

even palliate the recent outrages in Montreal, show at one that they are ignorant of the duties of good subjects, and that they cannot appreciate the blessings of constitutional government.

We would add, yet farther, let us with all our efforts for promoting religious revival and reformation, not forbear to warn our rulers, whether colonial or imperial, against the danger of touching the ark of the Lord with their hands, even when they think that they could stay it on its rugged course,—and the guilt and danger, too, in which alas they have involved Britain and this Province, of maintaining the worship, and building up the shrines of the modern Dagon.

KING'S COLLEGE BILL, AND THE CHRISTIAN GUARDIAN.

In our last number we made a few remarks on this Bill, giving it a qualified commendation. We were desirous, so far as we might be entitled to speak for the Presbyterian Church of Canada, to put in a caveat against its being supposed that our Church was opposed to the Bill, as the Bishop of Toronto, in his petition to the Legislative Assembly, had insinuated was the case. And in those remarks we were expressing something of the indignation which we have felt at those who have been decrying the Bill as godless and antichristian.

The *Christian Guardian*, of the 25th April, which we had just looked over before penning our remarks, had filled a page with extracts from papers having a very questionable right to the character of *Godly*, with such captions as these:—“INFIDELITY OF THE UNIVERSITY BILL,” “THE GODLESS UNIVERSITY BILL,” “THE INFIDEL UNIVERSITY BILL,” &c. And our remarks were to the effect, that the same opprobrious epithets might with equal justice be applied to the Normal School, and to every common school throughout the land. In saying this, we had a reference to the Act under which these schools are constituted, and which so far as we at the time could remember, made no allusion to the Bible or Christianity.

Now, the *Christian Guardian*, of the 9th May, replies to our remarks, and it does so by quoting the testimony to the good working of the Normal School, which we had borne, and that cheerfully and spontaneously in an article on the Provincial Normal School; and it says in effect to us, “where is the consistency to laud the Normal School, in which a provision is made for the religious instruction of students; and to defend the College Bill, in which no provision is made for this?” Now, we have a ready answer to this, and it is this, that the Common School Act, of May, 1846, under which our Common Schools and the Provincial Normal School are now constituted, says not one word about the Bible or Christianity, and yet, we believe, that that Act is an object of some complacency with the *Guardian*, and though in reality more entitled to be branded as infidel, antichristian, and godless, than the University Bill, has never been so branded by that paper. We could certainly have liked to have seen embodied in that Act some sentiment implying that it was the aim and the will of the legislature, that learning should be diffused amongst all the people, in order to reading the law of Him

who is King of kings and Lord of lords; and so to their being the better fitted for being the subjects of an earthly government; yet we do not find any such sentiment in the Act; and though we know that it has been represented as a godless one, we have never so styled it, nor will we do so, so long as under it we can have a Protestant minister, Superintendent of Education; and may also have the trustees and the teacher of every several school, God-fearing and praying men; and while we have, in point of fact, as we believe, the Scriptures taught in almost all our schools.

But, whatever of religion we have, or may have, in the Normal School, and in the Common Schools, we have it through the men who work them, not from any special provisions in behalf of religion in the Act itself. And so we believe it will be with the Bill for modifying King's College, now before the Legislature. If it become law, and be worked by good men, it will be worked in favour of religion. And it is so much less godless than the Common School Act, that it formally contemplates, as is stated in the preamble, the establishment of an institution, which, “under the blessing of Divine Providence, may encourage the pursuit of literature, science, and art, and may, thereby, greatly tend to promote the best interests, religious, moral, and intellectual of the people at large.”

This is but a scanty recognition of God and Divine truth, we acknowledge, but let the Editor of the *Guardian* shew us as much in our Common School Act, and let him either retract his charges against the College Bill, or in consistency, agitate for an alteration in the Common School Act.

But the charge of godlessness may perhaps be fastened on the Bill because of those clauses that are of a prohibitory kind, as respects the teaching of Divinity, forms of worship, and the admission of ministers to certain offices in the University. Let us look at these for a moment.

Divinity is the science of religion; and surely the Bill is not ungodly because it leaves this to schools instituted and supported by particular Churches! We do most earnestly desire, that our Government would do the same with pastors, missionaries, and theological schools—leave the support of them all, to the Churches with which they are connected; and then they would free themselves from the guilt of supporting Popery, and several discordant and questionable sects of Protestantism.

Then, as to the clause forbidding “religious observances according to the forms of any particular religious denomination to be imposed upon the members or officers” of the University. We see nothing godless in this. Had there been a clause rendering it imperative on all students to attend on some particular religious observance within the College, we would have accounted it tyrannical: as it is, we presume that the pious Professor, of whatever denomination he may be, will feel a liberty in imploring the Divine blessing on the studies of his class, and in his class room; yea, that he may make the same chamber or hall, if he deem it prudent so to do, an oratory—a place of prayer for his students, at times when he is not required to teach.

There are several clauses in the act which exclude ministers, ecclesiastics, and religious teachers from certain offices. Now, we are not called on to approve of these clauses, and in common with others, have recorded our disapprobation at least of the way in which they are expressed; but, in so far as they are intended to impose a limit to the number of ministers who may at any one time be found in the governing body of the University,—we have no controversy with the principle involved in them. Thus, THE RELIGIOUS TRACT SOCIETY OF LONDON, one of the most liberal evangelical associations in the world, requires that its governing body, the committee, shall be composed of four ministers and eight laymen.

There is at least one provision in the Act which directly favours a religious influence in the government of the University, of a most important kind, that, namely, which allows incorporated Theological Colleges to send representatives into the Senate. The other ordinary members of the Senate are to be chosen by the Crown; and when we consider that, under our system of responsible government, the advisers of the Crown must in all principal matters be found in harmony with the majority of the representatives of the people, we see in this, all that law can do, for giving to the religious element among the population, its fair influence in the appointment of the directors of the University. So that we are quite disposed to stand by our former statement, that “if the bill be made to operate injuriously to the christian religion, the blame must attach to the professedly christian part of the community.”

Let christians shew a becoming zeal for the public good—let them depart from the claim which some at least are too ready to prefer for State support—let them encourage statesmen in their efforts to help forward the cause of education in a way in which it may be rendered subordinate to the higher interests of the kingdom of the Saviour, even though these interests may be feebly appreciated by statesmen themselves; and we do not doubt that the working of the College Bill, if indeed it become law, will contribute mightily to the furtherance of sanctified learning.

Having a School Act working to a great extent in favor of true religion, simply from the character of the men who administer it, why should we despair of the result of a College Act which is, in some important respects, still more favourable to the introduction of the christian element into the government of the institution?

Our views of the moral qualities of legislation, do differ materially from some religious men, such as the editor of the *Christian Guardian*. We see no infidelity or antichristianism in the Common School Act, or the College Bill, so long as they allow religious men to conduct the system of education which they severally originate, in harmony with Christian truth, and in subordination to it; but we do see anti-christianism in the acts of our government,—in pensioning the teachers of “the man of sin”—the priests of Rome, and in supporting the colleges and schools of that anti-christian system, and we would lift up our feeble testimony against such acts; nay, we go farther, we behold an injury to the truth, in the support which our govern-