

attendant of education; the other aims at their total separation. The one provided for the incorporation of the several colleges as integral parts of the University, and for a participation, by Queen's College, in the public endowment; the other gives but a mere shadow of representation to the several colleges that may agree to the measure, and no share whatever of the endowment.

Although the Trustees of Queen's College, anxious to promote a peaceable settlement of the question, would have agreed to the plan of union proposed some years ago, notwithstanding several serious objections to which such a plan is liable, yet, from the entirely different character of the new measure,—the apparent impossibility of procuring a union of colleges on Christian or equitable principles, and the rapid increase in the population of the country calling for additional seats of learning, they have, on mature consideration of the subject, come to the conclusion to maintain Queen's College, not only for instruction in Theology, but for all the purposes for which it was established.

The objections to the new University Act, and the reasons for maintaining Queen's College according to its Royal Charter, may be comprised under the following heads:

1. The irreligious character of the Act referred to. Not only is the teaching of Theology prohibited in the University of Toronto, but all forms of Divine Worship, all public prayer, every thing that can remind either professors or students of God, and the duties we owe to him,—of our responsibility and obligations, is rigidly and peremptorily excluded. And as no test whatever is required of the professors, not even belief in the existence of God, there is nothing in the Act to prevent infidels, atheists, or persons holding the most dangerous and pernicious principles, from being entrusted with the instruction of youth at that time of life when evil impressions are most likely to be made upon their minds.
2. Another objection is, that while the Act thus banishes the very semblance of Religion from the University, it makes no improvement, and no provision for improvement, on the existing system of literary and scientific instruction. It leaves entirely unreformed what chiefly stood in need of reformation. It leaves the management nearly in the same hands as formerly. There is indeed a show of alteration by the addition of several members to the governing body, but all who are acquainted with such subjects, will at once perceive, that in all practical and essential respects, the management will be the same as before.
3. The Act is liable to this further objection, that even although it made the best provision for the efficiency of the University, yet the confining of all the means of University education to one place and one set of teachers, will of itself very much impair that efficiency. In education, more than in any other subject, a wholesome rivalry, a generous competition, is of paramount importance; in this department the deadening effects of monopoly are more apparent than in any other. And if such a system would be at once condemned, if attempted to be applied to ordinary trade or commerce, what reason can be assigned for applying it to a subject of such immensely higher importance as the education of our youth.