

fact does not touch the broad basis on which the legislation proceeded, namely, the propriety of encouraging the diffusion of educational facilities. And even if it did, there is another more recent testimony which flatly contradicts it. This testimony is recorded in the report of the Commissioners appointed by Lord Monck in 1861 to inspect the University and University College, Toronto. It is to the effect, that there were complaints of the accommodation afforded by these buildings being altogether inadequate, notwithstanding their splendour and costliness—declared by the Commissioners to be unwarranted. But, did not the Legislature of 1853 regard the denominationalism of certain institutions as a disability? Did it not feel towards that bugbear something of the horror which is exercising the souls and disturbing the peace of so many in the present day? Not at all. Its Act describes the institutions to be benefited. It legislated in favour of those which are denominational without even mentioning their denominationalism. It was deemed enough that they were known to be incorporated and efficient Academical Institutions, frequented by the youth of Upper Canada. These colleges, therefore, irrespective of their denominationalism, have a recognized public standing, with certain rights and privileges secured to them by law.

And this unquestionably is the only sound and tenable position to take with regard to them. What has the government to do with denominationalism in its legislation, except to respect the rights and turn to proper account the taxable resources of denominationalists for the general good? Is the eligibility of an individual, for a public situation and public pay, dependent upon his religious views or ecclesiastical politics? The decision of this question, which must be in the negative, is not affected by the substitution of several persons or a corporate body for a single individual. The conditions of government support, namely, fitness for service and fidelity in its performance, are as entirely untouched in the one case as in the other. If a corporation fulfils these conditions, it does its part in the state, equally with the Roman Catholic schoolmaster, the Presbyterian treasurer, or the Episcopalian Premier, in his office. The only concern of the Legislature is to legislate and administer its measures equitably, and to enforce the observance of its laws. We have legislation with respect to the Colleges

as has been shown. The administration of it is a history of educational institutions deprived of their just rights, as can easily be proved. If in any particular, the authorities of any college have infringed either statute law or executive regulations, it is owing to the remissness of the government. If it can be made out that the colleges are averse to an improved legislation or a stricter inspection, so that all reasonable demands with respect to their character as public and efficient institutions may be satisfied, we shall cease to be their advocates. The colleges ask no favour, no assistance from the state, for the propagation of denominational predilections. They avow an ecclesiastical connection, and they are valued on that account, just as the private citizen or the public official is. This connection enables them to conjoin with state aid, an amount of revenue, which the government cannot raise without a burdensome taxation. It has a special attraction for students belonging to particular sections of the community. And to all classes of the population, it affords a guarantee for that moral influence and respect for religion, which the incessant berating of denominationalism by our opponents has a direct tendency to diminish.

But we are told, it has been reproachfully asserted on the floor of the Assembly at Toronto, that the extending of government assistance to these colleges is a "fragment of the connection between church and state." If this charge has any foundation at all the grounds of it are so microscopical as not to be discernible to the naked eye. It would have point and force if the grants were made directly to churches as such. But the colleges have not received and have not spent public money for purely ecclesiastical purposes. The churches as has been conclusively proved by statistics, only share the general benefits derivable from the colleges as public institutions. One or two denominations which have no colleges of their own, receive the same kind of advantage from University College, Toronto. With no expense to themselves they get a general education for their students, intending to enter the ministry, at the public expense. In that respect the charge holds against the favoured institution as much as against those which it is proposed to proscribe. This charge, moreover, carried consistently to its proper issue has applications which ought not to escape attention. Every advertisement for a public servant should