

The pupils then, through two of their number, presented their teacher with a handsome album containing their likenesses, with a farewell address. Deep and tender emotions had been awakened by the last of the essays read, entitled "The Old School Bell," and now the thoughts of the parting between teacher and pupils, so much attached to each other, increased those sympathetic feelings, so that many of the pupils and others present were moved to tears. Mr. Creed, after thanking his pupils for their present and their kind wishes, read an appropriate closing address. Several clergymen and other prominent gentlemen of Sydney afterwards spoke of their satisfaction with the exercises of the day, the progress made by the scholars, and the general management of the school, and gave expression to a common feeling of regret that Mr. Creed had deemed it necessary to resign his position. This closed the proceedings. The following Address was presented on a later day.

ADDRESS.

Sydney, C. B., May 1st, 1869.

H. C. CREED, Esq., B. A.

RESPECTED SIR,—As we learn with regret that you are about to leave Cape Breton, we, the undersigned inhabitants of Sydney, desire to express the feelings entertained by us on this occasion. In the first place we would express our appreciation of your services as Head Master of the Academy in this town. In that position you have given evidence of high scholarship and superior abilities as an instructor, and have constantly manifested a deep and unabated interest in the moral and intellectual culture of those who have been brought under your influence.

Again, in the relation of a citizen, you have ever sought to promote the best interests of the community; and we feel that your removal from us will be a public loss, and that our Temperance Societies, the Mechanics' Institute, and other public objects, both secular and religious, will miss your counsel, liberality and assistance.

But while we regret your departure from Sydney, we trust it may be to occupy a sphere of still greater usefulness, and we unite in wishing you all of prosperity and happiness that Providence can bestow, for yourself and your amiable partner.

The address was signed by,—

R. J. UNICKE, D.D.,
Chairman School Commissioners.
H. McLEOD, A.M., and D.D.,
C. H. HARRINGTON, J.P.,
N. L. MACKAY, Barrister at Law,
ED. M. DODD, Judge Supreme Court.
HENRY DAVENPORT, Custos.
J. L. HILL, High Sheriff.
D. N. McQUEEN, Q. C. and Judge of Probate.
C. E. LEONARD, JR., Prothonotary.
P. PRESTWOOD, Wesleyan Minister.
JAMES QUINAN, P. P.
W. B. BOGGS, Baptist Minister.
JAMES P. WARD, Editor "C. B. News."

And many others of the leading professional men, merchants, and tradesmen of Sydney.

Such tokens of appreciation must be specially gratifying to a teacher, and we cannot but express our own pleasure at these evidences of the esteem and respect in which faithful teachers are held.

We understand that Mr. John Sievwright, late Principal of the Gloucester (N. B.) Grammar School, has been appointed Head Master of the Cape Breton County Academy, and we trust the institution will steadily increase in efficiency under his management.

THE STATE AND EDUCATION.

II.

WE propose to bring together the opinions of some of the most eminent men of modern and ancient times, upon the great subject of public education. Probably no subject except that of religion itself has so largely enlisted the profoundest thought of the profoundest minds.

Among the resplendent names of modern English literature that of Thomas Babbington Macaulay stands preeminent. In his place in the House of Commons, in 1847, Macaulay earnestly advocated the cause of popular education. We make the following extract from his speech:

"Take away education, and what are your means? Military force, prisons, solitary cells, penal colonies, gibbets—all the other apparatus of penal laws. If, then, there be an end to which government is bound to attain—if there are two ways only of attaining it—if one of those ways is by elevating the moral and intellectual character of the people, and if the other way is by inflicting pain, who can doubt which way every government ought to take? It seems to me that no proposition can be more strange than this—that the State ought to have power to punish and be bound to punish its subjects for not knowing their duty; but at the same time is to take no step to let them know what their duty is.

I say, therefore, that the education of the people ought to be the first concern of a State, not only because it is an efficient means of promoting and obtaining that which all allow to be the main end of government, but because it is the most efficient, the most humane, the most civilized, and in all respects the best means of attaining that end. This is my deliberate conviction; and in this opinion I am fortified by thinking that it is the opinion of all the great legislators, of all the great statesmen, of all the great political philosophers of all ages and of all nations, even including those whose general opinion is, and has ever been, to restrict the functions of government. Sir, it is the opinion of all the greatest champions of civil and religious liberty in the old world and in the new; and of none—I hesitate not to say it—more emphatically than of those whose names are held in the highest estimation by the Protestant Nonconformist of England. Assuredly if there be any class of men whom the Protestant Nonconformists of England respect more highly than another—if any whose memory they hold in deeper veneration—it is that class of men, of high spirit and unconquerable principles, who in the days of Archbishop Laud preferred leaving their native country, and living in the savage solitudes of a wilderness, rather than to live in a land of prosperity and plenty, where they could not enjoy the privilege of worshipping their Maker freely according to the dictates of their conscience. Those men, illustrious for ever in history, were the founders of the commonwealth of Massachusetts; but though their love of freedom of conscience was illimitable and indistructable, they could see nothing servile or degrading in the principle that the State should take upon itself the charge of the education of the people. In the year 1642 they passed their first legislative enactment on this subject, in the preamble of which they distinctly pledged themselves to this principle, that education was a matter of the deepest possible importance, and the greatest possible interest to all nations and to all communities, and that as such it was, in an eminent degree, deserving of the peculiar attention of the State. I have peculiar satisfaction in referring to the case of America, because those who are the most enthusiastic advocates of the voluntary principle in matters of religion, turn fondly to that land as affording the best illustration that can be any where found of the successful operation of that principle. And yet what do we find to be the principle of America, and of all the greatest men that she has produced upon the question? "Educate the people," was the first admonition addressed by Penn to the commonwealth he founded—"educate the people" was the last legacy of Washington to the republic of the United States—"educate the people" was the unceasing exhortation of Jefferson, Yes of Jefferson himself; and I quote his authority with peculiar favor; for of all the eminent public men that the world ever saw, he was the one whose greatest delight was to pare down the functions of governments to the lowest possible point, and to leave the freest possible scope for the exercise of individual exertion. Such was the disposition—such, indeed, might be said to be the mission of Jefferson; and yet the latter portion of his life was devoted with ceaseless energy to the effort to procure the blessing of a State education for Virginia. And against the concurrent testimony of all these great authorities, what have you, who take the opposite side, to show? * * * Institutions for the education of the people are on every ground the very description of institutions which the government, as the guardians of the people's best interests, are bound to interfere with. This point has been powerfully put by Mr. David Hume. * * * After laying down very emphatically the general principle of non-interference and free competition, Mr. Hume goes on to make the admission that there undoubtedly may be and are some very useful and necessary matters which do not give that degree of advantage to any man that they can be safely left to individuals. Such matters, he says, must be effected by money; or by distinctions; or by both. Now, sir, if there ever was a case to which that description faithfully and accurately applies, I maintain that it is to the calling of the schoolmaster in England. That his calling is a necessary and an useful one, is clear; and yet it is equally clear that he does not obtain, and can not obtain, adequate remuneration without interference on the part of the government. Here, then, we have the precise case, if we are to adopt the illustration of Hume, in which the government ought to interfere. Reasoning *a priori*, the principle of free competition is not sufficient of itself, and can not supply a good education. Let us look at the facts. What is the existing state in England? There has, for years, been nothing except the principle of non-interference. If, therefore, the principle of free competition were in reality a principle of the same potency in education as we all admit it to be in matters of trade, we ought to see education as prosperous under this system of free competition as trade itself is. If we could by possibility have had the principle of free competition fairly tried in any country, it would be in our