Messenger and Visitor.

$2.00 per annum:
When paid within thirty days, $1.50.

S. McC. Black, - - - - Editor.
J. H. Saunders, - Business Manager.

OFFICE:—No. 8 Pugsley Building, Prince William St., St. John, N. B.

All Correspondence intended for the paper to be addressed to the Editor. All communications in reference to advertising, business or subscriptions to be addressed to the Business Manager.

Payments for the Messenger and Visitor must be by check, draft or P. O. Order. Cash must be sent in registered letter; otherwise at the risk of the sender. Acknowledgment of the receipt of money will be sent to agents remitting, and the date on the address label will be changed within two weeks.

Discontinuance.—The Messenger and Visitor will be sent to all subscribers until an order to discontinue is received. Returning the paper is not sufficient notice. All arrearages must be paid when the paper is discontinued.

A change in address will be made provided the old and new addresses are given. No change can be made unless the old address is sent.

Advertising Rates furnished on application.

Messenger and Visitor.

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 14th, 1895.

THE CONVENTION.

As our readers are informed by the usual notice from the secretary, the next annual meeting of the Convention of the Maritime Provinces will be held in the, Germain St. Church, commencing on the 24th inst. The meetings of the Convention are always occasions of much interest to our people, both because of its representative character in relation to the churches and because also of the important interests and enterprises the management of which is committed to its charge.

Special interest attaches to the approaching session, because it is the Jubilee meeting and, as we are informed, arrangements have been made to mark the occasion by exercises which doubtless will be of much more than ordinary interest. It is a somewhat remarkable coincidence too that the twenty fifth anniversary of the organization of the W. M. A. Societies falls on the same year as the Jubilee of the Convention, so that our sisters of the W. B. M. U. also announce exercises of special interest in connection with their annual meeting.

The several departments of the Convention's work, we are told, will be reviewed and their importance set forth by brethren whose general ability and whose acquaintance with the work of the denomination should enable them to deal with their several subjects in an effective manner. It is expected that a Jubilee prayer meeting will be held on Lord's day morning and that a Thanksgiving and Reminiscence meeting will be held on the afternoon of the same day. These services of devotion and praise should be of a very deep and tender interest. Some of the papers of the Baptist Institute, which meets on Friday the 23rd, will be on subjects connected with the work of the denomination during the last fifty years.

These Jubilee services as a whole will doubtless be of great interest to our churches. The period which will come under review, while it is not long enough to make a great history or to produce, in so small a theatre as ours, results to attract very powerfully the attention of the world at large, does afford opportunity for an exhibition of a denomination's life, principles and character. A devout and intelligent review of this period should afford lessons of great value. There are lessons in our failures, as well as in the successes, which, by the blessing of God, we have been enabled to achieve. And perhaps the lessons in the former case are no less important than in the latter, if we have but the wisdom and humility to discern them and turn them to proper account. A study of our history in these provinces will, we believe, but strengthen in the sympathetic student the conviction that the men who under God laid the foundations of the denomination were men of rare devotion and piety. They were, many of them, men richly endowed in brain and heart, fitted to be leaders in a great cause and spiritual fathers of a numerous people. The record of what they did, the work and the organization, which they initiated and which their successors, with some measure of faithfulness and success, have endeavored to carry on, should inspire in us devout thankfulness for the divine guidance which has been granted and a pure ambition, in unselfish devotion and in wise and heroic labors, to be the worthy successors of the men on whose foundations we are endeavoring to build.

We are hoping for a new impulse in christian work from the gathering to be held next week. We trust that the churches will be careful to send their delegates, and that each delegate may go up to the convention praying, and followed by the prayers of his church, for the divine blessing upon the meetings to be held. Let it be a meeting of rejoicing for the blessings of the past and a time of renewing of vows for days to come.

Mrs. Talmage, wife of Rev. T. DeWitt Talmage, died at Dansville, N. Y., on Monday. She has suffered from nervous prostration since the burning of the Brooklyn Tabernacle last year.

GLADSTONE ON THE ARMENIAN QUESTION.

Mr. Gladstone's speech on the Armenian question, which, being previously announced, had been anticipated by the public with much interest, was delivered before a great audience in the town hall at Chester on Tuesday 6th inst. From the reports of the speech and the newspaper comments upon it which have appeared in the despatches, it is evident that Mr. Gladstone's oratorical forces, if they are not all that they were in the past, are not so far abated but that he is still able to lift up his voice in thrilling eloquence and with mighty effect on an occasion when he conceives it to be his duty to speak out against the oppressor and in the interest of a down-trodden and oppressed people.

The venerable speaker was of course received by the great audience before him with enthusiastic demonstrations. Mr. Gladstone approached his subject by saying that the Armenian question was not a party question or a religious affair. The present situation in Armenia, he declared, had been brought about by intolerably bad government, the worst government probably on the face of the earth. He read a resolution expressing, on behalf of the meeting, the conviction that her majesty's government will have the cordial support of the entire nation without distinction of party in any measures it may adopt in order to secure for the Armenians such reforms in the administration in the province, as to provide effective guarantees for the safety of life, honor, religion and property and that no reforms can be effected without the continuous control of the European powers.

Mr. Gladstone showed that the reports respecting the Armenian outrages, at first received with incredulity as too horrible to be true, had been fully confirmed by the investigation which had taken place, and in scathing and vehement language he denounced the Turkish government for its perfidy and its responsibility for the horrible cruelties and villainies practices upon the Armenians. To plunder and murder had been added the more terrible atrocities of the ravisher and the torturer. And these horrible brutalities, the recital of which makes the blood run cold, Mr. Gladstone charged, were not the work of the "dangerous classes" merely, but of the government of Constantinople and its agents, and there is not one of their doings for which the government is not responsible. "The Kurds, troops and tax collectors entered into deadly competition as to which should prove the most adept in this horrible, infernal work. But guiltier than they are the high officials of the government . . If there were the slightest hope of better government, the Constantinople authorities would be eager to discover and to punish the perpetrators of these outrages; but the government only met the allegations made against it with denial and falsehood, weapons familiar to the Turks . . We must not fear the word 'coercion.' It is a word heartily appreciated at Constantinople." Concluding Mr. Gladstone said: "We are sensible as to what is due our honor. We must interpose to demand no more than what is just. But we must demand as much as is necessary and demand that this be accomplished, whether it is met by resistance or not."

THE MURDER OF MISSIONARIES IN CHINA.

Reports recently received in England and America tell of a terrible massacre of christian missionaries, which took place July 31st, at Ku Cheng, a city ninety miles south-west of Foo Chow, in the province of Fo Kien, one of the southern provinces of China. Of the general correctness of the reports there seems to be no room for doubt, though the despatches differ in respect to the number of the killed. The largest number mentioned is ten or eleven. Most of the victims are ladies who are declared to have suffered atrocious outrages, worse than death, at the hands of their murderers. A Rev. Dr. Stewart, who with his wife and child was burned in his house, is the only man whose death is reported. Definite information in regard to the cause of the massacre is not given, but according to known facts and the judgment of Dr. Baldwin, a missionary of the Methodist church now home in America, the outrages have been insligated by the anti-foreign element among the Chinese, operating through certain secret societies. Chinese officials too, it is charged, connived at the attack upon the missionaries, if indeed they did not instigate it. The missionaries upon whom the murderous assault was made belonged to the church of England, the Zenanna and the American Methodist Episcopal Missions. All those who were killed are said to have been English, but some American missionaries are reported to have received injuries. The reports of this terrible affair have naturally excited great indignation in England. The government appears to have acted very promptly in demanding of China protection for British subjects resident in China and the punishment of those concerned in the recent outrages. And, as stated in later despatches, Mr. O'Connor, British Minister at Pekin, following instructions of his government, has demanded of the government of China that it secure the safety of British subjects residing in that country and that a full enquiry be made into the recent massacres at Ku Cheng and the guilty parties punished. It is further stated that the Emperor and government of China had agreed to these demands and that an imperial proclamation had been issued ordering the capital punishment of the murderers. An independent enquiry under the British consul at Ku Cheng is also ordered. A despatch received in Washington Aug. 6th, from American Consul Hixon announces that the American missionary property at Yungsuh has been burned.

It is to be feared that the anti foreign and anti-christian element in China, probably aggravated by the results of the war, is much excited and that missionaries who are so situated as not to be under the immediate protection of European or American consular stations may be in much peril. The Presbyterian and Methodist churches of Canada have missions in China, but according to latest reports received their missionaries are safe. The *Wesleyan* of last week however publishes letters of thrilling interest from Canadian Methodist missionaries at Chen-tu where a riot occured on the 28th and 29th of May, in which the missionaries were exposed to the greatest peril, barely escaping with their lives, while the mission buildings were burned and their property all destroyed. In this case also the outbreak was an expression of the fanatical, anti-foreign Chinese spirit, the more lawless element being inflamed and urged on, as would appear, by men belonging to the literary classes who are reported to have scattered pamphlets and broadsides among the people full of the most false and shameful imputations against christians. It appears to be the general testimony of the missionaries too that the local Chinese officials have used their influence rather to promote than to prevent or quell the outbreaks which have occurred. It seems certain that unless the British and United States governments shall adopt peremptory measures toward China, the lives and property of missionaries in that country will be very unsafe, and it is uncertain whether the Central government of China with the best intentions can afford foreigners adequate protection in its interior province.

THE MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION.

We publish in this issue from the pen of B. H. Eaton, Esq., of Halifax, an article on the Manitoba School Question, which will, no doubt, be of interest to many of our readers. Those who are thus interested will have reason to thank Mr. Eaton for the very considerable pains he has taken to present a synopsis of the deliverance of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the case. The essential points in the said deliverance and its constitutional grounds, in the 22nd section (sub-sections 2 and 3) of the Manitoba Act, appear to us to be clearly and concisely stated. But Mr. Eaton, if we correctly apprehend his position, has reached, and has expressed at the close of his article, the conclusion that, in view of that deliverance of the Privy Council, the Governor-General in Council had no constitutional alternative but to issue a remedial order requiring Manitoba to reinvest the Roman Catholic minority in that province with the rights and privileges as to separate schools which they possessed previous to 1890, and, on the refusal of the province to comply with that demand, to introduce in the Dominion Parliament remedial legislation with a view to giving effect to that order. From this conclusion we feel obliged quite emphatically to dissent. We regard the decision of the Judicial Committee, so far as it had to do with the action of the Canadian Government, as wholly advisory, leaving the Government as free to use discretionary power in the matter as it was before. We would not, of course, put forth our unsupported opinion in such a matter in opposition to that of a gentleman learned in the law. But there is no lack of very respectable legal opinion on record, and very clearly expressed, in support of the position we have taken in this matter. We had intended to present the matter more at length in this issue, but find that the space at our command will not admit of our doing so and that we must hold over until next week what we had written. Meanwhile we think our readers will be wise not to make up their minds hastily that "the Privy Council decision is an imperative command couched in the language of an opinion," or that that decision did not leave the Goverment and the Parliament of Canada perfectly free to exercise discretionary power as to a remedial order and as to remedial legislation, in accordance with what they—the Government and the members of Parliament—understood to be the claims of justice and the interests of the common weal.

The London Telegraph publishes a despatch from Vienna reporting that a battle has been fought at Lillahovo, Macedonia, between insurgents and Turkish troops. The report says that 150 of the Turks were killed.

ST. MARTINS SEMINARY.

As will be seen by a notice which appears in another column a meeting is called for Monday the 26th inst., at 7 p. m., to meet in the Brussels street church, to take into consideration the affairs of St. Martins Seminary. There are some questions which it is felt should be considered and answered at this time. One question is: Is there any prospect or reasonable hope, immediate or otherwise, of resuming educational work at St. Martins, under Baptist direction, and should any steps be taken having that end in view? But a more pressing question is: What is to be done in respect to paying the debts of the Seminary? Is the honor of the denomination concerned at all, and if so, how far is it concerned in reference to the payment of those debts? We think hardly anyone will dispute that responsibility in this matter rests somewhere, and that the debts ought in all conscience to be paid. Can the two denominations which have had to do with the history of the school afford to permit these debts to remain unpaid? Some of the creditors are little able to lose the sums which are due them. The case of one principal creditor of the Seminary is especially hard. During the time that the Seminary was being erected when funds were needed, and from time to time afterwards, he advanced money to avert disaster, until several thousand dollars were advanced—and he was shouldered with a financial burden which he was by no means able to carry. Instead of being lightened, this burden has but grown heavier, until it has become a crushing weight, and the man who so generously placed himself in the gap in times of extremity is made to feel that he is left to suffer the results of his too generous deeds with little or no practical sympathy from his brethren. We say that the Baptist people of this province cannot afford to allow this brother to be sacrificed in this manner.

The Manitoba School Question.

I have before me the decision given Jan. 29th last, by the Privy Council on this subject. Nothing, I am sure, could put the matter before your readers in so good a shape as the publication of the decision itself. But I suppose it is too long for that. I think, however, a brief synopsis of it may help to the right understanding of the issue. So I venture to tender the same.

The case was argued 11th Dec. last, before Lord Herschell (then Lord Chancellor), and Lords Watson, MacNaghten and Shand. This was a strong and able tribunal. Never, I believe, in any period of history, has there existed so august and important a civil Judicial tribunal as the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Among other matters within its jurisdiction it hears and decides appeals from all sections of Her Majesty's colonial empire. Its deliverances are governing decrees for much vaster areas of the world than those of any other judicial board. In view of the amplitude of its jurisdiction and the eminent learning and wisdom of its members and their entire freedom from local bias, its decisions are entitled to the greatest possible respect. Nay, they are law.

Before this case came to the Privy Council, it had passed the stage of a long and able argument before the Supreme Court of Canada and the opinions of the judges of that court were before the Lords of the Privy Council. This was a great advantage to the latter. It must, of course, be assumed that all material facts were also before the Privy Council. The judges of the Ottawa Court were divided in opinion, three against two, on all points. The Privy Council were unanimous and the judgment was delivered by Lord Herschell. From that judgment I will try to condense into concise form all the facts and conclusions that will assist in obtaining a clear and just knowledge of the situation.

In 1870 the Dominion Parliament created the Province of Manitoba. Section 22 of the creating act reads thus: "In "and for the Province (i. e. of Manitoba) "the said Legislature (i. e. the Manitoba "Legislature) may exclusively make "laws in relation to education, subject "and according to the following provisions:—

"(1) Nothing in any such law shall "prejudicially affect any right or privi"lege with respect to denominational "schools which any class of persons have "by law or practice in the Province at "the Union.

"(2) An appeal shall lie to the Govern"or-General in Council from any act or "decision of the Legislature of the Pro"vince or any Provincial authority, af"fecting any right or privilege of the "Protestant or Roman Catholic minority "of the Queen's subjects in relation to "Education.

"(3) In case any such Provincial law "as from time to time seems to the Gov"ernor-General in Council requisite for "the due execution of the provisions of "this section is not made, or in case any "decision of the Governor-General in "council or any appeal under this section "is not duly executed by the proper "Provincial authority in that behalf, then, "and in every such case, and as far only "as the circumstances of each case re"quire, the Parliament of Canada may "make remedial laws for the due execu"tion of the provisions of this section, "and of any decision of the Governor-"General in council under this section."

Now, so far as the 1st. sub section above quoted is concerned, the Privy Council had already in Barrett's case decided that at the time of the union of Manitoba with the Dominion the Catholics had no rights or privileges whatever in respect to education which could be affected by any acts which might afterwards be passed. There was, in point of fact, previous to 1870, no school system in Manitoba. Such being the case you need not read sub-section over again. It is out of the case.

The whole difficulty arises, therefore, out of the legislation passed subsequent to 1870 and the case turns entirely upon sub-section 2 above quoted. Keep your finger on that section.

The view of the Privy Council being that that section extends to rights and privileges of the Catholic minority acquired by legislation in the province after the union, the next question they had to determine was, whether any such right or privilege had been affected by the acts passed by Manitoba in 1890. To do this they examine very closely the system established between 1870 and 1890 and the change effected by the acts of 1890. It is in respect of these latter acts that the appeal is made. Let us now follow the examination made into Manitoba legislation by the Privy Council.

The Legislature of Manitoba first met on 15th March, 1871. On 3rd May following they passed an Education Act. The Catholics and Protestants in the province were then about equal in number. It is not necessary to outline the features of that Act since it was long ago repealed. It was no doubt considered fair to both sections of the people. The Board of Education were to be one half Protestants and the other half Catholics. Acts were passed in subsequent years amending that of 1871 but these all were repealed in 1881 by a new act by which the number of the Board of Education was fixed at not more than 21 of whom 12 were to be Protestants and 9 Catholics. The Board were to form 2 sections, Protestant and Catholic, each to control the schools of its own section and to select its own books. There were to be a Protestant and Catholic superintendent. Legislative appropriations of money were to be divided between Protestants and Catholics in proportion to the number of the children of each between the ages of 5 and 15. Local assessments were payable by Protestant ratepayers for Protestant schools and by Catholic ratepayers for Catholic schools. These were the leading features of the act of 1881.

In 1890 all former acts were repealed and two new ones enacted which are those now complained of by the Catholics. These were the Department of Education and Public School Acts. Under the former Catholics were not entitled as such to any representation on the Board of Education or Advisory Board which was to authorize text books and to prescribe forms of religious exercises. All Protestant and Catholic school districts were to be subject to the provisions of the public school act. The public schools were to be all free and to be entirely non-sectarian. No religious exercises were to be allowed unless conducted according to the regulations of the Advisory Board and with the authority of the School Trustees for the district. All taxable property was to be assessed for school purposes. Any school not conducted according to the Acts and regulations should not participate in the legislative grant.

The position of Catholics prior and subsequent to 1890 is thus contrasted by Lord Herschell: "Before these (Acts of "1890) passed into law there existed "denominational schools, of which the "control and management were in the "hands of Roman Catholics who could "select the books to be used and determine the character of the religious "teaching. These schools received their "proportionate share of the money con"tributed for school purposes out of the "general taxation of the province and "the money raised for these purposes by "local assessment was, so far as it fell "upon Catholics, applied only towards "the support of Catholic schools.

"What is the position of the Roman "Catholic minority under the Acts of "1890?

"Schools of their own denomination, "conducted according to their views, will "receive no aid from the State; they "must depend entirely for their support "upon the contributions of the Roman "Catholic community while the taxes out "of which State aid is granted to the "schools provided for by the statute fall "alike on Catholics and Protestants. "Moreover, while the Catholic inhabitants remain liable to local assessment "for school purposes, the proceeds of "that assessment are no longer destined "to any extent for the support of Catholic schools, but afford the means of "maintaining schools which they regard "as no more suitable for the education "of Catholic children than if they were "distinctively Protestant in their character.

"In view of this comparison (he adds) "it does not seem possible to say that the "rights and privileges of the Roman "Catholic minority in relation to education which existed prior to 1890 have "not been affected."

Having reached this conclusion, the judgment is, that the appeal made by the Roman Catholics of Manitoba to the Governor-General in Council and followed up so patiently and persistently, should be allowed.

Beyond deciding that point the Privy Council say very little. They were asked whether the Governor-General in Council has power to make the declarations or remedial orders asked for in the memorials or petitions and they reply in the affirmative but add that "the particular course to be pursued must be determined by the authorities to whom it has been committed by the statute. It is not for this tribunal to intimate the precise steps to be taken." The general character of those steps is sufficiently defined by sub-section 3 above quoted. Read that sub-section carefully again.

The Privy Council adds another remark: "It is certainly not essential that the "statutes repealed by the act of 1890 "should be re-enacted, or that the pre"cise provisions of those statutes should "again be made law. The system of "education embodied in the acts of 1890 "no doubt commends itself to, and "adequately supplies the wants of, the "great majority of the inhabitants of the "province. All legitimate ground of "complaint would be removed if that "system were supplemented by provisions "which would remove the grievance "upon which the appeal is founded, and "were modified so far as might be neces"sary to give effect to these provisions."

I think I have now given all that is essential to a clear understanding of the Privy Council decision. Let me add a few words as to what has since taken place and as to the future.

When this decision came from England the Dominion government proceeded to exercise the functions thereby unmistakably thrust upon them. What else could they do? They then passed the remedial order in such terms as in their judgment would carry into effect the Privy Council decision and do justice to the Catholic minority of Manitoba. This order Manitoba refused to obey, but intimated, so it is claimed, a willingness to make some concessions. But for this intimation, no doubt the government would have introduced a remedial bill at the last session and if no compromise or adjustment be effected before next session I take it that the introduction by the government of remedial legislation on which they must stand or fall will be inevitable. And I shall be surprised if both parties are not found in the main voting for it. The policy of the government has long been distinctly propounded and the patriotic opposition have so far uttered no word against that policy. Must it not be assumed that they are therefore in favor of remedial legislation? I cannot see what course the government could have taken other than it took. The Privy Council decision is an imperative command couched in the language of an opinion.

I am sorry for Manitoba. Less than 1-7th of the population is Roman Catholic and yet at their instance the Province must in some form re-establish separate schools. But it is too late in the day for Manitoba to say we want nothing but non-sectarian schools. Too late because they are bound by the history of the case. What was done when Catholics and Protestants were about equal in number cannot in justice be now undone because Protestants have become the larger number. It was just to prevent the possibility of such injustice that the Manitoba act was drawn as it was. What was written was written.

But I must conclude. I had not intended to go beyond giving a digest of the case but have been led (I think by your very able editorial) to go a little further.

B. H. Eaton.

Halifax, Aug. 3, 1895.

Rev. Robert Morton.

Rev. Robert Stone Morton was born at Wilmot, Annapolis county, June 8th, 1820. He was brought up on a farm, and continued to labor there till seventeen years of age. About twelve years more of his life he labored as a carpenter. His advantages for securing an education were exceedingly limited. Between the ages of five and nineteen he attended school five different times, in all receiving fifteen months instruction. While attending school he worked evenings to pay his board.

In June, 1840, when twenty years of age, he professed faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. He was baptized by Rev. I. E. Bill, and united with the Baptist church at Nictaux. He was still a member of that church at his death. He was married September 29th, 1841, to Miss Hannah Parker Morse. Seven children were born to them, but only two of them survive their father. These two, a son and a daughter, are both living in the United States.

He began to preach in the summer of 1849. After preaching a few times he concluded that preaching was not his calling, and went to the States to get rid of this work. He had only been there a short time when he found himself again engaged in preaching. He then resolved to return home and give himself to the Lord's work, as He might direct. In the summer of 1850 he made his first missionary tour. He visited New Albany, Springfield and several places in Lunenburg county. In the autumn of that year he went to Cape Breton, and spent the winter at Margaree. The following summer he visited the churches at East Dalhousie and New Germany, and preached for a time. At the request of these two churches the Baptist church at Nictaux called a council, Feb. 13th, 1852, and he was ordained as an evangelist. He accepted a call to the pastorate of the New Germany and East Dalhousie churches and continued in this position for two years. He then became pastor of the churches at Hampton and Port Lorne, where he labored for one year. From this time he seems to have engaged chiefly in evangelistic efforts, travelling and preaching, in various parts of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, laboring in destitute places and assisting pastors in holding special services. He preached nearly a year at Pereaux and Scott's Bay, King's Co., N. S., also a year at New Mines, where he saw some sinners converted and the church quickened. He also preached at Kentville during his stay at New Mines. During his evangelistic labors, he had the joy of seeing sinners converted in nearly every place he visited. He was also pastor of the New Albany, Springfield, and Sherbrook churches, for one year. For several years more, from 1864 to 1868, he continued his evangelistic labors, and closed his work at Newport, where he had preached about seven months. His last sermon was preached at Deacon Joseph Dimock's, from Jeremiah 8:20. The chief revivals under his ministry were at New Germany, Sherbrook, New Abany, Port George, Long Point Tremont, Stronach Mountain, Greenwood, Chipman Brook and Morristown. "At all these places God wrought in a marvellous manner, and it is believed that many souls were truly born again." On the 18th of September, 1868, in the forty-ninth year of his age, he fell from the roof of his barn, receiving injuries which paralyzed his lower limbs, and left him an invalid for the rest of his life, unable to walk or stand, and a constant sufferer. His pain was perpetual, and much of the time excruciating. He had the use of all his senses and his mind seemed bright and clear. For nearly twenty-seven years he was laid by from active service. During this long period of suffering he was able to converse freely with those who called to see him, and to write many letters to his friends and a number of articles for the papers. His heart was full of love to Christ, and he earnestly desired and prayed for the prosperity of the cause of God. He desired the salvation of the unsaved, and rejoiced when sinners were brought to Christ. It was a mystery to him why his life was prolonged under such circumstances. He longed to depart and be with Christ, but bore with patient resignation to the will of God, all the suffering through which he was called to pass. He was always patient and never known to murmur at his lot. He was an example of what grace can do for one, who, trusting in God, is called to pass through sore affliction. It will never be known this side of eternity how much he did to honor Christ during those twenty-seven years of suffering. Who can tell the results of words he spoke and the prayers he offered, while he was prevented from en-