



THE magnitude of the interests involved to our Church and country are sufficient reason for again directing attention to the college question in the Province of Ontario. We do so on this occasion mainly to notice the drift of the discussion on the subject in the Ontario legislature. There is little doubt that all who spoke on the question thought they did so free from bias, and viewed it entirely on its own merits. Now we venture to say that every one who uttered a word either for or against existing institutions, did so under the influence of *peculiar* views, views arising from his individual stand-point. It is rare indeed that men can be found who have full communion with truth *as truth*; the very limitations by which they are almost necessarily surrounded narrowing them down to one-sided views. It is, therefore, not ungenerous to remark that, with the exception of the minister who opened the discussion, all those who argued against continuing the annual grant to the various denominational colleges, were either gentlemen living in Toronto or had previously some connection with University College, which they would desire to build up, perforce, upon the ruins of the other colleges of the province.

Some of the facts and principles involved in the statement of Treasurer Wood in bringing forward his supplementary estimates may first be mentioned. In stating the number of graduates in Queen's College, he is reported in the *Globe* of February 26 to have said that the number of Lawyers was 41, the number of Physicians 27, of Professors 5, of Judges 2, whilst the number of Ministers was 83, from which the inference was easily deducible that the institution existed mainly for the education of Ministers for one particular Church. We are sorry that we are obliged to correct this view: we wish it were as Mr. Wood put it. The fact is the college was established by the friends of the Church originally for the *purpose indicated*, but this is the purpose it has least subserved. Whilst it was endowed by the friends of our Church mainly for the education of ministers, our Church has reaped only a small share of that particular benefit, the number of Divinity students at any time being but a small fraction of the total number of students, whilst the doctors turned out from it must have been treble the number of ministers. It is clear that the gen-

eral community has all along reaped large benefits from that which the Church raised specially for her own benefit, and it is rather too bad that it should now be made a matter of reproach to our Church that she made these sacrifices which have resulted for the good of the community. The burden of Mr. Wood's argument against continuing the allowance to the college under denominational control, is that, by so doing, the minor sects in the country would be obliged to suffer great hardship in contributing to the support of institutions from which they receive no direct advantage. He tells us that the aggregate population of the sects represented by the denominational colleges is about 897,000, whilst those sects that have no such institution number about 499,000. Now, did it never strike the Hon. Treasurer of Ontario that his argument cuts two ways? Two-thirds of the population of the province as it was constituted in 1861, according to his own showing, desire to have their superior education given under certain conditions, the remaining one-third under entirely different conditions, and the whole question is this, whether the *two-thirds* or the *one-third* shall control the policy of the state. Mr. Wood pretends to be a reformer, and the reformers pretend that it is one of their principles to give effect to the wishes of the majority. How, therefore, can he reconcile his reasoning with the alleged fundamental principle of his party? He *assumes* that the majority of the people of the province are opposed to these annual grants, but the member for Welland, we think, answered him well in saying that in the fact of every administration for the last twenty years having bestowed these grants, there was proof presumptive to the contrary, and we mistake not if Mr. Wood shall not find, before he is done with the question, that he has not gathered well the public opinion upon it. It is true that the opponents of the grants have been the noisiest—have been the most forward and blatant in stating their views—as they are naturally demagogues, and their very life is bound up in agitation, but in proportion as those believing in the propriety of aiding the sectarian colleges, as they are called, are quiet and undemonstrative in their nature, it is dangerous to trifle with them, as Mr. Wood may probably find out to his cost if he attempt to carry out the policy foreshadowed in his speech.

The only other speech on the subject to which we would advert is that of