

Acadia Athenæum.

WOLFVILLE, N. S., MAY, 1876.

EDITORS.

W. G. PARSONS, '75, W. H. ROBINSON, '76,
G. E. GOOD, '75, G. A. SMITH, '77.

MANAGING COMMITTEE.

J. G. SCHURMAN, J. O. REDDEN,
H. J. FOSHAY, SIDNEY WELTON,
G. E. GOOD, Secty.

CONTENTS.

Lines on the Death of a Student	49
Crises	49
Geological Excursion of the Senior and Junior Classes.	50
Rev. W. J. Johnson's Lecture on John Howard	51
The Student's Roward	51
The New Academy Building (an Appeal)	51
Editorials	52
Caricature—Truth	53
Cricket—Items—Personals—Locals	54
Exchanges—Acknowledgments—Errata	55

Subscribers who have not yet remitted the amount of their subscription will please remember that the Managing Committee is on that account, placed under financial embarrassment. The College year is speedily approaching its close, and all accounts must be squared by that time. The amount due is just what is required for that purpose.

THROUGHOUT the editorial tilt that has of late occurred between the *Athenæum* and *Gazette*, the latter paper most palpably proceeds upon the assumption that "to contradict" and "to disprove" are terms quite synonymous. We will be charitable enough to state that in our opinion, this lamentable fallacy is not the result of ignorance. It is rather a pitiful shift to which a blatant organ resorts when legitimate weapons fail.

Our contemporary in its 'last issue says: "The (ATHENÆUM'S) reply consists of blunders and mis-statements, mingled with a few truisms and a good many falsehoods. We have neither *time* nor *space* to mention more than a few of these." It is the opinion of the public pretty generally that at least one other element besides "*time*" and "*space*" was wanted by the *Gazette* editors in order to construct a successful rebuttal to our proven statements.

The principal part of the turbid mass to which we have just been helped from the table of Dalhousie consists of a stale rehash of their previously proffered viands.

The *Gazette* thinks it lies quite a pretty piece of blue ribbon by stating that Mr. Hill, at Convocation, said,— "The whole course of Acadia is characterized and tinted by sectarianism." If this statement was really made, it is just at par with that paper's own threadbare assertion against us. The charge has been before accessfully refuted. Dalhousie has not made out her case against us,—she cannot possibly do it,—nor will the assertions of any person, be he puppet or dignitary, succeed in establishing it.

The next out-crop is, further trouble evinced by the *Gazette* in understanding how the students, "settle down", immediately after the arts course, as preachers. We told the obtuse little pedant that they never had taken a *regular* theological course at all, and we repeat it. The *Gazette* in pretending to re-produce our statements on this point ingeniously (and O, how ingenuously!) omits the word *regular*. We had admitted that they *could* and frequently *did* take theological extras.

As to the contradiction that the *Gazette* thinks we have made, we beg to say gently that we have not done so. We nowhere say that "many of our theological students have never taken a course in arts." We said, "young men have settled down as preachers without even an art's course,"—not referring to men who had taken a course at any theological institution.

With reference to the printing of examination papers, we may say that no particular news was communicated by the *Gazette's* informing us that "even Oxford prints them, just as Dalhousie does." The point on which we insisted still remains untouched. *Qui bono?*

In the course of the article to which we are now replying, a contemptible, cowardly lunge is made at our Professors which we will not readily pass over. The basis of attack is simply a series of mis-statements and unwarrantable inferences, paralleled in audacity and untruth only by previous "fabrics" from the same "factory."

Whoever states that the ATHENÆUM is in great part conducted by our Professors tells a direct falsehood; and we gravely doubt that the *Gazette* ever heard such

a thing from a source which, it could reasonably consider reliable. If that paper wishes particularly to try its skill at rant and slur, we would kindly advise it to be more careful in the selection of its objects. We are quite willing to bear a portion of it, but resent with profound indignation the despicable accusations hurled by a smirking cliquo against our respected Instructors.

But three huge points made by the *Gazette* are unanswered and unanswerable, according to that paper. Verily! Let us examine them.

First.—The "denominational" Colleges have not plucked enough men on application for entrance during the last half-dozen years to give themselves a respectable position among such institutions as Dalhousie! Ye clouds, what an argument! The only thing thus shown is, that those who attempt to pass the low examination at Dalhousie are not as well prepared, on the average, as those who try the higher examination at Acadia. This is but natural. When men feel that a large amount of work is necessary in order to accomplish an object, they set about it with a will, and are much more likely to succeed than those who, feeling that they have little to perform, neglect to do even the smallest amount required. Men who apply for entrance at Dalhousie know before hand that the printed requirements of the institution are quite small. Seeing that they venture a test frequently, we have no doubt, with very little preparation and are plucked. The same men would not make the attempt at Acadia without considerable additional work. In proof of this we assure the *Gazette* and the public generally that the Dalhousie freshman referred to in our last issue remained eight months in our Academy before attempting to pass our board examination for college. Probably the *Gazette* has something further to offer on this point (?).

Secondly.—"Sectarian Colleges cost \$20,000 more than they are worth." Dalhousie's editors have been plunging deeply into the "exact Mathematics" during the past year, evidently. They come out on the heights, glance at the institution, and by the rule of thumb tell us just what we are worth. It would