

the responsible station of religious teachers, and that no person would resist more strenuously than he, any improper interference with the freedom of thought, or religious opinions of those who might resort to the school. Indeed, when the institution was established, and its business matters placed on a proper basis, he withdrew, in a great measure, from any active participation in its concerns. The historian of the Meadville school will always have one fact to record worthy of commemoration,—that its principal founder had in view the advantage, not only of the young men connected with the body of which he was a member, but equally so, the advantage of those who were associated with a denomination to which, personally, he did not belong. He did not require any sectarian bond, before he acknowledged the tie and the claims of Christian brotherhood. It was a true liberality — not that which supports one form of religious belief as readily as another, because it is utterly indifferent to all — but a liberality which is regardless of sectarian names and success, provided that truth prospers and flourishes. The management of the school has been in the same spirit. Christians and Unitarians have been associated in it harmoniously — each using its advantages — and each retaining its name and individuality. It belongs to, and is under the control alike of Unitarians and Christians; or rather, we would hope, it belongs to Christ and Christian objects: and long may this union and co-operation of two bodies of Christian believers in the service of their common Master, continue.

We are not attempting — for we have not the means of doing so at our command — to write a biography of Mr. Huidekoper; but simply mentioning such incidents