

anything by examples. We may add, however, that a Dalhousie freshman who subsequently entered our College pronounced our examination far more searching and severe than that of the Institution left; and further, an "Acadian" who has pursued his medical studies at Dalhousie corroborates the statement.

In another editorial of the *Gazette*, these words occur: "When the other colleges print examination papers, it will then be time for them to criticize our standard of scholarship." Again, "What our degrees are worth can be told from an inspection of the examination papers at the end of our Calendar." To this we reply that, in the first place, we fail to recognize anything strikingly remarkable in the character of said papers. They are of average difficulty and nothing more. Secondly, it is not easy to see the force of printing the test papers placed before the students, when the *answers* to them never come to light. Under the present condition of things, we have a nice example of the ability of their professors to put searching *questions*, but no evidence whatever of the ability of the students to give thorough *answers*. That the young men must make a certain *average* on their work, we, of course, admit; but the very publication of the questions, without a similar publication of the replies, puts a false gloss on the work done at the examinations.

We have thus reviewed the various statements of the *Gazette* that bear particularly upon us; and though our reply is unusually long, reference to all the points at issue has necessitated it. We cheerfully place this before the public side by side with the articles of the *Gazette*, and yield a ready acquiescence to public decision. Our countrymen, with both sides presented to their view, are now in a position to judge whether, as the *Gazette* states, we have "quibbled," and "prevaricated," and "told deliberate falsehoods," or whether it is that astute sheet *itself* that has defied the principles of "common sense" and "common honesty."

"PATENT THEOLOGICO ARTS" is the derisive neologism with which the *Gazette* is pleased to stigmatize the curriculum at Acadia. We have since forwarded to its editors a conspectus (published on another page) of the studies pursued at our institution during the present year. This was accompanied by a short note which *Gazette* No. 9, is pleased to designate as "a unique production of touching simplicity." For the benefit of our readers we insert the note *in toto*:—

EDITORS DALHOUSIE GAZETTE.

Gentlemen,

In the last issue of your paper a statement occurs to this effect: "We do not insinuate that the course of study at Acadia is a patent theologic arts' one; but affirm the fact unreservedly." In order now that you may see that you have given publicity to a glaring falsehood in the coarsest manner, we enclose to you a conspectus of our studies for the present year. This conspectus is carried out to the very letter. Point out, if you can, the theological element in it or else retract your statement. You have now before you the undoubtedly pleasant task of relieving yourselves from the charge either of malicious traducers or of incautious and heedless assertors. The public will be informed in our next issue that this paper has been forwarded to you. We had no particular desire for entering the lists; but, having been drawn thither by your misrepresentations, we shall by no means shrink from the duty of defending ourselves.

The above is the "unique production."

Now for their reply. They state that the epithet which heads this article was applied to our curriculum "because of the undeniable fact that students attend both courses and pass in both in four years."

This assertion we have most positively controverted in the preceding editorial.

Next, having our conspectus before them, they shift their ground of attack, and attempt to show that theological studies are *intermingled with our regular course* and form an essential part of it. If they succeed in establishing this idea, a point is gained; but if not, their sneering appellation is most unwarranted, and their cause falls to the ground. Let us see what measure of good fortune attends their endeavor. With much avidity three studies of our course are seized upon as the very evidences they have been seeking. First, the history of the Middle Ages. "This is a favorite subject with church historians," we are told; "yet" continues the *Gazette* "the subject may be treated without touching upon theology." So we think; and for the edification of our contemporary we affirm that the *political* history of France and Germany during the mediæval era is the cause on which it has, unhappily for itself, alighted. Secondly, the Evidences of Christianity. The very first remark of the *Gazette* on this study is,—*"This subject is not necessarily theological."* Here, again we agree. In every college in New England in which christianity is recognized as a supernatural fact, the Evidences of Christianity form an essential part of the regular arts' course, just as is the case with us. In Harvard the study forms a portion of the work of the Freshman year. Is Dalhousie pleased to call Harvard a sectarian and denominational institution with a "patent theologic arts' curriculum?" Lastly Hebrew. Now any one at all conversant with the work performed in American colleges, knows perfectly well, that, in many of them, Hebrew is studied on account of its

philological value. In Acadia a similar provision is made for those who may wish to acquire some knowledge of the language. Students who do not intend to enter the ministry, as well as those who frequently elect this interesting branch of philology. The three subjects, triumphantly selected by the *Gazette*, summoned into court on its behalf, evidence of the infusion of theological teaching into our course of study, fail to yield the slightest proof in support of the paper's assertion.

The *Gazette* having throughout its article manifested a sense of inability to manipulate the above mentioned studies to advantage, makes a *final grab* for something tangible in the declaration that these three subjects were not taught in the arts' course at Acadia, they would have been taught in the theological department. Astonishing revelation! The same may be said of Greek, of Moral Philosophy, of other regular studies of the arts' curriculum. Yet we scarcely think that the intelligent Faculty or Board of Governors would exclude these from the course if simply because they might be subsequently utilized in a theological course.

The *Gazette* then proceeds to draw its conclusion, with as much seriousness as it had *really* been arguing:—"Such as these show that our epithet (patent theologic arts') was not applicable." In view of the facts in the case it is plain that the scornful epithet is flagrantly unjust, is not upheld by even a single line of reason, or a gossamer thread of truth.

Is Dalhousie the Provincial University?

We have very little space for discussing the question in the present article, nevertheless we will briefly state some reasons for answering decidedly in the negative. In order that any college may rightly claim such an appellation, three points at least must be clearly established:—

First, the Provincial Legislature must have publicly recognized such college as the Provincial University. This has never been done in Nova Scotia respecting any institution, nor is there any likelihood of Dalhousie, or any other college, being so recognized.

Secondly, a Provincial University must be under direct governmental control. Such is by no means the case with Dalhousie; inasmuch as no vacancy in the Board of Governors can be filled by the Governor in Council, except upon recommendation of the remaining Governors of the college; and no governor can be removed by the Governor in Council except at the instance of the Board of Governors. (See Dalhousie's Charter, Division 10.) This portion of their charter reposes real power in the hands of Dalhousie's own Governors.