

saying into what doctrinal or practical errors those feeling and speaking thus may be led. Surely, at the least, Gamaliel's advice is the safest. "If this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to nought; but, if it be of God ye cannot overthrow it, lest haply ye be found evildoers to fight against God."

Revivals will not come unsought, and there be improper suspicion of them, the likelihood is still less. What a contrast the two shores of the sea of Galilee presented on a memorable occasion, during the personal ministry of Jesus! In an open fishing boat he crosses to Gadara, and there performs a miracle of mercy and of wrath. Instead of being savingly impressed as they ought to have been, courting his presence, eagerly coveting his ministrations, the Gadarenes "besought him that he would depart out of their coasts." Is not this the manifest tendency of our restraining prayer, and disparaging the Spirit, of our practical inconsistency, and this disposition to deal in doubts and mockery? Need we wonder if Jesus, who is passing through our land ready to bless us, should refuse to turn aside even to tarry for a night, should decline doing a mighty work amongst us because of our unbelief, and should say of us, as he turns to depart out of our coast, "These Canadians are joined to their idols, let them alone."

How different with the people on the other side of the Lake! When "Jesus returned, the people gladly received him, for they were all waiting for him."

Here was longing desire, and earnest expectation, and diligent preparation. They missed the Master. They waited their desires across the Galilean wave after Him. Their eyes were on the out-look to catch the first glimpse of that little boat and its precious passenger. Oft did the cry ascend, "Oh! when will he come back again."

They expected his return, else they would not have lined the shore, waiting for Him. Surely he will not disappoint us. It seems long since he left, but though the vision tarry we will wait for it. They were all prepared to greet him, and to receive his instructions as soon as he stepped on shore.

Do not these rude, unpolished Galileans teach us? If we are to get Jesus back to us, we must take the stumbling blocks out of the way. We must shew a proper appreciation of the value of his presence, and an earnest and sincere desire to enjoy it. We should be longing for his return, feeling his absence to be as the greatest possible privation, and his presence to be as the day of our espousals, and the day of the rejoicing of our hearts. "Return O Lord, how long! and let it repent thee concerning thy servants. O! satisfy us early with thy mercy, that we may rejoice and be glad all our days, &c."

We should be *expecting* his return. "What wait I for? my hope is in thee." This hope strengthens the hands that hang down, and the feeble knees. Though the sea that rolls between be stormy, and the mist that envelops the horizon be thick, yet "I with expectation will hope continually."

But let us like those Galileans, be prepared for his visit, that when favoured with it, we may get all the good out of it, which it is fitted to confer. The preparation of the heart

is from the Lord.

Let there be nothing on our part to prevent a speedy visit from Jesus, or to obstruct the free and full descent of heavenly influences, nothing to hurt or to destroy in *our God's holy mountain*. That we may soon be privileged to see Him rending the heavens, and coming down, let us joyously hail his approach, and "he that shall come, will come, and will not tarry." Even now while our watchmen lift up their voice, crying one to another "What of the night?" "What of the night?" to their straining eyes are discernible the streaks of dawn, "The morning cometh."

"His coming, like the morn shall be,  
Like morning songs his voice."

R. F. B.

#### A GLANCE AT THE WESLEYAN MEMORIAL.

In making some remarks on the memorial of the Wesleyan Conference on University matters, I do not intend to enter fully into all the points which are raised. I am not going to touch any of the questions regarding the funds and the standard of the Curriculum. These are the subjects of investigation before Parliament, and I go on to other points still more prominent in the memorial.

The memorial opens with all fairness. It takes the University Act of 1853 as its foundation or basis, and tells us so in the first line, and in a distribution indicating no lack of intelligence in its authors. The memorial goes on to shew a three-fold object, which the Legislature clearly proposed and avowed in passing the Act. They are marked out first, secondly, and thirdly in regular order, as will be seen in the memorial. These three particulars shew the grounds on which the memorialists took their stand, and nothing but what can stand on these should have never had a place in the document. At the end of the *thirdly*, a hair stroke or little dash appears with three lines and a half or so behind it, and they are lines which require attention, for several reasons:—(1) They are plain English, and can be easily understood. (2) As an addition to what is in the third head, they are wholly unnecessary; and as a summing up of the previous statement they are sadly at fault. (3) A new object is introduced in those three lines and a half, which is not included in any of the three divisions, which the memorialists have given, nor in them all. It differs not in degree, out in nature, from the other three, and should have therefore stood up boldly by itself with its head up, as object the fourth. (4) A marriage is formed between object third and the new object. They are treated as one, and union is power. (5) It must be most particularly observed that the memorialists are at this point just about to leave the fountain head and basis of the process. They have shewn the Act—the charter of their privileges—and we can shew that there is something in the lines behind the little dash, which, on their peril, they dare take no further, when, on their own shewing of the Act, they cannot take along with them without an error in logic, and if they have taken it along with them into the shewing forth of their claims of right, complaints, conclusions or prayer, it shall be shewn, *bye and bye*, to be no mere error, but something which cannot

be allowed to pass so easily. (6) Another reason why the reader of the memorial ought to pay attention to the first part of the lines, which by a fine stroke are at once struck out of, and held fast to the body of the third object, is the contrast he will find between the manner in which the new point makes its appearance, and the prominence given to it in every succeeding part of the document. It is not a *fourth* head of the shewing of the memorialists when they are telling what the Act proposed. Money—public revenue—is surely something different from degrees, literary honors, and University powers. And yet the revenue question is most insisted upon ever after. It is made the horse-rake that sweeps over the whole field, and that rakes in learning, justice, and religion, and everything sacred, in support of their cause.

The University Act of 1853, in order to encourage young men in any and every part of the Province to pursue their studies where it might be found most convenient for them, and in order that it might, at the same time, be in their power to obtain literary honors or degrees from the University made provision for a sort of sisterhood between the University and schools of learning over all the land, so that the certificates of those schools or colleges could be received by the University Senate, and for the certificate which he brought to the Senate he would be sent back after examination with some literary honors or other. *But would the University Senate give him money?*—He would have perhaps to pay some. What would the College whose certificate he had presented before the University receive in return for it? Nothing; but that they had the honor of training a successful student. The money element is not by any means assential to the connexion between the University and the Colleges, or Literary Institutions recognized. It is a foreign element pressed unto service by the Memorialists.

Let the reader of the memorial peruse it carefully marking its broader features, and say if the foreign element be not the element that predominates. Let him again look into minor features, listen to its soft breathings and whisperings, and say if they partake not of the same characteristics.

A second broad fallacy in the whole document arises from the union formed between two things which have no logical connection—equality of footing in regard to public and equality of footing in regard to senatorial power. On the surface it would appear that the two are things which justice forbids to be separated. At bottom it is a confounding of things which have no logical connection. The University is simply the high court of learning. It knows the associated colleges merely as seats of learning, and the relation which the associated colleges have, in common to one University, makes them known to one another in no other character. The interchange carried on between them is that of documents about learning. Bank bills, as all the world knows, are quite a different matter. They know each other's character in regard to learning. The question, as to comparative wealth or poverty, lies outside the relation, and equality of footing in that respect must be sustained on other grounds, if sustained at all. How came the writer of the memorial then to confound association with a court of learning with a partnership, in regard to funds? Partly it may be from his own taste, but chiefly, we apprehend, from the fact that he had forgotten to put up a *head in the right place*. From that