

exceptions; but beside these, the religious bearing of the subject appears to have been very carefully avoided. And yet several of the institutions which it is proposed to affiliate, had their origin in a deep conviction that education without religious teaching would be an evil rather than a blessing; and their existence continued to the present time has always had in view the combination of a training in the highest, the oldest, and one at least of the most certain of all the sciences—that of Theology—with secular learning. For the establishment of these Universities all the eloquence of their founders was made use of, and the most pressing solicitations were employed in order to show the urgent necessity of their formation. Agents were engaged to travel over this continent, and to visit Europe, in order to excite the feeling of Churchmen, and to raise contributions for the purpose. Large sums of money were received for the endowments, necessary to put on a permanent footing, arrangements that were required for the object so earnestly desired. That these efforts were made, and that these contributions were obtained on the condition that the teaching of the Church should form the main fundamental principle to be steadily kept in view in the formation and permanent establishment of Trinity College, Toronto, is very evident from the history of the proceedings connected with it. The petition of the clergy and laity of the Church of England in Upper Canada, signed by the late Bishop of Toronto, Archdeacons Stewart and Bethune, Rev. H. J. Grassett, Chief Justices Robinson and Draper, with nearly thirty others, states that they “can have no confidence or connection with an educational institution in which the voice of prayer and praise can never be heard, and from which the acknowledgment of the Deity and belief in the Saviour are excluded;” that “therefore it is their duty to make the most strenuous efforts for founding a university or college in connection with the Church.” They add also that “they do not desire to see tests imposed of such a nature as would create uneasiness among the members of the Church; and they would therefore consider the great object of religious peace and unity within the Church sufficiently secured by requiring from all who have any share in its government, or any duties as professors, teachers, or officers, the declaration that they are sincere and faithful members of the United Church of England and Ireland, conforming to her Liturgy, submitting to her discipline, believing in her doctrines, and pledging themselves that their conduct shall always be in accordance with that declaration.” On laying the foundation stone of the College the Bishop said: “I lay this corner-stone of an edifice to be erected, by the name of Trinity College, to be a place of sound learning and religious education, in accordance with the principles and usages of the United Church of England and Ireland.” And at the inauguration of the College, Jan. 15th, 1852, his Lordship stated:—“As it was impossible for us—great as the sacrifice might be—to hold any connection with an institution essentially anti-Christian, it became our duty to establish a

university in close connection with the Church.”

There can be no mistake, therefore, in the fact that the charter of Trinity College, Toronto, was obtained, money collected, and an endowment secured, upon the express condition that the Christian Religion as sound Churchmanship should be combined with the entire system of training introduced into the institution. We believe that Bishop's College, Lennoxville, and King's College, Nova Scotia, were established with the same object just as distinctly enunciated.

The Statutes of King's College, N. S., now in force were passed in 1806. Several attempts have been made to secularize the Institution—one especially in 1835—but without success. Its connection with the Church is too clearly defined to allow of such an alteration in its constitution; and such a change would have necessitated the surrender of a large portion of the endowment.

Now should the universities established for the purpose of combining religion with secular education, become affiliated with an institution for the whole Dominion, the fundamental principle of which shall be that all religious teaching shall be entirely ignored, who sees not that the very object for which the Church universities struggled into existence will be at once abandoned, and churchmanship, that is Christianity, must suffer in consequence? Religion, if taught at all, must be put into the background, its religious teaching must become entirely voluntary, and in process of time would probably be scarcely attempted at all.

The privilege of granting academical degrees confers a great power upon the corporation that possesses it; and such corporation would miserably fail in its duty if, after its establishment for the purpose of using this power in support of religion, it should suffer it to be transferred to a central body, which not only has no such object in view, but which starts with the principle that all religious teaching, and examination in it, are to be altogether kept out of sight. We have no doubt that the corporations of Trinity College, Toronto, Bishop's College, Lennoxville, and King's College, Nova Scotia, are duly impressed with this sentiment. They probably feel that a trust has been placed in their hands which, as conscientious members of an Apostolic Church, they dare not, they cannot repudiate; and if they should abandon it, they would deserve the reprobation of universal Christendom. They hold in their hands respectively an influence for the Church and for the Gospel, which is second to none in the Dominion.

Reference has been made, in the discussions upon the subject, to King's College, London, which is affiliated to the University of London. But it happens to be a fact that the immense influence wielded by the privilege of conferring degrees in the various branches of an Academical course has been repeatedly sought, year after year, by the Council of King's College, but hitherto without success. Could they but once possess the privilege, it is not too much to say that no motive on

earth would induce them voluntarily to surrender the trust placed in their hands.

We believe some proposal has been made to unite all the Church Universities in the Dominion into one University, for the purpose of conferring degrees, the value of which would be very materially enhanced by such an arrangement. For a Church College to become affiliated with such a University would involve no sacrifice of principle. Degrees in Divinity, as well as in Arts, could be granted, and much good would doubtless result therefrom. We purpose to return to this subject shortly again, as we trust that some arrangement of this kind will be ultimately secured.

BISHOP WHIPPLE AND THE INDIANS.

THIS indefatigable veteran in the cause of the Indian population of the United States, in a letter addressed to the *New York Tribune*, reviews with much force the case of the Indians against the people and Government of the United States. The case of the Sioux Indians is that more particularly which presents the most shameless violation of sacred rights. They had the solemn pledge of the Government that they should be protected in the absolute possession of the tract which was set apart for them by the treaty of 1868. This treaty would not have been entered into by the Sioux had it not been proposed by men in the highest official stations. The Constitution of the United States makes these treaties the highest of all authority, while the ordinance of 1787, which is equally binding, declares that the Indian tribes shall not have their property taken from them except in a war authorized by Congress. But the Bishop says he knows of no instance in history where a great nation has so shamelessly violated its solemn oath. It was the old story of Ahab coveting Naboth's vineyard. A war was begun which originated in a mistake of the Commissioner on Indian Affairs, and which was not ordered by Congress. That war forced all the Indians in the Powder River County into a hostile attitude. Then came the massacre of General Custer, followed by a cry not for justice, but for extermination. And the war has gone on; glorious victories have been talked about, over a few score of Indians who have been killed; while the food, clothing, and shelter of multitudes of others have been destroyed, and they themselves turned out amid the horrors of a Dacotan winter, to famish and die. He says their own soldiers have not tortured the wounded and the dying, but the “Pawnees” and the “Crows,” the savage enemies of the Sioux, have been employed to do it for them; and not long ago, a number of Sioux chiefs came to the United States camp with a flag of truce to sue for peace, when they were brutally murdered by the “Crow” scouts. No attempt is made to redress the wrong, but repeated promises are made to the Indians, which are as repeatedly broken.

The Bishop states that some years ago, he visited Washington to plead for the poor red man. Secretary Stanton said to a friend of