

burden is light. It is disobedient shoulders that feel the yoke.

"Love will make our willing feet. In swift obedience move."

And now if I could only gain the ear of Mr. Somerville I would give him this advice:

- 1. Never again write or speak on Baptism as you now view it, unless you wish the Baptist Cause and Scriptural Baptist success.
2. NEVER fight a Baptist. Sure to get beat.
3. If you do take this matter up again, don't spread it over six months.
4. Don't suppose that hard words will serve for hard arguments.
5. Don't fail to let me know when you bring on the subject of Infant Sprinkling.
6. Read Acts 5. 38. 39. Be sure.

In closing I beg to thank the Editor of the Witness for finding space for all my communications so long as the discussion continued in that paper, and to congratulate him on his wisdom in discontinuing it when he did and on escaping the letters of Mr. S. that have appeared elsewhere.

I have only quoted, in the Messenger, a small part of Mr. Somerville's revilings and scornful remarks. Worse things he could not say than he has said.

It is to be hoped that whenever he or any other Pedobaptist minister sprinkles a child, he will plainly and distinctly tell the people by what authority he does it; and if this is not done, that they will ask at the proper time and place for their authority and not be put off by such an answer as a certain minister, once gave when asked as a learned man what the word baptize really means in the original, replied, "If I tell you you will only have my word for it."

I am sorry if I have been thought to have any hard feelings toward Pedobaptists. I leave those who know me to judge.

The Sabbath Schools and youthful Temperance organizations are institutions which merit the fostering care of earnest workers.

These Institutions embrace many who are, we fear, sadly neglected at home, and materially aid such parents as are doing what they can to properly train up their children around their own firesides.

We are of opinion that this subject has not yet reached that point of interest which its importance demands.

Yours truly, W. J. G.

the undivided attention of all presents, even the smallest child, by coining down to their capacity, as he did the attention of crowds who gathered in the Hall on the preceding evening to listen to his wholesouled address on the important subject of the Railway in which he is deeply interested, Mr. Page referred in pleasing terms to the Rev. J. W. Manning of Halifax, a former pupil of whom the school might be justly proud.

We surely may learn from such a course as that pursued by our esteemed Rail Road friend that tis quite possible to be diligent in business and yet fervent in spirit serving the Lord; the latter in no sense interfering with the former.

They aid in laying a solid foundation in the youth of our land upon which a useful superstructure is often erected, which the surging shifting sands of time cannot destroy.

Let us of to day see to it that the youth are early trained in right ways. We may do much by stimulating them to this course as such men as Mr. Page is doing.

That the future of our youths, will be just what the parents by their home training make them." Parental home training of children cannot be over estimated, as impressions made on youthful minds will not easily be erased.

We may properly compare such to the footprints in the clay which the rising sun soon gradually hardens.

Whilst on the other hand impressions made on more mature minds filled as they are with many things are often as the footprints on the sea-shores and which the incoming tide soon erases. Surely then it is no unimportant matter to lend a helping hand in the proper formation of youthful character, for by so-doing it may be our happy lot to save souls from death and cover a multitude of sins.

The Sabbath Schools and youthful Temperance organizations are institutions which merit the fostering care of earnest workers.

These Institutions embrace many who are, we fear, sadly neglected at home, and materially aid such parents as are doing what they can to properly train up their children around their own firesides.

We are of opinion that this subject has not yet reached that point of interest which its importance demands.

Yours truly, W. J. G.

Public Meeting on College Matters.

We mentioned in our last that a meeting had been called by the Mayor, on requisition from a number of gentlemen, for Tuesday evening, in Temperance Hall, on the question of one Central Provincial College. We go to press on Tuesday afternoon, and were consequently unable to do more than make the announcement.

At the hour appointed, a large number had assembled, filling the Hall. His Worship the Mayor took the chair, and a number of prominent gentlemen took seats on the platform.

Among these were: The Bishop of Nova Scotia; Rev. Dr. Sawyer, President of Acadia College, Wolfville; Dr. Allison, President of Mount Allison College, Sackville, N. B.; Rev. G. M. Grant, Rev. Professor Allan Pollock, Rev. John Lathern, Rev. Costello Weston, Rev. E. M. Saunders, Rev. John Read, Rev. A. W. Nielson, Rev. Alfred Brown, E. D. King, Esq., H. McD. Henry, Esq.,

Peter Jack, Esq., Drs. H. A. Gordon, R. F. Black, W. B. Slayter, and J. F. Black, Alderman W. D. Harrington, John L. Whytal, and others.

We are desirous that our readers should be informed as accurately and fully as possible what was said at this meeting. We have, therefore, taken the liberty of copying from the Chronicle a very fairly written report.

We might have given some of the speeches more fully, but if we should do so to one or two and not to all, it would be unfair to the other speakers. We therefore insert the following; which, whilst it is not a verbatim report, yet may be regarded as a very fair, impartial record of a meeting of first importance, and one that will probably be frequently referred to in the future on this question:

Mayor Richey said the meeting was called to consider a question of prime importance to the country—one on which strong feeling was apt to accompany strong opinion. It should be approached dispassionately, with a desire for the prevalence of truth. He suggested that a secretary be appointed.

On motion of Dr. Gordon, Mr. Hugh McD. Henry was appointed Secretary.

Mr. E. D. King said that before the meeting proceeded with the discussion, he would offer a preliminary motion. It was that the advocates of a Central Teaching State University, and the advocates of Denominational Colleges be allowed to occupy half an hour on each side, in turn.

Rev. Mr. Lathern seconded the motion. He said he had been in doubt in regard to the purpose of the meeting, and had placed himself in communication with its promoters, who had assured him that the object was to have the fullest discussion.

Mr. W. H. Neal (in the body of the hall) thought it would be better to allow each speaker say twenty minutes, and let the two sides speak in turn.

Mr. King said the best way would be to assign each side a specified time, and let them put as many speakers into that time as they pleased.

Rev. Mr. Grant thought a short time to each speaker would be the fairest. The meeting, he said, had been called by the friends of a Central Teaching University and they, not expecting opposition, had prepared four resolutions, each with two speakers. It would be a hardship to them to throw this arrangement aside, but they were willing to do it.

He was not one of the eight chosen, as he declined to speak when asked, but owing to the unavoidable absence of Rev. Mr. Lowden and Rev. Mr. Milner he had been placed on the list as a substitute.

Mr. King said he was willing to have the time of each side reduced to twenty minutes.

This was agreed to. Rev. Allan Pollock said before commencing his speech he would like an explanation. He had come prepared to speak in regard to Dalhousie College and recent legislation affecting it. He would like to know if the question to be discussed was Denominational Colleges vs. a Central University.

The Mayor said he presumed that was the issue. Rev. Mr. Lathern said he supposed each speaker would take his own view of the question, and bring forward whatever he thought was proper.

Rev. Mr. Pollock set out by asserting that Dalhousie College was a Provincial University. It was Provincial in its origin, having been resuscitated by a Provincial Act supported by both political parties. It was also Provincial in its constitution and in its attendance. Why, then, was it persistently described by many as a Presbyterian University? He could not answer. Was it Presbyterian because a Presbyterian suggested its resuscitation. Surely a Presbyterian could give a good suggestion. Was it Presbyterian because it was supported by the Presbyterians? Surely if he gave a few cents to a beggar the aid did not make the beggar a Presbyterian.

Some parties refused to see in Dalhousie a Provincial University, simply because they looked at it as Nelson did at the flag at the battle of Copenhagen, with a blind eye. Mr. Pollock proceeded to argue in favor of a Provincial University as preferable to denominational colleges, on the grounds so often used—the advantages of combining a large body of able educationists, a large body of students, &c. He referred to Scotland, his native country, as a land that was developed through the education of its people, and argued that the establishment of a strong central University would largely assist in the development of Nova Scotia.

Denominationalism and political party spirit had so permeated the whole system of Nova Scotia that not even a factory could be started without the evil influence being felt. He spoke of the efforts put forward by the Presbyterians to assist Dalhousie College as a Provincial institution. It was unfair to say that a body which did this—and at the same time liberally provided for a theological hall—was merely striving for a Presbyterian college.

Mr. E. D. King was the next speaker. He said the audience had received what might be called the gospel of Dalhousie College coming from a minister. They would be willing to hear from him the lae. He entered into a history of the

legislation in connection with the institution. It was established by Provincial and Imperial funds in 1829. If it was ever to be a Provincial institution it should have been then. But denominationalism got into it so far that a gentleman who applied for a professorship was rejected because he did not belong to the ruling denomination. He (Mr. K.) understood the previous speaker to say that there was nothing denominational in the present constitution of Dalhousie. The fact was that its constitution was nearly all denominational. (He read the act permitting any Christian body to have a share in its management.) Who asked for this? Surely not the Episcopalians, Baptists or Methodists, for they all had their colleges.

Mr. Pollock—The Presbyterians also had a college.

Mr. King said when a man allowed his name to appear in print as a candidate, he usually knew something about the matter before the public did. The Presbyterians knew what the Act meant when it was introduced. Dalhousie's late report acknowledged that no other denomination than the Presbyterians had taken advantage of the Act. If all the denominations had taken advantage of the act the whole institution would have been denominational. The act of 1875, amending the act of 1863, altering the number of Governors, &c., originated he was informed, with two Presbyterian Governors of the College.

Rev. G. M. Grant—No, that is not the case.

Mr. King said the act of 1875 left the Presbyterians the power to keep their Governors in, but took away the power given in the act of 1863 to other denominations to appoint Governors. The other denominations could still give their money, but could not appoint Governors. The Presbyterians had crossed into the happy land and cut away the bridge which carried them over. The lately published report of Dalhousie went to show that there was not much interest taken in it. It was otherwise with the denominational institutions. He knew men who had put thousands of dollars into these institutions, and were still putting their money in them. The people wanted colleges that won their sympathies—colleges in the hearts of the people. The denominational colleges were permanencies while Dalhousie was in an uncertain state. Were he to move a resolution it would be this: "That Dalhousie College never was, is not, and never can be a Provincial University."

Rev. Costello Weston first defined the fact that he was not a Presbyterian and paid a compliment to the catholicity of the Presbyterian church of Nova Scotia. He asked that that church should not be accused of hypocrisy when it said it did not own or control Dalhousie. If Dalhousie was a denominational college like the other five, surely the others offered the same privileges. The Archbishop could fill six chairs in Dalhousie College with six professors,—suppose he were to send them to Wolfville? He went on to show that only in Dalhousie could all denominations meet on Provincial ground. He could not see how the idea of a central teaching University could be furthered by the Presbyterians leaving Dalhousie. It was too true, he feared, that Dalhousie had but little hold on the hearts of the people, and if this were so he thought it was time the denominations established a proper college such as was required. The least Nova Scotia could demand was that the public money should be placed somewhere under the immediate direction of the Government, instead of being divided among the various colleges owned by denominations. The fear of godlessness in an unsectarian college would be counteracted by the influence of the church. He referred to Harvard which, he said, was not a State college but a Unitarian college under control of the Unitarians. A State college would not, could not, he thought be dangerous.

Dr. H. A. Gordon, who spoke on the same side as Mr. Weston, referred to Mr. King's remarks on the Acts. For himself he could look at the Act from an independent point of view. The Act of 1863 did not originate with the Presbyterians, but with Mr. Howe. The Presbyterians were merely anxious to have a good Provincial University, and when asked if they would support one at once said yes; and invested \$75,000 for the endowment of three chairs. He reproached the construction put upon the Acts referring to Dalhousie by Mr. King. That gentleman had said the basis of Dalhousie had broadened—it wanted broadening badly—it wanted broadening till all denominational differences were sunk.

Dr. Sawyer had not intended being here and doubted whether he would understand the subject better after than before. He defined the parties now interesting themselves on the education question—the denominationalists did not see their way to accepting the views and plans of the friends of a Teaching University. He reviewed the changes and improvements which had taken place in Nova Scotia during the past twenty years, showed that Acadia College had grown steadily since then and he felt bound to protest against the declaration that sectarianism was injuring society in this country. The growth of Sackville College, too, had been constant and beneficial to the people. Twenty years ago Dalhousie was small, it was now a credit to the

City of Halifax and to the province. It seemed to him impossible, in the present state of our society to discuss the college question satisfactorily. There were present representatives of four ideas of what a University should be. He went on to show that there were different types of universities. He believed it would be a misfortune to the country to close up the existing colleges and try to substitute one here in their place. There was another side to the picture of a central Provincial College not so attractive as that generally presented. The existing colleges gave life to the country places where they are situated. He did not believe the staunchest Presbyterian in Kings County would care to see Acadia closed. If he had time he would like to say more. Before he closed he wished to say the colleges had a hold on the hearts of the people—a Provincial University which had not this hold would fail.

Rev. G. M. Grant said neither Dr. Sawyer nor himself had learned much this evening. That was not the fault of the University's friends. They had prepared resolutions which, had they been taken up, would have put the question in a practical form. He agreed with Dr. Sawyer that the men who would put Dalhousie on a Provincial basis would deserve the thanks of the people. Let the Legislature do it and deserve Dr. Sawyer's thanks. Regarding the influence of sectarianism he must agree to disagree with his friends. The capital did not want to injure the country, but the capital, must look after itself, just as Windsor, or Wolfville, or Sackville would. If Dalhousie went down the capital would suffer. Dr. Sawyer had said there was no sectarianism in the colleges. If there was not it was strange that there should be so much sectarian interest in them. When he visited a school taught by the nuns or sisters of charity they told him the doctrines of the Catholic church were not taught. He believed them, and he believed Dr. Sawyer too, but he did not want to send his son to a monastery or to a sectarian college. He would give some reasons for the establishment of a Provincial University:

- 1st. Our denominations are practically too small to get up proper colleges.
2nd. Every denomination has its own work to do and should not have state work to do.
3rd. The State had its own work to do, which was not denominational work.
4th. The present system of grants is unjust to the denominations, both those that have colleges and those that have not.
5th. It is unjust to the professors and the students.

An eminent Baptist minister, who was educated at Acadia, said to him: "When I went to the States and saw what a college was, I felt that I had been sold." The idea of denominational colleges was wrong in principle. The Legislature had no right to take the public money and give it to denominations. \$4,000 would support Dalhousie, clearing the Presbyterians out of it. This would meet the wants of the country, and save at least \$6,000 a year. We ought to have a party to take a stand for this, and the people would support the principle. It was not a question of the interests of Dalhousie, but of a Central University, call it by what name you like. The present system was putting us deeper and deeper into the slough of sectarianism. If this was to continue, Presbyterians might be driven to withdraw their aid to Dalhousie and establish a college of their own. He would deplore it deeply, but that might be the result. The Presbyterians had injured themselves for the sake of supporting a Provincial University, and they should at least have the credit of their work.

Dr. Allison, of the Mount Allison Wesleyan College, said he regretted that it had not fallen to the lot of one of kindred eloquence to Mr. Grant's to reply to him. He was in favor of University reform, and would support any measure designed to improve collegiate education; but he was not convinced that the ideas of the advocates of a Central Teaching University were the correct ones. He thanked Mr. Grant for raising the question into a general one. He admired Dalhousie for the work it had done, and his fear was that if the Presbyterian element was withdrawn Dalhousie would fall. The question had to be considered in the light of history. He declared that in nearly every case where a central State supported teaching University had been tried on this continent it had failed. He challenged the other side to name two exceptions.

Rev. Mr. Grant—Michigan and Toronto.

Dr. Allison maintained that Toronto University was not a success. The denominational colleges existed and flourished, and Mr. Grant's own denomination maintained its own college, notwithstanding the establishment of the Toronto University. The Wesleyans, one of the largest denominations in Ontario, and the Church of England, also a large body, supported their colleges. He was, therefore, not inclined to accept Toronto University as a success. It was safe to say that every graduate of Toronto cost Ontario \$1,000. Michigan University had been named; the latest reports showed that it was likely to fail, like the other State Universities of the West, owing to dissensions between the teach-

For the Christian Messenger.

Letter from Bridgewater.

Dear Editor,—

J. Bloomfield Page, Esq., one of the promoters of the Nova Scotia, Nictaux Atlantic Central Railroad, delivered a very interesting and instructive address to the Baptist Sabbath School in this town, on Sunday afternoon. The speaker seemed to possess the faculty of riveting