

no sees before him, a being, which is destined to exist forever; upon whose soul the spirit of a doubtless immortality has been breathed by its Maker; placed here, and entrusted to his especial guardianship, to be prepared, not only for the duties and the enjoyments of this life, but for happiness in that state of existence, on which it must enter, when this short life is over. In consequence of its natural depravity, it is not born to any degree of moral or intellectual excellence. It does not, and of itself it cannot rise spontaneously and unaided to those attainments, which so develop its powers and affections, as to secure for it that degree of influence and enjoyment of which it is capable.

The relation of a parent, imposes, therefore, an obligation, from which no consideration can excuse him, to develop and cultivate every faculty and affection, which God has given to his child, whereby that child may answer the great purposes of his existence, both here and hereafter. To train a child to think, and to act, with sole referencé to his success in this life, is to betray a solemn trust, and violate an obligation, which constitutes one of that class of sins of the fathers which are visited upon their children. The power to resist evil and to do good,—to aim at and strive for a high degree of moral excellence, like the power to think and reason, must be trained, and the parent is the schoolmaster, whom God has appointed to do this work of training. This duty is all the more necessary, because the natural impulses of the heart, are in an opposite direction. The natural affections are neither pure nor passive. They develop as rapidly as the faculties of the mind, and unguided, they fasten upon the forbidden, and to which, they soon wed the mind in bonds that no human power can break, drawing away the soul, from the practice of the holy and the enjoyment of the pure;—and holding the heart back from God, and keeping it in the gall of bitterness and in the bonds of iniquity.

We do not mean to say, that by education, in the ordinary acceptation of that term, a child is to be fitted for Heaven, because this is not the mode of salvation, as plainly laid down in the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ. But every power of his being capable of development and improvement, whereby he may be made happy in himself, useful to his fellow-men, and the means of promoting the glory of God by doing His will, should be the subject of the most constant and careful attention of him to whom the guardianship of his early years is committed.

Beyond a certain point, the parent cannot be the schoolmaster. He must entrust the instruction of his children to other hands. They are to be, for the most part, beyond his control, at any rate, beyond his immediate observation. In this necessity what is he to do with his responsibility as a Christian parent? Can any circumstances whatever of convenience be allowed to dislodge this responsibility altogether, so that he is not to be answerable for the nature and character of the education, which his child is to receive from others, who undertake, as their profession, the duty of instructing the young? If we had parochial schools, in every parish, where the children of Christian parents might be under the immediate influences of religion, and where, a portion of the daily instruction which they received, would include the great principles of the doctrine of Christ, and the education of the head and heart, were not essentially separated, then this question would be relieved of much of its embarrassment. But such a system of education does not now obtain, and so far as we can judge, is not likely to prevail for some time to come. Children must be sent to public schools, or to seminaries, in cases, where it is not convenient to secure the benefits of more select and private tuition. Under this necessity, how shall the parental obligation be met? If a public school is the only alternative, where but the faintest form of instruction in religious truth is allowed, then an increased attention should be given to the inculcation of divine principles in the family and in the Sunday school. But if other schools are to be patronized, as having superior advantages, how shall the selection be made? Is the parent to consider wholly or mainly the advantages of an intellectual, literary or scientific character?—yes, if nothing but the mind is to be educated. If a parent believes that his child is a mere temporary compound of mind and body, made for this world and for no other, then he may, with a show of consistency, at least, select a godless school, for the instruction of his soulless child. But if he have, in any due degree, a sense of his obligations as a Christian parent, growing out of the immortality of his child, and its destiny as unfolded in the Gospel of Christ, then he cannot with propriety, as he certainly cannot with impunity, be indifferent, in respect to the character of

the school in a religious point of view, which he is to select for the education of his child.

Nor is it sufficient, that all infidelity is eschewed, and certain religious principles are inculcated. There are many schools, which go thus far, in the way of religious education. But it does not follow that such schools, are safe repositories, for the instruction of the young, for whose welfare we are responsible. With such negative religion, there may be and there usually is a great deal of positive error. Not a few Churchmen send their children to schools, which are under influences, that are most decidedly at variance with the faith which they regard as essential to a well-founded hope of salvation. We would not be considered as unduly exclusive in our views upon this point. The true test in this matter is this: Shall we send our children where we would not go ourselves? Shall we place them, while their characters are in a state of formation, under influences, which we believe to be sound and beneficial, and which we ourselves find it necessary to resist? For example, can a Churchman send his child to be educated where religion is nominally respected, and a sufficient regard paid to it, to create a sort of pleasing assurance, that the pupil's religious principles will be cared for, and yet the fundamental truths of the Christian Religion, are looked upon as of no importance whatever, if they are not treated, as old wives' fables? Can we do not believe to be the truth as it is in Jesus? We send our children to be educated where that form of religion is directly and indirectly inculcated, which surely cannot do this either consistently or innocently.

But in selecting schools we are not to be satisfied with what is commonly called orthodoxy, in distinction from some of the grosser heresies, which are rife in these days. If we would do our whole duty, we should seek for schools, where no religious influences prevail, except such as are closely identified with the Church of which we are members, and the truth which we profess as the faith once delivered to the saints. This rule applies as well to colleges as to institutions of less note, but not less influence and importance.

The consequences of sending boys to colleges, where the principles of the Church are openly, though covertly opposed, are anything but encouraging to Churchmen, who desire to see their sons faithful soldiers and servants of Christ in that branch of the Holy Catholic Church in which they have been consecrated to the service of their Saviour in the sacrament of baptism.

We are quite satisfied that the members of our Church need occasionally to be stirred up, by being put in remembrance of these truths, and to this end we have suggested the above hints.—*Boston Christian Witness, and Church Advocate.*

News Department.

CANADIAN PARLIAMENT.

THURSDAY, Sept 6, 1852.

Mr. Merritt moved an address for a Statement of the Provincial Revenue and Expenditure of the Province for 1850, 1851, and 1852; also, that a similar Statement be procured from each of the provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Newfoundland, and Prince Edward Island, with the amount of their Public Debt respectively at the close of the last year.

The hon. member stated in support of his motion that he, as one of those who did not think, under the present system, the country could ever be so prosperous as it might be. It was, therefore, his desire to obtain such information as would next session, enable him to come down and show the evils which arose from the present tariffs existing between the colonies, and to recommend, if that seemed advisable, a system which would have the effect of doing away with the barriers to commerce.

Messrs. Richards and Morin opposed the address, on the technical ground that the government had no right at all to demand the information required from the governments of the sister colonies, and suggested that what was wanted might be got by a private application through the Provincial Secretary. Motion withdrawn.

Mr. Drummond, in answer to Mr. Brown, stated that ministers had no intention to introduce a general Bankrupt Law during the present Session?

Mr. Brown moved the appointment of a Committee on the subject of Sunday labor in the Post office department and on the Canals.

Mr. Morin opposed the reference of the petition as one which was not fit for the operation of a committee.

Mr. Brown was astonished at the opposition to the petition. He had a bill of his own, but he believed it very desirable that the whole question should be fairly considered by a Committee.

Mr. H. Smith thought a committee was the very best thing that could be had. There were many petitions embracing different views, and instead of Mr. Brown bringing in his own bill, it was very desirable that the general opinion should be harmonized.

Mr. Cauchon was very glad to find there was no denigration of the Sabbath in Lower Canada, at least in the seigniories, for he found there was not a man placed on the Committee from Lower Canada, except

one from the Townships. He supposed this was because the hon. member knew there was no Sabbath breaking there.

Mr. Brown had desired to have some French Canadian gentlemen on the Committee, but really he had been so laughed at, in applying to one or two that he was quite discouraged.

Mr. Cauchon would not oppose the reference to the Committee; but he would certainly oppose the bill.—He was speaking to a gentleman from Maine, the other day about the liquor law, and the reply was, "oh it does not prevent us drinking our champagne; but it is intended only to keep the poor from drinking too much whiskey." It would be the same thing he supposed here. The poor would not get their bitterns, and the rich would find some way to reach theirs.

Mr. Rose was glad the canals were mentioned as well as the Post Office, for he lived near a canal and knew the evils of the traffic. The law of God was superior to the law of man, and he knew no part of it which allowed of any man's desecration of the Lord's Day.—He knew a lock keeper, who had once preached the Gospel, and he was obliged either to neglect the privilege of divine service or to give up his post.

Col. Prince was opposed to the committee, and would vote against it. The world was very different now from what it was in the time of old Moses; for now Providence had blessed the world with a large amount of commerce and social intercourse, which did not then prevail—there were no post-offices then, and could it be believed that all those advantages were to be given up, or that the Almighty would be offended, or that it was a greater offence to God to break up all these intellectual and social benefits which he bestowed, rather than have one hour's labour performed on the Sunday? He thought not. In England the closing of the post office on the Sunday had been tried and had signally failed; so that Punch had drawn Lord John Russell and Lord Ashley, one of whom remarked to the other, "Well, my Lord, between you and me and the post we have made a pretty mess of it." He did not think the Sabbath was desecrated by keeping open the Post-office and receiving letters on business, or social intercourse; but what he did consider desecration was the exhibition of variety in clothes, on the way to Church, or the pomp of horses to carry their owners, even to the door of the temple of God. He had, after saying his prayers, last Sunday, taken his quiet, tranquil walk, and had admired the landscape; but he met there two men shooting, and two others fishing, and this he conceived to be a real desecration of the Sabbath. This was never seen in Upper Canada; but these persons were not Lower Canadians but Englishmen.

Mr. Gamble, we understood, did not regard the Sunday in a Sabbatarian point of view; but did not think it proper to read letters on business or pleasure, nor to attend to such subjects on the Lord's Day. He wished to have the committee, in order that it might be seen, perhaps not how the present accommodation afforded by the Post office might be stopped, but how the work done there might be reduced to the smallest possible amount.

Mr. Drummond explained to Mr. Brown that the Catholics of Lower Canada were not opposed to the due observance of the Sabbath; on the contrary, there was not a single priest who did not inculcate such observance on his people. At the same time, he did believe there was a slight difference in the doctrinal views which prevailed in the two sections of the Province, inasmuch as the Catholics did not conceive there was anything wrong in quiet recreation, though they did object to necessary labour. For his own part, he had no objection to the committee, if it were named by the House, instead of being named for a one-sided purpose, and to the exclusion of a certain number of members of a particular race and creed. His own opinion, however, was, that the Postal Department would be best reformed in this respect by departmental action.

Mr. Brown was astonished at the action of the Government on this question, and especially at the objection to his naming of the committee. It was desired by him, of course, to have a committee so far favorable to his views as to secure the eliciting of all the facts. Why was the Government so opposed to facts? Was it because they were afraid of facts that would compel them before the country to grant this bill? He would, if it were usual, however, consent to the House naming the committee. He must here make one observation, and that was, that he thought the question ought to be treated with gravity.

Mr. Tancorre was decidedly opposed to this attempt to get a one-sided opinion from a partial committee. If the hon. member should get a committee appointed that day to declare in favor of the abolition of the Post office labour—another day he would, in the same way, get a committee favorable to his bill for abolishing the fetes of the Catholic Church in Lower Canada. He warned the House that if there was anything better calculated than another to overturn all the institutions of the country, and dissolve the union, it was just the agitation of these religious questions, which seemed so much favoured by certain sections of Upper Canada.

Mr. Sanderson, after a few preliminary remarks, said he would like to ascertain the views of the government upon the question. The Provincial Secretary stated that the matter was one which should not be referred to a Committee named by the House. The Government should be united on such a question. It was admitted on all hands that it was one of importance, and it was one on which there should be no difficulty in having it referred to a committee. Numerous and respectably signed petitions had been presented to the House on the subject, and they ought to be treated with respect. The hon. member dilated upon the im-