

# Messenger and Visitor.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER,  
VOLUME LX.

THE CHRISTIAN VISITOR,  
VOLUME XLIX.

Vol. XIV.

ST. JOHN, N. B., WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 26, 1898.

No. 4.

## Contents.

EDITORIAL.	Short Stories.	6
Paragraphs.	THE YOUNG PEOPLE.	6
China's Awakening.	Prayer Meeting Topic.	7
Christ Teaches Men to Pray.	etc.	7
"Ye are Brethren."	FOREIGN MISSIONS.	8
Notes.	W. B. M. U.	8
Book Notices.	F. M. Board, Notes by the	8
CONTRIBUTED.	Secretary.	8
Historical Paper - Truro	Home Missions.	8
Churches.	Seminary Indebtedness.	8
Why Should a Bapt. S. S.	THE HOME.	10
Convention Exist?	THE SUNDAY SCHOOL.	10
From North Sydney.	Bible Lesson Feb. 6-	11
Sudden Death at Acadia.	Matt. 6: 24-34.	11
SELECTED.	FROM THE CHURCHES.	12
Fishing for Souls.	MARRIAGES AND DEATHS.	13
An Incident of the Jubilee.	THE FARM.	15
STORY PAGE.	Quarterly Meeting.	16
Some Out-of-School Equa-	Notices.	16
tions.	News Summary.	14 and 16

**After Long Service.** The death of the Right Hon. Charles Pelham Villiers, which occurred on the 16th instant, removes a man who had been continuously for more than sixty years in public life. Mr. Villiers, who was known as Father of the House of Commons, was at his death a member for South Wolverhampton, and had sat continuously in the House since 1835. Mr. Villiers was born in January, 1802, and had just completed his 96th year. Besides being the oldest member of the Commons, Mr. Villiers was father of the English Bar, having been called at Lincoln's Inn in 1827. His political career may be said to date back to the same period, for it was in 1826 that he contested though unsuccessfully a Yorkshire constituency under the reform banner of Canning. Mr. Villiers was a man of mark in the political world. He became a member of Lord Palmerston's second administration in 1859. As an independent Liberal he was one of the most able and eloquent leaders of the Anti-Corn Law agitation, and his earnest speeches and persistent motions in Parliament contributed substantially to the triumph of the cause. He was also the author of important legislation in connection with the Poor Law administration. In recognition of his public services his constituents at Wolverhampton in 1879 unveiled a marble statue of Mr. Villiers. Notwithstanding his great age, he had retained his faculties in a remarkable degree, his memory was singularly retentive, and he was able to entertain his friends for hours at a time with descriptions of scenes in the House of Commons belonging to times which lay beyond the memory of nearly all his later contemporaries. Canning had passed away eight years before Mr. Villiers entered parliament, but the two often met, as Canning was a bosom friend of the uncle of Mr. Villiers. The latter often went to the House to hear Canning speak, and he described him as a wonderful orator. With Cobden and Bright he was intimately associated in the Anti-Corn laws agitation and he is always described as one of the triumvirate that brought about the repeal. Among the famous personalities he could recall and vividly portray were the great Sir Robert Peel, Lords Melbourne, Russell, Derby, Aberdeen, Brougham, the Duke of Wellington, Daniel O'Connell, Hume, Grote and Disraeli. He always delighted to recall the circumstance that he was in the House when Disraeli made the celebrated speech in which he said that one day the House would be compelled to listen to him.

**Should the United States Acquire Territory?** The general question as to the wisdom of a policy of territorial acquisition and the particular questions as to the advisability of annexing Hawaii and Cuba, are the cause of a good deal of discussion in the United States. There appears to be a pretty strong public sentiment in favor of the annexation of Hawaii. A bill is now before Congress looking to that result, and President McKinley has declared himself strongly in favor of the scheme. It is, however, doubtful

whether the bill can obtain the endorsement of Congress. Public sentiment too is by no means unanimously in favor of annexation, and a number of influential newspapers are vigorously opposing the scheme. The project is opposed both for political and prudential reasons and on grounds of morality. The Christian Advocate, of New York, contends that the method by which annexation has been brought about will not bear inspection, that the political rights of the people of Hawaii, except a small minority, have been stifled, that the only people on the island who are clamorous for annexation are Americans who constitute but a small part of the population, and have no more moral right to tender these islands to the United States, than the English residents would have to tender them to England or Portuguese to Portugal. The New York Outlook has been asking the opinion of Mr. James Bryce on the wisdom of a policy of territorial acquisition for the United States. Mr. Bryce is very favorably known in the United States as the author of "The American Commonwealth," which The Outlook regards as "the best interpretation both of our institutions and of their practical working which has been issued from the press during the last half century." Mr. Bryce's sympathy with America and American institutions, his ability and breadth of view, and his independent position should entitle his opinions on this subject to great respect. In answer to The Outlook's enquiries, Mr. Bryce says that, on the general question as to the wisdom of territorial acquisition by the United States, there is no general opinion in Great Britain, that in reference to the proposed annexation of Hawaii, the British people would not care one way or the other. "As to the proper policy of the United States toward Cuba, Mr. Bryce says: "It is not for a stranger to say. But if I were an American citizen I would have nothing to do with Cuba, and I should not consider that my country had any special duty toward it." The annexation of Cuba by the United States would be regarded by the British people as taking on a heavy and needless burden.

**As to British Extension as a Precedent.** Another question is propounded: "If the policy of territorial extension by the British has been followed by a corresponding extension of civilization, why might not this hold good with regard to an extension of United States territory?" "To answer this question properly," Mr. Bryce says, "one would have to define civilization. To give savage or backward races our railways and currency and laws is perhaps less of a benefit than we are apt, in the pride of our superiority, to imagine. The only territorial extension by the British which can be regarded with satisfaction is the establishment of the British as colonists in temperate regions, where they are in little or no contact with black or yellow races, and where they can establish self-governing republics, so as to be parts of the English nation, enjoying complete Home Rule. In our tropical dominions where we rule over blacks, some good has been done by stopping slaughter and revolting religious rites among the natives, but these benefits are qualified by some corresponding evils. Ceylon, where the people are peaceful, and Singapore and Hong Kong, which are important trading marts, are the most prosperous of these dominions. In India we have done much which may be regarded with just pride, for the administration is pure and efficient; but whether the people feel themselves happier is doubtful, and the burden of responsibility we have assumed is a tremendous one. Answering your question in regard to the United States, I should think the answer must depend on the kind of territory proposed to be annexed. If you mean Cuba, I doubt if annexation would do much to raise the moral or intellectual civilization of that island. It would, however, stimulate its material and commercial progress. But would it benefit you? Most people think you have already too large a black population on your own continent."

**Reciprocity.** Whatever may be the opinion of the Washington Government and the United States in general, there is no doubt that the business men of Boston and other New England cities are of opinion that great advantage would accrue from a reciprocity of trade between their country and Canada. At the annual meeting of the Boston Board of Trade, held last week, the report on Reciprocity, presented by Mr. George H. Leonard, after stating that the possibility of improvement in trade relations with the Dominion of Canada is looking a little more encouraging each year, and that it is generally conceded that the two countries would be vastly benefited by uniting in one common trade interest, expressed the belief that the opportunity is ripe and the sentiment of both peoples is earnestly in favor of the change, and active measures on the part of the Board are accordingly advised with the aim of securing freer trade relations between the two countries. These opinions, it must be said, seem highly optimistic, not to say chimerical, in view of the habitual attitude of the United States Government on the subject of reciprocity. The report goes on to declare that, no greater duty is demanded of New England today than an earnest effort to establish a treaty of reciprocity with the Dominion of Canada and Newfoundland. Following the report, the following resolutions were read and unanimously adopted:

Whereas, After thirty years of anxious hope for a revival of reciprocal relations with the Dominion of Canada and the Crown Colony of Newfoundland, and believing most thoroughly that reciprocal relations are decidedly for the best interest of New England and the entire United States, and

Whereas, We, the Boston Chamber of Commerce, feeling the great necessity for the development of our natural resources, that we may realize larger and more prosperous business relations with the territory immediately adjoining our own, therefore,

Resolved, That we respectfully represent to the President of the United States the great value to commercial interests of a treaty of reciprocity with the Dominion of Canada and the Crown Colony of Newfoundland, and earnestly petition that such a treaty be negotiated as soon as practicable.

**In the Far East.** Recent public utterances of several British ministers go to confirm the intimations which have been given in news despatches and cabled correspondence to American newspapers, that the government is quite alive to the gravity of the situation in the Far East, and is prepared to take vigorous measures to protect the nation's commercial and political interest in eastern Asia. In a speech delivered at Bristol last Wednesday, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, said that China had approached England for assistance to pay the Japanese indemnity and that the negotiations were still pending. The newspaper statements on the subject he, however, characterized as inaccurate and incomplete. The government was not ashamed of their negotiations, and he believed the country would approve them, but if the negotiations failed, that did not imply that British interests in China would be sacrificed for the advantage of other powers, as Great Britain would then take her stand on existing treaty rights. In a speech made about the same time at Liverpool, Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, Secretary of State for the Colonies, said: "Looking to the certainty that we are likely to be excluded by hostile tariffs from any country where the British flag does not float, our present policy is to take a very firm attitude and to maintain free markets. What the foresight of our ancestors has done for us in building a great empire we must continue to do for our successors. We have a three-fold duty:—First, to keep what rightly belongs to us; second, in Lord Rosebery's admirable words, to 'peg out claims for posterity,' and, third, if anyone tries to rush those claims, gently to prevent him." The latest news from the East at time of writing is that Japan has a fleet of nine war ships, three of which are extremely formidable vessels, prepared to sail in a week into Chinese waters. The St. James Gazette, of London, commenting upon this news, says: "It is almost certain that the destination of the fleet is Wei-Hai-Wei, and there is no doubt the movement means that the status quo in China, so far as Corea and Manchuria are concerned, shall not be altered by Russia or any combination of Russia's allies in defiance of Great Britain and Japan." It is also stated that France is about to send two war ships to China.