

existing institutions and leave nothing in their stead, as seems to be proposed, would be utterly folly. From what I know of the state of public opinion in Nova Scotia at this moment, I do not believe that a majority of the people would desire to cripple the existing institutions to endow one, and certainly they would not approve of sweeping away the seminaries they have if nothing better is to be created.

But it may be asked, would you recognize the sectarian principle? Would you allow half a dozen Divinity chairs? Would you make Dalhousie denominational? Would you continue the permanent grant to Kings?—Certainly not. If any member moves a resolution here affirming the principle of that passed in 1843, I shall vote against it. I will not give a shilling to support Divinity chairs anywhere. Rather than make Dalhousie denominational, I would see it blown up. That King's college may share the fate of all the others, I shall vote for the bill before the house. How, then, are we to proceed? Is there any solution of difficulties? I have reflected much upon the subject, Mr. Chairman, and I think there is, and it is very simple—apply to the higher seminaries of the country the same principle that you apply to your academies and common schools, fix a standard of utility, place a tax in the hands of commissioners, to be appointed by the Governor, and allow the higher seminaries to draw from that fund an amount not to exceed £200, on proof that three professors had been employed throughout the year, in teaching the sciences, the classics and the modern languages. By adopting this course, you will neither recognize the denominational principle, nor provoke a needless contest with it. You give to those who desire a free University the means and the opportunity to try their experiment at no great cost, and you do not run a tilt against the prejudices and predilections of those who are conscientiously attached to the more exclusive plan of instruction. I cherish no feelings of hostility to any of the existing institutions. I never attacked any of them till unfairly pressed on and provoked. But I prefer the combined, the free, the provincial endowment for education.—Others, and by no means a small portion of our people, nay, of the people of all countries, prefer the denominational mode. Assume they are wrong, and I believe they are, their opinions, even their prejudices, are entitled to respect. The learned member for Annapolis and I are wide as the poles asunder on this point, and yet I cannot but admire the consistency with which he has maintained his opinions at every personal hazard. He was the leader of a government—he might have sat upon the Bench. His peculiar views of education created all his embarrassments, and have cost him all that he has lost. His opinions are shared by many others, and it is impossible to shut our eyes to the fact that the denominational principle has its advantages as well as its evils. The Presbyterian friends of the old Pictou Academy clung to it when it was only a wreck. One individual left £1000 to Acadia, another £1000 to Windsor, and a third £4000,

to Sackville. The friends of Acadia raise £100 a year by voluntary contributions—they have already expended £14,000 of their own funds—and within the last year the Alumni of King's College have raised £2500 towards the support of that institution. It is clear, then, that the denominational principle draws forth, and dedicates to the cause of education, funds which the Legislature could not command. It is equally undeniable that boys are attracted into these seminaries from the rural districts, who, but for them, would not be educated at all.

The arguments of the learned member for Annapolis on these points are sound. The different religious bodies must have their divinity chairs somewhere—either in the neighborhood of the central institution if you endow it, or in their own. And why not? If we must have ministers, we may as well rear as import them. You cannot destroy these institutions if you would. You may withdraw the grants and endow a free college, but they will, I have notwithstanding. If you sweep away Dalhousie, and so do no other, Nova Scotia will be left with nothing but denominational seminaries, and you will have done the very reverse of what we intended in 1843. If this is attempted at any future stage of this discussion, I shall resist it. If gentlemen with whom I have hitherto acted, adhere to the policy of 1843, I shall go with them, but after giving the subject due reflection, I see no necessity for asserting or negating an abstract principle, when, by applying to the higher seminaries of the country the policy which is applied to our common schools, we may arrive at a practical solution of a very difficult question. Fix a standard of secular education—define the branches to be taught, and the number of Professors and students, if you will, and then give as you would to a school in the Baptist settlement of Wilmot, or the Catholic settlement of Chezetook, without reference to sectarian distinctions of management, or to any other branches taught except those contemplated by law, and for teaching which the public money is paid.

This, Mr. Chairman, is the policy which, after hearing the conflicting views of gentlemen all round the house, I believe on my honor and conscience to be true wisdom at the present time. It may not please my learned friends who, engaged in the attack and defence of Windsor, like the soldiers attacking and defending the French Farm House at Waterloo, cannot or will not take an enlarged survey of the whole field. It may not please those who desire to affirm or to deny an abstract principle, to which one portion of our people will cling and which another will repudiate, even though you put a dozen resolutions on the Journals. It may not please those who seek a party triumph, or wish to sweep away everything and build up nothing. It may be inconsistent with the policy of 1843, but that has been deliberately abandoned by Mr. Huntington, Mr. Henry and Mr. Young, and but languidly affirmed by the hon. and learned Speaker.

My consistency is not that obstinate