

Giving, learning to give cheerfully and bountifully, is part of a Christian education, which is very apt to be neglected by the pupil if not properly looked after by the teacher. And yet the training up a congregation in this essential duty has been very successfully accomplished, and to such a degree, that certain churches have a character quite as marked and distinctive as in the case of individuals noted for their benevolence. We have known congregations where the improvement in this respect has been manifestly attributable to no other cause than the influence of the clergyman, and the resolute, determined, untiring, and fearless manner in which he brought home to the conscience of his people the duty of holding their wealth as a trust from the Almighty, and to be dispensed in his service. And there are others, possessed of just as ample means, whose scale of gifts on all occasions is of the most diminutive order, and whose gold shines only like particles of dust in the sunbeam of avarice. As a general rule, there is need of more boldness and freedom from the pulpit on this theme, and it may be considered as a safe prediction, that so far from frequent calls tending to freeze up the fountains of charity, there is something in the mere act of giving which thaws them out and leaves the heart melted and softened for a new appeal. Every good action tempers the soul with a refining and beneficent influence, purifies it from the dross of worldly and selfish motives, and renders it more readily susceptible than before to the demands of duty, the admonitions of conscience, or the plaintive voice of human suffering.—*Prot. Churchman.*

Provincial Legislature.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY,
MONDAY, March 24.

Hon. Attorney General rose, and intimated his intention to move a resolution, which he held in his hand, embodying the leading feature of an Educational Bill which Government had prepared, viz: assessment of inhabitants of school districts, or sections, to an amount equal to the sum appropriated out of the public funds for the support of common schools severally. If the House affirmed this resolution he would proceed with the Bill founded upon it, otherwise he would at once abandon the Bill. In its essential features the Bill did not differ materially from that which in past time had been framed by an hon. gentleman, not at present in the House, but in whose skill and sound judgment the country had great confidence.—He (the Attorney General) had not the remotest wish to enlarge the powers of the Executive Government by innovating upon the leading features of the old Bill; indeed, the measure which Government proposed to lay before Parliament presented no striking novelty, and hardly one perfectly new feature. He trusted that hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House would approach the discussion of the resolution, and take up the Bill, not in the spirit of party, but with strictly conscientious regard for the all-important subject—a subject undeniably involving considerations of paramount importance to the future well-being of this people—this whole people. In the opinion of Government the time had arrived when assessment—partial assessment—for the support of Common Schools, (at present it was proposed to confine the application of the principle to Common Schools,) might and should be made compulsory,—this was the leading feature of the Bill which he had prepared with much care and deliberation. The Bill would contain a clause providing for separate Schools, but this was necessary, due regard being had to satisfy conscientious scruples entertained by a certain section of that House, and a very large proportion of the whole population of the Province. He was of opinion, however, that such Schools would not be many—perhaps not over thirty in all the Counties. He trusted in the sound discretion of a majority at least of that House to adopt the resolution and permit the Bill to go to a Select Committee, where the details might be carefully revised, and the measure, so matured, be submitted to the House for its calm and deliberate action. He was afraid to speak of party or of party action in this matter. If treated as a party measure, the Bill would, he knew, be lost; the defeat, however, would not touch the Government. He again implored the House to approach the question as one of great magnitude, touching the common weal of this whole people.

Mr. Munroe would go for the proposed measure if he could see that we were to better our condition, as a people, in an educational point of view. He should like to be assured that the Schools which it was contemplated to support by direct taxation were to be in reality free-schools, where all the children in a district or section might be educated without additional cost in the shape of fees for tuition, &c. If it were not so, the measure was but a sham.

The Hon. Attorney General explained the extent to which it was proposed that Common Schools should be free.

Mr. McLellan was glad to hear the principle of assessment for Common Schools again introduced. It had long been a favorite principle with him, equally so as was the ballot, which he hoped yet to live to see introduced into Parliament and carried. For years education had been going backwards in Nova

Scotia. Whatever other improvements had been introduced, educational improvement was not among them. Why was this? For the want of a will, or for want of a way? Where there was a will, there was a way. If the poor of the country, had not the means to educate their children, the Legislature should step in and help them. In Nova Scotia there was no lack of means—only the will was wanting. [The hon. gentleman enforced an argument in favor of a broad system of popular education by pertinent illustrations, but in a style so peculiarly his own as to forbid an attempt to do them adequate justice in our report.]

Dr. Tupper had, after hearing the speech from the Throne, expected that Government would come down to the House with an educational measure matured—a measure well digested in all its details—and submit it on their own responsibility, for the action of the House. Government had failed so to do; and this could not have been the case were Ministers entitled, in respect, intelligence, and a knowledge of the wants and requirements of this people, to the confidence of the country.

He (Doctor Tupper) was not opposed to the application of the principle of assessment for the support of a system of popular education, but was clearly of opinion that the time had not arrived when resort might be properly had to it by the Government of this Province. Taxation and Representation should go hand in hand, but in the face of this sound constitutional maxim, the Hon. Attorney General had opposed the Counties Incorporation Bill introduced by the hon. member for Annapolis.

[Attorney General.—Not only in so far as it was proposed to make its acceptance compulsory, leaving it to the people themselves to say, whether they would accept or reject it.]

Well, the Hon. Attorney General had not given that bill that full measure of support which might have been expected of him; and, in his (Dr. Tupper's) view it would not be for the interest of his people to adopt the principle of taxation for the support of Schools until they had local self-government in their counties, respectively. This bill would in effect vastly increase and extend the influence of the Executive government,—one of its provisions went to create several hundred offices, every one of which would be in the gift of the Executive Government,—the Executive was already sufficiently strong and powerful enough to be felt and feared, in the dispensation of patronage, and now that the country was aware of the exclusive principle upon which it would be meted out in the future, it was at least prudent to pause before that power was increased by an act of the people's representatives.

[The hon. gentleman proceeded to fortify his position by reference to certain cases in which the Executive was assumed to have dealt arbitrarily by certain parties, School Commissioners, &c., in the County of Cumberland, and concluded by intimating his intention though not opposed to the principle of assessment, to vote against the regulation.]

Mr. Tobin was pleased to learn that the Government did not propose, by their bill, to separate religious from secular instruction in any class of schools. Catholics could not conscientiously or consistently be parties to carrying any measure in which such separation was contemplated and provided for. The parent, the clergyman, and the schoolmaster should work together, and strive, by imparting religious as well as useful knowledge to make of our children intelligent and worthy citizens. He attributed (upon the very highest authority) the undoubted march of crime, in this day and generation, to the march of what was termed "Popular education"—a system of instruction which divorced religion from education, this was eminently the case in the United States, the educational system of which it was the fashion so much to applaud.

[The hon. gentleman proceeded to read lengthy extracts from—(the reporter did not catch the title of the work), explanatory of the actual state of education in the United States, and showing the proportion that educated criminals actually bore to uneducated—the balance being against the educated.]

The question was—"Had crime increased proportionately with the advance of secular education?" It had; at least tables of statistics—both English and American—seemed to bear out this inference. The hon. gentleman concluded by saying that he should vote for the resolution.

Mr. Wade would be glad to learn of the hon. member for Cumberland whether, as he intended to vote against the resolution, it would be because of objection to the principle of assessment, or of the fact of its having emanated from the Government?

Dr. Tupper had already stated that he was not opposed to the principle of assessment. He intended to vote against the resolution, but not simply because of its having originated with the Government. His opposition to the bill was that it should have been preceded by enactment of the bill, or some such bill as the hon. member for Annapolis had introduced for incorporation of counties. [The hon. gentleman was not heard by reporter very distinctly.]

Hon. Mr. Johnston (not clearly audible in the gallery) was understood to ask the hon. the Attorney General, with what assurance of a favorable response could he (the Attorney General) require a denounced minority to agree to tax their friends in order to strengthen a Government in which they had no confidence? However, he (Mr. Johnston) had no insuperable objection to let the bill go to a select committee; nevertheless, under any circumstances, he should oppose the passage of the bill, unless it were preceded by an act

establishing municipal corporations, generally, throughout the Province—the only way (considering the avowed policy of the party and government in power, touching the distribution of patronage,) in which the country could be emancipated. The bill went to create some four hundred offices, the incumbents of which, every one of them, would be obliged to support the Government.

Hon. Attorney General—This is matter of detail. The bill, after having undergone revision, in so far as might appear desirable to the select committee, must pass through the committee of the whole House, open to amendment in every stage and clause.

Mr. Marshall objected that the wording of more than one clause of the bill was, to say the least, ambiguous. The clause which gave Government the entire patronage under the bill, he could understand,—it read clearly enough. But what, he wished to be informed, was meant by "the assessment becoming inoperative," &c.? There were other clauses which did not read very intelligibly.—[The hon. gentleman was understood to say, in substance, that he should vote against the resolution; for apart from other considerations, he did not believe the principle of assessment, as proposed to be applied by the bill, would be effective. The working of the machinery of the bill would not be smooth, or satisfactory to the country.]

Hon. Mr. Wier reminded the hon. member for Guysborough that they were not then discussing the bill in detail, but simply a resolution propounding the principle upon which the bill was constructed. It would be the duty of the special committee to pass every clause of the bill, in review, and reject altogether, or amend, as might be resolved by the committee to be expedient.

Mr. Wilkins insisted that the duty of the Government was to have come down to Parliament, not with a crude, but with a perfectly matured measure. A paragraph in the speech at the opening of the session had led the House and the country to expect as much at the hands of Ministers, and not that they would bring down an imperfect bill, and ask for a special committee to help them to make it presentable to the House. What he (Mr. Wilkins) wanted was a matured measure, the production of the Government.

Hon. Attorney General—Well, sir, here you have it—a well considered measure.

Mr. Wilkins dissented.

At the close of a conversation, carried on in a low tone of voice, in which the Hon. Mr. Johnston, the Hon. the Attorney General, the Solicitor General, Mr. Munroe, and other gentlemen took part, the resolution subjoined, as amended with the consent of the Leader of the Government, was put and carried:

Whereas, the principle of assessment is the only permanent foundation for the Common School Education of the Country—and as this principle is the leading feature of the measure now under consideration, and the details may be modified and improved,

Resolved therefore, that the Bill, entitled an Act for the better encouragement of Education, be referred to a select committee with instructions to consider the same and report thereon, by a short day.

Which being seconded and passed, and the House dividing thereon, there appeared for the Resolution 37, against it 9.

For the Resolution.—McDonald, Killam, Hyde, Brown, Robertson, Archibald, McFarlane, Moses, Esson, Tobin, McKenzie, Munroe, Parker, Bill, Johnston, McLellan, Geldart, Marshall, Bent, Locke, White, McLearn, Wilkins, Tupper, At. General, Morrison, Chambers, Thorne, Sol. General, Anand, Whitman, Wade, Prov. Secretary, Mariell, Wier, Fin. Secretary, Dimock. Against it.—Richard, Webster, Bourneuf, Campbell, C. Campbell, Smyth, Bailey, Ryder, Robichau.

So it passed in the affirmative.

News Department.

From Papers by Steamer Arabia, March 1.

COADJUTOR BISHOPS.

Pamphlets and articles have been written, discussions have been held, and grave reports have been issued, all tending to prove the propriety and importance of satisfying the desire very generally entertained for some aid to the notorious incapacity of two or three (at least) among the present members of the English Episcopate. Whether this could legally be done—or, if it could, by whose authority, and under what conditions—seemed to be matters of no small doubtfulness and difficulty. On a sudden we learn from the Gazette that, for the Colonial Church at least, a very easy solution has been found. A coadjutor to the Bishop of Jamaica has been appointed by one of those exercises of the prerogative which Whig statesmen have always been so ready to venture upon, whilst they declaimed about the liberty of the subject and the sovereignty of the people. Such acts, unprecedented and unexplained, are apt to raise a spirit of opposition, as Ministers have found in the case of the Wensleydale peerage, which the motives, perhaps, of their authors, and the effect of the proceedings themselves, would never have called forth. The Bishopric of Kingston may, possibly, in the confused state of Church law in the colonies, escape animadversion; or may fail to furnish objectors with any technical grounds for disputing the legality of its creation. Not not the