

principles, to be the *voice of this Province*, it appears that the present Charter is directly opposed to the application of the many of his Majesty's subjects." If therefore his Majesty gave his royal sanction to your Charter under this impression—as is undeniable—he must have been misinformed, and as his Majesty can do no wrong, the minister who gave him this mal-advice and false information, ought to be punished, and the act of his Majesty recinded.

It was the design of his Majesty to give his royal sanction to the Charter of a University, that would "conduce to the welfare of the Province." But from the voice of the above mentioned petitioners—the address of our Provincial Parliament—and the unanimous opinion of eleven learned clergymen of the church of Scotland, it is obvious, that "a University upon such a partial and exclusive system (to borrow the language of E. W. Armstrong and 51 others) will be from year to year and perpetual source of religious, if not political animosity; as it will give to one church a permanent separate interest, adverse to the other more numerous churches; and all these churches, irritated by a two fold monopoly and domination, will upon the known principles of human nature, be induced to make common cause in their own defence, in opposition to the dominant church. The conflict will be a lasting one, and its effects cannot fail of being prejudicial to true religion, and to the peace and prosperity of the Province, so long as the irritating cause shall continue, that is, during the continuance of the envied monopoly."

Hence, his Majesty's grant, which was intended to "conduce to the welfare of the Province," being nothing but an apple of discord, a source of unjust monopoly on one hand, and of barbarous exclusion on the other, ought to be extended or withdrawn altogether.

But these observations are only introductory to the principal argument—which will in some respects include the preceding—against the establishment of your University—namely, *its unsuitableness to the state of the Canadian population.*

As an example and argument for your University, according to the principles of

the present Charter, you refer to the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge and to the Parochial schools of Scotland, and say, that to these, in connection with the establishment England and Scotland owe their vast superiority over other nations. But from a very short examination of those famous institutions, it will plainly appear that your statements are partly incorrect—that one of your arguments is totally inapplicable to Canada—and that the other is most completely against yourself.

The University of Oxford, which has existed (as Cowper says) "time out of mind," and that of Cambridge, also venerable for its antiquity, have indeed thrown a literary splendour around Great Britain, which very justly gives her the preeminence over most of the European nations, and have produced many of the brightest lights that ever graced any age or nation; but when it is recollected that these patronised seats of the muses, annually engross legal endowments so great and sums of money so vast, that they almost exceed the belief of the most credulous—that dissenting schools, without any legal endowment or support whatever, have produced many of the most eminent divines, orators, poets and scholars of whom England can boast—that the most illustrious Preachers of the present day—the most eminent Chemist, and the most distinguished Oriental linguist and philosopher, are dissenters, and have been educated at dissenting seminaries, we shall be far from giving to Oxford and Cambridge the sole meed of praise, or of supposing that they have even equalled, in usefulness, the dissenting schools in proportion to their resources and power.

You have taken those institutions as the prototype of your intended University, at York, and (intending to handle this subject in like manner with the former as far as possible, *historically*) a brief sketch, in some particulars, of the Oxford and Cambridge Universities, will therefore, serve to set forth in the strongest light the utter unsuitableness of Kings College to the present state of Canada. "The University of Oxford and Cambridge (says a good writer) have always been regarded as the depositories of *Ecclesiastical* influence, and the great bulwarks of the establishment. Every