

OUR CONTRIBUTORS.

SHALL MANITOBA COLLEGE BE MAINTAINED?

MR. EDITOR.—Permit me to refer to "Burden-Bearer's" strictures on Manitoba College. It will be remembered that the General Assembly of 1871, of the late Canada Presbyterian Church, made provision for higher education in the North-west, and that in the fall of that year the Rev. Geo. Byce, M.A., was appointed teacher. The Assembly of 1872 appointed a small committee to draft an Act of Incorporation of Manitoba College. This Act was to be submitted to a committee composed of the members of the Board of Management of Knox College, Toronto, and the Assembly's Home Mission Committee; and this large Committee, with the Presbytery of Manitoba, were empowered finally to sanction the Act, and have it submitted to the Legislature of Manitoba. This was done, and the College, as such, dates from the passing of that Act. The Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland took action in 1872, and sent the Rev. Thomas Hart, M.A., to this country as educational missionary. Mr. Hart was appointed Professor of Manitoba College, by the late Canada Presbyterian Church, with Mr. Bryce, the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland paying his salary.

It is to be presumed that these two bodies proceeded with due caution in instituting the College and making provision for instruction therein. What change has taken place since to render the College any longer unnecessary? At that time there were about 120 Presbyterian families in the country; now there are at least 1,200. The prospect of a speedy settlement of the country was not then bright; now all admit that tens of thousands of settlers must pour in in a few years. Fort Garry was then a hamlet of a few hundred people; we have now a city of 8,000 inhabitants. Few required a college education at that time; now the number is largely increased.

"Burden-Bearer" asks, why maintain a college at Winnipeg rather than at London, Goderich, Sarnia, or Ottawa? The asking of such a question shews how completely "Burden-Bearer" misapprehends the situation. The circumstances of the places are totally different. At each of the places mentioned there is a high school. There is no provision for a high school education in Manitoba, and for years the revenue of the country will not admit of it. If Manitoba College is not maintained, our sons must attend the Episcopal or Roman Catholic College for their classical education. Let them live at those institutions for several sessions at a tender age, learn their catechism, and breathe the atmosphere of the place, and it requires no prophet to foretell their future, or the influence they shall wield against Presbyterianism. The influence of the Colleges mentioned all admit to have been great in the past. Many, and some of them in high position, are now lost to the Presbyterian Church, owing to college influence. Let "Burden-bearer's" advice be followed, and educated Presbyterians will be as rare as buffalo in Manitoba. Let it be remembered that classics are taught nowhere else here than in the three colleges named.

But were the College abolished in the face of these facts, in what light would the General Assembly appear? Not only did it establish the College, it voted \$3,500 in 1875 to purchase buildings, and about eighteen months ago appointed Dr. Patterson to proceed to the mother country and endeavour to secure an endowment of \$100,000. Were the Church to withdraw support from the college now, would it not stultify itself? Artemus Ward's distinguished patriotism in sacrificing all his first wife's relations for the good of his country was nothing to this. Does "Burden bearer" think of the loss of prestige and consequent injury by such a vacillating and retrograde policy? He forgets, too, apparently, that the College is yet only in its rudimentary stages. We shall soon require a theological department. Let no one be startled by the statement. Winnipeg is nearly as far distant from Toronto in money as Toronto is from Edinburgh. When the population west of Red River is as large as that of Western Ontario, or the Presbyterian population as large as the adherents of the Free Church in Canada when Knox College was established, or Presbyterians as numerous as when Queen's

College was founded, I hope no one will expect us to send our sons to Toronto to study for the ministry; and that time is not far distant. If it does not already exist, there will soon be as much reason for having theology taught here as there was for establishing a college in Montreal for that purpose. When the prospects of this country are so bright, and when the Presbyterian Church promises to be so influential, why be compelled to reply to this insane proposition of abolishing the only means of fulfilling our mission properly? The Legislature of Manitoba will ere long, we trust, be in a position to make provision for higher secular education. Manitoba College can then take something of the position of old Knox College.

"Burden-Bearer" maintains that the College could not be maintained as a separate scheme, and that a vast number of members and contributors see no necessity for the College. I presume that a vast number of contributors see no necessity for the existence of four colleges in Ontario and Quebec, and would rather see some of the money now given to maintain them devoted to higher education here. I maintain, moreover, that if nothing more was done to keep these colleges before the Church than is done for Manitoba, their present yearly deficits would be much larger—I fear that, like the Home Mission Committee, they would talk of insolvency or repudiation. But Western Ontario is full of graduates of Knox College; professors preach for them, speak to them, and write to them; these graduates bring the case of the College before missionary associations, sessions, etc., and a comfortable sum is voted out of the funds for the College. Central Canada is full of graduates of Queen's and they do ditto. Principal McVicar is doing yeoman service for Montreal College in that city and neighbourhood, and to make it more popular, has "hitched" to it the French Evangelization work. The fierce contests over constituencies, as seen by us here from afar, tell their own story about the difficulties of finance. Poor Manitoba College has no friend to urge its claims. It has been dropped like a lamb on the moors of Scotland, and because the weather is cold and there is no grass, the mother proposes to leave it to die. No screaming appeals, no private letters, no Canada Presbyterian or Kirk arguments are called into play for Manitoba College, and hence the indifference. Let some one who knows the situation here go through Ontario and Quebec, and I venture to say he will succeed, without difficulty, in persuading the people to aid the College. When the case was presented before the Assembly of 1875, \$3,500 were recommended at once to be raised for the purchase of buildings.

I might state here that Dr. Crawford, late of the Baptist Institute is coming up here to start a college in connection with that body. Those who have watched the course of the Woodstock College know how much it did for the Baptists. Their experience is the cause of Dr. Crawford's venture. And when the money we spent in the past is beginning to tell practically, we propose to abolish our College!

Your correspondent sneeringly quotes the statement of the Moderator of the General Assembly, that "Those most competent to judge think the existence of the College necessary," and replies then "let those who think so have a chance of shewing the earnestness of their convictions by supporting it." Sir, no man who has been here, or considered the question on the spot, but is convinced of the necessity of the College. Principal Grant, Professor McLaren, Mr. Macdonnell, Mr. Laidlaw, Mr. Moore, Mr. Cochrane, Dr. Ure, ex-Governor Morris, and others, are all of one mind in this respect. I know how the Presbytery of Manitoba would vote in the matter. Some shew their earnestness practically too, as is seen by Knox Church of this city voting \$100 each year, for the last five years, for the support of the College. This year \$800 will be raised from local sources. When the circumstances of the country are considered this is a large sum.

"Burden-bearer" says: "I do not think the existence of the College necessary, and not even very needful." Who is this Daniel that has come to judgment, anyway? He has been in this country, and knows whereof he speaks, or he has not. If he has not, it argues some assurance to oppose his opinion to so many findings of the General Assembly, and the views of the gentlemen I have named. But if he has been here, his name would enable us to know how much weight to attach to his judgment in the case. Let "Burden-bearer" not be so modest. Let the Church know who is her reprover and counsellor. I would

like to see a man of prominence in the Church, and knowing the circumstances of the case, come out squarely against the College, above his own signature. Your correspondent might, Chinese-like, desire to burn the College to roast (metaphorically, of course,) some one inside, but the process is expensive. In any case let me ask him, in justice to important interests, not to fight behind a mask.

The importance of the subject is my excuse for trespassing on your space to so undue a length.

JAMES ROBERTSON.

The Manse, Winnipeg, Jan. 6th, 1880.

THE ANSWER.

BY REV. JAMES HASTIE, LINDEAY.

The training of the child—when should it begin? The answer to this question is, the earlier the better.

Before it is twelve months old, even, the child is learning. Sponge-like, it is sucking up at that age every influence about it, good and bad, indiscriminately. As it gazes up into its mother's face, its own countenance is taking form for life. A smiling mother's face makes a smiling babe's face; a frowning mother's face makes a frowning babe's face; a peevish mother's face, a discontented mother's face, a haughty mother's face, imparts a corresponding countenance to the little learner. Hence, one cause of the marked contrast often seen in two of the same parentage; one so sweet and winsome, the other so sour and repulsive. The same mother they had, but not the same mould.

The earlier the better—this is a golden rule. If parents don't begin early, Satan will. Between the two, it is a race which shall occupy the ground first. The mother, more than the father, determines the early piety of the child, just because she has most to do with the child at the outset. She it is who soothes its pain, and hushes its cries, and supplies its needs. No arm is so often around it as mother's, no voice so often heard, no eyes so often seen. A mutual interest grows up between mother and child which, in the very nature of the case, does not exist between father and child. At a later stage the father's influence is more felt and is more direct, but in the earlier the mother's influence is more powerful because more formative. If there must be a difference of mental and moral qualifications between father and mother, by all means let the mother be the better of the two. Bodily cast and quality take after the father, mind and temper after the mother. Piety on the part of mothers, and wisdom and prudence, are more important to early childhood than piety and wisdom and prudence in fathers (young men, *nota bene*).

Was it ever known that a truly good and great man had other than a truly estimable mother? but many eminent men, and good, might be named who had very indifferent fathers. Matthew Henry, Philip Doddridge, Sir Isaac Newton, Sir William Jones, J. F. Buxton, Howe, and Hooker, and Herbert, and Robert Hall, Foster, Dr. Watts, Pasyon—time would fail to tell of the good mothers all these had, and how much their destiny was determined by those holy women. But, the mother of the Wesleys! we must pause a moment beside her. The father of the Wesleys (John and Charles and the rest)—history is almost silent about him; but history shall never hold its peace about the mother of the Wesleys! Susannah Wesley prepared "by-laws" for the management of her children (and she had fifteen children to attend to), one of which was to subdue their will the very first thing in life. She held that the "root of all sin and misery" is *self-will*, therefore to get rid of the effects we must get rid of the cause. She trained them from earliest infancy to habits of self-control. They were taught to put restraint upon all their appetites and passions. They were taught to CRY SOFTLY—luxury, oh, how rare, fathers! And nothing would they get so long as they cried for it. From these specimens, judge of her whole family governance; and verily she had her reward, as all the world knows. And as for Timothy, how noteworthy that Scripture is silent in regard to his father's character and influence; but the compliment paid by the apostle Paul is paid to his mother and grandmother. "I call to remembrance the unfeigned faith that is in thee, which dwelt first in thy grandmother Lois, and in thy mother Eunice" (2 Tim. i. 5).

Happy those children whose morning hours are spent under wise maternal care and culture, but better still the lot of those where both maternal and pa-