

one. In Britain the Universities are subject to this salutary stimulus, not only amongst themselves, but from the number of superior academies, some of which impart education little inferior to that obtained in Colleges, and also from the eminent private lecturers in various branches of science; besides which, on account of the much more extensive diffusion of a higher education, public opinion exerts far more influence on the Universities there than it can possibly do here. If one great central institution in this Province should escape that stand-still, stagnating character which has been always found to attach, sooner or later, to such exclusively privileged bodies, it may be pronounced to be a kind of moral miracle.

But, suffering this objection to be obviated, there is another of no little importance, the amount of inconvenience and expense to which students would be exposed by requiring them all to come from every part of the Province to one place. It is very easy to say that a day or two more of travelling, or a few pounds of additional expense, will make no great difference. But, by experience, it is found to make a very great difference. To young men of slender means, who can scarcely make up the very smallest sum now required to carry them through College, a few pounds a year of additional expense forms an insuperable obstacle; what was before difficult is now rendered impossible. For the wealthy classes the plan of one central University might answer well; but for the middle and poorer classes nothing can be more disadvantageous. Why this plan then should be popular, we cannot see; why a different one, which, by placing Colleges in different localities, would render education accessible to every one, should be looked on with jealousy, we are at a loss to conceive. Let this subject be viewed, not with the eye of prejudice, but of common sense.

But it is said, that this country is too poor to support more than one University. It certainly appears a strange assertion that a country so vast in extent, with such boundless resources, with a population so rapidly increasing, cannot afford support to more than one solitary institution for the advancement of liberal education. Let us not look to the temporary depression which has lately affected both public and private affairs; a depression arising from circumstances unprecedented in the history of this Province and of the world; but let us think what this country is destined soon to be. But the truth is, that this plea of poverty simply amounts to this, that the munificent Royal endowment of King's College has been so mismanaged and squandered away under the old monopoly system that there are no funds available except for the support, and that very imperfectly, of one institution. And so, by a singular kind of logic, the very evil conse-

quences of that system are brought forward as a good reason for its being perpetuated: for, whatever rules or enactments may be framed, we fear that, in regard to financial as well as other concerns, the inherent evils and abuses of a monopoly cannot be obviated. X.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE PRESBYTERIAN.

SIR,—There appeared in the *Montreal Gazette* of the 8th November an article from the *Daily News*, containing some remarks on a Pamphlet, published by the Duke of Argyle, on Presbytery, especially as exemplified in the Church of Scotland. Presbyterians of the Church of Scotland must feel obliged to the Editor for giving what he considered likely to prove interesting to them, though certainly not by any means complimentary to their Church.

We get very little from the Duke's Work, but we learn that he had been endeavouring to show that the Church of Scotland had renounced all claims to a priestly character in her clergy and assigned a fair share to the laity in the management of all ecclesiastical matters. These things, the writer of the newspaper article admits, were really asserted, at first, in the constitution of the Church of Scotland, but affirms they never came effectually into practice, and in the end were denied even in theory. "Every thing great," says he, "in Presbytery, as exhibited in Scottish History, is a negation. It is no positive, independent growth. The Roman Catholic Church had introduced the worship of images; Presbytery denied the propriety of that worship. The Roman Catholic Church denied the laity its due position in the Christian Commonwealth; Presbytery asserted the claim of the laity. The Roman Catholic Church introduced the notion of sacramental efficacy into many of its rites; Presbytery abolished *in toto* the Romish idea of a sacrament. Its use to the world ended with these negations." How forcible are right words! and how feeble are forcible words, when not right ones! Does he mean to say that, when the propriety of worshipping images or of God by images was denied, it made no positive change, either in the outward form of the worship of the Church or in the inward frame and spirit of the worshipper? In truth, we do not think he knew what he was saying, for in the very next instance of the negations—with which he says Presbytery favoured the world, he makes her utter, not a negative but a very clear and distinct affirmation. "Presbytery asserted the claim of the laity." We suppose the "negation," by which Presbytery was in this instance "of use to the world," was the negating of this claim in practice. This, at least, is what, he elsewhere says, Presbytery did.

With respect to the third negation, which is intended, we suppose, in some way or other to neutralize an assertion of the Duke that "from the beginning Presbytery made a stern denial of all notions of Priesthood, of

any mediatorial power in the Christian Ministry." We might here suspect him of wishing to hide the Truth under the ambiguity of expression he employs. But we suspect him of nothing but ignorance, pure ignorance, which, when it dictates to the pen of a ready writer, is very apt to flow out in a mist of vague words. Presbytery did not abolish *in toto* the Romish idea of a sacrament. What Presbytery negated was the idea of the efficacy of the outward observance of the rite as a mere *opus operatum*, or outward work outwardly done, for securing to the doer of it the inward spiritual blessing. We presume the inward spiritual blessing to be a part of the Romish idea of a sacrament, and this is not denied by Presbytery, nor yet the use of the outward sign by which it is signified and conveyed to the right-minded worshipper. The priestly and mediatorial character of the officiating Minister was denied. Not to dwell on this point, we give the words of the Shorter Catechism on the subject; "The sacraments become effectual means of salvation not from any virtue in them or in him that doth administer them, but only by the blessing of Christ, and the working of His Spirit in them that by faith receive them." In short the power of giving efficacy to the sacraments was denied to the Ministers, and affirmed to lie between Christ and the heart of the worshipper.

We come now to a more clearly expressed charge against the Presbyterianism of Scotland. "It proved," it is said, "when brought into unchecked operation, to be more bigoted than the Papal Church in its most bigoted times with respect to the exposition of Scripture. It allowed of no dissent from the few dogmatic propositions into which the whole mass of Scriptural doctrine was tightly compressed. All freedom of thought in some of the most important regions traversed by the human mind has been checked." We wish he had indicated these regions into which Ministers and members of the Church of Scotland have not ventured to extend their enquiries.

The charge against Presbyterianism in Scotland has been brought forward in the most unfair way, and in the most odious form. The charge of bigotry is odious in itself. All comparisons are odious—odious alike to the party compared, and to the party with whom the comparison is made. The Church of Scotland is said not only to be bigoted, but more bigoted than the Papal Church in its most bigoted times.

We will endeavour to avoid saying any thing that can give just offence to the Roman Catholic Church, with which Presbyterianism is so odiously contrasted to the intended shame of both; and shall therefore in the first place dispose of the odious charge of bigotry. Give every man his due in this matter, and no sect, nor individual will have much to say for themselves. There is enough, and more than enough of bigotry in