

believe this. At all events, if such cases do occur, the sooner they are put an end to the better. The closing of the post-office on Sabbath will do no mischief: it will be a real mercy to the dying man if it force his friends to send for the doctor *express* instead of calling him by post.

4. Nearly related to this latter reason, stands another. Some persons of fine sensibility and tender feelings are sure that on some Sabbath of their lives they are to get a letter telling them of the sudden illness of a dear friend; and "How terrible it will be if that letter shall be detained in the post-office during the whole Sabbath, while they are enjoying it in happy ignorance of the coming calamity!" We are not sure that there is anything in this last sentence beside a little sentiment; and we are not sure that the sentiment is sound. It appears to us that that Sabbath, well spent—i. e., spent in communion with God—might be a very admirable preparative for the sorrow, and the sudden strokes that were waiting you. And even although you were thus deprived of the opportunity of witnessing the death-bed of the friend you loved, this might be overruled for your good. But allowing full weight to this plea, we shall see if it can hold its ground against the reasons that are to be urged on the other side.

5. We have heard it said, that some persons decline joining in the movement because it is inconsistent with their Voluntary principles to do so. But we can hardly credit this. What is their objection? Is it this?—that Government have no right to interfere with the Sabbath post-office. But that would be a strange doctrine, surely, involving the manifest absurdity, that Government have the right to introduce a desecration of the Sabbath, but no right to withdraw one; and that whatever desecrations they do introduce, it is wrong for us to petition against them, because we thus recognise the right of Government to interfere with religion. We do no such thing. But seeing that they have interfered with religion, by establishing a Sabbath post-office, we ask them to withdraw that interference, just as we would ask them to withdraw an ordinance which fined every man who did not go to church on Sabbath.

But we are forced to suppose that such persons have a different objection from this, because, while they will not petition Government to close the Sabbath post-office, they feel no scruple in petitioning Government to keep it open. Their objection cannot be that Government have no right to interfere with the observance of the Sabbath, for they are desiring it to continue its interference with it, while we are desiring it to cease that interference. Their objection must be something else. We have heard it stated thus:—That while they don't wish any one to be forced to receive his letters, they wish every one, who chooses to receive him, to have them. But surely this objection has nothing to do with the Voluntary principle—at least, beyond the first clause. And then the second clause has nothing to do with the present question. The present question is not—shall letters be *delivered* on the Sabbath, or not? but shall the mails be carried, or not? And all that, as a Voluntary, any one of you can demand from Government is, that they shall not interfere with your right of communicating with whom you please on the Sabbath. Your Voluntary principle gives you no ground for compelling Government to provide you with a medium of communication. Indeed, it seems to us that you strangely contradict your idea of religious liberty, when you petition Government to carry the Mails. If Government forced one ungodly man to keep the Sabbath holy, you would be indignant at the invasion of his liberty; but if Government force twelve thousand men to break the Sabbath, it is all right. You will not compel a man to be religious; but you will compel a man to be irreligious, if you can. It humbly appears to us, that it is a greater interference with liberty to say to one man, You shall carry the mail on the Sabbath—than to say to another man, You shall not receive your letters. And if the objector still insists upon being secured in his privilege, at whatever cost to others, then we leave him to the disgrace which such a heartless demand deserves. Surely he must have

a low idea of the rights and religious necessities of man, who would sacrifice his brother's liberty of worshipping God, for his own liberty of getting his letters on the Sabbath.*

6. There is another reason which we must mention, but which it is not our duty to characterise in this place. The Sabbath is a wearisome day to some; and they don't see how they could enliven its tedium if they had not their letters to read and think about, and their newspaper. Never do they enjoy it so much as after the services of the Sabbath. For whatever the merit of these may be, they are never half so interesting to them as the last quotations of the Funds and the London Markets; or the last telegraphic despatches from the Continent—from Prague—or Paris, during the bloody butcheries of the barricades.

But let us now look at some of the reasons which may be urged for closing the post-office, and putting an end to its present Sabbath arrangements.

1. Its present Sabbath arrangements are *unfair*, inasmuch as some feel themselves at liberty to send for their letters—others do not.

2. They are *inconvenient*, inasmuch as there is a Sabbath delivery in some places, and not in others. This produces confusion and disappointment.

3. They interfere with the regularity of business. Tuesday used to be a blank day, both in Edinburgh and Glasgow, for London letters and papers. If a mercantile house did not call for its letters and papers on Sabbath, it had four London mails, instead of two, on Monday—and on Tuesday it had none at all. Had the Mail been stopped entirely on Sabbath, it would have had two every day, except Sabbath; and the same thing would have happened to letters in every part of the Island. Sabbath would have been the only blank day; and surely this would have been a beneficial change. The introduction of the railways makes no alteration, we believe, except by shifting the blank day from Tuesday to Monday.

But the three reasons which follow will be felt by every right-minded man to be conclusive:—

4. Men of the best character cannot be secured for the service of the post-office—at least for those departments in which much Sabbath work is exacted. The most trustworthy men are undoubtedly those who fear God. But such men reverence the Sabbath, and will not engage in an occupation that forces him to profane it. To this, as a retributive consequence, we must in part ascribe those irregularities and frauds which occur in the post-office, to a much greater extent, we believe, than is generally known.

5. But supposing respectable men to engage in these departments of the post-office, will their character remain uninjured by their constant labour on the Sabbath, and separation from Divine ordinances? Quite the contrary. Indeed, if you wished to introduce a man gradually to sin, and to deaden his religious feelings, you could not take a better method for compassing your malignant purpose, than by inducing him to sell a few of his precious Sabbath hours for gain. Some time ago, a boatman, being on the point of death, was visited by a gentleman who had been a partner in the firm to which the boat belonged. The boatman had once been an excellent character, but had subsequently become a drunkard. His employer referred to the contrast, and upbraided him for his misconduct. The poor fellow retorted by declaring that the cause of his ruin was being compelled to work on the Sabbath, by which he had become more and more hardened in iniquity; asking, further, *what else could be expected from a man in his station, cut off from all religious instruction, and exposed to every kind of temptation.* The gentleman was deeply affected by this appeal to his conscience by the dying boatman. He called a meeting of his partners, stated the case, and pro-

posed giving up Sunday traffic; but being outvoted, he left the firm.

6. If the carrying of the Mail cannot be included among works of necessity and mercy, then it is a breach of the Fourth Commandment,—it is a sin.

But it is not a work of necessity, otherwise it could not be dispensed with anywhere. But it is dispensed with in London.

And to say that mercy requires it—that it requires the whole apparatus of the post-office to be kept in motion for casual sick-bed calls, is just as reasonable as to say that doctors, instead of going to church, should go round their patients every Sabbath, in case any of them may be suddenly seized—or that the fire-engines of Edinburgh should parade the streets every Sabbath morning, in case any house should happen to go on fire.

But as this mercy plea is the only plausible one—as the mails, if carried, are henceforth to be carried for mercy's sake—we appeal to Mercy. Does she require those 12,000 servants of the post-office to urge their labours on the Sabbath? Will she send them on her errands on the day of rest and religious privilege? She denies indignantly that she will. She has a care for their souls as truly as for sick and dying men. So casting these upon Him who regards the destitute in their affliction, she sends the emancipated servants of the post-office to the proper duties of the Sabbath, and charges them to meet her at the throne of grace, that they may obtain mercy, and find grace to help them in their time of need.

FRENCH PROTESTANT SEMINARY FOR YOUNG LADIES, IN MONTREAL.

Many promising Protestant children have been diverted from the ways of truth into those of Popish error by being educated in Convents and Nunneries; and no accomplishments, however valuable in their own place, can justify parents for sending their children to such places. We learn, with much pleasure, that a Seminary for young ladies, conducted by Mlle. Tregent, and Madame Ecuyer, from Geneva, Switzerland, has been opened in Montreal.

We heard very favourable accounts of these ladies, when recently in that city; and found, on our return, a letter from Mr. Doudiet, Missionary, waiting us, in which he thus speaks of them:—

"If it were but for the honour of Protestantism, such a boarding-school ought to be supported or encouraged by every friend of the Redeemer's kingdom. It is the first of the kind that has ever been tried in this country, whilst the Roman Catholics have long ago been abundantly supplied. I doubt, however, whether any one of the leaders of the French Catholic schools can outdo Miss Tregent, as to an accomplished and long experienced way of tuition; but more, I am convinced, could be compared to her as to *vital piety and true respectability.*"

The Rev. H. Wilkes, Rev. William Taylor, Rev. J. McLeod, Rev. E. Tanner, Rev. F. Doudiet, Rev. P. Wolf, and the Editor of the *Montreal Witness*, recommend this Seminary.

POPERY EVER THE SAME.

We extract from the *Globe* the following condensed account of what has attracted just notice in the mother country, and is likely to do so still more. It is the beginning of disclosures which must throw much light on the real character and working of Popery:—

"THE BLACK ROCK KUNNYERY."

"A case has lately been brought before the House of Peers by appeal, which has attracted the deepest attention of the British public, and awakened universal indignation. In 1826 and 1827, Maria and Catherine McCarthy, daughters of Alexander Mc-

* Of course we do not mean to say that all the persons engaged in the post-office on Sabbath are precluded from attending upon Divine worship; but a number of them are—and a number more are indisposed, by the secular work which is thus forced upon them, for attending to the spiritual.