Tight Binding

lar branch of science you can get all the information contained in the lecture, and very much more. If it is historical the well read listener will, before the lecturer has been going five minutes, be able to detect from what historical work it is pilfered almost word for word, the difference, if any, being that the lecturer in making such changes as will, in his opinion, prevent its being identified, replaces the language of the historian by his own nerveless composition. If the lecture is a popular application of certain scientific principles, you see at once that ideas and to a great extent, language, have been selected from Dr. Dick, or some of his worthy compatriots. If it refer to political or social economy, or industrial progress, you have met it all in your files of newspapers of the preceding month or two.

Generally popular lectures are flat and stupid beyond bearing. Were they put in print nobody would read them; any man of moderate courage would never get beyond the tenth line They convey very little useful information; they contain few ideas but such as are stolen; they are in point of composition and matter about as worthless trash as can be inflicted upon poor humanity.

Yet they are popular. People flock to hear them; and do sit still for an hour and more listening to them, with a patience which speaks volumes for their good nature They furnish a little excitement for the intellects of the hearers; they are not so totally destitute of information and interest but that they take the attention of the mass. People prefer living, breathing relators and teachers to the silent pages of books. With the multitude commmonplaces and platitudes from the platform have far more interest and weight than the golden sentences of Plato stretched out in cold ink. The influence of the voice and of the manner of the speaker is fully as much to them as the words which he utters.

Popular lectures have another value. If they do not afford much real information they at least excite to further inquiries. If they fall very far short of books as means of education, they draw attention to books, and induce people to read them who would not be likely otherwise to do so. Lectures and libraries should always go together; every place that can afford one should endeavor to afford the other; for they are a mutual assistance. The utmost that the lecturer can do is to excite in the minds of his hearers a desire for information upon certain subjects, a curiosity to dip more deeply into them, and to direct their attention to the proper sources of knowledge. If he does thus and no more, he does a vast deal of good. It was said of Professor Wilson that the information contained in his lectures on Moral Philosophy was neither exact nor profound, yet that he was a most successful professor. And the explanation is that he imparted to his pupils so much of the fire and fervency of his own spirit that he gave them an impulse in the path of improvement which plodding and fact-filled pedants could not have done. Popular lectures do, we think much good in this way; they furnish intellectual excitement and stimulus to hundreds who would not obtain it by other means, and they thus lay the foundation for efforts in the pursuit of knowledge and mental improvement which result in considerable and permanent advantage.

Mr. Raymond's Letter.

In making a brief reply to the letter of Mr. Chas. W. Raymond, the author of the communication of "A Subscriber" in our last issue, we must premise that as he expresses a desire that it may be his last communication on the subject, we therefore purposely refrain from going into the matter as we should have been justified in doing in prospect of the continuance of the discussion, and shall endeavor to confine ourselves strictly to such a reply as seems absolutely required.

And we commence by saying that we certainly have not the slightest intention of taking up the discussion on the part of a "Free Enquirer," or in any way interfering between him and Mr Raymond. Had not the latter directed his censure against us for the publication of the objectionable letter we should never have troubled ourselves about the matter. Having been attacked we defended ourselves from what we considered an unjust and uncalled-for accusation; with the controversy itself we have nothing to do.

The additional illustrations which Mr. Raymond adduces in support of his charge make nothing for him. We think it a mistaken notion to view an attack upon one's opinions, even those the most cherished, as an "insult." It has, for instance, been our lot, in the prosecution of the political course which we have thought it our duty to take, to meet with no small amount of vituperation; but we have never looked at the abuse, ridicule, and the like, which have been occasionally vented upon us, in the light of "insults," or as things to be resented. We rested calmly on the goodness of our cause satisfied that eventually the TRUTH must prevail. It may be very bad taste for one religionist to call all those who differ from him fanatics, but we think it very unwise to take such terms of reproach to heart, or to regard them as "insults"

As for inserting a letter from "A Free Inquirer," calling "one of the most estimable members of this community a liar," it would depend almost entirely whether the charge was made respecting his public or his private life. The universal rule of journalism is that private character is sacred from notice or comment, but that public character is public property. There is no man in the Province of New Brunswick, no matter how estimable he may be in private life, whose public acts and words can claim exemption from comment. If a correspondent should write to us merely to state that any public man whom he might name was a liar, the probability is that his letter would speedily reach the stove. But should he first relate certain acts of his public life, and certain words which he had uttered as a public character, and then draw the inference that he was a liar, the probability is that his letter would be sent forth to the readers of the JOURNAL, to speak for itself.

When we come to that portion of Mr. Raymond's letter which refers to the blasphemous nature of the article, we must confess to being puzzled. If we understand him at all, he asserts that if we do not see blasphemy in the letter of "A Free Inquirer," we cannot be a believer in the Christian religion, and, reversing the proposition, if we were a believer in Christianity we would see blasphemy in it, and would therefore not publish it. If this is Mr. Raymond's argument,—of which we are by no means sure—it is certainly ingenious. But like a great many other ingenious arguments it is wanting in soundness; of which fact we think we can convince Mr. Raymond himself

Each man's duty depends upon his conviction. To every question there may be, and undoubtedly is, a right and a wrong; but so far as regards man's responsibility right is more relative than positive. Conduct should follow upon faith; that in which a man has faith he should practise and support. For a believer in Christianity to speak as does "A Free Inquirer" may be blasphemy, because he would be speaking slightingly of what he believes. But the disbeliever in Christianity has not the same obligation: he must walk by the light with which he is filled. For a man to assert that a system is false which he believes to be false cannot certainly be blasphemy, or even "profanity." What would be blasphemy or profanity in a Christian would not be blasphemy or profanity in a Jew or Mohammedan.

But Mr. Raymond, if we understand him aright, argues, "Allowing that 'A Free Inquirer' is not blaspheming, inasmuch as he is not a believer, the Editor of the JOURNAL must either be guilty in its publication, or he must be, like "A Free Inquirer," an unbeliever." It is not at all necessary to predicate anything concerning the religious opinions of the person in question; it is enough to say that the inference which Mr. Raymond attempts to draw is not deducible from the premises. He falls into the error from not distinguishing the two offices of the newspaper.—The first office, to pronounce and advocate certain opinions, is fulfilled by its editorial department. The second office, to act as a medium of discussion, as a channel for the publication of opinions of all kinds, is fulfilled by its department of correspondence. It is because the newspaper is thus a medium of communication on all questions and for all sides, that it is supported by all Certainly Mr. Raymond does not accuse us of a hankering for Smasherism because our columns may occasionally contain letters from Smashers in advocacy of Smasher doctrines. If the principles respecting the reception of communicated articles which we have enunciated are incorrect all freedom of discussion in public journals must go by the board, and every party, every sect, indeed every man, must have a newspaper of his own. If Mr. Raymond wishes admission denied to anything opposing or reflecting upon Christianity, another, taking up his principles, and carrying their result one step further, may require us to deny admittance to anything not in conformity with the religious principles known as Protestant; another, taking but another step in exactly the same path, may insist upon our forbidding our columns to anything that does not savor of Presbyterianism; still another may reduce our standing ground to that of the Free Church; and so on, so long as the system of divisibility is practicable. We, on the contrary, contend that our duty requires us to take the broadest ground. We think that it is only by so doing that we can properly fulfil that which we have above affirmed as the second office of the newspaper. We trust that we have made ourselves understood; and that Mr. Raymond will see that we can give all sects and all creeds the opportunity of a free discussion without committing ourselves to any.

We need scarcely say that we had no intention of charging Mr. Raymond with intolerance or persecution. But we do say that the results of the principles which we understand him to advocate would be intolerance, persecution and proscription. Men are not unapt to assert in theory principles from the practical results of which they would shrink.

In saying that he respects the liberty of the press, and objects only to its licentiousness, Mr. Raymond states a general proposition which means everything or nothing, just as it is interpreted. Under shadow of the words "licentiousness of the press" Napoleon the Third institutes the censorship, and prevents the publication in France of anything of which he does not approve. Rome uses the same words as an excuse for the Index Expugatorius. Until Mr. Raymond descends to particulars upon this point it is impossible for us to meet him with either dissent or approval. But we do not think that by any stretch of argument the word licentiousness can be fairly made to apply to discussions of theological questions, or examinations of the foundations of religious belief.

The "apparent" inconsistencies to which Mr. Raymond alludes in his postcript are more apparent than real, and require in their explanation no cleverness whatever. "A Free Inquirer" used the expression, "the person called Jesus Christ," which had we noticed we should have insisted upon his altering. We scarcely think that Mr. Raymond will say seriously that in reading over a manuscript in a hand new to us we might not have misread, or entirely missed, the words "person called," and yet have had a thorough comprehension of the scope and tenor of the article. As to saying that we "refuse our columns to none," and then refusing them to "S. F. C." we presume that even Mr. Raymond scarcely understood us to mean that we would print every communication sent us "S. F. C." wrote us concerning a certain recent publication of a nature bordering upon, if not positively running into, indecency. We thought that to draw attention to the matter would be worse than to leave it alone, and therefore declined to print the letter. Had Mr. Raymond a year's experience in the conduct of a newspaper he would find that he would be obliged to exercise in many cases a nice discrimination in deciding upon the insertion or rejection of communications. Otherwise he would have his columns crammed full of ill-written, mis-spelled, disjointed, ridiculously-transcedental, silly-sentimental trash. He would find that he could exercise this discrimination without interfering with an honest carrying out of the principles of free discussion, in fact that he would be really promoting it, by being able to spare more room for the articles of those who could write intelligibly, and could argue with some attention to clearness and logic.

Sheriff Winslow.

In the usual place will be found the announcement of the death of the late Sheriff Winslow.

John Francis Wentworth Winslow was born at Kingswood, near Fredericton, in 1793. He was a worthy descendant of a line of distinguished ancestors. His father, Edward Winslow, a great grandson of Governor Winslow who landed with the Pilgrims at Plymouth in 1620, was himself born, we believe, in Plymouth. He came to this Province with the other Loyalists in 1783. Edward Winslow rendered long and distinguished services to his king and his country, both in military and civil capacities. He was a Colonel in the army, Military Secretary to Generals Fox and Campbell, and for some time Paymaster General of the Royal Forces in British North America. He was also Administrator of the government of this Province for some time, and, although he had never received a legal education, was appointed a Judge of the Supreme Court, which position he held until his death.

John F. W., the subject of this sketch, was the youngest of a family of four sons and five daughters, of whom but two survive him. He commenced life in 1808, as an ensign in the Royal Newfoundland Fencibles. He soon exchanged into the 41st Regiment, and served with it in the West Indies. He sold out of the 41st, and when the war of 1812 broke out went to Canada, where he served as Adjutant on the Staff of General Pearson, then in command of the Canadian militia. Mr. Winslow afterwards volunteered into the 104th, a regiment raised in New Brunswick, with which he served during the war with that gallantry and devotion to duty which marked every stage of his busy life. So distinguished was his conduct that when a second battalion was added to the Regiment he was reinstated in his former rank in it, though not attached, and received the full amount of his pay during the time at which he had sold out. At the conclusion of the war he retired from active service; and in 1828 sold out his half-pay in order to render himself eligible for appointment to the Shrievalty, Sir Howard Douglas, then Lieut. Governor, having promised him that office in the County which it was proposed to set off from York, the bounds of which were stretched up to the Canada line. In accordance with this promise Mr. Winslow was in 1832 appointed Sheriff of Carleton, in that year erected into a new County.

For twenty-four years, until the 1st of April, 1856, Mr. Winslow continued to discharge the onerous and responsible duties of his office with characteristic energy and thoroughness. In a border county stretching along a frontier of nearly a hundred and fifty miles, and that too on the confines of civilization, as it were, his office was not a bed of roses. But Sheriff Winslow went through the routine of his duty thoroughly and unflinchingly, caring nothing for exposure, inconvenience, hardship, or even danger, so that he might discharge well and promptly the trust reposed in him. He regarded his office not as a mere business, to be prosecuted for his own profit and according to his own convenience, but as a sacred trust received from the Government to which the whole experience of his life had taught him to look up with love and veneration, and to be discharged at any cost and at all risks. At the same time he tempered the discharge of his frequently disagreeable duties with a courtesy and considerateness which were the genuine growth of a generous and kindly heart, not unfrequently in his sympathy with suffering and distress taking upon himself pecuniary risks with no other guarantee of relief than the rectitude of human nature, and sometimes finding that he had trusted to a broken reed.

At the time at which Mr. Winslow first received the appointment the tenure of the office was during good behavior. But in 1836 by Act of Assembly the appointments were made annual. In 1856 the Fisher-Tilley administration, under the influence of the representatives of this County, supperseded Mr. Winslow by Mr. Samuel Dickinson. In 1857, the Chandler-Gray Government being in office, Mr Winslow was re-installed. He was finally superseded in 1858 by the present administration when Mr. F. R. J. Dibblee received the appointment. It was a source of satisfaction to Mr. Winslow and his friends that when after having filled the office for one quarter of a century, he was removed, it was on no charge of dereliction of duty but solely, so far as the public know, from party motives.

The change from the active life which he had led without intermission for four-and-twenty years to a state of almost total inactivity soon told upon the constitution of Mr. Winslow. A tumor on the neck, which originated in 1815 from a blow which he received while defending himself against a number of rowdies, and which had been gradually increasing until it had gained an enormous size, now began to afflict him exceedingly, causing a difficulty of breathing, and a general deterioration of the system. His removal from office affected him by what he looked upon as its injustice. All these causes combined to produce the gradual decline of his health. At about eleven in the evening of Friday, the fourteenth instant, death relieved him from all his worldly troubles.

Sheriff Winslow belonged to a class of men who seem to be fast disappearing in this Province. He was the son of one of those men whom attachment to the throne and to the institutions of Great Britain led to desert much that men hold most dear and sacred to commence life anew in a strange land To this class Mr. Winslow belonged in spirit. He was possessed of all their reverence for the throne, of all their respect for the ancient institutions of their country, and of the generosity of spirit and the high sense of honor which were among the worthiest of their characteristics. Undaunted in danger, impulsive of spirit, ever ready at the call of duty, fearless of consequences, immovable by either threat or bribe, frank, simple-minded and upright, a staunch friend, a generous