

"In proceeding to observe upon this extract, I would mention my entire acquiescence in that which is stated at the beginning, that the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge supply ample means of educating the clergy of the Established Church : I wish the observations here made, to be considered as applying solely to those students who are destined for lay professions."

"In the first place then, I am gratified at finding it admitted in this extract, that theological instruction, or the formation of the religious principles, is 'THE GREAT AND PRIMARY OBJECT OF EDUCATION,' and that this is 'a subject FAR TOO IMPORTANT FOR COMPROMISE.' Thus, by their own admission, while the founders of this Institution establish an University for the systematic education of youth, they establish it on a plan which compels them, by necessity as they profess, to omit 'the great and primary object of education.' Can it be wise or politic to attempt to found an University, which, by their own confession, is defective in the main and essential part? They state, at the opening of the preceding paragraph, that 'It is a fundamental principle of the University of London that it shall be open to persons of all religious denominations ;' and from this fundamental principle arises that necessity which they apparently deplore, of omitting, in their scheme, the great and primary object of education. Thus, while they acknowledge that their plan of education is essentially defective, they, themselves, knowingly and designedly create that necessity through which it becomes so.*

* It is admitted by the founders of the London University that the formation of Religious principle is "the great and primary object of education."—It should therefore evidently form the ground work of the system of every University. But how, we would ask, is this principle to be fully reduced to practice in such an establishment without the daily use of common prayer? And how is prayer to be thus daily used without the application of some particular form. That form must be either Episcopalian, or Presbyterian, or some one of the numerous sects into which Christianity is divided. But it may be said that Religion should be taught in the same University, according to all the forms in the world ;—then there must be a Chapel and a Professor for each of them.—The wildness of such a scheme needs no exposure.—We confess, we would rather see a Presbyterian, or a Methodist, or a Baptist, or any other London University, or one for each sect, than one from which Religious instruction is entirely excluded.—For whether Christ be preached, "of envy and strife" or "of contention," or "of good will," yet "Christ is preached," and we should "therein rejoice." If it be objected that many sects are not sufficiently numerous or wealthy to support a separate University, we answer that it must be their business, not that of the Government to provide, in the best way they can, for the preservation and extension of their peculiar opinions.

Let us apply this reasoning to the case of King's College in Upper Canada, whose Charter has been so unceremoniously assailed by the opposers of the Church of England in this Country. The King's religion is that of the Church of England, which he has thought proper, with the consent of his Parliament, to establish in this Colony.—His Majesty has moreover thought proper to grant to that Church the Charter of an University which he has chosen to endow with certain lands and monies which are entirely at his own disposal. Is it to be supposed that the King or the Church of which he is a member should desire to propagate schism, or dissent, or sectarianism in that University? If not, the Teachers or Professors must of course be members of the Established Church : and none but her doctrines must be taught there.—The Patrons of the University, knowing that the population of this Country is of a mixed character, were desirous of opening its doors to all denominations, as far as that could be practi-