

to their beloved sovereign, accepted them almost to a man, and began their preparations for departure. The Commissioners claimed a year from the time the people were called upon to make the choice, and the favor was granted. The fact of their contending for only one year showed that their understanding agreed with the language of the treaty.

The year passed and no transports appeared. The King was perhaps satisfied with the love of his subjects, and could afford to be careless of their presence in his domains. Perhaps the authorities in Cape Breton began to see a better supply for their garrison in the fat of the Acadian fiske-lands than in the dry bones of the soil about Louisburg. The Acadians could easily have betaken themselves thither, without the aid of the King's transports. The few who did so gradually made their way back again. The others blamed the English for not providing them with vessels. Possibly the English, like Pharaoh with the Israelites, could not afford to let them go; certainly they were not bound to furnish the means, and it was extremely unlikely that, in the absence of other colonists, they would willingly aid in depopulating the country.

What a situation! The Acadians would not take the oath, and they would not, or could not, go; the French openly told them to go, and secretly urged them to stay; the English entreated them to do one thing or the other, and could not, or would not, make them do either.

Each successive governor tried to solve the problem, but in vain. Excuses for evasion of the order multiplied as the years went on. At first, fealty to the King of France was thought sufficient reason for refusing it to Queen Anne. Once the deputies could not take any decided steps because they were waiting to see whether James the Third was about to be restored to the throne of his ancestors. The next time they were ready to do everything required of them, if only they might have assurance of protection from the Indians. Not till 1727, however, does the well-known claim of neutrality appear to have been made, or even thought of. In that year George the First died; and as the words heirs and successors had been omitted from the oath taken to him, in accordance with the spirit of the Act of Settlement, which made each new sovereign a creation of Parliament, it became necessary to exact a promise of fealty to his successor. All his subjects were required to take it, Protestant and Catholic, English and French alike. At Annapolis the habitants refused it through their deputies. At Mines and Chignecto an officer named Wroth, on his own responsibility, and after "seriously weighing their Demands and not judging them repugnant to Treatys, Acts of Parliament and Trade," granted them as an indulgence—"That they should in no way be obliged to take up arms against any one whatsoever, and without obligation in what regards war." This unauthorized concession on the part of Wroth, though immediately repudiated by the council, furnished the basis upon which the Acadians subsequently claimed exemption from any other oath. Governor Philips, in 1730, also succeeded, in some mysterious way, in obtaining the oath from the majority of the inhabitants. He was accused of making a similar concession, but unless he was a deliberate liar, his own words refute the charge. He says, "I have done nothing contrary to orders, as has been done by one Eusign Wroth of my regiment." It has also been suggested that the form of the oath: "I promise and swear on the faith of a Christian that I will be thoroughly faithful and will truly obey His Majesty King George III," cunningly interpreted by the priests to mean "a simple promise of fidelity without saying to whom," may have brought about the compliance; though it is hard to see how even Jesuitic ingenuity could compass a plan for being faithful to King Louis and obeying King George at the same time.

Whatever may be the facts, however, concerning the alleged condition granted, it is certain that an unqualified oath of allegiance to the British sovereign, as clearly demanded by the terms of the treaty, was never taken by the Acadians at any time during the whole period from 1713-1755. It is therefore equally certain, aside from the charges of treachery and open rebellion, that their claims to the rights of British subjects were forfeited, and that the government was bound to take some action in respect to them.

That which brought the government face to a close and opened the tragedy of the people, however, was determined not so much by the government, as by the course of the larger affairs of the continent. At that time French power in America was at its height. Canada, with the fortress of Quebec at its heart, seemed impregnable. All the water-ways from the Gulf of St. Lawrence to the mouth of the Mississippi were guarded by French forts. The English had been kept east of the Alleghenies, and driven back from their former vantage-ground on Lake Champlain. In Acadia there was a struggle going on to bring the French boundary down to the very sea-coast. The prospect for England was dark, and no one at that day could possibly have foretold the wonderful change that was so soon to follow. In the very year in which the expulsion took place, four English expeditions were planned against Canada, three of which were utter failures. Braddock's defeat at Fort Duquesne on the Ohio was felt to be an especially heavy blow, and the disaster seemed irretrievable. In Nova Scotia, as elsewhere, the situation was critical. Fort Beauséjour, on the Isthmus, was a constant menace, as was also Louisburg in Cape Breton. The priests were

intriguing more busily than ever, the Indians were at their usual work of plundering and scalping, and the Acadians were growing more openly hostile. But unexpected relief came in the fall of Beauséjour before English troops; and the French, though checked for the moment only, were obliged to retire from the Isthmus. This was the "favorable opportunity" which Governor Lawrence utilized for stamping out the rebellion forever. The troops at his disposal would soon be withdrawn; his garrison, small in number and poorly equipped, would be left to face the danger of being overpowered at any moment by a hostile population, ready, in the words of their leaders, "to take up arms at the first opportunity." The English settlers, too, were in danger, and justice demanded that they should be protected. From the military standpoint it would have been the height of folly not to take advantage of the temporary discomfiture of the French. For the last time the Acadians were offered the usual terms. Their refusal was more emphatic than ever. Orders were then given for their removal to the other English colonies. It seems strange that the expedient of sending them to France was not thought of, since a monarch to whom they had been so faithful would doubtless have been ready to receive them with open arms.

For the sake of comparison, it is interesting to know what King Louis himself would have done in the emergency. Not very many years before, the Governor of Canada received instructions from the King for a descent upon the Atlantic colonies, in which Boston and New York were to be taken and burned, and the whole country subdued and laid waste. The scheme was not one of retaliation, but of ambition and aggression. The Governor's instructions as to the disposal of the inhabitants were explicit: "If there are any Catholics among them, let them remain, first exacting the oath of fidelity. Keep as prisoners, if you think fit, such mechanics and other laborers as you may need to cultivate land or work on the fortifications. Imprison all officers and such of the principal inhabitants as may be able to pay ransom. As regards all the rest of the inhabitants, men, women, and children, send them out of the country, scatter them in New England, Pennsylvania, and other distant places (!), by land or by sea, together or separately. Disperse them in such a way that they cannot get together again to form any enterprise against the colony."

It is in similar artless communications that the clue to the Acadian puzzle lies. The letters of French agents, civil, military, and religious, throw a flood of light on the scope and methods of the power that lay behind the wills of the simple people in its grasp. The governors of Louisburg suggested the answers "to demands for the oath; the priests of the Acadians taught them that fidelity to King Louis meant fidelity to God, and that allegiance to King George was equivalent to eternal perdition; while the Governor of Canada and his officers furnished opportunities for active hostilities that were often too tempting or too powerful to resist. In short, the Acadians were used as a lever in the intended overthrow of English power in the province. The King himself was not ashamed to lend countenance to the scheme; and his ministers of religion regarded their part in it as the highest service they could render for the glory of God. The DuVivier memorial of 1735 shows what success they had met with at that period. "The people are very numerous. They have preserved their hope of returning to their allegiance to the King. We may be assured of the affections of the savages of the country. The missionaries are incessant in keeping them in the disposition they feel for France. One may reckon on the zeal of the inhabitants and of the greater part of the savages." Again in 1745, the French official report for the year states that "all, except a very small portion, are desirous of returning under French dominion. Sieur Marin assures us that they will not hesitate to take up arms as soon as they see themselves at liberty to do so."

When Le Loutre, the famous Micmac missionary came on the scene, still more questionable means were resorted to in the interests of the approaching struggle for French supremacy. On the side of the English there were all the signs of an awakened interest in the province, and of a determination to ensure its future possession. To the mind of Le Loutre there was need of correspondingly increased activity on the part of the French. In a letter to La Jonquière, the Governor of Canada, he says: "I think nothing better can be done than to excite the savages to go to war with the English. Such is the course I will take for the good of the State and for religion, and I will do my best to make it appear to the English that this design has its origin with the savages, and that I have nothing to do with it." La Jonquière gave the scheme his fullest sanction, and advised also that "some Acadians should join the Indians and assist them in their enterprises, and if caught and hanged, it could be said that they followed their own impulse." The King and his minister added their approval, and generously sent a number of medals to decorate the most deserving savages. La Jonquière furnishes proof that Acadians led or accompanied the Indian raids, and that La Loutre received 1800 livres from France to distribute as prizes for scalps.

Enough has been said to show that French priests, and French civil and military officers, acting as political agents for the French government, were responsible for the bad faith of the Acadians. At the same time the British home government deserves censure for its long and shameful neglect of the province. In spite of the representations of the Nova Scotian authorities, it failed to realize the value of its acquisition, and the only garrison in the heart of a disaffected country was left for years in such a condition as must have incurred contempt, and encouraged the belief that the British dared not enforce their demands. The clemency upon which so much stress has been laid, proceeding as it did as much from weakness as from kindness, is rather to be regretted than admired. The weak indulgence that distinguished English colonial policy in Acadia only served to bring into stronger relief the harshness of the measure to which the Government was at last forced to resort.

Notes of Rev. H. R. Hatch's.

Introductory Service in the Baptist Church, Wolfville, Sabbath, March, 20th.

(BY REV. D. O. PARKER.)

Rev. H. R. Hatch arrived in town on the 17th inst., and is domiciled at the Royal. His family are expected

about the first of April, and will at once warm up the parsonage. On Sabbath morning he entered upon his ministerial work with an introductory service quite out of the ordinary course. After the usual preliminaries, he said he would speak without a text, since, in their new relation as pastor and people there were things he wished to emphasize that were not in the line of any appropriate text. He uses no notes in the pulpit, and enters upon this duties under the most auspicious omens, and doubtless will prove a worthy successor of his much esteemed predecessors. He said:

The things of which I wish to speak this morning bear no logical connection one with another, for I have chosen them on account of their connection with this day—the first Sunday of our relationship as pastor and people. Furthermore, while I trust that all I may have to say may be scriptural in the truest sense, yet I know of no one passage of scripture that would do service as a text for my remarks, consequently I have not taken any text, for I believe it is better not to take a text than to use one simply as a motto and not refer to it again after mentioning it. The Word of God is abused again and again in this way, and I am frank to confess that preachers are culpable for such abuse of the Bible: I once heard a minister preach on "The Bicycle, its use and Influence" and he found his text in Nahum, in the verse, "The chariots rage in the streets, they jostle one against another in the broad ways; the appearance of them is like torches." (Nah. 2:4 R. V.) We dishonor God and his Word of truth by such a use of scripture.

I. The first thing of which I wish to speak is The Apparent Providence which has brought us into this relation of pastor and people. In connection with this thought allow me to bring to your attention the words of Joseph when he made himself known to his brethren, "Be not grieved, nor angry with yourselves that you sold me hither, for God did send me before you to preserve life. . . . So now it was not you that sent me hither, but God." Joseph recognized their agency in his going down into Egypt. It was they—his brothers—who sold him to the Midianitish merchants. But as he looks back and thinks anew about his life in Pharaoh's kingdom, and remembers how God had graciously given him favor at court and power over the people, he understands the meaning of all that past. God was in it. God was at the centre of things, shaping events, controlling circumstances, over-ruling conditions to work out just what he had worked out.

Few of us will deny the truth of these words of this godly man, for we all, I think, believe that Joseph was quite right, God did indeed send him to Egypt for a purpose that was far-reaching. But when we come to apply this principle of Divine Providence in its broadest fashion, we sometimes fail to see just how it applies to our own experiences. I know while we are passing through our experiences it is hard to find God's hand, if those experiences are full of perplexity. Probably Joseph, when he made his journey to Egypt, had difficulty in determining just how slavery and captivity were Providential. But a belief in Providence, that brings hope and courage to the heart, does not mean that we must see clearly God's purpose respecting ourselves. It means a faith in God as concerned in us, and in ourselves as having intimate relation with God's plans.

Last summer, after finishing my work at Newton Seminary, I went to Chicago, planning to spend this present year there in further preparation for the teacher's office. As I was making my final arrangements, matters took such a turn, through sickness, that the way to Chicago was hedged up. I cast about in my mind for an explanation of this hedging-up, and after prayer and meditation, I decided that my work was in the active service of the pastorate. Then came a period of waiting during which my constant prayer was,—O God! Lead me whithersoever thou wouldst have me go—only guide me and light the way before me! Your invitation came asking me to spend a month with you. You had hardly heard of me. I came, confident in the faith that if my work was to be here you and I would know it—and know it clearly. All this time you, too, had been praying to be led aright, praying for a pastor, and for some reason had been waiting until now. You have asked me to become your pastor and I have accepted. Are these things mere coincidences? mere happenings? mere chance combinations of events? or is there some infinite intelligence who has been working? and is this a part of his plan for your life and mine? With all my heart I believe that such a Providence, mysterious, inexplicable, infinite, has brought us together; and in the strength of that faith, with all the hope and courage it gives me, I take up my abode with you as your pastor and may God, our Lord, bless our union.

But not only should we look for marked Providences, we should also learn to find the hand of our Father in the experiences of each day. We should constantly be interpreting our life and work with reference to God. We should find God at the very centre of our existence, in all and over all. He is the Almighty Father, and if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without his notice, sure it must be that he has concern for all our life—in its crises and in its hum one word drum routine, too.

You will remember that one of the names of Jesus is

Immanuel—"God with more and put into it cause he brings God our life.

II. My second point have already said, to the Preacher.

I have been situated to visit and to preach the opportunity of the ences upon me. The his congregation in know their influence preacher when he ap undercurrent of com tween the pen and th this influence strong the people have spok brought them. But me little, or nothing garding any helpfu "Good preaching," reciprocity; "that is bility for good preach touching poor preach If the preacher loo

he sees dull and sleep different and inattent conditions will reap conditions exist in seen also in the audien you came to church which you came, affect then the preacher.

I am persuaded that the preacher should preach presumably a ful word as touching looks into eager expect uplift and his heart and

I am persuaded that least of those who pray secondly, one of prayer who lost his prayer-book with evident power, b power. His deacons w sible, what the trouble lost his prayer-book. pastor should use a p didn't suppose he used somewhat as follows: church were all praying and in answer to your p You were my prayer-bo ing for me, and I have power. Brethren, you the result of our work prayers for the Divine want to lose my prayer-pastor in your morning Sunday morning and d in the Spirit of that pray pathetic influence that excepted—will help me may have for your heart

III. Allow me to speak of the Congregation attitude of the congrega large sense the attitude t worship is larger than in sorts on a Sunday morn the cheery good mornin church he passes a neigh vestibule of the church h a Christian handshake, a his seat among the worsh his feelings and the fe suffers.

Moreover, there is no God counters and yard-st in order to make the ho chanlise; no need to bri implements in order to need to parade cares and the brethren in order to spirit of God. All one n these things and the wor and so far as he influence sure and a deception.

The preacher, we're tol of his study behind him w must strive to be in the S must the individual wor your bank account. Quit mathematics, in social life, theology. Quit thinking Quit thinking about Mond shopping and Friday's soci the cares of the world—let meditation upon God. L your heart and then the b the very gate of heaven to and a vision of God—of Chr will fill the hearts of Go hope and peace.