

STANDING REGULATIONS.

Correspondents must send their communications written in a legible hand, and, unless they contain the names of new subscribers, or remittance, free of postage; and request us in confidence, with their proper names and address.

The Editor holds not himself responsible for the opinions of correspondents—claims the privilege of modifying or rejecting articles offered for publication—and cannot pledge himself to return those not inserted.

Communications on business, and those intended for publication, when contained in the same letter, should, if practicable, be written on different parts of the sheet, so that they may be separated when they reach us.

Communications and exchanges should be addressed to the Editor, Halifax, N. S.

Issued weekly, on Saturday Morning—Terms Ten Shillings per annum, exclusive of postage—half yearly in advance—Single Copies three pence each.

The Wesleyan Ministers of the Nova Scotia and New Brunswick Districts are our Agents; who will receive orders and make remittances.

THE WESLEYAN.

Halifax, Saturday Morning, March 9, 1850.

THE CHRONICLE.

We thought we understood the *Chronicle*, but we confess we are at a loss to fathom his profundity, principally because, from a careful perusal of his last lucubration, we are led to conclude that he does not understand himself. When a person involves himself in impenetrable obscurity, or in the mazes of self-contradiction, we may be excused from attempting to follow an *ignis fatuus* into unknown regions. We stated our cotemporary's then recent conclusion that "our Colleges and Academies are a curse rather than a blessing," and therefore, in his mature judgment, "the wisest thing the Legislature could do would be to leave them all to the voluntary support of their friends." Pinched and fretted by our exposure of this unjust inference, we now find our consistent friend admitting the truthfulness of our allegation, that he was "the advocate of one college," &c., but affirming that "it is not true" that he was "ever opposed to Denominational Institutions"! Well, we are glad to hear that our cotemporary has at last confided his friendliness to the Institutions, in whose prosperity we feel so much interest. We justly require him to show that *Christianity deals as well as by words*. Professions, however, are so cheap in these times, that we value them little, especially when contradicted by actions. How would the *Chronicle* exemplify his good-will towards denominational Institutions? Evidently, on the descending scale—by knocking them down! Now we earnestly pray to be delivered from such ardent friendship. We maintain such a "scheme" is not upright—it is *lost* and *gravelly* in its tendency, and therefore we cannot approve of it.

Our "insinuation" (rather assertion) that he had come to the sage "conclusion" that our Colleges and Academies are a curse rather than a blessing, because he "had not been allowed to have his own way," the *Chronicle* pronounces "mean." Yet, if we can credit his last deliverance, he had a "scheme" of his own; and what does he say about it? Let not the reader be surprised. We know he is scarcely prepared for the statement. But why need he be surprised at our friend's tergiversation? Though, in one breath, denying the truth of our allegation, in another he says—"Our scheme to give the country an efficient system of Collegiate Education, was marred by a few narrow-minded, self-willed and interested *Cops*, operating upon a simple-minded and unsuspecting people!" The "shrewd" Editor has here over-reached his own shrewdness. He has let out the cause of his great and sudden change. His own beautiful "scheme" was "marred"—hence, because he has been thwarted in his *large-souled* purpose, he goes dead against all our Academies and Colleges, and piously con-

cludes "they are a curse rather than a blessing"! It will require some *scheming* to make this crookedness appear straight.

But is it not passing strange that a "few narrow-minded, self-willed and interested bigots" have been able to exercise such marvellous power as the *Chronicle* ascribes to them? That they have succeeded in *marrying* a "scheme," so wise in its plans, so just in its principles, and so efficient in its operations, as the one which has excited the longings of this disinterested, pliable, broad-minded, and latitudinarian Editor? We cannot consent to give these "bigots," whoever they are, so much credit. We attribute this imputation of power to the disordered state of our friend's spleen. He has evidently been very melancholy, and for him therefore we bespeak sympathy.

Hear him again, whilst in this sombre mood. He says he is "opposed to a few clamorous and interested Sectarians pressing unfairly upon the Legislature and controlling the Government." And yet this is the man—he is no sectarian—he belongs to no religious school—who, bursting with indignation, lifts up the *claymore* in threatening attitude to the Legislature and exclaims—"Aye, how long would the Assembly be settling the entire College Question, if there was MANLINESS and INDEPENDENCE enough in that Body, to repudiate all State grants to religious Denominations?" Soft impeachment! Will any honourable gentleman write a note to this said Editor making this "extraordinary attack," to ascertain whether he assumes the responsibility of this language, branding as it does the Members of the Assembly with *meanness* and *distortion of principle*? The *Chronicle* can deliberately charge the Members of the Assembly with want of "manliness and independence"—and yet his conscience, so tender in the case of "sectarians," quietly sleeps!

We admire his exceedingly great jealousy for the consistent conduct of Clergymen. If, however, he insinuates that *Wesleyan Ministers* "course the country, sowing strife and nurturing feelings of ill-will among our population, under cover of zeal for 'religious education'"—we tell him plainly that he knows it is not true, though it may be perfectly consistent with his apparent "scheme" to blacken and traduce their characters. Dear man, the *appearance* of two Wesleyan Ministers, in the lobby or gallery of the House, during the debate on Education, has affected his nervous system. It has literally haunted him—"ghosting" him, one would suppose, night and day. We wonder if he has not dreamed of it. What can be done? Well, it may allay his perturbation a little, if we assure him we were not "ghosts"—but true men. Dear—dear Sir, don't be afraid—we won't run after you—we won't hurt you. There—there—didn't we tell you so? Seriously, has it come to this pass, in a free and enlightened country, boasting of its free and liberal Institutions, that the Managing Committee of an Educational Seminary, to whom is entrusted the oversight of its interests, though Christian Ministers, cannot avail themselves of a privilege accorded to persons of all ranks, and listen to the debates of a wise and deliberative Body, the Representatives of the People, without the Editor of the *Chronicle* yelping after them, crying "ghosts"—"ghosts"—and taunting them with dereliction of duty? Such an attempt at oppression and tyranny is unparalleled in any other free country; and we say to this would-be large-minded Editor, in language as explicit as we can find, that he degrades his position by the repetition of these harsh, indecorous, and despotic charges, and that they will fail to pro-

duce in our minds any feeling other than pity for his littleness of soul.

"What is it but the money?"—"What is it but the money?"—"What is it but the money?" rings out the *Chronicle* that has influenced "two or three" he "could name."—Sure enough! What is it? We told him before he understood not their motives. But judging of others, perhaps, by the more perfect knowledge he has of himself, he asks, and asks again, "What is it but the money?" Poor man—he says he has never seen "the inside of any Institution of higher pretensions than a Common School"—and of course "Money tables," "the Rule of Three"—"Interest"—"Practice," &c., formed no mean part of his studies. Now we propose that he sit down and cipher out the question by *Vulgar Fractions*, and be sure to reduce it to the lowest denomination. Moral Philosophy is of course out of his line, otherwise we might direct his attention to the doctrine of *motives*. But we do not wish to take him in this cold weather beyond his depth. Does he understand us now?

Chagrined and chafed, the *Chronicle* evidently wishes to precipitate a discussion on the subject of *secular* education. Hitherto, we have avoided entering into it at large, not wishing unnecessarily to come into collision with the opinions of some who differ from us, but whom personally we highly respect. What we have said on this topic has been drawn from us, by what we considered unjust representations of education conducted in connexion with religious principles. But the *Chronicle*, like a mad horse which has thrown his rider, rushes forward, and is as likely to run against friends as foes. We caution him. The subject has not yet been put as extensively before the country as it is capable of being; and should he eventually force us to act on the offensive and carry the war into the camp of others, the fault will not be ours—it will lie at his own door. We can justify the course we take to our own consciences, and, on a fitting occasion, to the country.

THE HON. G. R. YOUNG.

On Saturday morning last, we received a Note from the Hon. G. R. Young, requesting to know if we admitted "responsibility for the three Editorials" contained in our number of the 23rd ult., on the subject of Education. To this request we replied by Note, and posted it in time, as we thought, for him to receive it the same day. Why it did not reach him until a late hour on Monday, we cannot say. Though, on the reception of his Note, we were fully expecting to be summoned to the Bar of the House to answer in the premises, yet this did not deter us from giving prompt satisfaction to the honourable gentleman. But instead of pursuing this course, the Hon. Gentleman has adopted a more enlightened one, and has sought through the columns of the *Chronicle* to make his reply. Now we tell the Hon. Gentleman with the utmost frankness that we respect our own position and character too highly to misrepresent *designedly* himself, the Hon. Speaker, Mr. Creelman, or any other Member of the House. We have published nothing more than what we conceive to have been the real design of their respective Addresses, and the statements which they made amply warranted. If wrong, we stand open to conviction. We do not intend to "degrade" or "profane" our columns by "scurrility and low abuse," but are resolved to conduct our periodical on such truthful principles as that our utterances shall have weight with the enlightened and unprejudiced portion of the community.

The Hon. G. R. Young styles our remarks on the subject in question an "extraordinary attack" on himself and others. If public Journalists have no absolute right to comment on the sayings and doings of the Representatives of the People in Parliament assembled, then we admit, on that ground, our articles might be construed into an *attack*, but if this right be conceded, then they were only an *answer*. Whether "extraordinary" or not must be determined by the facts of the case. What were then?

They may be thus briefly stated:—We knew "Sackville Academy" was an Educational Seminary which had been adopted by a large, respectable, and influential Body of Christians in Nova Scotia—that this Institution had been receiving pecuniary aid from this Legislature to assist it in its noble, enterprising—and that, on grounds which we conceived were as fairly represented, a strenuous effort was being made to denude it of this assistance and to cripple it to that extent. We knew that this Institution had been principally founded by a private, magnificent donation by one of Nova Scotia's worthiest sons—who had called forth the spontaneous liberality of thousands in its support, and in the course of the seven years past had expended upwards of *Twenty Thousand Pounds* directly and indirectly connected with its great and avowed object. We knew the Principal and other Officers of the Institution and the untiring zeal and indefatigable labour they had displayed in securing its efficiency—the Committee and Trustees, men of character, piety, and sterling worth, who have managed its affairs with the utmost economy—the education given, sound, thorough, extensive, and with strict reference to the morals of the students—the hundreds of youth who have reaped these advantages, and the country through them. We knew that Sackville Academy was not erected, and has not been sustained, for proselyting purposes, but has ever been conducted on the most liberal basis—that it has no Theological Chair, though in our judgment if it had its character would not be marred—and moreover that it has given general satisfaction and largely enjoyed public confidence. Why hostility should be manifested to this Seminary, we were, and are, at a loss to conceive, except on the ground of the infusion of the *religious element* into its system of practical working. When, therefore, we found honourable Members—we did not ask, nor do we now ask to what political party they belonged—urging and urging, not by sound and appropriate argumentation, but by slinging the charges on *sectarianism*, *sectarianism*, the "withdrawment"—excuse the word, we cannot find a better—of the generalised Legislative Grants, to clear the way for the introduction of a system of education to which thousands conscientiously object, we felt it a solemn duty to place their sayings and doings in this behalf honestly before the country. So much for the *causes* which led to our remarks. Now let us turn a moment to the subject matter of our statements.

The Hon. gentleman has given a selection of what he has been pleased to call " terse and pungent sentences," as "a sample of the uncharitable and sarcastic spirit in which the articles were dictated," and to enable him to "give the explanations which they imperatively demand." As to the *spirit*, we assure him that the said articles were written in a state of mind perfectly calm and unruffled. Truth, when most plainly told, oftentimes stings. That is not the fault of the agent of its transmission, but of the party giving cause for its use.

We have searched most industriously for the plain and positive *denials* of the truthfulness of our allegations—but in vain. "Explanations" have been vouchsafed, but not in the least degree affecting the *facts* we set forth. We might, if judged necessary, exhibit these *seriatim*, and then propose from them definite questions and demand categorical answers. For instance—we might ask if Mr. Henry did not affirm of Harvard College what we attributed to him? If the Hon. Speaker did not assert that he believed that there was not *one* Educational Institution under denominational government throughout the length and breadth of the American Union, that received a Legislative grant? If he did not propose to allow the Grant to King's

College to remain intact for two years, the same time to withdraw grants from the other Denominational Institutions, that this policy would arraign the latter against King's and affirm a plea to withhold aid from it? If the Speaker did not expressly *decide* among the present Institutions in the way of the erection of a new University? And if the Hon. himself did not avow his determination to support his brother's views to withdraw aid from Pictou Academy as well as Academies and Colleges? Some embraced in these questions are embraced given by the Hon. gentleman of our "uncharitable and sarcastic" style. But we did not *manufacture* the only *reported* them—and if they of an "uncharitable and sarcastic" style be placed to the account of

"I deny in express terms," says R. Young, "that I have ever uttered, either in the Assembly or elsewhere, the value and importance of a religion." We place this statement to the purpose of giving the Hon. full benefit of his denial, and for reference. On what ground the Hon. Legislature aid to Sackville Academy? The Editor of the *Wesleyan*, "has entirely misrepresented me. We will admit that we have not expressed opinions, when the fact not before. 'It is not true,' we have ever been opposed to the Theological Chairs or denominations for the special purpose Ministry, with the funds, and supervision of a sect." Grant the case—it is wide of the mark, touch the point at issue. Sackville, for instance, has no Theological Chair designed for the special purpose Wesleyan Ministers. It is a body under the management of belonging to the Wesleyan Body, give a sound and thorough secular connexion with the cultivation of the students, and general intellectual truths of Holy Writ, tempt, we again say, to proselytism. Abstract the religious element, believe that the Hon. gentleman find no fault with the secular system. If then he opposes this, be solely on account of its religious or religious principles. Truly adverted to above, we call the Hon. G. R. Young, and we fore him, as we have stated the account satisfactorily for his avowal of withdrawing Legislative aid to Sackville Academy to which the Hon. resort for education, he has never uttered a single the Assembly or out of it, and importance of a *religious* education he did oppose the grant thus conducted, we were shut out that he was opposed to a education conducted on *christian* therefore we conceive we have exposition of his views.

One would suppose that he that religion in connexion with necessary only for "the Ministry, be necessary for all—for those who are farther advance the season of youth is peculiar requirement of religious instruction great misapprehension, as a den of his defence appears to all, we wish to be informed speaks of his own "principles" Tolerant of what? The religious element into our high learning? Rather is it not a College and Academies instruction, the reading God, and devotional exercise or covertly to be excluded, dents ever acquire instruction