

*Objection 2.* "To grant public aid to denominational Colleges is inconsistent with the fundamental principles of our non-denominational common school system."

*Answer.* The reverse is the case, as will presently appear. But observe, there is a wide difference in the circumstances of pursuing common school and university education. In pursuing the former the pupil is with his parents sixteen hours out of twenty-four, and the whole of Saturday and Sunday, and has therefore the security and benefit of ample parental and pastoral instruction and oversight; in pursuing the latter he is not with his parents or pastor from one month's end to another.

Now the objection is founded upon the assumption that the fundamental principle that our common school system is non-denominational—an assumption founded upon an ignorance of the school law; for the law provides, and has provided during twenty years, that there may be a denominational school in every school section if desired; it provides also that the Board of School Trustees may establish denominational schools, and denominational schools only, if they please, in every city, town, and incorporated village in Upper Canada. The law leaves it with the electors and their Trustee representatives in each of these municipalities to decide for themselves whether their schools shall be denominational or not. What is optional cannot be fundamental, but must be contingent or incidental.

The fundamental principles of our common school system are two. First, the right of the parent and pastor to provide religious instruction for their children, and that they shall have facilities for that purpose. For this express provision is made in the law and general regulations. Apply this principle to the Collegiate system of the country. Should the United right of the parent and pastor not be provided for during the years that the son is away from home pursuing his higher education, or should it be provided for as far as possible? Let parental affection and conscience reply. Then can the combined care and duty of the parent and pastor be best provided for in a denominational or non-denominational College? This question admits of but one answer.

The second fundamental principle of our common school system is, the aid of the State upon the condition of, and in proportion to local effort in each school section. This is a most vital principle of the system, and as a chief element of its success, no public aid is given until a school-house is provided, and a legally qualified teacher is employed, when public aid is given according to the work done in the school; that is, in proportion to

the number of children taught and the length of time the school is kept open; and public aid is given for the purchase of school maps and apparatus, prize books and libraries in proportion to the amount provided from local sources.

Now, apply this vital principle of our system of common school education to our system of collegiate education. A section of the community—a denominational or not—provides college buildings and employs the professors. The State, through a University Board prescribes the kind or, curriculum of collegiate education to be given and decides upon the amount and merits of the work done in each college by examining its students and determining their degrees, and then aids each college in proportion to the number of students taught and approved. This is the system of collegiate education which we have advocated; and is not this the fundamental principle of our common school system instead of being opposed to it? On the contrary, the advocates of a one-college monopoly repudiate, in relation to the system of collegiate education, this fundamental principle of our common school system. They have provided no college buildings, nor employed professors, nor done a certain amount of collegiate work, and then asked for public aid in proportion to the work done. They have contributed nothing, have done nothing as a condition of public aid in the great work of collegiate education, yet, though drones, and standing with folded arms, they claim to consume all public aid given for its promotion, and have even the hardihood to denounce, as sectarian and selfish, the bee-like industry of their fellow-citizens for insisting upon sharing in the bread of the common hive in proportion to their own contributions of educational honey to it! Now, if the principle of public aid combined with local effort is so vital to our common school system, and has produced such wonderful results, why should it be repudiated in our collegiate system? Whether it be a municipal, or a denominational section of the community that puts forth the efforts and fulfils the conditions of public aid, involves no principle, is merely incidental, is no part of the concern or business of the State; the principle of co-operation is the same; the work is the same; the education is the same; the public benefit is the same; and the public aid should be the same.

We may also add, that while the system of collegiate education we advocated, thus accords with the fundamental principles of our common school system, those denominations and parties who have most earnestly advocated University Reform, have