

far as religion is concerned, but a reproduction of the policy of Lord Ellenboro'. Christianity is to be suffered rather than encouraged—and schemes of proselytism or conversion to be eschewed, or at least prosecuted with such extreme caution—that it might seem as if the recent agitations had established the danger of christian missions to public peace and order, instead of bringing out, more clearly than ever, their utility and necessity. The same phantoms rise up before the imagination of our new Indian rulers, that disturbed the vision of the Montgomeries, Suttons, and Lushingtons, of fifty years ago, when Wilberforce, and his associates had enough to do, to secure a hearing in support of the Christianization of India—and had not only to combat the fears of offending native prejudices, but even to encounter such eulogies of Hindu virtue, and amenity, as went to represent missions as uncalculated for. It will hardly be pleaded now, indeed, as it was boldly pleaded then, that the religion of the Hindu is only second to christianity itself in forming men to good order and morality. But it appears as if it were the greatest danger we have to guard against, that Governmental influence should in any way be exerted to wean the natives from their superstitions, or the least intention to christianize them should be hinted at or avowed. It is in refreshing contrast to this, that Major Edwards, a soldier of the good centurion stamp, has been raised up to assert a line of policy the reverse of so Gallic-like one—and who brings his experience, and those of his noble coadjutors the Lawrences, the Havelocks, and other successful defenders of British interests, to justify his avowal of the necessity of christian government. He shows that our country is indebted for the tranquillity of the Punjab and the re-capture of Delhi, to the labors of missionaries. It seems that in that part of India, missionary labor had been most encouraged, and “the old traditional policy” most departed from; and it is remarkable that by the troops gathered in that quarter, the power of the rebellion was crushed even before the arrival of reinforcements from England.

It has not failed to be noticed, too, that while Lord Stanley was haranguing the Fishmonger's Company of London, a native Brahmin of high caste, comes forth with his testimony that “religion has had nothing to do with this rebellion whatever.” He, with Dr. Duff, in a recent letter, traces it to a sense of certain political grievances in the minds, alike of the Mahometans and Hindus—but which so far from being chargeable on missionaries, had rather been tempered and rendered more tolerable by their presence. That such a testimony from a high-bred Indian should be given through the London Press on the same week in which Lord Stanley was counselling the old policy of governing without religion, bespeaks a watchful Providence, and is suggestive of our righteous and imperative obligations. We do hope that as the field of christian enterprise opens in the East, not only the churches will be awakened to the duty of following where Providence leads, but that our country will arise to the conviction that its extending relations with distant parts of the globe impose upon it the obligation of employing its great influence to other effects, besides those of mere commercial advantage. It is time to see that so many millions of the human race have been subjugated to the British rule to benefit by our civilization and religion and not merely to subservise our ambition and covetousness. And guilty as the leaders of those recent agitations may have been, it becomes a great people to use its triumphs generously: to look at the discounts and possible wrongs that have sought so rudely to redress themselves; and, above all, to confess the error of

neglecting to sow where we would gather; and to employ the God-ordained means of protecting ourselves as well as blessing our neighbours. We are not of those who expect much from mere secular education. We trust that schools will be established all India over, in which the Bible shall be read—at least encouraged to be read; we deprecate the idea that christianity should be put only on a common footing with the superstitions of Brahma; Or that some common principles, (as has been talked of)—as old, we suppose, as the seven precepts of Noah, should be rested in, as an accommodation between true religions and the false. We read in the recent events the rebuke of the Almighty on the time serving policy of by-gone days; and we prognosticate from the employment of half measures a recurrence of the lamentable evils by which a law of nature as irreversible as that of day and night has vindicated itself, that the nation and kingdom that will not serve God shall perish.

We took up the pen to write these lines the rather, as we had just been struck with some of the eloquent pleadings of Wilberforce in the discussions forty-five years ago, on the state of India, which we happened to light upon, and in which we see illustrated the superiority of generous to selfish principle, as well in the truthfulness of its anticipations, as in the wisdom of its counsels. His vindications of the mission cause in the persons of the Swartzes and Careys of an earlier time might almost be transferred into our pages as a fitting refutation of charges which the will is not wanting to moot still against the self-denying men who have gone far hence to seek the good of the heathen; and we only wish that his exposure of the political folly as well as guilt of pandering to idolatry were read by all our modern statesmen.

“Mr. Wilberforce said he was far from being one of those who thought that our Indian empire was not exposed to great dangers; he thought was, and that we ought to strengthen ourselves in that quarter; but our real danger lay in the moral degradation of the natives, and the true cure of that danger in their moral improvement. If instruction can be given to our native subjects without danger, as I have proved it can, I need not detain you with showing that it ought to be given. It is politically necessary to the security of India, which at present we do not hold by a very secure tenure. By becoming christians, the natives will become attached in heart to the British to whom they will have been indebted for the greatest of all obligations—a knowledge of the gospel. This I regard as an indisputable consequence: and if so, never was a duty so clear, so strong, so imperious, so irresistible, as that which calls upon us to instruct the people of India. (Replying to some of his opponents, he goes on) I am not a little struck Sir, with the great resemblance which the objections to this measure bear to those formerly urged against the Abolition of the Slave Trade. But, Sir, we have lived to see the day when all have consentaneously rejoiced in our success. We were then, as now, assailed by the weight of local authority. We were told that the Abolition of the Slave Trade would be productive of numerous evils—that insurrection must follow. How had these assertions been belied? In every instance it appeared that those who had made them had formed erroneous ideas on the subject; and it is somewhat remarkable that since the passing of the Abolition Act, as if providentially to take away even the colour of a pretext for maligning that measure, no insurrection of any kind had occurred. So I trust it will be with the assertions and predictions which are employed on the present occasion. I mourn that during the last fifty years this country should not

have done more to raise so many millions of our fellow creature—our fellow subjects—from their wretchedness and depression. The truths, we have been misled on the subject.”—

We trust the day has passed, when our rulers will extend their support to the degrading rites of Idolatry; but we see no pledge as yet of such a decided avowal of christian principles in the administration of Indian affairs as is evidently called for, both on grounds of humanity and sound policy. If reforms so sweeping as those recommended by Colonel Edwards, are not to be adopted, it is to be hoped surely that nothing less than Sir John Lawrence's christian policy will be engrafted on the new regime. It is indeed not so decided in the withdrawal of public endowments from heathen institutions as it ought to be; nor in the discouragement of caste. In the opinion of the chief commissioner, however, the Bible should not only be placed among the college libraries, and the school books, for the perusal of those who might choose to consult it, but should be taught in class, wherever there are teachers fit to teach it, and pupils willing to hear it. We have no doubt of the sincere design of Sir John Lawrence to give such advantages for the diffusion of christian truth, as he imagines to be reconcilable with the spirit of the gospel itself, and consistent with a regard to the feelings and prejudices of the natives. His proposals are a great advance on the “traditional policy.” While he holds it impracticable to withdraw at once or entirely from the native religions, grants of property to which they have acquired a prescriptive right,—differing in this from Colonel Edwards, who would confiscate such property,—he agrees in the principle that no further appropriations should be made for the support of heathen rites, or institutions. Of the appropriations made by former governments, he says, “They are old; they were never considered any religious offering on our part, either by ourselves, or by the grantees, or by the people. On our accession, we regarded them as the property of certain religious institutions, just as conventual lands in Roman Catholic countries, are ecclesiastical property. To recal these grants on the ground that the institutions are heathen, would be nothing short of the persecution of heathenism.” Many will demur to this; and Sir John is scarcely sure of his ground. “In the Punjab, he says, many overgrown grants have been reduced.” It will probably be found in the issue, that the bolder policy of Colonel Edwards is the wiser. Yet we confess we cannot altogether blame our statesmen for what seems an exaggerated estimate of the rights of conscience and of the danger of governmental interference, when so many religious bodies are ever protesting to our rulers that their business is to preserve a neutrality to religious creeds, and to leave the religious education of the masses under their sway entirely to private missionary zeal, or to the churches. We observe that the London Missionary Society, almost in the same breath in which they condemn the President of the Board of Control in avowing his determination still to adopt the course of his predecessor, tell him that, after all, a real neutrality is all they ask of him. They of course hold that it could not be called “neutrality” to banish the Bible from schools, into which the Koran and the Shasters were admitted: “Certainly not. But only, say they, admit them to equal favor: They ask no more. The Evangelical Alliance, the other day, expressed itself content with something of the same kind. Now, we sympathise with their laudation of such christian heroes as both Edwards and Sir John; and are glad that their unanimous conviction was expressed, that nothing short of the policy indicated by the latter statesman will satisfy the British