

no inferiority. The Baptists of the maritime Provinces have voluntarily assumed the work of sustaining it, and they are determined that it shall be second to none in the same field.

But is not Dalhousie a denominational college also? If we abide by the cool assumptions and assertions of the *Dalhousie Gazette*, we must conclude not. Says that journal,—“The Presbyterians have no college of their own, but send their sons to the Provincial University.” “In Nova Scotia, besides Dalhousie, the Provincial University, there are five denominational colleges.” Again, the system of higher education pursued in these five colleges “is unfair to the Provincial University.” We can well afford to let the *Gazette* indulge in these assumptions. Their groundlessness is equalled only by their impertinence. But if the Presbyterians have no college, who looks after Dalhousie? What denomination has taken possession of it, and founded chairs therein, and assumed the responsibility of its entire control, if the Presbyterians have not done so? Who does not know that if the Presbyterians withdraw from the support and management of Dalhousie it would not stand as a college six months?

A comparison of the charter of Dalhousie with that of Acadia reveals nothing to show that the former is not as much denominational as the latter, or the latter as much provincial as the former,—for these charters are indeed very similar. The framers of the Dalhousie Charter, who seem to have copied word for word in many points that of Acadia, have chosen to omit the proviso touching the character of the teachers. The Acadia Charter permits the appointment of “competent persons of any religious persuasion whatever” as professors, “provided such persons be of moral and religious character.” But this proviso is not found in the Dalhousie Charter. Accordingly it permits, and the *Gazette* seems to glory in it, the appointment of persons as professors who may have no moral and religious character at all. A leading Presbyterian minister asks in the public press, “what difference does it make what a professor’s theological opinions are so long as he is highly qualified to teach the branch or branches entrusted to him?” In fact

there is nothing in the Dalhousie Charter to prevent a rationalist or a universalist from being made a Professor, and nothing to authorize his dismissal if he were such. It remains to see whether Presbyterians will continue to relish this kind of liberty.

On the other point to which we have alluded, namely, that of *efficiency*, we need not say much. If the Baptists continue the policy which they have adopted of securing the best teachers and plenty of them, they need not fear that Acadia will suffer in respect of efficiency from a comparison with Dalhousie, even though the friends of the latter continue to affirm concerning it what is not true, namely, that it is a Provincial University. Indeed a glance at the standard of matriculation as set up in the Dalhousie Calendar, joined to the fact that the regular course of study after matriculation extends over only four terms of six months each, rather favors the conclusion of *inefficiency*. And this conclusion the *Gazette* confirms. It says, “our present standard of matriculation is too low.” As a consequence the first year “is packed with general students who ought to be learning the elements of Latin Grammar and Geometry.” As these general students are not prepared to go on with the regular ones, the latter are obliged to wait for them; or, as the *Gazette* puts it, to be “lowered enough to deprive them of much of the benefit that should occur from the teaching of the year,”—a rather anomalous and discreditable state of things in an institution putting on such airs as does Dalhousie. Now this state of things would not be tolerated an hour in Acadia. In this institution the standard of matriculation is considerably higher than it is at Dalhousie, and it is rigidly adhered to. Then the regular course in Acadia extends over four terms of nine months each, allowing thus twelve months of solid study more than is put in at Dalhousie. In the light of these facts the people can judge which institution is the more efficient. We can hardly help pitying the supreme ridiculousness of a college calling itself by pretentious names, when really these names are only a shelter of inward weakness;—resorting to intrigue, endeavouring to manipulate the Government with a view to the overthrow of other institu-

tions, when it is apparent to all that such college must greatly advance before it can reach even the position of equality with them. Poor Dalhousie!!

THE sentiments of the students at Dalhousie, as voiced in their organ—the *Gazette*—show clearly that they are not a little vexed at the rapidly increasing prosperity of the “denominational colleges;” and that they hesitate not to flaunt their sheet before the public gaze, pregnant with scurrilous epithets and calumnious assertions respecting these various institutions. The first effervescence of their spleen showed itself in *Gazette* No. 4, of the current collegiate year. No man can read the third paragraph of the leading editorial of that issue and fail to recognize the cynical spirit that prompted its production. In its closing sentences, even our members of parliament are arraigned before Dalhousie’s judgment seat, and, in view of their granting governmental support to other colleges as well as to Dalhousie, are pronounced guilty of the grave charge of inconsistency.

The gratuitous affirmations and aspersive insinuations of that article were fully examined and answered in the editorial of *ATHENÆUM* No. 4, which, in turn, elicited a replication from our opponents (*Gazette* No. 8,) that is doubtless considered by them a *poser*. With much pleasure we now meet their averments and give some information for which they are seeking.

The denunciation of our editorial, above referred to, as “coarse and violent” is quite unnecessary and really out of place; inasmuch as said editorial contained merely a plain statement of facts, free from any abusive or slanderous sentences. It is, however, wonderful that persons so eager for the proof of things, so desirous of consistency, as the *Gazette* editors profess to be, should not make some attempt at least, to extract from that article a few examples of the “coarse and violent” style, and hold them up to public contempt. A wise regard for the economization of energy has probably precluded them from the effort.

We are next informed that “the *ATHENÆUM* confounds the students of Dalhousie with the Board of Governors.” Not so. We have a clear apprehension that they are two distinct classes of individuals. By reference to our editorial we find that but *one* allusion is made to the Dalhousie Governors. The *Gazette*, in reference to the refusal of Acadia and Mount Allison to confer with Dalhousie for the purpose of establishing a central Provincial University, had said, “of course any other reply to the invitation was not to be hoped for.” Now we