

mutual improvement afford them opportunities, not till lately within their reach, and many are wisely profiting by them. The school-houses of recent erection are generally better constructed, and more fully and commodiously furnished, than those of older standing. The book, authorized, and now generally introduced, are better adapted for the cultivation of the intellect than those formerly used. All this speaks favorably for our excellent and rapidly advancing country.

The Irish national series of school books, so far as the writer is acquainted with it, is good. A mass of valuable information is compressed in these books, and, so far as he is aware, they contain nothing to which any can reasonably object on social, moral, or religious grounds. This constitutes one feature of the excellence of these books, and the history of their compilation, know the care taken to render them perfect in this respect. They are well adapted for the cultivation of the intellectual nature, but one must be spared from giving them the character of being well fitted for the cultivation of our moral nature. This is not designed by them. It is not affirmed that there are no moral lessons contained in these reading-books, while it is evident that the lessons containing scripture texts, and history, are likely enough to impress the heart, or to lead the pupil to draw strong moral deductions from them. But a good education must have a relation—not to a part only—but to the whole moral being, and bear fully on the physical, mental, and moral nature.

Another volume needs to be used in our common schools, to complete the means by which a good education may be obtained. The writer would appeal to parents and guardians; to trustees and teachers, in behalf of this volume, containing the whole word of God. This book has its just and proper place in many of our schools, but it is denied its own room in many others. From some, it is excluded merely because the teacher wishes to add to the number of his classes; from others, from mere apathy—and care; and from others, by design, supported by various considerations. Were the inspired volume a book of sectarian character, such as the symbols recognized by various denominations, then, by all means, let it be excluded—but it is not. To that holy book, all who profess Christianity, avow their adherence. Each one declares solemnly he believes it to be the word of God, infallible and authoritative in its doctrines and precepts. In the fullest sense, the writer respects the rights of conscience; and by no means does he wish to see sectarian jealousies excited; but he also dissents from the expediency of separate sectarian schools. It is difficult for him to believe, that no sinister, unavowed motive operates in the hearts of those who clamour for it. He affirms that the use of the scriptures in our schools affords no just cause, either for sectarian jealousies. And why? Because he is fully satisfied and assured that the scriptures contained in the Old and New Testaments, are the word of God. Then, what cause of offence! Do some say, "we do not approve of the common English version." It might be asked, have you a version of which you do approve? Then, by all means, let your families use it; but do not expect to find fault with those who employ the liberty, which both the law of the land and the law of God fully authorize.

But it becomes a proper question: In what manner are the scriptures to be read in our schools? The writer would say, without note or comment. Teachers, in most instances, loudly exert themselves, by varied illustration and examination, to enable their pupils to understand the subject of their lessons; but, for obvious reasons, they cannot be permitted to do so with the scripture lesson. But who would deny a teacher such a privilege as to call the attention of his class, occasionally, to what they read. For example—in the lesson contained in Eph. vi. 1, 2, 3—might he not say—my class—who do you observe that these verses teach you? Or the lesson might be Matt. xii. 6, 7, 8, and 9. It might be proper to call their attention, permit a pupil to read, and inquire what the Lord God would be his own word, and by it impress the youthful soul. Still, this, on the part of the teacher, is no attempt to explain or illustrate the passage.

Can such lessons be found in any other book than the scriptures? Have we any class book fitted in any way to cultivate the highest moral affections? But it is not to be denied, with the parents and ministers that teach the scriptures? But the common school is not the place for teaching religion. Well, admit that many parents, and all ministers do so, can this avail for the want of such a knowledge to youths attending school? It is well known, that many parents do not direct the minds of their children at all to the word of God, and that but few of these children come under the influence of scripture training, and the heart remains uneducated. It is unnecessary to attempt to depict the woeful consequences of this great evil to themselves, or to the community. Many of these, however, may receive a moderate share of intellectual culture, but though this should be of a superior order, experience proves that such training alone cannot make a good man.

Is it necessary to pass from a limited field of observation to an extensive one, to prevent our minds from the evil of prejudice? Do so. Contemplate the moral aspect of those countries, in which, though the word of God may be nominally regarded, yet it is not given to the young, nor sought after by the aged. There you see immorality luxuriating in licentiousness. In their political conditions, you see men down-trodden by despotism—the yoke of oppression galling, that naughty, though but despicable—their souls crushed, their souls rendered barren—a few noble spirits are again crushed, and a cruel death-grasp crushes innocent liberty in its birth; and all this deepened and perpetuated under the dark gloom of a soul-destroying superstition. Consider all this in the light of eternity, and let your thought remain untold.

What has elevated the Anglo-Saxon race, and committed the blessings

of liberty, to a vastly greater extent than to any other tribe under the sun? Other nations are intellectually enlightened, as well as those which comprise that race, but in respect of liberty, of enterprise, and of morals, these nations are far from standing in comparison. And what portion of the favored Anglo-Saxon race bears on a dead weight on that portion which would at this hour be better employed in other and nobler doing? It is that class which neglects the bible in the family, in the school, and in the sanctuary—who treat not God and regards not man.

If we truly wish well to ourselves, to our families, to our neighbors, and to mankind, we must unite our influence to retain the scriptures in the hands of our youth. But we shall fail to obtain this, if we do not keep the bible out of our common schools. It is well to secure equal rights to ourselves and to see every man, without regard to his origin or creed, that he feel, the bible is the true palladium of liberty—it must be found in the hands of the youth. In order to this, let it be read in all our schools.

We look for peace and good will prevailing among men—for the nations of the world becoming as one family. To hasten this period, by appointed means, circulate the bible, read the bible, and live under its influence. Thus the heart will influence the head, and direct the whole conduct. We shall possess a good education—an education valuable in time, and preparatory for eternity. J. S. L.

[FOR THE CANADIAN PRESBYTERIAN MAGAZINE.]

In the last No. of *The Magazine*, the Rev. James Dick, of Richmond Hill, in his notice headed "Our Church progress and self-support"—also giving an account of the statistics of the Presbytery of Toronto—very interesting and stimulating indeed, and calculated to induce a spirit of emulation into our Presbyteries and congregations—in that part of his statue cast representation against which I take exception, says, "There is another subject to which our attention may be properly directed: it is the duty of self-support. It is evident from the report of the Committee on Missions, published in our Oct. No. of the *Presbyterian Magazine*, that the United Presbyterian Church in Canada is not yet a self-supporting Church. The liberality of the parent Church in Scotland is very great, and our need or meanness is equal to her generosity. "There has been received and distributed to five ministers, without charges, the sum of £352, which gives an average of £70 per annum to each minister—enough in such circumstances to be more than sufficient to defray the want of congregational contributions were not contributing anything at some of them are certainly not contributing much, or these sums would not be drawn from the funds. We must have retrenchment in this department, or we can expect nothing but evil."

If the above statement means, as I can infer no other meaning from it, that £70 per annum to each settled minister in our present dependent circumstances, is a sufficiently comfortable living. Then, if so applied, say, distinctly affirmed, that ministers without charges can, and ought to live upon less than settled ministers.

Now, this statement, in point of fact, is incorrect as an estimate by experience and trial, and moreover, neither can I understand how the mere circumstance of a minister not being settled, obliges him, either upon charity or principle, to live upon less than a settled minister. How should the former, who endures equal, if not more labour and fatigue for the benefit of the Mission generally, be satisfied with £70, while others who are doing nothing more in point of usefulness in the Mission field, nor subjected to greater expenditure, should be receiving £100?

This is manifestly not the proper way for the former the *Firstborn* were to be most liberally supported, placing them beyond every thing but anxiety and embarrassment. And with regard to the latter, the gospel neither warrants nor encourages any such invidious and arbitrary distinctions, as the principle stated, and if duly acted out by Mr. Dick, would necessarily originate.

Who will say, but Mr. Dick himself, that £70 currency, whatever be our exchange with Missions, is itself a sufficient support for any minister, whether he be single or otherwise, settled or unsettled? Whether would it be greater meanness for us as a Church to receive the very necessary and most generous grant of the Home Synod, or for our Synod in the extent of their charity, to set aside such a generous grant, and allow their preachers and ministers, unsettled and weak congregations, to content with embarrassment and poverty the best way they can?

I shall leave the author of the above statement to consider the difficulty the best way he can. I can say, for one, that I cannot and will not live upon £70.

It seems to me that the above spirit and principle are at direct variance with the truly admirable address emitted by the Home Synod on this very point, and which is contained in the last number of *The Magazine*, as well as directly opposed to the spirit and letter of the Synod's injunction, where he says "bear ye one another's burdens," &c. It seems to me that the above statement, against which exception is hereby taken, has been penned by Mr. Dick subsequent to his perusal of the Synodical address of the Home Synod adverted to—by the members of the United Presbyterian Church on the more liberal support of the gospel ministry. "We must be retrenching, and poverty shall begin." How far must it extend? If Mr. Dick chooses himself to cast in his lot with the rest of the 70-pounders,—I mean, by sharing with them whatever he receives over and above £70, I pledge myself to be the first to stand by him.