THE AMERICAN HORSE-TAMER.

On Saturday, the 23rd, Mr. Rarey, an American, now on a visit to this country, whose skill in taming the horse, and completely subjecting him, however wild, vicious, or intractable, to his will and mastery, is beginning to attract public attention, was afforded an opportunity of exhibiting his peculiar powers in this capacity before the Queen, the Prince Consort, the Princess Royal, the Prince of Wales, Prince Alfred, and other members of the royal family, with the ladies of the court and most of the foreign princess and distinguished visitors now in London, including Prince Frederick William of Prussia, the Prince of Prussia, Prince Frederick Charles of Prussia, Prince Albert of Prussia, Prince Frederick Albert of Prussia, Prince Adalbert of Prussia, Prince Hohenzollern Sigmaringen, the Duke of Saxe-Coburg and Gotha, the Duke of Brabant, the Count of Flanders, Prince William of Baden, Prince Edward of Saxe-Weimar, and Prince Julius of Holstein Glucksburg. Of his first exhibition at Windsor a notice has already appeared in our columns.

To show (says the *Times*) that Mr. Rarey's power is not a thing personal to himself, he has since his exhibition of it at Windsor communicated the secret of it to Major-General Sir Richard Airey, Lord Alfred Paget, and Colonel Hood, under the most stringent obligations, of course, that they will not disclose it to others; and Lord Alfred Paget, who is now as much a horse-tamer as Mr. Rarey, on Saturday gave a successful exemplification of his skill before her Majesty, the Prince Consort, and their august visitors, taking for his subject a beautiful dapple grey pony belonging to the Prince of Wales. Lord Alfred was left alone with the pony for a few minutes in the riding-school, and on the admission of the royal party it was prostrate on the ground with his lordship sitting, caressing it, handling its feet and legs, resting on its haunches, and in all respects treating it in a manner proving its complete subjection to him. That over, Mr. Rarey appeared with the black horse from Anderson's, in Piccadilly, to which reference has been made, and his mastery over which he showed in a variety of ways. Placing himself at one end of the riding-school, he called to the animal, which he had left at the other, and it immediately cantered towards him in a playful manner. It lay down at his bidding, or followed him like a dog round the building. When down, a plank was laid upon its shoulder, up which Lord Alfred Paget ran a wheelbarrow. Finally, when the horse had regained his legs, he was mounted by Mr. Rarey, who sat on the animal's crupper with his back to the head, beating a drum and cracking a whip over him, this treatment resulting in neither motion nor fear on the part of the horse. One of the fine stud of cream-coloured horses belonging to her Majesty was next subjected to the manipulation of Mr. Rarey, with an equally successful and surprising result, so far as laying the animal, which is an entire horse, down was concerned, and handling him all over with the most perfect freedom, the horse-tamer not deeming it desirable, on so short an acquaintance, to carry the familiarity to the extent of opening an umbrella in his face, or cracking a whip, or beating a drum over him. Besides the frequent display of some vicious propensities, this particular animal of late has never permitted any one to ride him; but he allowed Mr. Rarey to mount him without offering the least resistance. With this the exhibition terminated, and the Queen and her illustrious visitors, by whom it was witnessed with the most evident tokens of interest and wonder, took their departure.

It ought to be stated that Sir Richard Airey, Lord Alfred Paget, and Colonel Hood, to each of whom Mr. Rarey has communicated his secret, are understood to declare that there is nothing in the treatment in the smallest degree painful or improper towards the horse subjected to it, or which would offend the susceptibilities of a bystander sensitively alive to anything partaking in the least of cruelty to a dumb animal. They also assert that it consists of no trickery of any description, nor of the use of any drug, or mesmeric or other similar influence whatever. Mr. Rarey's theory is that hitherto all our treatment of this noble animal—at least in the preliminary stages of breaking, and so forth—has proceeded on ideas of his nature altogether erroneous and cruel, and been invariably characterised by unnecessary violence, which has provoked the display of resistance and other kindred qualities on his part, and so the evil has been perpetuated. The principle on which Mr. Rarey goes, on the other hand, is one of extreme kindness and tenderness to the animal, the object being to convince him that man is his natural master and friend, and to elicit his confidence and kindly regard. Mr. Rarey appeals to what he calls "the intellect and affections of the horse," and states that this is the secret of all his success. He is a slightly made man about 30 years of age, the son of a stock farmer and breeder of horses, who lived in Franklin county in the state of Ohio, and is himself engaged in a similar occupation at a place called Groveport, about ten miles from Colombo, the capital of that state. From boyhood he is stated to have exhibited an intense fondness for horses and a remarkable aptitude for breaking and training them after the old fashion, until he discovered this more humane system of treatment, which he has since practised with the greatest success in his native state. The subjects on which he has operated have been in many cases horses reclaimed in a perfectly wild condition from the American prairies, and in the course of his experience he has had one arm and both legs broken. We believe that Sir Richard Airey and Lord Alfred Paget have been requested to inquire into and report upon the system of treatment adopted by Mr. Rarey in the interests of the Government.

Steam Communication between Quebec and Shediac.—There seems to be a prospect of the New Brunswickers establishing communication by steam between the Gulf ports of their province and Quebec. The Sackville Borderer says:

"A correspondent at Moncton informs us that the steamer to ply between Quebec and Shediac weekly will be ready for service the coming season, and also another to connect the principal ports on the Gulf Shore with Shediac. We are happy to learn this intelligence, indicating as it does the progress of New Brunswick notwithstanding the depression of trade. As an effort will, no doubt, be made to obtain assistance from the Government, we hope that they will adopt such precautionary measures as will afford a guarantee to the enterprising individuals engaged in this undertaking, that they shall not suffer loss, in case the proposed line proves not self-sustaining, such being very likely to be the case at the commencement."

On Sunday evening, the 24th ult., a dreadful accident happened at Lower Stewiacke, Colchester County. One of the railway navvies having purchased a bottle of rum, took it to a neighboring shanty where it was soon consumed. The owner having thus had his depraved taste excited, went to the tavern, after his visitor had left, and soon procured another bottle of rum, with which he returned, and having driven out his wife and child, who took shelter in a neighboring shanty, he proceeded to split up a bench for fuel. This was the last that was seen of him. In the morning his shanty was found to have been reduced to ashes, and his charred bones were brought before a coroner's inquest, at which a verdict was rendered in accordance with the facts.

The unfortunate individual alluded to is said to have been an Irishman named Joseph Meagher.

Extract of a Letter from Broad Cove.—*dated 12th Feb'y.*—On Tuesday, the 2d inst., four men went out on the ice from Broad Cove, in the Island of Cape Breton, for the purpose of killing seals, and while engaged in that occupation some distance outside of Margaree Island, the wind sprung up off the land and the ice parted so as to render it impossible for them to reach the shore; fortunately the keeper of the light house on the island, Mr. N. C. M'Keen, happened to observe them and see the situation they were in, and immediately got his boat, which he had to haul across the island, and let down the steep bank on the northern side of the island, and after some time succeeded in reaching the edge of the ice, and getting them on board, and with great difficulty, (in consequence of the wind increasing almost to a gale) made the island about two o'clock at night. Two of the men were so done up between fright and fatigue that they had to be carried to the light house, where all of them remained for two days before they could return to the shore. They left about 30 seals dead on the ice, which were taken off at Margaree harbor after the wind changed back to the north.—*Colonist 20th inst.*

THE GREAT PROTESTANT MEETING.

[*Continued from our last.*]

3. *Resolved*, That moral training from the Bible is indispensable to the efficiency of the Normal School.

The Rev. R. S. Patterson, in seconding the third Resolution, said:—After such a thorough discussion of the subject, by the mover, a long speech will not be expected from me. As I shall have occasion to allude to the Romanists, I would wish to have it clearly understood, that I cherish no antipathy to their persons. True christianity breathes animosity to none. It inspires us with a desire for the good of all. It leads us to love our enemies, to bless them that curse us, do good to them that hate us and pray for them that despitefully use us and persecute us: like our Divine Master, to pray for our murderers with our expiring breath, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do;" and, like the proto-martyr Stephen, "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge." But, while we cherish no antipathy to the persons of Roman Catholics, we cannot approve of their principles,—we cannot but hate their false doctrines and idolatrous worship,—we cannot but wish the overthrow of a system so dishonoring to God, so hostile to the best interests of man, and whose tendency is to destroy our civil and religious liberties. Popery is a master-piece,—a skilfully organized system, to enslave mankind. It aims at being dominant. To deny this, is to deny the testimony of all history;—to deny this, is to deny the testimony of passing events. Now, that it may be seen how what we are saying bears upon the subject in hand, we remark, that one method employed by Romanists, for the purpose of establishing their sway, is to get into their hands the education of the youth. The priests in Belgium, not long ago, made a desperate attempt to put down all seminaries not under the control of the church. In Sardinia, also, whatever other face may be attempted to be put upon the matter, their real design is to get the education of the youth under their management. In many parts of France also, the Protestant schools have been closed. In Ireland, where the schools are already more than half popish, they are not sufficiently so to please Dr. Cullen. In Nova Scotia, and here also, the Romish church is opposing Protestant education, and endeavoring, as much as possible, to get the training of youth into its own hands. And Protestants are lending them a helping hand. In England, the Committee of the Privy Council have sent abroad books, edited by the Christian Brothers, an offshoot of the Jesuits. Government, also, has for some time past supported many schools wholly popish; paid the salaries of teachers, and even provided them with residences. In this Island, Protestants are helping Romanists to carry out their schemes of getting the education of youth into their hands,—one instance of which we have in the exclusion of the bible from our Normal School. Pursuing such a course, I ask—Is there no ground for alarm? Has popery become better than it once was? If it gain the ascendancy, are not our civil and religious liberties gone? Do we expect to be more free than the inhabitants of popish countries? Is there any of these in which the same liberty is enjoyed as in Britain?—Is it at Rome?—is it at Naples?—is it in Spain?—is it in France? Even many Romanists themselves have allowed that, no where had they the same liberty as in Britain. Ah! my friends, Roman Catholics themselves are little sensible how much they owe to Protestantism. Now, how is it that we are to prevent the aggressions of Romanism? How is it that we are to preserve our civil and religious liberty intact? It is by securing for our children a sound education. And mere secular learning is not sufficient. Of this we have a melancholy proof in what has taken place in India. Look at the case of Nana Sahib. He had a finished secular education. Look at the case of thousands of others of a similar stamp. There must be moral and religious, as well as secular education in our schools; and the bible must be the text-book. The minds of our children must be imbued with its holy principles; they must be taught its benign precepts, and copy after its lovely examples. And it is not enough that the bible should be in our Common Schools; it ought also to be in our Normal School. Here Teachers are instructed in the method of imparting the knowledge which they possess. Of course, they ought to be taught the manner of conducting the Bible lesson. To exclude the bible from the Normal School, is to lay the axe at the root of the whole matter,—to leave the teachers unqualified to conduct the bible lesson. If we would maintain our civil and religious liberty, our children must receive scriptural instruction. The bible lies at the foundation of our freedom. Those nations that reject it are under the most crushing despotism. The Bible, the Bible alone—as Chillingworth says—is the religion of Protestants. With these remarks I would beg leave to second the Resolution.

The next speaker, (Rev. Andrew Lockhead), having addressed the Chairman and the audience, began by saying: It will hardly be expected that I should compete with the previous speakers, as I have only recently ascertained the nature of the resolution. Indeed, I would feel justified were I to move the resolution put into my hands, and say no more; but, as I feel interested in the business of this meeting, and love the Bible, I will make a few observations on the subject, at the hazard of making many mistakes, and even of breaking down altogether. But to the resolution. It is there stated that the present condition of the Academy is not suited to the wants of this Island. Now, Sir, this will appear from the remarks made by the previous speaker in reference to the Normal School, when he plainly, yet eloquently, pointed out one great defect in the training received there, viz: the want of Bible instruction. For the same reason the Academy is not suited to the wants of this Island, for a Bible education is imperatively required in the teaching of the young. This being the case, sir, it seems strange to me that the parents of the children attending that seminary should still continue to send them there, the more especially that I know that the majority of them are in favor of Bible instruction. It appears to me, sir, altogether mean that they should do so, when it can only be for the purpose of saving the expense of their education elsewhere. If they really loved the Bible as they ought, were resolved that their children should have the benefit of being taught its holy precepts, "that make wise unto salvation," they would, I am certain, be willing to make a greater sacrifice. It was not in this mean-spirited or selfish manner that the Ministers of the Free Church, a few years ago, acted, that they might testify to free representatives and sound Bible principle—for they left, as you know, much that was valuable behind, in order to show their sincerity. Let the people of Charlottetown do the same,—let them truly show to the world that their pretensions are supported by realities,—that they really love the truth, and are determined to have it taught to their children. But we must go on to notice the other clause of the resolution. That the establishment of a college, on right principles, would be welcomed by the people. This I believe to be true, sir, for many reasons. First, because the Academy does not profess to teach those branches that are necessary for a professional position in society; on this account, those who wish their children trained for that purpose, have to send them, at great expense, and very great inconvenience, to other parts. This is a serious evil, and one which it is intended to rectify by the measure proposed. But, sir, it is necessary that a college should be established for other reasons, and one of those is—to meet the gigantic schemes which Popery has proposed for the overthrow of Protestantism, and establishment of its unhallowed principles in this Island. We need professional men, sir, to take the field, and to contend with these evils; and, in order to have that end carried, we must have a college where they may be trained for the purpose, and on the spot, that the evils, flowing in like a flood in the midst of us, may be counteracted or extirpated. I ask, sir, is it not necessary to have a college to train those who are wanted in the professional field, when we have nuns enlisting the patronage of the people, that they may be permitted at leisure to instil their pestiferous dogmas into the ears and minds of our young and rising generation. I should think so. You have only to become acquainted with what monks and nuns are, to see the force of these remarks; for their doors are the habitations of crime, cruelty and abomination. If you do not wish to take my word for it, consult the letters of Kirwan to Bishop Hughes, Pascal's letters to the Jesuits, or even the works of Hogan, which have never been refuted that I know. Look at these and think on them, and you will see the need of having educated men to expose and counteract and expose the evil tendencies which Popery and its agencies are crowding upon us. With a view to get the number of educated men which we require, we must have a college, and you may depend, sir, that if it was properly conducted, and with students of the right stamp, the claims of *monks and nuns* on your patronage, for the teaching of your children, would be small indeed. What have Protestants to do with Popish teachers? The very idea appears strange. It tells a woeful tale of indifference and treachery among those who ought to be otherwise minded. However, I see I must conclude; I will, therefore, move the resolution put into my hands—Resolved, That the present state of the Academy is not suited to the wants of this Island, and that a college, established on proper principles, would be welcomed by the people.

The Rev. Isaac Murray, in rising to second the fourth resolution, said:

Mr. Chairman,—When I entered this room, I had no intention of addressing this audience, and can say, with the mover of the Resolution, that I knew not the object of the meeting until an hour or two ago. Indeed, having refused to take part in this night's proceedings, I thought it a settled point that I would not be called upon to speak, and listened with that impression,—and now would not answer to my name, might not such a position be misconstrued, to the prejudice of my feelings. In rising, then, to second this resolution, I may say, I agree with all the previous speaker has advanced in its favor. That the Central Academy of this Island is not in an efficient state, I hold to be an incontrovertible proposition, both as regards its literary department and its moral tendencies. In saying this, I cannot be charged with any hostility to the person who at present is at the head of that institution, and that too on the ground of his religious predilections; but I only give utterance to that which you in this city have recorded by your actions. The fact is, you give the most undisguised proof of your want of confidence in it; and its languishing existence, its uninteresting character, its feeble staff of teachers, its weak support, its paucity of scholars, is demonstration enough that it is not what you would like it to be; whilst, in the eyes of the country, it seems to be bald of all attractions,—and takes no stand in importance with many institutions of a similar name in the neighboring colonies, whither our aspiring youth are constantly being sent for educational purposes, because these cannot be obtained at home! Why, Sir, I was perfectly amazed, in looking into one of our newspapers, which contained an authentic document shewing the present state of our highest institution of learning, to find that the only Classic work there read, and supporting competition, was Cæsar's Commentaries; whilst Sallust, the most advanced book, was read without any competition! Thus, it is clear that education, in a department necessary at least for three professions, is, amongst us, neglected. I would ask this audience if the people of Charlottetown are satisfied with the present state of your Academy,—the highest seat of learning in this province? Is it worthy of you as citizens? I tell you it is disreputable to the country. I could bring you to secluded parts of this Island, where more advanced Latin authors are taught, and the Greek of Isocrates is by boys translated. You must give your Academy a larger endowment, increase the number of its professors (!) create for it an influence and a name, raise it to something like life,—and let it not be dead whilst it liveth. Seats of learning are the best tests of a people's character; if this be so, what must be thought of us!

But, now, who is to take the lead in this good work? Shall you wait for the movement of our Catholic neighbors to such an end? Let me tell you, education is not indigenous to Popery—it is foreign to it, is only grafted upon it; nay, rather, is only allied to it by a sort of pressed juxtaposition. It does not penetrate its nature or amalgamate with its interests and motives. Popery cultivates education only because it cannot help it. In those days when Popery reigned supreme, and gave laws to the nations, do you find seats of learning dotting the countries lying under its uncontrolled authority; and constantly streaming from such fountain heads a pious and devoted priesthood, hallowing society with the light of their example, and scattering everywhere the blessings of divine truth, or love of arts and sciences? No! but those seminaries so truthfully delineated by the previous speaker, sat in clusters everywhere, pestiferous and blighting; for the pall of superstition, moral death and woeful ignorance, far and wide, covered the people—steeped in every species of vice, and asleep in the security of mediæval midnight darkness! The glory of Popery is the glory of darkness; so that for this, as by a necessary law of its existence, it must constantly seek. If you wait, then, for it to assume the leadership, and trust to its guidance, you will find, when too late, that you will not be ascending the steps which lead to the true and pure regions of learning—still laboring to ascertain more of these, but you will descend to the trifling and grossly superstitious and impure! Its past is the best proof I can give of this. Says Niebuhr—"It is thought that at length people will come to read ancient history, as if it had really happened;" and a heathen, the companion and friend of Plato, enjoins us, when drawing conclusions concerning the future, to make the past our rule. History is prophecy. What is the state of education in Austria, Italy and Spain, when compared to that of Britain and America? We must, trusting to the Divine blessing, advance education, without the aid, it may be under the pressure of, Popish opposition. This is Protestant work, and we must do it.

But the Academy is not satisfactory in its moral tendencies, nor can be, so long as the Word of God has no influence in its teaching. Giving, as it thus does, the weight of its example *against* the Bible, and teaching other institutions, subordinate to it, to do so likewise, it assumes a very dangerous character. The present state of the Academy must be as unsatisfactory to every sound-hearted Protestant, as it is to every sound-headed one. Divorcing Bible influence from education, you act as unwisely as if the loose rein were laid upon the neck of the fiery courser, and still you would anticipate no danger. Such is uncontrolled, and therefore dangerous power, and might realize the poet's description—

"Practiced in arts of hell,
In wretchedness refined."

Yes, and tolerating this unholy divorce, what gain you in way of compensation? The Bible may be viewed as Jehovah's representative amongst us—his image, his voice, his will; and I would ask if his august majesty can reside where His Word, which he magnifies, above all his name, is contemptuously rejected; and departing, mind he takes with him his blessing, whilst his curse rushes in to fill the empty space, which, as a whirlwind, overthrows all human greatness, and converts our wisdom into madness! Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach unto any people. Is the approbation of men, then, to be viewed as compensation for Divine disapprobation? and the word of men regarded, whilst God's remains unheeded! Can we ever forget what Jehovah has done for us as Protestants? Can we forget the Spanish Armada, which God foundered in the deep, and delivered us from the power of the Strong one? Can we forget that liberty lay in Great Britain all pale and bleeding, when the Lord called the immortal William, who "came, and saw, and conquered," because our God was with him? Can we forget the diabolical scheme, known as the Gunpowder Plot, which was intended to clothe England in mourning for the loss of the noblest part of her aristocracy, and Protestantism for its able defenders? A recollection of merciful interpositions, like these, in animating our souls with gratitude, should also teach us to treat with horror any proposition that would, directly or indirectly, compromise Jehovah's power and authority amongst us. If, Sir, our religious opponents think that they can "prosper in their way" without the Lord's presence and blessing, certainly it is not so with us; if God had no part in building up their greatness, and needs not to smile upon their institutions to render them efficient and useful, such is not the relation in which we stand to Him—and surely it ill becomes us, in the day of our prosperity, to turn round and despise the hand that has done great things for us, that, too, out of regard to those from whose grasp he delivered us! And yet it fills one with sorrow to reflect how Protestants have forgotten their God. And one does not know whether most to detest the ceaseless activity, determined perseverance, and the cunning and tact of Romanists, exercised in pushing forward their dark schemes; or the lukewarmness, even deadness, of Protestants, in advancing the principles of the glorious Reformation. Did Protestants, man, woman and child, feel that each had a part and a duty in this great work to perform, our victory, gained by the force of truth, would be as speedy as it is sure. But, Sir, there is a set of mentrimmers amongst us, (and if there be a human being I heartily despise, this character is the one), who, with the ease of the vane upon yon church steeple, can adjust their position to every worldly breath that flies, no matter at what *sacrifice of Divine rights and honor!* These men may think that they are advancing public peace and good order, but are, in truth, doing the worst they can to complicate difficulties, and render the conflict of truth with error—Christ with Antichrist—the more terrible. A poet of England has finely told us this:

"Battles at last shall cease—
At last, not now: we are not yet at home.
The time is coming, it will soon be come,
When those who dare not fight
For God, or for the right,
Shall fight for peace!"

If I am detaining the audience too long, I have Pascal's apology—"I had no time to make" my speech "shorter," and in conclusion I have this yet to say, that I have no sympathy with those who would obstruct Protestant discussion by a reference to Catholic feeling. Catholic feeling the rule of Protestant discussion and action! Why, Sir, our very existence as Protestants hurts their feelings. It hurts their feelings that Victoria, our beloved Queen, holds the British sceptre as a Protestant; it hurts their feelings to find Protestant nations so prosperous, our institutions and our press so free, and that our discussions, despite their impotent rage, are free;—aye, it hurts their feelings to hear proclaimed aloud that there is but one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus! If, Sir, we are to assert that their feelings are to constitute for us a rule of conduct, we must crown our churches with a cross, and suspend the same from every fair neck; and, renouncing our Protestant principles as an abominable superstition, and placing our bared knees upon the cutting pebbles, confess to his Lord God the Pope that we have been guilty of the heinous crime of being heretics, fit only to be burnt, but hope that, through his extraordinary clemency, he will forgive us, and adopt us as penitents, and still repenting, among his saintly flock. If this is to be the rule, we had better close our mouths at once, and say nothing more about Protestant's rights! But whether it be right to please God or man judge ye.

YOUNG MENS' CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION.

On Thursday evening last, Commander Orlebar, R. N., delivered a very interesting and instructive lecture on the all-engrossing subject of "India," before an unusually large assembly. The lecturer commenced his subject by stating that it was the bounden duty of every Briton to make himself in some measure acquainted with that vast empire to which he belongs—to gain some knowledge of the British constitution, of the constituent parts of the empire, their extent and their geographical position. After a few preliminary remarks relative to the empire generally, he then proceeded to illustrate his subject, in doing which he exhibited a degree of research, relative to ancient British India, which must have been highly gratifying to the inquiring mind. He clearly delineated the manner in which the government of India has been conducted, and justly stated, that "they were nearly as unfriendly to vital Christianity as the Cæsars of Rome." But did the unfriendliness of the Cæsars—nay, even their persecutions of the Christians—stop the progress of the mighty soul-subduing Gospel? No! Even in St. Paul's time several of Cæsar's household believed, and, in the fiercest persecutions, believers were found by thousands, everywhere permeating the court, the army and the senate.

He then dwelt on the necessity of every national policy being based on religious principles, and that the great fundamental principles of the Bible ought to be made, by rulers, the moving principle of action. The following is an extract:—

"The Bible teaches in the history of Judah and Israel, clearly enough that power is entrusted to rulers that they may glorify Him in its exercise; and that when this duty is neglected, sooner or later those nations that neglect it have received from the hand of God, punishments of various kinds. I know some will say, what have our rulers to do with religion, better leave that to the clergy—but such is not the revealed will of God—"Righteousness exalteth a nation"—God's blessing attends the righteous ruler and is poured out upon the people, as we see in the histories of David, Solomon, Asa, Jehosaphat and Hezekiah, and I cannot but consider it a sign of a low state of morals in any community, that in the selection of members for the legislature, so little care is given by Protestants and Catholics to the personal character of the men for whom they vote at the hustings; so that we often see members of Assembly and notable leaders of Party, disgraced by vices and by habits that must unfit them for the right consideration of any moral question.

"Surely if there is any place we want good honest men and God-fearing men it is in our Legislative Assemblies, so that we may be godly and quietly governed, and I have little hope for any country where strong party feelings and prejudices are considered sufficient to command our countenance and support, irrespective of the moral and religious character of the man."

To me it appears a maxim quite incontrovertible that that system of human policy is the best, which is most favourable to the diffusion, the prevalence and the predominance of true religion; and that that system of religion must be the best, which is the most favourable to the purity, the prosperity, and the stability of human government. When a man or a body of men presides at the helm of power, and have entrusted to them the welfare of a nation; how plain it is, that, if a total exclusion of the religious element from their system of national administration be the chief end that they have in view, such an anti-religious institution must prove exceedingly detrimental and demoralizing to the nation generally. Whatever involves consequences that are not merely confined to this temporal scene, but moral and eternal in their duration—must greatly transcend the mortal interests of the present world alone. Are not such consequences then involved in every government, and do they not follow, in a great measure, precisely as that government is favourable to the toleration and spread—or the utter suppression and extinction of virtue and vice.

As a deduction from this, we will at once perceive that "politics and religion are inseparably connected," and all the attempts of a particular faction to draw a line of demarcation between them, must prove to the minds of all right thinking men, as contemptible as the principles for which they emanate. To sanction what is politically beneficient, is a duty that every lover of his race is called upon to perform; and to oppose what is politically injurious, is a duty equally incumbent. Would a minister of the Gospel then, be doing his duty to his Divine master, by withholding his influence from the proper government of the state. Is morality or immorality the most honorable to a country? Is the wickedness and rebellion of a people more acceptable to the Sovereign ruler of the universe, than the strict observance of his laws? If so, why should we labour for its suppression. But, on the other hand, if it be hateful, how plain is the path of duty. They are bound by the strictest obligations to labour for the dissemination of religious principles among the people—*the Bible among the people*, and to see that the government under which they live has the interest of their country at heart. Were they from weakness or false delicacy to render themselves chargeable for not discharging their duty—to allow the dearest interests of a country to be sacrificed to the caprice and self-aggrandizement of a particular party of politicians, who seem to make "allegance to self" their rule of action *while* in their public capacity;—to allow the bulwark of a nation's glory and a people's temporal and eternal happiness, to fall beneath the sordid intersts of a few—then, I say, that generations to come would rise up in judgment against such culpable neglect.

Let us not view the momentous consequences which result from political systems with apathy and indifference. Let not the tremendous movements, which, if permitted to pass unnoticed, will mournfully seal our Island's destiny—pass before our eyes without exciting our warmest feelings of interest. The Bible and the Bible only will make a nation—a people prosperous. Of all the treasures of a nation the Bible is the grandest. Darkness vanishes when it appears. Tyranny and oppression are changed unto the loudest acclamations of triumphal satisfaction. Satan and his hosts begin their groaning when the sound of its chariot is heard reverberating over the land. For why would they not? Is not victory sitting on its gleaming page. Does it not sing as it goes "all my enemies shall be put under my feet." The omnipotence of its power crushes beneath it every resistance of impiety and grovelling ambition. Yea more—Popery with its mists dreads the brillancy of its light, and the whole embassy of the Pope cry aloud for fear." And why; if its power burst assunder the iron fetters which bound the hearts of the household of the ancient Cæsars, may it not also gain a trumphal admittance into the hearts of our modern rulers. Yes, reader, we hope it will. "Of all the gems in a monarch's diadem, it is the brightest," remarks a noble philanthropist. And we trust that ere long the beauty and sublimity of its precepts, and the power which they wield over a nation's prosperity, may enlist their affections, and that they also may co-operate in resisting the swelling tide of *infidelity* and superstition.

On Thursday, 10th inst., (D.V.) Mr. Fullarton will deliver a lecture on "Decision of Character." The public are respectfully requested to attend.

Holloway's Pills.—Delicate females, who suffer from those peculiar disturbances of the system incident to the gentler sex, will find in these Pills a safe remedy for all the functional disorders under which they may labour. Acting specifially upon the local irregularity, and generally upon the system, this comprehensive remedy will simultaneously remove the immediate cause of suffering, and invigorate all the bodily organs which have been affected by sympathy therewith. In the three most perilous phases of female existance, viz., the dawn of womanhood, the period of maturity, and what is termed *the change of life*, the alternative and restorative properties of these Pills, render them indispensible to the feeble sex.

The Protector & Christian Witness

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 3, 1858.

We conclude to-day all the speeches at the late Protestant Meeting which we have been able to obtain. The fifth Resolution was moved by the Rev. Ingham Sutcliffe, who enlarged eloquently on the blessed results of giving the Bible — the pure Protestant Bible to the world. As that Bible was the word of God, and a mighty lever in elevating man, it ought to be defended from all its foes. The common schools were fitted to diffuse education universally, and deserve our united and hearty support. The Rev. John Mackinnon seconded the resolution, with a few remarks. The sixth resolution was introduced by the Rev. Andrew Lockhead, and pressed by some powerful statements. It was seconded by the Rev. T. Duncan, and supported by the Revs. George and Alexander Sutherland. Roman Catholics sent their members to Parliament with instructions—were Protestants to send theirs with blank paper? The questions to candidates were not the work of one individual, but of the combination. Constituents had a right to know the views of men whom they would choose; and it was their duty to send to Parliament only sound-hearted and faithful men.

At the request of the gentleman who signs himself "J. H. G.," we give insertion to the following communication; but we cannot allow it to pass without repelling its accusations, and exposing its absurdities. To those acquainted with the latest discoveries of Astronomy and Geology, especially in their bearing on Divine Revelation, it carries its own refutation; to others, who deem dignified language and appropriate expressions the only medium of communication becoming gentlemen, its vulgarisms and abusive terms might sink it beneath notice; but to many its bold assertions and misrepresentations require a clear and decided answer. Does it not seem a little strange that Mr. Maclean, whose antecedents in the Bible cause are so well known throughout the Island, should now appear to defend a once commonly received interpretation of a portion of Scripture, in a point of chronology, which interpretation has long been disputed by men of science? He would charge the writer in the *Protector*, who reviewed "Miller's Testimony of the Rocks," with "infidel doctrine," with "rank and avowed unbelief in the inspired word of God." But whose opinion has that writer adopted? The opinion of men who, the world has admitted, have occupied the first place, both as men of science and as *Christians*. Hence, if these men rejected the truth of the Bible, why may not other professed Christians be regarded as doing the same; and, a step further, you arrive at the conclusion that all religion, or at least Christianity, is a fable, seeing that its professed advocates have rejected the testimony of their only authoritative standard of doctrine. Thus the apparent advocate of a certain interpretation of Scripture may really be promoting, on a large scale, the cause of infidelity.

It may be necessary to state that the present writer is not the author of the articles on Miller's work—he has never adopted Miller's theory, and, thus far, may be disposed to do justice to the question in dispute. Let the whole subject be viewed fairly and dispassionately. Among men of acknowledged talent and piety, who have ever avowed their belief in the inspiration, and therefore infallibility, of the whole word of God, *three* different opinions have prevailed as to the interpretation of the first chapter of Genesis. The first is the opinion extensively entertained, that the sidereal heavens and the solar system, including, of course, the earth, were created *immediately before* the six days' work began, and that the six days were six ordinary days, of twenty-four hours each, and that the earth is not yet six thousand years old. The second is, in substance, Miller's theory—that the opening verses of Genesis do not fix or definitely determine the antiquity of the globe—that the heavens and the earth were created many ages ago, and that the six days were not ordinary days, but extended periods of time. The third is—that the earth and the heavens were created many ages ago, of which creation Revelation says: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth," which language expresses no distinct or computed time—that the six days are six natural days, of twenty-four hours each—that previous to the creations which they describe, various races of inferior animals inhabited our world, rank with luxuriant vegetation, which animals and vegetation were buried by a chaos, produced immediately before the six days mentioned in Genesis, to prepare the earth for the abode of man, and those animals who were to inhabit it with him. Now, who will venture to say that the entertainer of any one of these opinions holds "infidel doctrine." Godly men, holding each of these opinions, utterly deny the charge. They believe the whole word of God to be true, although they may differ in understanding a difficult point in chronology. They do not condemn each other as infidels—they express their opinions, and wait for further sight. The interpretation, however, that regards the first verse of Genesis as a general statement, presenting no reckoning of time, is rapidly approaching universal adoption, and never can invalidate the smallest portion of Scripture. The present writer is strongly disposed to adopt the third opinion. The late Dr. Kitto, who will not, certainly, be accused of maintaining "infidel doctrine," says, in his Daily Bible Illustrations, vol. 1, page 17: "The disclosures [of geology] were not reasonings, nor conjectures, nor hypotheses; they were facts of the least mistakeable kind—disentrenched remains of ancient generations of the earth—remains *tangible, visible, certain, and reconcilable with no hypothesis* which allows *no more ancient date to the earth* than the *commencement of the week which closed in the creation of man.*" If the reviewer of Miller's work has expressed "rank unbelief in the inspired word of God," in stating that the earth was called into existence anterior to the creation of Adam, so have Dr. Chalmers, Dr. Kitto, and a host of others of like celebrity.

It requires men of Mr. Maclean's cast of mind to charge such devout and intelligent students of the work of God with holding "infidel doctrine." The calculation of Fergusson, if correct, will only establish the comparatively recent origin of the present order of things, and is quite compatible with the third opinion or interpretation above expressed. We turn now to the argument from Astronomy. On this the chief points of dispute have turned. In the quotation from the *Protector* of Dec. 16th, 1857, as appeared in the *Islander* of date Feb. 12th, 1858, the reviewer stated the "creed" or opinion generally entertained up to a recent period as the interpretation of the account of the creation in Genesis. Of that "creed" he says that astronomy was the first to "shake the stability." In the communication from the *Islander*, which we to day publish, the *Protector* is made to say that astronomy first shook the stability of "the account of the creation in Genesis." It is manifest that such an interpretation of language is wholly unwarrantable. It was the "creed," or generally received interpretation, that was shaken by astronomy, according to the reviewer, and not the *account* itself of the creation as given in Genesis. Neither the reviewer, nor the present writer, nor any editor of the *Protector*, believes that any true discoveries in geology or astronomy will ever shake any truth of the Bible, though they may shake and remove some incorrect interpretations of portions of it, relating to physical science. In the quotation from the *Protector*, of date Dec. 23d, 1857, as appears in the *Islander*, of date Feb. 12th, 1858, the reviewer says: "*If we remember aright*, astronomy proves that stars are at such immense distances, that it is demonstrable that they existed previous to the creation of Adam." Now mark, the reviewer speaks conditionally—"IF WE REMEMBER ARIGHT;" and, certainly, any one perusing the latest works on astronomy would be very apt to imbibe the idea here expressed. We shall briefly notice the facts and analogical reasonings of astronomy on this point.

The brightness of a star may be occasioned by either its size or its nearness—as the dimness of a star by its smallness or distance. The question is, which is the more probable? Shall we say of a dim star that it is very small or very distant? Duncan Maclean says that "it is not only possible, *but very probable*, that some small stars, catalogued of very low magnitude, and consequently assumed to be very distant, may, in reality, be much nearer than any stars of what is called the first magnitude." Dr. Lardner says, in Lectures on Science and Art, vol. 1, page 591, that the supposition that stars appear small according to their *distance*, rather than their size, "*is infinitely the most probable and natural*, and has usually been adopted." We have, then, the opinion of the most distinguished men of science, who have spent their days in examining distant objects, opposed to the editor of the *Islander*. The public, in the absence of proof on one side or other, will judge which opinion is the more probable. Shall we adopt the opinion of the men of science in every age? If so, what we call the various magnitudes of the stars, from 1