

flowed forth in sympathy at the grave of those he loved, to the exemplification in human form of the arch-fiend, who would have caused the Prince of Light to have fallen beneath his power are to be found examples of either class.

Many are the noble efforts put forth amidst the dwellings of discouragement; many the upward steps made only the more unflinching by the dangers of the way; many the Alpine heights attained by exertion inspired by the same spirit as that which possessed

"The youth who bore 'mid snow and ice
The banner with this strange device
'Excelsior.'"

In every department of human industry the need of such spirits is keenly felt—spirits aglow with a holy enthusiasm for truth—willing even to die in her cause, while her proud banner's wave over their slumbering dust wakes a requiem to their memory, and in proportion as they do exist will the true purpose of life be attained, will man be qualified to occupy the position designed for him by his Maker, the better prepared to meet the time when the body shall slumber in the ground, and the spirit return to God who gave it, as in its flight it pierces the darkest shade and soars into the vast unknown declaring that the Problem of Life is solved.

LITERARY.

THE success attending the last open session of the Collegiate Debating Society induced the members to appoint a similar meeting for the evening of Friday, 29th ult.

At the appointed hour, the usual gathering of members assembled, their numbers largely augmented by representatives from the Seminary and Academy.

The general routine of business and other preliminaries having been dispatched, a critique was read by Mr. I. M. Longley. A humorous sketch of the difficulties encountered by youthful aspirants for oratorical distinction; some sound practical rules for guidance in public speaking, and an earnest plea for the importance of the Society and similar institutions, were among the topics discussed in this admirable paper.

Mr. E. W. Kelly followed, with an exceedingly interesting and instructive essay upon "Language, the Incarnation of Thought." The subject was dealt with in a most attractive manner, but within the narrow limits of a mere cursory glance, we are unable to note the many beauties of the style, or trace the line of clear thought and sound argument pursued by the essayist in the development of his subject.

The question for discussion was then entered upon,—“The relative poetical merits of Longfellow and Tennyson.”

Mr. F. D. Crawley, as appellant, opened the debate in a well-arranged and forcible speech. Beginning with some very appropriate remarks upon the art of poetry, he applied them with force and skill to prove the poetical merits of Longfellow.

The respondent, H. Foshay, then took the floor in defense of Tennyson. Mr. Foshay's speech was throughout a most humorous and happy effort, abounding in clever hits which elicited frequent bursts of applause and laughter from his hearers.

Mr. D. H. Simpson followed, dwelling at some length upon the nature of poetry in general, and the essential qualifications of a true poet. Turning to the subject in hand, he sought to give the prominence to Longfellow, advancing some strong arguments in support of his chosen position.

Thereupon Mr. B. Lockhart took the stand, and at once launched forth into a bold and vigorous strain. Indignantly repelling the charge of obscurity that had been brought against some of the productions of Tennyson, he sought to show that the so-called defect could arise alone from a lamentable want of appreciation of high poetic thought on the part of those who indulged in such criticisms. Mr. Lockhart displayed an intimate familiarity with the productions of his favorite poet, and proved himself a worthy exponent of the many beauties of his style and thought.

Mr. W. G. Parsons then appeared in defence of the American. Having rapidly reviewed the chief points suggested by the foregoing speeches, he proceeded with the effectual weapons of a pleasant wit and sturdy argument to attack the opposite party, while entrenching himself more securely in his own position. Point and force were given to his remarks by some telling and well rendered illustrations from the two poets under consideration.

Mr. Schurman then made a few brief remarks in his usual impressive manner, disclosing what he deemed to be a fallacy in the course of reasoning adopted by his opponents. This formed the closing speech of a debate which had been throughout of an unusually interesting and spirited character.

RELATIONS OF MANKIND.

WE are connected with our fellow-men in every quarter of the world by thousands of ties. Millions of human beings whom we have never seen are laboring to promote our interests without whose exertions

we should be deprived of the greater part of our accommodations and enjoyments. While we are sitting in our comfortable apartments feasting on the bounties of Providence, thousands and tens of thousands of our fellows, in different regions of the globe, are assiduously laboring to procure for us supplies for some future entertainment. One is sowing the seed, another is gathering the fruits of the harvest; one is providing fuel, and another furs to guard us from the winter's cold; one is conveying home the luxuries and necessities of life, another is bringing intelligence from our friends in distant lands.

In the midst of these never-ceasing exertions some are crossing deep and dangerous rivers, some are travelling a vast howling wilderness, some are shivering and benumbed by the blasts of winter, others are tossing in the midst of the ocean buffeted by the winds and raging billows.

Since we are connected with our fellows by so many links is it not reasonable, is it not congenial to the nature of man, that we should be connected with them by the ties of sympathy and benevolent affection? It is true indeed that the various classes of mankind, in every country who are toiling for our good seldom or never think of us in the midst of their difficulties and labor. Perhaps they have no other end in view than to earn their daily subsistence and provide for those under their care. They may be actuated only by the most selfish motives,—by principles of variety and avarice, while some, under the influence of that depravity which is common to the species, may be secretly cursing and reproaching us as individuals or as a nation. But by whatever motive they are actuated it is a fact which cannot be denied, and which they cannot prevent, that we actually enjoy the benefits of their labor, and that without them we should be deprived of the greater part of our comforts and enjoyments which render existence desirable, and cheer us in our own life work. We have therefore, in almost every artificial object that surrounds us, so many sensible emblems of our connection with every branch of the great family of mankind.

Now while we feel gratified with the results of the labor and industry of every class of mankind, is it reasonable that we should look with indifference on any one of them? Is it not in accordance with the dictates of enlightened reason, and with everything that we consider amiable in the nature of man, that we should embrace them all in the arms of kindness and brotherly affection, and that our active powers, so far as our influence extends should be employed in endeavouring to promote their present and everlasting