

Tyndall, Huxley and Froude, and Herbert Spencer, are examples of what may be developed under the patronage of denominational education. Nor have national colleges been behind in furnishing defenders of religious truth. One of the most gifted champions of Christianity in our own day, was a student of Harvard college; yet Rev. Joseph Cook has routed the whole band of Boston infidels and free-thinkers. The president of McGill College, an undenominational institution, has secured a wide reputation, no less as a scientist than as an upholder of religious power. Denominational universities cannot boast of their superior government and the healthier *morale* of the students. Recent events at Yale College indicate a laxity of discipline, unexampled at Cornell. The disgraceful conduct of some of the Princeton College students, as exhibited a short time ago, does not place at any disadvantage Harvard, Ann Arbor, or our own Toronto.

When a church takes away from the state institutions its sympathy and support, the latter must lose as well as the former. By refusing to give its proper share of encouragement, the very defects which it suspects must be produced. Would it not be more patriotic for a denomination to maintain its right in determining the religious and moral character of the national schools? It is preposterous to suppose that any college in Ontario could retain its position as a recipient of public funds, if there is any well-grounded apprehension of defective moral teaching. Are not the people who rule the country the adherents of the various denominations; and surely the influence of religion is more effective than that of infidelity. When a member of a church speaks of "our university," he should mean the national institution; if not, the policy of either the state or his church is wrong. The church that does not stand by the

national system of education, acts antagonistic to its own interests. That denomination will exercise most weight in the country, in proportion to its population, that utilizes most fully the admirable system of education which the state provides. That church that shuts itself out from the provincial institutions will find its adherents, through want of intellectual power, occupying secondary positions in the service of the country. Does not our own experience prove the truth of each of these propositions? One of the religious bodies of Ontario has been frequently charged with having more than its due share of political power. Its adherents are said to gain the greater number of positions of trust, numbering more seats in Parliament and offices in the Executive than any other body.

If such is the case I attribute the fact to no national clannishness, or superiority of church organization. If its influence is high the cause arises from the educational advantages which the wise policy of that church has secured. That church has ever stood firm in defence of our national system. It has resisted every effort made to transfer the work of education from the domain of the State to the domain of religious denominations. Its ministers give no uncertain sound when spasmodic attempts are made to disendow our highest seat of learning. As a church, it builds no colleges, except those for theological purposes, and has made no efforts to secure university powers. We have, on the other hand, a church that has repeatedly complained of not having a fair proportion of representatives in Parliament and in municipal councils. So strongly do many of its adherents feel on this point that leagues have sometimes been formed with political parties to secure increased power in the administration of public affairs. A neglect of its wishes in this respect