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Abstract

Ontario's Royal Commission on the University of Toronto, 1905-06: Political and Historical Factors that Influenced the Final Report of the Flavelle Commission
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Although much has changed in the relationship between Canadian governments and publicly-assisted universities over the last century, the principles of 'institutional autonomy' and 'annual public grants' remain sacrosanct. The codification of this relationship may be found in a document written in 1906; the final report of the Royal Commission on the University of Toronto and University College, also known as the Flavelle Commission of Ontario. Appreciating the forces that acted upon the commission is important to understanding the fundamental principles of government/university interaction in Canada today. The forces that acted on the commission included a growing recognition of the United States as a comparable jurisdiction for Canadian public policy questions, the background and personal relationships of some commissioners and the political landscape of Ontario at the time. This paper examines some of these issues and the impact they had on the commission's recommendations.
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Introduction

It has been argued that Ontario's universities enjoy more institutional autonomy than any other public university system in the English-speaking world (McDaniel, 1996; Ontario Council on University Affairs, 1995; Roberts, 1932; Stewart, 1970). This relationship did not evolve out of thin air. The *University of Toronto Act of 1906* set the template for university funding and university-state relations which permeated Ontario's university system as it expanded from one 'public' university to the eighteen publicly-assisted universities the province now has as of 2007. The 1906 University Act arose from the final report of the *Royal Commission on the University of Toronto and University College*, more popularly referred to as the Flavelle Commission.

Based on evidence surrounding the work of the Flavelle Commission, it may be surmised that the modern incarnation of universities in Ontario were born from a hybrid of best practices drawn from the private and public higher education spheres as demonstrated in the United States of the late nineteenth century. As will be discussed, the commission was clearly directed by the provincial government of the day to pursue an investigative line focussed on the United States. The commission's final report makes specific textual reference to American universities and American university leaders. It is hardly surprising, then, to find parallels between most of the commission's recommendations and activities in the higher education sector of the United States.
There was a great deal of activity going on within the realm of American colleges during the latter half of the nineteenth century. The rising influence of scientific inquiry within the academic realm, highlighted by the German concept of the 'university', had introduced the concept of research-focussed graduate programs to the traditional, privately endowed American undergraduate colleges. The demands of a burgeoning national economy were also making an impact, calling for study in applied fields to serve natural resource markets like agriculture and forestry. The state and federal governments were also realizing the economically strategic importance of higher education and the value of public subsidies to open academies that were no longer the exclusive purview of the rich and powerful. Given the perceived demographic and economic similarities between Ontario and the United States at the time (Smith, 1891; Smith, 1893), it is not surprising that Ontario would consider the United States when looking to reform and improve the province's 'state university', including the emergence of the American 'land grant' universities, rather than rely on traditional British examples and best practices.

There is more to this story, though. One of the commissioners, an eighty-two year-old historian and political scientist, Goldwin Smith, not only had considerable personal experience with college reform but also a very personal connection to the American university system and one college in particular. Smith had been a member of two commissions struck to review and make recommendations on modernizing Oxford University while he was a member of
faculty at the university (Roberts, 1932; Smith, 1911). Upon leaving Oxford he took up a position with a new institution in Ithaca, New York; Cornell University. Smith maintained a deep and abiding affection for Cornell until his death (Bishop, 1967; Schurman, 1867-1942; Smith, 1871-1910; Smith, 1911). Cornell and Cornell's president, Jacob Schurman, are mentioned by name in the final report of the commission. Furthermore, the educational and political philosophies of Schurman, Smith and Cornell's founding president, Andrew White, are clearly reflected in the arguments made by the commission's final report regarding the need for applied education, the role of the state in the university and the nature of public financing appropriate to higher education.

An analysis of the Flavelle Commission is not simply a discussion of the University of Toronto or even the political environment of Ontario at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Goldwin Smith opened a door to two centuries of accumulated higher education history in the United States for the commission. This knowledge included the evolution of private and public universities in the States, and a growing focus on research and applied education in the higher education sector. The final report of the commission, by extension, laid the groundwork for a Canadian university system that complemented the universities south of the border and helped solidify an American higher education model, in contrast to the English, Scottish and German models from which it had previously drawn.
Research Methodology and Sources

Researching the Flavelle Commission and the factors which acted upon it required four distinct phases of research. The first phase involved understanding the commission's report within the context of Ontario's higher education history and the University of Toronto's, specifically. This research involved secondary sources, including three histories of the University of Toronto ranging chronologically from University of Toronto librarian, W.J. Alexander's history completed in 1906, the same year as the commission's final report, to Martin Friedland's 2002 *The University of Toronto: A History* (Alexander, 1906; Friedland, 2002; Wallace, 1927). Additional reading helped place the commission within the broader world of Ontario's growing university sector of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (Bovey, 1984; McKillop, 1994; Stewart, 1970).

The next phase was an analytical reading of the final report of the commission and a review of available related archival material. This began with a careful review of the final report of the *Royal Commission into the University of Toronto and University College* (Flavelle, 1906) including cataloguing its various recommendations on governance, academic mission, finances and funding, administrative structure and relationship to government. This led to a review of reports on Ontario's legislative debates during the period preceding the 1905 general election which brought Premier James Whitney and the Conservative
Party to power and the commission's appointment later that year. Unfortunately, official minutes of the legislative debates from that time period do not exist, but the Ontario Legislative Library does have reports of the proceedings of the legislative assembly debates covered by *The Globe* daily newspaper for the period 1904-1907. These materials must be used as a proxy for the verbatim Hansard reports of legislative debates on record since 1944.

The third phase of research involved delving into the personal papers and archival materials of individuals serving on or associated with the commission. This includes personal papers of the Honourable James Whitney and Professor Goldwin Smith at the Archives of Ontario (Smith, 1871-1910), materials remaining from the work of the commission housed at the archives of the University of Toronto (Cody, 1905-1906) and personal papers of President Jacob Schurman from the Cornell University archives (Schurman, 1867-1942). It also involved delving into the lives and influences of these individuals, such as a review of Goldwin Smith's autobiography, *Reminiscences* (Smith, 1911), political and academic writing (Smith, 1891; Smith, 1881) and Michael Bliss's biography of Joseph Flavelle, *Canadian Millionaire* (Bliss, 1992).

Commissioner Reverend Canon Cody's personal papers from the commission include notes of the commission's meetings. The commission met a total of seventy-five times between October 4th, 1905 and April 3rd, 1906. At their October 11th meeting, and on Goldwin Smith's suggestion, the commissioners
agreed that only "brief minutes" of the meetings would be recorded. Some of the meeting minutes are as succinct as "university questionnaire decided" (Cody, 1905-1906). Unfortunately this means that there isn't a well documented record of the commission's debates and discussions. As a consequence it is therefore necessary to consider other personal correspondence and peripheral writings for insight into the thinking behind the commission's recommendations.

Despite the brevity of the meeting minutes, they do provide some clues to the influences that were acting on the commission's deliberations. At its third meeting on October 25th, Goldwin Smith articulated his view of the central concern of the commission; "(Bissell) purpose of the university... to impart culture or to add to the knowledge of the students for practical purposes in after life?" (Cody, 1905-1906). While it is possible to interpret Smith's comment as referring to scholarly knowledge for the purposes of academic research, which may indicate a predilection for the German university model of graduate education, Smith's own writing on higher education and his connection to New York State's Cornell University strongly suggest "practical purposes" refers to economic development, applied research and students' career preparation "after life" in higher education.

Notes from the early meetings also indicate that commissioners Flavelle and Cody attended the October 17th American National Conference of University Trustees in Illinois. Also noted are two days of personal meetings which took place in Toronto between the commissioners and Professor Jacob Schurman,
president of Cornell University. According to the minutes of the commission’s
November 4th and 6th meetings, Schurman addressed the commission on
“various points in connection with university administration” (Cody, 1905-1906).

Finally, an extensive understanding of developments in American higher
education was required to identify the sources of some of the commission’s
recommendations for the University of Toronto. This included drawing from
general treatments of the history of American higher education (Brown, April 10,
1903; Rudolph, 1990; Thelin, 2004). It also required a more detailed
understanding of how private chartered universities in the United States inherited
the autonomy they enjoyed at the time of the commission (Herbst, 1982; Trow,
2003) and the educational implications of land grant funding provided by the
United States federal government to support State involvement in higher
education (Halliday, 1890; Lang, 2006; Lang, 1978; Parker, 1924).
Politics and Higher Education: The University Question

In the spring of 1904, the Honourable George W. Ross was four and a half years into his first mandate as premier of Ontario, rounding out over thirty-six years of Liberal governance of the province. And yet, in all that time, no government had been able to settle ongoing questions around higher education in the former Upper Canada. The most significant question, whether a university supported by public funds should be sectarian, was settled in 1849, when Premier Robert Bawldwin successfully passed legislation abolishing Upper Canada's Anglican King's College, replacing it with the a secular University College and creating a new University of Toronto (McKillop, 1994). However, debate over the focus and purpose of the university did not abate. If anything, it increased over time.

In the late 18th century, the role of higher education in the British colonies of Upper and Lower Canada was seen by the colonial authorities as a stabilizing influence. This desire was part of a larger strategy to stave off the republican, revolutionary sentiments which had lost Britain the American colonies. In the eyes of John Graves Simcoe, Upper Canada's first Lieutenant Governor, education would help secure British influence and culture amidst the barbarism of a new land (McKillop, 1994).

The most imposing figure in Upper Canadian higher education at this time was John Strachan, the Church of England's Lord Bishop of Toronto. A member of
Upper Canada's ruling oligarchy, the 'Family Compact', Strachan agreed with Simcoe's vision for education in Canada. Through Strachan's efforts to secure a university charter from the British crown, Toronto's first higher education institution, King's College, began awarding degrees in 1843, just two years following the legislative union of Upper and Lower Canada, the modern day provinces of Ontario and Quebec, respectively.

However, Strachan had actually brought King's Charter to Upper Canada from England in 1827. The intervening sixteen years are evidence of the political volatility surrounding higher education at the time. The legislatures of both Upper Canada and the United Canadas debated a total of sixteen different bills to enact the King's College charter between 1827 and 1843. These proposals were defeated by opposing forces who thought that the proposed bills did not go far enough to support a social mobility and market orientation for the college or who thought that Canada's universities should preserve the existing order, in the interests of peace and stability (Friedland, 2002).

The question of political and social mobility was a key public policy issue. Lord Durham, dispatched to the Canadas by the British government to assess the causes of the short lived 1837 and 1838 rebellions in Upper Canada, concluded that the ruling oligarchies of the Canadas, notably the Anglican "Family Compact" in Upper Canada, were preventing each province from achieving its economic and political potential. Further complicating this political concern were increasing
numbers of immigrants representing non-Anglican Christian denominations. Between 1842 and 1862, the combined number of Presbyterians and Methodists in Upper Canada alone was double that of the Anglicans (McKillop, 1994). In the context of public institutions, such as a publicly financed and supported college, this significant numeric imbalance brought the question of religious affiliation into sharp focus.

As a consequence, these religious denominations initiated their own efforts to build institutes of higher learning and religious instruction. Methodist Egerton Ryerson secured a charter for a Victoria College after considerable lobbying of the legislature. Likewise, the Presbyterian community sought out a charter from the crown for a new Queen's College, to be established in Kingston. However, scarcity of resources led the newly founded Queen's to approach King's and Victoria Colleges about forming a partnership – a single university with separate divinity schools. For Queen's and Victoria, this would permit them to access the sizable endowment provided to King's by the legislature of Upper Canada. Ultimately, this proposal failed for two reasons. The first was the intolerance of the respective colleges' religious communities to subjugate themselves under a single institution. The second was that Anglican King's College had no real incentive to share its resources with the two other colleges.

This would not be the last time an attempt would be made to force the increasing number of sectarian colleges into a single university. On October 12, 1843,
Robert Baldwin introduced a University Bill to the first Parliament of the United Canadas. The bill proposed to create a single University of Toronto, allowing the sectarian colleges to offer divinity instruction but centralizing the Faculty of Arts in a secular King's College, and physically moving all the participating colleges to Toronto. Not only was the proposed bill defeated, the issue also brought down Baldwin's young government.

A subsequent bill, introduced by future founding Prime Minister of Canada, John A. McDonald, proposed to permit the continued existence of independent sectarian colleges while providing some state funding to support them. Once again the bill was defeated. This defeat was brought about by two groups: those sectarian elements that did not have their own college to benefit from the proposed funding and those that held to the belief that any publicly funded university should be secular in nature and should centralize the multiple, rebel colleges. In the view of this second group, now growing in number, the university should reflect national interests, not those of religious factions, including the Church of England. The 1848 general election focused on the yet unresolved "University Question". The hustings' results supported those who favoured the secularization of higher education. This was an affront to members of the old Family Compact, including Bishop Strachan. The ascendancy of the Church of England in Upper Canadian higher education was coming to an end.
In 1849, Robert Baldwin once again introduced a University Bill. Arguably going further than his first attempt at a centralized university in 1843, the new bill proposed a single, secular University of Toronto to serve the province as a whole. This act of centralization involved the legislature taking direct control of the King's College endowment and placing government representation on the Senate of the new university. This meant there would be political, versus religious, oversight of all academic and administrative appointments. As an additional act of dispersing the old Anglican control of state-subsidized higher education, Strachan's King's College was abolished, in favour of a new, University College which would provide instruction in the new university.

John Strachan criticized the proposal as "a Godless college" without the moral or ethical instruction he saw as being central to higher education (Wallace, 1927). Strachan left for England that same year, to return to Toronto in 1851 with a Royal Charter for a new Church of England college, Trinity, which he located in the western outskirts of Toronto. However, as an Anglican college, Trinity was left on the same footing as Queen's and Victoria: without access to public funding and in serious financial trouble.

Refusing to abandon their own religious missions or their individually charted ability to confer degrees, Queen's and Victoria refused to join the new university of Toronto. Knox College, a Presbyterian divinity school composed of dissenters
from Queen's University, chose to affiliate with the new university and were permitted to continue offering religious education.

In one of its final acts of solidifying its power over the new University of Toronto, the government of Upper Canada annexed the old King's College building, forcing University College to relocate to an abandoned medical building close by to the original college grounds. The original King's College building was converted to a provincial lunatic asylum on the grounds of the modern-day Queen's Park (McKillop, 1994).

As a consequence of the university's public and political importance to the young Canada, the operation of the now secular University College and University of Toronto was closely tied to the will of the legislature and government representatives. The secular University of Toronto was intended to serve the province as a whole. A new University Act of 1887, which ushered in a significant round of college federations to the University of Toronto, including the Methodist Victoria College, also "continued – even intensified – government control of the university", meaning that "faculty members continued to hold their positions at the pleasure of the government, and the lieutenant governor, as visitor – in effect, the provincial government – had to consent to every act of the senate" (Friedland, 2002).
While this government control helped ensure that the University of Toronto served the social, economic and political needs of the provincial government, it also meant that university issues were prone to debate in the legislature. Throughout his term, Ontario Premier George Ross faced unrelenting attacks from his political rival, the Conservative leader James Whitney, on under funding of and interference in the operations of the university. In 1904, these criticisms were coming to a head.

In early 1904, the attacks on the government were focussed on two issues. The first had to do with the university’s requests for a physics building and laboratories to support a growing interest in scientific research. The second issue was the funding and creation of a department and appointment of a Chair of Forestry. The Minister of Education, Richard Harcourt, defended the government’s inaction on these two fronts, referring to government grants for the University of Toronto in 1904 totalling over one million dollars and expanding undergraduate enrolment to six hundred students (The Globe, March 15, 1904; The Globe, March 24, 1904). However, Whitney continued to express concern that insufficient support for the sciences was allowing Toronto to fall behind higher education in the United States. Reports of the March 22nd, 1904 legislative debates make specific reference to the forestry program at Ithaca, New York’s Cornell University, referencing the American institution as a model for the University of Toronto.
In addition to faculty and alumni, on March 23rd, 1904 the Canadian Manufacturer's Association and the National Trust Company, voiced the support of the business sector for increasing university grants to expand the University of Toronto's science-based programs (The Globe, March 24, 1904). The increasing pressure on the ruling Liberals to expand the government's support for the university brought the premier personally into the debate allowing Whitney to face off against Premier Ross in the legislative assembly. Whitney accused Ross's government of political interference in the university operations, including influencing faculty appointments and encouraging media attacks on the university president, James Loudon. Whitney went on to refer to increasing funding for higher education in the State of New York, arguing that if "Ontario did not spend more, it would soon fall so far behind that it could never recover, and the Provincial University would be of no value" (The Globe, April 20, 1904).

Ross continually denied political involvement in faculty appointments at the university or attacks on President Loudon, and defended his government's record on funding the university at the expense of other branches of education in Ontario (The Globe, April 20, 1904; The Globe, March 24, 1904). However, Ross dismissed the idea of a formal Department of Forestry at the University of Toronto. Whitney took this as the premier's inability to see the importance of applied education in the university. Embodied in the arguments between Ross and Whitney was a debate on the defining purpose of the University of Toronto; broad-based liberal arts education or increasingly specialized research as
represented by the growing field of applied and theoretical sciences. On April 19th, 1904, Ross articulated his view by arguing:

The foundations of the country rested not on one or two brilliant products of the university, but upon the masses, upon whose broad shoulders rested the government of the country; not upon the few, but upon the great multitude who earned their bread from the sweat of their brows. (The Globe, April 20, 1904)

Whatever his views on the matter, within a year, a general election would force Ross to the Opposition benches and bring Whitney’s university-reform minded Conservative Party to government.

The first meeting of the Ontario legislative assembly following the general election of February 1905 focussed on the new government’s plans for the University of Toronto. On May 17th, 1905, Premier Whitney described a number of new initiatives, including university funding for the creation of a new teaching hospital, the founding of a university science museum, a new physics building, facilities to serve applied instruction in botany and forestry, a convocation hall and the expansion of student residences. However, perhaps more importantly, Whitney signalled an end to the traditional budgetary approval process the province had subjected the university to in favour of a formula of annual grants. The new proposed annual grant scheme would devote a percentage of the annual succession duties collected by the province to the university. Whitney promised that this proposed funding mechanism would not be discussed until the next session of the legislature (The Globe, May 18, 1905). This announcement was made in the context of advances being made by universities in the United
States thanks to large public investments, relative to that funding provided by the legislature for the University of Toronto.

This new funding proposal represented a significant departure from how the province had funded the University of Toronto to date for a number of reasons. Prior to 1906, the university president had to present a budget to the premier and Minister of Finance for approval, allowing the province to decide which line items the government was prepared to finance and which items it would not support (Flavelle, 1906; Friedland, 2002; McKillop, 1994). This budget approval process would have invited political involvement in the operations of the university no matter what the intentions of the party in power. Everything from the appointment and remuneration of faculty, purchasing of laboratory equipment and maintenance of library holdings would have been subject to the scrutiny of the government. The institution of annual grants to the university, whatever its basis, would create the conditions to increase the separation between the university and the state. However, for all its faults, line-by-line budget approval also ensured maximum accountability between the university and its benefactor, the provincial government. With annual grants could come greater institutional autonomy, provided the government turned over the university's grant entitlement based entirely on the size of that year's succession duties.

Whitney's proposed grant scheme also gave the university a financial security that hadn't existed since the original King's College's endowment; the promise of
greater funding predictability. While it may have been extremely difficult to
precisely forecast the amount of funds succession duties would raise, a general
understanding of mortality rates in Ontario would at least give some indication of
future provincial grants. Annual line-by-line budget approval was subject to party
politics and the whims of the individuals in power in any given year. The
university would never be in a position to plan for its own academic and
organizational future under a line-by-line budget approval regime. And while not
necessarily perfect, Whitney’s proposed annual grant system raised the
possibility of a university planning for its own future.

At the same time the premier proposed a new funding scheme for the University
of Toronto, he also announced a review of the university’s operations and
governance. The May 18th, 1905 Globe reported that while the newly funded
projects got underway, “the Government would conduct a full inquiry, with a view
to a complete change in the administration” in order to “acquaint themselves with
the circumstances of the university” (The Globe, May 18, 1905). This is the first
recorded public reference Whitney made on what would become the Royal
Commission on the University of Toronto and University College, otherwise
known as the Flavelle Commission.
Goldwin Smith

Goldwin Smith and Oxford University

The first person Whitney formally contacted about serving on the commission was Professor Goldwin Smith. Goldwin Smith was considered a prominent member of the Canadian intelligentsia. He had emigrated from England to Canada in 1871, via the United States, marrying the widow of a former Toronto mayor whom he had met visiting relatives he had in Upper Canada (Smith, 1911). However, it wasn't Smith's familial connections that had afforded the high regard of a provincial premier. Smith had considerable experience in the world of higher education reform and political commentary and he had already shown that he had some influence on the new premier's views toward education, trade and the economic future of Ontario.

Goldwin Smith was born in England in 1823. Goldwin went on to study history and philosophy at Oxford and eventually became a professor of modern history at Oxford University in 1858. In Smith's views, the Oxford University of the mid nineteenth century had become very sectarian and overly religious. According to Smith, math and science had been "exiled" in favour of ancient languages (Smith, 1911). In 1854, two Royal Commissions of Inquiry, one for Oxford and another for Cambridge, were struck by the government to "inquire into the state, discipline, studies, and revenues of the University and Colleges of Oxford" (Smith, 1911). A fellow of Oxford at the time, Goldwin Smith was appointed as secretary and treasurer for the Oxford inquiry. He was considered a suitable
candidate because he had conducted research into the history of the Oxford colleges.

A Parliamentary Executive Commission followed the original Commission of Inquiry, and Smith was again one of the two secretaries appointed, the other being the Principal of Trinity College, Oxford, Samuel William Wayte. This new commission followed the election victory of the Liberal Party in the British Parliament. The English Liberal party was favourable to reform at Oxford. The Parliamentary Executive Commission's recommendations led to a new Oxford Act, which, according to Smith, "swept away the medieval statutes, opened the Fellowships and scholarships to merit, and practically transferred the University from classical to academic hands" (Smith, 1911).

Smith commented on his experiences with the two Oxford commissions in his autobiography, Reminiscences, edited and published posthumously in 1911. Smith was clearly in favour of the push for reform of Oxford, favouring, despite his own humanistic education, a focus on the hard and applied sciences for higher education in England. Reflecting back on the Oxford reform experience, Smith commented on the superiority of the American and Canadian higher education systems, which had made a concerted effort to bring trade and applied education into the university (Smith, 1911). By contrast, he argued that change at Oxford had continued into the twentieth century but nowhere near to
the level of scientific inquiry and practical science education present in North American universities:

The proper function of the University... at Oxford and elsewhere, still remains unsettled. The old idea was that the University in its educational capacity was to be a mental training-place and a seat for studies unremunerative in themselves... devoted to the teachings of things that were of no use. The new idea, which is gaining ground in America has almost displaced the old idea, is that the University is to be a mart of all kinds of scientific or superior knowledge, out of which each student is to choose the article most useful for his destined career... There is no essential antagonism between studies. (Smith, 1911)

Smith's support for applied learning and science in the university is clearly reflected in recommendations in the final report of the Flavelle Commission. One of the instigating factors of the commission was a growing political concern over adequate funding for the University of Toronto's science programs and provision for a new physics building (The Globe, April 20, 1904; The Globe, March 15, 1904; The Globe, February 10, 1904; The Globe, March 23, 1904; The Globe, March 24, 1904). The commission's recommendations clearly bolster the scientific capacity of the university.

**Goldwin Smith and Cornell**

In 1866, Smith resigned from his professorship at Oxford to look after his ailing father. In 1867, Dr. Richard Smith died. Goldwin began "casting about for a more worthy employment of his life" (Bishop, 1967). With little left to tie him to Britain, Goldwin Smith considered leaving England for the United States. Sometime earlier, he had met American professor Andrew White in London. White was in Europe on a faculty recruitment mission for a new university being built in Ithaca...
New York, named Cornell. Smith was on White's list of preferred academics to seek for the university. Goldwin was admired in much of the United States because he had argued that England should have supported the Union in the American Civil War, and his lectures on history and politics at Oxford had become legendary (Bishop, 1967). In White's own words "on arriving in London, I sought to engage (Smith) for the new university and was authorized by Mr. Cornell to make him a large pecuniary offer" (White, 1905).

Cornell's design and educational focus was intentionally unlike older American universities based on the English, undergraduate model. As condition of receiving New York's land grant revenue, this new university was to include practical education and be committed to giving poor youth the opportunity to access a university education (Bishop, 1967; Lang, 1978). This appealed to Smith's view of what English universities like Oxford were lacking, and he decided to become one of the founding faculty members of Cornell University. In 1867 Goldwin was appointed Cornell's professor of English and Constitutional History. Although he remained at Cornell for only two years, the experience profoundly impacted his life.

Smith's initial impressions of his new home were less than complimentary. He is quoted as having complained that Ithaca was a "rough place... barbarous so far as the comforts of life are concerned" (Ross, 1942). The university itself, however, was another matter. Smith's autobiography describes his time at
Cornell as "one of the happiest scenes of my life", noting that in his "chequered passage through life there is no happier incident than my connection with Cornell" (Smith, 1911).

It would be difficult to overestimate Goldwin Smith's abiding love for the university. Long after he left Cornell, Smith maintained personal contact with President Andrew White and his successors, particularly Jacob Schurman. In 1910, shortly before his death, Smith commented to White that "Cornell did more for me than I can ever do for Cornell" (Bishop, 1967). It was not for lack of effort on Smith's part. Smith donated considerable sums of money to Cornell, including twenty thousand dollars in January 1905 (worth approximately half a million dollars in 2007) for the building of Goldwin Smith Hall (Schurman, 1867-1942). He expressed wishes that his ashes be scattered on the grounds of Cornell (Smith, 1871-1910) and, after his death, he willed his entire 3,400 volume library to the university (Bishop, 1967). When Smith became very ill in 1905, he wrote a letter to Cornell president Jacob Schurman in March of that year saying "it is doubtful whether I shall ever leave home again. But if I do, it would be to pay one more visit to Cornell" (Schurman, 1867-1942). Although he may have been at Cornell for only two years, the experience obviously marked Smith, guaranteeing some link between Cornell University and the recommendations that would eventually come out of the Flavelle Commission.
Goldwin Smith and the Politics of Canada

In 1871, Smith left Ithaca to live with family near Toronto, Ontario. Shortly after the move, Smith met Harriet Boulton, window of former Toronto mayor William Boulton. They married on September 30, 1875, and Smith moved into his wife’s family’s home in Toronto, known as ‘the Grange’. According to the eulogy delivered at his funeral on June 9th, 1910, “when [Smith] came to Canada he was in the full power of his brilliant maturity” (Smith, 1871-1910). In spite of this, Smith claimed that he “never had any intention of entering public life in Canada” (Smith, 1911). Whether he changed his mind or if he felt that circumstances forced him to do otherwise, Smith became very much part of public life in his new adopted home.

One of the first observations Smith made upon moving to Canada was its "comparative weakness of patriotic ambition" (Smith, 1911). What he meant by this was that Toronto's wealthy elite were noticeably less philanthropic than those in the United States. This concern for lack of individual philanthropy in Canada could have had some influence over Smith's views on the necessity for adequate government funding for the University of Toronto. However, the observation itself may be problematic. Smith had formed a very strong and positive relationship with Cornell benefactor, Ezra Cornell (Bishop, 1967). As a consequence, he may have developed an overly optimistic view of the role of private donors in funding higher education.
Smith did use the insights he had gained from his previous academic study of the United States to consider issues affecting Canada. In 1878 Smith published a book entitled *The Political Destiny of Canada*. In the book, he argued the inevitability of a political union between Canada and the United States. This work was followed by *Canada and the Canadian Question* in 1891, which continued the thesis set out in *The Political Destiny of Canada*. Smith suggested that Canada's ongoing political fascination with the United Kingdom was ill-advised, and that the economic and political prosperity of Canada lay in the relationship it could have with the United States (Smith, 1891).

In a later work, *Essays on Questions of the Day: Political and Social*, Smith asserted that "American people are completely free from class division and jealousy... eminently law-abiding, and are on the side of government" compared to the scepticism, class division and unionism of Great Britain (Smith, 1893). He further argued that increasing cooperation between countries was the prevailing trend among civilized nations; "Mankind is being unified by the increase of intercourse among the nations, and conscious intelligence is gaining the ascendancy over unconscious evolution" (Smith, 1893). It was abundantly clear in this statement which nation Smith believes Canada should be working with. In all three works, Smith argued that Canada had more in common, economically, politically and socially, including a shared frontier temperament and a practical approach to life, with the United States than it did with any other country.
Smith's views on Canadian-American relations haunted him for the rest of his life. He was personally attacked by those who believed in Canada's place within the British Empire, and even faced public accusations of treason (Smith, 1871-1910). Despite this controversy, he continued to play an active role in Canadian public life, corresponding with academics and political leaders in both Canada and the United States. In 1904 he was honoured with the Presidency of the American Historical Association, although ill-health prevented him for attending his own inauguration ceremony (Smith, 1871-1910).

**Goldwin Smith and the University Question**

Smith provided an overview of Canadian history for readers of *Canada and the Canadian Question*, including discussion of the early university movement. Smith also took the opportunity to attack Bishop John Strachan and the other sectarian interests that had dominated Canadian higher education. Of Strachan, Smith commented that the former Anglican Bishop had been "shrewd, but not wise, the type of clerical politician, even more mischievous to the Church for whose interests he fought than to the State" (Smith, 1891). Of the old Canadian 'university question', Smith made his views very plain:

> Reconcentration [of Ontario's multiple, sectarian colleges] was accompanied by the admission of science and other utilities. The exclusively classical or mathematical University, though we may venerate its memory, is a thing of the old time and the old world. (Smith, 1911)

Smith concluded his commentary on Ontario's higher education system observing that Ontario's resources were inadequate to supporting even "one university worthy of the name. At length, happily for the advancement of high
university worthy of the name. At length, happily for the advancement of high
education, learning and science in Ontario, university consolidation has begun”
(Smith, 1891).

Goldwin Smith and His Second Royal Commission

Smith, perhaps more than any other member of the commission, had significant
influence on the ultimate outcome of the commission’s deliberations. In a May
7th, 1905 letter to Smith, Premier Whitney stated that:

I have been overwhelmed with work of various kinds lately and expect that
state of affairs to continue to the end of the session. I hope, however, to
have an opportunity to confer with you for a few minutes about the end of
the week with reference to our proposed action on the University question.
(Smith, 1871-1910)

Whitney and Smith were in agreement on a number of issues, not the least of
which included the separation of Church and State, particularly where the topic of
education was concerned (Friedland, 2002). In the same period, Smith was
writing a great deal on the question of state-sponsored separate school boards in
the new western provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan (Smith, 1871-1910) in
addition to his criticism of sectarian divisions in higher education (Smith, 1891;
Smith, 1893; Smith, 1881; Smith, 1911).

Whitney exhibited a high regard for Smith and clearly invited the academic to
influence the direction of the new commission on the future of the University of
Toronto. Whitney wrote to Smith again on July 19th, 1905:

I have been anxious to consult you with reference to the composition of,
and methods to be pursued by the Commission which I expect will be
issued by the Government to deal exhaustively with the university question... The first point with which to deal is the question of who shall be the head of the Commission. It is the earnest wish of my colleagues and myself that you will consent to take this place... In order to meet any possible objection on your part I may suggest that a Deputy Chairman may be appointed, and that I suppose a subcommittee of three or perhaps four will visit similar institutions in the United States in order to gather evidence which will be of great importance. (Smith, 1871-1910)

This letter became the founding terms-of-reference for the commission, and guided their work in the months to come.

Although Smith declined the invitation to head the commission due to the state of his health, he had already exerted a profound impact on the direction the commission would take. Shortly after Whitney's election victory, Smith sent the new premier a copy of Essays on Questions of the Day. The premier referred to having read the book in correspondence with Smith (Smith, 1871-1910). At a minimum, the effusiveness of Whitney's letters to Smith suggests at least a benign support for, if not agreement with, the ideas Smith put forward in the book. These included greater American-Canadian cooperation, separation of church from publicly supported education and the need for science and applied learning in higher education (Smith, 1893).
The Appointment of the Commission

Premier Whitney announced the creation of the Royal Commission on the University of Toronto and University College in October 1905. The membership was drawn from the educational, political and business elite of Toronto (Alexander, 1906). Joseph Flavelle, a self-made millionaire in the meat packing industry and considered an “authority on industrial organization” (Wallace 1927), was named chair of the commission after Smith declined.

Of humble origins in Peterborough, Flavelle had never attended university himself. He came to be chair of the commission partly as the consequence of early public dissent regarding the commission’s composition. Although the University of Toronto and University College were non-denominational and considered secular, Christian denominations were still concerned that the interests of their particular colleges were being seen to. Flavelle had been the only Methodist named to the commission. Partly as a means of balancing denominational interests, Whitney named Flavelle as chair (Bliss, 1992).

All of the members of the commission went on to other high profile roles in public service following the completion of the commission. Flavelle went on to chair the Imperial Munitions Board, coordinating Britain’s industrial war machine during World War One (Bliss 1992), and remained in close contact with Smith until the latter’s death in 1910 (Smith 1871-1910). Of the other members, William
Meredith went on to become Chancellor of the University of Toronto, as did Byron Walker. Reverend Canon Cody became the Minister of Education and later served as the chair of the University of Toronto Board of Governors. Commission secretary, A.H.U. Colquhoun, later served as the Deputy Minister of Education (Wallace 1927). Goldwin Smith and Reverend D. Bruce Macdonald, along with all of the members of the commission, became the university's first new Board of Governors following the proclamation of the 1906 University of Toronto Act which arose from the commission's final report.
The Commission’s Timeline

The commission began its work immediately following the announcement by the premier. Holding its first meeting October 4, 1905, the commission met a total of seventy-seven times over a six month period (Cody 1905-1906). Most of these meetings occurred at ‘the Grange’, Smith’s Toronto home (Friedland 2002). The commission met with a number of University of Toronto bodies and representatives, including students, faculty, administration and alumni. It also met with external groups, such as the Law Society of Upper Canada, the Faculty and Alumnae of the Ontario Medical College, the Ontario Department of Forestry, the Mayor of Toronto, the Canadian Manufacturers Association and the College and High School Department of the Ontario Educational Association. The Ontario Ministers of Education, Agriculture, Lands and Mines and Public Works were given the opportunity to meet with the commissioners. The commission also took the extraordinary step of visiting several university campuses in the United States, while commissioners Flavelle, Cody and McDonald attended the October 17th 1905 meeting of the National Conference of University Trustees in Illinois (Cody 1906-06). The commission covered a great deal of ground in the six months it considered the future of the University of Toronto.

According to the minutes of the meetings, the commission spent from October 4th 1905 until January 19th 1906 receiving and considering presentations from invited parties, including its American campus visits. By January 22nd, the commission
had shifted gears, from consideration to deliberation, and began drafting its report to the Lieutenant Governor (Cody 1905-1906). The morning of March 1\textsuperscript{st}, 1906, the entire commission met with the premier and key members of Cabinet in the Privy Council Office at Queen's Park. They discussed the financial implications of the “new scheme of government to be suggested for the university” with the premier, only to reconvene as a commission again at 8pm that evening to continue their deliberations (Cody 1905-06).

On April 3\textsuperscript{rd}, 1906, they adopted their final report and presented it to the government. It included all their recommendation for the university, as well as a draft for a new University of Toronto Act which reflected the recommendations. The government endorsed the commission’s report and, on April 16, 1906, adopted the draft legislation with only one change\textsuperscript{1} (Friedland 2002). The commission had successfully restructured the governance of the University of Toronto and set the university on a new path.

\textsuperscript{1} In addition to an annual grant tied to a provincial succession tax, the Commission had recommended that one million acres of Northern Ontario be set aside as an endowment for the university. The government did not accept the land endowment recommendation.
The University Survey

The commissioners undertook a number of site visits but also circulated a written survey of those universities it felt were model institutions and leaders in higher education. Although these included token gestures to Oxford, perhaps based on Smith's involvement with an 1862 government review (Friedland, 2002; Roberts, 1932; Smith, 1911), and fellow Canadian universities Queen's and McGill, the commission's focus was clearly on activity in the United States. The commission's survey included Cornell University, the University of Pennsylvania, the University of Chicago, Columbia University, Harvard University, Leland Stanford University, the University of Minnesota, Princeton University, the University of Wisconsin, the University of Michigan and Yale University (Cody, 1905-1906).

The survey provides valuable insight into the areas the commission had identified as issues for the University of Toronto. The questions chosen included governance issues, the nature of the office of university president, breadth of curriculum and credentials offered, and funding and revenue. The survey started off asking if the responding institution was a "state university" and, if so, what official connections it had to government. At this time, there was an increasingly blurred line between 'state' and 'private' universities. While some institutions were being created from scratch through public funds, others, such as Cornell
University, were a complex mix of both private and public funding (Lang, 2006; Lang, 1978; Rudolph, 1990; Thelin, 2004).

A number of the survey questions spoke directly to the powers and responsibilities of the university president. Of the twenty-one questions in the survey, six dealt with the powers of the president over staff appointments, student discipline and involvement in university governance (Cody, 1905-1906). These questions spoke directly to the central concern of the commission – the management of the University of Toronto and the dysfunction that the university had been suffering under with its three person executive of president, Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor (Friedland, 2002).

Finally, a number of survey questions searched the issue of financing: How were institutions funded? What were the sources of that funding? Where was authority for management of those funds located? These questions spoke to the very close relationship between the University of Toronto and its principal benefactor, the Government of Ontario. It was this relationship, which included the provincial government’s influence on the management and deployment of funds within the university (Flavelle, 1906; Friedland, 2002; Stewart, 1970; The Globe, April 20, 1904) that had prompted Whitney to propose a Royal Commission on the University of Toronto in the first place (Friedland, 2002; McKillop, 1994; The Globe, May 18, 1905).
How did the commission decide which institutions to include in the survey? In its introductory letter to survey recipients, the commission explained that the "commissioners are most desirous of obtaining information in regard to the system of administration in the leading Universities on this continent" (Cody, 1905-1906). Although the commissioners surveyed some of the oldest and largest institutions in the United States, their list was by no means exhaustive. Some publicly supported land grant colleges, such as the University of Wisconsin, were included in the list. However, not all land grant colleges were selected, suggesting that the commission had some criteria for selection of institutions. It was also clear was that the commissioners were not looking exclusively at state-funded and controlled institutions, since institutions like Harvard, Princeton and Yale formed part of the survey.

Despite these differences, the University of Toronto had a good deal in common with the older private institutions in the United States. Although predating Toronto by over a century, the oldest American universities, including Harvard (founded 1636), Yale (1701), New Jersey (later Princeton, 1746), William and Mary (1693) and Dartmouth (1769), were founded by royal charter. These colleges' charters also included the same principles as the federated colleges of the University of Toronto, namely to educate their local populace, support specific Christian denominations and some suggestion of an educational mission amongst the aboriginal peoples of North America (Friedland, 2002; Rudolph, 1990).
Furthermore, even these old private institutions experienced some level of
government funding. Harvard benefited from the proceeds of Charleston,
Massachusetts ferry rents well into the 1800s, while Virginia’s College of William
and Mary benefited from Virginia’s tobacco tax and also housed the State’s land
management office (Rudolph, 1990; Thelin, 2004). In most cases the American
universities operated as monopolies, being the only degree granting body in their
respective colony. Although not a direct source of funding per se, monopoly
status guaranteed these institutions a source of income, through student fees, by
virtue of their government mandated charter. So, while these institutions may not
have evolved with the same level of government influence in institutional
management as the University of Toronto, they did share a sectarian history with
some blend of public and private support.

While these comparison’s held true for Toronto’s federated colleges, which at this
time included Victoria, Knox, St. Michael’s and Wycliffe, and the founding college
of King’s, they did not hold true for the founding of University College and the
university itself. University College had been intentionally secular from the day of
its inception and the university enjoyed both an endowment (inherited from the
defunct King’s College) and sporadic grants from the provincial legislature
(Friedland, 2002).

In 1862, Justin Morrill, a United States Senator, successfully negotiated the
presidential approval of their Agricultural College Act, leading to a small
explosion of higher education institutions. Later popularly referred to as the Morrill Act, this 1862 legislation provided 17,430,000 acres in land grants from western federal lands to State legislatures\(^2\), the sales proceeds of which had to be used for the creation of agricultural colleges. The envisioned colleges were intended to educate the largely rural American populace in practices to maximize agricultural production and conduct research into agricultural questions (Lang, 2006; Lang, 1978; Ross, 1942; Rudolph, 1990; Thelin, 2004).

The resulting application of these funds led to different models for an 'agricultural college'. These included State commissioned Agricultural and Mechanical, or 'A&M', colleges. However, it also included the creation of new, private-public hybrid institutions, like New York State's Cornell University. Cornell was the product of the combined effect of a private donor, Ezra Cornell, and the funds generated from the sale of New York State's land grant appropriation (Rudolph, 1990). Cornell's obligation to the agricultural nature of the federal land appropriation was realized through the introduction of advanced research into forestry and related sciences to an otherwise broad-based curriculum.

As early as the 1840-50s some American colleges were looking toward the technical institutes in France for emerging new faculties in natural and applied science. Support began to build for a new purpose for higher education in America. This new purpose expanded the borders of liberal arts and theology

\(^2\) By the terms of the 1862 Morrill Act, each State was given 30,000 acres for each Senator and Representative a State had as of 1860 (Rudolph, 1990).
study which had dominated the prevailing educational model of the existing
colleges. In the words of Cornell's first president, Andrew White, his institution's
founders' "aim had been to help in founding and building a worthy American
University" (The Cornell Public Library, 2005). This was a new vision for higher
education, and Cornell's early successes, including having the largest freshman
class in American higher education by 1871, raised the profile of this new type of
institution. Others were to emerge as well, Johns Hopkins University, and older
institutions followed suit, notably Yale and Harvard.

These 'land grant' institutions were born with a much stronger connection
between state and college by virtue of the relatively specific academic objectives
the institutions had in exchange for use of public funds. These new institutions,
different from the older, private colleges noted above, also shared common
features with the University of Toronto and University College. Like Toronto,
these American institutions were intentionally secular, in keeping with growing
public opinion on the use of public funds in education (Thelin, 2004).

Furthermore, there was an accountability mechanism established between the
state and the educators -- the educators were beholden to support the articulated
mission associated with the land grant proceeds. The institution was not an ivory
tower, but an educational institution in the service of the State's economic needs
and its people, at least in part. In several instances, the Flavelle Commission's
final report makes reference to the University of Toronto being "the state"
university of Ontario (Flavelle, 1906). Although it is difficult to tell if this reflected all the commissioners’ views before they surveyed and visited the institutions they targeted for study, it is clear that the ‘land grant’ universities had a significant impact in how the commissioners envisaged the University of Toronto.

The commission’s survey results reflect a diversity of governance, financing arrangements, structure and academic pursuits among the responding institutions. In some cases, the responses to the survey questions comprised point form notes and in other cases explanatory paragraphs provide insight into the operations of the responding university. In the case of Oxford, a significant portion of the completed survey was spent explaining how the questions did not pertain to that university’s federated structure (Cody, 1905-1906). Oxford’s response to the commission’s survey raises some interesting issues however. As a graduate and someone intimately knowledgeable of Oxford’s structures, Goldwin Smith would have known that a great deal of the survey would not be applicable to Oxford, so why send Oxford a survey at all? It also raises the question of the commission’s agenda. Oxford was unable to respond to questions dealing with central administration and financial control, citing its collegial structure as being incongruous with the survey’s suggestion of central executive authority. This suggests that the commission was focussed more on finding positive examples of centralized university authority than it was finding best practices for decision-making per se. The need for a strong president as
chief executive was presumably already in the minds of the commissioners long before the university surveys had left Toronto.

Unfortunately, it is difficult to surmise who completed the surveys at each of the responding institutions. It would be useful to know the author's identities given that various officers of a university may have had different perspectives on how their institution operates. A university president may not have characterized his decision-making authority in the same way as a Registrar, Board Chair, or Senate Chair would have.

The results of the returned surveys were compiled for the commissioners for ease of reference and comparison by question (Cody, 1905-1906). One of the unifying features of the American responses was the importance of the president's position. In all cases, the president was the single link between the academic functions of the institution and the governing board with fiduciary responsibility for the university. As part of these responsibilities, the president was responsible for making staff appointments himself or of recommending them to the Board. Furthermore, the president was characterized by most American respondents as the chief academic of the university and that the president was *ex officio* chair of all academic bodies within the institution.

This portrait of a president was a far cry from the situation described by Oxford in its response to the commission (Cody, 1905-1906) and from the reality faced by
the University of Toronto at the beginning of the 20th century (Friedland, 2002; McKillop, 1994; Wallace, 1927). It is important to note that in its final report, the commission drew heavily from the presidential structure found amongst most of the American institutions, casting the president as final arbiter of most academic matters (and non-academic matters in the case of student discipline), including staff appointments, and consolidating the authority of the president as the single link between an academic senate and the proposed Board of Governors (Flavelle, 1906).

Also common was the existence of a Governing Board, the membership of which was appointed by groups external to the university community (the two exceptions being the Corporations of Harvard and Yale, which both included some internal representation). This principle of external 'expert' managers was a theme drawn heavily upon within the commission's final report to the Ontario government. These recommendations were in the spirit of the government's desire to increase the separation between university and state. Although the commission concluded that the government should still be responsible for nominating the Board members, this approach was not inconsistent with the state universities included in the survey, including Wisconsin, Michigan and Minnesota.

The merging of public resources and private control became a central feature of the Flavelle Commission's final report. Although careful to characterize the University of Toronto as the "state university", the commission's report was
equally adamant that the direct control the Ontario government had been exerting over the university was untenable. Early in the commission’s report it states:

To administer the affairs of a State University by a political government, occupied with different matters, constantly changing its party character, and gifted with no special talent for the management of universities, has not commended itself to a practical and progressive people. (Flavelle, 1906)

The key to proper governance of the university was separation of the state from the management of the university, while maintaining a public commitment for funding. Citing the examples of Minnesota and Michigan, the report states that the “tendency now is for the Legislatures to vote the necessary supplies without hesitation, and to leave the university authorities to management of the institution” (Flavelle 1906). The role of the state, according to the commission, was limited to two functions: the appointment of governors for the university board and ensuring adequate funding is available to that board for management of the university.

This was a sharp departure from how the University of Toronto had been controlled by Queen’s Park since the dissolution of King’s College, which had included the university president coming to the provincial premier, Minister of Education and Minister of Finance on an annual basis for approval of the university’s budget (Friedland, 2002). This annual budgetary approval process opened the door to political influence in academic and personnel decisions made by the university. It also brought the management of the university into the
provincial legislative debates, leading to the criticisms of partisan interference in and mismanagement of the university that Whitney and the Ontario Conservative party had levelled against Ross and the governing Liberals prior to the 1905 general election (The Globe, April 20, 1904; The Globe, March 15, 1904; The Globe, February 10, 1904; The Globe, March 24, 1904). The new approach of university management recommended by the commission, in which professional academic managers are extended the flexibility and freedom to plan with increased financial freedom from the legislature, was taken directly from the commission's study of American university governance.

Where the American survey respondents differed the most was in how they were funded. Based on the survey results, many institutions enjoyed sizable endowments from which they drew operating income. Others described access to annual grants from their respective state legislature, while indicating that these funds were seldom sufficient to cover all operating costs. All mentioned some level of private philanthropy and all charged students tuition, typically on a differentiated scale depending on the program. These fees varied from as low as $20 per year for out-of-state Arts students at Leland Stanford University in California to an annual fee of $250 for applied science and medicine at New York's Columbia (Cody, 1905-1906).

The commission's final report takes lessons from both the privately endowed American universities and the new state-funded institutions. The report
recommended that the Ontario government provide a stream of annual grants to the university by giving Toronto the proceeds of the province’s succession duties. However, in the interests of providing the greater stability enjoyed through endowment, the commission recommended that the province gift “at least” one million acres of north-western Ontario to the University of Toronto (Flavelle, 1906). It was the one recommendation in the commission’s report that the provincial government did not accept.

The commission also addressed the question of academic quality and diversity. The University of Toronto had been suffering from competition for faculty and students with American institutions from King’s College’s inception. At first, the competition was for faculty coming from the United Kingdom, but by the early twentieth century this competition extended to graduates of the University of Toronto itself (Friedland, 2002). As a consequence, there was growing concern that lack of resources to support scientific study was contributing to the University of Toronto losing ground to the increasingly science-focussed and research-based American universities (Flavelle, 1906).

The commission’s final report made a number of recommendations regarding the resources the university needed to make it competitive for scholars in a North American market. The commission characterized the University of Toronto as more than an institution serving local needs. The commission’s final report describes the University of Toronto as a national institution that must serve the
interests of all of Canada. Although some the report makes specific recommendations on the creation of new, applied faculties in education, forestry and engineering within the context of Ontario's economic need, reference is made to competition for students and faculty in these areas from south of the border:

That among the young graduates the workers were and are available may be seen from a consideration of the list of those who have gone to other Universities to follow the career denied them at home. It is no small satisfaction to the friends of the University [of Toronto] that it should have trained the successor of Dr. Osler in the Chair of Medicine in Johns Hopkins University and the successor of Dr. Barker in the Chair of Anatomy in the University of Chicago, and that it should have developed the desire for research among not a few of its graduates who worthily represent it in the great Universities of the United States. (Flavelle, 1906)

Furthermore, significant emphasis was placed on the resource-intensity of these areas of study and that failure to meet these resource needs will leave Toronto at a competitive disadvantage. The purpose of the commission's recommendations was to make the University of Toronto a competitor with the best of its American sister institutions, not simply a cheap imitation of them. The universities of the United Kingdom and Canada, while relevant, were not seen to be adequate comparators for what the Premier and the commission aspired to for the University of Toronto.
The ‘University Movement’

The creation of institutions like Cornell University helped to hasten the transformation already underway in American higher education, the blending of theoretical and applied knowledge with vocational ideals. Lang argues that these ‘land grant colleges’ were the catalyst that permitted the broad transformation of the prevailing American “liberal arts or ‘classical’ college” from an adapted English educational model to the Germanic-inspired universities (Lang, 2006). While it would be difficult to overestimate the impact of the resources provided through the Morrill Act of 1862 (and subsequent 1890 legislation), it would not be correct to assume that the growing focus on research and applied education came about because of the land grant acts.

Notwithstanding the early inspiration of the French technical institutes, Baltimore’s Johns Hopkins University followed a slightly different path. Founded in 1867 after intense and broad study of existing American colleges, Hopkins was designed following the German model of higher education (Thelin, 2004). Clearly defining the concept of graduate education, Hopkins’ focus was not so much education as research. As a consequence, the faculty rather than the students were the central concern of the university. This again was a new concept for higher education in North America and provided yet another interpretation of what the term ‘American university’ could mean.
In 1884, a political science professor at New York’s Columbia University, John Burgess, published *The American University: When Shall it Be? Where Shall it Be? What Shall it Be?* The book advocated that modern universities needed to be urban, privately controlled and focussed on advanced scholarship, including research and graduate studies (Thelin, 2004). Burgess challenged the older American colleges, like Princeton, which had continued to vociferously campaign against the ‘university movement’ (Rudolph, 1990) to embrace applied science and research on a grand scale. The increasing orientation toward research and graduate study led to a separation between the emerging American universities and all other institutions of higher education. In 1900, this separation manifested itself with the formation of the Association of American Universities (AAU) by fourteen self-declared ‘universities’. These were Harvard University, Johns Hopkins University, Columbia University, the University of Chicago, the University of California, Clark University, Cornell University, Catholic University, the University of Michigan, Leland Stanford University, the University of Wisconsin, the University of Pennsylvania, Princeton University and Yale University (Rudolph, 1990). It is worth observing that the Flavelle Commission included nine of these fourteen universities in its institutional survey, and only one of the American universities included in the survey, the University of Minnesota, was not also represented by the AAU.

While the commission may have looked to the United States for how to transform the University of Toronto into an ‘American university’, it also spent considerable
time looking inward. Over the course of its six months of consultations, the commission met with and heard from the heads of the federated colleges as well as other interested parties within the existing university. The commission was keen to maintain the delicate balance that had been achieved between the federated colleges and the central authority of the university, and this was something that few of the American institutions the commission looked to had to contend with.

The commission saw the real value of retaining the positive aspects of student identification with their college; “the value of the residential [college] system has been abundantly demonstrated both in the Old World and the New” (Flavelle, 1906). The commission also recognized that Toronto’s college system was “not exactly parallel to that of either an American or a British university... Through federation we have developed a form of organization that is unique” (Flavelle, 1906). Ultimately, useful and unique enough to ensure preservation in the commission’s final recommendations:

The combination of a State college [University College] and denominational colleges provides variety of ideal and spirit, and avoids the dead level uniformity that might ensue in one large individual body, and furnishes to each member the needful stimulus of healthy rivalry. (Flavelle, 1906)

The federated colleges of the University of Toronto helped ensure students received individual attention for educational and disciplinary matters, while the university gave academic breadth and achieved economies of scale for resource-intensive scientific equipment. There is a sense in the final report of the
commission that the University of Toronto’s federated colleges give the university the best of both worlds in higher education. On the one hand, the federated colleges provide the close knit undergraduate community of the traditional liberal arts college, while on the other hand, the larger institution provides the diversity and scholastic depth of a university. In this sense, the commissioners were actually promoting a new kind of ‘Canadian university’; comparable to the American institutions they looked to for best practices while retaining elements of the University of Toronto’s history. However, recognizing the usefulness of the federated colleges in a larger university structure did not diminish the commission’s recommendations around a much stronger, centralized university administration.
Cornell and Jacob Schurman

Given Goldwin Smith's prominent place within the commission, it is not surprising that Cornell University came to be singularly featured in the final report. One of two university presidents thanked personally in the commission's final report (Flavelle, 1906), then-Cornell president Jacob Schurman had regular contact with Smith before, during and after the commission's work. In fact, an April 12, 1906 letter from Smith to Schurman makes reference to a draft of the commission's report Smith sent to the Cornell president for his review (Schurman, 1867-1942). While it is unclear whether or not Smith shared the report before it had been officially approved by his fellow commissioners, it is most certainly the case he sent the report to Ithaca before it had been endorsed by the provincial government.

Schurman may have had a personal interest in the future of the University of Toronto. In spring of 1906, long-suffering University of Toronto president, James Loudon, resigned his position (The Globe, May 11, 1906; Wallace, 1927). Loudon had faced increasing criticism from students, faculty, government and other university administrators (Friedland, 2002). As the commission concluded its deliberations, commission chair Joseph Flavelle had told Premier Whitney that the restructured could not be led by Loudon (Friedland, 2002). The search for a new president went on for almost a year, concluding long after the new University of Toronto Act 1906 had been adopted. Whitney's hopes that the new Act would
forever silence legislative debate over the university proved futile when his
government was criticized in the assembly on January 29, 1907 by the new
leader of the opposition, George Graham, for the lack of a permanent university
president (The Globe, January 30, 1907)³.

However, this is not to suggest that suitable candidates had not been found. A
short October 29, 1906 letter from Goldwin Smith to Jacob Schurman may
suggest that Smith was working to bring Schurman to Toronto:

Secrecy is desirable to prevent gossip here...We are very glad to know
that we may still hope to see you and Mrs. Schurman before long. Still no
President of the University. Prejudices of one kind or another confront us
on all sides. (Schurman, 1867-1942)

Unfortunately, Schurman’s reply to Smith’s letter, which could confirm Smith’s
intentions around the University of Toronto presidency, has proven elusive.
However, although inconclusive, Smith’s letter to Schurman raises the possibility
that the Englishman supported a Schurman candidacy for the very president’s
position Schurman had played a role in reforming. If Schurman has been
considering a move to the University of Toronto, it would have been in his
interests to ensure that the reformed president’s office had the authority to
operate in a manner Schurman had grown accustomed to at Cornell. It would
have been clear to those familiar with the University of Toronto that James
Loudon was disliked by both members of the government and the university as

³ Shortly after Whitney’s election victory, former Minister of Education, Richard Harcourt
prophetically commented, as reported by The Globe, the new “Premier sought finality [on the
university issue], but Mr. Harcourt believe that this was impossible... the university question
would ever be with them” (The Globe, May 18, 1905).
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early as 1904 (Friedland, 2002; The Globe, April 20, 1904; The Globe, March 23, 1904), so it is possible that Schurman could have been strategizing to become Loudon’s replacement from an early stage. It is also possible that Smith had been strategizing on Schurman’s behalf, with or without Schurman’s knowledge. However, Schurman did eventually ask that his name not be considered for the presidency of the reformed University of Toronto. After the 1906 University Act had been adopted, Schurman wrote “I am bound to Cornell by ties of affection and of interest in my work and I will never leave it to take a place in another university” (Friedland, 2002).

But who was Jacob Schurman? Based on his personal correspondence, he believed in strengthening the link between the United States and Canada as Goldwin Smith did (Schurman, 1867-1942). This view may have arisen from Schurman’s own upbringing. He was born in Freetown, Prince Edward Island, May 22, 1854. His family had emigrated from New Rochelle, New York, during the American Revolution. Schurman left Canada to pursue an academic career and, supported by scholarships, he earned two degrees from the University of London and a doctorate from the University of Edinburgh. He travelled and studied in Germany before returning to Canada to take up teaching posts at Acadia College in Nova Scotia and then became Professor of Philosophy at Dalhousie University in Halifax (Bishop, 1967).
A chance meeting between Schurman and Andrew White in Berlin, during the same European trip when White recruited Goldwin Smith, led to Cornell stealing Schurman away from Dalhousie. White was a great supporter of Schurman and the Cornell president had major impact in Schurman’s thinking on governance of universities and the relationship between the university and the state. In a public address Schurman gave four years before becoming Cornell president himself, he argued that a good university should embody three principles: “universality” of access for qualified and motivated students, fitting the curriculum to meet the “general needs” of the economy and industry and adaptable to changing conditions (Bishop, 1967).

Schurman drew inspiration from the work and opinions of his predecessor, Andrew White. White’s time in Germany had led him to conclude that governments have an obligation to financially support higher education, including that which is privately administered. Schurman adopted this perspective as well (Bishop, 1967), helping justify Cornell’s somewhat unique position of being a private university as well as the recipient of the State of New York’s portion of the Morrill Land Grant Act (Lang, 2006; Lang, 1978; Parker, 1924; Rudolph, 1990; Thelin, 2004).

Schurman also believed in a clear bicameral separation between the financial governance and the academic governance of a university. In a letter to Leland Stanford University in 1903, Schurman argued:
The principle for which I have always stood is a complete divorce between the businesses of the University and the work of instruction, investigation, and discipline. This latter should be vested exclusively in the faculty. The business belongs as exclusively to the Board of Trustees... When a Board of Trustees goes beyond their function and undertakes to direct the education work of the University, I consider [the Board] guilty of a fatal usurpation. (Bishop, 1967)

In this statement, Schurman articulated the argument for bicameralism as a principle for ideal university governance; academic Senate whose membership is drawn from the university itself balanced by a financial Board with external membership. The same sentiments were later echoed in the recommendations of the commission's final report. The commission vested "the control and management of the University" in a Board of Governors, while asserting that the "Senate... should direct the academic interests of the University" (Flavelle, 1906).

Perhaps more importantly, however, was the role of the university president in Schurman's ideal university governance model. The president should not carry a veto at either the Senate or the Board. Although the Chief Executive of the university, the president is bound by decisions made by the Senate and the Board, so where does the president's authority come from? According to Cornell University's completed commission survey, the power of the president's office arises from two circumstances. The first is that the president is the only person who is a member of all university boards and committees. Consequently, the president is in a position to understand the context of all decisions being made at the university and may influence decision-making based on this actual, or perceived, position of authority. The second is that the president proposes all
nominations of university appointments, so that neither the Senate nor the Board may make appointment decisions without the approval of the president (Cody, 1905-1906). This was also included in Schurman's recommendations to Stanford (Bishop, 1967).

A final advantage that Schurman left out, though, is that the president is also the only person to sit on both the Senate and the Board, thus bridging the two decision-making bodies and being privy to the details of each body's deliberations. This unique position was not lost on the members of the commission. The report states that the president "should be, in general, the channel of communication between the Governors and other academic bodies" (Flavelle, 1906)⁴. The commission report also conveys the power over all faculty appointments to the president, as described by the completed university survey from Cornell, arguing that the Board may hold the president accountable for the overall academic status of the university but not individual faculty members and that the president should be considered a member of all university academic committees (Flavelle, 1906).

⁴ This point would later become a source of concern raised during the 1970 review of the University of Toronto's governance structure (Bissell, 1970).
The Commission Report and Recommendations

The political purpose of the commission was relatively simple – to design and recommend a new university governance structure that would allow the university to run itself and keep university business out of the provincial legislature. However, it also had a number of other tasks, including providing recommendations on the financing and funding of the University of Toronto and the question of new science-based programs, like forestry and physics.

The commission’s final report starts off by examining the problems faced by the university under its current structure. The majority of the university’s issues were blamed on political interference, or, in the words of the report, the “exceptional and unsatisfactory method by which the powers of the Crown in relation to the university have been exercised.” The report goes on to suggest that “no parallel to this method exists within Great Britain or in North America”. (Flavelle, 1906). The criticism of the Ross government is clear, as is the unprecedented ability of a government to inject itself into the affairs of a university, such as faculty appointments and curriculum decisions.

The report identified three goals for its recommendations on a proposed university governance structure: cooperation between the various governance bodies, simplification of the central authority, and clearer definitions of “the place and working of each part in the whole” (Flavelle, 1906). The commission carefully
constructs the justification for one its most important recommendations, the establishment of an independent Board of Governors for the university, early in the final report:

To administer the affairs of a State university by a political government, occupied with different matters, constantly changing its party character and gifted with no special talent for the management of universities, has not commended itself to a practical and progressive people. We see no ground for the belief that this plan of direct State control, rejected abroad and in ill-repute at home, can be made a success in this Province. (Flavelle, 1906)

While one might argue that any democratically elected assembly does not necessarily have the specialist knowledge to manage any public institution, the commission's report presented a compelling argument for university management. Particularly useful was the report's reference to other jurisdictions, including Great Britain and the United States. However, the commission would still exercise judgement regarding which jurisdictions' universities it would consider as governance best practices.

Outlining the commission's mission, the final report considered the preceding fifty years of the University of Toronto's history, noting that the original King's College legislation of 1797 set aside 295,705 acres of land for the state university's "endowment and maintenance" (Flavelle, 1906). Legislation in 1853 consolidated the university's position as the province's single institution of higher learning. Based on the University of London model, the University of Toronto's constitution had the university fulfilling the role of an examining body rather than a teaching centre, in an effort to "prevent rise of little universities" (Flavelle,
1906). The irony of this mission would not have been lost on the commission or political leaders of the early twentieth century, since as recently as 1884 attempts had been made to bring Ontario's multiple degree-granting institutions under a single university.

The commission highlighted the need for adequate funding for the university. In doing so, it specifically referenced the escalating costs of science education and laboratory equipment. The legislative debates regarding funds for a new physics chair and building brought this issue into sharp political focus. The commission went even further, however, identifying growing support for science education at American universities as a source of academic competition, for students and faculty, and potential economic growth. In this case, the commission observed the activities of one university in particular:

The foundation and rise of Cornell University forced upon Canadian universities the alternative of setting up of costly equipment or of seeing their students go to the United States for training. (Flavelle, 1906)

The commission's recommendations were divided into a number of initiatives which may be broken into four main theme areas; governance and administration, academics, research and scholarship, and financing.

---

On July 24, 1884, Hon. George Ross, then the Minister of Education, convened a conference of the heads of the province's colleges and universities in an effort to find agreement on province-wide federation into one University of Ontario. The meeting included University of Toronto, University College, Victoria, Queen's, Trinity, St. Michael's, Wycliffe, Knox and Woodstock. An agreement was reached, although no formal report or minutes of the discussions were made. Both Queen's and Trinity ultimately refused to abide by the conference agreement. Given that Ross was the recently deposed premier at the time of the Commission's deliberations, this component of the Commission's final report would have been particularly poignant. It is worth noting, though, that Commissioner Goldwin Smith had also argued for a province-wide university federation in 1896 but was rebuked in print by Queen's Principle George Grant.
**Governance and Administration**

The recommended reforms to university governance and administration were arguably the most important, and influential, of those made by the commission. Notwithstanding its criticisms of past political interference in operations of the university, the commission repeatedly defined the University of Toronto as the “provincial university” or “state university”. This assertion is important for a few reasons. The first is that it clearly establishes the public responsibility for funding of the university, which becomes quite important to the commission’s recommendations around financing of the university. A second reason is that it provides justification for the appointment of the proposed Board by the government, via the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario.

The final reason, and perhaps less obvious, may have to do with the evolution of the American publicly-funded private universities, like Cornell University, from which the commission drew their inspiration for an independent university governing Board. In 1815, Dartmouth College president, John Wheelcock, had a dispute with the Dartmouth College Board over the appointment of a faculty member and the question of students’ mandatory attendance at chapel. The new governor of New Hampshire, William Plumer, sympathetic to president Wheelcock, but wanting to avoid an outright confrontation with the Board, attempted to amend the college’s charter to include a publicly appointed Board of Overseers to govern the college’s Board of Trustees (Herbst, 1982). The
Dartmouth Board saw this as an aggressive attempt to “wrest control of the college from its Board” (Thelin, 2004) so challenged the state legislature’s legal authority to alter the Dartmouth charter without the Board’s consent.

In the case of Trustees of Dartmouth College versus Woodward, the Superior Court of New Hampshire found for the state and the unilateral charter change was permitted. However, the college appealed the decision and, in 1819, the Supreme Court of the United States reversed the decision of Superior Court of New Hampshire, stating that although the college’s charter to grant degrees originated with the state and that the state provided Dartmouth with funding, the college’s charter was in fact a contract between the founders of the college and the legislature, and any change to that contract required the approval of both parties. In the absence of the original founders being present, the Supreme Court found that the Board of the college would act as the founders’ representatives (Herbst, 1982). As a consequence, the college was not in fact responsible to the State of New Hampshire, but was exclusively accountable to the college’s governing board (Rudolph, 1990).

Although an American legal decision, the Dartmouth decision would have impacted the recommendations being made by the commission. The Dartmouth decision had a profound impact on the evolution of higher education in the United States, and had a steering effect on university-state relations for the next century (Herbst, 1982; Trow, 2003). These were the same universities that...
the commission was considering in their deliberations regarding governance and the relationship between the university and the government. As a consequence, the commission's recommendations on university independence would be reflecting the impact of the United States Supreme Court Dartmouth decision, albeit in a second hand way.

In the 1819 Dartmouth decision, Supreme Court Chief Justice John Marshall noted that the original source of funding for the founding of Dartmouth was private, so that the college Charter was a contract made between the state and private citizens (Trow, 2003). Although the University of Toronto was publicly endowed, some of its federated colleges were not, so it would be important to emphasize that the university was a state institution in the final report of the commission, justifying the Government of Ontario's ability to make changes to the governance structure and components.

In its recommendations for a new governance structure for the University of Toronto, the commission noted in the states of Michigan and Minnesota that the "tendency now [is] for the Legislatures to vote the necessary supplies without hesitation, and to leave the university authorities the management of the institution" (Flavelle, 1906). The management of the University of Toronto would rest with a new fifteen member Board of Governors, to be appointed by the Lieutenant Governor with input from the premier. The Board would include two ex officio members, the revised positions of university president and Chancellor,
with the Chancellor representing the interests of the university alumni. The size of the Board was intended to be "sufficiently numerous as to permit [members] being drawn from different parts of the Province" (Flavelle, 1906) to reflect the diversity of Ontario. The Board would create the necessary buffer between the provincial government and the university, but not without limitations of its own: "The power of appointment should be vested in the Governors... the appointments of the teaching staff of the University, of University College and all Faculties... being made upon the recommendation of the President" (Flavelle, 1906). Confident in both the recommendation and the abilities of the commissioners themselves, the government adopted the commission's proposal and named the commission members as the first Board of Governors (Alexander, 1906).

The University of Toronto already had a Senate, and its continuation was endorsed by the commission. Part of the reason for this recommendation was to maintain the relative peace that existed between the university and the formerly independent federated colleges, such as Victoria and St. Michael's: "By their representation in the Senate, the federated institutions are secured in their right of sharing in the determination of academic policy". Although the commission conceded that most of the work for academic planning and decision-making would occur in the individual Faculty Councils, all Faculty Council decisions would be subject to the Senate.
One interesting aspect of the commission's recommendations around the University of Toronto Senate was the commission's concern that the Senate should embody a balance between academic interests and relevancy to the needs of the world outside the university campus. In its recommendations, the commission noted that "the composition of the Senate as a whole, while distinctly academic in its quality and outlook, should provide for a sufficiently large non-academic element" (Flavelle, 1906). Two groups to benefit from the commission's outlook on the University of Toronto Senate were Ontario high school teachers and University of Toronto alumni, who were believed to be able to "contribute to the Senate the stimulus of intelligent encouragement and criticism from their own ranks, thus helping keep the University more intimately in touch with the outside world" (Flavelle, 1906). This is markedly different from the Senates of the Canadian universities included in the commission's survey, whose membership was limited to the faculty of the respective university, but notably not unlike some of the American institutions (Cody, 1905-1906).

Of equal importance to the creation of an independent Board of Governors was the commission's revision of the office of the university president. Before the recommendations of the commission were adopted by the government, the University of Toronto had a three-person executive comprising a Chancellor, a Vice-Chancellor and a President (Alexander, 1906; Friedland, 2002; Wallace, 1927). At various points in the university's history, these three positions fulfilled varying, at times conflicting, roles. As a result, the university suffered from lack of
direction. The commission recommended collapsing the position of Vice-Chancellor into an invigorated presidential position. The commission had noted that while American universities had increased the powers of their presidents, the University of Toronto had eroded the authority of its president.

The commission also did not want to create a dictator: "The head of a great university, to be influential, must have wide powers, but he need not be supreme" (Flavelle, 1906). The president was freed from teaching duties, was made an ex officio member of the Board of Governors and was empowered to preside over the Senate. The ideal president had to represent qualities of an academic and manager. The president had to possess "the academic sympathies and qualifications which would make him a suitable chairman of the academic body, the Senate". However, in the words of the commission report, the test of a president's success "as an administrator will be his ability to secure the cooperation of the Governors since, lacking their ratification of his acts, all his efforts must be futile" (Flavelle, 1906). The Board and the president would have a symbiotic relationship; the Board needing the president to propose university appointments and generally act on behalf of the university, and the president needing the Board to approve his actions and keep the president, and through him the activities of the entire university, accountable to the public trust embodied by the Board.
The Chancellor, which had been an executive on similar footing to the president, was relegated to ceremonial duties, overseeing meetings of the university graduates. However, the commission saw this role increasing in importance as the body of University of Toronto alumni continued to increase, and, presumably, the university's capacity to fundraise. That said, the role of the Chancellor in the day-to-day life of the university was sacrificed in the interests of empowering the president's office in the interests of real leadership and firm administration.

**Academics**

The commission discussed a number of academic departments of the university, including practical science, agriculture, medicine, forestry, fine arts, music and veterinary medicine. In particular, the report made specific and important recommendations on practical science, forestry and the role of scholarship and research in the university.

The commission looked to the example of the newer, American land grant universities' prioritizing of engineering and agriculture, and compared that to the relative poor support provided to practical sciences in Canada:

> The policy pursued in the State-owned universities of the United States is to have the Faculties of Science and Agriculture in visible unity with the whole institution, and this has, doubtless, led to more generous endowments from the legislatures than if the claims of higher education had been less strikingly demonstrated. (Flavelle, 1906)

This position also provided the argument for combining independent schools of practical science with the state-funded university, like the union between Boston
Polytechnic and Harvard University (The Globe, May 3, 1906). At the end of the nineteen century, some branches of learning viewed as being beneath the mission of a university, in a classical English sense, were established as separate schools. The commission saw a value in bringing these separate schools under the tent of a single university, increasing the power of the university as a single institution of higher education and improving the ability of these schools to attract funding from the province. In this way the university would better address the needs of the country’s economy, with engineers, farmers and miners, and student demand, rather than losing them to American institutions (Flavelle, 1906).

A similar approach was taken with the commission’s approach to a proposed School of Forestry at the University of Toronto. Their principle concern was that Canada was not going to be in a position to fully exploit its forestry resources in the absence of scholarship in and students of forestry. More troubling, however, was that some American institutions were advancing in the area of forestry and were already in a position to usurp the University of Toronto for providing higher education in this area. The commission met with the head of the Forestry Department of the United States Federal government, Gifford Pinchot, who had created forestry curriculum at Yale, and while visiting Cornell, they met with “Professor Fernow, who was the founder of the School of Forestry maintained for a time by Cornell University” (Flavelle, 1906). The Americans convinced the commission of the value of such a school for Toronto:
It is surprising that Ontario, with its rich areas of timber, has hitherto failed to set up a school of forestry in its own University for the double purpose of providing technical training for young men in an important branch of science, and of benefiting in the conservation of its forest wealth by their knowledge and skill. (Flavelle, 1906)

The commission noted that given the national economic importance of the forestry industry, public support for a Faculty of Forestry within the University of Toronto could be justified. The report did point to the use of land grant funds for Cornell's School of Forestry as an example, acknowledging however that the school at Cornell had been relocated due to "a dispute with the State of New York" (Flavelle, 1906). The former United States Department of Agriculture forestry division chief and Cornell's former Dean of Forestry, Bernhard Fernow, was later named the dean of the new University of Toronto faculty of forestry in 1907 (Friedland, 2002).

**Research and Scholarship**

One unifying feature of the commission's proposed academic additions to the University of Toronto is that they would cost money. The commission echoed the criticisms that had been thrown at the Ross government by Whitney's opposition Conservatives regarding inadequate funding and lack of support for science education. The commission went even further however, picking up on the influence the German research universities had and were having on the American institutions they wanted the University of Toronto to partially emulate. The commissioners argued that faculty appointments must consider research ability as much as teaching skill. To be attractive to ideal faculty candidates, the
university would have to provide better equipment and resources for scientific research and free faculty time from teaching to conduct research (Flavelle, 1906). Both recommendations would carry a much greater financial burden, but also represented a paradigm shift in how faculty were viewed at the university at the time. This, perhaps more than any other recommendation made by the commission, would transform the University of Toronto from a loose collection of English-style colleges to a modern, American university.

The greatest threat to the future of the university, and a drain on the economic well-being of the province, was the loss of promising scholars to American universities prepared to make an investment in research and graduate study.

That among the young graduates the workers were and are available may be seen from consideration of the list of those who have gone to other Universities to follow the career denied at home. It is no small satisfaction to the friends of the University that it should have trained the successor of Dr. Osler in the Chair of Medicine in Johns Hopkins University, and the successor of Dr. Barker in the Chair of Anatomy in the University of Chicago, and that it should have developed the desire for research among not a few of its graduates who worthily represent it in the great Universities of the United States. (Flavelle, 1906)

Proper funding of labs and a new research-focussed faculty would stem the Canadian brain drain to the United States the commission believed to be taking place.

**Financing**

Shortly after the 1905 general election, Premier Whitney proposed significant increases to the public funding provided to the University of Toronto. The fomer
Minister of Education, Richard Harcourt, criticized this position, arguing that more funding would not guarantee a great university and that the funding regimes of the United States would not be an appropriate comparison for the University of Toronto (The Globe, May 18, 1905). The commission observed that there was continuing need for private support of higher education through "publicly-spirited benefactors" (Flavelle, 1906). However, as Goldwin Smith had noted in his autobiography, the report observed that American philanthropists were more likely to provide for their universities than Canadian philanthropists would provide for Canadian universities. However, the report also noted that public funding of state universities was also higher in the United States than in Canada. The commission pointed to the states of Wisconsin, Minnesota and Michigan as being similar to Ontario in overall wealth, but with much higher rates of public funding for their state universities.

Part of this disparity would have been attributable to the federal Morrill Act land grants, designed to support practical education at a postsecondary level. The commission recognized that in order for the government to enact the academic recommendations it was making, an infusion of new funds would be required. In order to support the recommendations around an independent Board to manage the university, the university would need an assurance of financial stability. Essentially, the commission needed to ask the government to invest in the university and then permit the institution to manage its own affairs without interference.
In order to find stable funding, the commission recommended that the province set aside a percentage of its succession duties, or inheritance tax, for the use of the University of Toronto Board of Governors. This idea had been suggested by Premier Whitney a year before, when the commission was being created (The Globe, May 18, 1905). The commission had noted that given Ontario's growing population and wealth, that these duties had grown from $228,360 in 1900 to $684,143 in 1905 (Flavelle, 1906). As a consequence, this source of funds was seen as a consistently growing pot and reflective of the access demands that the university would face with increasing population. However, in the interests of increasing funding predictability, the commission recommended that the province calculate the university's allotment of the succession duties based on a three year average of receipts. The traditional variability in the university grant would be erased by ensuring that the annual payment would not be less than $275,000 (The Globe, May 3, 1906). This annual grant formula would distance the government from influencing the budgetary decisions of the university, which would rest with the Board, and increase the autonomy the University of Toronto could enjoy.

As a final act of assurance that the university would have greater independence from the provincial government, the commission also recommended a new endowment for the University of Toronto. Drawing from the American experience of the Morrill Act land grants, the commission report stated that "throughout North
America little in the financial history of universities has been more noticeable than the good effect of large grants of wild land" (Flavelle, 1906). The province had recently resolved a land dispute with the province of Manitoba regarding the provincial border, resulting in new territory for Ontario. The commission recommended that at least one million acres of "New Ontario" be endowed to the university.

While every other recommendation of the commission's final report was included in the 1906 University Act, including the succession duty-based funding formula, the land endowment recommendation was not. This is important for a number of reasons. One of the stated objectives of the commission was to free the university from political interest. To accomplish this goal, the commissioners presented a reformed governance structure which removed direct decision-making abilities from the government and placed them in the hands of an, albeit government-appointed, Board of Governors. However, the commissioners recognized that their governance reforms would be toothless without affording the university some degree of financial independence from the province. Somewhat predictable annual grants, through the succession duties, removed the need for the university to present its budget to the province each year for approval, thus extending the university greater freedom.

However, the commission's recommended land grant would have provided an order of autonomy almost unimaginable today, so much so that the
recommendation almost appears ridiculous to modern eyes. The net result of accepting the commission's recommendations on reformed governance and formula-based annual grants was a buffer between the government and the university. Premier Whitney avoided explaining the government's rejection of the land grant recommendation, only saying that it would not be addressed during the that session of the legislature (The Globe, May 3, 1906) and, ultimately, not returning to the issue. Had the government also accepted that the university should also have a one million acre endowment of undeveloped, resource rich land, the government would have arguably turned the university in its entirety over to its new board and still been responsible for annual grants from the public purse. When the new University Act 1906 was introduced to the legislature, Premier Whitney argued that the government “did not wish the University authorities to be worried about what the Government might do from year to year” (The Globe, May 4, 1906). This did not mean making the University of Toronto entirely self-sufficient. Although prepared to increase the autonomy of the ‘provincial university’, the government was not prepared to entirely abdicate its influence over the institution.
University Autonomy and Accountability

Although Whitney’s Conservative government accepted the commission’s recommendations, save the land endowment, this did not mean that the report was endorsed by the opposition. At the very start of the commission’s work, the former Minister of Education, Richard Harcourt, asserted that the best manner by which to fund the University of Toronto was to “meet the wants and needs of a great and growing institution as they came up” (The Globe, May 18, 1905). This statement exemplified the previous government’s approach to the university, addressing its financial requirements through an annual review of the university’s budget or on an ad hoc basis. Whitney’s proposed predictable annual grant plan and arms-length governing board were a marked departure from the piecemeal approach to university planning and management practiced prior to 1906.

The commission’s proposed university governing board raised considerable concern among the government opposition. The Globe reported that the “Opposition doubted the wisdom of making the Board of Governors so independent as the [University Act 1906] provides... [with] no power over the Governors except that of dismissal” to which Premier Whitney responded that he “wished to remove any temptation to or opportunity for backstairs influence” (The Globe, May 4, 1906). Whitney’s response to the opposition to the new University Act drew from his earlier criticism of the Ross government’s alleged interference in faculty hiring at the University of Toronto.
However, Whitney's defence of the autonomy the commission report recommended for the university is not to say he was prepared to endorse an unaccountable university. Whitney later characterized the changes to the University of Toronto's relationship with government and new governing structure as a "reorganization of the university under the control of Governors appointed by my Ministers, who are responsible to this Legislature" (The Globe, May 15, 1906). When pressed on the standard to which new university governors would be held by the government, Whitney responded that he would not hesitate to dismiss a governor was acting irresponsibly (The Globe, May 4, 1906). The University of Toronto would not be entirely autonomous from the public will, but the university's accountability to government would be channelled through the new Board of Governors rather than through a direct relationship between the university administration and the government's cabinet office. This principle of public accountability through the agency of a governing board has survived in Ontario's university sector to this day, most recently upheld in 1993 by the Government of Ontario's Task Force on University Accountability (Broadhurst, 1993)
Conclusions

The impact of the Royal Commission on the University of Toronto and University College of 1905-06 travelled well beyond the University of Toronto campus. It established the relationship between the government and the publicly assisted universities of Ontario as the province expanded the publicly supported university education through the twentieth century. The commission also provided the governance template used for the establishment of new universities throughout Canada: a bicameral structure that trusted the guidance of publicly elected or appointed trustees over direct manipulation by government. This contributed to the considerable autonomy Canada's public universities enjoy compared to institutions in other jurisdictions (McDaniel, 1996; Ontario Council on University Affairs, 1995). The commission’s final report suggested that its recommendations were intended to govern the university for a period of fifty years. The Flavelle Commission’s report far exceeded that expectation.

The commission accomplished a remarkable amount in the short time it existed:

- The commission’s recommendations signalled the formal transformation of the University of Toronto from a English ‘collegiate’ education model to a North American ‘university’ model, with graduate study, a focus on research and scholarship and funding to support scientific inquiry;
- It established a new balance of institutional autonomy and public accountability, with a university governing body whose membership is
drawn from the local community representing various interests external to
the university, inspired by the American model of private university boards,
to manage public funding;

- It created a position of a strong president to administer the university,
  based on an American model; and
- It created the basic template of a funding relationship based on a core
  formulaic annual operating grant from the provincial government to its
  public university.

There were a number of factors at work on and within the commission, including
the political environment within Ontario at the time, the make-up of the
commission membership, the viewpoints and intellectual leadership within the
commission, a sea-change in American higher education that was taking place
from the 1850s-1900s and personal connections between the commission, the
University of Toronto and Cornell University in Ithaca, New York.

The debates of the parliamentary session before Premier Whitney's election are
telling. Whitney made great political hay of the Ross government’s involvement in
the affairs of the university, which he alleged were inappropriate. Whitney
articulated a clear and conscious direction for the commission to look to the
United States for best practices in higher education, as opposed to the United
Kingdom or even other universities in Canada. The provincial legislative debates
of 1904-06 Whitney was setting the stage for the commission to bring the University of Toronto into a North American context.

Evidence suggests that the government intentionally directed the commission to consider the American examples to aid reform in Ontario, going so far as to appoint a high ranking scholar reputed for his strong opinions on American-Canadian relations and with a strong personal connection to an American land grant institution. The recommendations found in the final report of the commission draw heavily from information collected from American universities, particularly Cornell University, which had a personal connection to the commission in the person of Goldwin Smith and a Canadian connection through Cornell president, Jacob Schurman.

Smith's influence on the commission's and the future of higher education in Toronto appear to predate the commission itself. Premier Whitney had been communicating with Smith before the striking of the commission, and he had at least read Smith's arguments for increased cooperation between Canada and the United States. The familiarity present in Whitney's correspondence with Smith (Smith, 1871-1910) suggests an agreement of ideas if not total agreement between the Premier and the retired academic. It is likely that Smith had a profound steering effect on the commission through influence on the Premier.
Smith's and Jacob Schurman's influence on the conclusions of the commission may be seen through the writings by and about these two men. Smith's views on the United States and the value of applied education within the curriculum of the university speak loudly from the pages of the commission's final report. Schurman's positions on the blending of private management with public funding in the university sector and the responsibility of government toward higher education are also clearly represented. While the final report of the Royal Commission on the University of Toronto and University College is not exclusively the product of Goldwin Smith and Jacob Schurman, their influence on the outcomes of the commission was considerable.

But what significance does the various influences on the Flavelle Commission hold for Ontario's university system more than a century after the final report was tabled with the provincial government? Although a detailed analysis of the genealogy of the commission's recommendations is outside of the scope of this paper, it is possible to see the commission's legacy in the early twentieth century. The predominance of the bicameral governance structure in the Canadian university sector, the existence of largely predictable block operating grants between provincial governments and universities, and the principle of autonomous universities accountable for public funds through lay governing boards were all articulated by the commission's final report and all continue to this day. Many of these ideas may find their root with the positions and reflections
of people like Goldwin Smith, Jacob Schurman and James Whitney, and the various factors which in turn acted upon them.

The individual features of the Canadian university sector may be found in other western jurisdictions, there is still something uniquely Canadian in how they mix together in this jurisdiction. In the end, the final report of the Royal Commission on the University of Toronto and University College provided the architecture for a new university that, while more like its American cousins, would not simply be a facsimile of them.
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