

tion, and the endowment of the New Brunswick University, the *Courier* says:—

“Our idea is, to let each denomination educate its youth as it will or can in high-school and academical training; let the University, which alone is, or will for a long time, be competent and equipped to do it, give the collegiate education to all denominations; and then let divinity and theology be taught by each denomination to its own preachers. We will then have an efficient and well sustained college, and every want will be supplied. Undoubtedly denominational Colleges and a Provincial University are incompatible. It is better far, that we should have one competent and well sustained University where members of all denominations may obtain a thorough collegiate education, than five or six scarcely above mediocrity and insufficiently sustained. It is patent to all, that, at present, New Brunswick is only capable of properly and judiciously sustaining one college—one, of course, which will not prove inferior to those of other countries similarly situated; and we believe that, under the present management, the one in Fredericton will fully equal the expectations of the most sanguine.

In Common School education, as in the higher grades, sectarian grants will have to be abolished, or the efforts of the Legislature to accomplish any great benefit by the passing of the Parish School Act, will prove of non-effect and totally inoperative. Is it a right principle, in this Province where all men of every sect and opinion stand on an equal footing and enjoy the same privileges and advantages, to grant large sums to particular denominations in addition to the grant for Parish Schools which are common to all? In one breath the Legislature endeavors to enact a law for the establishment of our Common Schools on a proper basis, and in another it grants sums of money to religious bodies for educational purposes, thereby stultifying and counteracting the good effects which would likely flow from the first act. Is not this a species of legislation contradictory theoretically, and injudicious, nay extremely injurious practically? What possible use is it to pass enactments having for their object the improvement of the masses, while opposite and antagonistic interests are not only allowed to exist, but are absolutely fostered and encouraged? Can our Legislators, to whatever party belonging, remain blind to this manifest and glaring clashing of interests, without exhibiting culpable negligence? Is there no remedy for this state of things? Most undoubtedly there is. The remedy is nothing short of direct taxation and a total abolishment of all sectarian grants. We are not aware of any measure which can so effectually remedy the evils resulting from the present system. We want no distinctive sects—no preferential endowments. Let all sectarian grants of whatever nature and kind soever be at once abolished; and let all enjoy free and equal privileges, independent of sect or party, with no clashing of interests, and the fruits resulting from a policy so established on a just and equitable basis, will speedily become manifest.”