

Let the measure be disguised as it may by specious generalities, it is virtually nothing more than a plan for dividing the endowment of King's College between the Churches of England and Scotland.

Is it fair, or reasonable, to deprive all portions of the Province but one of the advantages to be derived from the possession of a University, and confine the benefits of education, so that many must be excluded who might otherwise have participated in them?

The principle is the same, as if it were proposed to benefit the lands by turning off the pure clear rills, which fertilize and enrich them, and forcing them to form one turbid and troubled stream.

Is it statesmanlike to construct the most powerful engine for effecting national good and evil, on principles, not only never tested by experience, but directly in opposition to those adopted in the best models, and to clog it with machinery so ill-adapted to work, that the whole power would be exhausted in efforts to overcome mere friction?

Is it prudent to recognise agitation as an element of the colonial constitution, and sacrifice principle and abandon justice for the hope of pacifying clamour?

Is it safe to establish a precedent, threatening the security of private property, and justifying a partition of the possessions belonging to the Church of Rome in the Lower Province?

Nor let it be said that this danger is imaginary, or that there is no intention of invading the possessions of that Church. What mean the petitions which have been recently presented to the House, calling for the application of the same principle to educational establishments in both portions of the province? What means the demand of equal justice for Canada East, which has been urged in the public papers? What means the ominous admission in the conclusion of "Thoughts on the University Question," that "the general principles maintained [in that pamphlet] are in favour of the establish-