

room in Upper Canada College, where even degrees have been conferred on students of the University. The *Globe* is right in saying that the expenditure in relation to the cumbrous machinery of the University, as heretofore managed, is needless waste. Yet after all the expenditure for college accommodations at Toronto, the college class-rooms are already crowded to excess. Suppose then that all the students attending the several colleges of the country, were to come to University College at Toronto, as the advocates of monopoly contend, where would they find room, and what one professor could teach them all classics, what other professor could teach them all mathematics? To deny aid, therefore, to other colleges, is either to provide additional college accommodations and employ additional professors at Toronto, or leave more than half of the now college going youth of the country without any facilities of higher education, unless provided for them by voluntary exertion. The *Globe* has admitted, that "the University lands were set apart to afford higher education to the youth of Upper Canada, not to give places to incapable servants;" but not one-half of the youth of Upper Canada now pursuing collegiate education can be educated in the one college at Toronto, with its present accommodations and present corps of teachers, notwithstanding the immense expense incurred in providing them. The only just and effectual, as well as most economical method of providing facilities for the higher education of all the youth of Upper Canada seeking it, is through the several colleges appertaining to and established by different sections of the people.

(Objections Answered.)

A few words, in conclusion, in answer to objections.

*Objection 1.* "To aid the several Colleges is to encourage sectarian education."

*Answer.* Suppose this were the case, would it not be better that the youth of the country, educated or uneducated,—and the more so if highly educated—should be carefully taught and trained in the doctrines, principles and duties of religion, as believed by their denomination, than to have no religious tendency or training at all? What would soon be the state of our country, if its youth were not nurtured in the doctrines, principles or practice of any religious persuasion—for that is the simple import of the objection against what is called "sectarian education." If the youth of the country are taught in religious doctrine and worship at all, must they not be taught and

trained in the doctrines and worship of some religious persuasion? Is there any such thing as non-denominational religion or worship? Have not all the great good men that have blessed Great Britain or America, been members of some "sect," and received, earlier or later, a "sectarian," that is a religious, education? There is no such thing as religious instruction which is not given by the member of some "Sect", that is a "sectarian." To oppose an education, which involves religious instruction by some sect, is therefore to oppose all religious instruction of youth. If "sectarian" worship, (that is worship according to the forms of some sect) teaching, habits, are good on Sabbath, are they evil on other days? If a parent wishes his son to be nurtured in Christian doctrines, worship and duties, does he wish that son to be without any such nurture or even oversight during four years of his education—four of the most critical years of his life? Will the objector answer these questions? Besides, are Classics, or Mathematics, or Chemistry, or Natural or Mental and Moral Philosophy, sectarian because taught in a denominational College? Is not a bushel of wheat grown by a sectarian as good and worth as much as one of like weight and quality grown by a non-sectarian? And is not a given amount of Classics, Mathematics and other prescribed subjects of an University education, of as great value to the student and to the country at large, if taught in a denominational College as if taught in a non-denominational one? And is not the religious worship, religious instruction, and religious oversight of a denominational College as useful to a student and likely to be as useful to the country, as no religious worship, no religious instruction, nor religious oversight of a non-denominational College? When both Colleges teach the same subjects of literature and science and up to the same standard, if the College of no religion is supported with both buildings and income, and the College of some religion is denied even an income, is not the conclusion irresistible that no religion is to be endowed and some religion is to be proscribed when connected with higher education? For a man of no religion to make the objection in question is quite consistent; but for a man professing religion to make it, does it not prove beyond doubt that his bigotry to his own denomination and his jealousy and hatred of other denominations having Colleges are stronger than his convictions of religion itself? When the objector shall have answered these questions, we will be prepared to give a still more ample answer to his objection.