the founding of St. Michael's College in 1852. When Armand Francois Marie, Comte de Charbonnel was consecrated Bishop of Toronto in the Sistine Chapel on May 26, 1850,¹⁷ his elevation elicited the following response from George Brown, writing in his The Globe:

The world has scarcely realized that Cardinal Wiseman [Archbishop of Westminster] and his Roman satellites, are great English facts of the year 1850, than the said world is to be harrowed with the news of an astounding Papal assumption in Canada!...We earnestly demand—where are these assumptions of the Papacy to end?¹⁸

The appointment of Bishop de Charbonnel to the Toronto diocese, although greeted with indignation by some, marked the first stage in the history of St. Michael's College.

The Founding of St. Michael's College, 1850-1853.

Before Bishop de Charbonnel left for his new diocese, he knew he had to recruit at least some priests to bring with him to Toronto. Providentially, he had

¹⁶ Christian Guardian, February 2, 1852.


¹⁸ The Globe, December 30, 1850.
been a student of the College of Annonay, administered by a newly established order of Catholic clerics by the name of the Congregation of Priests of St. Basil—the Basilian Fathers.

The Basilian Fathers were founded as a result of two consequences of the French Revolution: the number of priests in France had been reduced to one-third of the formal total, and the number of vocations to the Roman Catholic priesthood was, in France, nominal at best. When the Catholic hierarchy in France finally faced the consequences of the inevitable decline in priestly vocations, they looked to a small group of diocesan priests who had found refuge in the inaccessible mountains of the Vivrais, and who had as their purpose the education of young men for the priesthood. Encouraged by Archbishop d'Aviau of Vienne, these seven diocesan priests were encouraged in their work despite persecution, poverty, and almost insurmountable obstacles. The seven formed a society of priests, chose St. Basil as their patron and went about founding, in 1822, the College of Annonay as their headquarters.19

Bishop de Charbonnel was a graduate of the College of Annonay. He was a French nobleman, a count by birth, and a member of one of the wealthy and influential families of the aristocracy of France. Upon his appointment as Bishop of Toronto, he immediately turned to his former masters—the Basilian Fathers—and asked that they might establish a college in his diocese. The Basilians had no

idea of what lay before them. The diocese of Toronto in 1850 was a barren structure. It stretched on an east-west axis from Oshawa to Windsor; it extended north to Manitoulin Island and Sault Ste. Marie. The city of Toronto had a population of some 25,000, of whom 8,000 were Catholics; the diocese had a population of 400,000, of whom 100,000 were Catholic. And for these 100,000 there were twenty-eight priests to care for their pastoral needs. In 1850, the city of Toronto had only two Catholic churches—St. Paul's and the new St. Michael's Cathedral. There were no seminaries, no Catholic colleges or hospitals, no charitable institutions for Catholics, no convents and no religious communities of priests and brothers.

Bishop de Charbonnel had, in August of 1850, written to the Basilian Superior General in France, Father Pierre Tourvieille. de Charbonnel was familiar with an Irish Basilian named Father Patrick Moloney, who was stationed at the Little Seminary of Vernoux. The Bishop made the following request of Father Tourvieille:

Je desire vivement voir votre Congr. entreprendre une maison d'éducation dans le plus beau de mes districts. Pour cela, il faut, outre M. Molony, 2 ou 3 autres membres de votre Congr., parlant anglais; les autres employés pourraient, en commençant, n'être que les bons auxiliaires bien choisis.


21 Ibid.

22 Cited in Robert J. Scollard, C.S.B., Notes on the History of the Congregation of Priests of St. Basil, Vol. 23, (Toronto, 1965), p.32. This work of Scollard's—hereafter referred to as Scollard, Notes—is a 40-volume reference work, unpublished, and containing all the documents that Scollard thought important to the history of the Congregation as its Archivist. The 40 volumes are to be found in the Archives of the Basilian Fathers.
While Tourvieille was able to "loan" Moloney to the Bishop for his mission to Toronto, he was unable to spare any other priests, and so de Charbonnel and Moloney set sail for Toronto in November of 1850. Because of his English, and because of his strong teaching background, Moloney was to prove indispensable to the Bishop when they arrived in Toronto. During their voyage the two had extensive discussions concerning their future plans for Catholic education in Toronto, and although the letters containing their proposals that they separately sent back to Tourvieille are not extant, the replies of the Superior General are.

There were two possible scenarios: Moloney's preference was for the Bishop to acquire the buildings and furnishings for a Little Seminary—secondary education for those preparing for the priesthood—that would be staffed by Basilians; de Charbonnel favoured a plan whereby the Basilians would open a school of their own. The latter proposal was out of the question for the Basilians: they had neither the money, nor the personnel to spare. What is of special importance here is the fact that, initially, neither the Bishop nor the Basilians had any intention to begin their efforts by establishing a secular school or college. That would have to wait.

In the meantime, living in the Bishop's Palace, Moloney began an elementary parochial school in that same building, until such time that men could

---


be found, either locally or in France, who could help him in establishing the Little Seminary. While this school cannot be seen as a forerunner of St. Michael's, it is the first occasion of a Basilian teaching in the New World. Living in the Palace with Moloney was a French Jesuit named Tellier, who had hoped to establish a Jesuit college in the diocese with the help of the wealthy and prominent Catholic convert, Captain John Elmsley. Elmsley had offered the Jesuits fifty acres of prime land upon which today the University of St. Michael's College sits. But the Jesuits were as lacking in funds and priests as the Basilians, and the Jesuit college never materialized.

Bearing in mind the financial exigencies of the Basilian Order in France, de Charbonnel made a firm proposal to Tourvieille concerning the latter's offer to send men to Toronto to expand the educational work of the Basilians. It is fair to say that without the Bishop's support, the Basilians could never have committed men to Canada, and Catholic higher education in Canada would have evolved in a decidedly different manner. The Bishop wrote Tourvieille:

> My heart tells me that I should endeavour to treat your foundation and its members, my collaborators, in a manner compatible with the demands of justice and charity as well as with those befitting ecclesiastical poverty and an administration with financial difficulties. First of all here are some figures: the expense for the first trip will be mine. Moreover I promise

---

25 This statement is defended by the fact that the Basilian Fathers now administer and direct the following Catholic colleges within the federated framework that has the University of Toronto as its model: the University of St. Michael's College and the Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies in the University of Toronto, Assumption University in the University of Windsor, St. Thomas More College in the University of Saskatchewan, St. Joseph's College in the University of Alberta, and St. Mark's College in the University of British Columbia. These Basilian institutions are six of the fourteen Catholic institutions of higher education in English-speaking Canada.

26 The Bishop's letter shows that he first wrote: "If no one can help me, the expenses...", then he crossed out the first words.
your confreres a house, the necessary funds to furnish it, 50 louis for food and upkeep of each priest who knows enough English to be of service, not including Mass stipends. I also promise an increase as soon as my debts are looked after.

Your priests will share the work with Father Moloney and they will be asked to establish a minor seminary in strict conformity with the decrees of the Council of Trent. This shall be exclusively at my expense.27

It was, in all ways, a generous offer, and the Basilians reciprocated by committing four of their only twenty-one members to the mission to Toronto. They were: Mr. William Flannery and Mr. Charles Vincent, both in preparation for ordination; and Fathers Jean-Mathieu Soulerin and Joseph Malbos.

The four Basilians, with Father Soulerin acting as their Superior, arrived in Toronto on August 21, 1852, and took up residence with Father Moloney in the Bishop's Palace. On September 15, they moved into a temporary home on Queen Street, to be called St. Mary's Little Seminary, and classes began with nine students.28 At about the same time, another Catholic religious order, the Brothers of the Christian Schools, began operating a small college also in the Bishop's Palace. It was called St. Michael's College. An advertisement in The Toronto Mirror, on September 10, 1852, provides the following information:

This Establishment presents to young people all the advantages of a Christian Education, and at the same time of solid instruction preparatory to commerce and the arts...

The course of instruction comprises Religion, Reading, Writing, English, Grammar, Arithmetic, Geometry, Book-Keeping, Natural Philosophy, Geography, History,—Sacred, Ancient and Modern, and of the United States, Cosmography, Natural History, Elements of


Despite their good intentions, the Brothers could attract only a few students. The 
*Mirror* had listed tuition as 25 pounds—a sizable sum for most Irish immigrants 
in Toronto. Father Soulerin informed Father Tourvieille in France that 

St. Michael's College, opened in the new buildings of the Bishop's Palace, and directed by the 
Brothers of the Christian Schools has as yet a total student body of but eight day scholars.  

There were now two institutions of Catholic education operating in 
Toronto. St. Mary's Little Seminary had no problems attracting students—by 
early 1853 they had twenty-one students. But with St. Michael's College 
struggling, the Bishop was faced with a dilemma: he knew that it was the explicit 
preference of the Basilian Fathers to conduct a Little Seminary, since this had 
been their primary work in France, and since it was for this work that they were 
specifically trained; and yet, the Bishop realized that he could not afford to 
operate St. Michael's in his Palace as long as enrollment was so low. The obvious 
solution was to combine the two institutions and house them both in the Palace, 
thus saving on the rent that he was paying for St. Mary's on Queen Street. 

As Superior of the Basilians in Toronto, Father Soulerin knew that it 
would be difficult to persuade the Superior General, Father Tourvieille, to agree 
to allow the Basilians to begin operating anything other than a seminary. To 
make his case, Soulerin informed Tourvieille that the Bishop intended that the  

---

29 *The Mirror*, September 10, 1852.  

30 Archives of the Basilian Fathers, Undated Letter of Father Soulerin to Father Tourvieille, Christmas, 1852.
merger of St. Mary's and St. Michael's in the Cathedral Palace would only be
temporary, and that a permanent home would eventually be found for the
Seminary. Soulerin speaks of a piece of land north of the city, once offered to
the Jesuits, and known as Clover Hill. It was becoming apparent through the
experiences of other religious orders in North America that the only solid
foundation for expansion lay in the private purchase of land and construction of
buildings at the order's expense. Tourvieille obviously became convinced by this,
and with the intention of seeing his Toronto Basilians secure their own lands and
buildings he agreed to their temporary move back to the Palace, with the
provision that

Each member may render service, as much as possible, to the external ministry; but this must
in no way hinder his presence at daily classes, religious exercises and meals.  

On February 14, 1853, the Basilian Fathers and students of St. Mary's Little
Seminary left Queen Street for the Bishop's Palace, displaced the Brothers of the
Christian Schools, absorbed the few students of St. Michael's, and, eventually, its
name. By July 5, the Superior General was addressing his letters to "Father
Soulerin, Superior of St. Michael's College." And on August 25, we find the
following notice in The Mirror:

St. Michael's College,
Toronto,
Under the Superintendence of the

Archives of the Basilian Fathers, Letter of Father Soulerin to Father Tourvieille, October 1, 1852,

Registre pour les copies des lettres de m. Tourvieille, 1850-1853, p.275.
Rev. Gentlemen of St. Basil.33

Although St. Michael's would not be legally incorporated for another two years, it was, by September, 1853, with now close to fifty students,34 firmly established.

St. Michael's in Isolation, and the University Question, 1853-1868.

As stated in the introduction to this chapter, it is possible to argue that, from the very beginning, there were plans that would see St. Michael's in some sort of relationship with the University of Toronto, and that St. Michael's never desired to conduct its affairs in "isolation"; at least not in the sense that Victoria and Trinity intended to operate, from their beginnings, entirely apart from the same university. But St. Michael's, for its early years, was forced to operate in isolation. The reason for this isolation needs to be examined.

By the fall of 1853, it was clear that Palace accommodations would be quite unsuitable for St. Michael's, which was now engaging students in both college and seminary programs. Moreover, it was beginning to appear, at least from all the reports that were being sent to Father Tourville in France, that the Basilians were doing indispensable work in Toronto—at their college, in the parishes of the diocese, and in outlying communities. Father Soulerin writes of travelling one Sunday "to say Mass 9 or 10 miles from Toronto, where there were

33 The Mirror, August 25, 1853.

34 GABF, Register of St. Michael's College, September, 1853. Among the list of students in the Register are to be found the names of three future bishops: Richard O'Connor, the first Bishop of Peterborough; Denis O'Connor, third Archbishop of Toronto and founder of Assumption College; and Thomas Dowling, first Bishop of Hamilton.
40 Catholic families, almost all Irish, who had not seen a priest there for two or three years." Moreover, the Basilians were anxious to establish themselves with property.

To this end, the aforementioned Captain John Elmsley now offered to the Basilians the same land that he had previously offered to the Jesuits. With the condition that the Basilians build a parish church as well as college buildings, Elmsley deeded over to St. Michael's College four building lots on his Clover Hill Estate. Soulerin considered this land to be ideal; the Superior General had instructed him to acquire land sufficiently vast in the direction that the city would expand. If anything, the Clover Hill property, at the present-day intersection of Bay and St. Joseph Streets, seemed too far north! But it was, providentially, adjacent to the property held by the University of Toronto, recently established by the Baldwin Act, and it was thought that it would be beneficial for the new Catholic college to be near to another institution of higher learning, even if it was "Godless."

Soulerin had, during the summer of 1853, received 20,000 francs (roughly 4,000 dollars) from the Superior General in France to initiate the construction of the new St. Michael's College. Another 10,000 francs was to be sent later in the

---

35 GABF, Letter of Father Soulerin to Father Pages, October 9, 1852, trans. Kevin Kirley, C.S.B.

36 The church and college which were to be built on this land still stand today, and form, respectively, the collegiate church of the Archdiocese of Toronto (St. Basil's), and the largest Catholic university in Ontario (The University of St. Michael's College).

37 GABF, Letter of Father Tourvieille to Father Soulerin, February 8, 1853, trans. Kevin Kirley, C.S.B.
summer, and a fund drive was organized\(^{38}\) which would, with the 6,000 dollars from France, cover the cost of building both the church and college.\(^{39}\) For the next two years, St. Michael's College remained at the Bishop's Palace; it would be September of 1856 before the new St. Michael's College, together with St. Basil's Church, would be opened at Clover Hill. During these intermittent years, three significant developments took place that need to be examined.

The first was the drawing up of a formal agreement between the Bishop and the Basilians that stipulated the terms by which St. Michael's would operate, and the relationship between the diocese and the college. The document reveals a very deep level of mutual respect between the Bishop and the Basilians, and is indicative of the value which de Charbonnel attached to the work that the Basilians were doing in his diocese.\(^{40}\) The agreement is also of interest because it identifies issues that are as important to St. Michael's today as they were one hundred and forty years ago.

There had long been a concern among the Basilian Fathers that the Bishop's Palace was an inadequate location for the operation of their College. And not only from the point of view of limited space and facilities; perhaps even more important was the need for the Basilians to escape the constant scrutiny that living under the Bishop's roof invited. In correspondence between the Basilian

\(^{38}\) It was eventually to raise 2,000 dollars. Roume, *A History of the Congregation of St. Basil to 1864*, p.340.


superior in Toronto and his superior general in France, there is an indication of the hopes of the Basilians. From Toronto, Father Soulerin wrote to Father Tourvieille in France in November 1853, that the Palace had reached its maximum enrollment and that "...if the numbers increase the Bishop might leave us the entire Palace and move to another house." And by the following year, Father Soulerin was writing that the Bishop felt "that fifty-three students in his Palace are already too much and that is why he would like to see us go." Such a separation necessitated the drawing up of a treaty or concordat that would detail the various aspects of the relationship between the diocese and the Basilians, not in any sense to bind Bishop de Charbonnel but rather to build for the future and to establish a binding force which later bishops would recognize.

In negotiating the details of the Concordat, the Basilians were to discover that the Bishop was a man possessing equal measures of generosity and business acumen. While the Bishop was to suggest that Father Tourvieille in France make initial proposals, he later insisted on a number of modifications. In the final

---


43 As Father Soulerin wrote, "...good intentions can be forgotten; what is written remains." Ibid., November 4, 1854, p.1.

44 The entire Concordat documentation consists of five manuscripts. The first one was written by Father Tourvieille and though undated, was received by the Bishop no later than August 8, 1854. To this the Bishop added the reasons for the necessity of a Concordat. The second document written by Bishop de Charbonnel on November 28, 1854, included his modifications of the first manuscript. The third document was the final Concordat. It was issued from the Episcopal Palace in Toronto on January 28, 1855. The fourth manuscript was identical to the third and was Father Tourvieille's acceptance of the Bishop's plan. The fifth document dated November 1, 1855, contained some slight revisions by the Bishop, a result of his displeasure at the proposed desire to extend their work to the Sandwich area (which was to lead to the founding of what is
draft of the Concordat, both the Bishop and the Superior General make clear their willingness to undertake certain commitments and accept certain responsibilities which would ultimately lead to the federation of St. Michael's College with the University of Toronto (even if neither of them were aware of it at the time). Most notable among the clauses of the Concordat are the following:

I, Armand Francois-Marie de Charbonnel, Bishop of Toronto...grant in my name and that of my successors, to the priests of the said Congregation, the education of the aspirants to the Ecclesiastical state of the Toronto diocese as well as those other students found worthy of being admitted and whom we hope will profit from the same good atmosphere;

and;

I, Pierre Tourvieille, superior-general of the Congregation of St. Basil, in my name and those of my legitimate successors, accept that the direction of the establishment, with its risks and perils, remains the responsibility of the Congregation of St. Basil.45

Without such a clear declaration of the separation of powers and responsibilities,46 it is unlikely that St. Michael's would have ever enjoyed the institutional autonomy that would allow it to move towards a relationship with the University of Toronto.

This is not to suggest, however, that close ties did not continue to exist between the College and the diocese. The Concordat between de Charbonnel and Tourvieille laid out a detailed financial relationship that would allow the College to grow while both parties to the agreement benefitted. To provide the College today the University of Windsor). All of these documents are contained in the Basilian Archives in Toronto.

45 GABF, Concordat entre Mgr. Armand Fr. Marie de Charbonnel, Eveque de Toronto et M. Pierre Tourvieille, Superieur General des Pretres de St. Basile, November 1, 1855.

46 While the Concordat indeed established a separation of powers and responsibilities in general, it should be made clear that the Bishop had the power and canonical authority to prevent the Basilians, or any other religious congregation, from operating in a manner that the Bishop thought to be inappropriate.
with immediate financial aid, the Bishop promised that he would pay for the fees of seminarians at the rate of twenty-five louis per year to a maximum of fifty students, while protecting the College from low enrollment difficulties by guaranteeing an annual gift of two hundred and fifty louis.\(^\text{47}\) In addition, the Bishop would transfer to the Basilians at least a portion of an annual collection taken up by the priests of the diocese for the education of seminarians, as well as half of the government grant that the diocese received for the purposes of education. He also stipulated that seminarians who proceeded to ordination would be bound to teach at the College for three years after their ordination. Moreover, the Bishop granted permission to the Basilians to foster vocations to their own Congregation, and stated that he would not only tolerate such vocations, but would consider them "...as one of the greatest blessings accorded to the diocese."\(^\text{48}\)

For their part, the Basilians promised to provide such priestly services to the diocese as their time and personnel allowed, the most important of which would be to provide the sacraments to those in the mission parishes of the diocese. They would also turn over one-tenth of all parish revenues to the Bishop, which was no less than their canonical obligation. And most importantly, the Basilians assumed full responsibility for the construction of the church and college on Clover Hill, for their upkeep, and for the salaries of the professors and

\(^{47}\) \textit{Ibid.}, Article 3.

\(^{48}\) \textit{Ibid.}, Article 9.
other employees.\textsuperscript{49} This meant that St. Michael's was now under the firm
direction of the Basilians, and they could give it all of the attention they
felt it deserved with the confidence that all of Bishop de Charbonnel's successors
would be bound to observe both the independent character, and the financial
obligations, that the Concordat stipulated.\textsuperscript{50}

The second development concerns the relationship between St. Michael's
College and the University of Toronto. Central to this issue, of course, was the
question of whether St. Michael's College was to be primarily an institution for
the education of aspirants to the priesthood, or whether it would attempt to
provide an education for those who sought higher learning for purely secular
purposes. Originally, the intention had been on the part of both the Basilians and
the Bishop to focus on the education of seminarians alone. But by January of
1854, in a letter to Cardinal Franconi, the Vatican's Prefect for the Propagation
of the Faith, de Charbonnel wrote that "...of the thirty-six students enrolled [at St.
Michael's], twenty are for sacred orders."\textsuperscript{51} This indicates a trend towards the
acceptance of students not pursuing sacred orders, a pattern that was soon to
become normative.

The acceptance of students at St. Michael's into a program of higher

\textsuperscript{49} Ibid, Article 2, 4, and 5.

\textsuperscript{50} It should be noted that the relationship between the Archdiocese of Toronto and St. Michael's
College remains today remarkably similar to that initiated by the Concordat of 1855. Little of the essential
features of the Articles has changed.

\textsuperscript{51} GABF, Bishop de Charbonnel, Letter to Cardinal Franconi, January 7, 1854.
learning would necessarily engage the Bishop in an examination of the relationship between St. Michael's and the secular University of Toronto. His views on this question display an inconsistent attitude.

In January of 1851, de Charbonnel approved the acts establishing the University. The Catholic Mirror reported that the Bishop believed that "...they are fully calculated to meet the wishes of the whole community, and announcing his intention on behalf of his people, to become affiliated with the University, charging himself with their religious instruction." It seemed at this point that the Bishop hoped for a future affiliation with the University that would permit him to oversee the religious instruction of Catholic students. But the Bishop's earlier feeling of complacency towards the University underwent a profound change later in the decade. In a further communication with Cardinal Franconi in Rome, the Bishop wrote that at the University of Toronto

degrees are granted to Catholics if they reject their faith...Catholics are excluded from burses...they follow courses determined by the state and are instructed in history and philosophy by Protestants...nine-tenths of the students and nineteen-twentieths of the professors are Protestants.

This obvious change in de Charbonnel's position is, perhaps, partially explained by the fact that even the two Catholic newspapers were in disagreement over the University. An editorial in The Catholic Mirror in February of 1854 cited a passage of The Citizen which had approved of the sending of Catholic students to the University. The Mirror firmly opposed the suggestion and based

52 The Catholic Mirror, January 17, 1851, p.3.

its opposition on the fact that "not only are all the professors Protestants, but that
six are ministers!" But perhaps the most influential factor in de Charbonnel's
thinking on the issue derived from his awareness of the monies that might accrue
to the diocese if St. Michael's was to formalize its relationship with the University
and undertake its share of university level education. It had been established by
the Concordat of 1855 that any government monies that St. Michael's received for
teaching would be given by the government to the Bishop, who would then turn
over such funds to the College as he saw appropriate. In fact, we learn from the
memoirs of Father Soulerin that Bishop de Charbonnel never turned over the
government funds he received for the teaching of the Basilians at St. Michael's.
He did indeed give gifts to the College to assist in its financial welfare, but only
when, and in the amount, that he thought appropriate. At the same time, the
Bishop must have been very much aware of the subsidies being received by the
other Colleges in the province. In 1854, grants of five hundred pounds each were
distributed by the House of Assembly to Victoria, Queen's, and Regiopolis
Colleges. It is not surprising, therefore, that Bishop de Charbonnel was
prepared to support Father Soulerin's intention to seek the legal incorporation of

54 Ibid., February 13, 1857, p.2. For the purposes of comparison, it may be helpful to recall an editorial in The Globe, some five months before by George Brown, who stated that "we oppose the Church of Rome, the most grasping and tyrannical of churches, the ally of despotism in every country in which it has a
foothold," The Globe, October 27, 1856, p.42. In light of such rhetoric, it can be said that no Christian
denomination engaged in debate on the University Question was free of bias.


the College by the Legislature, and subsequently to petition the Senate of the University of Toronto for affiliation.

The first of these events was initiated by a petition "...of the Right Reverend Doctor de Charbonnel, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Toronto, praying for an Act of Incorporation, under the name of St. Michael's College, in the Diocese of Toronto." The Act was opposed by, among others, George Brown, editor of The Globe and member of the House of Assembly for Lambton county. He attempted to stall successive readings of the bill by objecting to the College's right to hold real estate or to benefit from the sale of any property that might be bequeathed to it. It was difficult for Brown to hide his sectarian motives, and the general attitude of his fellow legislators was to provide for whatever were the needs of the province's voters, regardless of their denomination. The bill was passed on April 13, 1855, by a vote in the legislature of "Yeas, 70; Nays 25," and received royal assent on May 19, 1855. It established a Corporation to consist of the Bishop of Toronto, the Superior of the College, and all of its professors, who would, with their successors, be responsible for the governance of the institution and be held accountable to the Legislature. Three days later, on May 22, 1855, the upper house of the Legislature—the Legislative Council—resolved that "a sum,


60 18th: Victoria, Chapter CCXXXVII, An Act to Incorporate Saint Michael's College, Toronto.
not exceeding three hundred and fifty pounds, currency, be granted to her Majesty, as an Aid to St. Michael's College, Toronto, for the year 1855.\(^{61}\)

Despite the fact that these monies were received by the Bishop and never properly transferred to the College, Father Soulerin's intention to explore the possibilities of affiliation with the University was not diminished. It seems quite certain that Soulerin hoped that affiliation with the University could only result in further grants being accorded to the College. It would also seem reasonable to speculate that Soulerin held the hope that such funds that might be obtained by affiliation would be transferred from the government to the University, and from the University directly to St. Michael's, without going through the Bishop (who would likely withhold such funds as he had in the past). There is, though, no proof for such a theory. What is certain is that Soulerin saw affiliation as an attractive financial prospect.\(^{62}\) Proof of this latter claim is to be found in his letter to Father Tourvieille, to whom he writes

We have also asked to be affiliated with the University of Toronto, which is so richly endowed. If the conditions attached to the affiliation are suitable, we shall be in line for help from the government just as are the Protestant colleges. This is what we are asking for in our petition. The secretary of the University has so far replied only to the effect that our request would be sent on to the Senate of the university as soon as possible.\(^{63}\)

Father Soulerin's letter is not extant; we can presume that it included some


\(^{62}\) There is little doubt that Soulerin was very much aware of the passing of the Hincks Act of 1853, Section LIV of which provided for surplus funds from the University endowment to be distributed to the denominational colleges once University College and the University of Toronto had been provided with the Funds necessary for their efficient operation. See above, Chapter Two.

history of the founding of St. Michael's, and some indication of the course of studies that it provided to its students. The proceedings of the Senate of the University indicate that, as was the custom, the letter was read on two occasions: December 18 and 21, 1885.\textsuperscript{64}

The Senate's response to the request of St. Michael's was evasive: "The registrar was directed to inform the authorities of that College, that, by a general statute of the University, students are admitted to degrees without reference to the educational institutions in which they receive their education."\textsuperscript{65} On the surface, it appeared that the University Senate was merely reminding the College of the provisions of the Hincks Act of 1853, whereby the University of Toronto had as its primary function the examination of students regardless of where such students had been prepared. If the young men of St. Michael's wished to present themselves for matriculation examinations into the University they were free to do so. Beneath the surface, though, it is likely that members of the Senate were hesitant to encourage such affiliation lest St. Michael's apply for membership in the Senate, which would be their right according to the same Act.

It should be remembered that the promoters of the Hincks Act had as their primary motivation the affiliation of Victoria and Queen's with the provincial University, on par with University College. The last thing they wanted to encourage was the affiliation of a nascent, untested, popish college, with what

\textsuperscript{64} DH\textsuperscript{E}, Vol. XI, p. 278.

\textsuperscript{65} Ibid.
they hoped would become the primary institution of higher education of Canada West. They were also, no doubt, aware that the curriculum being followed at St. Michael's paled in comparison to the curricula of Victoria and Queen's. As stated above, Father Soulein's letter of application to the Senate for affiliation no longer exists. It is likely, though, that it included in its description of the curriculum of the College, some similar reference to that contained in the following letter that Soulein wrote to historian J. G. Hodgins in reply to Hodgins' request for details of the same letter: At St. Michael's College, Soulein wrote, "Religious training, the basis, or foundation, of all Education, receives the particular attention which its importance requires." Such a statement would have been of great concern to members of the Senate who would have interpreted it as contrary to at least the spirit of the Hincks Act—legislation which enshrined the notion of non-sectarian higher education in the province's only University.

This issue of the curriculum of St. Michael's College requires some attention. For while the three other important denominational colleges in the province during the period leading up to 1863—Victoria, Queen's, and Trinity—were to remain isolated from the University of Toronto because of the issue of institutional autonomy, in order to protect their students from the "godless" University, it is probably fair to say that St. Michael's remained isolated because of the perceived inadequacies of its educational program, rather more than because of its own hesitation to unite in some formal way with a purely secular

———

institution. One must remember the mind set of the immigrant Irish-Catholic community in Toronto. There was the unceasing desire to transcend their inferior social status; affiliation of any sort with a provincial institution would contribute considerably to such social advancement, even if it meant consorting with those who did not share their Roman faith. Soulerin's motives for affiliation can, therefore, be interpreted within the context of both social and economic circumstances.

Similarly, the motives of the Senate of the University of Toronto in rejecting the request from St. Michael's were probably, in about equal measure, due to their reluctance to grant St. Michael's any share in their endowment, and their judgement that the Catholic curriculum was inferior.

A brief comparison of the curricula operative at St. Michael's with the other denominational colleges that would eventually enter federation will highlight the issue faced by the University of Toronto's Senate in their decision to refuse affiliation to St. Michael's. The latter institution's Catholic students were offered a choice of two programmes of study. According to the prospectus of 1857, the Commercial department was suitable for those students preparing for a career "...suitable to the ordinary conditions of life." A second program of studies, the Classical department, was appropriate for "...students preparing for sacred orders, or for a more liberal profession." The Commercial course was normally of three years' duration, and while students of any age could attend, a knowledge

67 The prospectus for 1857 was printed in The Catholic Citizen, April 24, 1857.
of the reading and writing of English was essential.⁶⁸ During the three year period the students studied Religious Knowledge, English and French Composition and Grammar, Arithmetic, Bookkeeping, Elementary Geometry, Algebra, and Surveying. History, Geography, and Natural Philosophy were also compulsory. There is no doubt that this is little else than a secondary school course of studies for students who intended to proceed to employment upon graduation, at about the age of sixteen. Graduates of the Commercial program at St. Michael's would be quite unable to sit for the matriculation exams of the University of Toronto.

The Classical course of studies, on the other hand, was of an entirely different nature, and was part of the academic heritage that the Basilians brought to Canada from their college in Annonay, at which Bishop de Charbonnel himself had been educated. It was upon the strength of this course of studies that the Basilians of St. Michael's would have placed their hope that some of its graduates might be sufficiently prepared to matriculate into the University of Toronto and eventually sit for its B.A. examinations. Its primary purpose was to prepare young men for ordination to the priesthood, but there is evidence in the Prospectus of 1857 that students could be admitted to the program with the intention of proceeding to the professional schools of law and medicine, thereby justifying the College's petition for affiliation.⁶⁹ The Classical course was eight years in duration, with most students entering the College at the age of about

---

⁶⁸ This qualification compelled most applicants to spend some time in the elementary school conducted by the Christian Brothers before attending St. Michael's.

twelve years. The first four years embraced the subjects taught in the Commercial program, while the succeeding four years entailed the study of Belles-Lettres, Rhetoric, and junior and senior philosophy.\textsuperscript{70} This was a solid curriculum that the Basilians could be proud of,\textsuperscript{71} and by no means some local invention: it was virtually identical to the program taught at the Petit-Seminaire de Quebec in 1857.\textsuperscript{72}

In contrast, both Trinity and Victoria offered a course of studies leading to the degree of Bachelor of Arts (St. Michael's, of course, had no such degree granting power), and which was firmly established upon the Oxford-Cambridge tradition. According to this pattern of study, success was measured in terms of the passing of specific examination papers rather than on the completion of specific course. Also, the papers did not mirror precisely a "subject" and students were expected to read widely under the direction of a tutor. At the University of Trinity College in 1860, the degree was conferred upon those students who completed three sets of examinations: the Matriculation (upon entry to the University), the Previous (half way through the three year degree, and the B.A.

\textsuperscript{70} For the ecclesiastical students there was an additional two years devoted to Theology.

\textsuperscript{71} While this was a solid program, the Prospectus of 1859 gives some indication that of how thinly spread the faculty were in providing for some sixty-five students: Classes in the Commercial program were conducted by Father Vincent who taught Mathematics and Bookkeeping, and by a Mr. Northgraves (probably a senior theology student) who taught all other subjects. Father Flannery and a Mr. Rooney were responsible for the Classical scholars in their first four years. The education of more advanced students, including all the theologians, was the responsibility of Fathers Soulerin, Malbos, and Moloney. GABF, Prospectus of St. Michael's College, 1859.

Degree examination itself. Students at Victoria followed a similar course of studies leading to the B.A. degree, although over a four year period instead of three. This Oxbridge model distinguished itself from the College Classique model of St. Michael's in a number of notable ways: the prescription of a modern language in all years of study, the inclusion of science in a developing sequence throughout the course, and the appearance of English literature as distinct from rhetoric. It is likely that the members of the Senate of the University of Toronto would have been very much disposed towards the clearly and classically defined degree programs of Trinity and Victoria. About the St. Michael's program they would have been suspicious; not only because of its French heritage, but also because of its Commercial, and therefore, illiberal content. The reputation of the University of Toronto would not be enhanced by its affiliation with the smallest and least influential college in its constituency.

And so, while St. Michael's was the only denominational college in Canada West to even attempt to avail itself of the provisions of the Hincks Act of 1853, it was firmly rebuffed and would remain "isolated" until 1881, by which time its curriculum would be significantly developed. Perhaps the frustrations of these early years are best summed up by the relationship between Father Soulerin and the President of the University of Toronto, Dr. McCaul: they maintained a warm and personal friendship, and while McCaul respected Soulerin's theological

---

73 Ibid., p.40.

74 Ibid., pp.43-44.
insight, he is said to have regretted that Soulerin "had not a more progressive religion." St. Michael's continued to receive grants from the government in increasing amounts; for the year of 1868—the date of the termination of the grants to the denominational colleges—St. Michael's received 7,500 dollars. And its determination to seek affiliation would eventually pay dividends: it would be the first denominational college to affiliate, and subsequently federate, with the University of Toronto. To use a metaphor employed in the title of our first chapter, it was St. Michael's College that truly "paved" the road to federation.

75 Scollard, Notes, Vol. III, pp.91-92.
Religious and Social Background.

In the second chapter of this thesis, reference was made to the Anglican presence in Upper Canada during the first half of the nineteenth century, and to the role of the Family Compact (of Church and State) in determining the conservative political and religious ethos of Upper Canadian society. That brief analysis also identified some of the critical questions that arose from the prominence of the Church of England, and from their relationship with other Christian denominations, especially the Methodist Church. The most important of these questions was whether the Church of England should be considered the established church of Upper Canada--was it to share the same status in the colony that it had in the Mother Country? Proceeding from this primary question were others: which denominations were rightfully entitled to the proceeds of the Clergy Reserves?; and, should members of all denominations have access to, and share in the governance of, educational institutions established with the proceeds of the
Clergy Reserves?; and if so, which ones?

There is also in the first chapter evidence of the aggressive role that Anglican clergymen played, most especially John Strachan, in fighting to ensure that the Anglican tradition was at the very centre of the political, social, and economic fabric of Upper Canadian society. But to understand the motivation of these churchmen to ensure that church establishment was the cornerstone of society, it is necessary to ask the further question, why? Why, in the presence of significant representation from the Methodist and Presbyterian traditions, was the Church of England so determined to be the mother church of Upper Canada? Why would it eventually be so critical that there exist in Upper Canada an institution of higher education that was solidly built upon Anglican principles, and which was governed solely by the Church of England? Why would a compromise institution like the University of Toronto under Baldwin's University Bill of 1849 be totally unacceptable to Archbishop Strachan? It would be simplistic to suggest that it was just a matter of their having unbridled access to the proceeds of the Clergy Reserves; it would be equally as superficial to claim that it was simply a matter of political control. A proper response to these questions requires at least a brief reference to one of the theological foundations of Anglicanism.

Central to this theology for the purposes of this summary is the thirty-seventh of the Thirty-Nine Articles, promulgated in 1563 and representing the authoritative teachings of Anglican Belief:
The Queen's Majesty hath the chief power in this Realm of England, and other of her dominions, unto whom the chief government of all estates of this Realm, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Civil, in all causes doth appertain.¹

This Article was the basis for perhaps the most significant element of the Anglican creed: the principle of the union of church and state. Queen Elizabeth I's successors, right down to King George III-whose dominion extended to the province of Upper Canada during the early part of the nineteenth century—all defended the notion that the Church of England had a vital role to play in the governing of the nation, and in maintaining social and political stability.² This establishment of the Church in England resulted in a range of special privileges: Anglican bishops sat in the House of Lords, at the time the more important of the two Houses of Parliament; the universities of Oxford and Cambridge were firmly under Anglican control; Catholics and dissenters were prohibited from holding public office of any kind; and all Englishmen, whatever their denominational affiliation, were obliged to support the Church of England with tithes.

In the Canadas, with the passing of the Constitutional Act of 1791, this principle of the union of church and state, or church establishment, was enshrined in the political culture of Upper Canada, not only as a means to thwart the republicanism emanating from the south, but more importantly to enable the Church of England to fulfil its mission as the guardian of the social and political...
order. This was the third element of a three-part strategy developed by Prime Minister William Pitt and Colonial secretary William Granville in the Constitutional Act of 1791 to ensure that Upper Canada did not fall victim to an American-like colonial revolution. The other two elements of their strategy included the establishment of a landed aristocracy through the provision of crown reserve lands and life-long appointments to the Legislative Council to resemble membership in the House of Lords, and the creation of an executive branch of the legislature that was financially and politically independent of the House of Assembly. Two of the most prominent leaders in Upper Canada towards the end of the eighteenth century were Lieutenant-Governor John Graves Simcoe, and the first bishop of the newly created diocese of Quebec (which was to include all of Upper and Lower Canada), Jacob Mountain. Their understanding of, and commitment to, the role of the Church of England in Upper Canada reveals, perhaps, the best example of Anglican ecclesiology operative in the colony. Before Simcoe had even arrived in Upper Canada, he wrote that "every establishment of Church and State that upholds the distinction of ranks and lessens the undue

---

It was stated in Chapter One that reference in the Constitutional Act of 1791 to provide for "the support and maintenance of the Protestant clergy" (i.e., the Clergy Reserves) was to haunt those who laid claim to such funds. Was the "Protestant clergy" to refer only to members of the Church of England? What about the Church of Scotland? Or the Methodists? Certainly there is room for argument here. But there is no question about Clauses XXXVIII and XXXIX of the Constitutional Act: these provide for the King to authorize the governor or lieutenant-governor of each of the provinces to constitute in every township or parish, parsonages or rectories, according to the establishment of the Church of England and to endow such rectories with land. These rectory endowments were limited only to ministers of the Church of England. Anglicans in Upper Canada would have considered this firm evidence that the Church of England was the Established Church of Upper Canada, without doubt. See Adam Short and Arthur G. Doughty, eds., "The Constitutional Act of 1791," in Documents Relating to the Constitutional History of Canada, 1759-1791, (Ottawa: J. de L. Tache, 1918), pp.1043-1045.
weight of the democratic influence, ought to be introduced.⁴ And after he had been in office for only a short period, he wrote again that "all just Government...is founded on the Morality of the People, and that such Morality has no true basis but when placed upon religious principles," and that he had "...always been extremely anxious, both from political as well as more worthy motives that the Church of England should be essentially established in Upper Canada.⁵ And for his part, Bishop Mountain held that the establishment and prosperity of the Church of England in Upper Canada was absolutely critical, "...not only for the Interests of His Majesty's Government, & of his Protestant subjects in this Province, but for the progressive improvement & happiness of his Canadian subjects also."⁶

When John Strachan arrived in Upper Canada on the last day of 1799, he held a social and political philosophy that was firmly rooted in an Anglican theology that was devoted to strengthening the Church of England's structural foundations in the colonies.⁷ This was also a theology that saw the hierarchical

---


⁷ The son of an overseer of granite quarries near Aberdeen, Strachan was brought up a Presbyterian. Upon his father's death he decided to qualify himself for teaching school as the best way of supporting his mother, and so entered the University of Aberdeen at sixteen and supported himself by teaching during vacation times. Invited to Upper Canada by two resident merchants who wanted a schoolmaster for their children, he was eventually induced by Simcoe's successor General Peter Hunter to take a newly vacant parish in Cornwall in 1803, and so presented himself for holy orders to Bishop Mountain of Quebec according to the
divisions of society as divinely ordained. Even though he himself was rose from humble beginnings to a position of power and influence, Strachan still maintained the validity of the Church of England's natural theology that looked upon those who were "obscure in the world or of no account or consideration" as owing their "low station" to the "will of God." A further aspect of his theology was the quintessentially "high" Anglican (albeit originally Roman) notion of the respective roles of faith and good works in the economy of salvation. While this may seem to be a relatively nebulous theological distinction, it would be at the very heart of Strachan's criticism of Methodism. For Strachan, the grace necessary to obtain salvation was gained through a life-long struggle to believe and trust in God, and to live in accordance with the commandments of the new covenant. The revivalist tradition of Methodism, whereby the Christian could enjoy conversion in a single moment of blinding revelation brought on by a certain emotional hysteria, was anathema to traditional Anglican soteriology. For Strachan, this Methodist

rights of the Church of England in the Colonies, thus cutting his Presbyterian ties and becoming an Anglican. In 1812 he moved to York to take charge of a poor parish and serve as chaplain to the garrison stationed there. By 1819 he had achieved prominence, and was appointed chairman of the new Clergy Corporation for managing the Clergy reserves. A year later, Lieutenant-Governor, Sir Peregrine Maitland appointed him to the Legislative Council. By 1825 he was the Archdeacon of York. The preceding is a summary of J. L. H. Henderson, John Strachan 1778-1867, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1969). And for Strachan's own account of his early life, see Henderson, ed., John Strachan: Documents and Opinions, (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1969), pp.1-13.


* The distinction between faith and good works in the theology of salvation takes its origin from Martin Luther's dismissal of the Epistle of James as non-canonical (because of the second chapter), and the primary place that he accorded Paul's Letters to the Romans and Galatians in its defense of his theology of justification by faith alone. The Council of Trent, of course, repudiated this Lutheran theology, as did high Anglican theology.
emotionality reduced the importance of living the virtuous life in the attainment of salvation. An early letter to his colleague Dr. James Brown reveals Strachan's concern about the emerging Methodist presence in Upper Canada:

The Methodists are making great progress among us and filling the country with the most deplorable fanaticism. You can have almost no conception of their excesses. They will bawl twenty of them at once, tumble on the ground, laugh, sing, jump, and stamp, and this they will call the working of the Spirit. All this arises from the fewness of the regular clergy, there being only six of us in the upper province.10

The references above to Strachan's emerging theology are intended to provide a background to what would eventually become his relentless campaign to establish in Upper Canada an institution of higher education that would serve the interests of the Church of England, and to offer an initial indication as to why he would find the complete secularization of King's College in 1849 to be entirely unacceptable. In summary, this theology can be stated as follows: the Church of England was the guardian of the true faith; it is a branch of the catholic and apostolic church and as such claims a divine origin;11 its episcopal government was sanctioned by tradition; its liturgy imposed uniformity and order on religious worship; and all that is necessary for salvation is contained in the Thirty-Nine Articles. And as for the Church of England in the Canadas, "it is the real Established Church of the two provinces, because it has been lawfully established


11 The idea that the Church of England was a branch of the one, universal church, of which the Roman Church was another, was certainly not new--Henry VIII used it to justify his break with Rome--but it was responsible more than any other Anglican premise for Strachan's commitment to the establishment of the Church of England in Upper Canada. This is because the claim that the Anglican Church was the branch of the Church Catholic which is to be found in England or her dominions only stood up if all Christians in these areas were adherents of this one Church.
in these Colonies by the King, who has the undoubted, and long practised prerogative to do so.\textsuperscript{12} And that was that.

So much of Strachan's work as the leading churchman of Upper Canada was motivated by a passionately held conviction that the Church of England was the denomination best suited to perform the social functions of religion. The establishment of the Church of England in Upper Canada provided the greatest hope for the survival of the province as a stable and loyal society. Closely allied to this establishment was the Church of England's claim on the Clergy Reserves, and not only for the financial fruits that such a claim would bear. More importantly, according to Strachan, the notion that the Church should derive its support from the voluntary contributions of its members—the solidly Methodist principle of voluntaryism—would only lead to the destruction of the independence and status of the ministerial calling; clergymen would be bound to conform to the tastes of their flocks.\textsuperscript{13}

This protracted defense of the role of the Church of England in Canada, which lasted well into the 1830's, when it became clear that the Church of England's established status was in danger of having to give way to the denominational pluralism that Strachan had for years denied, became increasingly bitter. Strachan set his sights not only upon the Methodists, whom he

\textsuperscript{12} University of Trinity College Archives, John Strachan, \textit{Observations on the provision for the maintenance of a Protestant clergy, in the Province of Upper and Lower Canada, under the 31st Geo. III, cap. 31.} (London: n.p., 1827), pp.33-34.

\textsuperscript{13} UTCA, John Strachan, \textit{Observations on the Provision Made for the Maintenance of a Protestant Clergy.} (Toronto: n.p.), p.3.
accused of disseminating fanaticism and republicanism, but also on the
Presbyterians (the Church into which he had been born), whose demand for co-
establishment led them, according to Strachan, to fill newspapers with "unmerited
and vulgar abuse of the Church of England."\textsuperscript{14} Nor did he escape opposition
from within his own Church. The Evangelical Movement within the Church of
England was gaining remarkable support by the 1830's.\textsuperscript{15} Their beliefs led them to
question the validity of claiming for any church, even their own, a monopoly of
religious truth, and to hold the view, anathema to Strachan, that all religious
denominations were in fact no more than convenient organizations in which
Christians could find fellowship together. Bishop Charles James Stewart of
Quebec, who did much to encourage the Evangelical tradition in the Church of
England during his episcopacy (1826-1837), was always far less uncompromising
in his claims for the Church than Strachan. About the Clergy Reserves he stated:
"...if it can be really shown that we are making an unjust claim or grasping more

\textsuperscript{14} UTCA, Strachan Letter Book, 1827-1839, Strachan to Stewart, Nov. 5, 1827.

\textsuperscript{15} The Evangelical movement within the Church of England (distinct in origin from Methodism), which
would lead eventually in Upper Canada to the founding of Wycliffe College in Toronto—one of the first
denominational colleges to affiliate with the University of Toronto in 1885—stressed the overwhelming
importance of personal salvation, and the individual's relationship with God. Salvation, in their view, was an
intensely personal matter of conversion and faith which did not depend exclusively upon the mediation of a
clergy. They challenged the traditional notion that the clergy possessed, by virtue of their office, any claim
of authority over their congregations, and thus challenged Strachan's concept of church discipline. While the
Evangelical movement within the Church of England in Canada cannot be said to have been formalised until
the founding of the Church of England Evangelical Association in 1869, it was a force within Anglicanism
in Upper Canada as early as the 1830's, and was greatly encouraged in its growth by its opposition to the
Tractarianism of the Oxford Movement, which Strachan was so attracted to. For more on this movement, see
Kenneth Hylson-Smith, Evangelicals in the Church of England, 1734-1984, (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark,
1988). And for the history of the founding of Wycliffe College, see Dyson Hague, "The History of Wycliffe
College," in The Jubilee Volume of Wycliffe College, (Toronto: Wycliffe College, 1927), pp.1-60; and
College, 1978).
than is fairly ours, let us subscribe with heart and hand to a renunciation of our pretences."

By 1836, it was becoming clear to Strachan that any hope for the triumph of the Anglican cause had been slowly but definitively undermined by its friends who had abandoned it, and by its enemies who had ruthlessly persecuted it. In that same year he preached a sermon in his capacity as Archdeacon of York, in which, before the assembled clergy of Upper Canada, he declared that the Anglican Church in Upper Canada was "separated, in a great measure, from the Mother Church, and deprived, by the pressure of the times, of much of the protection which the Civil Government has hitherto willingly accorded—assailed on every side by enemies whose hostility is openly avowed." 

Before long, it was clear that the Clergy Reserves would either be divided among all Christian denominations, or secularized entirely, and Strachan was forced to soften his insistence that the Church of England be at the forefront of all political and social decisions made for Upper Canada. After all, as Strachan proclaimed in 1837 in a sermon preached before the clergy of the archdeaconry of York:

> The basis of the Church of Christ is not secular but spiritual, it is not to be considered merely a civil institution—an erection or portion of the State;—nor does it depend upon the breath of Governments or upon the enactments of human law. On

---


the contrary, it is an ordinance of God.\textsuperscript{18}

This was a sure sign that Strachan was retreating from his previously intractable position, and an indication that the Clergy Reserves would soon be appropriated for the benefit of other denominations in the province. In that same sermon, Strachan speaks of the inevitable:

\[...\text{if, therefore, the property of the Church be taken from us by legal oppression, we must receive it as a trial of our faith, and, submitting in all patience, seek consolation in turning with redoubled ardour to our sacred duties.}\]

It was not surprising, therefore, when in 1840 Governor General Thomson (now Lord Sydenham) decided to at least attempt a settlement of the Clergy Reserves problem, which Lord Durham, in his famous report, had seen as one of the major causes of the rebellion of 1837. He successfully persuaded the Legislative Assembly to agree to a bill which stipulated that one half of the proceeds of the Reserves would be divided in equal parts between the Church of England and the Church of Scotland, leaving the remainder to be divided among the other denominations.\textsuperscript{20} And while this would by no means settle the issue,\textsuperscript{21} it does set the backdrop for the university bills of 1843 and 1845. It will be recalled from Chapter Two that these bills—the Baldwin and Draper Bills respectively—proposed to transform King's College into a non-sectarian arts college and to divide its

\textsuperscript{18} UTCA, John Strachan, \textit{Address to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of York. By the Honourable and Venerable The Archdeacon of York. Delivered at Toronto on Wednesday the 13th September, 1837}, (n.p., n.d.), p.9

\textsuperscript{19} \textit{Ibid.}, p.11.

\textsuperscript{20} For a full account of the events surrounding the secularization of the Clergy Reserves, see John Moir, \textit{Church and State in Canada West}, pp.27-51.

\textsuperscript{21} The Clergy Reserves would not be fully secularized until 1854.
endowment among the denominational colleges that decided to affiliate. That legislation was to lead to the death of the University of King's College, and the birth of the University of Trinity College. Having provided the necessary background, we can now take up the story in some detail.

The Founding of Trinity College, 1850-1852.

Sometime in the early summer of 1850, Attorney General Robert Baldwin gave to Egerton Ryerson a copy of a rough draft of the Bill he was to introduce to the Legislative Assembly on July 5. The bill, entitled, "An Act to declare groundless certain doubts respecting the intentions of the Act of last Session of the Parliament of this Province for Amending the Charter of the University of Toronto," was very revealing. There was little doubt as to the intention of Baldwin's University Act of the previous year: the University of Toronto was to be the provincial University, it was to be the only institution of higher education in the province that could lay claim to the endowment intended for such education, it was to be completely secularized, and there was to be a provision for the denominational colleges to affiliate with the University upon the surrender of their charters. There was even less doubt as to the intention of Baldwin's

---

22 It will be helpful to review some of the clauses of Baldwin's Toronto University Act in order to understand Strachan's determined opposition. Clause 12 stipulated that there would be no Faculty of Divinity in the University. Clause 17 prohibited any cleric from being appointed by the Crown to the Senate of the University. Clause 29 disallowed any form of religious observance to be imposed upon the Officers of the University. See "Educational Acts Passed by the Legislature of the Province of Canada, 1849," in D.H.E., Vol. VIII, pp.147-146. It would be hard to underestimate how reprehensible this legislation would be to
subsequent bill of July 5: to soften the significant opposition that had been organized as a result of the University Act, and to ensure Anglicans and Methodists alike that the "non-sectarian provisions [of the Act] had originated [only] in a sincere desire for the advancement of True Religion, and a tender regard for the conscientious scruples of all classes of professing Christians." It was a desperate bit of legislation; too little, too late. With hindsight, it can be said that the only purpose it would serve would be to indicate to future historians how conscious Baldwin was of the profound opposition to the University Act of 1849. For the denominationalists, it was empty political rhetoric, and neither Ryerson nor Strachan, nor the Governors of Queen's in Kingston, would have anything to do with it.

For Strachan the writing had been on the wall for several months. When Baldwin's University Act became law on January 1, 1850, he began writing a pastoral letter to the clergy and laity of the diocese of Toronto which he would promulgate on February 7, and which would deal with the pernicious legislation. With the demise of King's, Strachan had a limited number of options. He could send the young men of the Church of England in Upper Canada to what he called the "Godless" University of Toronto, or he could establish a university of his own with faculties in both Arts and Theology. The former option was unthinkable; it

Strachan and other members of the Anglican hierarchy.

would "leave her children to perish for lack of spiritual knowledge." The latter option was the only course, for "the whole revelation of God tells [the baptized] that Religion ought to form the sum and substance of education." The only question that remained was that of the location of such a new institution.

It should be noted here that in 1841 Strachan had established the Diocesan Theological College at Cobourg where candidates for Holy Orders were trained until 1852 when the institution was transferred to Toronto to become the Faculty of Divinity in the new Trinity College. Cobourg was chosen only because of the presence there of the Reverend A. N. Bethune, Rector of Cobourg and Professor of Theology. So there was always the possibility of erecting a new university at Cobourg. But that site was considered second to Toronto for two reasons: first, because Toronto would provide a body of students and staff that could not be found at Cobourg (Victoria College was learning that lesson the hard way); and second, because Toronto was the site of the Cathedral, and Anglican tradition had always provided for the training of candidates for the priesthood at a location within proximity of the bishop's cathedra. And so Toronto it would be.

In the pastoral letter noted above, Strachan proposed

---


25 Ibid.


27 Subsequently, Alexander Neil Bethune (1800-1879) served as Archdeacon of York (1847-67); was consecrated as coadjutor to Bishop Strachan on January 25, 1867; and succeeded him as Bishop of Toronto on November 1, 1867.
that the Church of this Diocese, consisting of the clergy and laity, should approach our beloved Sovereign the Queen, and the Imperial Parliament, by respectful petitions for such redress in the restoration of her University..."

There were three challenges that had to be met to accomplish this restoration. The first was the raising of sufficient funds for the College, for Strachan was aware that no government, either in Canada or in Britain, would provide public funds for the support of an exclusively Anglican institution. This, ironically, made Strachan into a proponent of voluntaryism, a doctrine that had been for Strachan—until 1850—utterly contemptible for its advocacy of the separation of church and state. The second challenge was to obtain an Act of Incorporation; this would be difficult to refuse in light of the existence of Victoria and Queen's—exclusively denominational institutions. The third was the most difficult: securing a Royal Charter to grant degrees in Arts and Theology. This would arouse significant and organized opposition from those who supported the newly established University of Toronto, and who wanted to encourage the affiliation of all the province's denominational colleges with the provincial University. A charter for a new Anglican college would allow the granting of rival degrees, and would be opposed as being counter to all that was best for the new University.

An extensive fundraising campaign was immediately undertaken in response to Strachan's pastoral letter, and over 25,000 pounds was committed to the new university in lands, promissory notes, and real cash. Strachan wasted no


29 See 'List of Benefactors,' in Henry Melville, The Rise and Progress of Trinity College, Toronto: With a Sketch of the Life of the Lord Bishop of Toronto, As Connected with Church Education in Canada. (Toronto: Henry Rowson, 1852), Appendices, pp.85-95. Strachan himself gave 1,000 pounds; Alexander
time in preparing for a trip of England to secure a Royal Charter and to appeal 
for funds for a new university. On April 10, 1850, a large crowd of citizens led by 
the Chief Justice, John Beverly Robinson, saw the seventy-two-year-old bishop off 
for England. By April 30 he was in London and hard at work, and where he 
would remain until early in November. Strachan had a number of objectives 
while he was in England: to present the Queen with a petition which sought a 
charter for a private church college was the most important. The petition bore 

thirty-two official signatures, with 11,731 other signatures appended. And it 
sought a charter for "...founding an University or College, in which instruction in 
the sciences may be combined with a sound religious education; and in which the 
truths of Christianity, as they are held by [our] Church can be taught without 
jealousy or reserve." It should be noted that, unlike the original charter that 

Strachan had sought for King's College, religious tests were required only of the 
faculty; students from any denomination would be free to attend. 

The second objective of Strachan's work in England was fund raising. 
Subscription lists were opened, and a manifesto published directed at "his 
brethren in the faith in England." "The members of the Church of England," he 
declared, "thus deprived of the revenue of 11,000 pounds a year, and rejecting 
what was once 'King's College', but is now the Antichristian 'University of 
Toronto', are desirous of establishing a University, in strict connexion with the 

Burnside, a friend of Strachan's, gave 6,000 pounds. 

Church, without pecuniary aid from any public source... The Bishop of the Diocese, having to begin anew the work which has occupied fifty years of his life, has come to England, with a view to obtain assistance..."31.

To assist in this fund raising, a committee was formed to offer guidance and direction, and which was to meet weekly at S.P.G. House (Society for the Propagation of the Gospel). Among the committee were the Duke of Wellington and Lord Seaton—the latter being the former Lieutenant Governor of Upper Canada, Sir John Colborne. Throughout the summer and autumn the bishop canvassed England, preaching, speaking at public meetings, and meeting with distinguished public figures. Of the latter, the most important was the Secretary of State for War and the Colonies in the Whig government, Charles, Earl Grey. Sitting in the House of Lords, Grey was the first British minister to pursue a policy of self-government for the Colonies (especially in Canada). And so Strachan's trip to London might have seemed to Grey as an attempt by Strachan to go over the head of Grey's carefully appointed Governor General, the eighth Earl of Elgin. He was, to be sure, far from convinced by Strachan's argument for support for his university; it is not unreasonable to suggest that Grey might have also been hesitant to support publicly a churchman who was less than reserved in his condemnation of Baldwin's government, duly elected and loyal to Her

---

Majesty. Strachan asked Grey for a charter, a "Queen's Letter" authorising collections in all the parish churches of England (and worth about 3,000 pounds), and a subscription of 1,000 pounds from the Queen herself! Grey responded with the suggestion that a charter might be possible, but the other requests would be out of the question. (As for Strachan's suggestion that the Queen herself might make a Royal Donation of 1,000 pounds: the complete lack of reference to the request in Grey's reply suggests the Colonial Secretary considered the request so crass as to be undeserving of a response.)

Strachan was quick to furnish Lord Grey with a draft copy. The charter was based almost entirely on the original charter of King's College, and to a lesser extent on the system adopted in regard to Bishop's College in Lennoxville, Lower Canada, under the patronage of Bishop Mountain. The proposed charter

---

32 It should be noted that Earl Grey was aware of Strachan's opposition to the "godless" University of Toronto (although not familiar with the complexity of the University Question), and his desire to establish yet another university in Upper Canada. Some five months before Strachan arrived in London to petition Grey, Elgin had written the following to Grey concerning the Lord Bishop: "I am afraid of getting into some trouble with the most dangerous and spiteful man in Canada who is no other than its Bishop on the subject of a letter against the University Bill which he sent to you in original". Canadian Archives, The Elgin-Grey Papers, 1846-1852, Vol. II, (Ottawa: J. O. Patenaude, 1937), p.552, Elgin to Grey, December 2, 1849.

33 "I shall, therefore, be ready to consider with the utmost attention the suggestion you have offered for the incorporation of a new University in Upper Canada, whenever your Lordship shall have forwarded a Draft of the Charter, which may be deemed adequate for the purpose...With respect to the application for a Queen's Letter, for the purpose of raising a collection in aid of the design, I have to inform your Lordship, that I find upon communicating with the Secretary of State for the Home Department, that a very strong objection is entertained to the multiplication of such appeals to the benevolence of Her Majesty's subjects...I fear it will not be practicable to comply with your request." "Earl Grey, Colonial Secretary, to Doctor Strachan," in D.H.E., Vol. IX, pp.97-98.

34 In a preface to the draft charter, Strachan acknowledges Grey's refusal to grant a Queen's letter, but adds that precedents for such a request were not wanting, and that "...the reasons for granting such a favour, are, in the judgement of others, as well as of myself, all but irresistible." "Doctor Strachan to Earl Grey, Colonial Secretary," in D.H.E., Vol. IX, p.99. Apparently Grey was quite able to resist.

35 UTCA, Proceedings of the Provisional Church University Board of Trustees, December 21, 1850. p.18.
stipulated that the Chancellor, President, and five members of the faculty form a governing body styled the College Council, and that such members of the College Council subscribe to the Thirty Nine Articles. And, as at the King's of old, students were excused from all religious tests, save those who were studying towards degrees in divinity. But after submitting this draft to Grey, the Bishop was invited to meet the the Colonial Secretary where he learned that Grey had further reasons for delaying the granting of a charter. According to Strachan's account of his meeting with Grey in the Cobourg Star, after he had returned to Canada, Grey informed him that the more satisfactory course of procedure would have been for Strachan to procure a charter from the government in Upper Canada (consistent with Grey's devotion to Canadian self-government), and then present it to the Colonial Office. Her Majesty's government would have little choice but to recommend royal assent.\footnote{Later correspondence between Grey and Elgin would indicate that Grey falsely presumed that Strachan would have little difficulty obtaining a charter in Upper Canada; he was obviously unaware of the Baldwin government's determination to consolidate the denominational colleges under the umbrella of the University of Toronto. The Elgin-Grey Papers, Vol. II, p.700, Grey to Elgin, August 2, 1850.} That was, claimed Grey, the procedure that Queen's College in Kingston had followed.\footnote{Cobourg Star, December 18, 1850.} The fact that Strachan, an elderly and prominent bishop, had travelled to London to obtain his charter, would not incline Grey to be sympathetic to the point of recommending the hasty granting of a charter.

No doubt Strachan was frustrated and angry. But it is evident from a subsequent meeting with the more agreeable Sir Robert Peel—the former Tory
Prime Minister, then retired—that Strachan's primary purpose in visiting England was not so much to obtain a charter, but rather to raise much-needed funds. Peel asked Strachan about his strategy should he fail to receive the charter he sought. "The College [will] commence as soon as I return to Canada, whether we receive a Royal Charter or not," was the bishop's bold reply. Knowing how this would infuriate his old Whig antagonists, Peel encouraged Strachan: "You are right, the Church must do her duty!"38

Money was the primary purpose of Strachan's trip. During the summer of 1850, he travelled throughout England, and was able to report by mid-October that he had raised 10,000 pounds in cash. Of that amount in cash, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts donated 2,000 pounds, in addition to land worth at least 4,000 pounds, while the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge gave a valuable piece of land in Toronto worth 3,000 pounds.39 When added to the sum of nearly 28,000 pounds that had been raised in Upper Canada in cash and land subscriptions, there was about 47,000 pounds in endowment that been raised for the projected University.

When Strachan returned to Toronto on November 4, 1850, he was met by a delegation of leading physicians who had organized the Upper Canada School of Medicine, and who proposed that their school immediately become the Faculty of

38 "Interview of Doctor Strachan with the Colonial Secretary in Regard to the Charter for Trinity College," in D.H.E., Vol. IX, p.113.
39 UTCA, Strachan Papers, Strachan to the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, October 18, 1850.
Medicine of the nascent church university. Moreover, they offered their services gratuitously until the University possessed sufficient finances to maintain the faculty. Naturally, Strachan thought this to be a splendid idea, even if there was no provision yet for the teaching of the liberal arts. He proposed a formal opening of the medical school designed to draw attention to his university scheme and thereby encourage further financial support. The Anglican newspaper *The Church* recorded the formalities held on November 7, 1850 with, perhaps, slight hyperbole:

> Seldom if ever, has our Province witnessed a more interesting event. Generations yet unborn will keep that day in remembrance, connected as it is with the first operations of a University founded to counteract the infidel spirit of the age, and to continue the blessings of Science with the far more precious blessings of Christianity.  

During these latter months of 1850 there was the now the prospect of two rival universities being in operation: the University of Toronto, and Strachan's Church University (the name "Trinity" had yet to be adopted). The former institution enjoyed the endowment of the now defunct University of King's College; the latter the funds raised by Strachan. That there was considerable antipathy between the supporters of these two schools is perhaps best evidenced by a pastoral letter which Strachan wrote to his diocese after he had returned from England. In it, Strachan is scurrilous in his indictment of the Reverend John McCaul, who was at that time serving as the first president of the

---

40 Of the six physicians that composed the delegation, one was Henry Melville, who was later to write a hagiographical account of Strachan's founding of Trinity; and Norman Bethune, later to be immortalized by his missionary work in China.

41 *The Church*, November 14, 1850.
University of Toronto after supporting legislation that led to the demise of King's:

Some of our friends are filled with grief, and others with indignation, on being constantly taunted by our opponents with the fact, that, if it was wrong to destroy King's College and establish an infidel institution in its stead, it was a Churchman who did it [McCaul], and that he has still some members of the Church of England among his abettors...We have only to reflect that such contradictions have happened in the Church of God from the beginning,—there was an Adversary among the Apostles, and St. Paul had his Alexander the Coppersmith.  

It is surely difficult to underestimate the force of such remarks. For an Anglican bishop, in a letter to all of his faithful, to label an Anglican university president as a Judas, as akin to the one who betrayed Christ, must have led to the most bitter feelings at a time when public discourse, especially in written form, was characterized by exaggerated politeness.

While teaching had commenced at the medical school, much remained to be done before the new university could be considered established: land had to be purchased, legislation had to be enacted, buildings planned, faculty recruited, and a royal charter was stilled thought to be crucial.

At the close of 1850, the city of Toronto had a population of about 30,000.  

While the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel had given a gift of valuable land worth some 4,000 pounds, Strachan knew it would only increase in value (it would eventually sell in 1855 for over 9,000 pounds). A shrewd businessman, Strachan retained the valuable property, and purchased another property of 20 acres on Queen Street using 2,000 of the 3,000 pounds that he

---


43 The boundaries of the city were roughly from the Don River to Bathurst Street, and from the lake to a line drawn east-west about were Dundas Street runs today.
realised in the selling of the less valuable property donated by the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge.\textsuperscript{44} Having purchased the land, plans for construction were soon underway. While in England, Strachan had been impressed by, and had obtained a copy of, the plans intended for the construction of a theological College near Liverpool--St. Aiden's in Birkenhead. Architects were retained and instructed to adapt the plans for the Toronto college at a meeting of the Provisional Council on January 23, 1851. A few weeks later, sod was turned in a brief but formal ceremony, and on April 30 the cornerstone was laid before a gathering of thousands who heard Strachan proclaim: "I lay this corner stone of an edifice to be here erected by the name of Trinity College, to be a place of sound learning and religious education in accordance with the principles and usages of the United Church of England and Ireland."\textsuperscript{45}

Next on Strachan's agenda was the matter of securing provincial legislation for the incorporation of the College. Nor would he be placated by a partial charter, one that permitted the College to exist if it agreed to some form of association with the University of Toronto. Fifty years before Trinity College was to petition for federation with the University of Toronto, Strachan stated with determination: "Members of the Church of England...would never cease to indulge the reasonable hope, that the Government would consent to grant them a perfect Charter, nor would they solicit a restricted one with the remotest

\textsuperscript{44} UTCA, \textit{Strachan Letter Book}, Strachan to the Reverend Ernest Hawkins, Secretary to the S.P.G, February 4, 1853.

\textsuperscript{45} Melville, \textit{The Rise and Progress of Trinity College}, p.125.
intention of affiliating with Toronto University." Not surprisingly, there was strong opposition to legislation which would incorporate yet another denominational college; opposition from the Senate of the University of Toronto, from the House of Assembly, and from Dr. Ryerson of Victoria.

From the Senate, Mr. Peter Boyle de Blaquiere, Chancellor of the University (and a member of the Church of England) had, the previous November, declared that it would be dangerous "...to permit the revival of an Institution, wholly exclusive in its nature, and, therefore, unsuited to the well-being of this Province...," and followed this up with letters to Strachan which eventually elicited the following reply from the Bishop: "Having been made acquainted with your bitter and un-Christian hostility to the Church University...I must decline any further Correspondence with you..." and followed this up with letters to Strachan which eventually elicited the following reply from the Bishop: "Having been made acquainted with your bitter and un-Christian hostility to the Church University...I must decline any further Correspondence with you...

The House of Assembly heard the first reading of the bill, "An Act to Incorporate Trinity College" on July 11, 1851. In response, William Lyon Mackenzie moved an amendment which would replace all six sections of the Act with a statement that had as a preface: "...inasmuch as the United Church of England and Ireland has heretofore been, and now is, arrayed against the People of Upper Canada in their long continued efforts for equal Civil and Religious

46 "Doctor Strachan's Reply to the Letter of the Provincial Secretary, January 20, 1851" in D.H.E., Vol. IX, p.254

47 Cited by Hodgins in D.H.E., Vol. IX, p.253. de Blaquiere and Strachan were later to conduct a particularly bitter correspondence during January of 1851, which is fully cited in D.H.E., Vol. X, pp.51-54. Much of it has to do with the meaning of Strachan's description of the University of Toronto as the "Godless" University.

48 Ibid., pp.53-54.
rights..." and which proceeded in essence to prevent the legislation from coming before the house and leading to the passing of an Act of Incorporation for a Church of England college. The motion was, of course, defeated, but not without escalating the vitriolic tone of the debate.

And from Dr. Ryerson came a response to an editorial in The Church which claimed that he had met with Colonial Secretary Lord Grey in London, shortly after Strachan had returned to Canada, and that he had represented his strong opposition to Grey concerning the proposed charter for the Anglican college. To be sure, Ryerson did meet with Grey in London, and they did discuss the issue. But he insisted that he simply told Grey that Wesleyan Methodists had objected to the Baldwin bill of 1850 because of its irreligious prescriptions, but that legislation had been passed in the legislature which would permit religious instruction at the University of Toronto, and that, if it was made affordable, Victoria would move from Cobourg to Toronto and there affiliate with the University. While he claimed he had no reason to think that an Anglican college

49 The text of Mackenzie's amendment, which was nothing other than a nuisance intended to embarrass Strachan, is recorded in The Elgin-Grey Papers, Elgin to Grey, July 12, 1851, p.836, the opposition of both Boyle de Blaquiere and Mackenzie was also covered extensively in the Toronto Globe. See especially July 8, 1851.

50 The Elgin-Grey Papers, Vol. II, Grey to Elgin, March 11, 1851. Grey writes of his meeting with Ryerson: "It has been explained to me by Dr. Ryerson, that this policy of confining the powers of granting degrees in Arts to the University of Toronto has been obstructed by the existence of denominational colleges." This hardly amounts to an attack on The Church of England by Ryerson; at least on the basis of Grey's account of the meeting, Ryerson was falsely accused of speaking against the Anglican college.

51 While Ryerson states in his letter to the editor of The Globe that Victoria would be willing to remove to Toronto if there was financial inducement, it is highly unlikely that this was ever seriously considered as long as Victoria would have been reduced to a mere theological college, which was exactly what would have happened under both the Baldwin and Hincks Acts. See above, Chapter Two.
should not enjoy a charter just as Victoria had, he did claim that Strachan's attempts to obtain such a charter "...[did] more real injury to that Church than the most powerful of her avowed opponents."³²

For Strachan, opposition seemed to come from all directions: from the University of Toronto, from the legislature, and even from the other denominational colleges. But it is clear from his correspondence during these months of 1851 with Lord Elgin, Lord Grey, and others, that such opposition only steeled Strachan in his determination to obtain what he considered to be the right of the established church of Upper Canada: to secure for the youth of the Church over which he presided the means of enjoying the best secular education in the Arts and Sciences, coupled with the religious teaching and influences of the Church of England, and all of this with the inestimable advantages of residential collegiate life.

The bishop's influence, and that of his church, was still considerable. And so, despite opposition from a number of quarters, the legislature was able to pass "An Act to Incorporate Trinity College, Toronto" (14 and 15 Victoria, c. XXXII) on August 2, 1851. The act was uncomplicated, and did little else than incorporate and invest complete control of the College in the Corporation of Trinity College, which was to consist of the Bishop of the Diocese of Toronto (and such bishops of the dioceses that the Diocese of Toronto might thereafter be

³² The Church, October 13, 1851.
divided into), the Trustees, and the College Council. Three of the most prominent members of this College Council—the Provost and two senior professors—had already been recruited by Strachan by the time of the passing of the Act. He had written for advice on the matter to his contacts in England, stating that:

We are anxious that the three belong to neither extreme of the Church, but that they should be true sons of the Church of England, not low, or what is called Evangelical, but equally distant from Romanism on the one hand and Dissent on the other.

Later in the year the three were appointed: Reverend George Whitaker of Cambridge as Provost, and two Oxford men: one a Professor of Mathematics, the other of Classics. Finally, on January 15, 1852, the formal opening of Trinity College was held. Twenty-one students had been accepted as undergraduate students, and nine others had come from the Diocesan Theological Institution at Cobourg to finish their Divinity degrees at Trinity. All of the students signed a declaration of obedience to the rules of the College, and the divinity students also pledged their allegiance to the Thirty-Nine Articles. In opening ceremonies that, judging by the length of the speeches, must have lasted well over four hours, Provost Whitaker summed up the early history of the College:

The foundation of this College is a solemn protest against the separation of religion from education; we have joined together what others had put asunder, and what, as

---


54 Strachan Letter Book, Strachan to the Societies, February 16, 1851.

55 The entire Ceremony of Inauguration, including full transcripts of all the addresses, is found in Melville, The Rise and Progress of Trinity College, pp.129-155.
we believed, God joined together from the beginning.\textsuperscript{56}

All that remained was the granting of a Royal Charter, which Strachan still felt was at least their due. Lord Grey, in a manner in keeping with his predilection towards resolving issues locally, had advised Governor General Elgin to direct Trinity to obtain its charter in the Province, and refrain from petitioning the Queen (or at least deal with the matter himself without involving Westminster). Elgin had responded in May of 1851, informing Grey that he thought it unwise for a Royal Charter "...containing such ample powers as that for which His Lordship (Strachan) has applied [to] be granted to any denominational College while negotiations for the surrender of the charters of Queen's and Victoria are still pending."\textsuperscript{57} This must have infuriated Strachan: to have the word "denomination" applied to the Church of England—the Established Church of Upper Canada—by the Governor General himself, surely caused the Bishop great distress. In a letter to Chief Justice J. B. Robinson he declared: "The matter must not rest here; the Queen shall be reminded of her Coronation Oath" (as Defender of the Faith).\textsuperscript{58} As pretentious as this sounded, Strachan was serious. He sent off a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury and, through the Governor General, an Address to the Queen.

In the end, it was found that Victoria College would not relinquish her

\textsuperscript{56} Ibid., p.154.

\textsuperscript{57} "Despatch of the Governor General to the Colonial Secretary," in \textit{D.H.E.}, Vol.IX, p.264..

\textsuperscript{58} \textit{Strachan Letter Book}, Strachan to J. B. Robinson, June 17, 1851."
charter only to become a theological college, and this left Elgin to be reminded by Strachan that there was no longer any reason why the members of the Church of England should not be "put upon as favourable a footing as the Methodists and Presbyterians." The Charter was granted on July 16, 1852. In a wonderfully ironic report which aptly closes the history of the founding of Trinity, Strachan stated: "We have received the Charter. The heat has melted the seal but I believe it is of little consequence as a fragment remains." A fragment of King’s College indeed remained, and remains today: the University of Trinity College.

**Trinity College in Isolation, 1852-1868.**

Early records of the University of Trinity College reveal that, in essence, the new university was an attempt to reproduce on Canadian soil, as nearly as was possible, the collegiate foundations of Oxford and Cambridge. The Royal Charter granted in 1852 allowed Trinity to confer degrees in Divinity, Arts, Law, and Medicine, but no degree of any kind would be conferred to a student who was not prepared to declare, under oath, that he was "...truly and sincerely a member of the United Church of England and Ireland." Every professor was also to be a member of the Church of England, and was to subscribe to the

---

59 Ibid., Strachan to Elgin, February 3, 1852.

60 Ibid., Strachan to the Societies, September 8, 1852.

61 UTCA, Records of Trinity College University, From its establishment in 1852 to 1855. Letter of Reverend William Jones, Bursar and Registrar, to J. G. Hodgins, [n.d].
Thirty-Nine Articles. Students were to reside in college, unless granted special dispensation, and were to attend chapel. Even the professors were expected to live in residence; and though this rule did not necessarily imply celibacy, it had a tendency to do so. The faculty were drawn almost exclusively from Oxford and Cambridge; this tended, of course, to provide an Oxbridge influence on all aspects of the College's ethos.

While this was the intended effect, there was also the result that the inadequacies of that particular educational tradition were similarly transplanted in Toronto. The matriculation requirements in the Faculty of Arts were not exacting. Applicants were examined in Scripture History and in the Greek Testament; in Latin and Greek authors, Arithmetic, Algebra, and Books I and II of Euclid. This would have presupposed grammar school or high school training, but students would also be accepted upon the presentation of a certificate from a principal of a suitable Anglican institution. The enrolment in October of 1852 consisted of thirteen men in Divinity, eighteen in Arts, and five in Medicine.42

Between 1853 and 1855, the minutes of the Trinity College Corporation indicate that the early concerns were primarily financial, and that the Corporation considered the establishment of scholarships to be the most effective way to provide for an uncertain future. Endowed scholarships would ensure a pool of applicants to the College, not all of whom would receive such assistance, but some of whom could be induced to enroll even without financial assistance.

42 Ibid.
During these years, more than fifteen scholarships were established for different categories of recipients and well over 5,000 pounds raised.\(^{63}\)

It is not until March of 1854 that there is any indication in the minutes of either the Corporation or the College Council of Trinity's relationship with the University of Toronto.\(^{64}\) It will be recalled that the Hincks Act of 1853 had made the University of Toronto, like the University of London, solely an examining body, and had delegated the work of instruction to University College, and to any other colleges willing to be affiliated to the University of Toronto. Nor did the Act divide the endowment of the University of Toronto; rather, it gave a prior claim on the endowment to University College, with the provision that any surplus would be divided among the denominational colleges entering into affiliation. And it gave to each of the heads of Victoria, Queen's, and Trinity Universities—the institutions that the framers of the legislation hoped would affiliate—an *ex officio* seat on the University of Toronto Senate. But Provost Whitaker made the following reply to the invitation he received to assume his seat on the Senate:

I beg respectfully to decline acting as a Member of that Body. The University of Toronto and the University of Trinity College being distinct and independent Societies, and founded on widely different principles, it is not, in my opinion, expedient that any Officer of one should accept an appointment to the other. I am authorized to state that this communication is made under the sanction of the Council of Trinity College.\(^{65}\)

---

\(^{63}\) UTCA, *Proceedings of the Corporation of Trinity College University for the Years 1853, 1854, and 1855*, January 13, 1853 to February 23, 1854, passim.

\(^{64}\) The Corporation was made up of the Bishop, three Trustees, three Treasurers, and the eighteen member College Council, the latter being made up of the Provost, senior faculty, and prominent public figures. The Council met more frequently than the Corporation after 1853.

Both Victoria and Queen's were to make use of the provisions of at least one facet of the 1853 Act: the heads of both schools assumed their rightful places on the Senate (there is no record though of either ever sending up a student for examination). But Trinity was determined to remain aloof.

A very good indication of how Trinity viewed its relationship to the University of Toronto is revealed through an incident in 1855 when legislation was proposed in the House of Assembly that would lead to the revival of the King's College Medical School as the medical faculty of the University of Toronto. The faculty of the Trinity Medical School hastily entered into negotiations with the Government to stave off what amounted to a direct threat to their existence. They made the mistake of proceeding with such negotiations without first consulting the Trinity College Council. This was not the first time that the two bodies had clashed. The Council sternly criticized the medical faculty, and made it clear as to what it thought of any such negotiations with either the Government or the University of Toronto. The proposed Act, said the Council, should be ignored, since it "...does not in any way lie within its province to discuss the measures contemplated in [it], relating as they do to an Institution (the University of Toronto) with which Trinity College neither has, nor seeks to have any connection..."66. The attitude of the Council towards the University of Toronto was absolutely clear: isolation was the only course.

This early attitude of isolationism would eventually manifest itself in a

---

66 Ibid., February 22, 1855.
stubborn determination to remain independent of the provincial University until as late as 1903, when the pressure of circumstances finally made its weight felt. But this determination could not lessen the serious difficulties that challenged the College in its early years. The conflict mentioned above, between the College Council and the Faculty of Medicine, did not abate, and led to the resignation of the entire faculty in July of 1856 over questions of procedure. The most deleterious effect of their resignation was the immediate decline in enrolment which contributed to a serious financial crisis. During the 1855-56 academic year, enrolment totalled only forty-six students in Arts, Law, Medicine, and Divinity. This was the highest number of students that Trinity would enrol in the years following the closure of the medical faculty.

To these financial difficulties were added the vicissitudes of faculty appointments. The Proceedings of the College Council indicate that between 1855 and 1862, more than seven senior professors either left the College to return to England, or retired for the purposes of health. This would have surely led to an

---

67 The incident which resulted in the mass resignation involved a medical faculty advertisement which appeared, unknown to the College Council, indicating that no religious tests would be asked of students attending lectures in the autumn of 1856. See Proceedings of the Trinity College Council, August 7, 1856. The minutes of this day record a motion of thanks to “the late Professors of the Medical Faculty,” while at the same time accepting their resignation.


69 Tuition in 1856 amounted to less than 12 pounds, while room and board was 50 pounds. That yielded an income of less than 3,000 pounds, which in turn produced a significant deficit, not off-set by income from the endowment since so much of it was in land holdings. See Proceedings of Trinity College Council, March 8, 1956 and May 22, 1856 to December 2, 1856, passim.
unsettling effect on College routine.\textsuperscript{70}

While the College Council was able to grow accustomed to the high turn-over in faculty, it was unable to adjust to the lack of funds needed for the proper administration of the College's academic program and its buildings. The serious financial situation led to a consideration of solutions at the annual meeting of the Synod of the Diocese of Huron during the week of July 11, 1860.\textsuperscript{71} It was clear that a fundraising campaign would once again have to be undertaken. To this end, the following motion was moved by the Reverend Adam Townley, Rector of the Parish of Paris, Ontario:

\begin{quote}
That seeing it is greatly to be desired that the Canadian Church should unite in the upholding of one University, thereby ensuring for it a high literary character and extensive religious and Church influence, this Synod respectfully requests the Lord Bishop to adopt such means, as in his wisdom he may see good, as shall tend to secure the hearty co-operation of all Churchmen in support of Trinity College, Toronto, which, through the energy of the Bishop of Toronto and the liberality of Churchmen here and at home, has been for some years in successful operation, and with the high honour of possessing a Royal Charter.\textsuperscript{72}
\end{quote}

This motion, in and of itself, would have caused little response; the Anglican community, especially those attending the Synod, would have been well aware of Trinity's financial situation. What shocked those present was the intervention of Benjamin Cronyn, Bishop of Huron. Known as a devoted and unbending

\textsuperscript{70} There were a number of reasons for these departures: Reverend Edward Parry resigned on account of bad health in 1855; he was professor of Classics. Reverend Edwin Hatch of Pembroke College, Oxford, resigned in 1862 because of his evangelical theological leanings. Reverend John Ambrey returned to Trinity College, Cambridge as Professor of Classics in 1863. In the chair of Mathematics, Professor John Irving resigned for reasons of ill-health in 1856.

\textsuperscript{71} The Diocese of Huron had been created out of the Diocese of Toronto in 1857. According to the terms of the Act to Incorporate Trinity College, this gave the Bishop of Huron \textit{ex officio} membership on the Corporation of Trinity College.

proponent of the strictest form of Evangelicalism, Cronyn informed the Synod that he had carefully studied the teachings of Trinity College and, had he a son to educate, Trinity would be the last place he would send him to. He could not, therefore, support any motion for the support of this dangerous institution where supreme power was invested in the Chancellor.

The controversy which ensued, based on the Bishop of Huron's charges against Trinity, deserves to be examined. It provides an important insight into the fact that, during these years of isolation, the denominational colleges in general and Trinity College in particular, were far from immune from the criticism of members of their own denomination. The University Question was not only a conflict between supporters of a consolidated University of Toronto and supporters of separate denominational institutions; it was also a struggle among members of the various Christian communities to define a philosophy of higher education for their own churches. There was division within all three communities under examination: Methodist, Roman Catholic, and Anglican.

Bishop Cronyn's serious concerns regarding the teaching carried on at Trinity were founded upon his examination of certain graduates of Trinity who had presented themselves to the Bishop for ordination in the diocese of Huron. He found their theology to be suspect, and upon investigation of the notes of these students, determined that both the method of teaching and the instruction given

---

73 On the evangelical movement within the Anglican Church in Canada, see above, note 15.

74 Colonial Church Chronicle, p.347.
at Trinity was dangerous in the extreme, setting forth views unsound and un-
protestant. In particular, it was the Provost, Reverend George Whitaker, who was
guilty of teaching this perilous doctrine through a catechism which he distributed
to all students of Divinity.\footnote{75}{"To the Clergy and Laity of the Diocese of Huron, from the Bishop of Huron," July 21, 1860, cited in \textit{Colonial Church Chronicle}, 1860, pp.349-353.}

What Cronyn objected to goes to the heart of the theological
differences between what is commonly known as the High Church element and
the Protestant element within Anglicanism. On one end of this spectrum of
differences were those Anglicans whose theology was primarily Roman Catholic,
and who saw the Anglican church as defined by its national identity. In other
words, the essential difference between the Anglican communion and the Roman
communion was that the British sovereign was the head of the Church of England
and Ireland, while the Pope was the head of the Church of Rome. On the other
end of this spectrum was the evangelical movement within the Anglican church,
whose theology was profoundly Protestant, and in many ways defined by its
renunciation of Roman theological doctrine. Cronyn accused Whitaker of
tractarianism: of espousing the doctrine and practice of the Oxford Movement.\footnote{76}{The Oxford Movement refers to the effort by Anglican clergymen at Oxford University to renew the Church of England by a revival of Catholic doctrine and practice. It can be said to have lasted from 1833 to 1845, roughly. Its greatest proponents included Newman, Keble, Froud and Pusey, who published tracts to espouse their Anglo Catholicism. Hence the name "tractarianism." The following can be regarded as pillars of tractarian theology: That the Church of England was weakened in some way by the Reformation; that the Blessed Virgin Mary played a part in the economy of salvation; that Christians could pray to, and could be prayed for, by the Communion of Saints, and that such prayers could be efficacious in achieving redemption; that there were five other sacraments other than the two necessary for salvation, viz., Baptism and Holy Eucharist; and, that the sixth chapter of John’s Gospel applied to the Holy Eucharist.}
He laid his charges in a number of lengthy letters that contain a great amount of theological detail, and which were published England by the Colonial Church Chronicle, and in Canada as a collection of letters and papers. Much of the material is an investigation of the supposed catechism that was said to be distributed at Trinity, with responses to the charges written by Strachan and Whitaker himself. Cronyn was sharply criticised for conducting his inquiry of Trinity in a seditious manner, for failing to approach the Provost with his charges before making a public accusation, and even for causing scandal among the faithful. The controversy erupted into tractarian warfare; the culture of Oxford was indeed being sown on Canadian soil, but not in the manner that Strachan had intended.

The matter continued to be discussed and debated for three years, until September of 1863. Rather than resolve any theological differences within the Anglican communion in Canada, the whole business only succeeded in further polarizing that community into those who sided with the Bishop of Huron, and those who supported the Bishop of Toronto and Trinity College. Nor did it do

---

77 For the latter publication, see Archives of Ontario, Letters and papers published in 1860 in reference to the Charges brought by the Lord Bishop of Huron against the theological teaching of Trinity College, Toronto. ([n.p.], 1862).

78 The following were among the tracts published by prominent participators in the debate: UTCA, Bishop of Huron's Objections to the Theological Teaching of Trinity College as now set forth in the letters of Provost Whitaker published with the authority of the Corporation of Trinity College to which is prefixed An Address by the Bishop of Huron containing a brief history of the controversy and replies to some of the statements publicly made on the subject. (Toronto: Thomas Evans, 1862); I. Helmuth, D.D., A Reply to a letter of the Rt. Rev. the Lord Bishop of Montreal, and Metropolitan of Canada addressed to the Bishops and Clergy of the United Church of England and Ireland in Canada. (Quebec: Middleton & Dawson, 1862); and Francis Fulford, D.D., A Letter to the Bishops and Clergy of the United Church of England and Ireland in Canada. (Montreal: John Lovell, 1862). Short titles were not the hallmark of nineteenth century Anglican tracts.
anything to contribute to the welfare of Trinity during this period of financial hardship; no doubt supporters of the "Godless" University of Toronto observed during this time that the consequences of attempting to unite religion and university education were less than uplifting. Eventually, the Corporation of Trinity recommended that all the papers in the case be submitted to the Metropolitan Bishop of Montreal and the other Canadian bishops for examination. The five bishops who examined the case upheld the Provost and the character of the teaching at Trinity without exception. It was then resolved "That the Corporation after fully considering the charges preferred by the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Huron and the opinion of the Canadian Bishops on those charges and the Provost's replies, is, of the opinion that that teaching is neither unsound, unscriptural, contrary to the doctrines of the Church of England, dangerous in its tendency, nor leading to the Church of Rome." The motion was not passed without opposition, but passed it was by a vote of thirteen to eight. Bishop Cronyn and his representatives then withdrew from the Corporation and ceased to have any connection with Trinity College. In the meantime Cronyn had taken steps to form a diocesan college of his own in London, Ontario, with the Reverend Issac Hellmuth as Principal. In September 1863 Huron College was opened and is now an affiliated college in the University

79 UTCA, Minute Book of Corporation, September 29, 1863.

80 The dissenting members of the Corporation then insisted on publishing The Protest of the Minority of the Corporation of Trinity College, against the resolution Approving the Theological Teaching of that Institution with an appendix containing the Opinions of the Five Canadian Bishops on the same subject, (London: Dawson & Bros., 1864).
of Western Ontario.\textsuperscript{41} And while it was not directly born out of the Cronyn affair, another denominational college, Wycliffe College, was eventually founded in 1878 as an Anglican college in the evangelical tradition.\textsuperscript{42}

The University Question, 1862-1868.

Trinity's pre-federation history can be brought to an end with a reference to an extraordinary set of documents published as early as 1862. Extraordinary, because at a time when Trinity was the most determined of the three colleges under examination to isolate itself from the influences of the University of Toronto, these documents give serious consideration to the College's affiliation to that same University. That such a plan was even considered at this early stage was the result more of misunderstanding than anything else. Sometime prior to the Anglican Synod of the Diocese of Toronto held in June, 1862, a committee had been struck to monitor legislation passed by the government concerning university education. That was the extent of their mandate: simply to report on legislation. Going far beyond that mandate, the committee obviously discussed the question of affiliation with the University of Toronto at great length and, quite remarkably, made a formal submission to Bishop Strachan which included the following recommendations:

\textsuperscript{41} For more on Huron College and the University of Western Ontario, see A. B. McKillop, Matters of Mind: The University in Ontario, 1791-1951. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994), pp.36-40.

\textsuperscript{42} See above, note 15.
1. That it is desirable that there should be one University for Upper Canada, which should embrace all the bodies in the Province possessing Academic Powers, and that all Graduates of these Bodies should be entitled to the same standing in the Provincial University. [And]

2. That the separate Colleges to be incorporated into the Provincial University should be required to abstain from the exercise of their right to confer Degrees, except Degrees in Divinity, so long as they remain in connection with the University.

The records indicate the names of only three members of this committee: a Reverend Mr. Dewar, the Honourable James Patton, and a Mr. S. B. Harman. Presumably, the former was an Anglican clergyman; surely he must have known that such a recommendation would enrage Bishop Strachan. But the Bishop was moderate in his response. He stated that it was his impression that the committee had as its purpose to simply "observe" legislation that was passed affecting university education, and, when useful, to "enquire into the workings of other [denominational] Collegiate institutions." But, he continued, "I never contemplated any changes in the fundamental principles of our Charter, nor do I believe that it requires any. What we really need is pecuniary assistance, and nothing more."

This vignette includes a glimpse of the fundamental issues that would eventually lead to the federation of Victoria, St. Michael's, and Trinity with the University of Toronto. In the documents that surround the submission of the committee's to Bishop Strachan, all of the following issues are discussed: Trinity was in a difficult financial situation; the prospect of having access to the

---


14 Ibid., p.162.
University of Toronto endowment was enticing; the requirement that affiliating colleges hold their degree granting powers in abeyance, save those to grant degrees in Divinity, was acknowledged; the University of London as a model for such an affiliation was recognized; and the matter of the independence of such institutions after affiliation was explored. But this was only 1862. The conditions were not yet right to force the Corporation of Trinity College into a scheme of affiliation. When the Synod learned of the Bishop's displeasure with the mere consideration of affiliation, the result was that the report was withdrawn, "and the various motions on the subject fell to the ground."  

This thesis uses the date 1868 as being the critical moment in the history that led to the federation of the denominational colleges with the University of Toronto, for it was in that year that all government grants to the denominational colleges were terminated, leading the colleges to face the bitter reality of their situation. For Trinity, however, another, slightly earlier date might be said to mark the watershed of its existence. On November 1, 1867, Bishop John Strachan died in Toronto. A number of incidents, unrelated to the present investigation, combined to make the final days of the Bishop a time of sorrow and loss. It is fair to suggest that, as long as the Bishop was alive, Trinity could not mature as an independent institution with a command of its own destiny. Until his death, it remained the child of a legendary, and jealous, father. Even after his death, this

---

46 Ibid., p.170.
independence would be a long time coming. Trinity would not federate until 1903, some fifteen years after Victoria. Perhaps it took this long before the Trinity Corporation could make decisions without hearing the voice of the Bishop echoing through the College halls.
CHAPTER SIX

FEDERATION AND FULLNESS: THE ACT OF 1887

At different points in the preceding pages, three separate developments have been identified as being influential in the movement towards university federation. Separately, these developments would have provided sufficient impetus to contribute greatly towards the federation of the denominational colleges; that they transpired at relatively the same time (during the 1860's) allowed them to combine to make federation all but inevitable.

The first development was the great modern movement of curriculum expansion that had already exercised a profound influence in Germany, Britain, and the United States. This movement, which showed itself first in the immense extension of the physical and biological sciences, affected and widened the spheres and methods of all other studies: history, literature, and even philosophy. In his convocation address at Victoria University in 1885, President Samuel Nelles—who had been appointed to the Victoria staff in 1850—recalled the state of the
I can remember when a Canadian university could venture to issue its Calendar with an announcement of a single professor for all the natural sciences, and with a laboratory something similar to an ordinary blacksmith shop, where the professor was his own assistant, and compelled to blow not only his own bellows, but his own trumpet as well.¹

And William J. Loudon, a student at the University of Toronto in 1860, wrote in his biography of Sir William Mulock that prior to 1876 (when a physics laboratory was established at the University of Toronto), "...the subjects of Natural History and Zoology were taught in a lecture room on a blackboard", while in the subject of Natural Philosophy (the modern physics), "...a few pieces of mechanical apparatus did duty for a laboratory."²

As long as science was to remain a subject about which a professor lectured, and as long as the primary purpose of the scientific teacher was to reconcile scientific theory with metaphysical or religious opinion, then there was little need for sophisticated laboratories or scientific equipment. But the publication of Charles Darwin's On the Origin of Species appeared in 1860, and there was ushered in a revolution in scientific thinking that was to break through the anti-speculative empiricism of the day. Theoretical research would henceforth be limited in its ability to address the great scientific questions of the day, and the need for practical research emerged as clearly as the need for highly expensive

¹ Victoria University Archives, Samuel S. Nelles, Address of President Nelles at Victoria University convocation, Cobourg, Wednesday, May 13th, 1885.

laboratories and equipment. But proper laboratories required a considerable expenditure of money, which could not be justified unless a reasonable number of students were available to use them. In 1878, laboratories were established at the University of Toronto in chemistry, geology and mineralogy, biology, and physics in order to provide for the students at the School of Practical Science, which the government had established in 1875, and for which it provided a building on the university campus in 1878. From this time on, laboratory work became an integral part of the science courses taught at the University of Toronto. Victoria College at Cobourg, as well as the other denominational colleges, would have to follow suit, for if they failed to gather support for scientific education they might find themselves eventually teaching only theological subjects, or at best offering a truncated program in the liberal arts. In either case the result would be the same: a significant decline in student enrollment at the denominational colleges; a significant increase at the University of Toronto.

The second development that so encouraged the movement towards university federation at Toronto was the passage of the British North America Act. When the Dominion formally came into being on July 1, 1867, the politicians and educators in Ontario—supporters of the University of Toronto and of the denominational colleges alike—had before them a modern political model for reconciling unity and plurality. The intention of those who framed the British

---

North America Act was to adapt the traditional British parliamentary system to the needs of the new North American nation. The most obvious and necessary modification arose from the fact that British North America's regional and cultural diversities made a unitary system of government impossible. Therefore, like the United States, the new country was given a federal constitution. At the same time, Canadian leaders were well acquainted with the American system of government and were determined to avoid the features of the American system which had led to the Civil War.

They believed that the main weakness of the American system lay in a division of powers between the states and the federal government which had left the states too strong. To guard against this weakness, the authors of the B.N.A. Act tried to establish a central government so powerful that it would be impossible for any provincial government to challenge its authority. They carefully divided authority between the federal and provincial governments, giving to the provincial authorities only specifically enumerated powers that were clearly local in their application. All powers and responsibilities not named as being exclusively provincial were presumed to be the prerogative of the federal government. The constitution was a particularly Canadian product of resourcefulness and compromise. It would have been all but impossible for those involved in the University Question to have not seen the parallels between the federal government and the University of Toronto, and between the provinces and the denominational college. The question was, could they produce a product of a
similar kind.

The third development was of course the termination of the legislative grants to the denominational colleges in February 1868. It seemed at first that this would lead to disastrous consequences for the financial welfare of the denominational colleges. As it happens, it did not, although no one could have known that at the time of the termination. Everything indicated at the time that it would have a lethal effect. As a future president of Victoria College was to observe: "It [the termination of the grants] proved to be the beginning of a vigorous and independent life, such as they had never known before. In a few years, their income from voluntary subscriptions was greater than had ever been received from the public treasury."

What the termination of the grants did do, though, was to return the University Question to the centre of the political arena and to provoke the leaders and supporters of the denominational colleges into a renewed discussion of the potential benefits of some sort of affiliation with the University of Toronto.

---

4 The amounts of the last grants to the three colleges under review are as follows: to Victoria College, 7,500 dollars; to St. Michael's College, 3,100 dollars; and to Trinity College, 6,000 dollars. "Educational Proceedings of the Legislature of Ontario," in D.H.E., Vol. XX, p.160.

5 In a monograph published in 1867, the Board of Trustees of Queen's College, Kingston, made clear that between 1845 and 1867, the College had received 76,500 dollars in legislative grants: fully one-third of their total income. No college could be expected to survive such a sudden reduction in income without serious consequences. See Board of Trustees of Queen's College, A Plea for Legislative Support to Denominational Colleges, (Kingston: [n.p.], p.3).

6 Nathanael Burwash, in The University of Toronto and its Colleges, 1827-1906, (Toronto: The Librarian of the University of Toronto, 1906), p.41.
Suddenly, with the prospect of financial ruin on the horizon early in 1868, the Hincks University Act of 1853—the provisions of which had been resolutely rejected by all the denominational colleges when it was passed—looked like a reasonable compromise.

The first indication that the end of the grants had spurred the denominational colleges into action came at a public meeting held in Kingston to devise and promote united action in response to John Sandfield Macdonald's provincial government. The meeting was attended by equal numbers of supporters of both Queen's and Victoria, as well a delegation of Catholics from Regiopolis College. A number of resolutions were passed at this meeting, the most important of which contained a proposal for the affiliation of the denominational colleges with the University of Toronto to establish the "...foundation of a Provincial University—the name of which might be the University of Ontario."7 The proposal contained the essential elements of what would eventually constitute the federation agreement: that affiliated colleges would hold in abeyance their powers to grant degrees in Arts, Medicine, and Law; that such colleges would continue to offer instruction and grant degrees in Divinity; that the heads of the affiliated colleges would enjoy membership on the University's Senate; and that the University Senate would have the responsibility of prescribing the curriculum of studies to be carried out at the colleges, to set the standards for matriculation

and graduation, and to conduct examinations. But underlying this proposal were two premises which supporters of the University of Toronto would never accept, and which the province's legislators would have difficulty suggesting: first, that it would be appropriate for the denominational colleges to retain their current locations outside of Toronto (this was the least controversial of the two premises); and second, that the provincial government would endow the denominational colleges either as distinct universities according to their present charters, or as affiliated colleges in one provincial university. This last provision was their due, thought the representatives of Queen's and Victoria, who at the Kingston meeting also passed a strongly worded resolution denouncing the maladministration of the Hincks Act of 1853, whereby "...a large portion of the income contemplated and provided by the said Act of 1853 [was] expended to the great wrong and injury of the several [denominational] colleges." Moreover, there was also passed a resolution which sought compensation for these wrongs from the Dominion government. This was wishful thinking at best; education was now under the control of the provinces and the federal government would hardly violate the B.N.A. Act less than a year after it was passed.

So while some of the general principles of federation had been announced

---

9 Ibid., pp.214-215.

9 That this latter premise was at the basis of the proposal is confirmed by the resolution passed at the Annual Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in June, 1868. See D.H.E., Vol. XX, p.176.

by the denominational colleges themselves, there was still a long way to go before an agreement could be negotiated.

Next to take up the debate was the Legislature itself. With the termination of the grants, the University Question had returned to assume a prominent position in public political discourse. When it became clear that the Government had no intention of even attempting to reconcile the interests of the protagonists in the University Question, a number of supporters of the outlying colleges forced a debate on the issue by introducing a resolution. It was moved by M. Clarke of Grenville and seconded by A. Fraser of Northumberland,

That in the opinion of this House, it is necessary and expedient, in the interest of Collegiate Education, that some comprehensive scheme should be devised, or adopted, for giving effect to the objects and for extending the operation of the University Act of 1853, 16th Victoria, Chapter 89, in the establishment of a Provincial University and the affiliation of Colleges to be supported in connection therewith.\[11\]

The five hour debate which followed saw participants approach the University Question from every possible angle, and yet no one was able to present a scheme that would address two apparently incompatible facts: that the denominational colleges would never affiliate unless there was a financial inducement; and that to extend financial aid from the public treasury to the denominational colleges was not only inappropriate, but contrary to the public trust that the Government was bound to respect.

In the midst of the debate, which at times was raucous, and included a

reference to "the lobbies...crammed with these white-chokered gentlemen" to
describe the presence of clerics, there was a submission made by the mover of the
resolution which strikes at the very heart of this thesis. It addressed the fact that
there were profound ideological, theological, and political differences between the
various Christian denominations in the province that operated colleges, but that
these differences could be overlooked in favour of an endeavour that united them
all. Here are the words of Mr. Clarke:

If you wished to draw them [the people of the different religious denominations]
nearer to each other, if you wished to soothe the asperities which arose from the
differences of religious belief, then give them one more object in common with what
they have now. Give them a common field of action in which those among them who
are interested in higher education might cooperate together and...in that field there
would be buried a large part if not the whole of any remaining ill-feeling between
religious sects in Ontario.\(^{12}\)

There is, no doubt, an element of political posturing contained in these remarks;
it is unlikely that the differences born out of the Reformation would be "buried"
by a plan of university affiliation. Nevertheless, the sentiment is an important
one: in the teaching of the Arts, Medicine, and Law, different Christian
denominations could collaborate at a level that did not provoke hostility. A
federation of denominations engaged in the work of higher education was a
possibility that could not be ignored.

At the conclusion of the debate, the House was left with the original
motion and two amendments. The first prohibited any denominational college
from benefitting from the public treasury; the second stated the willingness of the

House to consider any scheme which would contribute to a uniform and elevated standard of graduation. The original motion, and the two amendments, were carried. In essence, the debate accomplished nothing; it was not the responsibility of the House to devise such a scheme; their responsibility was merely to ensure that the colleges received no public funds.

What allowed members of the Legislature to acquit themselves so readily of dealing in a substantive way with the University Question? Certainly it is reasonable to suggest that there was among the politicians a strong faction of support for the University of Toronto and its teaching arm, University College. To these can be added members of the Free Presbyterian Church and the Congregationalists, whose students were sent to University College for Arts degrees. But this support for the University is only a partial answer. Much more influential was the fact that the elected members of the House were conscious of the significant bitterness that had been provoked in the minds and hearts of voters by the three most important religious leaders of the day: Dr. Ryerson, Bishop de Charbonnel, and Bishop Strachan. Each had, in his own way, aroused the passions of common citizens by what were considered a series of blatant plays for power. Bishop Strachan was, of course, renowned for his virulent attacks upon the "Godless" University, and his determination to assert his church's claim to establishment, and its consequent right to the provincial endowment for education. And Ryerson and de Charbonnel had provoked anger by waging a
very public war over the Separate Schools question. Insults and accusations were traded with abandon, and the electorate became weary with the news of clerics engaged in what seemed to be endless power struggles. As long as this attitude of frustration was held by voters, members of the Ontario Legislature would be loathe to assist any college that was considered to be a bastion of denominational influence. The result: the University Question would remain unsolved for another twenty years; a federation of denominational colleges, united around the University of Toronto and its University College, was but a dream to be contemplated by those with a wistful imagination. The evolution of this dream into a reality will be the subject of the remainder of this chapter.

Victoria University, 1873-1892.

On December 19, 1868 the Principal Snodgrass of Queen's College had written to President Nelles of Victoria to state that he did not see "any course upon which the Colleges can now unite, and must therefore proceed on future on the ground that it is the duty of each to set itself in order after its own fashion and with its best endeavours to fulfil its own mission." Nelles agreed, replying

---

13 For an excellent treatment of the Separate Schools question leading up to Confederation, see John Moir, “Religion and Elementary Education, 1852-1867: The War of Total Separation,” in Church and State in Canada West, pp.150-180. A minor example of the debate was Bishop de Charbonnel's Lenten message in 1856 which stated that Catholics who did not employ their franchise to further the cause of separate schools were guilty of mortal sin. While not unusual for the time, such manipulation was not received well by even Catholic voters.
that he "thought it useless to struggle any more—at least at present." In the years that followed, both institutions turned in upon themselves, with Victoria devoting its energies to increasing its endowment and encouraging enrolment. For the academic year 1868-69, only seven Victoria students became Bachelors of Arts, so there was a great deal of work to be done in the area of recruitment. In the fifteen years that followed the exchange of correspondence between Snodgrass and Nelles, little was done to perpetuate the notion of the affiliation or federation of denominational colleges with Toronto. But the idea was kept alive as a possibility by the Liberal government of Premier Oliver Mowat.

Sandfield Macdonald's Conservative government had seen no political benefit in addressing the University Question; if it had its members would have tended to show sympathy towards the cause of the denominational colleges. With the accession of the Liberal government on the other hand, the position of the University of Toronto was considerably strengthened, and at the colleges' expense. Mowat's predecessor as Liberal leader, Premier Edward Blake, was a

---

14 Cited in Sissons, A History of Victoria University, pp.136-137.

15 An account of the internal history of Victoria during these years, especially in regards to fund-raising and student recruitment, is to be found in Sissons, Victoria University, pp.132-157, in a chapter aptly named "Left Out to Die."

16 The election of 1871 had produced a very close result. Conservative Premier John Sandfield Macdonald remained in office, but within a matter of days his government was defeated on a vital bill and was replaced by Premier Edward Blake's Liberal government. Blake remained in office only a short while; upon the abolition of "dual representation" he chose to sit in the House of Commons rather than the provincial legislature. He was succeeded by Premier Oliver Mowat late in 1872. Mowat was to serve as Premier of Ontario and Leader of the Liberal Party of Ontario from 1872 until 1896.
distinguished graduate of the University of Toronto, and would serve as its Chancellor from 1876 to 1900. Mowat, though not a graduate, had been for several years a valuable member of the University's Senate. It was not surprising, therefore, when legislation was brought forward to remedy the defects of the University Act of 1853 which had given—at least as the Liberals saw it—an inordinate influence in the Senate to those ex officio members who represented rival, and sometimes hostile, denominational colleges. Adam Crooks, the Liberal Provincial Secretary and former University of Toronto Vice-Chancellor (U of T, Class of 1852) introduced an amendment to the 1853 Act which terminated ex officio representation of the heads of the denominational colleges on the University Senate until such time as they actually affiliated (the 1853 Act allowed them to sit on the Senate without affiliating; it was thought to be an enticement). Conservative Members of Provincial Parliament argued that the amendment would discourage the denominational colleges from seeking affiliation and therefore render even more unlikely the attainment of the much desired single degree-granting University for the Province. The Liberals countered that any request from the denominational colleges for affiliation with the University would always be welcome and, once granted, affiliated college heads could enjoy membership on the University Senate. The amendment to the 1853 Act was carried, and while affiliation was still an option, Queen's, Victoria, and Trinity

17 The entire debate on the amendment to the 1853 University Act is recorded in Ontario Newspaper Hansard, January 28, 1873.
must all felt that they were less welcome than ever before.\textsuperscript{18}

Events detailed below will reveal that it was in 1883 that the movement towards federation began in earnest; during that year those who were to be the protagonists in the movement forced the issue into the public forum in such a way that it could not be ignored. However, in the late seventies a series of events transpired—much more difficult to date with the same degree of certainty—that played a very strong supporting role in the drama that would lead to the Federation Act of 1887. In 1877, the University of Toronto revised the course of study for their Bachelor of Arts degree. A significant percentage of the course of study would be given over to the study of Science, and laboratory and practical work in Science was introduced. The following year, in 1878, Natural Philosophy Professor James Loudon (later President of the University) established in University College the first physical laboratory in Canada. Down the road in Cobourg, Victoria College was advertising in its catalogue that students would find "in the Scientific Course the most profitable preparatory discipline for the occupations of engineering, surveying, mining navigation, architecture, etc., occupations full of promise in our country's future," and announcing the opening of Faraday Hall where provision was made for laboratory work in Physics,

\textsuperscript{18} While the amendment to the 1853 Act was surely seen by Victoria, Queen's, and Trinity as a further confirmation that they were far from welcome to initiate affiliation negotiations, it was nevertheless this same Act and amendment which allowed St. Michael's College to affiliate with the University of Toronto in 1881 (some six years before the Federation Act of 1887); but more on that below.
Chemistry, Mineralogy, and Biology. While students were being recruited with promises of extensive laboratory study, behind the scenes it was becoming alarmingly obvious at both the University of Toronto and the outlying colleges that the existing resources in equipment and income were utterly inadequate to meet the needs of the country. The specialization of scientific work in the University and in the colleges by men who had been prepared for their special work in Europe or the United States strongly reinforced this inadequacy.

This change in the scope of the university curriculum throughout the province led quickly to the realization that new sources of income had to be sought. Enter upon the scene Mr. (later Sir) William Mulock, who was elected Vice-Chancellor of the University of Toronto in January of 1881, and whom many would later refer to as the Father of Federation. A year later, in response to the sudden expansion of the curriculum, especially in Science, Mulock was before the Senate suggesting that the University solicit from the provincial government a legislative grant to counter the increase in expenses. The cat was now among the pigeons. The denominational colleges could barely contain themselves at the thought of Toronto receiving further government aid while the historic claims of their colleges were ignored, especially when they estimated that they were doing one-half or more of the university work in the province. An

---

19 Victoria University Archives, Calendar for 1877-8. (Cobourg: [n.p.], 1877), p.22.

20 Mulock was born in Bond Head, Ontario in 1843. Educated at the University of Toronto, he entered the Dominion Parliament in 1882, and served as Postmaster-General. In 1905 he was appointed Chief-Justice of the High Court of Justice for the province of Ontario.
unholy controversy broke out over the question in the pages of the Mail and the Globe. In the November 23 edition of the Mail, for instance, there were no less than seven letters, three from the University side, three from that of the denominational colleges, and one giving a theoretical definition of a university over the mysterious pseudonym of "Interpres."21

Participants in this debate included the leaders of the colleges themselves: Provost C. W. E. Body of Trinity College, for instance, railed against those who thought the University's request for further aid was all but certain since the Government created and controlled the University, and the University was in need. "It is vain to contend," wrote Body, "that the additional endowment of the University by direct taxation is a foregone conclusion from past legislation. The proposal is an absolutely new one, and must be considered upon its own merits."22 And President Nelles of Victoria wrote that Victoria was above all "trying to prevent the enemy from getting further aid," while allowing for the possibility of negotiations: "...we should try to meet them half-way, for none of us will get any money without such agreement."23 And University College President Daniel Wilson recorded in his diary his fear that "the politicians would sell us to win the Methodist vote," and that "with the representatives of three influential rival

21 Mail, Nov. 23, 1883.

22 Mail, December 14, 1883.

23 United Church of Canada Archives, Nelles Papers, box 1 file 14, S.S. Nelles to J. G. Hodgins, January 9, 1884.
institutions, Episcopalian, Presbyterian, and Methodist, all inevitably marshalled in opposition," it would be unlikely that they would ever see any government money.24

As Daniel Wilson had foreseen, the University of Toronto did not obtain in 1883 additional aid from the Provincial legislature. The opposition of the denominational colleges insured that the legislature steered clear of what would certainly be a politically difficult issue.25 The opposition of the colleges, and the luke-warm attitude of the Legislature might have inclined lesser university vice-chancellors to forego any further discussion with the colleges on the future of higher education in Ontario. Not so with Vice-Chancellor Mullock. In fact, it was Mullock who was about to write the most extraordinary letter, one which perhaps more than any other was to contribute to the Federation Act of 1887.

Mullock wrote to his old friend Senator John Macdonald, a member of the Victoria College Board. Although the letter is not extant, Nathanael Burwash remembers the letter to have asked: "Is it impossible for this Province to secure a

24 University of Toronto Archives, Daniel Wilson, The Diary of Daniel Wilson, October 17, 1883.

25 So politically volatile was this issue that the Legislature only discussed the University Question once during the years 1879 and 1884; in February, 1881 a Queen's supporter in the House moved that a committee consider:

whether with a view to promoting higher education in the Province of Ontario, the colleges having the power to confer degrees can be affiliated with the University of Toronto on just and equitable terms to all these institutions so as to secure without interference with their respective autonomies one Provincial University for Ontario.

See Ontario Newspaper Hansard, February 9, 1881.
University worthy of its name? Is there no way that we can unite to this end?"26 It then proceeded to discuss the need for some action that would bring the colleges together. The idea was not new, of course.27 But that it was proposed by the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Toronto was most remarkable.28 Senator Macdonald passed Mulock's letter on to President Nelles, and he in turn thought the letter of sufficient merit to travel to Kingston to share its contents with Principal Grant of Queen's. This was the beginning of a series of unofficial conferences between the heads of Victoria, Trinity, St. Michael's, Queen's, University College, (and the other theological colleges) that led to federation. Nathanael Burwash, who was soon to succeed Nelles as President of Victoria, and who was involved in these meetings, was to recall later that these conferences were not "of the character of secret negotiations. They were open, frank, and


27 At least two very prominent members of Ontario's educational elite had publicly dealt at length with the possibility of some grand scheme of unity. In 1877, J. George Hodgins had written a lengthy pamphlet on university consolidation under the pseudonym "Canadensis." See Canadensis, University Consolidation: A Plea for Higher Education in Ontario, (Toronto: Hunter, Rose & Co., 1877). And Goldwyn Smith, Professor of Modern History at the University of Toronto and former Regius Professor at Oxford, had written at length to President Nelles at Victoria about the possibility of "the transfer of so much of the denominational institutions as is really of a University character to Toronto, where they might enjoy the full advantages of a great University..." See UCCA, Nelles Papers, Box 1 File 18, Smith to Nelles, June 23, 1873. He considered the same issue in an essay in the October, 1873 issue of Canadian Monthly.

28 While it must be seen as a monumental moment in the history of federation, Mulock's idea of working towards consolidation cannot have come as news to the Senate of the University of Toronto. They must have grudgingly approved its broad terms. In fact, years later Mulock would state that he had expressed his views on consolidation at the time of his election as Vice-Chancellor, and that he was "unwilling to accept the office...unless the Senate sympathized with those views." See UTA, "The University Act," (An Address at the annual banquet of the Ottawa Branch of the Alumni Association), March 21, 1924, p.8.
friendly consultations of all the parties upon whom rested the responsibility of university work." This was not Daniel Wilson's recollection, however. A few years later he would record in his diary that "The history of the confederation movement is curious to look back upon. It was marvellously like a conspiracy in the earlier stages. I was kept entirely in the dark."

Regardless of the impressions of these early meetings, there was enough interest in the prospect of consolidation for the college heads to communicate to the government that it was time for an official meeting. Duly informed, the Honourable George R. Ross, Minister of Education, issued on July 8, 1884 a circular convening such a conference. Ross was known to be in favour of consolidation, so there was no doubt as to the purpose of the conference, and in order to prepare for it the representatives of the denominational colleges met and appointed a committee to identify where consensus had been achieved and where work had yet to be done. The committee consisted of Boddy of Trinity, Burwash of Victoria, and Principle J. H. Castle of McMaster Hall.

---

29 Burwash, "A Review of the Founding and Development of the University of Toronto," p.77.

30 UTA, Diary of Daniel Wilson, Entry of April 16, 1887.

31 The following were invited to the conference: the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Toronto, the President of University College, the Chancellor and President of Victoria, the Chancellor and Principal of Queen's, the Chancellor and Provost of Trinity, and the Principals of St. Michael's, McMaster Hall, Wycliffe, Knox, Woodstock, and Congregational Colleges.

32 In a convocation address at Victoria Ross had declared that if he "should prove a humble instrument in accomplishing the great task of the unification of our university system [he] would consider that a work had been done to which any true patriot might willingly devote his life." Acta Victoriana, May, 1884, p.11.
Their report contained eight principles: First, that any plan for confederation have as its basis the continuance of the denominational colleges for Arts purposes, as colleges equipped to teach in the ordinary branches of a collegiate course. Second, that all persons graduating from the new university would be bona fide members of one of the confederating colleges. Third, that the new university maintain its own university professoriate distinct from the participating colleges, and that there be a division of work between the university and college professoriates. Fourth, that the government shall compensate the colleges for their removal to Toronto. Fifth, that the confederating colleges hold in abeyance their powers to confer degrees in the Arts and Sciences. Sixth, that in the constitution of the University's Senate there be a fair proportionate representation of each of the federating colleges. Seventh, that in matters relating to discipline and all other internal regulations, each confederating college maintain absolute independence. And eighth, that the colleges entering confederation be maintained by their own resources. These were the principles upon which there was agreement. The report also identified issues where consensus was yet to be achieved: the role of University College in the new University; the precise functions of the university and college professoriates; and the relation of theological schools to the University, the manner in which to confer degrees in medicine, Law, and Music.33

33 The report of the committee is transcribed in The University of Toronto and its Colleges, 1827-1906, (Toronto: The Librarian of the University of Toronto, 1906), pp.45-46.
It must be remembered that this was the report of a committee representing only the denominational colleges. It contained what the colleges thought was necessary for the success of any scheme of confederation. The report was not submitted to President Daniel Wilson of University College, and when he did see it some four months later it was only by accident. The heads of the denominational colleges were wise to keep the content of their confederation discussions from Wilson, as is evident from the following entries into Wilson's diaries. They summarized wonderfully Wilson's attitude to the denominational colleges' efforts to work towards federation:

Dec. 5. More and more convinced that the scheme is neither more nor less than a revival of the old attempt of the Methodists to lay their hands on the University endowment. There are other Jesuits besides those of Rome.

Dec. 12. Day of weary college affiliation conference...Dined at the Club by invitation of the V.C. with the same gentry; and clipping, shearing, paring once more; got home to bed before one a.m. I wish it were possible to get a decent retiring allowance and be rid of political and clerical tricksters alike. But I must hold on, and hold them off. I did it before; why not now?

Dec. 20. Today an interview with the enemy, from 10 to 1;...an endless amount of talk and Jesuitical trickery.35

Although Wilson does not go into the details of the University of Toronto's position in his diaries, it is possible to outline the University's objections to the proposal of the denominational colleges based on an address he was to deliver to the Convocation of the University of Toronto in 1890.36 First, the University

34 Wilson recorded in his diary his accidental sighting of the report three years later: "I obtained sight of the 'strictly confidential' Report from Dr. Sheraton, Principal of Wycliffe College, who...took it for granted that, as it was then in print, I must be familiar with it. I saw it for the first time on the 4th of November." UTA, Diary of Daniel Wilson, entry of April 16, 1887.

35 Wilson, Diaries, Dec. 5, 12, & 20.
would have been determined that University College enjoy perfect equality with the other colleges, that it would enjoy with the University joint possession of the endowment and buildings, and that it [University College] would not be considered as one of the federating colleges. Second, the University would have also opposed any compensation for such colleges that agreed to remove to Toronto. And third, it would have argued for the strengthening of the faculty of University College. The denominational colleges would have objected to these principles, insisting that they violated the fundamental principle of federation: the unity and equality of a number of Arts colleges in a common university.

Minutes of the various conferences held between July, 1884 and January, 1885 were not kept, but various records including private correspondence and reports to the boards of the various colleges involved in the negotiations reveal the substance of the discussions. In a private letter to Minister of Education George Ross, President Nelles of Victoria outlines in a relatively (and uncharacteristically) brief statement, the benefits that would accrue from consolidation. Excerpts below identify the essential elements of the federated system which continues to this day.

1. It would create a truly national University in which the secular and the religious elements would find harmonious and effective adjustment, and by virtue of which the people of Ontario would be drawn into full sympathy with the University, and not largely alienated from it is is now the case.
2. By combining the present endowment of the Toronto University with those of the denominational colleges, it would virtually redouble the resources of higher education...
3. It would satisfy the convictions of those who desire a common standard for

---

\(^{36}\) UTA, Daniel Wilson, *Address at the Convocation of the University of Toronto*, October 1, 1890, esp. pp.10-17.
academic degrees...
4. It would bring into more intimate and friendly relations the educated youth of the different religious bodies, and be favourable to interchange of ideas and catholicity of sentiment.
5. It has in it both on the university and on the collegiate side the elements of stability and growth...
6. It would open to all the youth of the land the common advantages, not only of the University lectures, but also of the library, apparatus, and various collections belonging to the Departments of Natural Science.  

These features described by Nelles capture the fullness of federation. What is most remarkable is the concept of a "harmonious and effective adjustment."

Remarkable because of the conflict that has been recorded in these pages between the supporters of the University of Toronto and the supporters of the denominational colleges; remarkable because of the differing traditions and educational philosophies held by the three denominations under review, also recorded in these pages. That harmony could be born out of such conflict, and out of such differences, is extraordinary.

Returning to the negotiations that led to federation, it can be presumed from Wilson's diary that the meeting of December 12, 1884 was probably the critical moment when the final formula for federation was worked out. There are no meetings recorded between this date and January 9, 1885 when the heads of the denominational colleges were authorised by George Ross to submit the scheme agreed upon to their various constituencies. The plan that the college heads brought back to their colleges contained twenty-two sections, and began:

It is proposed to form a confederation of colleges, carrying on, in Toronto, work embraced in the Arts curriculum of the provincial university, and in connection

---

37 VUA, Nelles Papers, Box 1 file 15, Nelles to George Ross, July 24, 1884.
Central to the scheme that was proposed in the final plan was the issue of curriculum: how would the University and the colleges divide the teaching of different disciplines. Just as the B.N.A. Act of 1867 had divided between the Dominion of Canada and its constituent provinces the subjects of legislation, so would university federation assign some subjects to the University of Toronto, and others to the colleges, including University College. An earlier idea had the University teaching all the honours courses and the colleges the pass courses.  

This would have been wholly unsatisfactory to Daniel Wilson, president of University College; it would have given University College an inferior status. Nor would Nelles or his colleague Burwash have been pleased with such a distinction for the colleges. The principle that was finally agreed upon reflected one of the primary causes of the federation movement identified above: the proliferation and expense of the Sciences. Hence, the University of Toronto, with its publicly funded endowment, would teach the Sciences which involved the expense of laboratories and museums; the denominational colleges, with their limited financial resources,  

---

38 The entire plan is transcribed in The University of Toronto and its Colleges, pp.48-51.

39 In 1877, the University of Toronto had introduced the "honours" course; students not enrolled in the honours course of studies followed the "pass" course. The special features of the honours course was not so much the emphasis on special subjects, but rather the honours standing that had to be maintained by students throughout their four year course of studies.
would teach the less costly humanities. At least that was the theory. The actual division reflected this principle in general, but there were exceptions for practical purposes. Though English, French, German, Semitics, Latin, and Greek became college subjects, Italian and Spanish were delegated to the University, chiefly because Victoria had no desire to teach subjects which attracted so few students. Ancient History remained a college subject, but Modern History was assigned to the University. A Professor of Ancient History, Daniel Wilson presumably thought the subject of Modern History to be somewhat too sensational to be taught at University College. And while Ethics was made a college subject, Metaphysics was assigned to the University because of the prominence of Professor George Paxton Young at the University. And theology, of course, would be taught by the colleges alone.

With the twenty-two section federation proposal, The University of Toronto would now become both a teaching body (a role it had lost under the 1853 University Act) as well as an examining authority, and it would award all degrees except those in Divinity; that would be the exclusive province of the federating denominational colleges. Students at the federating denominational colleges would be allowed to take courses not available at their host institutions free of charge. In return for this gracious allowance, the provincial endowment would be applied solely and unambiguously to the maintenance of the University of Toronto, its faculty, and University College. For the University of Toronto, the stipulation that the endowment be maintained as its birthright was critical; for
the colleges, the key was the advantage and prestige of being a part of a common provincial university. For both the University and the colleges, the dream that would be realized by federation was that of a truly national university which, in extent, equipment, and resources, might be worthy of the Province; and all of this for students of every creed who could combine the full vigour of their religious life with the advantages of a broad and superior higher education.

The decisions of the governing boards of the various institutions were awaited with eager interest. The Senate of the University of Toronto expressed their general concurrence with the scheme along with their willingness to cooperate; they saw no reason why necessary legislation should not be formulated to give it effect. University College offered no separate opinion.

Queen's, while acknowledging the high aim of the proposal, pleaded her inability to meet the expense and her obligation to Kingston and Eastern Ontario. They had recently erected buildings at a cost of over 70,000 dollars; removal to Toronto made little sense. And if expense was not a sufficient reason, then an even stronger excuse would have been the exceedingly independent character of Principle Grant, whom Alexander described as "a man of outstanding ability, and one of the greatest university administrators Canada has produced." It was most unlikely that Grant would be willing to play second fiddle to anyone in Toronto. Nor did he really have to; Queen's was ideally located half-way between Toronto

---

40 For more on Grant, see W. L. Grant and F. Hamilton, Principal Grant, (Toronto: Russell & Co., 1904).
and Montreal. The prospect for sustained growth was too great to be thrown away with a move to Toronto for what appeared to be short-term gain. Toronto Baptist College expressed cordial approval of the plan as a whole, but requested that each college might decide to teach whatever it would prefer. They would eventually opt out of federation.

Knox College, which had enjoyed good relations with the University of Toronto since 1853 when it assumed an active role of the University Senate by virtue of the Hincks Act, decided under the provisions of that Act to affiliate with the University in 1885, with a view towards federating as soon as legislation was passed. And so it did when the Federation Act was proclaimed in 1890. It was then, and continues today, a purely theological college of the Presbyterian Church of Canada. It never offered a program leading to an Arts degree. Similarly, Wycliffe College affiliated in 1885, and federated in 1890, and continues today as the theological college of the Evangelical Anglican Church.

St. Michael's College, as will be seen below, had affiliated in 1881 under a unique arrangement. The governing body of Trinity at first endorsed the principle of federation but, as will also be examined below, not without conditions that would cause a long delay in their entry into federation. That leaves Victoria. How would its Board of Regents respond to the proposal that Nelles and Burwash had worked so hard to negotiate, and which they proudly brought back to Cobourg?

In the most general sense, the Victoria Board was disposed towards the
notion of federation, but there were concerns, and the Board was aware of a
significant body of opposition that was growing and that would have to be
answered. The Board expressed its willingness "on educational and patriotic
grounds to join in such a federation, and to move the proper authorities of our
Church thereto, as they may determine, provided the following conditions are
fulfilled:"

1. Equitable compensation to all colleges united in the federation for the losses
incident to their entering the federation.
2. The perfect equality of all colleges, University College included, in their relations to
and rights in the provincial university.
3. Such an arrangement as shall secure to the alumni of all the colleges an equitable
representation in perpetuity.
4. That the chairman of the university professoriate be appointed by the Government.
5. That the transfer of subjects from the University College course to the course
under the university professoriate, or vice versa, shall be made only by a three-
fourths majority of the Senate.41

These were not conditions that were unreasonable, nor were they stipulated in
order to scuttle the plan of federation. The Victoria Board truly wanted to amend
the defects of the plan so as to make it as attractive as possible to the Methodist
community. But the matter was not entirely for the Board to decide. They were
required by their charter to report to the General Conference of their Church,
where the question would be finally determined. The General Conference did not
meet until September, 1886. The Board had had the federation proposal before
them since January, 1885. Between those two dates there was a great deal of time
for forces opposed to federation to organize and strengthen their cause; but an
equal amount of time for those who favoured federation to gain new converts,

41 Cited in The University of Toronto and its Colleges, pp.52-53.
and to refine the plan for a smoother passage through the provincial legislature. Friends and foes alike began their work with haste.

In the centre of the arena of those who opposed federation was the Reverend Alexander Sutherland. Taking up the arms of pamphlet warfare—long the weapon of choice in battles fought over the University Question—Sutherland published two scathing attacks on the proposed scheme. The arguments offered by Sutherland are, in the end, characteristic of an economic perspective; nevertheless, he did speak for a large constituency of "old-time" Methodists who had legitimate fears about federation. References to the privileged status of University College under the proposed scheme reveal a bitterness caused, perhaps justifiably, by that College's claim upon the provincial endowment. A sampling of the questions posed by Sutherland:

Are you willing to furnish as much money to support a feeble college in Toronto—a sort of poor relation of the State University—as would suppose a vigorous University of your own in Cobourg, or some other country town?...
Are you willing to run the risk of transferring the loyalty of your sons from the Methodist Church, and to place them, at the most critical period of their life, in the midst of associations unfriendly, if not positively hostile, to Methodism and its teachings?  

Other tracts were distributed, but none of them came close in eloquence or sophistication to the Convocation address of President Nelies before his alma

---

42 Rev. A. Sutherland, The Proposed Plan of College Confederation, (Toronto: [n.p.], 1885), p.23. Sutherland's other pamphlet against federation was entitled Shall our higher education be Christian or infidel? (Toronto: [n.p.], 1885).

43 The following are the best examples of tracts distributed against federation: VUA, Should Victoria University join the proposed federation of colleges? (Cobourg: [n.p.], [n.d]); and H. Hough, Victoria under federation, (Cobourg: [n.p.], 1887).
mater in Cobourg on May 13, 1885. It was, more than anything else, a profound exploration of the place of the denominational college in the dawning of the age of the secular university. The following is but a small example of what might be the most important public statement of Nelles' career:

"At the revival of learning," as some one has said, "Greece arose from the grave with the New Testament in her hands,...It is one of the glories of Christianity that it can stand unabashed and unshaken in the presence of all forms of scholarly research, and make them tributary to its progress...Every sect cannot have a genuine university, and the Legislature cannot recognize the claims of one sect over another...We may, therefore, well begin to inquire, and the growing spirit of Christian union enables us to inquire with hopefulness, whether all the Churches of Ontario cannot combine in one national University, and with advantage to the common interests of science and religion. Those who distrust or oppose such a measure seem to me to raise imaginary obstacles, and also to fail in estimating the increasing extent of University work, and the consequent necessity of large endowments, such endowments as we can only secure in the Province by concentrating all our available resources. Such persons seem to forget that, if we keep our Universities poor, we shall have poor Universities in more senses than one. They also forget that in so far as any religious body stands aloof from the national system of education it not only deprives itself of advantages to which it is fairly entitled, but does what it can both to weaken and unchristianize that system."Let us beware," says Mr. Gladstone, "of a Christianity of isolation."

Contained in his speech are references to all the great themes of federation; through it Nelles weaves a wonderful tapestry of political and economic theory, educational and curriculum policy, philosophy, and theology. That is not to say that it ranks with the contributions of Newman or Arnold; rather, it provides a distinctly Canadian vision of higher education: bringing together the best of different religious and cultural traditions in a mosaic that is greater than the sum of its parts.

" At this Convocation, Victoria granted one hundred and four degrees: twenty B.A.'s; nine M.A.'s; four B.D.'s; three L.L.B.'s; sixty-three M.D.'s and C.M.'s; four D.D.'s; and one LL.D. Sissions, A History of Victoria University, p.168.

' S. S. Nelles, Address of President Nelles at Victoria University Convocation, Cobourg, Wednesday, May 13th, 1885, (Cobourg: [n.p.], 1885), p.5.
During the winter of 1885-86, it seemed that Neiles began to have second thoughts in face of the strong tide of opposition that was being led by Sutherland. The possibility that Victoria would be the only college to enter federation was becoming a real one, and any indication that removal to Toronto would dampen enthusiasm among Victoria's benefactors had to be seriously considered, thought Neiles. On January 27, 1886, Neiles wrote to a member of the Victoria Board of Regents, Dr. Albert Carmen:

> The fact is, Dr. Carmen, that I see hope now of a comprehensive scheme of Federation... Now although the absence of Queen's and Trinity would not hurt but perhaps help Victoria, say in regard to attendance, etc., yet their absence from the Senate would work greatly to preponderance of the State College in all Senate action. Then again in the division among ourselves, you prefer independence, Dr. S. [Sutherland] & other strong men more than prefer, they will have nothing else. This want of harmony will be very detrimental in any great effort for endowment, buildings, etc., etc., and without a great effort no plan will set Victoria where she ought to be.\(^6\)

Even though this letter reveals a significant degree of hesitancy in Neiles' thinking, there was no reason for him to think that there were not still powerful forces at work to see the federation plan through to legislation. The Premier himself wrote to Neiles on March 20, 1886; it was a most encouraging letter. Victoria should not be concerned if it alone entered the federation; if that was the case the Government would "not be deterred from taking steps necessary to bring the scheme into practical operation." In regards to Victoria's concern that they would suffer severe financial loss through removal, the Premier states his hope that "on the whole, there will be no loss, but great gain." And what about other

\(^6\) Neiles Papers, Neiles to Carman, January 27, 1886.
concerns that Victoria might have about the fundamentals of federation? Mowat's reply: "With regard to changes in the basis we should be glad to accede to any approved alteration which would make the scheme more acceptable to Victoria and to the other parties concerned." Nelles could hardly expect to receive a more encouraging letter, and from the Premier himself. And this was more than empty encouragement. While Mowat was offering his encouragement to Nelles, his ministers were engaged in difficult negotiations with University College's Daniel Wilson in favour of federation, as is clear from the following entry in Wilson's diary:

Invited to the Ed office to meet the Atty. Gen and Min. of Ed. My concurrence wanted in a proposal to concede everything demanded on behalf of Victoria College. Especially to allow of the separation of a dwarfed abortion, with a ridiculously inadequate staff, under the name of Univ. Coll., from the larger and more important chairs:—the latter to be called the University Professoriate...This is in absolute contravention of the agreement on the terms of Confederation as finally adopted by Victoria, Queen's, Trinity, etc...Also they distinctly aim at taking the building from Univ. College.47

On May 21, 1886, the Board of Regents of Victoria met with a view to make a final recommendation to the approaching General Conference of the Methodist Church. The Board was fully aware of the arguments both for and against federation, they were fully aware of what was at stake, and they were also

47 Mowat to Nelles, March 20, 1886. Cited in The University of Toronto and its Colleges, p.54.

48 The Diary of Daniel Wilson, April 2, 1886. This last claim, that it was the intention of the government to hand over the building of University College to Victoria reveals a certain paranoia on Wilson's part. As Wallace carefully details, there was never any suggestion of this, and Wilson probably developed this silly notion after Nelles had made a jocular remark when on a visit to University College. In the same way today might the President of Victoria University, in jest, say to the President of the University of Toronto while strolling past the Robarts Library: "I wouldn't mind having that building as our college library." See Wallace, A History of the University of Toronto, p.127.
aware that the whole issue was beginning to take its toll on a community that had been united in its mission for some many years.49 But there was enough consensus for the Board to adopt the following "Resolution on University Education":

Therefore it is the judgement of this Board that it would be neither wise nor patriotic in us as a Board to reject the scheme because it is not in every particular all that we might desire. We therefore recommend the entrance of Victoria into the proposed Federation to the favourable consideration of our General Conference, provided that full security be given us of the two points as to the permanence of the University professoriate and the certainty of a satisfactory sight in the [Queen's] Park, leaving the final determination of the matter with that body, whose decision this Board will be prepared to accept and carry out.50

The General Conference would have the recommendation of the Victoria Board, they would be made aware of the support of the Government towards the scheme, and, as for their future hosts in Toronto, they would also know of the remarks of Chancellor Edward Blake at the University of Toronto's Convocation on June 9, 1886: "I shall heartily rejoice," said Blake of the prospect of the Methodist college coming to Toronto, "if by the ultimate success of this plan, we may create a formal and a substantial relation between the Provincial University and that great denomination, and thus add to the cause of higher education."51

For the General Conference, there were three fundamental issues: the first

49 It was well known that despite his trepidation, President Nelles had devoted the final years of his academic life and much of his waning energy to federation. It came as a great shock, therefore, when in August, 1886, Nelles' former student and future successor declared in the pages of the Globe that the cause of religion and education would be best served by maintaining an independent position, at least for the present. See Globe, August 31, 1886. This must have been hurtful for Nelles; and is an example of the toll that the federation debate was exacting on the Victoria community.


51 Blake's convocation address was reprinted in the Christian Guardian, June 16, 1886.
physical and financial; the second educational; the third having to do with social justice. Regarding the former, the question was whether Victoria should abandon her home of thirty-five years on the basis of a promise of site of land somewhere in Queen's Park in Toronto, and the prospect of free instruction for her students in slightly more than half the subjects of the curriculum, together with free access to laboratories, museums, and superior libraries. Concerning the educational issue, the question was equally as difficult. The Board had to choose between a restricted course of studies in Cobourg, albeit conducted in an intimate collegiate environment that was informed exclusively by the ethos of the Methodist Church; and the advantages that might accrue from wider facilities in new fields of investigation, strengthened as they were by the resources of the provincial government. And finally, as regards social justice, the Conference had to determine whether it was fair to ask a loyal and efficient staff to leave their homes in Cobourg in favour of a yet to be determined physical arrangement in Toronto, which would definitely be in the neighbourhood of a state college whose head was less than cordial to the union, and without being able to offer any promise of security to those members of the faculty then teaching in Cobourg subjects that would, under federation, be taught by the University. Hardly an attractive proposition!

A tremendous debate ensued at the September meeting of the Conference—as was expected. The importance of the debate was shown by the distinguished visitors who attended one or more sessions: the Prime Minister, the Premier, the
Minister of Education, the Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor of the University of Toronto; all of these were in attendance at some point in the proceedings. Most of the debate was recorded—largely verbatim—in the Guardian. On the basis of these accounts, it is possible to summarize the important arguments advanced both for and against federation. Since the Conference heard first from those who opposed the plan, these arguments can be listed first. 52

1. That the conditions insisted upon by Victoria's Board of Regents in January, 1885 for final approval of the plan had not yet been agreed to by either the Government or the other colleges. The first such condition was complete financial compensation for their removal to Toronto. The Government had promised compensation, but not specific amount. The second condition had been perpetuity of graduate representation on the University Senate. The third was that there be a Head of the University who was distinct from the Head of University College (there was no way that Victoria would have accepted Daniel Wilson as President of the University). The fourth condition was that the college subjects be determined definitively, with no additions or subtractions allowed in the future. None of these four conditions had been agreed to.

2. That the withdrawal of Queen's, Trinity, and McMaster from the scheme of federation made it impossible for Victoria to accomplish an equal federation; they would always be subservient to University College with its state support.

52 The following arguments, both against and for federation, have been summarized from the transcripts of the debates carried in the Guardian from September 7 to September 11, 1886.
3. That federation would lead to the College's financial ruin.

4. That to adopt the plan of federation would be to abandon the traditional policy of the Methodist Church in its educational work. This argument held considerable weight since sixty-six members of the Conference had graduated from Victoria, and presumably held nostalgic memories of their Cobourg years.

6. That despite all claims to the contrary, federation would imperil the moral and religious element in education.

7. That to move the College to Toronto would be to abandon the people of Cobourg, who had for some many years extended hospitable assistance to Victoria, whose sons and daughters had staffed the College, and whose town council had given a gift of land to Victoria in 1855.

8. That entrance into federation involved a reasonable possibility, on the basis of the defects of the scheme, that Victoria would cease to exist as an Arts college, and would become a mere theological college clinging to the shirttails of a wealthy university. Such a possibility would inflict the gravest wrong upon the graduates of Victoria who had accepted their Arts degrees in good faith as being issued from a permanent institution.

And the arguments put before the Conference in favour of federation can be summarized as follows:

1. That federation offered a final solution to the University Question; a question that had agitated the country for over fifty years. It was an issue that placed the Church and State in apparent conflict over educational policy; it had even caused
discord and hostility between Christian churches. Federation was an opportunity to end this conflict and discord, and to unite in a common purpose that would heal old wounds and restore old alliances.

2. That the federation plan secured the principle which had for so long been at the centre of Methodism: the centrality of the religious element in education. Religious subjects were to be part of the Arts curriculum under federation, with Victoria providing such courses to her own students. Religious education would be forced upon no one, but would be available to everyone. Moreover, the internal life of each college that entered federation would remain entirely independent. The supervision of students and discipline, except in matters relating to their attendance at University courses, was to be left wholly in the hands of the College. There was no regulation consequent upon federation that would prevent the highest religious and moral standards from being maintained by Victoria's Board of Regents. And finally, that this religious element would be brought to bear upon the "Godless" University of Toronto was an opportunity too great to ignore.

3. That in conjunction with these strong religious influences, federation would make available to the youth of the Methodist Church an extensive and broad curriculum of studies that could not possibly be provided as long as Victoria remained isolated in Cobourg.

4. That Victoria's graduates would enjoy a prominence by virtue of their association with a great and strengthened provincial university, and as a
consequence of their connection with accomplished students from other denominations.

5. That in view of the expansion of scientific knowledge, no one institution could meet the needs of students; only a federation of institutions could sustain the facilities that would be needed in the future. For Victoria to remain aloof would mean that the province would be that much further from having as its own national university.

6. That the University that would be created by federation would and could be instrumental in conserving culture and moral influence in such a way that would be impossible at a small, denominational college.

7. That even if federation involved large sacrifices and costly effort on the part of Victoria and the Methodist people, these would be made worthwhile by participation in a great institution, while rejection would only lead to the claim that the Methodist Church had stood in the way of advancement in higher education in Ontario.

9. That the lesson of the Canadian federation of provinces was evidence that distinct entities can unite in a common cause, and that there was no greater cause than the union of Christians in a common educational endeavour; as Canada would provide the very best and noblest for her children, so would the University of Toronto.

10. That the competition of several colleges in the common life of the University was in itself a positive influence in promoting a higher standard of work and
preventing stagnation.

11. That the superior education that would inevitably be provided by the federation would be an important contribution to the preparation of ministers, allowing them to rise beyond sectarian narrowness and encouraging the unity of the Christian spirit.

Such were the arguments for and against federation. Finally, the Conference was ready for a vote on the following resolution:

Resolved, therefore, that this Conference hereby expresses its approval of Victoria University uniting with our Provincial University, on the line indicated in the plan of Federation prepared by the representatives of the different colleges; and further that this conference authorizes and instructs the Board of Regents to complete, on behalf of Victoria, any necessary details of the Basis of Union, and to take proper steps to give effect to such Federation at as early a period as due regard to existing interests, and to the necessary financial and other arrangements, shall render it practicable.53

The resolution was passed by a vote of 138 to 113. Premier Mowat's government immediately began to prepare a bill for the next session of parliament. It passed the Legislature without incident and the Federation Act of 1887 was assented to on April 23, 1887. It was provided that the Act could be brought into force at any time by Order-in-Council. Practically, all that would be needed for such an Order was an indication from Victoria that they were prepared to bring the Act into effect by entering into federation. But it was three years before that happened, and Victoria would not begin its work in Toronto until two years after that, in 1892. Perhaps, with hindsight, such a delay was predictable. There was, of course, the question of compensation, along with the matter of actually choosing a site at

Queen's Park. A site was chosen at the northeast angle of the Park (where Victoria continues to reside today), although Vice-Chancellor Mulock originally suggested a more central location (where Trinity resides today). The Government purchased Victoria's land in Cobourg, and imposed a rent of one dollar a year on the new Toronto property. But it would take three years before the necessary funds were raised for the move: some 450,000 dollars. Nelies' death also contributed to the delay; on October 17, 1887 he died at the age of sixty-four and was succeeded as President by Nathanael Burwash. It was October, 1888, before a joint meeting of the Board of Regents and the advisory committee appointed by the General Conference decided that it was advisable to implement the 1887 legislation and authorized the Board to proceed with building in Toronto. Work continued in Cobourg while preparations were being made for the move, and on October 16, 1890, the Board of Regents sent a statutory notice to the Provincial Secretary. On November 12, 1890, the Act of 1887 federating Victoria University with the University of Toronto was proclaimed. By October, 1892, the main building of Victoria University was ready; it had cost 230,000 dollars. Classes began there shortly after.

As the Federation Act of 1887 forms the basis of the new University constitution, it will be wise to briefly examine its provisions as it pertains to the relationship between the University and the colleges. The Act established a

---

54 The following summary of the 1887 Federation Act is based on a copy of the Act in the University of Toronto Archives contained in a collection of original documents collected by J. G. Hodgins, and labelled Toronto University Question: College Federation.
teaching faculty in the University of Toronto in Mathematics, Physics, Astronomy, Geology, Chemistry, Zoology, Botany, Physiology, Modern History, Ethnology, Comparative Philology, and certain other subjects, and made lectures in such subjects free to students of the federated colleges and universities. It required the curriculum of Arts of the University to include the subjects of Biblical Greek, Biblical Literature, Christian Ethics, Apologetics, the Evidences of Natural and Revealed Religion, and Church History, but declared that "any provision for examination and instruction in the same shall be left to the voluntary action of the federating universities and colleges, and provision shall be made by a system of options to prevent such subjects being made compulsory upon any candidate for a degree."

It also declared that there should be taught in University College, Greek, Latin, French, German and English, Oriental Languages. Moral Philosophy, and Ancient History, and permits the teaching also of such other subjects (other than those taught at the University) as might be approved by the Government. The Act permits any federated college other than University College to teach whatever subjects it may desire.

It also re-enacted the following provision which had already formed part of the University Constitution:

No religious test shall be required of any professor, lecturer, teacher, student, officer or servant of the said College or University, nor shall religious observances, according to the forms of any particular religious denomination, be imposed on them or any of them. But the University Council and the Council of University College may respectively make such regulations as they think expedient touching the moral conduct of the students and their attendance on public worship, and respecting their religious instruction by their respective ministers, according to their respective forms
of religious faith, and every facility shall be afforded for such purposes; provided always, that attendance on such form of religious observance be not compulsory on any student attending the University of University College.55

The Act also contained provisions entitling the federal institutions to representation upon the Senate of the University of Toronto, giving graduates and undergraduates in the federated universities and colleges a corresponding status in the University of Toronto. In summary, there are four pillars to the Act: First, that there be free instruction to students of the federated Arts colleges in the subjects taught by the University; second, that there be included in the curriculum the possibility of optional subjects; third, that the non-denominational character of the University of Toronto and University College always be maintained; and fourth, that there be the unrestricted right of a federated college, other than University College, to teach whatever subjects it desires.

As stated above, Victoria began its work as a federated university of the University of Toronto in October of 1892. Its relationship to the University, and that of Trinity College after it became federated in 1903, was governed primarily by the 1887 Federation Act.56 A most significant development would take place in 1905 when Premier Ross's Liberal Government was defeated by the Conservative opposition of leader James Whitney. When Whitney became Premier he immediately set to work to implement what he considered were long overdue

55 Ibid.

56 As will be seen below, the relationship of Trinity to the University was significantly determined by the 1901 University Act, but it remained under the general provisions of the 1887 Act.
changes in the governing structure of the University of Toronto. In the autumn of 1905, he appointed a Royal Commission for this purpose. It was a most distinguished Commission, chaired by Sir Joseph Flavelle, and it did not interpret its duties in a light-hearted way. Charged with the task of preparing legislation for a new University Act, members of the Commission visited the leading universities in North America, and interviewed virtually everyone of prominence in Ontario's educational community. The Report of the Commission remains an extraordinary document, and indispensable to the history of higher education in Canada in the twentieth century. The Report, and the Act which followed it, developed a completely new governing structure, which included the vesting of control and management of the University in a Board of Governors appointed by the provincial government, with the Senate responsible for purely academic policies. And in its review of the federated system of university polity in operation in Toronto, it also recommended significant changes, the most important of which was the creation of a Council of the Faculty of Arts, in which would be represented the teaching staff in Arts subjects not only in the University proper, but also in University College, Victoria College, and Trinity College. A University Council of this sort, in which the representatives of the federated colleges might come together, was one which, it was hoped, "could not fail to promote a better understanding in the work that all are doing in common."

The University Act of

---

57 The report is reprinted as an appendix to The University of Toronto and its Colleges, see pp.274-275.
1906 enshrined the system of federation which was originated in the 1887 Act, and which, in essence, continues today.

**St. Michael's College, 1881-1911**

It will be recalled from the account of the early history of St. Michael's College in Chapter Three, above, that in July, 1855, the Superior of St. Michael's, Father Soulerin, wrote to his Superior General in France about St. Michael's request "...to be affiliated with the University of Toronto, which is so richly endowed." In the same letter, Father Soulerin reveals the primary motive behind this request: "If the conditions attached to the affiliation are suitable we shall be in line for help from the Government, just as are the Protestant Colleges." The Senate of the University replied politely, but denied the request stating that St. Michael's already had everything it could hope to acquire by affiliation. The Senate's reasons for denying St. Michael's affiliation probably had more to do with their view that the Catholic college was a small and less than influential denominational college whose affiliation, on balance, would probably weaken the University as a whole. The University's decision was not that harmful to St. Michael's; by virtue of their incorporation in 1855, they were now eligible for grants which they began to receive in that year, and continued to receive until their termination in 1868. In that year they received 3,100 dollars from the

---

58 GABF, Letter of Father Soulerin to Father Tourvieille, July 5, 1855.
government. But from 1855 until 1878 the question of university affiliation remained dormant. But in the summer of 1878 a new member joined the staff whose early training equipped him in a special way to bring this matter up once more. This was Father John Reed Teefy.

Father Teefy had matriculated into the University of Toronto in 1867 with first-class honours in Classics, Mathematics, French and English. At the University he studied Classics and Mathematics and graduated in 1871 as a Silver Medalist and specialist in Mathematics. He was ordained as a Basilian priest in June of 1878 and was appointed to St. Michael's College. His superiors had made a wise appointment; as soon as Teefy arrived at St. Michael's he immediately renewed his old friendships on the University campus and began to investigate the possibility of re-opening the matter of affiliation.

Teefy approached Vice-Chancellor Sir William Mulock, probably during the 1880-81 academic year—the year Mulock became Vice-Chancellor. It seems that the University Senate was quite attracted by the idea of reconsidering St. Michael's request for affiliation. They were sure to have been impressed with the ever-growing prestige of the staff of the College, but that was not the only reason.


60 Teefy would have been aware of Mulock's support for the idea of bring the denominational colleges into affiliation, and eventually federation with the University. It also appears that Mulock was particularly disposed towards the idea of having a Catholic presence on the University of Toronto campus. This ecumenical sentiment is obvious in an essay that Mulock wrote years later when he was serving as Chancellor of the University. See William Mulock, "University Federation of Denominational Colleges in Canada," *Current History*, Vol. XXVII, (1928), pp524-538.
It was noted above that it was during these years that Mulock was planning to go before the government to plead for extended funding to the University of Toronto, beyond the income from the University endowment. To have St. Michael's affiliated with the University would have strengthened his case; Mulock would be able to point to the inclusive spirit of the University, which welcomed the Catholic, and which would welcome Methodists and Anglicans with equal enthusiasm. St. Michael's thus became a valuable political tool in the movement towards federation.

Teevy wrote the letter of application which was read before the Senate of the University on January 28, 1881. The Senate responded by striking a committee to consider the request. On March 9 the committee reported back to the Senate recommending that St. Michael's become affiliated with the University of Toronto under the following scheme:

1. St. Michael's is to be a college in affiliation with the University of Toronto.

2. In the Sub-Department of History (Medieval and Modern) no authors are to be specified in the University curriculum. The periods of History embraced in the University curriculum are to be subjects of examination without necessary reference to any particular authors, and examiners are to be instructed to carry out the spirit of this memorandum.

3. In the Department of Mental and Moral Science and Civil Polity no authors are to be specified in the University curriculum. The question will have no necessary reference to any one author or school of authors. In matters of opinion answers will

---

61 UTA, Minutes of the Senate of the University of Toronto, January 28, 1881.

62 The members of the Senate Committee were as follows: Representing the University Senate, the Vice-Chancellor, Mr. Taylor, Professor Loudon (University of Toronto Professor of Mathematics and future President), Reverend William Caven (Principal of Knox College), Reverend D. J. Macdonnell, Mr. Justice Patterson, Mr. Justice Cameron, Professor Chapman; representing St. Michael's, Father Vincent (Superior), Father Teevy, Dr. J. J. Cassidy, and Dr. G. A. O'Sullivan.
be judged according to their accuracy of thought and expression.\textsuperscript{43}

Five days after the memorandum was submitted, the Senate approved affiliation and St. Michael's could at last regard herself as part of the Provincial University. The Senate's deliberation on the issue was not, however, without drama. Mulock records the following account of the Senate's March 14 meeting:

The meeting began early in the day and it continued on into the evening. The Senate fully realized the gravity of the situation, the importance of the question, the far-reaching consequences of their decision, whether for or against the adoption of the proposition, and therefore gave to it the most anxious consideration that men could give to such a sacred question. As the discussion proceeded, fair, just and judicious, it became manifest that the scheme was a wise one. It commended itself to the sense of fairness and justice of every member of the Senate, and at last we realized that everyone was in favour of it.

No decision at that moment was taken, but it being known that Father Teefy and his associates were in attendance, it was thought wise to invite them into the meeting in order that they might have the satisfaction of being present when the formal decision was rendered, and so they entered the Senate Chamber. On invitation to speak, Father Teefy, not yet knowing the views of the Senate, addressed an eloquent and convincing argument in support of the scheme. When he sat down the question was put and every member of the Senate voted in favour of it, all rejoicing that they had found such a happy solution of the problem to which earlier in my remarks I referred. Father Teefy then in the fullness of his heart rose again and expressed in a few touching words appreciation of the decision.\textsuperscript{44}

This truly was a momentous moment not only in the history of St. Michael's College, but also in the history of the University. Since the passing of the Hincks Act in 1853, which created the provision for the affiliation of denominational colleges with the University of Toronto, not one college had exercised the option of affiliation, for reasons that have been detailed above. Now the Catholic college was the first to do so. The terms of the affiliation were very


\textsuperscript{44} Sir William Mulock, \textit{A Record of the Proceedings at the Centenary of the University of Toronto}, (Toronto:University of Toronto Press, 1927), p.5.
generous on the part of the University, and allowed St. Michael's to enter without compromising her integrity. The subjects of History, Ethics, and Metaphysics were identified as areas where there would inevitably be profound differences in approach by Catholics and Protestants, and so an arrangement was worked out whereby students could answer examination questions from their own religious perspectives—questions which would have no "reference to any one author or school of authors"—and which would be marked according to "their accuracy of thought and expression." This compromise paved the way for the entrance of Victoria and Trinity into federation; here was proof that the University was willing to work out a mutually acceptable arrangement that would accommodate the interests and concerns of the denominational colleges, while ensuring that its own standards were maintained.

Now that St. Michael's had worked out the terms of affiliation with the University, there remained the task of seeking the approval of the bishops of Ontario. The bishops might have hesitated in approving the scheme for two possible reasons: The first was that it would finish off any hope that they had that there could be in Toronto a great Catholic university, something like the

---

65 When this compromise was put into practice in Metaphysics the students of St. Michael's and University College were examined with the same questions; one year the papers were set by Catholics, the next year by non-Catholics. This lasted for some years until a Father Sylvester Dowdell from St. Michael's set an examination that proved to be utterly baffling to the University College students; most of it was in Latin. Faced with a storm of protest, the University Senate enacted the following statute on November 22, 1889: "In the honour department of mental and moral philosophy in the fourth year the Senate shall institute two distinct examinations on the two systems of philosophy taught in the confederating arts colleges." See Reverend Henry Carr, C.S.B., "The Very Reverend J. R. Teefy, C.S.B.," in Report of the Canadian Catholic Historical Association, (1939-1940), pp.91-92.
University of Notre Dame that had been established in Indiana by the Holy Cross Fathers. Such hopes for an independent university were even considered by Teefy himself. At a University dinner shortly after the affiliation agreement was reached, he stated in his oration that "the arrangement did not realize the ideals of his Church, declaring that he would have liked to see created a great Catholic university bearing the same relation to modern times that the University of Salamanca did to medieval; but he declared the arrangement was satisfactory as being the best attainable." The second reason the bishops might hesitate was because of the dangers of having their students exposed to Protestant ideology. But the special arrangement worked out for history and philosophy seemed to placate that concern.

Fortunately for St. Michael's, Archbishop Lynch of Toronto was firmly in favour of affiliation, and it was he who presented the plan to his brother bishops. On July 23, 1881, he wrote the following letter to Father Vincent, Superior of St. Michael's:

I laid before the Bishops of our Province your letter stating your reasons for affiliation to the University of Toronto. Their Lordships have found them satisfactory and desired me to express the same to you and to encourage you in the project. I have reason to believe that there will be no difficulty in obtaining what is very desirable from the Senate of the University, and the certificate of St. Michael's College will suffice as to proficiency in History and Mathematics, so as to obtain degrees in those departments. You will, of course, have lectures and a class book on religion and the evidences of Christianity, and particularly of Catholicism, so necessary in our days of infidelity.  


With this approval from the bishops of Ontario, the fortunes of St. Michael's were linked with the University. These first ties were not particularly close, in that the two institutions still lived separate lives. But a pattern had been set. St. Michael's College, "without whose attitude federation would have been impossible (to use the words a later Minister of Education, the Honourable Howard Ferguson), entered into a new period of its history, inexorably linked with the University of Toronto.

This new relationship with the University was described in the College calendar for the 1881-82 academic year. It describes the affiliation agreement as having been "effected upon a basis similar to that of the affiliation of Catholic colleges of England and Ireland with the London University." The somewhat complex program of studies is described for prospective students: "Students are considered as matriculated upon passing the matriculation examination before the University Examiners. At the end of the first and the third year of the University pass course, certificates from the College are received in lieu of the University examinations. At the end of the second and fourth year the University Board


69 USMCA, St. Michael's College Calendar, 1881-82. The similarity between the Universities of Toronto and London was based on the 1853 University Act, which made the University of Toronto a purely examining body that carried out no teaching, like the University of London. Teaching was the responsibility of the colleges. While the comparison is not exact, it is interesting to note that the Basilians would have been familiar with this model, for even before the University of London was founded, colleges in France prepared students for the Baccalaureate examinations which were set and conducted by the University of Paris.
Although affiliation was announced with considerable enthusiasm, most advanced students continued to follow the old St. Michael's programme not leading to a degree. Between 1881 and 1910 only about nine students made use of the advantages provided by the affiliation agreement, and communication did not go much further than Father Vincent attending occasional Senate meetings. When the Federation Act of 1887 was passed by the legislature, St. Michael's no doubt observed with great interest as Victoria made use of the provision which allowed the federation of existing theological colleges into the legal structure of the University of Toronto. While the Act provided that the University could resume teaching in those subjects not taught in University College (i.e., Mathematics, Physics, Astronomy, Geology, Mineralogy, Chemistry, Biology, Zoology, Botany, Physiology, Modern History, Ethnology, Comparative Philology, Italian, Spanish, History of Psychology, Logic, Metaphysics, Education, Political Science, Jurisprudence, Constitutional Law, and Constitutional History), it also—as is explained above—gave Victoria, as a federated Arts college, the right to provide instruction in those courses taught at University College. This gave Victoria the status of an instructional Arts college within the University of Toronto. St. Michael's, on the other hand, remained essentially a theological college—at least in terms of its relationship with the Provincial University—even though it could teach history and philosophy by virtue of the unique affiliation agreement with

\[70\] Ibid.
the University. But St. Michael's students who wanted a University of Toronto Arts degree had to enroll as students of University College, and take all their courses, save those in history and philosophy, at either University College or, for the subjects not taught by the colleges, at the University itself. This had the effect of disassociating those St. Michael's students studying towards an Arts degree from their college. There were also those Catholic students who were originally enrolled at University College and who could elect to take their philosophy and history at St. Michael's, but these could hardly be called St. Michael's students. The affiliation agreement, therefore, did not accomplish a great deal for St. Michael's in terms of its relationship with the University. In the vast majority of cases, students remained in the classical college pattern, retained their identification with St. Michael's, and did not proceed to a University degree. There was more than Queen's Park that separated St. Michael's from the type of federation that Victoria College students would enjoy upon their removal to Toronto.

While much can be said in favour of the University Senate's willingness to accommodate the particular situation of St. Michael's by allowing for the Catholic college to continue to teach history and philosophy (examples of ecumenism are hard to find in Victorian Toronto), this did not mean that the affiliation agreement was free from difficulty. In fact, Archbishop Lynch, who originally encouraged his brother bishops to support the terms of affiliation, was forced to write to Father Vincent in October of 1884 about some evidence that had come
before him that suggested that Catholic students were being perverted by Protestant influences while taking courses at University College. Lynch decided on the basis of the evidence that he had to "forbid them to expose their eternal salvation by attending lectures..." The letter from Lynch to Vincent deserves to be cited in full, as it reveals with stark clarity the forces that were at work against the principles of federation, and makes it even more astonishing that federation was ever fully implemented.

We learn with sorrow and dismay that the lectures on metaphysics given at present at University College are highly tinged with scepticism. When Baine is taken as a basis for the nature of the soul, and Kant is given in the study of thought—while the standard of morals is the general good, we deem such metaphysics as calculated to undermine and eventually destroy the principles of Christianity itself.

We also learn from undoubted authority that history, which should be only a true unbiased statement of facts, is in the very basis upon which it is nowadays placed, used to belittle the work of the Catholic Church and to insinuate the fatality of events, which will be calculated to utterly destroy free will.

We consider therefore that we would be completely derelict in our duty, as chief pastor of souls, and accountable before God, if we did not only not exhort our Catholic students, but if we did not also forbid them to expose their eternal salvation by attending lecture upon the subjects of logic, metaphysics and history in any non-Catholic College.

There is ample provision made in St. Michael's College, under the tutorship of the learned Reverend Father Teefy, for students to obtain a full and accurate knowledge upon the subjects without at all entrenching upon their holy faith.

As the teaching upon the above mentioned studies in non-Catholic Colleges is dangerous to Catholic young men, we only gave our consent to the affiliation of St. Michael's with the University upon the express condition, generously accepted by the University, that these studies should be specially exempted. The examinations were to be held upon the instructions as given in St. Michael's College, which would entitle the successful candidates to the same rank and honours as students of University College.

The Catholic views of philosophy and history as taught in St. Michael's College have an equal value with those upon the same subjects taught at University College.

We write to you, as you know the Catholic students, trusting to your zeal to make known to them the contents of this letter.71

71 USMCA, Letter of Archbishop Lynch to the Reverend Father Vincent, October 6, 1884. The problem with the teaching of history was to remain for many years after the affiliation agreement. In a letter from a St. Michael's alumnus named Father T. F. Battle to Father Michael Oliver, Battle recounts his experience as a third year University College student who was told by U. Of T. President James Loudon in
Father John Reed Teefy, University of Toronto alumnus, and the man responsible more than any other for the affiliation agreement, became Superior of St. Michael's College in 1889 and held that position until 1904. But Teefy grew to be a very prominent personality in the Catholic community, and his attention to the College's relationship with the University was distracted by increasing numbers of preaching and teaching engagements. He was also distracted by the tensions within the Basilian Congregation between the interests of the Basilians in France and those in Canada. Many of his academic responsibilities were assumed by Father Albert Pierre Dumouchel, who served as Vice-Superior.

During the 1890's St. Michael's spent most of its resources concentrating on the development of its classical course, and very little time and energy working on strengthening its affiliation with the University. There were only a small number of students who enrolled in the "Varsity Course" which prepared them for the matriculation examinations of the University. It was difficult for St. Michael's to encourage the preparation of students who would leave the College (with their tuition) and enrol at University College, only to return for their 1895 to ensure that he take all his history at St. Michael's. Battle not only ignored Loudon's advice, but he also wrote an official letter of complaint about University College Professor G. M. Wrong's history class that he had taken. The letter came before the Senate, to the embarrassment of both St. Michael's and the President. Battle recalls in the letter that Loudon sent for him to come to his office and said with annoyance, "I thought I told you to take your history at St. Michael's College." USMCA, Letter of Father T. F. Battle to Father Michael Oliver, C.S.B., November 6, 1929

The office of Superior of St. Michael's College was two-fold: it made the holder the religious superior of the Basilians at St. Michael's; it also made him President of the College. The College calendar of 1876 describes Father Vincent as "President of the College," but this was only for public usage. The term "Superior" was the more common within the College. The two functions of Religious Superior and President were held by the same man until 1959, when they were separated under the University of St. Michael's College Act.
history and philosophy. In response to this situation, Father Dumouchel developed a plan to correlate the college's academic programmes with programmes of the provincial department of education and the University. The seven year classical course (see above, Chapter Three) would now be divided into two divisions: a four year course that would follow the Ontario high school curriculum; and a four year Arts course that followed the curriculum of the pass course at the University of Toronto. It was not Dumouchel's intention to have students who completed the first part of the plan sit for matriculation examinations for the University, not for students who completed the Arts course to sit for degree examinations at the University; the idea was merely to establish a course of studies that was more in keeping with the educational system beyond the walls of St. Michael's. This thinking was in no small part a result of the debate that was raging in the secular press concerning the standards that were or were not maintained in Catholic separate schools in Ontario, and the question of requiring state certification for Nuns and Brothers in Religious Orders.

Dumouchel's idea that by following the Arts course of the University students would at least be eligible to receive a University of Toronto B.A. degree was never implemented, but it was important in that in was a precursor of the idea that would eventually be implemented and lead to St. Michael's complete
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73 USMCA, Catalogue of St. Michael's College, 1902-1903.

integration into the federated system. At this point, in 1904, another Basilian was to arrive at St. Michael's who would have a significant influence on the future of the College. Father Henry Carr, like Teefy, was a graduate of the University of Toronto; Carr graduated in 1903 with an Honours Classics degree. From the beginning of his appointment at St. Michael's, Carr was certain of what he wanted to accomplish. Using the provisions of the 1906 University Act, which solidified the federation of Arts colleges within the University of Toronto, Carr embarked upon a carefully thought out scheme. His first decision was to commit the College to the adoption of the Ontario Department of Education's high school curriculum, and he would integrate the four last years of the seven-year program—Belles Lettres, Rhetoric, Philosophy I and II—into the structure of the University of Toronto. At the same time, he convinced the Director of Studies, Father

75 Carr's role in the federation of St. Michael's with the University of Toronto gained him national recognition. He was to introduce the Toronto concept of federation at both the University of Saskatchewan where he founded St. Thomas More College, and at the University of British Columbia where he played an important role in founding St. Mark's College. Every institution at which he had taught—the University of Toronto, the University of Saskatchewan, the University of Windsor, and the University of British Columbia—conferred an honoury degree upon him. See Edmund J. McCorkell, Henry Carr—Revolutionary. (Toronto: Griffen House, 1969); and Scollard, Dictionary of Basilian Biography, pp.20-23.

76 When Carr approached the University concerning his plans (through Superior Father Daniel Cushing the Superior and Father M. V. Kelly) the University Act was on the point of being presented to Parliament and the Royal Commission which had prepared the Act generously added an additional clause to cover the particular case of St. Michael's. See An Act Respecting the University of Toronto and University College, Assented to May 14, 1906, Section 145. The amendment to the Act read as follows:

If and when a college now or hereafter federated with the University shall establish a faculty of Arts in which instruction in the subjects of the course of study in Arts, not being University subjects, shall be provided, and a statute of the Board shall be passed declaring that it has so done, such college, so long as it maintains such faculty to the satisfaction of the Board, shall be known as and may be called a College of the University, and the teaching staff in such faculty shall have the same representation in the Council of the Faculty of Arts as is by Section 74 of this Act given to the teaching staffs of the federated universities, and the regular matriculated students of such college, who are entitled therein and enter their names with the Registrar of the University, shall be entitled to the privileges which are by section 132 conferred upon the students mentioned therein.
Dumouchel, to allow him to take charge of the second year of the seven-year classical programme with the view to transforming it into a junior matriculation class. This he instituted in January, 1905. Taking full responsibility for all of the teaching, his students wrote the junior matriculation examinations in July of 1906. This meant that there was at St. Michael's a class of students who were eligible for admission to the first year of the University of Toronto's pass course. However, the class did not enroll as they might have at University College. Rather, they remained at St. Michael's to prepare for the senior matriculation examinations which they would write in the spring of 1907. The class behind them followed their example and prepared for the junior matriculation examinations to be written in July, 1907. Now St. Michael's had two classes of students, one eligible to enter the first year pass course, the other eligible for entrance into the second year honours course. But still Carr kept them at St. Michael's, and arranged with the University to have the second year honours philosophy class registered at University College, but actually taking their courses at St. Michael's. This class would graduate in 1910 as a St. Michael's class graduating from the University through University College. The next year, the class that had followed the original into the senior matriculation class, would graduate in 1911 from the University of Toronto but through St. Michael's College.

Thus by 1911 the work of federation was legally and integrally established at St. Michael's. Each succeeding year had its own graduation class. In 1912, the
privileges of federation were extended to women students of St. Joseph's College and Loretto College by enrolling them in St. Michael's. But if it had not been for Carr's vision of the position that St. Michael's could one day assume in the federation, St. Michael's might have missed its chance. When Fathers Cushing and Kelly submitted a brief to the Royal Commission on the University that was preparing the 1906 Act, they made no mention of the possibility of St. Michael's becoming an Arts college of the University. And this was after the University of Toronto's University Council submitted its own brief to the Royal Commission recommending that a Faculty of Arts be formed consisting of the Arts faculties of University College, Victoria College, Trinity College, and St. Michael's College. But whereas Trinity and Victoria entered federation as universities, suspending their degree-granting powers to do so, St. Michael's entered as an Arts college, undertaking for the first time to prepare students for university degrees. The position of the three federated Arts colleges within the larger framework of the University was not in 1906, either in fact or in legislation, identical. Previous to 1906, St. Michael's had not been a university, and after 1906 it assumed no university powers in its own right. But as the years passed, St. Michael's grew in size, in academic stature, and in national prestige. It began to function in much the same way as Victoria and Trinity, becoming a federated university in actual

77 Report of the Royal Commission on the University of Toronto, (Toronto: 1906), Section 121.

78 Ibid., Appendices, Section 92.
practice if not in official legislation. Steps to correct the legal lag were taken in 1954 when the original St. Michael's College Act, unchanged since 1855, was amended to provide civil establishment for its Faculty of Theology and to authorize the conferring of theological degrees. This amendment was but a prelude to the seeking of a full university charter so that St. Michael's might be able to take her place in federation on equal footing with the two other federated Arts colleges. Such a charter was granted by the Ontario Legislature during the Spring of 1958, and was made effective on July 1 of the same year.

University of Trinity College, 1884-1904.

According to the Minute Book of the Corporation of Trinity College, a committee was appointed as early as 1870 to consider affiliation with "a provincial university (presumably the University of Toronto) in order to deal with a very serious financial situation," which included a projected deficit for 1870 of about 2,000 dollars. The affiliation plan was reported to have been "surrounded by so many difficulties and open to so many and grave objections that it was one that should not be entertained."

There the issue remained until Trinity, like the other denominational colleges, was approached by Minister of Education George Ross in 1884. It will be recalled from earlier in this chapter that Provost Body of Trinity had been appointed chairman of the committee that represented the denominational

---

79 UTCA, Trinity College, Minute Book of Corporation, February 8, 1870.
colleges in preparation for the meeting called by Ross for July 24, 1884. That committee expressed certain concerns on behalf of the colleges and stipulated the conditions upon which the colleges could accept a scheme for affiliation. When the twenty-two point plan for the confederation of colleges with the University of Toronto was submitted to the respective governing boards of the colleges on January 9, 1885, Trinity was quick to respond.

Many students and supporters of Trinity were favourable towards the plan of federation, including Herbert Symonds, an Arts student enrolled at Trinity at the time. Symonds was one of the first to see that Trinity could never hope to compete successfully with the state-aided University of Toronto, and that if federation could be effected on equitable terms Trinity, without sacrifice of principle, would be infinitely stronger than by struggling along as an independent University. Ten years later, Symonds would write influentially on the issue, as will be seen below; in the meantime, he was ahead of his time. When the terms proposed were brought before the Corporation early in 1885, too many defects were identified for Trinity to support the plan. The corporation laid out four major objections, which were similar to those identified by Victoria, but which Trinity, unlike Victoria, could not move beyond.80

The first objection concerned the place of religious knowledge in the curriculum; it was the condition of Trinity that this subject should be extended to

80 The objections of Trinity are enumerated by Burwash, in “A Review of the Founding and Development of the University of Toronto as a Provincial Institution,” pp.80-81.
all the years of the Arts course, and to the Honours as well as the Pass programmes. The twenty-two point plan stated that the curriculum would include the subjects of Biblical Greek, Biblical Literature, Christian Ethics, Apologetics or the Evidences of Natural and Revealed Religion, and Church History, but it also stated that "provision shall be made by a system of options to prevent such subjects being made compulsory by the University upon any candidate for a degree." This was too liberal a provision for the Trinity Corporation.

The second objection related explicitly to the status of University College. That proposal stated that each college that federated with the University was entitled to teach all of those subjects that were taught by University College, and was entitled to the same number of chairs as University College held. While this was intended to establish equality between the various colleges that chose to enter federation, it had the effect of forcing those colleges with limited means to expend resources in order to remain on parity with University College, lest their students see the advantages of enrollment at University College. For Trinity, a small university with serious financial difficulties, this would be too costly. They insisted, therefore, that a restriction be placed upon the addition by the state of new chairs at University College, such as might add unduly to the burden of the other colleges. They also stipulated that there be a limit placed on the transfer of chairs from the University to University College for the same reason.

Their third objection was to the lack of clarity between the status of

---

81 The University of Toronto and its Colleges, p.51.
University College and the University itself. If there was a confusion between the two, especially as regards buildings and administration, University College would become synonymous with the University and, as such, be a more attractive institution to students than Trinity. (This objection was also designed to ensure that Daniel Wilson never become President of the University of Toronto, although this was never stated.)

Their final concern related to the representation of the colleges on the University Senate. The sixth section of the proposal provided for the separate representation of graduates on the Senate by the colleges and by the University for a period of six years. After that time, there would be no separate representation. Trinity insisted that the colleges be represented in perpetuity, both *ex officio* and through the graduates.

While the Board of Regents of Victoria and the General Conference of the Methodist Church were to continue in negotiations with the University and the government, Trinity withdrew from such discussions.\(^2\) However, by the academic year 1899-1900, the deficit, which in 1870 amounted to 2,000 dollars, had risen to about 11,000 dollars. When the Reverend Edward Welch was appointed Provost to succeed Dr. Body in 1895, he was a determined foe of any plan of federation. Welch, a graduate of Cambridge arrived in Canada to take up the post of Provost with a firm view that Trinity was to be the sole University for the

\(^2\) An editorial in the Trinity College paper at this time on the subject of federation indicates a majority of students in favour, but a majority of graduates against. UTCA, *Rouge et Noir*, (Vol. VI, no.1), 1885.
Church of England in Canada. What he soon discovered was that there were more Anglicans enrolled at the University of Toronto than at Trinity, and maintaining itself as the only University for the Church of England in Canada was quite impossible as long as this was the case. Still, though, federation was impossible until he could ensure that Trinity would be assured of compensation for the College's site and building, and the providing of a new site in Queen's Park. Premier Mowat's government had purchased the Victoria buildings in Cobourg, and provided a site for the Methodists in Toronto, but this would not be sufficient for Trinity; they required a significant outlay of capital by way of compensation. And the Government was not yet disposed to such a benefaction.

Welch was replaced as Provost by Mr. Thomas C. S. Macklem, the first lay Provost of Trinity in May, 1900. Before his appointment, Macklem had submitted to the Corporation a brief which set forth his views upon the general policy which he believed the University of Trinity College should follow, and these were endorsed by the Corporation. A few days after he took office, the Corporation—as a result of its endorsement of Macklem—appointed a Commission of three empowered to confer and complete negotiations with the Provincial Government and the University of Toronto looking to ultimate federation. At first the Commission dealt solely with the Government. The Honourable George Ross, former Minister of Education, was now Premier, and the Commission found a receptive and friendly attitude (except on the question concerning the Government's purchase price of the Trinity site on Queen Street). These
negotiations led to the passing of the University Act of 1901, which attempted to remedy the defects of the 1887 Federation Act. The Commission had approached the Government with four conditions that had been set by the Corporation. They were not entirely different from the concerns raised by Trinity in 1884: all federated colleges in Arts were to stand in equal relation to the University (this ensured that University College did not hold an advantage); each college was to retain in perpetuity the right to vote separately for representatives on the University Senate; the colleges and the University would come to a mutual agreement on which courses were offered in the colleges, and which in the University; and, (and this was the most difficult) Trinity was to receive 400,000 dollars for their site and buildings on Queen Street in addition to a new site on Queen's Park.

The Act of 1901 prepared the way for the entrance of Trinity into federation. The main sections of the Act, other than those concerning Trinity, dealt with the governance of the University. That governance was invested in three bodies: the Trustees who controlled the business affairs of the University; the Senate which controlled the academic affairs of the University and elected the Vice-Chancellor, while the Convocation elected the Chancellor, and the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council appointed the President and Professors; and the

---

Statutes of Ontario, 1901, Chapter 41.

UTCA, Trinity College, Minute Book of Corporation, May 9, 1900.
University Council, which was responsible for student affairs. But the Act also gave power to the Trustees, the Senate and the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to enter into an agreement with Trinity as to the terms of their federation. The Commission (mentioned above) appointed to negotiate with the Government consisted of the Provost, Dr. Macklem; Edward Martin, the Chancellor of the Diocese of Niagara; and John Austin Worell, Chairman of the Finance Committee of the Trinity and Chancellor of the Diocese of Toronto.

Just as the Commission was to begin its work in 1902, a anonymous pamphlet appeared addressed to the Senate of the University of Toronto. Entitled "Can Light Mingle with Darkness? Can Trinity affiliate with Toronto?", it was a scathing attack on the idea of federation and on the University itself. There is no doubt that the pamphlet was widely distributed; what is most interesting is the vehemence of the attack. The University of Toronto was described as "an unclean thing"; an institution with which "no honest, conscientious member of the Church of England could, under any circumstances, have ought to do." And the proposed provincial university was described as "deadly to the best interests of man; in its nature, atheistical, and monstrous in its consequence. It holds up the

---

65 Concerning the representation of the denominational colleges on the Senate, the 1901 Act stipulated the following membership: the heads of all the colleges federated in the University; two members from each federated college not represented in Convocation; one member from each college that elected representatives to Convocation; and twelve representatives of the graduates in Arts of University College, five for Victoria College, and five for Trinity College. St. Michael's was excluded from this last provision because it did not, at the time of the Act, have any of its own graduates in Arts.

Christian religion to the contempt of wicked men. It is a hideous scheme.\textsuperscript{87} That there would be opposition to the plan of federation is not surprising, but that the opposition should be this pronounced at this late stage in the University Question does reveal the extent to which passions were aroused by the concept of federation.

The Commission appointed to negotiate with the University and Government on the final terms of Trinity's federation was not deterred by the pamphlet, but perhaps the pamphlet does explain why the Commission's report, housed today in the Trinity Archives, bears the words "STRICKLY CONFIDENTIAL" on every page. The report details nine items of an agreement between Trinity and the University. The main features of the agreement gave Trinity the right to provide for its students religious instruction and influences in accordance with the teachings of the Church of England. It provided that the curriculum in Arts of the University should include the subjects of Biblical Greek, Biblical Literature, Christian Ethics, Apologetics, the Evidences of Natural and Revealed Religion, and Church History (there to be taught by the Colleges of course), distributed as evenly as possible over the years of the Arts courses, with the examination and instruction in these subjects entirely in the hands of the colleges.\textsuperscript{88}

\textsuperscript{87} \textit{Ibid.}, p.12.

\textsuperscript{88} UTCA, \textit{Report of the Commission on Federation to be made to the Corporation of the University of Trinity College at a special meeting to be held on Thursday, 25 June, 1903}, Item 1.
In the clause of the 1901 Act which provided against religious tests in the University of Toronto, the rights of the federated colleges were secured with the following caveat: "Nothing herein contained shall be considered as interfering with the rights of any federated University or federated College to make such provision in regard to religious instruction and worship for its own students as it may deem proper." The college subjects were once again stated as Theology, Greek, Latin. Ancient History, English, French, German, Oriental Languages, and Ethics. Provision was also made for the duplication of certain lectures where the number of students in Trinity College warranted it, to be held at the College, until such time as Trinity removed to a site closer to Queen's Park, and this at the Government's expense. And, in what must have been the most difficult adjustment for some members of the Trinity faculty to make, provision was made for the transfer to the University staff of certain professors who taught before federation in what were to become University subjects. Finally, provision was made for a suitable site, free of charge, on or near Queen's Park on which to erect a building to serve as a centre for Trinity's students; Trinity would not make use of this provision, however, until 1925.

89 Ibid., Item 4.

90 Ibid., Items 4, 5, 6, and 7. Another notable item was the third, which amalgamated the Trinity Medical College with the Faculty of Medicine of the University of Toronto.

91 In the Report of the Royal Commission on the University of Toronto, which undertook the task of preparing legislation for the University Act of 1906, the Commission members noted that Trinity's failure to make use of the provision to move closer to the Campus of the University was "not satisfactory." They suggested that Trinity might borrow on their Queen Street land and property, and with such money begin
The report of the Commission was submitted to the Corporation of Trinity on June 25, 1903, and adopted by that body; it was subsequently ratified by the Senate of the University of Toronto, and approved by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council on November 18, 1904. At a meeting of graduates and friends held in Convocation Hall on July 30, the following resolution had been passed by a vote of 121 to 73:

1. That the policy [federation] is in the best interests of our Church University and will serve to promote the well-being of Higher Education generally in Ontario;
2. That the position of the Church of England in this Province will be strengthened thereby and her highest welfare promoted;
3. That under the altered conditions of today the purpose and intentions of the Founder and the original Benefactors of the University of Trinity College can be better served and the sacred trust reposed by them in the Bishops of the Province and in the University Corporation more faithfully fulfilled, by this policy than in any other way. 

The vote in favour of federation was not unanimous. The nays were thirty-seven percent of those who attended the meeting and some of them were prominent in the Church as well as in College affairs. Many of those who voted in favour of federation did so reluctantly, realizing it was the only practical way of solving Trinity's many problems. In spite of the favourable terms of the federation agreement, the "die-hards" did not give up without a struggle, and application was made in the High Court of Justice for an injunction to restrain the College authorities from completeing the agreement. The case came up in the autumn of building at Queen's Park. Trinity hesitated because of their belief that property values would increase. When they did finally move to their present site in 1925, they found themselves only a matter of yards from the site of the old King's College, that Strachan had abandoned in 1852, and directly across the street from Wycliffe College, which was founded in opposition to Trinity in 1879. One can only wonder what Strachan would have thought.

92 Trinity College, Minute Book of Corporation, June 30, 1903.
1904 but the protesting element failed in their efforts. The injunction was dissolved by the Court on September 13. There were many who thought that Trinity lost more than she gained. Others, though, were certain that the Founder himself would have approved of the union of the two universities founded by him, and that in union Trinity would contribute to the University the influence of those very principles that Strachan spent his life fighting to uphold.
The title of this thesis includes the term "Federation and Fullness." By "fullness" is meant wholeness, breadth of vision, and catholicity in its fullest sense. This is the great strength of the federated form of university polity. Over one hundred years after the Federation Act of 1887, it seems fair to say that the federation scheme worked. It was an invention stumbled upon rather than envisaged, a product of compromise and resourcefulness, whose theory has never been articulated, but whose patrimony in the history of English universities is unmistakable. In short, it is a profoundly Canadian invention. The basis for the University of Toronto's reputation during the first half of the twentieth century was its undergraduate programme in Arts and Science, the chief features of which were the federated college system, under which each student in Arts was enrolled in a college; and the honours Arts courses, which antedated the Federation Act, but which owed much to the involvement of Victoria, St. Michael's, and Trinity, and which were taken by about half the students in that faculty. It must be recognized that another great strength of the Federation Act
was that it was permissive; no university or college was required to federate or affiliate with the University of Toronto. Its underlying purpose was to provide Ontario with a provincial system (even if the term "system" had not been introduced) of post-secondary education through an interlocking group of institutions which together would provide for the needs of the people of the Province. But no institution was compelled into the federation; the present-day position of Queen's University in the system is evidence of that permissiveness.

At heart, the road to federation enshrined two fundamental principles. First, it introduced the federal principle to higher education, the same principle which created the Dominion of Canada. The several denominational universities and colleges of the Province were invited to co-operate with the University of Toronto to make a truly provincial university, each federated college surrendering a portion of its autonomy in so doing. Each held in abeyance its power to grant degrees other than those in Theology. The colleges turned over to the University instruction in certain subjects, mainly the sciences, and retained instruction in certain other subjects, mainly the languages. Each college acknowledged the rights of the University over their students while these students were engaged in taking university subjects, while maintaining its own rights to determine the life and conduct of students while in their own college. And finally, the colleges also respected the prerogative of the University Senate to control examinations (save in certain religious knowledge options which remained under the auspices of the colleges), while exercising influence on that body by the
presence of its representatives. Such was the essence of the principle of federation.

The second principle that federation enshrined was the fact that there must be a place for religion in education if Ontario's system of higher education was to be of service to the people of that province. The Province invited the denominational colleges to federate and affiliate with a University in order to benefit from their moral and financial support; the various denominations were in return able to avail for their students the superior advantages of pursuing an education in the ever-expanding fields of the physical and social sciences—a most costly endeavour beyond the means of the colleges themselves. The University of Toronto, and University College were to remain entirely non-denominational; no student or staff member thereof would ever be subject to any religious tests. On the other hand, each denominational college would be free to determine what conditions and practices it might impose upon its own students, ensuring that there would be, by a process of osmosis, an end to the perception that the University of Toronto was a "Godless" institution.

Was federation a success? It will be of worth to examine three perspectives in answering this question. The first perspective is that of three separate entities: the denominational colleges, the University of Toronto, and the humanities. From the point of view of the denominational colleges, there is no doubt that it was life-saving in the financial sense: federation provided students of the colleges with the atmosphere of a residential college in a denominational ambience, with access to
well-equipped laboratories and libraries that only a large university could provide. It meant that the wider resources of the University of Toronto campus were henceforth at the disposal of students who took subjects not taught at their colleges. And it meant that those same students were taught alongside others who did not share their faith, but who shared their common desire to be graduates in the pluralistic society of twentieth-century Canada. For St. Michael's and Victoria, federation supported the minority rights of Roman Catholics and Methodists to full religious and civil liberty. For all three colleges and their denominations, federation provided for an educated clergy and laity, while allowing the development of a community of faith which would promote morality and virtue among its members.

From the point of view of the University of Toronto, the advantages were equally clear. A university supported heavily by public funding, a funding derived in large part from the disputed legacy of "wilderness lands" already claimed by the Anglican Church, could not but strengthen its claim to public support by admitting under its roof the foundations of various Christian denominations. Federation also brought into the common culture the spiritual and intellectual traditions of those denominations which were willing to take up such a task. It meant that the slender resources of a young and underpopulated country were not spent in duplications of effort and in the creation of a multitude of small, confessional colleges. It meant that there was a continuing debate on the University of Toronto campus between Christians and others over the common
tradition of the humanities. Federation also works against a tendency held to be a negative force by the secular academy: the tendency of the denominations to purvey to their adherents a special version of the truth, a blinkered outlook, designed to support the moral teachings and special claims of an authoritarian tradition. Federation discouraged this tendency: it precludes a monopoly of outlook, it acquainted those outside the household of faith with the intellectual distinction and critical acumen of different faith traditions, and it prevented the denominational college from degenerating into a home for apologetics and catechesis, while encouraging it to be an intellectual forum.

And from the point of view of the historic tradition of the humanities, federation was also a success. The European tradition in arts and letters—what the humanities called *bonae litterae*—has for better or worse been intimately tied up with the history of the Christian faith ever since late antiquity. These connections cannot be undone without destroying the subject itself: to attempt this is to strive to remove the backing from a carpet without destroying the pattern. The tradition of the humanities is most likely to be preserved in a liberal arts college where the Christian tradition of learning is honoured, which is not to say that it cannot be preserved elsewhere. Federation preserved three denominational colleges devoted to the liberal arts, and brought them together in a University in which the Christian faith was a point of common respect to all who were involved in the academic mission.

The second perspective that is worth examining is that of the senior
administrative officers of the University and the colleges some forty years after the 1887 Federation Act. Thanks to Sir William Mulock, who had been so instrumental in supporting the movement towards federation, and who was elected Chancellor of the University of Toronto in 1924—a position he held until he died at the age of 101 in 1944!—we have access to the opinions of the heads of the federated colleges in 1928, some forty one years after the passing of the Act of 1887. Thirteen years after the 1887 Act, President James Loudon had expressed his view about federation that indicates that there were some growing pains in the evolution of federation at the University of Toronto. Asked by the president of Clarke University to describe federation, Loudon wrote: "Our system is a very complicated piece of machinery and very few who have not worked in it succeed in understanding it." ¹ But by 1928, it was clear that the federation scheme was supported by the heads of the institutions involved.

Mulock used the occasion of the one hundredth anniversary of the University of Toronto to solicit the opinions of the heads of the federated universities and colleges on the question of the success of federation. Their responses reveal the various aspects of federation that were advantageous; they would hardly supply to Mulock negative opinions about their relationship with the University, so we can only learn of what was thought to be successful as opposed to what was not working. Despite this one sided view, the responses are still very helpful towards an understanding of how federation was perceived forty

¹ Quoted in an unpublished manuscript located in the UTA: G. M. Craig, “The Provincial University, 1850-1906.”
years after it was enacted.

Robert A. Falconer, who had been President of the University of Toronto since 1906, was the most enthusiastic. Arriving at the University as President after federation had been well established—he could therefore not be accused of promoting a form of university polity that he had sponsored—Falconer replied to Mulock that:

Having observed with close attention for more than twenty years the operation of the system of federation in the University of Toronto and its federated colleges I am able to state that it has worked with such remarkable success as to have more than fulfilled the hopes of those who brought it into being....Never have I seen in the Faculty of Arts nor in the Senate any deliberation coloured by one-sided college interests, nor any resolution or policy determined by party vote.2

Falconer also emphasized in his comments the loyalty of the faculty and students to their own colleges, loyalty matched in equal measure by pride in being members of the University.

Reverend R. P. Bowles, who was named President of Victoria in 1913, was slightly less effusive, but ultimately supportive: "It would not be accurate to say that there was no difficulty or friction during the first years of the new relationship." But, after noting that the relationship was, in 1928, a happy one, Bowles points out that "The financial advantage of having our students without cost participate in the teaching professoriate is obvious. It is also an increasing advantage inasmuch as, while the College courses are fixed, new courses are continually being added in the University and taken care of by the University

professoriate. 

Father E. J. McCorkell, the Basilian Superior of St. Michael's College in 1928, answered Mulock without hesitation: "Federation has been a great success!" McCorkell had two reasons to support his unqualified position, both of which were particular to the Catholic situation. The first reason he saw federation to be so successful was because it had full ecclesiastical approval: it had the full concurrence of the Bishops of Ontario. And as for their successors, McCorkell points to the establishment of two Catholic colleges in Western Canada that had been established in the previous ten years along the lines of the relationship between St. Michael's and the University of Toronto as evidence that the model of federation continued to be supported by Canadian bishops. The second reason that McCorkell gives for the success of federation is that "the men who had conceived the idea and conducted the negotiations were actuated by a genuine desire to safeguard every legitimate interest." For this latter evidence he points to the special right that St. Michael's was given to conduct alternate courses in philosophy and history; this indicated that federation was an

1 Ibid., p.527.
2 Ibid., p.527.
3 See above, chapter four, where a letter is cited from Archbishop Lynch of Toronto to Father Teefy on July 23, 1881, stating that the affiliation of St. Michael's with the University of Toronto had the full approval of the bishops of Ontario.
4 These three colleges were St. Joseph's College at the University of Alberta, St. Paul's College at the University of Manitoba and Campion College at the Regina campus of the University of Saskatchewan.
accommodating scheme that provided the best of both worlds: it allowed St.
Michael's students access to the University; at the same time "the religious
atmosphere has not been sacrificed."

Reverend Francis H. Cosgrave, Provost of Trinity College from 1926 until
1945, also mentioned in his responses following the lead of Bowles of Victoria,
that early support for federation were less than unanimous. The federation of
colleges in the University of Toronto was a notable achievement, said Cosgrave,
and was increasingly regarded as so by the graduates and friends of Trinity
College "who twenty-five years ago had doubts as to the feasibility of the whole
plan."8 In 1928, the advantages were obvious, and Cosgrave offers a fine summary
of the most obvious, and now very familiar (at least to readers of this work)
result: "Trinity College has gained for her students access to the lecture rooms of
a host of distinguished professors and to scientific laboratories and libraries
which are provided for in a way practically impossible for a small institution
supported by voluntary contributions from one section of the community." And
finally, in a reference to the patriarch of Trinity, John Strachan, Cosgrave points
out that Trinity has been able to preserve its own traditions and characteristics,
enjoying the advantages of participation in a large university "without losing or
even obscuring the ideals for the sake of which its founders established it as an
independent University."9

---

8 Ibid., p.528.
9 Ibid., pp.527-528.
The third perspective from which we can approach the question of whether federation was a success yields a slightly less positive answer than the responses of the the first two perspectives—those of the institutions immediately involved, and of the heads of the universities and colleges forty years after federation. This third perspective is the contemporary approach.

It is possible to look back now to the Federation Act of 1887 and, while considering it successful, still see that it had two serious flaws. The first of these was the notable absence in either the 1887 Act, or the subsequent 1906 Act, of any reference to graduate studies. This is not surprising: graduate studies is essentially a twentieth-century development, and one can not expect the authors of the 1887 Act to have divined in 1887 that by 1922 the School of Graduate Studies would be recognized as a fundamental component of the University of Toronto. In the years that immediately followed the founding of the School of Graduate Studies, only one of its departments—Near Eastern Studies—was a college subject. But by the mid-1950s, Ph.D. programmes had been developed in all college subjects, except Religious Studies, and involved the extensive participation of college faculty. This raised the question: how were the colleges to be compensated for the work that they were doing in the School of Graduate Studies. Dealing with this question strained relations between the colleges and the University, for both the 1887 and 1906 Acts gave no direction for such an arrangement under federation.

---

10 The Ph.D. degree was instituted at Toronto in 1897.
The second serious flaw in the early stages of federation was the related issue of the restriction of the academic programme of the colleges to college subjects. It will be recalled that the original idea was that the colleges would teach the subjects in the humanities since these were most appropriately taught in small classes, and from the financial point of view were far less costly than the sciences and the professional fields. But the 1887 Act also assigned all subjects not specifically assigned to the University to the colleges. The problem was that in 1887, the subjects now embraced in the social sciences—Anthropology, Economics, History, Political Science, Psychology, and Sociology—were only on the verge of emerging as recognized academic disciplines, and when they emerged they did so as University rather than college subjects. Thus, when the social sciences gradually became more popular with students in the 1920s and 1930s, usually at the expense of the college subjects since there was a decline in the number of courses prescribed for the B.A., the result was increased enrolment for University courses and decreased enrolment for college courses. Eventually, by the 1950's, the colleges played a less than significant role in the academic life of students. Federation, in this regard, was not to serve the colleges well at all.

Today, in 1996, only one clause of the Federation Act of 1887 is operative: that all full-time students in the Faculty of Arts (since 1960 the Faculty of Arts and Science) be members of a college. With the implementation of the Memorandum of Understanding entered into by Victoria, St. Michael's, and Trinity with the University, which became effective on July 1, 1975 and which
remedied the flaws detailed above, the colleges are no longer responsible for the provision of instruction in "college subjects" to their students, and an amendment to the University of Toronto Act of 1971, in 1978, gave the University authority, through its Toronto School of Theology, to provide instruction and grant degrees in Theology. Yet, legally and in operative terms, the University of Toronto remains a federated university. And it enjoys a certain philosophical, educational, and theological "fullness" by virtue of the continued presence of the three federated denominational universities, and by the non-denominational University College. The federated university is a profoundly Canadian contribution to the history of higher education. And one that must be considered a success.
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