

and practice of education in Acadia College. The denomination will thus see that Dr. Sawyer, Professors D. F. Higgins, R. V. Jones and E. M. Kierstead have by law, in virtue of the positions they hold, as well as by a vote of the Baptist Convention, assumed before the denomination responsibility for the wisdom and success of the new chair. In this they have taken ground held by many distinguished educationists on both sides of the Atlantic. On the senate then, from a literary point of view, and not on the governors, rests the onus of this advanced movement. The board of governors are responsible for furnishing the funds to meet the expense, and for taking the advice of the senate. These bodies will not fail to bear their full measure of accountability resting upon them respectively.

The Rev. D. A. Steele, a member of the senate, in his excellent and timely letter to the *Christian Messenger* has, I feel persuaded, expressed the intelligent and loyal sympathy of that body. Did the faculty feel called upon to speak, there would be, I am sure, all absence of timidity because of the mistaken views of a few interested friends of the college, published in the newspapers. For what purpose are all these particulars? To remind the Baptists that their educational work is in the hands of a large number of trustworthy men; to remind those rashly rushing into print that they are to no purpose disturbing the public mind, and obstructing, so far as their influence goes, the good work of our institutions.

The part taken in this business by the president and faculty, the senate and board of governors, has been plainly stated. Whatever may be said of the faculty and senate in the action taken by them, it is evident that the governors, advised and guided as they were, had no other course to pursue than to found and fill the chair of the principles and practice of education in Acadia College. Two or three of the writers against this movement have affixed their names to their letters, but the greater part have been anonymous. Even their number would be reduced if report is correct. They have resorted to the device of Peter Cartwright, who practised a pious fraud at a Methodist campmeeting. He had learned that on a certain night a number of mischievous fellows intended to come and disturb the camp. Peter, after all had retired to their beds, stationed himself at a distance from the encampment; as the night wore on he heard the enemy approaching. Plunging both hands into his capacious and well-filled pockets, he drew them forth full of pebbles, which he threw in all directions. At the same time he set up a great yelling in a variety of voices. The on-comers, thinking they were confronted by overwhelming numbers, were panic-stricken and beat a hasty retreat. It said that one writer has been throwing broad-ly into the denomination a large variety of anonymous signatures, hoping, by this artifice, to any impression that many are writing. When

the truth is found out it will be seen that it is only Peter throwing gravel-stones with both hands, and yelling in imitation of many voices.

Throwing pebbles did frighten mischievous boys from a Methodist camp-meeting, but it is yet to be seen whether an unknown Peter can frighten the senate, the governors, the Convention and the entire Baptist denomination.

In previous letters I have given a plain recital of the business transactions connected with the appointment of Dr. Rand to the chair of education in Acadia College. It has thus been made apparent that all the business was done honorably and in good faith. This ought to satisfy the Baptists that the board, to which they have entrusted the management of their institutions, have done nothing to disturb the confidence which has hitherto been placed in them. They have no ends to serve other than those of the entire denomination. A universal desire now exists throughout the denomination to perfect and enlarge the labors of this institution. This is earnestly sought by every member of the senate and by the board of governors. Had they not believed the appointment of Dr. Rand would contribute to this end, it would not have been made. If their wisdom is doubted, surely their integrity ought not to be assailed. Further writing in defence of these boards ought to be altogether unnecessary.

In one of my letters I stated that the making of education a subject for university training has been discussed for the last fifty years. A glance at the history of this agitation throws light upon the merits of the question.

Before calling attention to this phase of the subject I may say that what I shall write is not intended to take the place of public utterances certainly expected from the president of the college, Dr. Rand and other educationalists. As a member of the senate I wish to put on record the grounds on which I rest my defence of the "new departure." The officials referred to will choose their own time and place for discharging their duties in this matter. They hold decided opinions and will defend them on all suitable occasions. They are sure of a patient and impartial hearing. The weight, now attached to the views held by these gentlemen, will be greatly increased when the public know the substantial reasons by which they are sustained. A review of the history of introducing education into the curricula of universities leads impartial minds far along the way to a decision in favour of its soundness and utility. In justification of this assertion only a few sentences, referring to this phase of the question, are necessary.

*History of didactics in Great Britain.* As early as 1828 a number of educationalists in Great Britain saw the deficiency of the unscientific, mechanical methods employed in schools of all grades. To their minds, teaching was more than an art; it was a science. Taking their stand on this princ-