

Biographical.

MR. CALVIN GOODWIN.

Late of Ottawa, who was born in the Province of Nova Scotia, near Bay de Vert, in April, 1800, and who died of small-pox, December the 9th, of the present year. Was of respectable parents, who dedicated him to God in infancy by the hands of a Wesleyan Minister. What his early religious opportunities were we do not certainly know, but he evidently had the fear of God before his eyes from a very early period. He was recognized on his arrival in Bytown, in 1829, as a moral virtuous young man, though not a public professor of religion till thirteen years after.

In 1833 he married a member of the Wesleyan Church, in the person of Miss Mary Pollock, the public services of which Church he most extensively attended till 1842, when some trouble arising in the Wesleyan congregation, many of the hearers resorted to the meetings of the Rev. James Gardner, a newly arrived minister of the Canada M. E. Church, under whose labours several persons were converted, and among the rest Mr. Goodwin. He naturally united with that Church, and became one of its principal supporters for some years, and a trustee and leader. Several years ago, for reasons which seemed sufficient to himself, he dismembered himself from that Church, and returned to the Wesleyan Church, of which he had always remained a member, and of which he now boasts not only an adherent but a member. And he so far gained the confidence of his brethren as to hold the office of steward for some years. The November Quarterly Meeting, only two or three weeks before his death, elected him to the stewardship of the poor-fund.

Mr. Goodwin before his conversion, was characterized by the strictest morality and temperance, and by the greatest probity and uprightness in his dealings with his fellow-men. He was simple in his habits and manners, and amiable and prepossessing. He was an ingenious and industrious mechanic, who accumulated a very respectable competency as the fruits of his attention to business. Yet he found time to hold intercourse with books; and few men in his active habits were more generally read or better informed.

He had very modest views of himself religiously considered, and in health was very prone to "write bitter things against himself," as his immediate friends and class mates very well know. He often spoke of death; which one would have thought, from the low opinion he had of his spiritual attainments, he regarded with gloomy apprehension. Yet it was far otherwise when he came to pass through "the Valley of the Shadow of Death." On Sunday, the 2nd inst., he was well, and at his post in the choir as usual. On the following Thursday, the pastor heard he was ill, and went to see him, and found he had been indisposed two or three days. He now thought his life in great danger, but spoke of death with cheerfulness and hope, as all being right between him and God. Twenty-four hours after, I went to see him, and found him worse, but equally happy. This was the last interview between us; occasional engagements calling me from home for a week. But his sympathizing leader, and a few other friends, despite the infectious nature of his disorder, hung around his bed, and by their prayers, conversation, and triumphs of joy and praise, cheered him quite through the gloomy vale, which he passed with the most lovely tranquility. He arranged all his worldly affairs with composure, spoke in the most cheerful terms of "going home" to heaven, and bid farewell to his wife and friends with the cheerful bow of meeting them in a better world. Few thought him in such immediate danger as he knew himself to be, as he sat up in his chair only a short time before his death. He asked to be helped back into his bed; bid those around him good-bye, and quietly "fell asleep (we trust) in Jesus, on Sabbath the 25th: in less than one week after the symptoms began to appear. Community deeply regret his loss, but he leaves but an immediate mourner in this country—his sorrow-stricken wife, to whom he was "all the world," as they had no children. May the angels overlook him at last "where friends shall meet to part no more!"

N. B.—The "Provincial Wesleyan" will please insert, for the information of his numerous relatives in Nova Scotia.—Christian Guardian.

Obituary Notices.

The subject of the following notice.—HENRY MARWOOD DANIEL, son of the Rev. H. Daniel, Wesleyan Minister, was born in Milltown, St. Stephens, in the year 1842.

He was a delicate child, fears were entertained that he might die in infancy, but by careful nursing, he soon overcame weakness, and became a lively sportive boy—at the regular hours attending to school—(the regular changes of a stationary life could give him)—and when permitted noise threw more elastic vigor and heartiness into the innocent amusements of children than our young friend.

At the age of nine years he found himself with his parents in England. His father at that time was stationed on the St. Austle Circuit, in the Cornwall District. Admission was obtained for Henry at New Kingswood School, near Bath, and his father well recollects the conversation that passed between his dear boy and himself, as they walked up Lansdown Hill, and came in sight of the noble building known as "Kingswood School,"—on the great pleasure he felt at becoming a inmate of that invaluable institution; and, after being introduced to the Governor (the late Rev. J. C. Carver), the many very respectful manner in which he replied to the questions proposed to him. He soon gained the good will of his teachers and schoolfellows, and never once during his residence at Kingswood did he complain, or express discontent. The time came when his parents were called to leave the land of their birth and return again to New Brunswick, where so many years of Missionary life had previously been spent. This was a great trial to our young friend; he wished much to accompany his friends to America, but believing it would be for his advantage to remain at Kingswood, he cheerfully bore the separation. His progress at school was steady and very satisfactory. The prizes which he won, and the testimony of the Governor at his leaving school,—show the high estimation in which he was held. In the summer of 1858 he arrived at St. John's, N. F., where his father was then stationed. He had grown tall, was healthy, lively, ardent, and ambitious to excel in the profession of his choice. Arrangements were made for him to commence the study of medicine with Dr. Carson, and, accordingly, in whose establishment he remained, until after Dr. Carson's death, when he was naturally designed for the medical profession; his love of anatomical studies and operations, and his patient application to the study of different branches of the profession, marked him out as likely to excel,—so the lamented Dr. Carson expressed himself to his father.

On his father's removal to Charlottetown, P. E. I. it was decided that Henry should leave Newfoundland, and commence his Collegiate course of medical studies.—In the month of Oct. he reached Pictou in good health, but the weather being wet and stormy, he took a severe cold which brought on typhoid fever, so that he was unable to proceed as he had intended to do, and which helped to sustain him even when recovery was just at hand.

Resolved, that he was admonished by his example and his sudden death to improve with the same earnestness of spirit the opportunities before us; regarding this life as but a probation, and death as the inevitable fulfilment of it, in accordance with some great organic law.

Resolved, that we extend our heart-felt sympathies to his parents and friends in their bereavement; trusting that they will be consoled by the thought that he died with Christian resignation, and with full consciousness of the new and wider sphere upon which he was about to enter.

It is gratifying to his parents to receive such frank and unfeigned testimony of the high esteem and respect which their son had acquired in so short a time; and especially of the blessed evidence which he has left behind of his eternal happiness with God in heavenly glory. This is their solace and joy. "Be ye also ready, for in such an hour as ye think not the Son of Man cometh."

It is gratifying to his parents to receive such frank and unfeigned testimony of the high esteem and respect which their son had acquired in so short a time; and especially of the blessed evidence which he has left behind of his eternal happiness with God in heavenly glory. This is their solace and joy. "Be ye also ready, for in such an hour as ye think not the Son of Man cometh."

It is gratifying to his parents to receive such frank and unfeigned testimony of the high esteem and respect which their son had acquired in so short a time; and especially of the blessed evidence which he has left behind of his eternal happiness with God in heavenly glory. This is their solace and joy. "Be ye also ready, for in such an hour as ye think not the Son of Man cometh."

Provincial Wesleyan.

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 30, 1861.

In consequence of the official relation which this paper sustains to the Conference of Eastern British America, we require that Obituary, Revival, and other notices addressed to us from any of the Circuits within the bounds of that Conference, should be sent to the hands of the Superintendent Minister.

Communications designed for this paper must be accompanied by the name of the author, and we do not undertake to return rejected articles. We do not assume responsibility for the opinions of our correspondents.

Collegiate Education.

No. 3.

To thoughtful and intelligent Methodists throughout the Lower Colonies.

FELLOW COUNTRYMEN:

In our last we insisted upon the necessity of Christianizing Collegiate Education; adducing reasons rendering that necessity imperative. While thus engaged, we were not unmindful of the great truth, that God will plant an Apple tree, but God will give the increase. We were proceeding in reliance upon the strength of the correlative principle that without seed-sowing there can be no grain-reaping—that general showers and glistening sunbeams do not supersede human industry—they unite, and reward it. We now press the inquiry, by what means is the highest guarantee to be obtained for the union of moral with mental culture in Collegiate training? There are three principal methods of establishing, sustaining and controlling Collegiate Institutions. The first mode is that in which the State establishes, sustains and controls. The second, that in which the individual founds and endows and controls by representative legal appointment. The third, that in which the denomination, with or without State aid, founds, sustains and controls. Let us examine each of these methods, and ascertain by which of them the most effective guarantee for Christian education can be secured to a Christian people. The State or the Government which is its embodiment and representative, can neither justify nor wisely usurp the functions of the Church. The temporal well-being, not the spiritual interests of a nation, is comprised within the sphere of State responsibility. Secular Governments cannot of right intrude within the domain of conscience, or perform the office of a religious teacher. It cannot, save by usurpation, impart moral culture either in the College or Church. There should be an acknowledgment by the State of the existence and sovereignty rule of the King of Kings, to whom all Governments are responsible; and, as we think, also, a recognition of Divine Revelation and of the Christ made known thereby; and all its law-making and law-executing functions; and all its law-making and law-executing functions; and all its law-making and law-executing functions.

A State College is controlled directly by the Government of the state, or by a body appointed by the Government. This controlling senate or body, may or may not be composed of religious men. If it, or a majority thereof, shall be composed of non-religious men, the infusion of a religious element into the College is impossible. It cannot be without absurdity expected, if on the other hand, by some happy providence, it may now and then happen that the governing body shall be composed of intelligently pious men, its duties, doubtless, will be performed under a sense of religious obligation; but from the very fact that the members of this body represent the state, composed of many denominations, with their jealousies, fears, prejudices and very opposite views of religious truth, their efforts to ward combining moral with mental culture, must from their state character, be narrowed down to the most meagre outline of action; most likely they will find their duties almost entirely lying within the sphere of secular operation. How, then, can the appointment of the President and the Professors of a State College be made, whether directly by the Government or indirectly through a Senate, no religious test can be honestly applied—literary and scientific acquirement, aptitude for teaching and government, with general good character, can alone be regarded in competitors for Professorial chairs. Under such a rule, the only rule consistent with State management, the Presidency and other leading chairs, might fall into the hands of Roman Catholics or all the chairs might be held by Protestants; if the former supposition were verified, large portions of the Protestant population would be hostile to it—if the latter were realized, the Roman Catholics would severely be satisfied largely to patronize it. Or the chair might be occupied by Arians, Socinians, and Deists, it not infrequently, whose great and necessary influence with those sitting at their feet would be pernicious to all Christian interests. In such a case, and the State principle can give no honest, consistent pledge that such a case shall not arise, no conscientious parent, whether Protestant or papist, would educate his children under such auspices. An attempt might be made to meet these difficulties by permitting the clergy of the various denominations, as selected by the parents and guardians of youth, to have regular access to the undergraduates for specific religious purposes. Where State Colleges exist, we believe this arrangement should be made—as an arrangement exhibiting State Colleges in the most favourable light in which they can be presented in respect to provision for moral culture, if at the same time, the President and Professors be truly pious men, infusing, as far as State trammels permit, a conserving Christian influence into their respective departments. Nevertheless, we do not believe that what may be a godless or deistical or infidel education within the walls of a college will be sufficiently counteracted by the occasional interposition of the clergy from without. The highest guarantee for the effective presence of the religious element in Collegiate Education cannot be given by a State college.

In regard to Colleges, founded and endowed fully or partially by the benevolence of an individual, they may be presented to the State, sub-

ject of course, to State control, and then, they are to be regarded simply as State institutions; or they may be presented to denominations, and then, they must be classed with denominational institutions, or they may remain under the control of the founder or his representatives as a large amount of wealth at the service of Christian Collegiate Education, the magnificent gifts of sanctified affluence, the cheerful tribute of generous poverty, the precious time of the tearful widow, all consecrated by prayer and love, and faith and hope. Secondly, Denominations in a position to do more work for the same sum than State Institutions can perform—there are motives to economy which State Institutions never feel—this work, larger in quantity, will not necessarily be inferior in quality. Thirdly, the Denominational College system calls for a larger number of students than any other system is likely to obtain; for Denominations which have established Colleges by large-hearted benevolence, perhaps by painful sacrifices, will naturally seek out, and encourage as many youth as possible to fill up the Institutions thus supported and loved.

For the Provincial Wesleyan.

Collegiate Education, &c., &c.

MR. EDITOR.—As several Editorial articles have appeared in the Colonial Wesleyan in reply to my unpretending communications to your columns, I must make still further demands on your valuable space. I shall simply attempt to place, as clearly and concisely as I may, the exact position in which the question at issue, between us now stands, before the public eye. I make the attempt, I am free to confess, with a goodly degree of diffidence, in view of the fact that your contemporary pronouncements are, somewhat, "a miserable logician." The kindly remark that my "historical fact is considerable," would tend to take the edge off of this sharp assercion, did I not find in close connection therewith such clauses and expressions as these: "turning Sackville into a College," "the attitude of the dark ages," "Laicus who has only just made a feint," &c., &c., &c. The value of a compliment depends altogether on the character and capacity of the giver.

The design of my former communications was, in the first place, to assert for the Church to which I belong a perfect and indefeasible right to decide her own Educational policy. In connection with this point I attempted—with what success, let others decide—to show that the writer of the editorial, or "pseudo-editorial" in the Wesleyan, which called this right in question, was unfit for his self-assumed position of Educational Dictator-General. I then aimed to prove that the proposal to establish a College at Sackville, in connection with the existing institution, was not a "new-fangled notion"—the dreamy project of "Juvenis" and "two or three other ambitious men." Facts, which the Wesleyan may evade, but cannot controvert, were adduced to show that it is the deliberate and well-weighed purpose of the Wesleyan Church of Eastern British America, that she has bound herself to its speedy fulfilment by solemn pledge, and recognizes it as a sacred and pressing duty. In the third place I made it appear that there was nothing in the assertion of your correspondent "Juvenis" to the effect that the early accomplishment of this design was in every way feasible, which deserved the ill-mixed and ungentlemanly sneers with which the Wesleyan affected to greet it. By a reference to the past history and present status of the Mount Allison Institution, I showed, on evidence that is absolutely incontrovertible, that its Educational facilities need but a moderate increase to place it at least on a level with the other Provincial Colleges. In conclusion, I referred to the matter of Legislative aid, and showed that, in view of past liberality, and of the fact that neither Government nor Legislature has announced either principle or policy antagonistic to such appropriations, the friends of the institution may reasonably expect their moderate claims to receive due consideration. In doing so, I respectfully intimated that it would be safe for the present to assume that the Editor of the Wesleyan speaks his own sentiments—not those of Government and Legislature, as unfortunately for himself, he seems to suppose.

He affirms that I wish "to pooh-pooh the discussion," yet which of the points has he met fairly and openly? Does he expect me "to discuss his dreary commonplace on 'Secularism'?" Such a beggarly "begging of the question" I have not seen for many a day. Let the thinking public note the fact that the above mentioned points, containing in reality the whole substance of the original controversy, the Wesleyan has, in effect, "dodged."

The very first sentence of the reply to my first communication contains a gross misrepresentation. I am therein charged with professing to "think that the discussion of such matters (educational matters in general, as the context shows) should be avoided by the Press, and left in the hands of Synods, Conferences, etc." I profess to think no such thing. Speaking of the Theological training of the rising ministry, I did say that "it was eminently a proper matter for the Churches to decide for themselves." The Wesleyan can deny this, if it chooses. It would be in keeping with its sentiments to do so; but let it not impose on me opinions that I do not hold, and that I positively disown. Such conduct, it seems to me, is quite too bad for even "the tongue of the dark ages."

The Wesleyan then tells me that I had endeavored to convince the tax-payers of New Brunswick, and the friends of a thorough Collegiate education, that they have not a perfect right to canvass this matter thoroughly, and watch the future actions of the Legislature in regard to it most narrowly. "Laicus" will, doubtless, find it very hard to carry out any such foolish project as this; but as he has attempted nothing of the kind, and as he is doing all in his power to ensure these matters a thorough canvassing, the Wesleyan may find this a rather unhappy reference to tax-payers and appropriations.—Perhaps by the time my friend, the Editor, has secured for his own dear University "such additional endowments as may be required" in his opinion to save "the country from disgrace," and "his brightening educational prospects" from "destruction," as well as to prevent "the friends of liberal education" from "suspending further efforts" or "leaving the country in despair," he may meet with an unpleasant and practical application of his own doctrine. I commend to him his own favorite expression of a "Herculean task." The tax-payers of New Brunswick will need some convincing, it may be, before they consent to add anything to the ten or fifteen thousand dollars which this institution already drains from public funds—at least, until the resulting good assumes a more tangible and expressive shape than hitherto has been the case.

The charges that "Laicus does not desire to see any but a Wesleyan College endowed," and that "he thinks he can convince the Legislature of the Province to grant to the respected Wesleyan body what it will and cannot grant to the Presbyterians, Baptists, Episcopals, Catholics, etc.," I simply and indignantly deny. With my co-religionists, the wide world over, I protest against monopolies, and advocate equal rights for all. I seek the adoption of a comprehensive system of higher education, which, in accordance with the experience of the world, by ex-

ing private liberality and evoking denominational enterprises, will, at comparatively small public cost, accomplish for our country and mankind what, by any other means, they would scarcely be able to do. We are, therefore, most desirous to see the fountain of private benevolence, placing a large amount of wealth at the service of Christian Collegiate Education, the magnificent gifts of sanctified affluence, the cheerful tribute of generous poverty, the precious time of the tearful widow, all consecrated by prayer and love, and faith and hope. Secondly, Denominations in a position to do more work for the same sum than State Institutions can perform—there are motives to economy which State Institutions never feel—this work, larger in quantity, will not necessarily be inferior in quality. Thirdly, the Denominational College system calls for a larger number of students than any other system is likely to obtain; for Denominations which have established Colleges by large-hearted benevolence, perhaps by painful sacrifices, will naturally seek out, and encourage as many youth as possible to fill up the Institutions thus supported and loved.

For the Provincial Wesleyan.

Collegiate Education, &c., &c.

MR. EDITOR.—As several Editorial articles have appeared in the Colonial Wesleyan in reply to my unpretending communications to your columns, I must make still further demands on your valuable space. I shall simply attempt to place, as clearly and concisely as I may, the exact position in which the question at issue, between us now stands, before the public eye. I make the attempt, I am free to confess, with a goodly degree of diffidence, in view of the fact that your contemporary pronouncements are, somewhat, "a miserable logician." The kindly remark that my "historical fact is considerable," would tend to take the edge off of this sharp assercion, did I not find in close connection therewith such clauses and expressions as these: "turning Sackville into a College," "the attitude of the dark ages," "Laicus who has only just made a feint," &c., &c., &c. The value of a compliment depends altogether on the character and capacity of the giver.

The design of my former communications was, in the first place, to assert for the Church to which I belong a perfect and indefeasible right to decide her own Educational policy. In connection with this point I attempted—with what success, let others decide—to show that the writer of the editorial, or "pseudo-editorial" in the Wesleyan, which called this right in question, was unfit for his self-assumed position of Educational Dictator-General. I then aimed to prove that the proposal to establish a College at Sackville, in connection with the existing institution, was not a "new-fangled notion"—the dreamy project of "Juvenis" and "two or three other ambitious men." Facts, which the Wesleyan may evade, but cannot controvert, were adduced to show that it is the deliberate and well-weighed purpose of the Wesleyan Church of Eastern British America, that she has bound herself to its speedy fulfilment by solemn pledge, and recognizes it as a sacred and pressing duty. In the third place I made it appear that there was nothing in the assertion of your correspondent "Juvenis" to the effect that the early accomplishment of this design was in every way feasible, which deserved the ill-mixed and ungentlemanly sneers with which the Wesleyan affected to greet it. By a reference to the past history and present status of the Mount Allison Institution, I showed, on evidence that is absolutely incontrovertible, that its Educational facilities need but a moderate increase to place it at least on a level with the other Provincial Colleges. In conclusion, I referred to the matter of Legislative aid, and showed that, in view of past liberality, and of the fact that neither Government nor Legislature has announced either principle or policy antagonistic to such appropriations, the friends of the institution may reasonably expect their moderate claims to receive due consideration. In doing so, I respectfully intimated that it would be safe for the present to assume that the Editor of the Wesleyan speaks his own sentiments—not those of Government and Legislature, as unfortunately for himself, he seems to suppose.

He affirms that I wish "to pooh-pooh the discussion," yet which of the points has he met fairly and openly? Does he expect me "to discuss his dreary commonplace on 'Secularism'?" Such a beggarly "begging of the question" I have not seen for many a day. Let the thinking public note the fact that the above mentioned points, containing in reality the whole substance of the original controversy, the Wesleyan has, in effect, "dodged."

The very first sentence of the reply to my first communication contains a gross misrepresentation. I am therein charged with professing to "think that the discussion of such matters (educational matters in general, as the context shows) should be avoided by the Press, and left in the hands of Synods, Conferences, etc." I profess to think no such thing. Speaking of the Theological training of the rising ministry, I did say that "it was eminently a proper matter for the Churches to decide for themselves." The Wesleyan can deny this, if it chooses. It would be in keeping with its sentiments to do so; but let it not impose on me opinions that I do not hold, and that I positively disown. Such conduct, it seems to me, is quite too bad for even "the tongue of the dark ages."

The Wesleyan then tells me that I had endeavored to convince the tax-payers of New Brunswick, and the friends of a thorough Collegiate education, that they have not a perfect right to canvass this matter thoroughly, and watch the future actions of the Legislature in regard to it most narrowly. "Laicus" will, doubtless, find it very hard to carry out any such foolish project as this; but as he has attempted nothing of the kind, and as he is doing all in his power to ensure these matters a thorough canvassing, the Wesleyan may find this a rather unhappy reference to tax-payers and appropriations.—Perhaps by the time my friend, the Editor, has secured for his own dear University "such additional endowments as may be required" in his opinion to save "the country from disgrace," and "his brightening educational prospects" from "destruction," as well as to prevent "the friends of liberal education" from "suspending further efforts" or "leaving the country in despair," he may meet with an unpleasant and practical application of his own doctrine. I commend to him his own favorite expression of a "Herculean task." The tax-payers of New Brunswick will need some convincing, it may be, before they consent to add anything to the ten or fifteen thousand dollars which this institution already drains from public funds—at least, until the resulting good assumes a more tangible and expressive shape than hitherto has been the case.

The charges that "Laicus does not desire to see any but a Wesleyan College endowed," and that "he thinks he can convince the Legislature of the Province to grant to the respected Wesleyan body what it will and cannot grant to the Presbyterians, Baptists, Episcopals, Catholics, etc.," I simply and indignantly deny. With my co-religionists, the wide world over, I protest against monopolies, and advocate equal rights for all. I seek the adoption of a comprehensive system of higher education, which, in accordance with the experience of the world, by ex-

ing private liberality and evoking denominational enterprises, will, at comparatively small public cost, accomplish for our country and mankind what, by any other means, they would scarcely be able to do. We are, therefore, most desirous to see the fountain of private benevolence, placing a large amount of wealth at the service of Christian Collegiate Education, the magnificent gifts of sanctified affluence, the cheerful tribute of generous poverty, the precious time of the tearful widow, all consecrated by prayer and love, and faith and hope. Secondly, Denominations in a position to do more work for the same sum than State Institutions can perform—there are motives to economy which State Institutions never feel—this work, larger in quantity, will not necessarily be inferior in quality. Thirdly, the Denominational College system calls for a larger number of students than any other system is likely to obtain; for Denominations which have established Colleges by large-hearted benevolence, perhaps by painful sacrifices, will naturally seek out, and encourage as many youth as possible to fill up the Institutions thus supported and loved.

For the Provincial Wesleyan.

Collegiate Education, &c., &c.

MR. EDITOR.—As several Editorial articles have appeared in the Colonial Wesleyan in reply to my unpretending communications to your columns, I must make still further demands on your valuable space. I shall simply attempt to place, as clearly and concisely as I may, the exact position in which the question at issue, between us now stands, before the public eye. I make the attempt, I am free to confess, with a goodly degree of diffidence, in view of the fact that your contemporary pronouncements are, somewhat, "a miserable logician." The kindly remark that my "historical fact is considerable," would tend to take the edge off of this sharp assercion, did I not find in close connection therewith such clauses and expressions as these: "turning Sackville into a College," "the attitude of the dark ages," "Laicus who has only just made a feint," &c., &c., &c. The value of a compliment depends altogether on the character and capacity of the giver.

The design of my former communications was, in the first place, to assert for the Church to which I belong a perfect and indefeasible right to decide her own Educational policy. In connection with this point I attempted—with what success, let others decide—to show that the writer of the editorial, or "pseudo-editorial" in the Wesleyan, which called this right in question, was unfit for his self-assumed position of Educational Dictator-General. I then aimed to prove that the proposal to establish a College at Sackville, in connection with the existing institution, was not a "new-fangled notion"—the dreamy project of "Juvenis" and "two or three other ambitious men." Facts, which the Wesleyan may evade, but cannot controvert, were adduced to show that it is the deliberate and well-weighed purpose of the Wesleyan Church of Eastern British America, that she has bound herself to its speedy fulfilment by solemn pledge, and recognizes it as a sacred and pressing duty. In the third place I made it appear that there was nothing in the assertion of your correspondent "Juvenis" to the effect that the early accomplishment of this design was in every way feasible, which deserved the ill-mixed and ungentlemanly sneers with which the Wesleyan affected to greet it. By a reference to the past history and present status of the Mount Allison Institution, I showed, on evidence that is absolutely incontrovertible, that its Educational facilities need but a moderate increase to place it at least on a level with the other Provincial Colleges. In conclusion, I referred to the matter of Legislative aid, and showed that, in view of past liberality, and of the fact that neither Government nor Legislature has announced either principle or policy antagonistic to such appropriations, the friends of the institution may reasonably expect their moderate claims to receive due consideration. In doing so, I respectfully intimated that it would be safe for the present to assume that the Editor of the Wesleyan speaks his own sentiments—not those of Government and Legislature, as unfortunately for himself, he seems to suppose.

He affirms that I wish "to pooh-pooh the discussion," yet which of the points has he met fairly and openly? Does he expect me "to discuss his dreary commonplace on 'Secularism'?" Such a beggarly "begging of the question" I have not seen for many a day. Let the thinking public note the fact that the above mentioned points, containing in reality the whole substance of the original controversy, the Wesleyan has, in effect, "dodged."

The very first sentence of the reply to my first communication contains a gross misrepresentation. I am therein charged with professing to "think that the discussion of such matters (educational matters in general, as the context shows) should be avoided by the Press, and left in the hands of Synods, Conferences, etc." I profess to think no such thing. Speaking of the Theological training of the rising ministry, I did say that "it was eminently a proper matter for the Churches to decide for themselves." The Wesleyan can deny this, if it chooses. It would be in keeping with its sentiments to do so; but let it not impose on me opinions that I do not hold, and that I positively disown. Such conduct, it seems to me, is quite too bad for even "the tongue of the dark ages."

The Wesleyan then tells me that I had endeavored to convince the tax-payers of New Brunswick, and the friends of a thorough Collegiate education, that they have not a perfect right to canvass this matter thoroughly, and watch the future actions of the Legislature in regard to it most narrowly. "Laicus" will, doubtless, find it very hard to carry out any such foolish project as this; but as he has attempted nothing of the kind, and as he is doing all in his power to ensure these matters a thorough canvassing, the Wesleyan may find this a rather unhappy reference to tax-payers and appropriations.—Perhaps by the time my friend, the Editor, has secured for his own dear University "such additional endowments as may be required" in his opinion to save "the country from disgrace," and "his brightening educational prospects" from "destruction," as well as to prevent "the friends of liberal education" from "suspending further efforts" or "leaving the country in despair," he may meet with an unpleasant and practical application of his own doctrine. I commend to him his own favorite expression of a "Herculean task." The tax-payers of New Brunswick will need some convincing, it may be, before they consent to add anything to the ten or fifteen thousand dollars which this institution already drains from public funds—at least, until the resulting good assumes a more tangible and expressive shape than hitherto has been the case.

The charges that "Laicus does not desire to see any but a Wesleyan College endowed," and that "he thinks he can convince the Legislature of the Province to grant to the respected Wesleyan body what it will and cannot grant to the Presbyterians, Baptists, Episcopals, Catholics, etc.," I simply and indignantly deny. With my co-religionists, the wide world over, I protest against monopolies, and advocate equal rights for all. I seek the adoption of a comprehensive system of higher education, which, in accordance with the experience of the world, by ex-

ing private liberality and evoking denominational enterprises, will, at comparatively small public cost, accomplish for our country and mankind what, by any other means, they would scarcely be able to do. We are, therefore, most desirous to see the fountain of private benevolence, placing a large amount of wealth at the service of Christian Collegiate Education, the magnificent gifts of sanctified affluence, the cheerful tribute of generous poverty, the precious time of the tearful widow, all consecrated by prayer and love, and faith and hope. Secondly, Denominations in a position to do more work for the same sum than State Institutions can perform—there are motives to economy which State Institutions never feel—this work, larger in quantity, will not necessarily be inferior in quality. Thirdly, the Denominational College system calls for a larger number of students than any other system is likely to obtain; for Denominations which have established Colleges by large-hearted benevolence, perhaps by painful sacrifices, will naturally seek out, and encourage as many youth as possible to fill up the Institutions thus supported and loved.

For the Provincial Wesleyan.

Collegiate Education, &c., &c.

MR. EDITOR.—As several Editorial articles have appeared in the Colonial Wesleyan in reply to my unpretending communications to your columns, I must make still further demands on your valuable space. I shall simply attempt to place, as clearly and concisely as I may, the exact position in which the question at issue, between us now stands, before the public eye. I make the attempt, I am free to confess, with a goodly degree of diffidence, in view of the fact that your contemporary pronouncements are, somewhat, "a miserable logician." The kindly remark that my "historical fact is considerable," would tend to take the edge off of this sharp assercion, did I not find in close connection therewith such clauses and expressions as these: "turning Sackville into a College," "the attitude of the dark ages," "Laicus who has only just made a feint," &c., &c., &c. The value of a compliment depends altogether on the character and capacity of the giver.

The design of my former communications was, in the first place, to assert for the Church to which I belong a perfect and indefeasible right to decide her own Educational policy. In connection with this point I attempted—with what success, let others decide—to show that the writer of the editorial, or "pseudo-editorial" in the Wesleyan, which called this right in question, was unfit for his self-assumed position of Educational Dictator-General. I then aimed to prove that the proposal to establish a College at Sackville, in connection with the existing institution, was not a "new-fangled notion"—the dreamy project of "Juvenis" and "two or three other ambitious men." Facts, which the Wesleyan may evade, but cannot controvert, were adduced to show that it is the deliberate and well-weighed purpose of the Wesleyan Church of Eastern British America, that she has bound herself to its speedy fulfilment by solemn pledge, and recognizes it as a sacred and pressing duty. In the third place I made it appear that there was nothing in the assertion of your correspondent "Juvenis" to the effect that the early accomplishment of this design was in every way feasible, which deserved the ill-mixed and ungentlemanly sneers with which the Wesleyan affected to greet it. By a reference to the past history and present status of the Mount Allison Institution, I showed, on evidence that is absolutely incontrovertible, that its Educational facilities need but a moderate increase to place it at least on a level with the other Provincial Colleges. In conclusion, I referred to the matter of Legislative aid, and showed that, in view of past liberality, and of the fact that neither Government nor Legislature has announced either principle or policy antagonistic to such appropriations, the friends of the institution may reasonably expect their moderate claims to receive due consideration. In doing so, I respectfully intimated that it would be safe for the present to assume that the Editor of the Wesleyan speaks his own sentiments—not those of Government and Legislature, as unfortunately for himself, he seems to suppose.

He affirms that I wish "to pooh-pooh the discussion," yet which of the points has he met fairly and openly? Does he expect me "to discuss his dreary commonplace on 'Secularism'?" Such a beggarly "begging of the question" I have not seen for many a day. Let the thinking public note the fact that the above mentioned points, containing in reality the whole substance of the original controversy, the Wesleyan has, in effect, "dodged."

The very first sentence of the reply to my first communication contains a gross misrepresentation. I am therein charged with professing to "think that the discussion of such matters (educational matters in general, as the context shows) should be avoided by the Press, and left in the hands of Synods, Conferences, etc." I profess to think no such thing. Speaking of the Theological training of the rising ministry, I did say that "it was eminently a proper matter for the Churches to decide for themselves." The Wesleyan can deny this, if it chooses. It would be in keeping with its sentiments to do so; but let it not impose on me opinions that I do not hold, and that I positively disown. Such conduct, it seems to me, is quite too bad for even "the tongue of the dark ages."

The Wesleyan then tells me that I had endeavored to convince the tax-payers of New Brunswick, and the friends of a thorough Collegiate education, that they have not a perfect right to canvass this matter thoroughly, and watch the future actions of the Legislature in regard to it most narrowly. "Laicus" will, doubtless, find it very hard to carry out any such foolish project as this; but as he has attempted nothing of the kind, and as he is doing all in his power to ensure these matters a thorough canvassing, the Wesleyan may find this a rather unhappy reference to tax-payers and appropriations.—Perhaps by the time my friend, the Editor, has secured for his own dear University "such additional endowments as may be required" in his opinion to save "the country from disgrace," and "his brightening educational prospects" from "destruction," as well as to prevent "the friends of liberal education" from "suspending further efforts" or "leaving the country in despair," he may meet with an unpleasant and practical application of his own doctrine. I commend to him his own favorite expression of a "Herculean task." The tax-payers of New Brunswick will need some convincing, it may be, before they consent to add anything to the ten or fifteen thousand dollars which this institution already drains from public funds—at least, until the resulting good assumes a more tangible and expressive shape than hitherto has been the case.

The charges that "Laicus does not desire to see any but a Wesleyan College endowed," and that "he thinks he can convince the Legislature of the Province to grant to the respected Wesleyan body what it will and cannot grant to the Presbyterians, Baptists, Episcopals, Catholics, etc.," I simply and indignantly deny. With my co-religionists, the wide world over, I protest against monopolies, and advocate equal rights for all. I seek the adoption of a comprehensive system of higher education, which, in accordance with the experience of the world, by ex-

ing private liberality and evoking denominational enterprises, will, at comparatively small public cost, accomplish for our country and mankind what, by any other means, they would scarcely be able to do. We are, therefore, most desirous to see the fountain of private benevolence, placing a large amount of wealth at the service of Christian Collegiate Education, the magnificent gifts of sanctified affluence, the cheerful tribute of generous poverty, the precious time of the tearful widow, all consecrated by prayer and love, and faith and hope. Secondly, Denominations in a position to do more work for the same sum than State Institutions can perform—there are motives to economy which State Institutions never feel—this work, larger in quantity, will not necessarily be inferior in quality. Thirdly, the Denominational College system calls for a larger number of students than any other system is likely to obtain; for Denominations which have established Colleges by large-hearted benevolence, perhaps by painful sacrifices, will naturally seek out, and encourage as many youth as possible to fill up the Institutions thus supported and loved.

For the Provincial Wesleyan.

Collegiate Education, &c., &c.

MR. EDITOR.—As several Editorial articles have appeared in the Colonial Wesleyan in reply to my unpretending communications to your columns, I must make still further demands on your valuable space. I shall simply attempt to place, as clearly and concisely as I may, the exact position in which the question at issue, between us now stands, before the public eye. I make the attempt, I am free to confess, with a goodly degree of diffidence, in view of the fact that your contemporary pronouncements are, somewhat, "a miserable logician." The kindly remark that my "historical fact is considerable," would tend to take the edge off of this sharp assercion, did I not find in close connection therewith such clauses and expressions as these: "turning Sackville into a College," "the attitude of the dark ages," "Laicus who has only just made a feint," &c., &c., &c. The value of a compliment depends altogether on the character and capacity of the giver.

The design of my former communications was, in the first place, to assert for the Church to which I belong a perfect and indefeasible right to decide her own Educational policy. In connection with this point I attempted—with what success, let others decide—to show that the writer of the editorial, or "pseudo-editorial" in the Wesleyan, which called this right in question, was unfit for his self-assumed position of Educational Dictator-General. I then aimed to prove that the proposal to establish a College at Sackville, in connection with the existing institution, was not a "