



WASHINGTON AND JEFFERSON COLLEGE  
HISTORICAL COLLECTIONS

Archive No. XI j 6

Subject *Report of a committee of the  
Board of Washington College  
respecting the union of that  
college with Jefferson College,  
with an explanation of the Willie  
case. 1817.  
See XI j .5.*



REPORT  
OF A COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD  
OF  
**WASHINGTON COLLEGE,**

BESPECTING THE UNION OF THAT COLLEGE WITH

**JEFFERSON COLLEGE.**

And in explanation and justification of the conduct of the Trustees of the former, in relation to their agreement with the Rev'd. ANDREW WYLIE, late President of Jefferson College; together with an impartial and accurate view of *his* conduct in that arrangement.

Published by order of the Board of Trustees of

**WASHINGTON COLLEGE.**

---

WASHINGTON, Pa.  
PRINTED BY WILLIAM SAMPLE,

1817.

WASHINGTON COLLEGE, October 24th, 1817.

At a meeting of the Board of Trustees, the following report  
in answer to the resolution of Jefferson College, was read and  
adopted, and one copy ordered to be transmitted to the Jefferson  
Board, and another published.

W  
The  
the res  
25th  
Board  
union

That  
the sub  
opinion  
expedi  
by Jeff  
ployment  
late Pre

Altho  
doubt the  
tion, or  
Jefferson  
explanat  
renew  
ject of  
though  
ed in ex  
eral tem  
lege, wh  
ous, yet  
siderati  
stand in

It is  
public  
matters  
tion requ  
to the  
misrep  
public  
may be  
fore reco  
explanat  
College  
Gentlemen

To fo  
duct of  
lege, in  
made  
Jefferson  
it will be  
state and  
and its re  
terior to

For m  
versal de  
part of th  
ness—Th



WASHINGTON COLLEGE, Oct. 24, 1817.

The committee to whom was referred the resolution of Jefferson College, of the 25th ult. in answer to a resolution of this Board, dated 24th ult. in relation to the union of the two Colleges,

### REPORT,

That they have taken into consideration the subject referred to them and are of opinion, that, under all circumstances, it is expedient to give the explanation required by Jefferson College, respecting the employment of the Rev'd. Andrew Wylie, late President of Jefferson College.

Although, the committee entertain no doubt that there is not the slightest foundation, or even colour of right, on the part of Jefferson College, to claim or demand the explanation as a preliminary to opening or renewing the correspondence upon the subject of the union of the Colleges; and although this Board might be fully warranted in excepting to the language and general tenor of the answer of Jefferson College, without being considered too fastidious, yet they are convinced that minor considerations of this nature ought never to stand in the way of a great and public good.

It is at least due to this Board and the public at large, that they should overlook matters of this kind, and give the explanation required, in order that every obstacle to the union may be removed, and that any misrepresentation calculated to mislead the public mind upon this important subject may be done away. The committee, therefore recommend that the following reply or explanation be transmitted to the Jefferson College. [See Appendix page 1.]

Gentlemen,

To form a correct estimate of the conduct of the Trustees of Washington College, in relation to "the agreement they made with Mr. Wylie, the late Principal of Jefferson College while in their employ," it will be proper to take a review of the state and condition of Washington College and its relations with Jefferson College, anterior to the agreement with Mr. Wylie.

For many years back a strong and universal desire pervaded the whole of this part of the country to unite these seminaries. The funds and resources of Jefferson

College, were in a languishing state, whilst those of Washington College were much more ample.

The resources of the former were precarious and uncertain, depending in a great degree, upon private donations and contributions: Those of the latter were more permanent & certain, arising not only from the ordinary tuition, &c. but, also, from a steady, regular and semi-annual interest on the sale of lands granted by the state.

By an union, the funds and resources of both institutions would be combined—the philosophical apparatus, library, &c. would be much improved—and the united Colleges would be enabled, by extending their system of education, to enlarge their sphere of usefulness.

Beside these positive advantages, there were others of a negative nature. These Colleges were in the same county, and but seven miles apart. From their contiguity, there was reason to apprehend, that irritations and collisions might arise. That local interest, and prejudice—disaffection, disappointed ambition, or malevolence might thereby, in the event of any new arrangement, have too much facility furnished to alienate the attachment of parents and pupils from one or the other seminary. By subtlety and misrepresentation the passions of the unthinking might be inflamed, new prejudices excited, and former ones confirmed. Thus all subordination, discipline, or authority might be impaired, if not destroyed.\*

Considerations of this nature, no doubt, drew the public attention, and particularly that of the clergy, with deep and anxious solicitude, towards the union of these seminaries.

To effect this great desideratum, the Trustees of Washington and Jefferson College, on the 26th day of Oct. 1815, appointed four commissioners from each Board, who met at Canonsburgh to confer upon the subject, and to ascertain whether an

\*That these fears and apprehensions have been, in a considerable degree, realised, few if any, acquainted with the late occurrences which succeeded the new arrangements in these Colleges, will venture to deny.



union was practicable. At that meeting, there was no diversity of opinion, amongst the commissioners, as to the utility and necessity of the union. But they could not agree as to the *scite* of the united College. On both sides, the *scite*, at that time became a *sine quanon*. To obviate any difficulties or objection arising from local interest or prejudice as to the *scite*, on the recommendation of the commissioners, the two Boards agreed to select six commissioners in the following manner, viz: three commissioners to be selected out of the Board of Jefferson College, by the Washington Board, and three other commissioners, to be selected from the Board of Washington College by the Trustees of Jefferson College. In pursuance of which, the Rev'd Messrs. Marquis and M-Curdy, and Judge Allison, trustees of Jefferson college, were appointed by the Washington Board—And the Rev'd Messrs. Stephenson, Allison and Guinn were appointed by the Jefferson Board.

These commissioners met on the 25th day of October, 1815, and, after several meetings and much discussion, they finally formed a convention, by which the *scite* of the United College was to be established at Washington. In lieu of the *scite*, the Jefferson Board was secured in a majority of the Trustees and the Faculty of the united College.

The commissioners, who were Trustees of the Jefferson Board, were gentlemen of the highest respectability and most venerable character. They were unequivocally instructed, by their Board, to propose the specific conditions on which the compact was formed—And they were explicitly authorised to conclude the negotiation on that basis. To these conditions, so proposed, the other commissioners, (who had general powers except as to the *scite*), acceded. The Washington Board unreservedly approved of the compact, and, in a reasonable time, officially informed the Jefferson Board thereof.

Thus specially instructed and authorised the commissioners on both sides unani- mously formed the compact, and concluded to advise, and did advise their respective Boards to petition the legislature to confirm the union, upon the conditions stipulated between the parties.

In pursuance of this convention and immediately afterwards, the Washington Board commenced its execution, on their part—Numerous and large subscriptions were procured for the purpose of enlarging the College buildings. It was afterwards announced that Jefferson Board had refused, by a majority of *one*, to *ratify* the compact; and all further execution of this great and important object was at once suspended, by this extraordinary and unaccountable measure.

The course taken by the Jefferson board, must always remain a matter of wonder and regret. What evil genius thus interfered to frustrate the union, time may yet develop. What censure can be too severe, or what sentence too harsh, upon the man who has been instrumental in defeating the union?

Afterwards some of the most respectable members of that Board resigned and others declined attending, leaving the institution without a quorum or a Board, for about two years—a strong and practical commentary upon the conduct of the Board, in refusing to carry into execution the compact of union.

Let us, however, examine upon what pretext this refusal to *ratify*, or to speak with more propriety, to *execute* the compact, rested.

Did the commissioners mistake or exceed their instructions and authority? This has not been alleged, nor will it be pretended. Can it seriously be urged, that without ratification by Jefferson Board, the convention was null and void? Potentially, perhaps, it may be so, for without good faith and a willingness to execute the compact, there is no power to enforce it. But does not the moral obligation remain in full force?

When a power of attorney is given and the agent acts according to, or within the limits, of his instructions, are not his acts conclusive upon his principal, without any ratification or confirmation? Unquestionably they are. In private transactions or contracts, where some requisite is wanting to give them legal validity, though the party should be without remedy, is the moral obligation gone?

What is the public law, or law of nations



upon this subject, if that be more applicable to this question?

In a negotiation between independent nations, a sovereign clothes his ambassador with power to treat *generally*. Then his acts, must be submitted to his sovereign, that he may take care, that he has not committed the interests or the peace of the nation too grossly to be executed. So, in like manner, if the instructions of the ambassador are limited, that the sovereign may see that they are not exceeded. In such cases where the power is not transcended, *ratification* or confirmation, if at all necessary, is but form, and of course. Because the treaty *virtually*, is complete.

When the ambassador performs the precise act which he is ordered to do, shall it remain with his sovereign to say I will not ratify it? What faith could be placed in any proposition he would make? Who would afterwards treat with him? None.

Where the instructions and authority are precise, definite and certain, as in the present case, and pursued by the commissioner, it is at best a mere matter of form, and a ratification or confirmation, if at all necessary, ought to follow, as it generally does, of course.

If this view of the subject be correct, it necessarily follows, that the union, so far as depended on the authority of either Board, was at least *virtually* formed and complete.

But, perhaps it may be asked, why not have insisted upon the execution of the compact at the time? Without enquiring whether any omission in this respect, could have rendered the violation of the compact by the Jefferson Board less exceptionable, the answer is ready and decisive. For some time, and not until after other important arrangements, were made and entered upon, did the Washington Board know, or understand, that the express conditions of that compact, before it was concluded by the commissioners, were actually and specifically approved and directed to be proposed by the Jefferson Board, as the basis of the union. The Washington Board was ignorant of this important fact, which placed the compact beyond the moral or rightful controul of the Jefferson Board.

Had the Jefferson Board amidst all these considerations indulged a manly confidence

in the Washington Board, they would not have come to the rash resolution of rejecting the compact, and of disappointing the ardent hopes of the public, by sacrificing substance to form. How far such conduct is reconcileable with honour & good faith, is left to be decided by the candid and enlightened public.

From this examination, it may be seen, which of the institutions was entitled to the services of Mr. Wylie, and from the succeeding remarks, whether the Jefferson Board have any ground to complain of any want of honour or good faith in the conduct of this Board, with regard to their agreement with Mr. Wylie.

Before we proceed to a particular explanation of the agreement made with Mr. Wylie, it may be proper, in order to illustrate the propriety and necessity of that agreement, to attend to the situation of the College at this time.

The late principal of this College was also pastor of the Washington congregation. The duties of *each* of those charges were large and extensive. The duties of *both*, were too arduous for any individual. Whatever the talents, industry or fidelity of the principal might be, it was and still is believed, that they were not adequate to the necessary advancement of the institution to that degree of celebrity which was attainable, unless the whole and undivided attention of the principal was given to the duties of that station.

A majority of the Trustees were convinced, that the best interests of the College required a separation of those duties, at least so far as was contemplated by the resolution submitted to the Board.

Accordingly, a separation was proposed, and as an unequivocal mark of their confidence in, and attachment to the late principal, an assurance was directed to be given to him, that he would be continued as principal of the College, with a suitable salary.

Various and repeated efforts to accomplish this arrangement, were made by the Trustees, but without effect. To go into all the details of their proceedings in relation to this part of the subject, would be tedious and cannot be necessary. The Board were well assured, that if a resolu-



tion should be passed declaring a separation of the duties, the principal would immediately relinquish his situation in the College.

In this situation of affairs, it became necessary to consider whether a majority of the Trustees should pusillanimously recede from the ground which they had taken; and whether the proposition respecting a separation of the duties should be abandoned altogether. A more favourable time or opportunity was not likely ever to occur. Whether such a separation was necessary, was a question, to which few, if any, could answer in the negative.

Upon the most deliberate reflection and careful examination of this question, in all its bearings, a majority of the Trustees were well satisfied, that the measure was not only expedient but necessary.

By that measure it was left in the option of the principal to accept or reject the proposition. It was ascertained that he would not relinquish his pastoral duties: but on the contrary, that if a separation of the duties was declared, he would resign his situation in the College.

To obviate any inconvenience, which might arise from a sudden change in this respect, it was deemed most advisable, to bring the new system, if practicable, into operation after the spring vacation and at the commencement of the summer session. In the interim, it was incumbent upon the Board, collectively and individually to look out for a person qualified as principal to superintend the College—One who would give his sole and undivided attention to the duties of the College. A different course could not have been justified, as it regarded either parents or pupils.

To this arrangement several objections have been raised. The handle which has been made of them requires that they should be examined with some precision.

In the first place, it has been objected, that the connection with the principal would be *unnecessarily* dissolved. Is not this begging the very question? Who was to judge of the necessity and propriety of this measure, in the first instance? That undoubtedly was the business of the Board of Trustees, or a majority of them. In point of fact, this objection is not supported;

because, as we before observed, it was optional with the principal to remain at the head of the College, with an increase of salary. It was the desire of the Trustees that he should do so, relieved from his pastoral duties. But, was this connection permanent and indissoluble—subject to no alteration or modification? This certainly will not be alleged. He was under no obligation to remain in that situation longer than he pleased. The obligation, as it related to himself or the Board, must have been reciprocal, and liable to be put an end to, at the will of either party. It could never have been contemplated, that the will or the wishes of one party should be obligatory on the other, without consent. Another objection is made on the ground of expence.

What difference, in this particular, exists between the late and present arrangement? By the former, the principal, exclusive of his salary from the congregation, received from this Board \$700. Under the present arrangement, twelve hundred dollars are allowed to the principal for his sole and undivided attention to the duties of the College. A difference of \$500 is thus created.

In consequence of the new arrangement, a considerable accession of students was expected, whose tuition alone would more than have enabled the Board to meet that difference in the expenditure. Independent of this, the funds of the institution fully justified the Board. Was not the object to be attained in every view worthy of the increase of expenditure. Surely that objection ought not for one moment to be put in competition with the general advantages, which might reasonably have been expected to flow from having the sole and undivided attention of the principal to the duties of the College.

Again, it is objected by some that a *secret* engagement in writing was made with Mr. Wylie, by which he was *informally* assured of the support of a majority of the Trustees of this institution, for the place he now fills. Others complain, that the engagement was made in the *dark*. These, and other objections of a similar nature, both as they relate to Mr. Wylie, or the Trustees who made the agreement with him are so ludicrous, that it is difficult to treat them



with seriousness. Such objections furnish strong grounds of suspicion, that their authors while "straining at a gnat" would be easily disposed to "swallow a camel."

Lest, however, some weak but well disposed minds should be labouring under erroneous impressions in this respect, it may be well enough to attend to them a little.

In point of principle, what difference can it make whether the agreement was in writing or not in writing—Whether it was made in the dark, or in day light? Is the transaction to receive its moral hue from circumstances like these? This would be ridiculous in the extreme. But, it was

*secret and informal.* In answer to this objection, it is to be observed that an open, direct and official proposition, for renewing the negotiation with regard to the union, would have been preferred and adopted, but for one over-ruling objection. Some of the Trustees of Jefferson College, who were more particularly interested in having the site of the united College established at Canonsburgh, had formed a secret agreement and determination to withdraw from that board, whenever a proposition for an union was again submitted to them. In this way, a quorum would be prevented and every attempt to unite these seminaries would be defeated. For the truth of this statement, this Board may appeal to those Trustees themselves.

That course, therefore, could not have been pursued with any rational prospect of success. Believing that an union would eventually if not immediately follow the employment of Mr. Wylie, as principal of this College, an application for that purpose was made to him, by a majority of the Trustees of this institution. That application contained an assurance of their support to place him at the head of this seminary in the spring, provided he would give his whole and undivided attention to the duties of the College. To this proposition Mr. Wylie, acceded and the agreement alluded to was formed.

In all this, what is there in the conduct of the Trustees, to which any reasonable objection can be made?

If the measure of disjoining the pastoral duties from those of principal of the College, was deemed correct and proper—If

the Trustees were assured that the late principal would not accede to the measure, and would not relinquish his pastoral duties, the question recurs. Was it not the duty and the business of the Trustees to make the necessary arrangements for carrying that measure into effect? Was it not incumbent on them, collectively or individually, to secure the whole time, talents and qualifications of Mr. Wylie, to the duties of his present station.

For this purpose, was it incorrect, or immoral for any member of this Board to promise his individual support? If it would not be improper or immoral in one, it could not be so in a majority, or in the whole of the Trustees. Although the mode may be informal, it ought to be remembered that *informality* does not constitute immorality. If the agreement was informal until it receives official sanction, it would be altogether inoperative. When it receives that sanction what becomes of the objection?

It is further objected, that the agreement was not only *informal* but *secret*.

Will this circumstance change its moral character. Premature publicity is sometimes fatal to the wisest and best of measures. It is frequently the part of wisdom to avoid furnishing certain persons with an opportunity to obstruct and embarrass measures right in themselves, by an imprudent and ill-timed disclosure of them. This occurs in every day's experience, and in almost every situation in life. We seldom take counsel from our opponents.

It was well known that there were some individuals in both boards, who would have been opposed to this change. Some from one cause, some from another. Although, they would not have been able to defeat the measure altogether, they might have essentially embarrassed it. Whatever might have been the inducement to a temporary secrecy, the wisdom of the precaution is manifest from the unreasonable prejudice which has been raised against it.

Thus, when all or any of these objections come to be analyzed and critically examined, they prove to be altogether destitute of any reasonable foundation.

It still remains to be enquired, whether any of the objections to the conduct of



Mr. Wylie can be supported. It is of the utmost moment to the character of Mr. Wylie. Indeed, it is of vital importance to this institution itself, that correct views, on this part of the subject should be entertained.

Although, this enquiry may by some, be considered as irrelevant to the explanation required by the Jefferson Board; yet, doubtless, if it should, in any degree, involve a consideration of his conduct in relation to the agreement made with the Trustees, it would be more satisfactory to give his conduct that consideration which the occasion calls for.

Many of the observations which have already been made, with regard to the conduct of the Trustees, apply with equal force to that of Mr. Wylie. If it be neither immoral nor unwise, on the part of the Trustees, to propose and to enter into this agreement with him, what is there in his case to excuse the obloquy which has been heaped upon him, or to justify the fiery ordeal through which he has been obliged to pass.

He was called to the office of president of Jefferson College about the 28th day of April 1812. He engaged for no particular period. He was under no obligation to remain longer in that situation than suited his own convenience. He was not bound to that institution, by perpetual allegiance; nor was he precluded from changing his situation and bettering his condition. He had already made great sacrifices, by continuing in that situation, with a salary that was utterly inadequate to the reasonable support of a young and rising family. A continuation, of those sacrifices could no longer reasonably be expected. By the terms of his engagement he was not entitled to any previous notice from the board of an intention, on their part to determine that engagement. Nor was he bound to give any notice of his intention or determination to relinquish his situation. He might have been dismissed from his engagement, or he might have determined it without previous notice on either side; and neither would have had any right to complain or object. [See appendix page 4.]

It might, it is true, have been mutually convenient to have had a reciprocal stipu-

lation of that nature. There, however, was none. But Mr. Wylie, was not actuated by pecuniary considerations. His views were of a high and very different nature. He, together, with about one half of that board, was satisfied, that the union was *virtually* formed by the convention which had been made. He had no knowledge when he accepted of the office of President in Jefferson College, after the termination of the negotiation, that the Washington board had acceded to the conditions proposed by the Jefferson board as the basis of the Union; and upon which he recommended that a union should be formed. He did not acquire that knowledge for six months afterwards. He cannot, therefore, be charged with any inconsistency in continuing in that situation: For he had no other impression at that time than that the Washington board had rejected these conditions.

A prospect of realising all the advantages of a union, was now opened to his view. By acceding to the proposition submitted by a majority of the Trustees, he was induced to believe that the union would eventually follow. This was the moving & governing consideration with him. In common with many others, he had a strong hope and desire that a Theological Seminary might be established in Canonsburgh. He looked forward to the time when the United College might be considered as a grand reservoir out of which a constant stream might issue unto the Theological Seminary, and thence diffuse its influence throughout the world.

Until he was assured beyond the possibility of mistake that a majority of the Trustees were determined upon a separation of the duties, and that the late principal had determined on that event to resign his situation in the College, Mr. Wylie positively declined entertaining, for a single moment, any proposition to engage. He repeatedly declared, that no possible consideration would induce him to interfere, in the smallest degree, with the late principal, if he was inclined to remain at the head of the College. After all, his wish was for a public and official proposition to the Jefferson Board, on the subject of the union. But, for the reasons already



dy assigned, that course could not have been adopted with any hope of success.

Notwithstanding all that has been stated, some may still contend that there was a tacit understanding or implied obligation on the part of Mr. Wylie, that previous notice should be given to the Jefferson Board, of his intention to determine the contract.

In order that such objectors may be disarmed of every pretext—that the most censorious caviller may be striped of even a resting place, let it be understood once for all, that Mr. Wylie did give previous notice of his determination to relinquish his situation in Jefferson College. There had been no Board for upwards of a year. There was none at the time of his engagement with this Board, to whom he could give notice. Three months before the end of the year, and when a successor would be wanted, he did inform Doctor McMillan, who was then *vice president* of that College, of his intention and determination to resign his situation in the Spring. He did also about the same time give the same information to Doctor Murdoch who was then secretary of that institution; and to the Rev'd. Elisha McCurdy and Craig Ritchie, trustees of that institution, the same information was given about the same time.

Immediately after this information was given, Dr. McMillan applied to another gentleman to teach in the College, in the Spring. This circumstance alone, shews a clear and decided understanding and notice of Mr. Wylie's determination to change his situation *in the Spring*.

In all this where is there to be found the slightest shade of dishonor, bad faith, immorality, or impropriety of conduct on the part of Mr. Wylie.

Yet strange as it may appear his conduct has been held up to public view, in all the colours of exaggerated misrepresentation. Disappointed ambition and disaffection have been raging with the most vindictive fury, and detraction itself seems almost to have exhausted its malignant resources.

That the talents and qualifications, of Mr. Wylie, are every way worthy of the efforts which have been made to obtain them, none will doubt. That the Jefferson

Board, should be anxious to retain them, and this board to possess them, will occasion no surprise wherever he is known.

Without arrogating to themselves, any superior sagacity or merit, in this business, a majority of the Trustees did anticipate some dissatisfaction. But, they did not apprehend, that, by persevering in a measure, which to them appeared wise and necessary, umbrage would be given to any. At all events, prejudices and objections, susceptible of no controul, were not to be anticipated.

In every undertaking of any consequence an honest diversity of sentiment does prevail, and may be allowed. Candour, interest and duty all required that this measure when once adopted should have received a full, fair and impartial trial and experiment. That it should not be clogged; or embarrassed by unnecessary scruples and unreasonable difficulties and objections. Far different has been the reception it has met with.

This Board will not descend to notice all the little artifices and low intrigues which have been employed to deter the Trustees of this Board from their purpose—to retain Mr. Wylie at Jefferson College, and to intimidate him from entering upon the duties of the station he now holds.—By a becoming fortitude these difficulties which had a tendency to retard the union and mar the prosperity of this institution have been surmounted.

So long as disaffection, and disappointment continued their baneful influence, in fomenting discord and dissention, it was not to be expected that the latter would immediately and entirely subside. Happily for the prosperity of the institution, and the peace of society, generally, their nature is too unsubstantial, and their existence too evanescent to endure! "*Like the morning cloud, or the early dew, they pass away.*"

The union of the seminaries, has no doubt been retarded, and they may experience alternate elevation & depression; but, however the condition may fluctuate, or vibrate, for a *while*, the time, it is believed is not far distant when public sentiment will enforce an union.

Some may, perhaps, be disposed to reflect



upon this Board, for withholding the present communication, so long from the public, and for having by their silence, in this respect, permitted the public mind to be misled on these subjects. The only apology which can be offered is this. By deferring this communication, there was a hope that its necessity might be superseded altogether. If otherwise, a reasonable expectation might be entertained that when passion had abated, and the ebullitions of prejudice and disaffection had subsided, a more favourable reception would be given to it.

The sum of what has been here advanced, is, that, if the union of these colleges has failed, this board is not chargeable with any bad faith in that respect. That if the compact had been executed, in good faith by the Jefferson Board, Mr. Wylie would have been placed by the voice of both Seminaries, at the head of the united Colleges. That, if a separation of the pastoral duties from those of the principal of this college was in the opinion of the Trustees, or a majority of them, necessary and proper in order that the whole and undivided

attention of the principal, might be given to the duties of the College, it was their duty so to declare and provide for it. That the late principal had it in his option to remain at the head of the Seminary. That, as he would not give up his pastoral duties, but on the contrary would relinquish his situation in the College, it was incumbent on the Trustees, either collectively, or individually, to look out and provide a person, who would give his sole and undivided attention to those duties, and that by doing so, no person could reasonably object, or complain.

Finally, that in the agreement with Mr. Wylie, by which he has been placed at the head of this seminary, there is nothing either on the part of this Board, or any of the Trustees thereof, or in the conduct of Mr. Wylie, to which when explained, the most rigid moralist can reasonably object.

On an impartial review of all the circumstances, this Board may with a just confidence, appeal to the Jefferson Board, and the public at large, and ask for an honourable and faithful execution of the compact which has already been formed.

## APPENDIX.

Washington, September 22d, 1817.

GENTLEMEN,

The Board of Trustees of Washington College, have this morning passed a resolution, of which the enclosed is a copy.

By which we have been appointed a committee, for the purposes, expressed in the resolution.

Will you be pleased to signify, to this Board, the disposition and determination of your Board, upon this subject; and whether a committee, for the like purpose will be appointed by your Board—together with the time and place of meeting.

An early answer to this proposition, will be very acceptable to this Board.

We have the honor to be

very respectfully, your  
obedient servants.

PARKER CAMPBELL,  
THOMAS M'GIFFIN,  
ALEXANDER MURDOCH,

Committee.

To the President & Trustees of Jefferson College. }

Resolved, That Messrs. Campbell, Murdoch and M'Giffin, be a committee for the purpose of renewing and opening with the Trustees of Jefferson College the negotiation for an union of the two Colleges—And to ascertain and report, whether it be practicable to effect such union, and that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Board of Jefferson College immediately.

The committee appointed by the resolution of the 24th inst. report the following answer and resolution, as received from the Jefferson Board.

Canonsburgh, September 25th, 1817.

GENTLEMEN,

The Trustees of Jefferson College have received your communication of yesterday; enclosed you have the reply of this Board.

Your humble servant,

JOHN M'MILLAN, Sec'y.

To Parker Campbell, Alexander  
Murdoch & Thomas M'Giffin,  
esq's. a committee on behalf of  
Washington College.

Jefferson College, Sept. 25th, 1817.

The Board took into consideration the application of the Washington College of yesterday. When it was resolved that the following be the reply, viz: That as it is the duty of those to whom the education of youth is committed, to inculcate both by precept and example, the virtues of candour, honour, justice and truth; this Board cannot therefore consistently with the duty they owe to the public, to the youth committed to their care, and the respect they owe to themselves, to open a correspondence with the Board of Washington College, until they explain their conduct respecting the agreement they made with Mr. Wylie, the late principal of Jefferson College, while in their employ.

Extract from the minutes.

JOHN M'MILLAN, Sec'y.

On motion—Resolved, That P. Campbell, Alex'r Murdoch and Thos. M'Giffin, be a committee to whom the answer of Jefferson College, be referred, and that they report to the next meeting.

Adjourned, to meet on Friday the 24th October, 1817.

Friday evening, Oct. 24th, 1817.—The Board met, agreeably to adjournment.—Present,

Jno. Anderson, pres't. James Ashbrooke,  
Parker Campbell, Alex'r. Murdoch,  
Daniel Moore, Thomas Hoge,  
James Brice, David Morris,  
Hugh Wilson, George Baird, sec'y.

The committee, to whom was referred, the answer of the board of Trustees, of Jefferson College, to the late proposition from this Board on the subject of the union, report as follows: vide report which was adopted by the Board.

AYES.

NAY.

Campbell, George Baird.

Moore,

Brice,

Wilson,

Ashbrooke,

Murdoch,

Anderson.

The following members declined voting:  
Rev. Thomas Hoge and David Morris.  
It was, on motion, resolved that the afore-



said committee prepare and transmit a copy of the report to the Board of Trustees, of Jefferson College, and also, to have it published, together with the resolution which proposed a separation of the duties of president of the College, from those of pastor of the congregation, and the late president's reply to the same.

*Washington College, Dec. 2d, 1816.*

The committee, appointed at the last meeting not being prepared to report, Mr. Campbell offers for consideration, the following resolution, viz.

"This Board being earnestly impressed with a belief that the interests of this College and the cause of science generally require the undivided attention of the principal of the College—and being moreover deeply impressed with the high talents, important services and great fidelity, of the Rev'd. M. Brown as principal of the College, do hereby, declare it expedient, and necessary to have his undivided attention in the College—to appoint a committee to confer with him upon this interesting subject, and to ascertain from him so soon as may be convenient whether it be not practicable for the College to have and possess the benefit and advantage of his talents and qualifications, exclusively, or at least without more interruption than may arise from an occasional interchange and performance of clerical duties."

And after considerable discussion it was moved and seconded that this Board adjourn to meet again on the 3d Monday of December inst—

Which was determined in the affirmative—  
Adjourned.

December 16th 1816. The Board met pursuant to adjournment;

"The resolution offered by Mr. Campbell on the 2d instant, being under consideration: It was moved by Mr. Campbell and seconded by Mr. Reed that a committee be appointed to wait on the Rev'd. M. Brown, and respectfully request from him a definite answer in writing to the following enquiries—

1st. Do you consider yourself under any obligation by contract with this Board, to continue for any particular period of time, as principal of the College, if so,

2nd. Be pleased to state for what particular time you consider yourself so bound to remain in that capacity.

3d. In the event of a resolution, or determination of this Board declaring a separation of the duties of the principal of the College, from those of pastor of the congregation, so as to have the undivided attention of the principal devoted to the duties of the College, will you adhere to the College, or will you relinquish the charge of it—And if you will relinquish the College, be pleased to state at what particular time you will so relinquish, whether immediately, or at the end of the present session."

It was moved by Mr. Speer and seconded by Mr. Guinn, that the question on the preceding resolution be postponed, for the reading of a communication from Mr. Brown which was agreed to, and the communication was read. (filed.)

The question on the resolution offered by Mr. Campbell recurring, it was determined in the affirmative, and Messrs. Allison, Stephenson and Dodd were appointed a committee to carry said resolution into effect.

The committee having waited upon Mr. Brown, returned the following answer in writing from him, which was read; viz. In answer to the enquiries of the Board I beg leave respectfully to reply,

1st. That I do not "consider myself under any obligation by contract with the Board to continue for any particular period as principal of the College; this is my answer to the 1st inquiry. And this supercedes the necessity of any reply to the second. With respect to the third enquiry—I consider it answered in part by the communication already made—I have stated that in case of an *alternative* I will not give up my congregation but must relinquish the College."

As to the latter part of the 4th enquiry "at what particular time will you so relinquish, whether immediately or at the end of the present session." I have, as the result of mature deliberation resolved to relinquish immediately. After what has passed, my own views of the origin, the tendency of such a resolution, and its



aspect towards myself, I would consider that I had lost the confidence of a majority of the Board; that I was occupying a station for which I was considered disqualified, and could not for these and other reasons consent to remain any longer as principal. I am not however prepared to say that I would not consent after my resignation to serve the institution in an individual capacity for some time until they could obtain a successor.

With much respect &c.

(Signed)

MATTHEW BROWN.

To the Board of Trustees.

It was moved by Mr. Campbell and seconded by Mr. McGiffin that the consideration of the resolution offered on the 2d instant be postponed—

On the question, will the Board agree to it?

It was determined in the negative,

Whereupon, Mr. Campbell and Mr. McGiffin the mover and seconder of said resolution, withdrew it.

Adjourned—

April 30th, 1817.

A stated meeting of the Trustees held of this date—present all the members.

A motion was made by Mr. Campbell and Mr. McGiffin and read as follows viz.

Resolved, That it is expedient to separate the duties of the principal of this College from those of pastor of the congregation, so that the College may have and enjoy the undivided attention of the principal to the duties of the College; and said duties are hereby declared to be separated for the purpose aforesaid.

It was moved by Mr. Jennings and Mr. Stephenson to postpone the above for the purpose of considering the following, as a substitute, viz.

Whereas, the Rev. Matthew Brown has officially communicated to this Board, his determination to relinquish his charge as principal of the College and to adhere to the congregation, if a separation of the duties of principal and pastor of the congregation, should be deemed necessary,

And whereas, this board, do deem it necessary to promote the interest of this College, that the undivided attention of the

principal be devoted to the institution—Therefore,

Resolved—That after the end of the next session, the duties aforesaid, shall be separated and that a committee of three members of this Board be appointed to take the necessary measures to ascertain without delay, where a suitable person can be procured to take the charge of the College as principal, who will devote his whole time, and attention, to the same.

This motion to postpone was determined in the negative.

And the question recurring on the original resolution—it was determined in the affirmative.

A motion was made by Mr. Campbell and McGiffin, and read as follows, viz:—

Whereas, the Rev. Matthew Brown, has officially announced, to this Board, his determination to relinquish his charge, as principal of the College, and to adhere to the congregation, if a separation of the duties aforesaid, should be declared by this Board—

And whereas, the Rev. Andrew Wylie, has resigned his situation as principal or president, of the College of Jefferson, and signified his disposition to accept of the office of principal of this College, and to give his whole and undivided attention to the duties thereof—Therefore—

Resolved, That the said Andrew Wylie, be, and he is hereby appointed, by this Board, as principal of this College, with a salary of twelve hundred doll's. per annum, payable semi-annually, as heretofore.

And on the question will the board agree to the same?

The yeas and nays were required, and are as follows.

YEAS,	NAYS,
Messrs Stephenson,	Messrs. Jennings,
Allison,	Speers,
McGiffin,	Penticost,
Wilson,	Reed,
Anderson,	Morris,
Murdoch,	Baird. 6
Brice,	
Shields,	
Moore,	
Ashbrooke,	
Campbell,	
Dodd. 12	



And so it was determined in the affirmative. Jefferson College. I had no knowledge, at that time, that the Washington Board had acceded to all the conditions proposed by the Jefferson Board, as the basis of the union of the Colleges. I was not present during any of the sittings of the Board, and consequently had no other way of coming to the knowledge of the proceedings relative to the union, but by communication with the members, several of whom intimated to me, that the committee, on the part of Jefferson, had not secured the object of their Board in the negotiation, and others, that the Board of Washington would not execute the convention in good faith as concluded by their commissioners. I did not know till at least six months after, that any assurance had been formally and officially given by the Washington Board contradicting these surmises.

The Rev'd. Thomas Hoge and Andrew Guinn, declined voting; the Rev'd. John Anderson, president of the Board, (there being a majority,) was not called upon to vote.

[COPY.]

The committee, to whom was referred, the resolution of the Jefferson Board of Trustees, of the 25th ult. respectfully request, that you will be pleased to give them any information you possess in relation to the following points—

I. When did you accept of the station of president of Jefferson College, and for what length of time?

II. When you accepted of that situation after the negotiation for a union, was closed what was the nature of your engagement and had you at the time of such acceptance, a knowledge that the Washington Board had acceded to all the conditions proposed by the Jefferson Board, as the basis of the union, of the Colleges?

III. Were you under any obligation to give previous notice of your determination to relinquish that situation?

IV. Did you give such notice; to whom and when?

V. From the termination of the negotiation, respecting the union, was there a Board of Trustees of Jefferson College formed or convened, until late in the last month.

PARKER CAMPBELL,  
Chairman.

The Rev'd. ANDREW WYLIE.  
October 15th, 1817.

SIR—To the questions proposed to me by the committee, &c. I beg leave to return the following answers, respectively, viz:

Ans. to question 1st.—I accepted the station of president of Jefferson College, the 28th April, 1812, but for no specified length of time. I considered myself at liberty at the close of every session.

Ans. to 2d.—“After the negotiation for an union was concluded” I entered into no new engagement with the Board of Jef-

Ans. to question 3d.—My recollection of the particulars relating to my acceptance of the office of president of Jefferson College, is not so full and distinct, as to justify me, in saying, *positively*, that I was not under “any obligation to give previous notice of my determination to relinquish that situation,” but my general impression has been, that there was no agreement implying any such obligation. Before I determined, however, what course I would take, I had recourse to the records of the Board, and found, that if there was such an agreement, no minute had been made of it. The secretary, also, assured me, that there was no such agreement; nor does any of that Board, with whom I have yet conversed on that subject, even allege that there was. To prevent, however, all cavil on this point, (and this is my answer to the 4th enquiry,) I *did* give such notice, fully *three* months previous to the time when the services of a successor would be required, to John McMillan, D. D. vice president, to Dr. Samuel Murdoch secretary of the Board, to the Rev'd. Elisha M. Curdy, and to Craig Ritchie, Esq.

To the 5th Qu. My reply is, that, “since the termination of the negotiation respecting the union, there has been *no* Board of Trustees of the College formed,” till late in last month.

ANDREW WYLIE.  
PARKER CAMPBELL, Esq. Oct. 15.