

Mr. Blake. He argued, as did also Mr. Gow (who is, we believe, an elder in the Canada Presbyterian Church, and as he was no doubt nurtured into intellectual life largely by the Shorter Catechism, we might expect a different verdict from him) that as the success of the common school system in Ontario has not been hindered, but on the contrary greatly promoted by the absence of the religious element, so there is no reason why parents should desire the religious element to mingle with the higher education of their sons. Now this argument is based upon an assumption, which assumption is a *fallacy*, that the success of the educational machinery in Upper Canada is traceable to the absence of the religious element. That is its main, we might say its *only* weakness as a system, as future generations will no doubt discover. The fact is there is no thoughtful mind in that province that would not gladly see education and religion go hand in hand; but there is this difficulty that, in a mixed community, there is such jealousy between the sects that teachers belonging to any particular denomination cannot be trusted to give a fair exposition of Christianity, and the families of any one denomination are, as a rule, so few and scattered in every community, that they cannot afford to support a teacher holding their own views. And we hold that the very premises of Mr. Blake lead to a very different conclusion from that he has drawn: the fact that the religious education of the young is proscribed from the common and grammar schools of the country, makes it all the more needful that it shall be faithfully attended to at a subsequent time. And surely it does seem very far wrong, that in a Christian land, all whose feelings and sentiments and views owe their truth, their vigour, their vitality to the influence of Jesus, that document which is the fountain of this all-pervading influence should be ignored in its educational institutions, as was so well put by Dr. Arnold when the constitution of the London University was under consideration. It might be well made a matter of reproach to Christians by a Hindoo or Mahometan.

But whilst in the circumstances of the province, it is impracticable to combine instruction in the elements of Christianity with the other parts of education taught in the Common Schools, for the reason stated above, the same impracticability does not extend to higher educational institutions

like Queen's College and Victoria College, which draw to them mainly the students of one particular denomination from all parts of the country, representing as they do a large homogeneous constituency. And, therefore, seeing it is practicable to combine intellectual with religious training to this small extent, the highest interests of the community demand that it should be done; and we would be recreant to the principles of the Church of our fathers if we failed to urge this point.

Another point started by Mr. Blake, and reiterated by Mr. McMurrich (also an elder in the Canada Presbyterian Church), was that "in the principle of equal justice to all \* \* \* \* he did not see how any system could be devised on which these denominational grants could, with fairness, be continued." Mr. Blake has too acute a mind not to perceive that practically, if not theoretically, the very system he proposes would be subversive of *equal justice*. In the fact of their establishing and supporting institutions on certain grounds, those denominations which represent the great mass of the people of the province, declare their want of confidence in the fundamental principle of University College. It exists almost solely for the benefit of the minor sects, which could not aspire in their circumstances to have colleges of their own, and which, therefore, make a virtue of necessity in patronizing University College. And the only way in which equal justice to all would be meted out consistently with the withdrawal of the grants, would be to do what the member for Ottawa suggested—break up the endowment of University College too, and let the minor sects support a joint college for themselves, and not be educated at the expense of the rest of the community. This we do not advocate, but we say it is a legitimate conclusion drawn from the position assumed: We do not wait to notice the invidious remarks of Rykert, Cook, Blake, and others, as to the comparative standing of the graduates of University and Queen's Colleges. It is enough to say that wherever and whenever they have come into competition before an impartial tribunal—the Law Society, the European Universities, or the Civil Service Board—the graduates of Queen's College have taken rank second to those of no other institution.

On the whole, however, the denominational colleges have reason to be satisfied for the present, both with the tone and the