

Trinity remains free? Can they insist on its coming into the one University—a mere question of expediency—as a condition of receiving an endowment? But if it can be endowed, standing apart, why not themselves, also, without giving up anything? This alone is enough to burst the bubble.

Again: *Where is all the money to come from?* When once these Colleges are quartered on the Public Endowment, private liberality will be dried up. The very hope of such a benefit has already produced such a result, in great part. They will be the equals of University College, and however moderately they may speak now, they will not be content without an equal share of the common fund. Already there are five Colleges, and there would certainly be more. The income of the Endowment is now \$50,000, and will not exceed \$60,000. Allow the University and University College a double share, \$20,000, and they are starved to allow the other four \$20,000 a-piece. Shall we so cripple our non-sectarian College? “Ah! but there are ‘other public funds.’” And is the Province, already groaning under debt and taxation, prepared to make up \$10,000 a year to these “connexional necessities?”—to teach in five places, by five sets of teachers, what could be learned as well in one? and to provide the same amount, as it must, for each other College that may be established? We would fain hope that our “collective wisdom,” in these days of retrenchment, will be wiser than that.

Further:—Will the people of Canada consent to endow institutions which are but a part of “the machinery of the” several “churches?” Some of them may boast of their liberality, that they will receive Students or Professors of other denominations. We cannot see any great merit in thus availing themselves of the labours and taking the fees of their fellow-Christians, while ample care is taken to secure thorough sectarian control. It is by no means impossible that it may even be counted a valuable means of denominational influence to have a number of the youth of various churches brought under their teaching at the most plastic period of life. But others of these Colleges are more exclusive. In Trinity, for instance, not only can no one be a Professor unless he belong to the Church of England, but neither can he take a degree! Are we to endow an institution with public funds from which three-fourths of the public are excluded? At Regiopolis, we dare say, a Protestant student could be received (and taught to be a Catholic), but would any “heretic” have a chance of filling a chair to which the country had contributed? Can you require these Colleges to give up these little peculiarities as a condition of receiving aid? Why, these are the principles for which they are willing to become martyrs! Avaunt, ye persecutors! How very easy it will be, too, under the denominational system, to get theological students taught at the public expense! We shall have the Rev. Dr. A. at the head of one institution, receiving a salary as Principal, and perhaps Professor of some light department, with a comfortable salary, on condition that he teaches Theology for nothing. The Rev. Dr. B. will fill the Chair of History, and, in a *religious* institution, must not neglect the History of the Church. The Rev. Dr. C. will take Logic and Rhetoric, and, under the latter head, cannot avoid teaching Homiletics. The Rev. Dr. D. will lecture on Greek, of course including the New