

light of the subsequent history of the Church of England in Canada, we cannot but regard his attitude on educational questions as highly unfortunate.

There are few to-day who would contend that the Church of England from the point of view of equity, had an undivided right to the control of the state endowment for an University, and surely all would admit that the proposition of Lord Goderich, "to divide the University Endowment, giving one-half to the Church of England, with her present charter unchanged, and the other half to the Province for the establishment of an University entirely satisfactory to the colonial mind," was a generous attempt to solve the difficulty, and should have been accepted. (*Bethune, p. 134.*)*

This brief review of the attitude of the Government towards religion, if it be, as I believe it is, a fair representation of the facts, ought to suffice to obviate any possible objections to Federation on the score of an alliance with secularism or as being a submission to the principle of the divorce of religion and education, or on the ground that religion is being degraded by being relegated to an affiliated College.

So far I have mainly dealt with what may be described as the negative reasons for urging upon the Corporation of Trinity University, the advisableness of reconsidering the question of Federation. It is necessary now to turn to the positive aspects of the question.

These may be regarded from three points of view. (1) That the advantages of Federation discussed from three points of view. (2) That of the interests of Church education. (3) That of the general interests of the Church.

The fact that there is no established Church in Canada does not alter the fact that every religious body has its duties towards the State. If this is true of other bodies, it is doubly the case with the Anglican Church, which in the mother country has so long been connected with the State, and is now strenuously battling for the preservation of its establishment. That we are not established in Canada may modify the force of the present argument, but does not entirely dissipate it. For the

*This seems to be the appropriate place to explain why no reference is made to the difficulties in the way of Federation, nor any scheme of Federation proposed. I am, of course, convinced that Federation is practical, but no step can be taken until the idea is favourably received by the supporters of Trinity. Until this is accomplished it is useless to discuss difficulties. So also the proposition of a definite scheme would at present be premature, and would only draw attention away from what is the main object of this essay, viz., the presentation of the argument in favour of Federation.