

The truth is, nothing more prejudicial to Turkey itself could have happened. The Turkish authorities either could have prevented these atrocities, or they were incapable of effectually interfering for their prevention. If they could have prevented them, (and warning seems to have been given) they are certainly most culpable in not doing so,—yea, they merit due punishment from the nations, whose feelings have been outraged, and some of whose citizens have been cruelly butchered. If, on the other hand, the authorities of the Porte were unable to repress the fanatical Druses and prevent their cold-blooded butchery of the Christians, and we rather think that this is true, so far as the Sultan is concerned, there is the question, whether the intervention of other nations is not required, whether in short, the old sick man should be longer intrusted with a charge which he is incapable of attending to. We have no doubt France, and Russia too, will be quite ready to take advantage of the occurrences, for the purpose of obtaining increased power, and it may be increased territory for themselves. Indeed, it is stated, and and it may be looked on as perhaps the best apology for Turkey, that the flame has been fanned between the Christians and Druses by French emissaries, or by Russian intrigues. We observe that there is to be a convention of the Powers for the purpose of deliberating what is best to be done in the circumstances, and we trust that while Britain, on the one hand shall assume a position of firmness towards Turkey, she will on the other guard against any undue influence on the part of France and Russia, both of whom, there is reason to believe are eagerly looking for a division of the spoils.

The results in the meantime of the indifference or imbecility of Turkish power are deplorable. Not only have thousands of the Maronites been destroyed by the ferocious and bigoted Druses, who with the fierce intolerance of Mahomedanism unite the rudeness and cruelty of savages, but many who have been under the teaching of Evangelical Missionaries have been the victims of the same violence. Hundreds of towns and villages have been laid waste, and many thousands have been put to the sword. It is with the deepest sorrow that we observe that the Rev. Mr. Graham, of Damascus, a Missionary of the Irish Presbyterian Church, is among the slain. He was struck down in the Streets of Damascus. Although he had a guard of Turkish Soldiers, they appear to have done little or nothing for his protection. Mr. Graham was a most earnest and diligent missionary. He had been scarcely

three years in the field, having been ordained in July 1857, on which occasion the Rev. Dr. Burns and other ministers from abroad were present. May the blood of God's servant, in this as in other cases, be the seed of the Church, and may the very cruelties of which we have so lately heard, have the effect, by the blessing of God, of attracting the attention of Christians, drawing forth their zeal, and increasing their devotedness to the cause of the Redeemer. We observe that liberal contributions are being made for the relief of the persecuted and suffering Christians. We trust more will be done, and thus increased means will be put in operation for the evangelization of the Turks. The value of their souls calls for this, and we believe farther, that in the spread of Gospel influences lies the only hope of the prosperity, and even the permanence of Turkey as one of the nations of the earth.

THE UNIVERSITY QUESTION.

We observe that, although the session of Parliament has closed, and the labours of the Parliamentary Committee have ceased, the agitation of the University question continues. With the exception of addresses by Rev. Dr. Little, and the Rev. Mr. Marling, delivered in Montreal during the session of the Congregational Union, and afterwards published in a supplement to the *Montreal Witness*, the discussion of the question has principally been in the pages of the *Christian Guardian*. This paper published, in successive numbers, speeches delivered by Dr. Ryerson, the Rev. L. Taylor, and others, in Kingston, on the occasion of the meeting of Conference, and has since devoted some space to remarks on the speeches of Dr. Little and Mr. Marling. We regret to observe a tendency to a style of personality and violence altogether uncalled for. The question is not one which rests upon, or is even materially affected by the literary character, or position of individuals connected with University College, or any other institution. Far less is it one which depends upon the number or standing of the denominations which may take a side. Did it depend upon this, we believe, that a large proportion of the denominations would be found in favor of non-interference with the present state of things. We entertain this belief from what took place at the recent meetings of the various ecclesiastical bodies. Besides the Congregationalists, the Presbyterian Church of Canada agreed to petition the Legislature against the changes which are sought by the Wesleyans. It is well known too that the United Presbyterian Church is

unanimously and decidedly on the same side, although it happened that no ecclesiastical action was taken. Some of the Methodist bodies, not connected with the Wesleyan Conference, are also decidedly opposed to the movement. The Diocese of Huron, and we believe many of the Church of England in the Diocese of Toronto, are opposed to the contemplated changes, and we might say the same of the Presbyterian Church, in connection with the Church of Scotland. Many of them are decidedly opposed to the movement, and we believe that not much aid can be counted upon by our Wesleyan friends, even from the authorities of Queen's College. Thus were the matter to be tested by an appeal to the various denominations, we are convinced that a decided majority would be in favor of the present state of things, or, at all events, would be opposed to the division of the endowment which is sought. Of the Protestant denominations, the Wesleyan is the only one that would be, with any measure of harmony, in favor of the changes sought, and even among them, there is not by any means unanimity of sentiment. But, as we have already stated, the question should be looked upon as a public one, which does not depend upon the characters of these who support either side, or on the mere fact, that this denomination or that, is for or against it.

We have no intention, at present, of entering upon the whole matters involved. We have, all along, been opposed to the movement, on the ground that the endowment of denominational colleges would be altogether opposed to our present system of public education. We do not profess to be out-and-out voluntaries, opposed to everything like the endowment of particular denominations in all circumstances. But we are satisfied, that such endowment would not be beneficial in a country like Canada. We are satisfied, too, that our present system of education, if not the best possible, is the best in the circumstances—the best which we can hope to obtain in the present divided state of religious belief and profession; and hence we are opposed to the endowment of denominational colleges from the University funds. If there are to be denominational colleges, thus endowed, why not Grammar Schools? or even Common Schools? Let once denominational colleges be endowed, and we shall have, in a short time such a clamour for denominational seminaries, of various kinds, as will lead to the utter downfall of our present educational system. This we should deplore, and therefore, we are opposed to the recently begun agitation.

We may observe here, that in the memo-