

yearpreceding Confederation, made efforts in vain to extend its views. To-day, the Roman Catholics of Ontario, may charge many Protestants with deserting their principles. They may say, "You now find your state institutions a failure! I contended that colleges supported by the state would be godless, and that moral training could not be given unless in connection with religious dogma. Now you admit the soundness of my policy in securing Separate Schools; and you tax yourself to support colleges to do the same work which you maintained the national institutions would do for you!"

We may be told, however, that elementary education may be national, but higher education, to be safe, must be denominational. The statement, however plausible, is theoretically absurd, and when examined in the light of experience, its absurdity is still more apparent. It might have some colour of truth if sectarian influences form the aim of these institutions; but our denominational colleges are prone to proclaim their freedom from dogma, and their great liberality of religious sentiment. This tendency to greater liberality, is a virtual abandonment of the principle of their *raison d'être*, and an acknowledgement of the soundness of the undenominational or national system.

To say that religious control is necessary in the case of higher, but not in the case of elementary, education, will appear strange to any one who knows how much more susceptible children are to moral impressions than grown-up persons. Is not the twig more easily bent than the sapling? Is the teacher of a Public school a safe guardian of character, but the professor of a state university a dangerous one? Is a trustee more likely to exercise care in selecting a teacher than the members of a closely watched government, in appointing lecturers in a national college? Are

we to understand that a boy may learn vulgar fractions, and read the Third Book of Lessons with perfect security, but when he gets as far as Trigonometry or Sophocles, he stands on slippery places. Experience is all the other way. Froude the historian is not far astray when he says our most lasting religious convictions are those of early youth which centre around the word *home*, the Christian sabbath, and the church of our childhood. When proper attention is given to the cultivation of correct principles in the boy, I have little fear they will be absent in the man; and when we see the children of moral and religious parents troublesome at school, and disgraceful in public, we may rest satisfied that their home training has been seriously defective. In short, every argument in favour of denominational influences for a college can be used with additional weight for the public school.

To hear the statements of some advocates of religious colleges, one would suppose that every state institution was a centre of infidelity. Voltaire, it should be remembered, had never the associations of a national university. Tom Paine received his education in England long before unsectarian schools were known. Neither Gibbon nor Hume was saved from scepticism by the fostering influence of denominational colleges.

I am not disposed to think Christianity will suffer from the writings of that vigorous class of scientists and mental philosophers, for which the present age is distinguished. If I might presume to express an opinion, it would be that the evolution theory, and the new metaphysics, will confirm, though they may modify in detail, our convictions regarding the adaptation of Christianity to the wants of our race. It would be well, however, for those who fear danger from that quarter, to remember that Darwin and