

THE CHRISTIAN VISITOR.

"HOLD FAST THE FORM OF SOUND WORDS"—Paul.

VOL. XXXVI.

SAINT JOHN, N. B., WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 1883.

No. 47

IN DEFENCE OF DR. RAND.

No. III.

To the Editor of the Herald:—

SIR,—No further reference to the business connected with Dr. Rand's appointment is necessary to convince every impartial mind that nothing has been done to reflect on the integrity or honor of the college boards. Hitherto the denomination has left the management of the institutions to the board of governors. Annual reports to the Convention alone have been required. Popular verdicts have never been sought before action was taken, not even in movements of advanced character, as for instance, the case of building a school for young ladies. If in the past the policy and direction of the institutions have been left to the governors, there are additional reasons why the same policy should be adhered to at present, and in the future.

The original charter of the college contemplated "the body of the college," to which body a large measure of power and responsibility were committed. In the early days of the college it was thought the matter did not exist for forming this body. No attempt was therefore made to do it. The authors of the charter were evidently believers in the development theory. They accordingly filled it with germs of a larger and perfected life. Within the past few years that life has been nurtured in the creation of the senate—the body—the real college.

The number and representative character of the men who compose the senate and the board of governors are such as to give a satisfactory guarantee that all educational affairs will be wisely and faithfully conducted. Their number (I speak from memory) is 35. There are 12 ministers, 6 lawyers, 1 judge, 8 business men, and 8 teachers and professors. A part of these were nominated by the alumni society, and a part by the faculty of the college. The governors are appointed by the Convention, and the senate by the governors. All that is done is confirmed by the Convention. The sanction of this body is necessary to perfect the business. The names of the gentlemen who now constitute these boards may be found in the year book. When they are read, it will be seen that their experience and character would of themselves be a sufficient guarantee for the faithful and successful management of the trusts committed to them.

It is simply amazing that the doings of this large and carefully chosen body have been assailed and aspersed by newspaper writers. If no more confidence is placed in their wisdom and integrity than has been expressed by the writers referred to, delegated authority and decency and order in business are impossibilities, and should not be attempted. But I am not so credulous as to believe that the Baptist body, bound together in the Convention, will withdraw confidence from these boards entrusted with its business.

Before the senate was created the board of governors took advice from the president in all they did to advance the literary interests of the college. Drs. Cramp and Sawyer in this way guided the work of the college for many years. This is now at an end. The president and professors, not only in their capacity as the faculty of the college, but especially in their capacity as the executive of the senate, are now responsible, officially responsible, not only to the governors, but to the Convention through the governors, for the chair of education and the occupancy of it by Dr. Rand. I wonder if Professor Higgins will say that this is "wholly incorrect." The senate, however, will not shrink from this grave responsibility com-

mitted to it both by civil law and a vote of the Baptist Convention—a responsibility which the senate has assumed and carried for more than twelve months. In good faith it was given; in good faith it was taken.

In establishing the new professorship the governors knew that on this executive board of the senate the responsibility virtually rested. The views of the faculty in this relation were heard by the governors with all deference. Had the faculty opposed the movement, I am supported in saying, the chair would not have been founded. The senate itself depended upon the executive for advice and guidance in this matter. It would have been reckless on the part of the senate to have done otherwise. The board of governors knew that upon the senate rested the responsibility of creating this new professorship. They waited to know and receive the decision of the senate in this behalf. What was that decision? By a vote, moved by Judge Johnston and seconded by the Rev. S. B. Kempton—a vote which passed unanimously—the governors were recommended to appoint T. H. Rand, D. C. L., to the chair of the principles and practice of education in Acadia College. The denomination will thus see that Dr. Sawyer, Professors D. F. Higgins, R. V. Jones and E. M. Kierstead have by law, in virtue of the positions they hold, as well as by a vote of the Baptist Convention, assumed before the denomination responsibility for the wisdom and success of the new chair. In this they have taken ground held by many distinguished educationalists on both sides of the Atlantic. On the senate then, from a literary point of view, and not on the governors, rests the onus of this advanced movement. The board of governors are responsible for furnishing the funds to meet the expense, and for taking the advice of the senate. These bodies will not fail to bear their full measure of accountability resting upon them respectively.

The Rev. D. A. Steele, a member of the senate, in his excellent and timely letter to the *Christian Messenger* has, I feel persuaded, expressed the intelligent and loyal sympathy of that body. Did the faculty feel called upon to speak, there would be, I am sure, all absence of timidity because of the mistaken views of a few interested friends of the college, published in the newspapers. For what purpose are all these particulars? To remind the Baptists that their educational work is in the hands of a large number of trustworthy men; to remind those rashly rushing into print that they are to no purpose disturbing the public mind, and obstructing, so far as their influence goes, the good work of our institutions.

The part taken in this business by the president and faculty, the senate and board of governors, has been plainly stated. Whatever may be said of the faculty and senate in the action taken by them, it is evident that the governors, advised and guided as they were, had no other course to pursue, than to found and fill the chair of the principles and practice of education in Acadia College. Two or three of the writers against this movement have affixed their names to their letters, but the greater part have been anonymous. Even their number would be reduced if report is correct. They have resorted to the device of Peter Cartwright, who practised a pious fraud at a Methodist camp-meeting. He had learned that on a certain night a number of mischievous fellows intended to come and disturb the camp. Peter, after all had retired to their beds, stationed himself at a distance from the encampment; as the night wore on he heard the enemy approaching. Plunging both hands into his capacious and well-filled pockets, he drew them

forth full of pebbles, which he threw in all directions. At the same time he set up a great yelling in a variety of voices. The on-coming thinking they were confronted by overwhelming numbers were panic-stricken and beat a hasty retreat. It is said that one writer has been throwing broadcast into the denomination a large variety of anonymous signatures, hoping, by this artifice, to leave the impression that many are writing. When the truth is found out it will be seen that it is only Peter throwing gravel-stones with both hands and yelling in imitation of many voices.

Throwing pebbles did frighten mischievous boys from a Methodist camp-meeting, but it is yet to be seen whether an unknown Peter can frighten the senate, the governors, the Convention and the entire Baptist denomination.

E. M. SAUNDERS.

Nov. 10.

LETTER FROM PROF. JONES.

To the Editor of the Herald:—

SIR,—What motive prompted Dr. Saunders to bring my name so prominently before the public in connection with the establishing of the new chair in Acadia, I am at a loss to determine. I can say with the utmost candor that the senate and governors carried forward and completed their arrangements without any special reference to my view of their action. No part of the responsibility which rightly belongs to the establishers of the new chair ought properly to be transferred to me. What weight, therefore, Dr. Saunders' statements in your issue of the 8th inst., relative to my part in the matter, should have with the Baptist constituency and the public generally, I leave for the Baptist constituency and the public to decide.

R. V. JONES.

PROF. HIGGINS' REPLY TO DR. SAUNDERS.

To the Editor of the Herald:—

SIR,—In their new form some of the statements now made by Dr. Saunders are doubtless true. But unfortunately these that are true are irrelevant, while those that are strictly relevant to the matter in hand are, I regret to say, not in accordance with the facts in the case.

Nov. 12.

DEFENCE OF THE ACADIA GOVERNORS.

No. IV.

To the Editor of the Herald:—

SIR,—You have kindly supplied captions to my letters. The heading over No. 3 is misleading. It is "In defence of Dr. Rand." It should be in the defence of the senate and board of governors of Acadia College. I have written to defend them, for their action has been assailed. In regard to the short notes of Dr. Higgins and Professor Jones, challenging the correctness of my statements regarding themselves, I may say that the correctness of all my references to these gentlemen can be verified or disproved by others cognizant of the facts. I would therefore refer these gentlemen to the hon. Dr. Parker, B. H. Eaton, Esq., E. D. King, Esq., Rev. J. W. Manning, and others who know what was said and done at the meetings of the joint committee of the senate and the board of governors. The concurring recollections of these gentlemen ought to satisfy both Dr. Higgins and Professor Jones. Being in accord with my memory of what took place, they are perfectly satisfactory to me.

In previous letters I have given a plain recital of the business transactions connected with the appointment of Dr. Rand to the chair of education in Acadia College. It has thus been made apparent that all the business was done honorably and in good faith. This ought to satisfy the Baptists that

the board to which they have entrusted the management of their institutions have done nothing to disturb the confidence which has hitherto been placed in them. They have no ends to serve other than those of the entire denomination. A universal desire now exists throughout the denomination to perfect and enlarge the labors of this institution. This is earnestly sought by every member of the senate and by the board of governors. Had they not believed the appointment of Dr. Rand would contribute to this end, it would not have been made. If their wisdom is doubted, surely their integrity ought not to be assailed. Further writing in defence of these boards ought to be altogether unnecessary.

In one of my letters I stated that the making of education a subject for university training has been discussed for the last fifty years. A glance at the history of this agitation throws light upon the merits of the question.

Before calling attention to this phase of the subject I may say that what I shall write is not intended to take the place of public utterances certainly expected from the president of the college, Dr. Rand and other educationalists. As a member of the senate I wish to put on record the grounds on which I rest my defense of the "new departure." The officials referred to will choose their own time and place for discharging their duties in this matter. They hold decided opinions and will defend them on all suitable occasions. They are sure of a patient and impartial hearing. The weight now attached to the views held by these gentlemen will be greatly increased when the public know the substantial reasons by which they are sustained. A review of the history of introducing education into the curricula of universities leads impartial minds far along the way to a decision in favour of its soundness and utility. In justification of this assertion only a few sentences, referring to this phase of the question are necessary.

As early as 1828 a number of educationalists in Great Britain saw the deficiency of the unscientific mechanical methods employed in schools of all grades. To their minds, teaching was more than an art; it was a science. Taking their stand on this principle they began to agitate the question of giving teachers a professional training from a scientific basis. This they contended was work for the colleges. Prominent among the advocates of this new doctrine was Professor Pillans. A general interest was awakened in the subject. The good will and co-operation of many able thinkers was secured. Even ministers of the crown were favorably disposed. Hopes were entertained that the project would be soon carried into operation; but radical measures do not quickly succeed in conservative England. The hopes thus raised in 1834 were not realized till many years afterwards. The zealous educationalists had ample opportunity for the discipline of their patience if not for the right instruction of teachers. The ripple of popular opinion that had reached the government of the country was followed by no practical results. But the pioneers were not discouraged. The heaven had been placed in public opinion, and they knew its diffusion through the masses was only a question of time. In 1862 hopes of the realization of early dreams were again revived. Professor Pillans, now the venerable author of the new doctrine, became so assured that the time had come to commence work that he went to London and signified to the government his intention of giving five thousand pounds sterling towards the founding of a chair of education in the University of Edinburgh. But his plans were frustrated and his hopes dashed to the ground. The scheme found no

favour with the government. Instead of the deference paid to his views in 1834 there was positive opposition. Mr. Robert Lowe contemptuously declared that there was "no science of education." Thus even the soundness of the new doctrine was challenged by the highest civil authority in the department of education. The battle had to be fought over again. On the one side were the supporters of Mr. Lowe's dogma, and on the other side the believers in the scientific method. All the ordinary means for educational warfare were laid under tribute and the discussion went forward. The advocates of the advanced theory would not allow the matter to rest. The world had in them another illustration of the irrepressibility of the authors of fresh doctrines. They regarded themselves as the discoverers of something new and important in the department of education. It was, so they believed, their duty to create public opinion in its favour and to give the public the benefits of its practical results. Their pet scheme had indeed been struck down by the powerful hand of a minister of the crown; but that did not discourage them. They were inspired by the genius of discovery and the hopes of pioneer labour. They therefore went forward courageously. In 1869 public opinion again turned in their favour. At this time the country was agitated with the discussion of modern schemes for the education of the masses. This lifted into prominence the subjects of scientific training for teachers; and gave the supporters of this doctrine a good opportunity for pressing their views upon an awakened public sentiment. Expressions of regret were heard on all sides that the golden opportunity was allowed to pass when Professor Pillans offered to endow a chair in the Edinburgh University. It was argued that the work contended for could not be done by training schools.

Professors in colleges, head masters and educationalists of various types gave their influence in favour of the new scheme. About this time the trustees of the Bell fund intimated their intention to give ten thousand pounds sterling toward the establishing of chairs of education in the universities of Edinburgh and St. Andrew's. The proposal met with general favour, but for a time it was held back by the opposition of civil authorities. In 1876, however, the educationalists conquered, and victory crowned their long continued and oft defeated labours. The universities of Edinburgh and St. Andrew's each established a chair of the art and science of education. Since that time the London and Cambridge Universities have made provision for this subject. It continues to gain ground year by year on both sides of the Atlantic. It is now on the curriculum of the University of Michigan and has become the subject of courses of lectures in Harvard and Cornell universities. Educationalists in the maritime provinces have not been inattentive to this revolution in the literary world. Its progress has been carefully observed. The first man to bring it to the attention of the public, so far as I know, was a resident of Halifax. The Rev. Robert Murray, a governor of Dalhousie college and editor of the *Presbyterian Witness*, submitted the matter in an excellent paper to the teachers' associations which met in Halifax about a year ago. Mr. Murray's views after a thorough discussion were adopted by a unanimous vote of those present. It is scarcely necessary to say here that Mr. Murray advocated the introduction of the subject of the science and art of teaching into provincial colleges. Mr. Murray has the reputation of being a careful observer of everything new in the departments of morals, letters and religion. He doubtless reflects the policy of prin-

cipal Ross, whose administration will be remembered as the period of great enlargement of the college, over which he presides. As a matter of course the discussion was continued in the columns of the *Presbyterian Witness*. There the subject rested, so far as I know,—till last spring, when it was taken up by Dr. Rand and the president of our college. They and others, I assume gave their attention to it during the summer. As is well known our theological work was removed by the late convention to Toronto. Many had believed for years in the utility of this movement, but so long as it could not be carried out. I with others was convinced that theological work should be done at Acadia. About the time it was decided that Dr. Welton should go to Toronto, Professor Tufts retired from the college to take charge of the academy. Enlargement, therefore, of the college staff became a necessity. At a meeting held for considering this matter, the president commended the chair of education and the appointment of Dr. Rand to the favorable consideration of the Board of Governors.

This brief and imperfect sketch of the history of this question is in justification of the acts of our president and the governing authorities of our institutions. In subsequent letters I shall consider the merits of the new chair, and the possibilities of its great usefulness in the educational work we now have on hand. When this shall have been done it will be seen that the grounds of action are not visionary, but substantial and worthy of the impartial examination of an interested public. Truly yours,

Nov. 14. E. M. SAUNDERS.

MORE ABOUT ACADIA COLLEGE.

To the Editor of the Mail:—

SIR,—Since the establishment of a chair of education in Acadia College, some two months ago, the act has been pretty thoroughly discussed both in private and in the public press. One feature of this discussion seems worthy of note. Not a single letter has yet appeared in support of the movement from a disinterested source. Mr. B. H. Eaton, who was the first to enter the lists as the champion of didactics, is a governor of the college; Mr. King, who esquired the first named valiant knight, is also a governor; then we had the logical and argumentative (?) production of Rev. D. A. Steele who tells us that he helped to put Dr. Rand there, and he intends to help to keep him there; and lastly, Rev. Dr. Saunders comes to the front and promises a "series" of letters on the subject. The last two gentlemen are members of the senate, and were, therefore, with the governors, a party to the movement. In attempting to excuse or defend the appointment they are, therefore, simply defending their own action; they are special advocates pleading their own cause.

Two letters of Dr. Saunders' promised "series" which already appeared—two letters have, if he will excuse me, I must characterize as most remarkable productions. So much do they contain about John W. Bars, Esq., Rev. Dr. Sawyer and others, and so little about the real question at issue, that any attempt to discover in the three columns he has written, any justification of the new departure is like searching after two kernels of wheat in two bushels of chaff. Three objections have been urged to the appointment of Dr. Rand, (1) that such a chair is not needed at Acadia while certain others are; (2) that there are no funds to pay the salary; and (3) that the larger salary is unjust to the other professors. Let any one examine the learned doctor's letters and I am sure he must admire the skill he has displayed in avoiding all reference to these three points.

(Continued on fourth page.)