

Our Monthly Review.

MEMOIRS OF THE REV. CHARLES SIMON, M.A., late Senior Fellow of King's College, and Minister of Trinity Church, Cambridge: with a selection from his writings and correspondence. Edited by the Rev. WILLIAM CARUS, M.A., Fellow and Senior Dean of Trinity College, Sec. London, 1847.

The subject of this memoir was the fourth and youngest son of Richard Simon, Esq., of Reading, by his marriage with Elizabeth Hurton, the descendant of a family remarkable for having numbered amongst its members two Archbishops of York. He was born at Reading, 24th September 1768, and in his nineteenth year succeeded to a scholarship of King's College in the University of Cambridge. Mr. Simon's youth presented no features of marked interest or importance; generally speaking, his habits were regular, and his general conduct correct. "In feats of strength and activity (his biographer says) he was surpassed by none; of some of these he was pleasantly reminded, in the decline of life, by his early school-fellow and constant friend, Dr. Goodall, the late Provost of Eton, who, in 1833, writes to him, 'I much doubt if you could snuff a candle with your feet, or jump over half a dozen chairs in succession.'"

Having come to evince a more than ordinary anxiety about sacred things, Mr. Simon very soon became an object of mockery and contempt to his inconsiderate companions, who, in particular, strove to ridicule his honest and literal observance of the duty of fasting. The following passage from an autobiography of which large use is made by Mr. Carus, furnishes a graphic view of the "peace and joy" which he obtained in answer to long continued prayer, accompanied with a diligent use of the other prescribed means of grace.

"In Easter week as I was reading Bishop Wilson on the Lord's Supper, I met with an expression to this effect: 'That the Jews knew what they did when they transferred their sins to the head of their offering.' This thought rushed into my mind, what may I transfer all my guilt to another? Has God provided an offering for me, that I may lay my sins on his head? Then, God willing, I will not bear them on my own soul one moment longer. Accordingly I sought to lay my sins upon the sacred head of Jesus; and on the Wednesday began to have a hope of mercy; on the Thursday that hope increased; on the Friday and Saturday it became more strong, and on the Sunday morning (Easter-day, April 4) I awoke early with these words upon my heart and lips, 'Jesus Christ is risen to-day; Hallelujah!' From that hour peace in rich abundance flowed into my soul; and at the Lord's table in our chapel, I had the sweetest access to God through my blessed Saviour. I remember that the next day, being Sunday, more bread consecrated than was sufficient for the communicants, the clergyman gave some of it as a piece more of it after the service; and on my putting it into my mouth, I covered my face with my hand and prayed. 'The clergyman said he smiled at me; but I thought if he had felt such a load taken off from his soul as I did, and had been as sensible of his obligations to the Lord Jesus Christ as I was, he would not deem my prayers and praises at all superfluous.'"

We may ask in passing, is it not possible that the smile in question was one of joy at beholding the devout bearing of the young communicant? Charity at least would incline us to come to this conclusion.

After stating that though the services in his chapel were at that time performed in an irreverent manner, "the prayers were as marrow and fatness" to him, "This is a proof to me that the deadness and formality experienced in the worship of the Church, arises far more from the low state of our graces, than from any defect in our Liturgy; if only we had our hearts deeply penetrated by the Holy Spirit, and earnestly expiated in this test and contrite, I remember that the next day, being Sunday, more bread consecrated than was sufficient for the communicants, the clergyman gave some of it as a piece more of it after the service; and on my putting it into my mouth, I covered my face with my hand and prayed. 'The clergyman said he smiled at me; but I thought if he had felt such a load taken off from his soul as I did, and had been as sensible of his obligations to the Lord Jesus Christ as I was, he would not deem my prayers and praises at all superfluous.'"

On Trinity Sunday, 1782, he was ordained by the Bishop of Ely, and began his ministry in St. Edward's Church, in good old Latimer's pulpit, serving that parish for Mr. Atkinson, during the long vacation.

"The very first day of his public ministrations was marked by an occurrence of a remarkable character. In returning from the Church through the thoroughfare called St. Edward's passage, his attention was arrested by the sight of a man and his wife. The door being open, he entered the house, and earnestly expiated in this test and contrite, I remember that the next day, being Sunday, more bread consecrated than was sufficient for the communicants, the clergyman gave some of it as a piece more of it after the service; and on my putting it into my mouth, I covered my face with my hand and prayed. 'The clergyman said he smiled at me; but I thought if he had felt such a load taken off from his soul as I did, and had been as sensible of his obligations to the Lord Jesus Christ as I was, he would not deem my prayers and praises at all superfluous.'"

In 1782 he was presented to the living of Trinity Church, in opposition to the wishes of a considerable number of the congregation, whose opposition being backed by the Churchwardens, was the source of much discomfort and anxiety to the youthful incumbent. By patient continuance in well doing, however, he gradually overcame these difficulties, and finally had the satisfaction of beholding peace and Christian love prevail, where strife and heart-burnings had abounded.

During the year 1788, Mr. Simon, entered for the first time upon a college office, being elected junior Dean of Arts;—the following year he was appointed to the important office of Dean of Divinity;—and in 1790 to that of Vice-provost. The influence which these positions conferred upon him, he diligently used in aiding the studies, and forming the characters of the young men at the University. To quote from the *Bishop of Calcutta's Recollections*, submitted to the memoir under review.

"He drew around him a constant succession of pious youths, whose minds he imbued with his own sound and laborious views of ministerial diligence. The last day alone would reveal the aggregate of good he accomplished. If we take only four or five cases now before the world, David Brown—Henry Martyn—John Sargent—Thomas Thomson, and Bishop Corrie, we may judge by them as a specimen of the hundreds of somewhat similar ones which occurred during the fifty-five years of his labours. There was an energy and sincerity in his manner, which, as he advanced in life, gave him a more than fatherly authority over the young men, as they came to his year after year."

Our contracted limits render it altogether impossible for us to attempt any thing like an analysis of Mr. Simon's various labours in the cause of his Master. We can only allude in so many words to the publication of his sketches or skeletons of sermons—the active part which he took in the evangelization of British India—and his exertions to raise the Christian character of the University in which he held office. We could fill columns with interesting extracts bearing upon these several topics, but we must refer our readers to the volume itself.

Mr. Simon died on the 13th Nov., 1836, after a short but severe sickness. In the words of Dr. Dealty who preached his funeral sermon—"the narrative of his last illness exhibits the same deep humility—the same strong faith—the same gentleness and patience, and entire devotedness to the will of God—the same simplicity of religious character, and the same love for others, which were all so conspicuous in his previous life."

The following extract from the "Recollections" of Bishop Wilson, above alluded to, must close our too brief series of quotations.

"Mr. Simon never varied throughout a long life, in ardent, marked and avowed attachment to the doctrine and discipline of our apostolic Church. Indeed his own discourses on the Liturgy, and the whole tenor of his ministry and labours, places his judgment on these questions in all our eyes. He never did any man lament or oppose more than himself the novelties and innovations which sprung up during the period of his ministry. He had no reserve on these occasions. The advocates of tongues and miracles and voices... do not support in him; any more than the high Calvinism on the one hand, or the Arminianism on the other, which at different times divided the members of the Church. The moderation and comprehension of the Church of England was his joy, as it is of all her best members. A thousand—ten thousand opinions on difficult or subordinate questions are all equally compatible with a conscientious obedience to her rules of discipline and form of sound words. Mr. Simon neither verged towards the great error of over-magnifying the ecclesiastical polity of the Church, and placing it in the stead of Christ and salvation; nor towards the opposite mistake of undervaluing the sacraments and the authority of the Apostolical Episcopacy. The temptations of the great adversary are directed to each of these extremes at different times."

more harmoniously evinced in the Magazine than in the School. It is astonishing how party-spirit in this country enters into and mars every public undertaking. Even where people are called upon to unite for the purpose—as we must suppose—of doing themselves and their children good, by making a provision for the education of youth, their meeting for this purpose— which ought to be one of common interest—are frequently made a test of party-strength. If the Common School system in this Province were perfectly faultless, these divisions would spoil the whole. In such a state of things, we think that the decision of the majority is offered very far from being "voluntary." It is generally nothing else than the putting down by main force of the dissentients, and that upon grounds not affecting in the slightest degree the question of real pertinence and importance, that is— "Whether the Trustee be eligible; or the Teacher efficient?" If people cannot be brought to discuss matters relating to education in an amicable spirit and according to their merits; but will insist upon transforming the public school-meeting into the hustings; we cannot altogether join the *Journal of Education* in congratulating the country, that "the employment and support of every teacher is the voluntary work of the trustees of each school section through their trustees, representatives, chosen by themselves." We are sure that the trustees of a city or town are not to be vested in parties more competent and less partial. When the Normal School has been in existence long enough to send forth its first supply of teachers, we think that it would be found to be practically beneficial that trustees should regard its certificates—unless there be grave reasons to the contrary—as conclusive; and if dissatisfaction arise, we imagine that it would be no more than allowing the teacher common justice and security, to refer the cause of disagreement—particularly if there should be a difference of sentiment amongst the trustees themselves—to the conductors of the Institution which gave him his certificate— This, perhaps, might occasionally be troublesome; but we think that trustees themselves would be greatly assisted and relieved from an unpleasant responsibility, if it were permitted them—when occasion required— to consult some higher tribunal. But if trustees have great powers, it appears, from a statement made by the Chief Superintendent to the District Councils, that they have great hardships likewise—

THE PEOPLES' LIBRARY OF THE FATHERS. London: Masters.

Three parts of this cheap and meritorious series are before us, comprising seven select treatises of St. Cyprian. The translator is the Rev. W. B. Flower, B.A., Chaplain of the Training Schools, Swinton, who seems well qualified for the undertaking, his rendering being both literal and popular. Should the undertaking prove successful, it will be the means of spreading a knowledge of the most profitable portions of patristic theology amongst the thousands, who otherwise might never have even heard of the authors. We might never forget to add, that the work is well printed, and wonderfully cheap, even for this age of economical literature.

A SELECTION OF HYMNS, for Public or Private Use: London: Burns. Oxford: Parker. Derby: Mozley & Sons. 1848.

The name of Burns being now unfortunately associated with the professed opponents of the Reformed Anglican Church, we took up the little volume under notice, with feelings of considerable doubt and suspicion. An examination of its contents, however, has convinced us that our alarm was groundless; and we can honestly recommend the collection, as adapted for the purposes of public and private worship.

The following Hymn for All Saints' Day, may be new to our readers:

The Son of God goes forth to war,
A kingly crown to gain;
His blood-red banner streams afar!
Who follows in His train?
Who best can drink His cup of woe
Triumph over sin and death,
Who patient bears His cross below,
He follows in His train.
The Martyr first whose eagle eye
Could pierce beyond the grave,
Who saw His Master in the sky,
And called on Him to save.
Like Him with pardon on his tongue,
In midst of mortal pain,
He prayed for them that did him wrong!
Who follows in His train?
A glorious band, the chosen few,
On whom the spirit came;
Twelve valiant saints, their hope they knew,
And mock'd the cross and flame.
They met the tyrant's brandish'd steel
The lion's roary mane;
They bow'd their necks the death to feel,
Who follow in His train?
A noble army—men and boys
On whom the spirit came;
Around the Saviour's throne rejoice,
In robes of light array'd.
They climbed the steep ascent of heaven,
Through peril, toil, and pain!
Oh God! to us may grace be given
To follow in His train.

THE IMPERIAL DICTIONARY, English, Technological, and Scientific. Messrs. Blackie & Son, Glasgow.

We have before us the third of the twenty-four parts into which the publication of this work is divided. It is evidently a production of considerable ability and research; but the value of such a compilation must be determined mainly by the manner in which it will bear this inquiry—Are its fidelity and honesty commensurate with the labour and study bestowed upon it?—As we stated, we have examined only one number; and in it we certainly have not met with anything which appears to us erroneous or paradoxical as regards its definitions in Natural Philosophy, Science, or General Literature. We wish we could say as much with respect to its treatment of religious terms. If we are to take the article upon the word "Bishop," as a specimen of its mode of dealing with ecclesiastical phraseology, we should declare at once that it is an authority throughly one-sided and unprincipled; or— to speak with greater accuracy—no authority at all.

The definition of "Bishop" is a mere party contrivance,—a Presbyterian artifice,—and one, we think, peculiarly discreditable. The "Dictionary" brings forward a citation from Whitty, the celebrated Commentator, in such a way as to leave an impression upon the reader's mind that this divine believed that there were only two orders of Ministers in the Primitive Church. "Bishop" is first explained to mean "Elder or Presbyter," in the *Primitive Church*; Whitty is alleged to prove this point; and then a second definition is colliely introduced to the effect, that "in the Greek, Latin, and some Protestant Churches,"—in contradistinction, of course, to the *Primitive Church*—the term "Bishop" signifies a "Prelate." In plain language, the compilers of this *Dictionary*—a work whose design is, or ought to be, to state facts, not to express opinions—take occasion in a sly way to settle, with two or three bold sentences, the whole controversy about Episcopacy; and elude for their purpose the testimony of Whitty; quoting him with as much complacency as if they were doing the fairest thing in the world. What Whitty did think about the right of Episcopacy—whether it be human or divine—may be gathered pretty positively, we fancy, from the following extract from his annotation on 1 Tim. iii. 1:—

"Though these rules, (the rules given to Timothy by the Apostle St. Paul) (saith Theodore) are given to the presbyters appointed to bishops, as being of a higher dignity. And this opinion, if true, is a full confutation of the Presbyterian hypothesis, for it declares that there were three distinct orders from the beginning of the Church, apostles or bishops, presbyters, and deacons; and that the bishops were of a higher dignity than the presbyters."

When we turn over the pages of a dictionary, to ascertain the origin or application of a word, we expect to find the received opinion regarding it; not the private judgment of the compilers. There was a lexicographer, indeed, who embodied in his wonderful dictionary of the English language, two or three definitions of this sort,—a *Whig*, the name of a faction." But Dr. Johnson might be allowed a liberty of this kind—would have been modest and prudent for Messrs. Blackie and Son to have avoided. Besides, the blunt, rough Toryism of the one can provoke nothing but a smile; it was not intended to mislead, and it does not mislead. Whereas the stealthy craftiness of the encyclopedist is contemptible; and as it requires some thought to see through it, we must regard it as a meditated and elaborate deception.

JOURNAL OF EDUCATION for Upper Canada.—Toronto: January, 1848.

In the introductory remarks—which describe the design and the proposed management of this publication—we are told that it is to be conducted in the same way that popular education in this Province is maintained—by "voluntary co-operation." "Co-operation" we venture to predict—will be rather

more harmoniously evinced in the Magazine than in the School. It is astonishing how party-spirit in this country enters into and mars every public undertaking. Even where people are called upon to unite for the purpose—as we must suppose—of doing themselves and their children good, by making a provision for the education of youth, their meeting for this purpose— which ought to be one of common interest—are frequently made a test of party-strength. If the Common School system in this Province were perfectly faultless, these divisions would spoil the whole. In such a state of things, we think that the decision of the majority is offered very far from being "voluntary." It is generally nothing else than the putting down by main force of the dissentients, and that upon grounds not affecting in the slightest degree the question of real pertinence and importance, that is— "Whether the Trustee be eligible; or the Teacher efficient?" If people cannot be brought to discuss matters relating to education in an amicable spirit and according to their merits; but will insist upon transforming the public school-meeting into the hustings; we cannot altogether join the *Journal of Education* in congratulating the country, that "the employment and support of every teacher is the voluntary work of the trustees of each school section through their trustees, representatives, chosen by themselves." We are sure that the trustees of a city or town are not to be vested in parties more competent and less partial. When the Normal School has been in existence long enough to send forth its first supply of teachers, we think that it would be found to be practically beneficial that trustees should regard its certificates—unless there be grave reasons to the contrary—as conclusive; and if dissatisfaction arise, we imagine that it would be no more than allowing the teacher common justice and security, to refer the cause of disagreement—particularly if there should be a difference of sentiment amongst the trustees themselves—to the conductors of the Institution which gave him his certificate— This, perhaps, might occasionally be troublesome; but we think that trustees themselves would be greatly assisted and relieved from an unpleasant responsibility, if it were permitted them—when occasion required— to consult some higher tribunal. But if trustees have great powers, it appears, from a statement made by the Chief Superintendent to the District Councils, that they have great hardships likewise—

"There is one more subject, and that of the most vital importance, to which I earnestly crave the most serious consideration of the Council. It is the relief which it is in the power of their honorable duties, and the blessings it is in its power to confer upon the entire youth of this District. The position of Trustees is painful, if not anomalous. It is true, they have much more power, and are placed in a much better position to do good, than the School Act, than they have heretofore. But still the power given to other ecclesiastical corporations is not yet fully accorded to School Trustees. The constituents of a county are all involved in the responsibility of the acts of their representatives, the trustees of a city or town are all liable for the acts of their respective corporations. Why should not the inhabitants of a School Section be equally liable for the acts of their Trustee Corporation? Why should all the household inhabitants of a School Section have a voice in the election of a Trustee Corporation for such section, and yet none of those electors be liable for the acts of their Representatives except such as might think proper to send children to the School?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remuneration for the last of them, and yet not provide a good School-house, good School Teacher, and a good School,—but denied the united resources of their constituents to fulfil such engagements, and realize such expectations, and left to individual opinion for meeting the whole of the whole?— Is this just to the persons elected?— to impose upon them positive duties and allow them only contingent resources to perform those duties? Is it equitable between man and man, that three individuals should be elected by all the household inhabitants of a School Section, and compelled under a penalty to act without remun