

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur
- Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée
- Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque
- Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur
- Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents
- Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure
- Blank leaves added during restoration may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming/
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.
- Additional comments:/
Commentaires supplémentaires:

- Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur
- Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées
- Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- Pages detached/
Pages détachées
- Showthrough/
Transparence
- Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression
- Continuous pagination/
Pagination continue
- Includes index(es)/
Comprend un (des) index
- Title on header taken from: /
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:
- Title page of issue/
Page de titre de la livraison
- Caption of issue/
Titre de départ de la livraison
- Masthead/
Général (périodiques) de la livraison

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below/
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	12X	14X	16X	18X	20X	22X	24X	26X	28X	30X	32X
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						

THE GOSPEL TRIBUNE, AND CHRISTIAN COMMUNIONIST,

A
Monthly Interdenominational Journal.

VOLUME III.]

DECEMBER, 1856.

[NUMBER 8.

"ONE IS YOUR MASTER, even CHRIST: AND ALL YE ARE BRETHEREN."

Moral and Religious Miscellany.

From the Wesleyan Missionary Notices for November.

NORWAY HOUSE.

Extract of a letter from the Rev. T. Hurlburt, Chairman, dated
Rossille, Dec. 11th, 1855.

In again reporting the state of this Mission, we render unfeigned thanks to the God of all our mercies for continued health, with the many other blessings we enjoy; but above all for the measure of spiritual favours graciously given to us.

We have on our Church books the names of 135, including three on trial. Some of them give evidence of deep piety, while there are others whom we fear are only nominally Christians. We are laboring to lead them on in a godly manner.

There are not so many at home this winter as last, but those we have here are comfortable in regard to means of living. There were three new and very comfortable houses finished off last fall. Fish were abundant and good, and rabbits swarmed in all the region. The other day I saw one of our brethren bring in forty, the avails of one day's hunt; and another, an old woman, showed me a pile of about thirty she had brought in that day. In addition to plenty of good food, we have a general time of health, and are living in peace, and many, I trust, are walking in the comforts of the Holy Ghost.

Our present school-house—the printing office—is well arranged and very comfortable. Miss Adams has an average attendance of thirty-five, but she has the names of fifty on her school register for this winter. The attendance of the larger scholars is not regular, as they are often absent to get wood, or to go with their parents and friends for rabbits. Last Sabbath I counted forty-nine present at the Sabbath school. In summer we have more. Some memorise portions of scripture, while the younger ones are exercised in the catechisms, never omitting the Ten Commandments.

We are sadly in want of school books. For the last two years none have been received. There are a few bibles and testaments still remaining, with a few other tattered school books. There are a good many old periodicals about the premises, such as "Juvenile Offerings," &c., &c., &c.; any or all of which Miss A. uses when she can find enough of the same numbers to form a class. With these, slates, and some writing books, she manages to keep both herself and the children busy. On account of this destitution of books, notwithstanding Miss A. is indefatigable in her attention to her duties, still it is impossible to do justice to the school. Had we paper we could print school books for ourselves.

Enclosed I send you a copy of the Ten Commandments which I have just published here, both in the Syllabic and Roman characters. Our elder people,

with thousands in the woods, read the former, and our school children the latter. I hope it may be a step towards inducing our people to use the Roman character.

This is my first effort at printing. I found the type much mixed, and I had the task of examining one by one more than 10,000, and arranging them in order. Then I had to learn the art of setting them. The first day I set about 300, and was in all haste to exhibit some proof of my skill on paper, but I found so many strange mistakes that I began to question whether I had not lost my senses. The next day I set at the rate of 3000. I then had another difficulty; we had neither rollers, black ball, nor anything of the kind. I studied long and experimented much, and now have rollers that answer, as you see, and that without cost, except my own labour. I struck off about 300 copies, and have pasted some of them on boards, and hung up one in every house in our village. I now feel able to print any thing we want in our missions, either in Chippeway or Cree, in the Syllabic or Roman character. If you will but furnish us with paper, ink, and cheap binding materials, it will prevent me ever having any idle time on my hands. You will observe that the space occupied by both characters is about the same. This is contrary to my former statement. I now learn, for the first time, that in the edition of the Gospel according to St. John, published here, the lines are separated by some "fixings," of which I know not the name; this, with the width of the margins, led me into the error above mentioned.

If we print much we must have the printing office solely for that purpose, and this will render it necessary to build a new school house. On our arrival here, we found the old school house torn down, it being too much decayed to be longer used. All the boards were disposed of to Mr. Mason. We require a school house for about seventy-five scholars, with an apartment in it for a work-room for the women and girls, where Miss A. could teach them all the branches of industry desirable in their circumstances. This is the nearest approach to an industrial school that the exigencies of his region call for. I estimate the expense at £50. The house to be 30 x 38 feet, weather-boarded outside, and ceiled inside with boards, both the walls and overhead. I should expect to superintend and do much work myself. I shall endeavour to get out as much of the material this winter as possible. I hope you will signify your pleasure concerning this matter at the earliest opportunity.

In regard to the brethren in this District, all are well as far as I have learned, and are pursuing their labours with more or less of promise and success. I have requested them, in accordance with the requirements of the discipline, to forward me quarterly reports of the state of the work under their charge.

From the Oxford House Mission I have no report.

I get reports from brother Salt, as means of conveyance allow. It appears he has made a good impression, and is contemplating the establishment of a regular Mission Station away from the fort, but had not, at last accounts, determined on the locality. He has taught a small school, and made himself otherwise useful, and has won the respect and confidence of all, both Indians and traders.

THE CHINESE REVOLUTIONISTS AND CHRISTIANITY.

BY REV. MR. MARTIN.

"Latterly it has been hinted that the insurgents are laying aside their profession of Christianity. This is however, a groundless conjecture, thrown out with a design to disparage the revolution. Such an event is next to impossible in the nature of things. Christianity is so interwoven with the entire constitution of the party, that they cannot exclude it without hazarding its dissolution. The chief claims the throne by virtue of a commission from the Heavenly Father, and publishes to his people that he has achieved his most splendid victories by the help of Jesus. And it is by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost that the Eastern King pretends to guide his counsels. They cannot therefore drop these pretensions without forfeiting the semi-idolatrous reverence by which they are regarded by their followers; they cannot abjure Christianity without invalidating every decree issued since the commencement of the revolution, and abrogating their whole political system. Indeed, so zealous have the insurgent leaders been in diffusing a knowledge of the rudiments of Christianity among their own followers, and so successful in imparting their own zeal, that there is not now on the face of the earth any other military body which is so fully pervaded with religious enthusiasm.

"Here, on the borders of the contested region, we have frequent opportunities of meeting with those who have been among the rebels. One of my missionary colleagues copied a hymn which contains a beautiful summary of Christian doctrine, from the recitation of a Ningpo man, who had been for a time detained among them; and I have myself obtained the same from two others, one a native of Nankin and the other a refugee from Chin-kiang. The account of the practices of the insurgents given by the latter is so interesting, that I shall relate a few particulars. Immediately on entering the city religious tracts were put into his hands; after reading and approving of which he received the rite of baptism, by kneeling (in company with others), repeating the above mentioned hymn, with a doxology to the Trinity, renouncing his sins, swearing fidelity to the cause, and then washing his bosom with a towel, which they call 'cleansing heart.' The Sabbath, though not strictly observed, owing to the interruptions incidental to a state of war, was still distinguished from other days. On the evening previous, a banner was hoisted bearing the inscription, 'the morrow is the day for worship; beware of disregarding it.' At day-break on Sabbath morning the troops were called together for prayer, and at a later hour they assembled in a place called 'Worshipping halls,' to hear a discourse from some officer, on the righteousness of their course, the certainty of success, the wickedness of idolatry, and the oppression of the Tartars; or in lieu of such service, which was always to be accompanied by prayer, to be examined as to their acquaintance with the religious manuals of the party. Those most esteemed were the ten commandments with notes, the ode for youth, commencing with a brief but correct statement of Christian doctrine, and concluding with

the duties of the social relations; the Trimetrical classic, which, after giving an epitome of the book of Genesis, and a detailed account of the deliverance from Egypt speaks of the coming of Jesus Christ to save the world, and then proceeds to describe the mission of the 'Celestial King' to deliver China from the Tartars. Of these the narrator repeated considerable portions; together with a hymn and prayers, which each soldier was expected to recite daily as a devotional exercise. Those whose hair had grown long in the service were generally the most devout, and were often seen on their knees repeating their morning prayer while putting on their clothes; but their later adherents who had learned those forms by constraint, would slip away to their breakfast without prayer, unless they were observed by some officer. They were even required to say a separate grace before meat. In times of peculiar danger they were accustomed to fall down, at any time and in any place, and implore the divine assistance."

The success of the insurrection, Mr. Martin contends, may be useful to the cause of Christianity, but its suppression cannot be otherwise than pernicious.

The Bishop of Victoria has also publicly stated that "if foreign intervention shall restore the sinking fortunes of the Imperialists, then it may be confidently predicted that the civilization of this vast empire will be hopelessly postponed; and the conversion to Christianity of this people, will (to human view) be indefinitely delayed. . . . The peans of Manchu triumph will be the melancholy dirge of a vast nation, having her liberties entombed among the dead, and sinking into the lowest depths of political annihilation."

USES OF THE SABBATH.

A celebrated English physician has lately given the following evidence before the House of Commons on the physical uses of the Sabbath:

"I have been in the habit, during a great many years, of considering the use of the Sabbath, and its abuses. The abuses are chiefly manifested in labor and dissipation. The use, medically speaking, is that of a day of rest. In a theological sense, it is a holy rest, providing for the instruction of new and sublime ideas in the mind of man, preparing him for his future state. As a day of rest I view it as a day of compensation for the inadequate restorative power of the body under continued labour or excitement. If I show you, from the physiological view of the question, that there are provisions in the law of nature which correspond with the divine commandment, you will see from the analogy that the Sabbath was made for man, as a necessary appointment. A physician is anxious to preserve the balance of circulation as necessary to the restorative parts of the body. The ordinary exertions of man run down the circulation every day of his life; and the first general law of nature by which God (who is not only the giver, but also the preserver and sustainer of life) prevents man from destroying himself, is the alternating of day and night, that repose may succeed action. But although the night apparently equalizes the circulation well, yet it does not sufficiently restore its balance for the attainment of a long life. For this reason one day in seven, by the bounty of Providence, is thrown in as a day of compensation, to perfect, by its repose, the animal system. I consider that, in the bountiful provision made by Almighty God for the preservation of human life, the Sabbathical appointment is not, as it has been sometimes theologically viewed, simply a precept partaking of the nature of a political institution; but that it is to be numbered amongst the nat-

ural duties, if the preservation of life be admitted to be a duty, and the premature destruction of it a suicidal act. This is said simply as a physician, and without reference at all to the theological question; but if you consider further the proper effect of real Christianity—namely, peace of mind, confiding trust in God, and good will to man—you will perceive in this source of renewed vigor to the mind, and through the mind the body, an additional spring of life imparting from this higher use of the Sabbath as a holy rest.

I would point out the Sabbatical rest as necessary to man, and that the great enemies of the Sabbath, and, consequently, the enemies of man, are all laborious exertions of the body or mind, and dissipation, which force the circulation on that day on which it should repose; whilst vexation from the ordinary cares of life, the enjoyment of this repose in the bosom of one's family, with the religious studies and duties which the day enjoins, (not one of which, if rightly exercised, tends to abridge life,) constitute the beneficial and appropriate service of the day.'

OUT OF WORK.

'It's of no use, Maria, I've tried everywhere.'

'But you are not going to give it up, Peter?'

'Give it up? How can I help it? Within four days I have been to every bookbindery in the city, and not a bit of work can I get.'

'But have you tried everything else?'

'What else can I try?'

'Why anything that you can do.'

'Yes, I've tried other things. I have been to more than a dozen of my friends, and offered to help them if they would hire me.'

'And what did you mean to do for them?'

'I offered either to post up accounts, make out bills, or attend to the counter.'

Mrs. Stanwood smiled as her husband thus spoke.

'What makes you smile?'

'To think you should have imagined you would find work in such a place. But how is Mark Leeds?'

'He is worse off than I am.'

'How so?'

'He has nothing in his house to eat.'

A shudder crept over his wife's frame now.

'Why do you tremble, wife?'

'Because when we shall have eaten our breakfast to-morrow, we shall have nothing.'

'What!' cried Peter Stanwood, half starting from his chair, 'do you mean that?'

'I do.'

'But our flour?'

'All gone. I baked the last this afternoon.'

'But we have pork!'

You ate the last this noon.'

'Then we must starve!' groaned the stricken man, starting across the room.

Peter Stanwood was a book-binder by trade, and had now been out of employment about a month. He was one of those who generally calculate to keep about square with the world, and consider themselves particularly fortunate if they keep out of debt. He was thirty years of age, and had three children to support besides himself and wife, and this, together with house rent, was a heavy draught upon his purse, even when work was plenty, but now—there was nothing.

'Maria,' said he, gazing his wife in the face, 'we must starve. I have not a single penny in the world.'

'Do not despair, Peter. Try again to-morrow for work. You may find something to do. Anything

that is honest is honorable. Should you make but a shilling a day we would not starve.'

'But our house rent?'

'Trust to me for that. The landlord shall not turn us out. If you will engage to find something to do, I will see that we have house room.'

'I'll make one more trial,' uttered Peter despairingly.

'But you must go prepared to do anything.'

'Anything reasonable, Maria.'

'What do you call reasonable?'

The wife felt inclined to smile, but the matter was too serious for that, and a cloud passed over his face. She knew her husband's disposition, and she felt sure he would find no work. She knew he would look for some kind of work which would not lower him in the social scale as he expressed it. However she knew it would be of no use to say anything to him.

On the following morning, the last bit of food in the house was put upon the table. Stanwood could hardly realize that he was penniless and without food. For years he had been gay and fortunate, making most of the present, and forgetting the past, and leaving the future to take care of itself. Yet the truth was naked and clear; and when he left the house he said—

'Something must be done.'

No sooner had the husband gone than Mrs. Stanwood put on her bonnet and shawl. Her eldest child was a girl seven years old, and her youngest four. She asked her next door neighbor if she would take care of the children until noon. These children were known to be good and quiet, and they were taken cheerfully. Then Mrs. Stanwood locked up her house and went away. She returned at noon, bringing dinner for her children, and then went away again. She came home in the evening before her husband, carrying a heavy basket on her arm.

'Well Peter,' she asked, after her husband had entered and sat down, 'what luck?'

'Nothing! nothing!' he groaned, 'I made out to get a dinner from an old chum, but could find no work.'

'And where have you been to-day?'

'O—everywhere. I've been to more than a hundred places, but it is nothing but an eternal no—no—no—no! I am sick and tired of it.'

'What have you offered to do?'

'Why I even went so far as to offer to tend a liquor store down town.'

The wife smiled.

'Now what shall we do?' uttered Peter spasmodically.

'Why we will eat supper first, and then talk the matter over.'

'Supper? Have you got any?'

'Yes—plenty of it.'

'But you told me you had none.'

'Neither had we this morning, but I've been after work this morning and found some.'

'You—you been after work?' uttered the husband in surprise.

'Yes.'

'But how—where—what?'

'Why first I went to Mrs. Snow's, I knew her girl was sick, and I hoped she might have work to do. I knew her, and told her my story, and she set me to work at once doing her washing. She gave me food to bring home to my children, and paid me three shillings when I got through.'

'What—you out washing for the butcher's wife?' said Peter, looking very much surprised.

'Of course I have, and earned enough to keep us in food through to-morrow at any rate, so to-morrow you may come home to dinner.'

'O, I have just seen Mr. Sampson, and told him

just how we are situated, and offered him my watch as a pledge for the payment of our rent within two months, and interest on the arrearages. I told him I did the business because you were away hunting for work.'

'So he's got your gold watch, Maria.'

'No—he would not take it. He said if I would become responsible for the rent he would let it rest.'

'Then we have got a roof to cover us, and food for to-morrow. But what next? What a curse these hard times are.'

'Don't despair, Peter, we shall not starve. I've got enough work engaged to keep us alive.'

'Ah—what is that?'

'Why Mr. Snow has engaged me to carry small packages, baskets, bundles, &c., to his rich customers.'

'What do you mean, Maria?'

'Just what I say. When Mr. Snow came home to dinner I was there, and asked him if ever he had light articles which he wished sent round to his customers. Never mind what was said. He did happen to want just such work done, though he had meant to call on the idlers that lounge about the market. He promised to give me all the work he could, and I am to be there in good season in the morning.'

'Well this is a pretty go. My wife turned butcher's boy! You will not do any such thing.'

'And why not?'

'Because—because—'

'Say because it will lower me in the social circle.'

'Well so it will.'

'Then it is more honorable to lie still and starve, and see one's children starve too, than to earn honest bread by honest work. I tell you, Peter, if you cannot find work I must. We should have been without bread to-night had I not found work to-day. You know that all kinds of light, agreeable business are seized on by those who have particular friend. At such a time, it is not for us to consider what kind of work we will do so as it is honest. Oh give me the liberty of living on my own deserts, and the independence to be governed by my own convictions of right.'

'But my wife, only think—you carrying out butcher's stuff! Why I would sooner go and do it myself.'

'If you will go,' said the wife with a smile, 'I will stay at home and take care of the children.'

It was hard for Peter Stanwood, but the more he thought upon the matter, the more he saw the justice of the path into which his wife had thus led him. Before he went to bed, he promised to go to the butcher's in the morning.

And Peter went. Mr. Snow greeted him warmly, praised his faithful wife, and then sent him off with two baskets, one to Mrs. Smith and the other to Mrs. Oixall. The new carrier worked all day, and earned 97 cents. It had been a day of trials, but no one saecered at him; and all his acquaintances whom he met, greeted him as usual.—He was far happier than when he went home the night before, for he was independent.

Next day he earned over a dollar; and thus he continued to work a week, at the end of which he had five dollars and seventy-five cents, besides having paid for all the food of his family, save some few pieces. Saturday evening he met Mark Leeds, another binder, who had been discharged from work with himself. Leeds looked careworn and rusty.

'How goes it?' asked Peter.

'Don't ask me,' groaned Leeds, 'my family are half starved.'

'But cant you find anything to do.'

'Nothing.'

'Have you tried?'

'Everywhere; but it's of no use. I've been to the

bindery to-day, and what do you suppose he offered me?'

'What was it?'

'To let me do his handcarting. He had just turned off his bigger for drunkenness, and offered me the place. The old curmudgeon! I had a great mind to pitch him into the handcart and run him to the—'

'Well,' said Peter, 'I have been doing the work of a butcher's boy for a whole week.'

Mark was incredulous, but Peter convinced him, and then they separated, one going home contented, and the other away from home, to find excitement in which to drown his misery.

One day Peter had a basket of provisions to carry to Mr. Wilson his former employer. He took the load upon his arm, started off, and just as he entered the yard, met Mr. Wilson coming out.

'Ah Stanwood is that you,' asked his old employer kindly.

'Yes sir.'

'What are you up to now?'

'I'm a butcher's boy, sir.'

'A what?'

'You see I've brought provisions for you, sir. I am a regular butcher's boy.'

'And how long have you been at work doing this?'

'This is the tenth day.'

'But don't it come hard?'

'Nothing comes hard so long as it is honest, and will furnish my family with bread.'

'And how much can you make a day at this?'

Sometimes a dollar, and sometimes not over fifty cents.

Well, look here, Stanwood, there has been a dozen of my old hands hanging round my counting-room this fortnight, whining for work. They are stout, able men. Last Saturday I took pity on Leeds, and offered him a job of doing my handcarting, a dollar and a quarter a day; and he turned up his nose and asked me not to insult him! Yet he owned that his family were suffering. But do you come to my place to-morrow and you shall have something to do if it is only to hold your bench. I honour you for your manly independence.'

Peter grasped the old man's hand with a joyous, grateful grip, and blessed him fervently.

That night he gave Mr. Snow notice that he must quit, and on the morning he went to the bindery.—For two days he had but little to do, but on the third a heavy job came in and Peter had steady work. He was happy more than ever, for he had learned two things; first, what a noble wife he had; and second how much of resource for good he held within his own energies.

Our simple picture has two points to its moral.—One is—no man can be lowered by any kind of honest labor. The second is—while you are enjoying the fruits of the present, forget not to provide for the future, for no man is so secure but that the day may come when he will want the squanderings of the past.

From the *Grahamstown Journal*.

MURDER OF A WESLEYAN MISSIONARY.

The attack appears to have taken the mission-family entirely by surprise; and perhaps nothing can be conceived more appalling than an unexpected outbreak of this character. The yells of the savages, the lurid flare of the huts, as one after another the firebrand is applied to them, the screams of affrighted women and children, and the agonising cries of the wounded and dying, form altogether a concatenation of horrors which no language can adequately describe. It appears that it was amidst such a scene of tumult

that the rev. missionary hurried down, against the importunities of his family, to the cattle-kraal, where, as is usual, the hottest of the conflict was raging, and that he had scarcely reached the spot ere he received three assegai stabs, one of which, across the jugular vein, proved to be mortal. The cry was speedily raised that the missionary had fallen; and, a rush being made to the spot, the unfortunate sufferer was rescued from the combatants, and borne into the mission-premises. But life was fast ebbing; and in about two hours death terminated the career of one of the most devoted men that ever came to this country on a mission of mercy to its barbarous inhabitants. The deceased, we may add, came to this colony about fifteen years ago; since which period his history has been an eventful one. His trials were of no ordinary character,—amongst which the loss of a most excellent wife must take the foremost place. But none of these things moved him from the great work he had in view. With indomitable courage and perseverance he laboured on. He had mastered all the difficulties of the language, he had acquired the high esteem and confidence of the natives among whom he dwelt, and there was open before him a field of usefulness of the greatest promise. All his bright hopes, however, as to the future were nipped by the late proceedings in the Amaponda country. The prestige of the missionary character, as well as the British name, seems to have been compromised, and to have led to those painful occurrences, the ultimate result of which it is not possible to foresee. In the mean time, we may remark, it will be incumbent on our government to watch narrowly the progress of events in the country in question. Until lately the Amapondas had been steady allies of the British government, and by no means unfriendly to missionary enterprise. This, however, be it borne in mind, was under the rule of the paramount chief, Faku, who is now in his dotage. The recent inquiry into the conduct of the British resident in that quarter has, we doubt not, something to do with these unfortunate disturbances; but still, if that misunderstanding, as, as is reported, satisfactorily settled, the savage slaughter of a peaceful missionary must be treated, would we secure the peace of the country, as an affront which demands the fullest explanation as well as the most ample redress.

THE SABBATH STROLLER—HIS COURSE AND END.

A young man, the son of a reverend father, was born and educated in a rural district. He shared the admonitions and prayers of his parents along with his younger brothers and sisters. His career as a school-boy was such as was to be expected of one enjoying such advantages; nor are we aware that he, as yet, ever gave his parents the least cause of anxiety. He was fast approaching an age when he must for a time leave his happy rural home, and procure a livelihood by his own industry. He was sometimes elated with the thought of being independent, and frequently indulged fond fancies of what he would do for his parents and his family when he grew to manhood. The kindness of friends procured him a situation in a distant city, and he became an apprentice.

The morning of his departure was anticipated by the anxious forethought of his mother, who was busy preparing everything for his comfort. On the night previous there was one of the family who slept but little, and whose waking eyes anxiously watched the dawning. It was his mother. She was first

astir. The family in a little gathered round the departing boy, to get the last glance of his eye. The father's farewell kiss is pressed upon his cheek, and a mother's parting tear rolls from her eye, and drops on his soft hand, as she shakes and presses it for the last time. He arrives in the city, and is introduced to his shopmates. They receive him with patronizing kindness, and surround him as candidates for his friendship, offering their services to initiate him into the regulations of the shop. A week passed, and they were insinuating themselves into his confidence, and his respect for them was gathering strength. They began in a week or two to drop hints that they thought it too much to be ever going twice to church, every Sabbath, and more especially as they were so closely engaged all the week; and seriously advised him to take a little relaxation—one half of the Sabbath occasionally; and very kindly offered to accompany him in a walk into the country. He had never been introduced to the clergyman whose church he attended—he had not therefore a fear of being missed; he consented and went. What was the subject of their conversation? Did they reason of judgment and righteousness? *To be sure not.* They talked continually of their master's tyranny, and how they had given him such pert and clever answers; and even insinuated that they thought it no shame to appropriate a little thing for their own use, *since their wages was so small.* He heard all this, his soft waxen heart was impressed, his memory was polluted, and he never could forget his Sabbath conversations.

He changed his master in order to better his situation; but still his companions clung to him, and he to them. They would make appointments to meet him at a certain place on Sabbath morning; and after being separated from him for a week, they would hail him as an old friend, and ask him many kind questions as to how he prospered in his new situation. He now began to think, "Can I not try some of those things which I hear so much about? I am sure I need a few pence for pocket money as much as John or James." From that moment he began to possess himself of little things which his master, after a while, began to miss; but never suspecting him, the thing went on. Once when returning from a message he found means of entering his master's desk. He abstracted a considerable sum of money. It is needless so say that this brought upon him the frown of the civil authorities, and he was lodged in jail.

One day, as his father was reflecting on the great mystery of godliness, interrupting himself with a thought and a prayer for the welfare of his family, a letter was handed him. It was not in his son's hand-writing. He turned it over and over. He opened it. He began to read; nor had his eye traced the line half down the page, when his pale face and fast-falling tears told a tale of woe. It was a letter from his son's master, revealing his disgrace. He sinks in his chair, with a deep drawn sigh, and could almost cry, "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?" And his poor wife! how was he to tell her? He could not, he dare not; such was the state of her health, that to tell her would have proved fatal. "A wounded spirit who can bear?" But yet this poor man had to bear it alone, pent up in his bosom, and concealed from his dearest on earth.

The time came when it could be prudently disclosed to her; and the dear, worthy, holy man set out to visit his son. He arrived at the prison. But let neither tongue nor pen attempt to describe the meeting; it was beyond all description; no third party could endure to witness it. There is only one

scene which we can link it, viz., that in the chamber of David when he lamented over Absalom. "O my son Absalom! my son, my son Absalom! Would God that I had died for thee, O Absalom, my son, my son!"

What was the cause of all this disgrace to this young man? What was the cause of this sorrow to these worthy parents? It was strolling on the Sabbath!

Some young man on reading this, may say, "O, these are extreme cases; no eye shall ever see me in such a position; no eye shall ever see me touch my master's property; no eye shall ever see me in prison! I was respectably educated; my father was a clergyman." Ah, young man, take care what you say! Many as secure as you have been caught and degraded. Think not to say I have Abraham to my father; the young man I have mentioned was the son of a clergyman highly respected and deservedly honored.

And here allow me to urge clergymen in town and country to take a deep interest in Young Men's Christian Associations. When a young man leaves the country without a friend or companion, let him be sent direct by letter of introduction, from his clergyman, without any ceremony to the secretary of the Young Men's Christian Association of the city for which he is bound; and he holds out a friendly hand to him, and introduces him to other young men of noble mind, and pious sentiment, and so long as he conducts himself well, he has them for his friends and companions.

Had the young man last mentioned got such an introduction, by the blessing of God his parents might have been saved all the disgrace occasioned by his imprisonment.—*British Messenger*.

A FRAID OF THE WAGES.

"I want your boy in my shop," said a shop-keeper to a poor widow. "I have had a great deal of trouble with clerks, and now I want your Seth—because I know he is honest."

The widow was glad, for it was time for Seth to be earning something, and she thought it would be quite a lift in the world, to have him to go with Mr. Train; and she knew he would suit Mr. Train, for Seth did well everywhere.

When Seth came home from school, he was almost as much pleased with his good fortune as his mother was. Neither mother nor son knew anything about Mr. Train's store. It was in the lower part of the town, but his family lived near the widow's, in fine style. Seth was to go the next Monday morning; and Monday morning he was punctually at his new post.

The week passed away. When he came home to dinner or supper, his mother used to ask him how he liked it. At first he said "pretty well," and then, "he didn't exactly know;" and then, "not very well;" and on Saturday he told his mother plumply, that "he did not like it at all, and wasn't going to stay."

"Why, Seth," exclaimed his mother, grieved and mortified at the change, "are you so difficult to suit as all this comes to? Do you know how important it is to stick to your business? What will Mr. Train say?" "Mother," answered the boy, "the shop is a grog shop, and I cannot stay there." The mother's mouth was stopped; indeed, after that she had no wish to have him remain; but she was very sorry that the case was so.

When Mr. Train paid the boy on Saturday night, Seth told him he could not stay. The shop-keeper was surprised; "how's this," said he, "haven't I

done well by you this week?" "Yes, sir," answered the boy; "I never expect to find a kinder master." "Do you find fault with the pay?" "No, sir," answered Seth, "It is good pay." "Well, what's the difficulty, then?" The poor boy hesitated to give his reason. Perhaps the man guessed what it was, for he said, "Come, come, Seth, you won't leave me, I know; I'll raise your wages." "O, sir," answered the brave boy respectfully, "you are very good to me, very good, sir; but I cannot be a dram-seiler. I am afraid of the wages, for I cannot forget that the Bible says, 'The wages of sin is death.'"

Seth left. The man afterwards said it was the greatest sermon he ever had preached to him; and it set him seriously to thinking about giving up the business; but he did not, and his own family bore awful witness to the Bible declaration. A few years afterwards he died the miserable death of a drunkard, and within six months his son, in a fit of intoxication, fell into the river and was drowned. Is it not dangerous to tamper with the wages of sin on any terms.—*Child's Paper*.

A PRAYING MINISTRY.

In prayer,—in real, hearty, earnest prayer, all things around us are set into their proper places. The earth and its interests shrink into their real insignificance. Time and all its train of pleasures, pains, shame, poverty, honor, and riches, what are these to one whose eye is on the great white throne, before whom lies the awful book of judgment, who sees heaven opened and Jesus standing on the right hand of God? In prayer, our minds are armed for the coming temptations of the day; they are cooled, refreshed, and calmed after its vexations, fatigues, and anxiety. In it, we can, indeed, even whilst compassing with infirmities, bring our own crooked or withered will into His presence who is the healer and whose word of power shall restore the shrunken sinews to their vigor, and make him strait whom long infirmities hath bowed down. On our knees, if anywhere, we learn to love the souls of our people; to hate our own sins; to trust in Him who shows us then his wounded side and pierced hands, to love Him with our whole heart. Nothing will make up for the lack of prayer. The busiest ministry without it, is sure to become shallow and bustling. To come forth from secret communing with Him, and bear our witness, and to retire again behind the veil to pour out our heart before Him in unceasing intercessions and devout adorations; this is, indeed, the secret of a blessed fruitful ministry. In God's strength thou must wrestle with wandering thoughts; sap their strength by the countermines of watchfulness and self-denial; fly from them into quietness and separation; so shalt thou find in the wilderness of this world the mountain of God's presence, where He shall look in upon the soul, and draw out all its hidden powers and fragrance by the sunshine of His own countenance.—*Bishop Wilberforce*.

Lecture of Prof. Gajani, before the Lowell Institute.

THE EARLY ITALIAN REFORMERS.

Professor Gajani began by saying that the present course being on the Italian reformers, he must necessarily allude to the abuse which they were called to reform. "I mean to do so," said he, "without bitterness. I am not a sectarian. I love, with all my heart, Christianity in all its forms and denominations, though I profess that which I think the most simple and pure. Besides, I am perfectly inclined to be tolerant because I am a victim of persecution.

Should, therefore, my words appear sometimes too strong, my hearers must remember that I am speaking of times which were really wicked—quite different from the present."

The lecturer announced then that his subject for the evening was, "Claudius, a bishop of Turin in the ninth century, and the Waldensian Church, with which he was in communion." He spoke of the origin of the Papacy, and of the opposition which this institution met, particularly in Italy. The reformers of the fifteenth century did not invent anything new; denouncing the evil which had grown intolerable, they completed the work of their predecessors. But it was now that the famous Council of Trent, patching up ancient abuses, errors and unsettled questions of the middle ages, reduced the papal doctrine to a close, formal system which excludes improvement. This rough reaction estranged the papal church entirely from the rest of Christianity, though the morals of its priesthood were greatly improved on account of the Protestant opposition. During the former period the Popes reigned by faith, and fixed the lever of their power on the masses in order to subdue the king; but now that the masses asserted their independence, the Popes resorted to the patronage of the kings in order to reign by force. He related then the appointment of Claudius to the chair of Turin by Emperor Lewis, the *Mack*, in 817; his efforts to correct the growing abuses of the age, the obstacles which he met, and his discovery of the Waldensian Church, which preserved the Christian faith as simple and pure as it was at the time of the apostles. The doctrines in which Claudius and the Waldenses agreed may be expressed in a few words: "No supremacy in the Christian Church for any bishop. No such a place as Purgatory. No merit in pilgrimages and formal penances. No worship of relics or images under whatever pretext. No pagan pomp in the worship of God. No transubstantiation in the Lord's Supper." The lecturer explained the state of those doctrines at that time, and said that the greatest difficulty which Claudius had to cope with was the worship of images, because there is a tendency in our weak human nature to represent God with our material forms and passions, and the bishops of Rome early made sinful concession to this tendency, very strong in the Roman people. By these means they became popular, and snatched Rome from the dominion of the Emperor Leo Isauricus, when he proscribed the worship of the images. This was the origin of that temporal power which was afterwards confirmed to the bishops of Rome by the French kings, Pepin and Charlemagne. It was so, that the bishops of Rome, recognized as kings, ceased to be bishops and became Popes.

The lecturer spoke of the course taken by Claudius, of his works and of his death. He said that he was accused of heresy when he could no longer answer; but his writings answer for him, and besides there is a living monument of the soundness of his Christian doctrines, and that is the Waldensian Church, with which he was almost identified.

Claudius, however, was not the founder of the Waldenses. They at all times maintained that their Church is as ancient as Christianity itself, and that their faith came down to them from father to son even from the times of the Apostles. It is a fact that from the times of Claudius, in the ninth century, even to this present day, no change whatever took place in the doctrines and worship of the Waldenses, though they were too often persecuted on this account. There is therefore every reason to believe that they preserved unaltered the same faith, even

during the former period when they lived quiet and secluded in their mountain homes.

The lecturer spoke then of the indomitable missionary spirit of the Waldenses, of the manner in which they used to send out their missionaries, of their success in Italy and Europe; and explained their spirit of proselytism by their deep conviction that their church alone possessed the Christian faith, pure and simple as preached by the Apostles. They applied to themselves the passage of the Revelations speaking of the woman flying to a wilderness, and regarded the Pope as the Anti-Christ. He illustrated their belief by their coat-of-arms, consisting of a lamp burning in the darkness amidst seven stars, and surrounded by the Latin motto "Lux lucet in senobris." They had been always looking for a better time when the Church of Christ at large should be purified, in order to shine again before the world. They thought that this time had arrived when they heard of the preaching of Luther and the progress of the Reformation.

The lecturer quoted the letter which the Waldenses wrote to Luther, and related the persecutions which now fell upon them. Cromwell proved an efficient protector of the Waldenses. Louis XIV. of France, Pope Innocent XI., and Vittorio Amadeo, Prince of Piedmont, succeeded once in driving the Waldenses out of their mountains. Their bloody remnants were hospitably received in Switzerland, and afterwards in Holland. The government of the Dutch Republic offered them a large quantity of land at the Cape of Good Hope, and would have paid for their passage. They were deliberating on this offer when Henry Arnauld, their future historian, stood among them like an inspired prophet. He was both a preacher and a leading warrior. "We need not," said he, "go the Cape of Good Hope. God is good hope. Let us go home." And home they went in spite of their enemies.

The Prince of Orange, who became a King of England, under the name of William III., proved an efficient protector of the Waldenses. They were called now to give a glorious proof of their true Christian spirit. Victorius Amadeas, the Prince of Piedmont, who united his arms to those of the Pope and King of France against them, was soon after deprived of his state by his former allies, the French. That bloody tyrant, now poor, alone and persecuted to death, sought for a refuge in the mountains, where the Waldenses lived. They hospitably received him, and sent the best of their youth to fight for him at the famous battle of Turin, 1706. Their valor deserved the high praises of Prince Eugene, who gained the victory and reinstated his cousin.

This conduct, however, did not save them from new persecutions. At length the last day seemed to have arrived for the Waldenses. During the year 1831, the old dynasty of Savoy was extinguished and the throne of Piedmont and Sardinia was occupied by Charles Albert of Carrignano, who was styled the King of the Jesuits, and deserved his name. This tyrant, when a private man, entered into the association of the Italian Patriots; soon after he betrayed them, and when a king put to death all of them who fell into his hands. Now to quench his remorse by a good work, he entered into a compact with Pope Gregory XVI., in order to do away with the Waldenses by quiet Jesuitical means.

A great deal of money was destined to this work, which was carried on with the most cunning artifices by the king and the monks. After fifteen years, the Waldenses were encircled, divided and overwhelmed by establishments of monks and fanatic papists, who tried by all means to pervert their wo-

men and children. Besides they were artfully reduced to the utmost misery, and allured to make debts; in this manner their lands were slowly snatched from them. The Jesuits were ready to pay the most extravagant prices. A few years more of this system, and it would have been all over for the poor Waldenses. Who could help them? God!

In fact, Pope Gregory XVI. was suddenly called to give an account of his sixteen years of bloody tyranny, and there he must go without Austrian, Swiss, or French soldiers. All Italy besides was at that time shaken by a strong general movement for freedom, and the king of the Jesuits was obliged to play the patriot, and nevertheless he closed his days in exile.

The Waldenses, on the contrary, had their civil rights recognized, sent their representatives to the Parliament, and were able to build churches and gather congregations throughout all the State. They are destined, no doubt, to see the dawning of a glorious day, when all the Italians, free from papal and foreign bondage, shall unite all in a prayer to God with a pure heart and the sincere faith of their forefathers.

GOUGH AT HOME.

BY REV. T. CULVER.

"Mr. Gough resides about five miles from Worcester, in a retired portion of the Township of Roylston. Here amid the bracing air of the Massachusetts hills, and with all the indoor comforts of a fine library and a happy household, he refits body and mind for next winter's new campaign against the demon of the bottle. Friend Gough is not rich, save in moral trophies and the benedictions of the good; but he has managed to lay by enough to buy a very attractive house. The house is a white Italian cottage.—Far up on a commanding elevation, with a retinue of royal hills about it, looking right down into waving groves of maple and chesnut, and into meadows knee-deep in verdure, with all the splendid green of New England uplands in view, stands the summer-house of our young Boanerges. Here he throws off the panoply of the reformer and turns practical farmer. His corn bespeaks good tillage; his "Malocatoons" would grace a Jersey peach basket. The humor that convulses vast audiences abroad makes our brother a most entertaining host, and quietly streams off him in abundance of pleasant sketch and anecdote,

During my late visit, a deep and delightful revival of religion was in progress in the rural church of Roylston. I preached every evening to solemn auditories; after service, a brief meeting was held for inquiries. Mr. Gough is an extemporized bishop of the flock, as they are without a regular pastor. He superintends the Sabbath School, leads the choir, and addresses the inquiry meetings. What an April shower of blessings to the Church one layman can be, if he only has a heart to work and to give.—The "Lee-avenue" Sabbath School in Brooklyn can testify to this.

GOLD COAST.

By recent letters from Mr. Freeman, of the Wesleyan Mission on this coast, we learn that he returned in February last from a visit to the king of Dahomie, at his capital, about 90 miles in the interior. This chief, who exercises a very wide sway among the tribes situate 500 miles west of the Old Calabar river, showed himself, along with his son, very courteous to

the missionaries, during a visit of six days; so that they were too occupied in interviews to have almost an hour's leisure to take a walk through any part of the capital. And the result of their visit is an impression, that there are strong grounds of hope that the day is not far distant when extraordinary moral changes will take place in Dahomie,—a country which has hitherto ranked among the dark places of the earth, full of the habitations of horrid cruelty. The entire mission district, embracing Abbeocuta, Lagos, Akruh, and Cape Coast, shows, in their annual statistics, an increase during the past year of 296 members, and 137 on trial. They speak of a gracious revival of religion in one or two of their circuits, and which is still spreading.—*United Presbyterian Mag.*

IMPRESSIVE ADDRESS OF DR. MERLE D'AUBIGNE.

Gentlemen, the times are serious! An impetuous movement is manifest on every side; those who desired and thought themselves able to resist it, are themselves carried away by an ungovernable force. At first they smiled at the sight of the early symptoms of this movement, now they are themselves led away by it, and hastening towards an unknown goal. Those who were but lately descending the river, find themselves suddenly in the open ocean, surrounded by unseen dangers, tossed with tempests hitherto ignored. Affrighted, they ask whether they are veering towards a port or an abyss. Rash men have gone beyond the reach of warning. Seizing the torch that had been kindled, they have hurried into paths of desolation. Some assail the Bible, others the organization of the church. Haughtily planting their banner beyond all former limits, they call to their side generous hearts by the enthusiastic cry—To this point for liberty! What to do? what to become? How choose between the new and the old—between order and confusion? How decide between the two great powers that stand before us? Poor young man, what wilt thou become! 'Wherewithal shall a young man cleanse his way? By taking heed thereto according to thy word.' When a house has to resist a storm, it must needs be 'built upon a rock,' which is Christ.

A PITHY ILLUSTRATION.

In his lecture on "The Beautiful," at Cincinnati, Mr. Beecher thus forcibly illustrated the tendency of a principle cherished by many:—he did not sympathize with, though he respected that philosophy which denied to one with whose means and station they were compatible, elegant surroundings and clothing. Let us see where the philosophy will lead: some one of this view says to us, 'My dear brother, the world is lying in guilt and wickedness at your feet, and you should do all you may to save it. Now linsey-woolsey is just as comfortable as broadcloth, and the difference in the cost will do much to ameliorate suffering.' So we go home, abandon the broadcloth, appear in the linsey-woolsey, and we think we have done a worthy deed. But then comes another, who carries the same principle a little further. He says: 'My dear brother, the world lies in guilt and wickedness at your feet. Why will you indulge in the extravagance of linsey-woolsey, when tanned leather is just as comfortable and so much less expensive?' We act upon the suggestion; don the leather suit, and congratulate ourselves on the approval of conscience, when a third appears. His language is: 'Oh, dull and slow of heart! While the suffering world languishes for your assistance, why will you indulge in

the luxury of tanned leather, when you can dress yourself with as much comfort and at less cost in plain skins with the hair on? (Laughter.) Thus we see that the principle would carry us back to original barbarism, until we should dress like the beasts, and inhabit, like them, a hole in a tree. The true idea is that in his dress and surroundings, as in everything else, the Christian gentleman should do whatever he may to elevate the taste of those around him."

THE CHURCH OF ROME IN MEXICO.

The Church is a thing of the past here. It may gain strength again; it may rule again, it may tyrannize and lay prostrate the works of progressive civilization, but in its past presumptuous form it is doomed unto mortification; still spasms may seize it to represent life. It will pass away, and the prosperous growth of intelligence will make green and fertile the barren heaths on which nothing but desolation has remained for centuries. The life of Church tyranny is near at an end, if indeed it has not ended, and the fabled stories which have held the human mind prostrate, must pass as the follies of other ages. The questions of religion and the *fueros* are the only ones that can reasonably be raised against the Constitution of 1824. It seems wonderful that so much good should have been secured and still that the most ultra retrogressive provisions should have been laid down in it.—*Mexican Extraordinary*, Oct. 15.

COVENANT OF SALT.

"And every oblation of thy meat offerings shalt thou season with salt; *nether shalt thou suffer the salt of the covenant of thy God to be lacking from thy meat offering; with all thine offering thou shalt offer salt.*" Lev. 2: 13.

"It is a covenant of salt for ever before the Lord, unto thee, and to thy seed after thee." Num. 18: 19.

"Ought ye not to know that the Lord God of Israel gave the kingdom over Israel to David for ever, even to him and to his sons, *by a covenant of salt?*" 2nd Chronicles 13: 5.

An anecdote is related of Mr. Layard illustrative of this idea of using salt in a covenant, when he was passing from Bokhara, in the Upper Province of India, to the site of ancient Ninevah. It is said that,

"On his journey down to Assyria, he had to pass through the territories of the hostile Khan, who had already taken away the lives of several Englishmen, and was trying to get hold of our traveller, now roaming through his dominions. Mr. Layard knew this; and one day, while drawing near his enemies, he waited till the hour of *tiffin*, when they were in their tents at the forenoon meal, when putting spurs to his horse, he dashed into the midst of the hostile encampment, rushed into the chief's tent, and plunged his hand into a bowl of salt, which he immediately put to his mouth, exclaiming,

"Now I am safe!"

"Well," said the chief, "you ARE SAFE."

"He admired the boldness and dexterity of the Englishman, but, above all, the faith thus reposed in the covenant of salt. Having tasted the chief's salt, he had now a claim, not only on his hospitality, but on his protection, and he was safely escorted on his way to the scene of his future discoveries."—*Macphail's Magazine*.

HE PRAYS BUT DON'T BELIEVE.

We must pray and believe—believe and pray. Praying and believing must go hand in hand. This

praying without believing will not suffice. We have known persons pray and fast for years, and still be in bondage; in doubts and darkness, fears and condemnation. "Without faith it is impossible to please God."

GEN. WASHINGTON'S APPEARANCE.

The general is about forty-nine years of age; he is large, finely made, very well proportioned. His figure is much more pleasing than the portraits represent it. He was fine-looking till within about three years; and although those who have been with him since that time say that he seems to have grown old fast, it is undeniable that the general is still fresh and active as a young man.

His physiognomy is pleasant and open; his address is cold, though polite; his passive eye is more attentive than sparkling, but his aspect is kind, noble, and composed. He maintains in his private deportment that polite and attentive decency which satisfies all and that reserved dignity which does not offend. He is the enemy of ostentation and vainglory. His character is always equal; he never manifests the least ill-humor; modest even to humility, he seems not to estimate himself duly; he receives with good grace the deference paid to him, but rather shuns than courts it. His society is agreeable and pleasing. Always serious, never constrained—always free and affable, without being familiar, the respect which he inspires never becomes painful. He talks little in general, and in a very low tone of voice; but he is so attentive to what is said to him that you are satisfied that he understands you, and are almost willing to dispense with a reply. This conduct has often been of advantage to him under various circumstances; no one has more occasion than he to use circumspection and to weigh his words.

WASHINGTON'S LAST MOMENTS.

Washington had taken a cold. He slighted the symptoms, saying, "Let it go as it came." In the morning of the 14th of December, 1799, he felt severe illness; called in his overseer, Mr. Rawlings, to bleed him. He was agitated, and Washington said to him, "don't be afraid." When about to tie up his arm, he said with difficulty, "more." After all efforts had failed, he designated the paper he meant for his will, then turned to Tobias Lear and said, "I find I am going; my breath cannot continue long. I believed from the first it would be fatal. Do you arrange and record all my military letters and papers; arrange my accounts and settle my books, as you know more about them than any one else, and let Mr. Rawlings finish recording my other letters which he has begun." Between 5 and 6 o'clock he said to his physician, Dr. Craik, "I feel myself going; you had better not take any more trouble about me, but let me go off quietly; I cannot last long!" Shortly after, again he said, "Doctor, I die hard, but I am not afraid to go; I believed from the first attack I should not survive it; my breath cannot last long." About ten o'clock he made several attempts to speak to Mr. Lear, and at last said, "I am just going. Have me decently buried and do not let my body be put into the vault in less than two days after I am dead." Lear says, "I bowed assent." He looked at me again and said, "Do you understand me?" I replied, "Yes, sir." "Tis well," said he. And these were his last words; and 'tis well his last words were "Tis well." Just before he expired he felt his own pulse; his hand fell from his wrist, and George Washington was no more.

Views and Doings of Individuals.

For the Gospel Tribune.

GOSPEL FRIENDSHIP.

BY THE FOREST BARD.

When the heart is lone and the spirit sad ;
When the brow is clouded with hoding care ;
When the soul in despondency's robes is clad,
And crush'd with the anguish of wild despair ;
Tis then that we seek in the world in vain
For a city or refuge where we can flee :
No haven is found, on life's chequered plain,
'Mongst the crumbling halls of mortality

Oh no ! 'tis in vain we seek the shrine
Where the world in its worship is bowing low,
In the temple of pleasure, a wreath to twine
Round the heart that is smitten with cankering woe.
Could friendship but speak, as of yore she could,
When in youth, from ambition's bondage free,
We might hope ; but with gold she hath mingled her blood,
And is now but a child of mortality.

If a stranger to God then the soul be found,
Unknown to the worship of praises or prayer,
From the moorings of hope will the barque be unbound,
And sink in the Scylla of dark despair.
Nought but wild desolation then covers our path,
From which we in vain vain would shrink from or flee :
The sin-stricken soul bends to merited wrath,
As it breaks from the links of mortality.

But oh there is one who hath call'd us afar,
Though our hearts are with sin like to crimson dyed,
Bereft of each hope, look to BETHLEHEM'S STAR,
And a faithful and true friend will be at our side—
A friend ? I say a true friend, when rest of each other—
Scared away in the hour of adversity's frown,
He comes, and closer he cleaves than a brother,
And gives for our mortal, an immortal crown.

BARRIE, Co. Simcoe, Dec. 1856.

For the Gospel Tribune.

THE PENITENT'S APPEAL.

BY D. J. WALLACE.

O Thou, whose piercing eye doth scan
The farthest bounds of space !
Instruct thine erring creature, man,
The path of Right to trace.
In sin and ignorance he treads,
If uninformed by Thee,
A gloomy path, where nothing sheds
One ray of certainty !

And must he wander on in night,
Untutored and uncheered
By Thee, O ! Thou great Source of light,
At whose command he appeared ?
Hast Thou not, by almighty force,
Him into being brought ?
And art Thou not the first great Source
Of Life, and Light, and Thought ?

And wilt, Oh ! wilt Thou then forsake
The work of thy decree ;
Nor into Thy protection take
Earth's sons who fly to thee ?
O, hast Thou not in kindness said
Thou hearest the raven's cry ?
And since they're by Thy bounty fed
Shall man Thy creature die ?

Direct him, then, in paths of right,
And guide his wayward feet
By Thine own uncreated might,
Till he, with Thee, shall meet.
Refine his soul, now darkened by
The stains of earthly sin ;
Bid all unholy passions fly,
And dwell thyself within.

DEATH OF THE OLDEST MEMBER OF THE UNITED METHODIST EPYTERIAN CHURCH IN CANADA.

At Brucefield, Stanley, C. W., on the 23rd Nov., died Mr. James McDonald, aged 102. His wife, 100 years old, still survives him: they had lived together eighty-one years—more than the promised period allotted to man upon the earth. Mr. McDonald was born in Urquhart, Inverness-shire, Scotland. At an early age he entered the army—was engaged in the war—taken prisoner at Boston and sent to Halifax, Nova Scotia, where being released, he remained for eight years in the army. From Halifax he went to Pictou in charge of a party sent thither to colonize. Soon after, a congregation being formed at Pictou under the ministry of the Revd., afterwards Dr. McGregor of the Secession Church, he was appointed at the age of twenty-five an Elder, and continued so till the day of his death. He was well-known and highly useful in Nova Scotia. He was in the habit of conducting prayer-meetings on the Sabbaths before a Minister was settled in that part of the country, and subsequently, in the absence of the minister. In these exercises, and in all things indeed, pertaining to the church, he took a deep interest; and in attending to them often underwent, and that too cheerfully, great bodily fatigue. By all the people around he was looked up to as a leader, and was deservedly held in high esteem. In many respects Mr. James McDonald was a very remarkable man, and one whose example the present generation would do well to follow. He was a great reader, having in his house when consumed by fire, a very considerable library. The books which he preferred, and indeed the only books which he would read, were books of solid, sound divinity; and thus as was to be expected, he became an intelligent, and withal a devout man. One very striking excellence in the deceased was that he seemed more anxious in regard to the future than the present—more anxious to lay up treasures in heaven than upon earth. He began early, and maintained to the last the worship of God in his family. His conduct was, uniformly, highly consistent with the profession of religion which he made: he delighted in, and sought after the society of ministers. The late Dr. McGregor, of Pictou, one of whose elders he long was, was a great favorite with him; he would scarcely let it be said that there was any minister so good as he was.

His death was, as became such a life, calm and tranquil; and as Providence ordered it, it took place on the Sabbath evening. He passed away without a struggle. He was in his usual health up till the

night preceding his death, on which night he went through his regular religious exercises—singing, reading of the Scriptures and prayer. During his last illness which did not last twenty-four hours, he never spoke. In the course of the fortnight previous he frequently got out of bed during the night, and wished, as he expressed it, to go home. The good man has now gone home: he has gone home to that God in whom he so long believed, and whom he had so long and so ardently loved. Freed from the clogs and infirmities of age, he is now, there is every reason to believe, blooming in immortal youth before the throne of God, serving him day and night in his temple.

"Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord from henceforth; yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors, and their works do follow them."

M. W. L.

BROOKFIELD, 25th Nov., 1856.

Continued from page 193.

REVIEW OF "TERMS OF COMMUNION AT THE LORD'S TABLE."

BY R. B. C. HOWELL, D. D.

The Apostle Paul's Principles of Toleration.

Dr. Howell, p. 86, speaking of Paul's principles of toleration, as laid down in the 14th of Romans, says, "They are three-fold. This is adding to the word of God, for the Apostle lays down only one principle, viz.: "God hath received him." Dr. H.'s second principle, "Conscientiousness," is necessarily implied in the first. The third, viz.: "That the peculiarities of the parties be not subversive of any divine law, is neither expressed nor implied in the Apostle's language. True, there must be reason to believe that the parties are persuaded in their own minds that their peculiarities are not only not subversive of, but in full accordance with divine law; the objecting party will, of course, view the questionable practices as tending to subvert some divine law; for it may be said every peculiarity, either in doctrine or practice, viewed as objectionable, is held to be so for the very reason that it is believed to have such tendency. No doubt the objecting party, whom the Apostle exhorted to forbearance, surely believed that the practices to which they objected tended to subvert a divine law, and objected to them solely for that reason. The Jewish converts were in the belief that the law of God given by Moses, respecting abstaining from certain meats was still in force, and the Apostle when he enjoined forbearance doubtless knew it, and yet did not persuade them to forbearance by informing them that the law of God respecting meats being abrogated, the Gentiles by eating them could not subvert it; which, if Dr. Howell be right, he would, without doubt, have done. The Dr. adds the third principle without any authority whatever. All the three principles, the Dr. says, were united in the case in question. And it may be said that in the case of many Pedobaptists they are united; for those who rather than "not subversive of any divine law," Dr.

evinced their acceptance with God sincerely believe that their Pedobaptism is not subversive of, but required by the divine law. Because Mr. Hall, in qualifying the questionable practices, chooses the phrases, "not incompatible with a state of salvation," H. is pleased to designate it a logical finesse; but truly it is his own mode of reasoning that may, with the greatest propriety be so designated. Mr. Hall's qualifying clause is clearly synonymous with the Apostle's "God hath received him."

But there is not only logical finesse in the Dr.'s reasoning here—there is sad incoherency. On page 86, he asks, "Has God received them?" (viz.: Pedobaptists.) "We trust he has," he replies. "Are they conscientious?" He farther asks, and replies, "We are willing to admit that they may be." And just a few lines further on, he says, "Their reception by us would, on our part, amount to a conspiracy with them in their design to overthrow the law of God, and render us not Christian communicants, but partners in their rebellion against the authority of the Supreme Legislator."

Truly these are very extraordinary characteristics for persons recognized as pious Pedobaptists! What! pious? and yet "designing to overthrow the law of God?" Pious? Though in rebellion against the authority of God! Nor is this all. Pious Pedobaptists are held to be "in design to overthrow the law of God." Yet, to the question, "Has God received them?" Dr. H. replies, "We trust he has!" Pedobaptists are declared to be in rebellion against Divine authority. Yet, to the question, "Are they conscientious?" The Dr. answers, "We are willing to admit that they may be!" We need then be at no loss to account for Dr. H.'s determined opposition to communion with Pedobaptists, if his adverse view of them be his actual or true estimate of their character, and this is obviously the only light in which he views them when "sacramental" communion is in question. Elsewhere we find him speaking of Pedobaptists "persevering in disregard of spiritual obligations;" "habitually violating the revealed will of God." This is bad enough; but a *designed conspiracy to overthrow the law of God—rebellion against divine authority*—can be viewed only as the summit of wickedness. But how shall we account for the Dr.'s trust that God has received them? for his willingness to believe that after all they may be conscientious? Believing the character of Pedobaptists to be such as here represented, no wonder though the Dr. scruple to commence with them; especially when he believes that receiving them would constitute him a partner in their guilt.

Thus he estimates the character of Pedobaptists when sacramental communion is in view. But speak only of Christian communion, and anon a happy transmutation takes place; he "cherishes for them, as the people of God, the sincerest affection;" takes pleasure in being associated with them in every good word and work; no danger is apprehended of being

held to be a partner in their conspiracy and rebellion. How the incongruity here involved could be entertained for a moment by a Christian man possessing Dr. Howell's intelligence, is perfectly unaccountable. One, however, can scarcely resist the conviction that he delineates the character of Pedobaptists to suit his purpose.

It is very obvious that the most plausible arguments, not only of Dr. H., but of every advocate of the Close Theory, are based on the assumption that Pedobaptists willfully disobey and disregard the law of baptism, or that they are equally as criminal as if the controversy on baptism had been impossible. Hence when Mr. Hall concedes that the Apostles admitted none to the Supper but such as were previously baptised, Dr. Howell asks, "Why then should we?" Just as if there were precisely the same reason why we should reject Pedobaptists that existed in the time of the Apostles for their rejecting the unbaptised. The reason why the Apostles rejected the unbaptised was *because they were unbelievers*. This reason we have not for rejecting pious Pedobaptists; and, therefore, were we to reject, it would be for no reason, or for one very different from theirs. Dr. Howell's question assumes that the reason why the Apostles rejected the unbaptised was *because they were unbaptised*; which is false. But this is the grand reason which he urges for rejecting pious Pedobaptists. Every other prerequisite the Dr. confesses many of them possess in such ample measure that "he cherishes for them, as the people of God, the sincerest affection—and takes pleasure in being associated with them in every good word and work.

But we might retort the Dr.'s question, thus—You must confess, Dr. H., that the Apostles cherished the sincerest affection for none, as the people of God—they preached, prayed, and laboured together with none—they consulted and co-operated for the spread of the Gospel with none—they took pleasure in being associated in every good word and work with none, as the people of God, except those who were promptly baptised,—why then should we? To us the question appears quite as puzzling in the one case as in the other; but the Dr. cannot see it so, neither can he furnish a plausible reason for a difference.

But none of the Dr.'s assumptions surprises us more than his affirming that "Had an unbaptised Christian presented himself to the Apostles, claiming immunities on the score of sincerity, they would certainly have treated him as an unbaptised Christian. They would have recognized his Christianity, &c." We presume there are few who would venture to ask this question. For our part we hesitate not to assert they would have treated him as *no Christian*, because there being then no controversy about baptism he could have had no pretext whereon to found a claim to exemption that could possibly have evinced sincerity. Or, if we could conceive it possible for him to satisfy the Apostles of his sincerity, we may far easier con-

ceive they would have treated him as a Christian *by admitting him to the Table of his Lord*, thus acting out, to its full extent, the principle laid down by themselves, viz.—"Forasmuch as God gave them the like gift as he gave unto us, what was I that I should withstand God." "Him that is weak in the faith receive ye; for God hath received him."

MR. HALL'S EXTRAORDINARY ADMISSION.

Mr. Hall has expressed his persuasion that the effect of the prevalence of open communion would be to promote a more candid inquiry into our principles, and thus increase the number of those who hold and practice them, while he admits it to be doubtful whither it would, with proportionable rapidity, extend the Baptist denomination as such. The reason of his uncertainty in respect to this is thus expressed:—"For were that practice universally prevalent, the mixture of Baptists and Pedobaptists in Christian societies would probably ere long be such that the appellation of Baptists might be found not so properly applicable to Churches as to individuals; while some more comprehensive term might possibly be employed to discriminate the views of collective bodies." The fair inference from this is that Mr. Hall believed that the prevalence of open communion would rapidly promote Baptist views and practice, though it might not, in the same proportion, extend the Baptist church as such, because he conceived it probable that in many instances Christian churches might become so mixed as to choose a more comprehensive name. Mr. Hall then asks "What, then, are we contending for names, or for things? If the effect of a more liberal system shall be found to increase the number of those who return to the primitive practice of baptism. He must be possessed of a deplorable imbecility and narrowness of mind who will lament the disappearance of a name, especially when it is remembered that whenever just views on the subject shall become universal, the name by which we are at present distinguished will necessarily cease."

In reference to these remarks of Mr. Hall, Dr. Howell asserts "The strongest advocate open communion ever had, and all its most discerning friends, concur with him, candidly confesses that its universal prevalence would certainly and resistlessly annihilate the Baptist Church."

Now this is gross misrepresentation, and it is difficult to see how it can be otherwise than wilful. Mr. Hall's beautiful passage might be examined sentence by sentence, and any unbiassed mind might be appealed to if it be not extreme injustice to put upon it any such construction: for its obvious meaning is really the reverse of what is here alleged. True, Mr. Hall is contending that the prevalence of open communion will extend Baptist views; but alleging that in certain cases the name Baptist might be dispensed with as a designation of Christian Churches, and that *that* need not be viewed as matter of lamentation, as the name must cease should Baptist views ever be-

come universal; Dr. Howell infers that this is equivalent to an admission that the prevalence of open communion will annihilate the Baptist Church, and his doing so is a virtual confession that he contends for the name *Baptist* even should the universal prevalence of Baptist views and practice render its use ridiculous. Dispense with the name BAPTIST? No, not though every Christian Church in the world were constituted of immersed Christians! They must be designated *Baptist* churches even then! Else, in the Dr.'s opinion, the glory would be departed!!! *Baptists* all must be, to suit the Dr., not only throughout all time, but as it would seem even in heaven; for he does declare (p. 114) "We shall assuredly never commune with Pedobaptists in any manner in heaven in which we do not now commune with them on earth."

We do not say that all this is precisely Dr. Howell's language; but we assert it is not far from its precise import; and we cannot help thinking that such language as he uses in reference to this may very properly be designated *childish*. Mr. Hall, and all the most discerning friends of open communion confess that its universal prevalence would certainly and resistlessly annihilate the Baptist Church! But how would it accomplish the sad catastrophe? By hastening the universal prevalence of their views and practice on Baptism, which would render the designation "*Baptist*" a misnomer!

"Admitted, Mr. Hall may be wrong; he may have been too sanguine as to the tendency and effect of the prevalence of open communion; but at present that is not the question. It is, did Mr. Hall confess that the universal prevalence of open communion would annihilate the Baptist Church in a sense that is really to be deprecated? Rather, if it be at all proper to call that which he anticipated annihilation; is it not evidently in a sense for the speedy accomplishment of which all sincere Baptists will most earnestly pray? We repeat, therefore, our conviction, that Dr. H's assertion is grievous misrepresentation, whether by mistake or design; and so plain is Mr. Hall's language it is difficult to believe it could have been the former. It is to be feared prepossession sometimes affects the minds of *Baptists* who are so loud in charging the evil upon others.

Dr. H. contends (p. 41,) that there is a perfect parallel between the necessity of *faith* to *baptism*, and that of *baptism* to the *supper*, i. e. that baptism is as indispensable a prerequisite to the Supper, as faith is to baptism. He says "if baptism is not necessary to communion, faith, for the same reason is not necessary to baptism." He himself, however, makes a wide difference between the necessity of faith and the necessity of baptism, which we will demonstrate to his own entire satisfaction; and, 1. We appeal to him if he does not hold faith to be indispensable to the acceptable discharge of every religious duty; and, 2. Does he not admit that every religious duty may be acceptably discharged without baptism? 3. He ad-

mits (p. 22) one may be so eminently religious without baptism that he could delightfully associate with him in the service of the Redeemer, and in every good word and work; could he say this of one destitute of faith? 4. It is the language of unerring truth, "Without faith it is impossible to please God." Would the commission, or any other part of the divine record, warrant us to insert *baptism* instead of *faith* in this declaration? It is a fact on which we have all reason to insist that according to the commission baptism is as necessary to the acceptable discharge of every religious duty as it is to the Supper. It is truly amazing to find Dr. H. attempting to draw a parallel between the necessity of baptism to communion, and of faith to baptism, while by his own practice he manifests that he holds the difference to be immense. Here it is that the parallel is completely broken; it is faith, not baptism, that qualifies for every religious duty and privilege as well as the Lord's Supper; if that be wanting nothing else can be a substitute. Pious Pedobaptists have this grand prerequisite to the acceptable observance of every gospel ordinance. Many of them are "rich in faith and heirs of the kingdom."

THE REASON FOR COMMUNION WITH PEDOBAPTISTS IN RELIGIOUS EXERCISES NOT SACRAMENTAL.

This is manifestly the department of the controversy which our close brethren feel to be the most difficult to deal with; and instead of an effort to assign a valid reason, they generally satisfy themselves by stating the fact as it stands, viz., that they do commune with pious Pedobaptists in all religious exercises except those peculiar to church fellowship or those which Dr. H. terms "*Sacramental*." The Dr.'s mode of disposing of it requires special notice. He remarks as follows:—

"We have already conceded their general Christian character; as such we fraternize with them in every form not sacramental. (1.) We deem this a sufficient testimony of our good will, and desire for their prosperity, as far as they are engaged with us in the same common cause. (2.) We give them credit for sincerity and conscientiousness. What more can be required? (3.) The exercises in which we unite with them were duties before baptism was instituted; and would have remained duties to the end of time, had no Christian church existed. (4.) Since those facts are undoubted, how can our course be inconsistent with the opinions we entertain? Such a thing is impossible. (5.) It is our pleasure to pursue it when we think proper; and still, in our judgment, (6.) infant sprinkling is not christian baptism. 7.) Christian baptism is the only authorised mode of entrance into the visible church."

NOTES TO THE ABOVE EXTRACT.

(1.) That it is a sufficient testimony of your good will we shall not dispute, but the question is, is it a sufficient reason for the distinction you make be-

tween *christian* and what you call *sacramental* communion? We say it is not.

(2.) You barely give them credit for sincerity, &c. (See pp. 106, 127, 225.) But suppose you did, what has that to do with what is required? Nothing.

(3.) What matters it to the question that those exercises were duties before the institution of baptism? Verily nothing; unless the Supreme Legislator had given express intimation that associating with Pedobaptists in the one was according to his will, and in the other against his will? Assuredly the strong presumption is, that he who made it the duty of his people to manifest their love and union by associating in those exercises in which you do associate with pious Pedobaptists, has not made it their duty to repel each other from communion in that ordinance, which more than all other was de-signed to symbolise their union with each other and with Christ their Head.

(4.) We nevertheless hold your course to be glaringly inconsistent with your views as to the unlawfulness of communing with the unbaptised. It is vain to say it is impossible.

(5.) You may pursue it as you please for us; but as you charge us with delinquency for communing with pious Pedobaptists at the Table of the Lord, we have a right to enquire whether you be not equally to blame for communicating with them in those exercises: and we must hold you to be so, until you show a satisfactory reason for the distinction which you allege.

(6.) Infant sprinkling will not, in your view, be christian baptism when you associate with them in those exercises any more than it would be should you commune with them at the Table of the Lord. What it is, or is not, in the one case, it is or is not in the other; so that a relevant distinction is still wanting as much as ever.

(7.) This is a strange position, and utterly unsatisfactory as a reason for making the alleged distinction: for the Pedobaptists with whom you associate are either not in the church at all, or if in it, they have entered by an *unauthorised* mode, so that, for anything that we can see, communing with them in the one, may be equally displeasing to God as communing with them in the other. For our part we think it might be equally appropriate to say that every religious exercise in which a Pedobaptist engages is unauthorised; yea, his very joining with Baptists in religious exercises of any description is, on this ground, unauthorised. So that the distinction perfectly foundered again. In fine, if Dr. H. heard a religious teacher belonging to any other denomination teaching that an external ceremony, call it a *sacrament*, or anything else, is the only authorised mode of entrance into the Church of Christ, he would denounce it as Puseyism, or worse.

Dr. Howell is much offended with Mr. Hall for alleging that the Gospel economy is too spiritual in its nature to admit the supposition that men of the most eminent piety are to be refused its privileges solely for the want of immersion. The passage of Mr. Hall in reference to this is quoted by Dr. Howell and admitted to be of dazzling beauty of style; but it is not more remarkable for beauty of style than for scriptural correctness of statement. In respect to both, indeed, it must commend itself to the conscience and judgement of every unbiased mind, at all acquainted with the New Testament. It is as follows:—"The genius of the Gospel is not ceremonial but spiritual; consisting not in outward observances but in the cultivation of such interior graces as compose the essence of virtue, perfect the character, and purify the heart. These form the soul of religion;

all the rest are but her terrestrial attire, which she will lay aside when she passes the threshold of eternity. When therefore the obligations of humanity and love come in competition with a punctual observance of external rites, the genius of religion will easily determine to which we should incline."

In vain does Dr. Howell carp and cavil at these beautiful sentiments. It is astonishing, indeed, that their verity should be for a moment questioned by a Baptist D. D. He attempts to make it appear that Mr. Hall denies that the Gospel has any thing to do with external ceremonies. "By whom," the Dr. asks, "is the assertion authorized?" It might be replied by Dr. Howell himself; for just after asserting that the great Author of revelation gives no countenance to such a dictation, he confesses that "Spirituality is an essential, and the most essential feature in the religion of the Cross;" and this is saying quite as much as Mr. Hall says; for the *genius* of the Gospel is certainly its most *essential* feature, and *vice versa*. Surely the Dr. ought to have known that the genius of the Gospel is its grand peculiarity; and who will deny that to be its spirituality? It is really too much for the Dr. to assert that the great Author of revelation, in no part of His word, gives any countenance to the opinion advanced by Mr. Hall, and then himself yield all that Mr. Hall's language fairly implies.

However much the Dr. may be surprised at the allegation that "the obligations of humility and love may come into competition" with a punctilious observance of external rites, it is, nevertheless, a fact that they are brought into competition. Yea, he himself furnishes a fine illustration of their being brought into competition, when (p. 22) he speaks of an *eminently religious gentleman with whom he delightfully associates in the service of the Redeemer, &c.* When, as he says, he walks with him to the house of God, the obligations of humility and love would suggest the propriety and desirableness of taking their seats together at the Table of the Lord; for, he informs us, "Nothing would be more pleasing to us than to go with them to the Lord's Table, but we are repelled by the fact that a preliminary duty is essential"—the *external rite* is wanting! Here, then, is a clear case of competition, and in such case the *genius*—the peculiar spirituality of the religion of Christ—easily determines the Open Communist to go forward and take a seat at the sacred Table with the "*eminently religious gentleman*," even though deficient of the external ceremony, assuredly believing that in doing so he is acting agreeably to the express law of his divine Master, as laid down in Romans xiv. chap., and Acts xi. xv. chapters, and implied in the tenor of His word throughout. But, alas! for the human intellect that it should be liable to be so perverted by its prejudices! Dr. Howell, though he "*delightfully*" walks to the very threshold of the house of God with the "*eminently religious gentleman*," and though he solemnly declares "*Nothing would be more pleasing*" than to go with him to the Lord's Table; and on p. 110 he speaks of the *painful* alternative of separating, yet, when the external rite presents itself in competition, the Dr. gives back—he decides in its favour! Who knows how many such thrilling scenes may transpire at the very threshold of the house of God! "Did not our heart burn within us while He talked to us by the way?" &c. Yes, but the external rite, like a thunder-bolt, separated between the disciples who were all but knit together in love!

Dr. Howell asks the following, and a variety of similar, questions:—"Is not obedience to the Christian commands the very criterion, not only of love to the Saviour, but also of love to our brethren?" Of

course such questions must be answered in the affirmative; but unless we assume that the disobedience of Pedobaptists evinces want of love both to Christ and the brethren, his questions are perfectly irrelevant, and we know he will not dare deliberately to assume this; for he knows many of them evince as ardent love to Christ, and to the brethren, as is evinced by Baptists. In reference to Mr. Hall's calling external rites the terrestrial attire of religion, he says:—"It would not be seemly to receive into our family and entertain a man destitute of garments. The decencies of society demand that he shall be clothed. But it is equally unseemly to introduce to the sacred Table those who are not furnished with the vestments of the former ordinance." This, in our view, would apply equally forcibly to publicly associating with them under any circumstances.

The fact is but too notorious that the obligations of humility and love are brought into competition with the punctual observance of the external rite of baptism in consequence of the introduction and prevalence of Pedobaptism, and the Communion controversy arising from it. But in proportion as the mind is free from prejudices of education, &c., and is pervaded by genuine humility, and that charity which vaunteth not itself, there will be a strong inclination to forbearance, and a deep repugnance so far to assume infallibility and claim the right peremptorily to dictate to recognized brethren what is their duty in reference to an obedience to Christ. Nor does it consist with the obligations of humility to say to our brother, who, we may be constrained to admit, is more eminent in piety than ourselves, "Brother, unless you adopt my views and practice respecting baptism you cannot have the privilege of communing with me at the Table of the Lord."

We now notice, briefly, a few of the Dr.'s extravagances.

And first, on p. 39, we find him objecting to Mr. Hall for saying that baptism is a mode of professing our faith, alleging that he ought to have said *the* mode, &c. Of course, in his opinion, it is the *only* mode by which faith can be professed. If the Dr.'s opinions were right it would certainly follow that the unimmersed ought not to be communed with; for if immersion be the *only* mode of professing faith, of course they have not professed faith, and to commune with those who have not even professed faith would look too like bare-faced latitudinarianism. It is rather surprising that the Dr. should have advanced this, aware as he must be of the Apostle's declaration, Romans x., "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." And the Dr. himself declared that Faith ought, in all cases, to be professed before baptism; but this contradictory assumption is necessary to the theory of close communion.

AN EXTRAORDINARY INSINUATION.

On p. 109 Dr. Howell observes, "If God has some secret code by which he saves those who habitually violate his revealed will, it is for his own government, not ours."

What meaning the Dr. intended to convey by this is rather uncertain; but after reading it, and its context, several times over, we have concluded that he must have meant something like the following, viz.—"Pedobaptists being habitual violators of God's revealed will, if they are saved, must be saved by a code different from that by which others are saved; a code too which God has not seen meet to reveal!" But can this be the deliberate opinion of Dr. Howell? If so, surely his orthodoxy needs to be inquired into.

Conflicting statements of the Dr. in regard to the purposes for which the Supper was instituted:—

His 7th chapter is for the discussion of this question, and in commencing he quotes the words of institution as proving it to be commemorative, and to show the Lord's death till he comes. "It is," he says, "to be invariably administered and received for these purposes, and for no other." But on his 22d p. he tells us "it is called a *sacrament*, because it is a public declaration of allegiance to our Lord Jesus Christ;" and "the *eucharist* because it is an act of personal adoration and thanksgiving to God." And on p. 111 he calls not only commemoration, but also "a testimony of our united love and obedience to our Lord, *purposes alone sanctioned by the word of God.*" On p. 105 he admits that the Supper was appointed to be a test of our love and confidence in each other, though not so much so as of our obedience to Christ; and further says, that "As it is a sacred feast, &c., *mutual Christian affection* among communicants is very becoming and *highly necessary.*" In the same chapter (p. 114) he calls the opinion that the Supper is designed as a test of Christian fellowship, and that one purpose of its administration is to express *mutual Christian fellowship, a mistaken notion, an exploded dogma.* Verily, these are not easily reconciled. And other similar instances could be pointed to, but let these suffice.

In his 8th chapter he discusses the three prominent considerations which influence Close Baptists to decline fellowship with Pedobaptists. A few remarks on the first of these seem called for, it is, that fellowship with these would involve an abandonment of all those principles on both ordinances held by Close Baptists. But is this a necessary consequence? What are their principles on both ordinances? They hold that baptism is an indispensable prerequisite to the Supper; and that the commission is equivalent to a law positively prohibiting the admission to the Supper of any one whom they, as Baptists, deem unbaptised. Granted, if these principles had their foundation in truth, communing with Pedobaptists would involve their abandonment. He assumes that they are proved. But where is the proof? It is the opinion of Close Baptists; and Pedobaptists, in general, are understood to hold the same opinion. Waiving, however, taking into account the vast difference as to character between the "unbaptised in relation to Pedobaptists, and that of those unbaptised in relation to Baptists, we remind the Dr. that Pedobaptists may be, and we believe are, all in error in respect to this, i. e., as far as their Close Communion amounts to rejecting recognized Christians. The truth is, as we firmly believe, the principle remains unproved by either Baptists or Pedobaptists. The assumption that my communing with a Christian who holds a view of a doctrine different from mine necessarily involve an abandonment of my own view of it, is a notion too childish to require refutation.

The Dr. is certainly very reckless in his assertions. For instance, he assures Pedobaptists that Open Communions differ from them more widely than Close. It is true that Open and Close Baptists hold the same views as to their being unbaptised; but while the Open hold that their error is to be ascribed to *involuntary mistake or misconception*, the Close brethren charge them with *conspiring in design to overthrow the law of God, and with rebellion against Divine authority!* Dr. Howell, moreover, charges them with foul conception; insinuating that, for all their pretensions, their only object in seeking fellowship with Baptists is to get them to acknowledge the validity of their infant baptism; and but for that, he assures us, they have no desire to commune in Baptist Churches. He

even assures us that they employ folsome flattery to induce Baptists to abandon their system! Does the admission that they are in *involuntary mistake* or *misconception* amount to anything comparable to these charges?

After a thrilling reference to the persecutions of Baptists by Pedobaptists in former days, he proceeds, "Am I asked if I intend to charge the Pedobaptists of the present day with these monstrous proceedings? I reply that such a thought is far, very far, from my heart. Our brethren are now peculiarly friendly; but I presume not the less desirous that we should abandon our odious Anabaptism. They approach us, not with fetters and faggots, but with smiles and kindness. They say to us in effect, 'Do give up your principles as Baptists, and then we shall have no more difficulty. We love you as brethren, but your doctrines and practices are most unfortunate. They are indistinguishably odious.'"—p. 127. Thus he proceeds in a tone of taunt and sarcasm which is really disgusting after making the professions of regard for Pedobaptists which he makes; yet he courts the suffrages of Pedobaptists by persuading them that Open Communionists differ from them more widely than Close!

Z. F.

REVIEW.

REPORT OF THE CHIEF SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCATION, CANADA WEST, FOR THE YEAR, 1855.

This volume is an elaborate statement of the practical character and issues of the admirable educational system, now so happily established in Upper Canada, under the able guidance of the Rev. E. Ryerson, D.D. Having, without any prepossessions in the Doctor's favour, closely and continuously scrutinized his official management, during the whole period in which he has been laying the foundation and building up our present system of Common School instruction—a system *already* abounding in precious fruit, and full of promise for the future; and finding, that for his efforts in the establishment and defence of this system, against all its open and secret enemies, Dr. R. has incurred the displeasure of Papal Episcopacy, all the Canadian *Sees* of which, are leagued against him, and often, by their plots and intrigues compelling him to feel the whole weight of the executive arm of United Canada, and finding, moreover, that the determination seems fixed, to crush Dr. Ryerson and the invaluable system of education which he has established, the time appears to have fully come, when every *press* and tongue that is with him should render him every possible assistance, that he may be strengthened in maintaining in all their integrity, the existing school regulations of Canada West. Most gladly, therefore, does the *Tribune* bear its testimony in favor of the sentiment, that the gratitude of all the friends of general education is due to the Rev. Dr. Ryerson, for "the just, equitable, and catholic basis on which our common schools are now established, and also for the great ability which he has ever displayed in defending the system against every dangerous assailant.

In accordance with the above, much satisfaction is

experienced, in presenting from the Report now under consideration, the following triumphant argument of Dr. Ryerson, against extending state support to sectarian schools:—

SEPARATE SCHOOLS.

While the general success of the school system during the year has been an increase over that of preceding years, the people of Upper Canada have evinced an unprecedented unanimity and determination to maintain it in all its integrity. It secures to all what all have a right to claim—equal and impartial protection. It provides equally for all classes of the community. No example of proselytism under its operations has ever occurred; and no charge of partiality in its administration has ever been substantiated. No less than 396 Roman-Catholic teachers are employed in teaching the public schools, and a corresponding or larger proportion of the superannuated teachers to whom pensions have been granted, are Roman Catholics.

A system of public instruction being founded upon the principle, that it is the duty of the State to provide for the school instruction of all its citizens, it follows, that none should be excepted from its advantages or obligations. If all do not need it, or do not desire to avail themselves of it, they are not the less obliged to support it, the same as all are required to contribute to provide court houses and the payment of the salaries of Judges, although many may never enter a court house nor seek the decision of a Judge.

In such a system, where there are diversities of religious opinion, the method is to have *combined secular* instruction, and *separate religious* instruction,—the State providing the former, and leaving the latter to the respective parents and religious persuasions of the pupils. In most cases, especially in America, the religious instruction (when given at all) is given at home, in Sunday schools, and in Churches. In other cases, religious instruction is also given in the school houses or elsewhere by the clergy or catechist of each persuasion at appointed times, such as will not interfere with the ordinary exercises of the school. This last is the national system in Ireland, and it is, for the most part, the system in Upper Canada, and will probably be so altogether. In such a system there is no interference with the religious convictions of any pupils in the schools, and therefore no reasonable pretext for separate schools. If public schools are founded at public expense and for the public good, no citizens can be separated from them without injury—injury in some degree to the public schools on the ground of support—but much greater injury to the parties separated, as being deprived of the advantages of the public schools and compelled to support other schools at greater expense and generally less efficient, and with the additional disadvantage of being severed and alienated from other classes of the community with whom their interests, position and future prospects are largely associated. It is only, therefore, for very grave causes that the State can be justified in allowing any portion of the population to be isolated from a system of public instruction. But where this is claimed with the avowed view to the interests of a religious persuasion, the answer is, "the State has nothing to do with the peculiar interests of sects, but has every thing to do with the school education of its youth." The State equally tolerates and protects the former, but it largely provides for the latter. As, therefore, a system of public schools is based upon public interests, the members of no sect or re-

ligious persuasion can claim on constitutional or public grounds, that any of such schools should be made sectarian, or that public funds should be expended for the support of sectarian schools at all—much less that such schools should be placed upon the same footing as public schools. The sole object of public schools is secular education; the leading object of sectarian schools is sectarian interests—with which the State does not interfere where there is “no semblance of union between Church and State.” If, therefore, the State does so far depart from the principle of a national system of instruction, as to permit any members of a religious persuasion to separate themselves from it, and to even give them public aid for a sectarian school, it is a favor granted them on the ground of indulgence, but upon no ground of constitutional right; since no sect has a constitutional claim to more than equal and impartial protection in the enjoyment of access to the public institutions of the country. It was on the ground of toleration or indulgence that separate schools were first sanctioned by law both in Upper and Lower Canada; but with this difference, however, that in Canada East, where the union of Church and State exists, the schools of the majority are for the most part denominational schools, while those of the minority are non-denominational—the reverse of what exists in Upper Canada.

It is only since 1850 that any persons pretended to demand separate schools as a right, and not as a favor. But when corporate powers and privileges are once granted to persons, they then acquire legal rights which cannot and ought not to be lightly taken from them, however unadvised and to be regretted may have been the act of conferring them in the first place. And it is upon this ground that I have stated in former reports, and repeat here, that I think the clauses of the school law providing for separate schools ought to be allowed to remain on the statute book. I found clauses in the school law for that purpose when I assumed the charge of the department in 1845; I have since successively submitted the re-enactment and extension of them, as far as I could consistently with the efficiency of the public school system, and the rights of individuals and Municipalities, and so as to place the parties supporting separate or “dissentient” schools in both Upper and Lower Canada on perfectly equal footing; but the separate school clauses of the law as prepared and recommended by me were complained against by some leading advocates of separate schools, and a bill was prepared on their part, and brought into the Legislature in 1854, without any knowledge respecting what I had done, and substituting, for my clauses, the provisions of the Separate School Act now in force. But though I have had nothing to do in preparing the provisions of this Act, and though I doubt whether they are as beneficial to the parties of separate schools as the provisions for which they have been substituted; yet I think they should be allowed to remain undisturbed. They were prepared and accepted by the complaining parties themselves as a settlement of the question; they have not affected, nor do I think they will affect, the general working and efficiency of our school system; they leave not the shadow of pretext for the complaint that Roman Catholics in Upper Canada are less liberally treated than Protestants in Lower Canada, and especially since providing in a Lower Canada School Act during the recent session of the Legislature that Protestants in Lower Canada must levy and collect themselves whatever sums they may require for school purposes, and taking away from the Muni-

pal Councils even the power to levy and collect any rates for “dissentient” schools. *

But if the parties for whom separate schools are allowed, and aided out of the Legislative School Grants, according to the average attendance of pupils (which is the principle of distributing the school grants among the common schools in all the townships of Upper Canada) shall renew agitation upon the subject, and assail and seek to subvert the public school system, as they have done, and endeavor to force legislation upon that subject against the voice and rights of the people of Upper Canada, by votes from Lower Canada, and the highest terrors of ecclesiastical authority, then I submit that the true and only alternative will be to abolish the separate school law altogether, and substitute the provisions of the national system in Ireland in relation to united secular and separate religious instruction, and extend it to Lower as well as Upper Canada. To the principles of that system in relation to national schools no party can object. It has been in successful operation in Ireland for more than twenty years, and has been recently re-affirmed after the fullest discussion, by the unanimous vote of the British House of Commons. It is too much that the people of Upper Canada, like the Israelites in their work of rebuilding, as mentioned in the fourth chapter of Nehemiah, should be compelled to stand constantly on guard for the protection of their school system, to labour at the erection and completion of their educational edifice “every one his sword girded by his side,” and “he that soundeth the trumpet by him.” There can be little doubt as to the result of an attempt, by means of external votes, at systematic legislation against the voice of the great majority of the people of Upper Canada and their representatives, on the vital question of public instruction. No such attempts have been made to repeal and change school laws in Lower Canada by bills brought in by Upper Canada members of the legislature, and carried by votes of an Upper Canada majority against the voice and remonstrances of a majority of Lower Canada members. I believe the leading members of the legislature from both sections of United Canada, are satisfied that the clauses of the laws in regard to separate schools in Upper Canada are, upon the whole, more favorable to their supporters than are the corresponding clauses of the laws in regard to dissentient schools in Lower Canada.

It is true there are difficulties attending the establishment and support of separate schools in Upper Canada that are not experienced in establishing and supporting dissentient schools in Lower Canada. But that difference arises from social causes, and not from partiality in legislation. In Lower Canada what are legally the national schools, are, as a general rule, church schools, the ceremonies and religious teachings being such as are directed by the authorities of the Roman Catholic Church. Where this is the case, there can be little difference or reluctance on the part of the Protestant minority to establish and support a dissentient school. But in Upper Canada the national schools are non-denominational; the religious convictions of all classes are equally protected,—as much so as in the mixed schools in Ireland; they are equally open to all classes,—are altogether or

* Yet I see in the columns of the ultra advocates of separate schools, statements to the effect that there are several essential particulars in which the case of the supporters of separate schools in Upper Canada is bad in comparison of the supporters of “dissentient” schools in Lower Canada—statements which are groundless and delusive, and put forth to justify the high-handed hierarchical proceedings which have been adopted to subvert our school system, or make it the ally of one particular church against the great majority of the people of Upper Canada.

nearly free; and in cities and towns are, for the most part in good buildings, well furnished and taught by able teachers.

Under such circumstances, it is extremely difficult to compel or persuade any considerable number, much less the whole, of any class of religionists to separate themselves from such schools, and erect separate ones at greater expense and less efficient; and that, upon the ground, not that the public schools interfere with their faith or attempt to proselyte them, but that Roman Catholics associate with Protestants and acquire personal feelings of respect and affection, which precludes the opportunity of constantly inculcating, and blunts the edge of the teaching, that Protestantism is a species of infidelity, that Protestants are a species of infidels, and should be loved, and pitied and prayed for, not even as nominal Christians, put as heretics and infidels,—that any other feeling in regard to Protestantism or Protestants, is dangerous “*indifferentism*,” only a shade better than infidelity itself,—that, therefore, the public schools supported by Protestants are infidel school, and the whole school system, created under the auspices of successive administrations and parliaments, and developed and sustained by the people of Upper Canada with unparalleled unanimity and liberality, is an infidel system! We have only to read episcopal circulars and their newspaper organs, to see that I have fallen far below the reality in thus epitomizing this foreign element which has been imported into Upper Canada since 1850, and which is as foreign to the spirit and feelings that Roman Catholics have in all past time cultivated and cherished, and which the great majority of them still cherish, in regard to their fellow subjects and the educational institutions of their country, as it is alien to the spirit of truth, and the progress of Canadian civilization. I have reason to believe that it is by extreme exertions of ecclesiastical authority that many Roman Catholics can be made to endorse such teaching against the character and cherished institutions of the great majority of the people of Upper Canada, and assume or continue the support of separate schools. Hence the effort to deprive them of their exercise of choice, by not leaving it to them to express their individual wishes from year to year, but endeavouring to include them as a body, placing the power of exemption from the public schools in the hands of trustees. Hence also the efforts to make municipal councils the imposers and collectors of rates for the support of separate schools on account of the reluctance of many of the rate payers concerned to pay the rates for the support of such schools, and in order to avoid the contact of church authority with them. Hence, likewise the efforts to get apportionments for the support of separate schools, not according to average attendance (which is the principle of apportionment adopted in regard to all the public schools) but according to the population of a whole religious persuasion. It therefore becomes every friend of general education and knowledge to protect our system of public instruction against these open and covert attempts to weaken and subvert it; and it becomes every friend of religious and civil liberty to aid in protecting individuals from all abridgement or invasion of their right of choice and action—an invasion which has assailed the highest personages in the legislature for the parliamentary exercise of their judgment and for the discharge of their duties as the responsible advisers of government for the whole people.—an invasion which would prostrate the government and legislation of the country at the feet of hierarchical assumptions.

As it is the duty of the state to provide for the education of all the youth of the country, it ought

not to permit the legal exclusion of any portion of them from the fullest advantages of that provision without their having the benefit of teachers equally well qualified to teach as the teachers of the public schools, and schools and instruction equally efficient. But while teachers of the public schools have to be examined and licensed by a county board according to a programme prepared by the council of public instruction, the teachers of separate schools are subject to no such test of their qualifications, but are licensed by each set of trustees that employ them; and from the inferior qualifications of some of the teachers employed in them, and which must be the case more and more from their inadequate remuneration, and from their exemption from the examinations required of other teachers, it is to be feared that many children set off and assigned to the separate school suffer serious disadvantages in comparison with other children residing in the same neighbourhood:—apart from the disadvantage of their isolation, the salutary influence of the emulation and energy which arise from pursuing the same studies in connection with the youth of other classes in the community, and with whom they are to act and associate in future life. I think that adequate protection and security are not provided for the school education of the youth separated from the public schools without any choice and responsibility of their own: and it may yet be the duty of the legislature to look carefully into this subject. In the mean time, I believe there are some separate schools in which full justice is done to the secular branches of the education of the pupils.

The provision permitting the establishment of these schools in the School Act of 1841, was doubtless dictated by liberal and benevolent intentions; and from 1841 to 1850, it was attended with no discord and little or no evil, but was scarcely ever acted upon except in neighbourhoods where the imported feelings of transatlantic religious hostility prevented Protestants and Roman Catholics from availing themselves of the same schools. But since 1850, what was before requested as a favor and acted upon as an exception, has been demanded as a right and insisted upon as a system; and though the provisions of the law in regard to Separate Schools have been extended since 1850, every concession has been followed by a new demand, and every demand has been accompanied by a proposed measure, essentially different from the demand on which it was professedly founded, and which would, if acceded to, (as I have shown in my printed reports and correspondence of past years) have subverted our whole system of common school instruction. Had even the present separate school Act introduced near the end of the session at Quebec in 1855, been passed as it had been prepared, our public school system would now be broken up. Nor would the consequence be less fatal were the short Bill introduced into the Legislature Assembly this session, and entitled, “An Act to amend the Upper Canada Separate School Act of the year 1855,” to become a law. This bill is still pending; and it is authoritatively stated that the ecclesiastical authorities under whose auspices it was prepared and introduced, persist in demanding the passing of it under pain of the highest penalties they can inflict. Under such circumstances, it becomes my duty to notice this bill, that all parties may be aware of its character and tendency before the next session of the legislature. This bill consists of two sections, the first of which repeals the *twelfth* section of the Separate School Act;—the section which contains the conditions on which supporters of separate schools are exempted from the payment of municipal school

rates,—conditions which both Protestant and Roman Catholic members of two successive administrations, felt to be the most easy and just on which any persons could be allowed exemption from what is common to all classes of their fellow subjects. This twelfth section of the Separate School Act is as it was prepared and introduced by the Roman Catholic section of the administration, and was excepted by the parties concerned without the slightest objection or hesitation; but within a few months past episcopal commands have been issued for its repeal! The second and principal section of the bill required to be passed by the legislature, (and for not voting for which this session, episcopal denunciations have been officially pronounced against several members of the legislature), is as follows:

"Notwithstanding any thing in the above named (Separate School) Act, or in any School Act or Acts to the contrary, every person paying rates, whether as a proprietor or tenant, who, when required to pay his school taxes or rates, shall present to the collector a certificate in duplicate from the secretary-treasurer of the trustees, or any board of trustees of any Roman Catholic separate school or schools, that he has paid all school rates or taxes required by such trustees or board for the then current year, shall be exempted from the payment of all rates or taxes imposed for the building or support of common schools, or common school libraries, for the same year; and it shall be the duty of such collector to retain one of the above named certificates, and sign his name to the other to be returned by him to the rate payer."

This section so imperiously demanded, but so wholly inadmissible in principle and detail, contains extraordinary provisions.

It relieves trustees of separate schools from imposing school rates themselves for their schools, imposes upon the municipality the obligation of *levying* rates for separate schools, the same as for public schools—an obligation which is imposed exclusively upon the trustees of "dissentient" schools in Lower Canada—so much so that even the power (were it disposed to exercise it) to levy rates for the support of dissentient schools in Lower Canada is taken from the municipality.

It invests the secretary-treasurer of any separate school corporation with the enormous and unheard of power of interposing between a municipal council, and the collection of all school rates levied by it, and of exempting every rate-payer of every religious persuasion from payment of school rates; and this he can do by a variety of means, and throughout all Upper Canada, and that without the slightest restriction, the slightest liability to any penalty whatever, but with absolute impunity. To one rate-payer he can say, "If you will pay two thirds, or one half, or one quarter as much to support the separate school or schools, as the municipal council has taxed you to support the public schools, I will give you a duplicate certificate of exemption." In this way a *bribe* may be held out to every rate-payer to support separate schools. But to those who would not accept of this bribe, one of another kind could be offered. The secretary-treasurer, or his agent, might say to each rate-payer who might refuse, on any terms, to support a separate school, "If you do not wish to pay any rate to support the public schools, I will give you a certificate that you have paid all the rates that the Roman Catholic trustees require you to pay for the support of the separate school for the current year." In this way might a *bribe* be held out to every rate-payer, *not* to support the public schools.

But apart from the preceding considerations, such a provision would put it out of the power of any municipal council, to levy any rate for the erection or payment of school premises or buildings, or for the support of public schools, without levying such sum for separate schools as the trustees of such schools may succeed in diverting from those purposes, by the power of ecclesiastical authority and by a two-fold system of bribery. Nor could any trustees of public schools levy and collect any rate whatever, for the support of their schools, from persons who might be furnished with the said Roman Catholic trustee certificate of exemption. Nor would it be possible for any municipal council to know how much per pound it would be necessary to levy in order to raise any sum or sums that might be required for the support of public schools, as it could not tell what amount might be obtained by trustees of separate schools; nor could trustees of public schools in any section, or town, or school division, know on whom to levy school rates, as they would have no means of knowing who had obtained, or who might obtain, a certificate of exemption from the adverse trustees of a Roman Catholic separate school.

It is perfectly clear, that should such a Bill become law, there would soon be an end of both free schools and public schools, and the trustees of Roman Catholic separate schools would possess a direct and indirect power in each municipality far greater than that of the municipal council and trustees of public schools together. Yet such a Bill intact is demanded, under the pretext of placing the supporters of separate schools in Upper Canada upon the same footing with the supporters of dissentient schools in Lower Canada! The most vigorous attempts are made to force such a Bill upon Upper Canada against the almost unanimous voice of its representatives and their constituents; and ecclesiastical penalties are inflicted upon members from Lower Canada who will not vote for this gross outrage upon the public school system, and the Municipal, and Protestant, and individual Rights of the people of Upper Canada!

The passing of this Bill is demanded at the next session of the Legislature. The same influence which has been brought to bear upon members of the Legislature, is exerted over each elector in each County, Riding, and Municipality. The issue of the question is before the Country; it is imposed upon it by the authorities of one religious persuasion. It cannot be evaded. It is, therefore, with a view to this issue that I have felt it my duty thus to defend our school law and system from the attacks made upon it, and from the efforts to destroy it—efforts unprecedented in the annals of Canadian history. In the eventual issue of this question, it remains to be seen whether the people of Upper Canada are to be under the rule of episcopal circulars and mandates, or continue to be a free people—whether their own voice is to control legislation for themselves, or whether legislation is to be forced upon them from without—whether their school system which has been established and thus far matured with so much unanimity and at so large an expenditure of their labour and money, and which equally protects and consults the just rights and interests of all sects and parties, is to be subverted or perpetuated—whether the principle of equal rights and privileges is to be maintained among all classes and denominations, and "all semblance of Church and State union discontinued," or whether that union in one of its worst forms is to be established, placing each Municipal Council, each corporation of public schools, each

rate-payer of every religious persuasion, and each public school and library, in a maimed and humiliated position before the ecclesiastical and corporate authorities of separate schools.

I shall continue, as I have done, to give to separate schools all that the more than just, the indulgent provisions of the law, and the most liberal construction of it, will sanction; but I should be unfaithful to the trust reposed in me, and to the obligations of patriotic duty, not to maintain and defend the system of national schools against all attempts to weaken and destroy it.

QUESTION OF RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION.

It now remains for me to make some remarks on the question of Religious Instruction. In the mind of every enlightened philanthropist and Christian, there can be but one opinion as to the necessity and importance of religious instruction as a part of education—indeed that there is no education, properly speaking, without religion, any more than that there is a man without a soul, or a world without an atmosphere, or day without a sun. Religion is the soul of education, as it is the life of the soul of man, the atmosphere in which he inhales the breath of immortality—the sun-light in which he beholds the face of the glory of God. The promises of Christianity are to children as well as to their parents; and to neglect the religious instruction of children, is to deprive them of their divine birth-right—is to send them forth morally maimed and diseased among their fellow-men—is to inflict upon them the direst calamities, and make them a curse, instead of a blessing to others.

The question is not, therefore, whether children are to be religiously instructed and trained, but, who are thus to instruct and train them, and how it is to be done? In each of my preceding reports, during the last three years, I have shown from the Holy Scriptures, and the Canons, Formularies and Disciplinary Regulations of religious persuasions, that the training up of children “in the nurture and admonition of the Lord,” clearly devolves upon parents and the professed teachers of religion, and not upon civil government; that all countries where these laws of nature and religion have been violated, by transferring to the Government teacher of the day school what belongs to parents and pastors, have been characterised by both vice and ignorance; that, while it is the duty of the State to make provision for the instruction of each child in those branches of knowledge that are necessary for him to know in order to enter upon his duties as a citizen, it is the duty of each church or religious persuasion to provide for the religious instruction of its own; that the State is not to ignore the Churches of the land in its school system, any more than it is to be their servant, to teach their commands or collect their taxes to pay for teaching them. In countries where, by virtue of church and state union, the state is a tool of the church, or the church is a creature of the state, or both, the question of a system of public instruction is essentially a church question, and the consequences of it are apparent—ignorance of the masses, or the absence of constitutional liberty, or both. But in Upper Canada, no political union of church and state is acknowledged; and, therefore, the claim of any church to state support for its teaching, whether of the young or the old, is inconsistent with the avowed constitution of our government, and incompatible with the principles of equal rights and privileges amongst all religious persuasions and classes. This principle is now acknowledged and avowed by all Protestant denominations in Upper Canada, without exception. The

few members of the Church of England that have hitherto demanded separate schools for themselves, supported by public funds and taxes, have at length acquiesced in the sentiments and views of the great body of the members of that church and of the country at large. So that all attempts to seize upon supposed differences of opinion among Protestants, and to promote them as much as possible, in order to break down or weaken the public school system, have thus far failed. As the system has become developed, public opinion in its support has gained in strength and energy; and the last year has witnessed a stronger and more united expression of it in Upper Canada, than during any former year.

Assuming that our system of public schools shall not only be maintained but maintained in all its integrity, and that it is the duty of the parents and pastors of each religious persuasion to provide for the religious instruction of their own children, it only remains to be considered how far facilities shall be afforded for that purpose in the public schools. As the state has no right to give religious instruction itself; so it has no right to *compel* religious instruction or exercises of any kind. All it can do is to *recommend* and *provide facilities* for such instruction and exercises. What is common to all, is *recommended* and provided for the adoption of all. But in this, there can be no *compulsion upon trustees*; nor are they permitted to *compel* the attendance of any pupil at any religious exercise or instructions whatever against the wishes of his parents or guardians. The text books and the whole teaching and government of the school are required to be based upon and in harmony with christian principles, but the teaching any pupil to recite his catechism and his religious instruction (if desired at all at the school), must be matter of private voluntary arrangement between the parents and teacher, and must not interfere with the ordinary exercises of the school in regard to other pupils. The spirit of our school system is precisely that which the British House of Commons unanimously approved in the following words, as late as the 23rd of June, 1856, in regard to the system of National Schools in Ireland: “That this House has observed with satisfaction the progress made in the instruction of the poorer classes of Her Majesty’s Irish subjects, under the direction of the Commissioners of National Education; and is of opinion that in the administration of that system, or in any modification of its rules, there should be maintained a strict and undeviating adherence to its fundamental principles, securing parental authority and the rights of conscience to pupils of all denominations, by excluding all compulsory religious teaching, this House being convinced that no plan for the education of the Irish poor, however wisely and unexceptionably conceived in other respects, can be carried into effectual operation, unless it is explicitly avowed and clearly understood, as its leading principle, that no attempt shall be made to influence or disturb the peculiar religious tenets of any sect or denomination.”

The principal rule of the Irish National Commissioners, in regard to religious instruction is as follows: “Religious instruction must be so arranged that each school shall be opened to children of all communions; that due regard be had to parental right and authority; that accordingly, no child be compelled to receive, or to be present at any religious instruction of which his parents or guardians disapprove; and that the time for giving it be so fixed that no child shall be thereby, in effect, excluded, directly or indirectly, from the other advantages which the school affords.” Where the patrons (the

same as the majority of electors or trustees of a school section in Upper Canada), are Roman Catholics, then the public religious exercises of the school are more or less of that character; but Protestant children are not required to attend them; and *vice versa*.

The mover and seconder of the resolution above quoted, made some references and statements in their speeches on the occasion which I may cite in this place. In alluding to the evidence of the Rev. Dr. Cooke, [Presbyterian], of Belfast, given before a recent Committee of the House of Lords, the seconder of the resolution [Mr. Kirk] remarked: "Dr. Cook stated that he was not in favor of any system of compulsion with regard to religious instruction, and he added, in answer to questions put by the Bishop of Ossory [the acting leader of the opposition to the National Schools] that it would be a very dangerous principle, to say the least, to make the reading of the Scriptures obligatory upon children, because he held as a Protestant—that no one ought to force religion upon another contrary to his conscience. The Presbyterians in their negotiations with the National Board, had always shown an anxiety to maintain their own rights and to extend the same liberty which they enjoyed to other denominations. They were not less desirous that the Scriptures should be read than the members of the church of England; but they did not wish that others should be compelled to think as they did. He [Dr. Cooke] held that the Bible would be rendered distasteful to children by being pressed upon them against their wish as well as by being altogether kept from them. A similar opinion [continues Mr. Kirk] was expressed by Dr. Chalmers in his evidence before the Committee upon the Irish Poor Law. Dr. Chalmers said that he would have no part of education made compulsory; that a child ought no more to be compelled to attend a Bible class than a reading or arithmetic class, and that compulsion tended to limit and prevent the spread of Scriptural education, and to establish in the minds of the people a most hurtful association with the Scriptures. He entirely concurred in these opinions, clearly sanctioned the principles now embodied in the rules of the National Board. With regard to the results of mixed education, although it had not succeeded to the extent once hoped, this he thought must be attributed to the opposition of the Church Education Society. The Rev. Mr. Woodward, for sometime Secretary to the Church Education Society, has published a pamphlet in which he stated, that in the first report of the Society, he had advocated opposition to the National Board upon two main grounds—first, that the rules of the commissioners 'forbade the church to instruct her children in her own holy faith;' and, secondly, 'that they withhold the Word of God from a class of our country men.' But the Rev. Mr. Woodward, in a manly and candid manner proceeded to retract these charges: he said—'plain truth compels me to declare that I regard these two main objections as having been founded on assumption utterly unsupported by facts. Personal observation of Scriptural and Church instruction, actually given in schools connected with the Board, showed me that there was a discrepancy between my pre-conceived notions and the reality of the case. I was led to examine for myself. I found that I had wholly misconceived the truth. It seemed to me as it now does, clearer than day, that the Board is wholly guiltless of either of the charges upon which I founded my original opposition.'

Similar opposition and upon similar grounds has in past years been made to the system of public

schools in Upper Canada; but it has latterly been abandoned, the assumptions on which it was founded having been shown to be utterly unsupported by facts. Mr. Fortescue, the mover of the resolution, concluded his speech in the following words:

"The great body of the Roman Catholics and Presbyterians of Ireland were satisfied with the working of the present system; the only class which was discontented with it being a portion, and merely a portion of the adherents of the Established Church. He wished to know on what grounds an alteration in the present system was demanded? It seemed to be pretty generally avowed that the change was sought for (making the reading of the Scriptures and instruction from them compulsory on all the children attending the schools) not with reference to the religious education of children belonging to the established church, but with the view of affording religious instruction to children who did not belong to that communion. They were told that many of the clergy and members of the established church in Ireland could not conscientiously give secular education to any children unless, at the same time, they were permitted to impart religious instruction; and as they objected to any system from which the reading of the Scriptures were excluded, they disapproved the rules of the National Board. He believed the assertion that the Scriptures were excluded from the National Schools in Ireland was altogether unfounded, for the Scriptures might be used in every national school in that country, provided their study was not enforced as a necessary condition of admission. In his opinion the opposition of clergy of the established church in Ireland to the national system of education was from false pride and from a feeling of annoyance at finding themselves placed, under that system, upon a footing of fair equality with clergymen of other denominations. That opposition arose from a sincere, but, as he thought, from a mistaken sense of duty, which led clergy of the establishment to refuse their countenance to any system of education which did not enable them to instruct the children in the doctrines of their own church. It could not be supposed that the great Presbyterian body of Ireland, who almost equalled in numbers the established church, entertained less reverence for the Scriptures than any other body of Protestants; yet they had fully and frankly accepted the national system of education. He had heard it said that special advantages had been afforded to Presbyterians in order to secure their adherence to the system; but they possessed no privileges which were not equally extended to all other religious denominations. As soon as the Presbyterians were satisfied that, under the rules of the Board, they could give full religious instruction to children of their own communion, they at once adopted the national system. He did not think, however, that the conduct of clergy and members of the established church had arisen from such conscientious scruples as that house would be disposed to regard, but rather from the false position in which the established church was placed, and from the unfounded claims to religious supremacy which were put forward on its behalf. He hoped, therefore, that the house, while it would be disposed to pay the utmost respect to conscientious scruples, would not listen to the claim urged on behalf of a portion of the clergy and laity of the Irish church by the right honorable gentleman opposite (Mr. Walpole.) He believed if there ever was a body of men who were able to make some sacrifices for their conscientious convictions, and to endure some privations on account of their religious scruples, it was the established church of Ireland which numbered among its

supporters a large proportion of the landed proprietors, and enjoyed the whole of the ecclesiastical revenue of the country. He trusted the day would come when the clergy of the established church in Ireland would change their minds and co-operate in making the national system in Ireland a still greater blessing than it ever was. The house would see that the proposal made by the right honorable gentleman (Mr. Walpole) the other night, was a direct reversal of those fundamental principles which had been the salvation and essence of the national system of education in Ireland. Believing that those principles were incompatible with the proposition of the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Walpole), and that they would in effect exclude the adoption of his resolution, when he would, at all events, have the effect of quieting the mind of the people of Ireland, he trusted that his [Mr. Fortescue's] motion would receive the support of the house, being assured that, as long as that house and the government acted upon the principles contained in his resolution, there would be no fear of the stability of that great system of education which had conferred such incalculable blessings upon Ireland. [Cheers.]

The honorable gentleman concluded by moving the resolution above quoted, and which, after an elaborate discussion, was adopted by the House of Commons without a division,—thus approving in the strongest manner, by the vote of both the Protestant and Roman Catholic members of parliament, and after an experience of twenty-three years, the system of national schools in Ireland, and refusing any essential modification of it.

I have made these quotations in reference to the principles on which the national schools are conducted in Ireland, because they are the same as those on which the public schools in Upper Canada are conducted, with this difference that the hour or hours for denominational religious instruction for each week is not stated or provided for in the Canadian schools. In Ireland it is left for the local patrons to fix the time each week, either "during school hours or otherwise." This can be easily provided for in our system by the Council of Public Instruction; but the practical utility of it is doubtful, as few clergy would be able to meet the children of their religious persuasion each week in each school, and the catechetical and other religious instruction which the clergy would thus give to the children of their persuasion in each school is, for the most part, otherwise provided to be given them in Sunday schools or in connection with Sunday services. In Ireland, the national schools are for the poor; in Canada they are for the whole population, and the patrons or trustees of Canadian schools are elected by all the landholders or resident householders. The clergy of all religious persuasions are visitors of the schools, and can visit them at their convenience. The teachers are examined and licensed by county boards, and must furnish satisfactory proof of good moral character. This is a better test than that of their merely being of particular religious persuasions, since they may be such, and yet not be either temperate or moral, much less otherwise qualified to teach; but if they are of good moral character, they will doubtless belong to some religious persuasion. The moral test is, therefore, better than that of sect, especially as one of the proofs required of a candidate for the teaching is the certificate of some clergyman, not that the candidate is of a particular sect, but that he is a good moral character. Again, it is the feeling and interest of the members of all religious persuasions [who constitute the large majority of every neighborhood] that the moral character of

the teacher be good, and the moral influences of the school, healthful. These feelings and interests of all religious persuasions combined on the single points of christian morals and efficient teaching, are stronger than those of any one persuasion developed in a separate school, where the peculiarities and partisanship of sect are the predominant object and interest. The people of Upper Canada, of all persuasions, have therefore the best guarantee possible, in the circumstances of the country, of sound morality, intellectual qualifications, and effective instruction in the public schools.

In a day school, the general christian character and spirit of the books, the teaching, the government, the social influences of the school, are of much greater importance than any catechetical religious instruction that can be given to each pupil. To provide for such denominational instruction is the duty of each religious denomination and of each parent, in his denominational capacity; and does not devolve upon the public school fund to pay for, or the public teacher, as such, to impart. It is the undoubted business of each religious persuasion and its members to provide for the teaching of their own catechism and peculiar dogmas; and all attempts to weaken church and parental obligations by transferring to the day school what belongs to the church and the fireside, must have a demoralizing influence upon churches and parents, and divert the day school from its legitimate and appropriate objects of teaching reading, writing arithmetic, grammar, geography, etc. The education of a child consists of all the habits of thought and feeling, of all the knowledge and views he has acquired, the manners he has cultivated, and the character he has formed from infancy to manhood. But a very small part of this education can be acquired during the few years, or parts of years, that a child is in a day school from 9 o'clock in the morning until 4 o'clock in the afternoon, during the five days and a half of each week. The whole of Sunday, and two thirds of each week day, and the whole of several weeks or months in the year, each pupil spends in the family, in the church, or in promiscuous society; and these are the chief educators of youth as to both morals and manners. Every child brings to the school a character formed under these influences—a character which they will probably maintain and develop, notwithstanding any efforts of the teacher of the day school. The teacher of the day school can do much to corrupt and demoralize by his example, and spirit, and teaching; and by the same means he can contribute much to elevate the moral feelings and taste, and improve the moral character of his pupils. especially if he is continued in charge of them a length of time; but this is done by the devout and consistent recognition of the Divine Being and authority, and the spirit and character of his whole department and teaching, based upon the Commandments of God, rather by his hearing recitations of a Catechism once a week—the latter being the special and appropriate duty of the parent, the Sunday-school teacher, and the pastor. One-seventh of the time [besides mornings and evenings] of children is, by Divine authority and appointment, at the disposal of pastors, parents and children, for the religious instruction of the latter, and other sacred purposes; and if the religious part of their education is neglected, the guilt lies with the parent and the pastor, and not with teacher employed for the secular part of their education. Combined literary and separate religious education, is the true and only principle on which free, equal, and universal education can be provided for a people of various forms of religious faith. The state, or body politic, provides

the former; pastors and parents individually impart the latter. The former is the peculiar work of the day school; the latter is the peculiar work of the church and the home fire-side. The former is imparted during one-third of five or six days out of seven; the latter should be imparted during some part of the two-thirds of six days out of seven, and the whole of the seventh day. Let not that be confounded which is distinct in the order of Providence and the nature of things, in any system of public instruction. Least of all, let not the teachings and influences and obligations of religious persuasions which determine the moral character of a people, and form that of their offspring, be ignored or left out of the account. And I may be permitted to add, that every grown-up person is a moral educator of the young, as far as his example, sentiments and doings may influence them. No individual in a community is an isolated unit; he is linked to the community of individuals around him by laws of dependence and influence as sacred and imperative as those which mutually bind and control each member of the community of worlds. "No man can live or die to himself" only. As every child is being educated by all that he sees and hears and learns, so is every adult person an educator by all he does and says, and counsels. Yet, specially and preëminently, parents and pastors are the divinely authorized and appointed teachers of religious education, while teachers, licensed and appointed under the authority of state laws, and paid out of state funds and public taxes, are employed to impart to youth their secular education.

From the National Era.

THE SOUTH'S INTEREST IN THE UNION.

It is well known that the main argument of the Southern Buchanan press for the last three months has been "Elect Fremont, and we'll dissolve the Union." It has been presented to the North in every form, with a view of alarming its Conservatism and Capital, and inducing them to support Buchanan. The Charleston *Mercury* rejoiced that the statesmen of South Carolina had at last come up to its standard. Commenting on speeches by Messrs. Orr and Boyce, it said:

"These speeches are significant, as indicating how men of all shades of opinion are driven, in these times, to occupy a common ground—in short, to occupy the ground which this paper has long maintained, that the union of the North and the South cannot be preserved. Momentary expedients may seem to close the wounds which sectional hostility has inflicted, but there is no art in political pharmacy that can heal them. Col. Orr is right—a thousand times right—in saying that the election of Mr. Buchanan would only defer the event four years. We are, in truth, two nations, with incurable antipathies, attempting to live under the same Government—and that by voluntary agreement, and not by the compulsion of a central and irresistible force."

Many hearts of Northern men must have quailed at the desperate and settled conclusion announced in this fearful paragraph! "We'll march upon the Capital," cried Colonel Brooks. "We'll starve you to death—take away your trade—transfer our custom to England—let loose an insurrection of labor on capital," shrieked the *Richmond Enquirer*. "We'll organize the yeoman of Virginia," said Governor Wise—and an inscrutable rumor went forth that Jefferson Davis was about to withdraw the United States troops from the navy yards of the Old Dominion,

to afford the Governor a chance to occupy! Let us have a Convention of Southern Governors, said the gullant Governor, and forthwith the telegraph announces a mysterious gubernatorial meeting at Raleigh. Meantime, the New Orleans *Delta* shows how Disunion is to be initiated, and the Richmond (Va.) *Enquirer* how it is to be consummated.

Some weeks since, the Washington correspondent of the *Delta* said:—

"It is already arranged, in the event of Fremont's election, or a failure to elect by the people, to call the Legislatures of Virginia, South Carolina, and Georgia, to concert measures to withdraw from the Union, before Fremont can get possession of the army and navy and the purse-strings of Government. Governor Wise is actively at work already in the matter."

The same paper avowed that it was designed to form a confederacy between the seceding States, and Cuba, Nicaragua, and Mexico.

The *Enquirer* said:—

"Let her, (the South,) if possible, detach Pennsylvania and Southern Ohio, Southern Indiana and Southern Illinois, from the North, and make the highlands between Ohio and the Lakes the dividing line. Let the South treat with California, and, if necessary ally herself with Russia, with Cuba, and Brazil."

And so they all foamed, threatened, and ranted.

Mark what followed. The State elections took place in Indiana, Ohio, and Pennsylvania, securing the next House of Representatives to the Buchanan Party, and authorising strong hopes of carrying the November election. Was it because Northern Conservatism and Capital were frightened by the Disunion cry? The Richmond *Enquirer* thinks so. In an editorial, Oct. 25th, it said:—

"No paper in the country has been more consistently and actively the friend of the Union, than the Richmond *Enquirer*. In its present hands, its love of the Union is not less sincere, however much its ability to serve and perpetuate it may have diminished. It has always avoided timid counsels and half-way measures, which invite and encourage encroachment and aggression, and lead to disunion, by the very means employed to prevent it.

"We never threaten disunion, till oppression is likely to become intolerable, and then as the only means left to induce the oppressors to pause and desist from their purposes—or, failing therein, to be rid of their rule.

"But we wish to know, should the Government ever pass into the hands of a sectional party, what right or what remedy will be left to the minority except disunion? Why, none whatever. Yet disunion is an easy and all-sufficient remedy—a check to sectional oppression—the fear of which, and which alone, will preserve the Union."

Proceeding to caricature the issues presented by the Republican party, and the nature of its triumph, had it succeeded, it complacently proceeds:—

"This is the vulgar despotism to which timid, pseudo-conservatives at the South propose to submit. Our rallying cry will be Disunion. Disunion! whenever we are threatened with such a fate. The danger, for the present, has passed. Our remedy has succeeded. We will reserve and cherish the remedy of resistance, to be used whenever similar dangers recur."

"Our remedy (the threat of Disunion) has succeeded. We will preserve and cherish. The remedy of resistance, to be used whenever similar dangers recur."

Will cowards in the free States tell us what they have gained by their meek submission?

Political and General Miscellany.

LORD PALMERSTON'S INDICTMENT AGAINST RUSSIA.

(From the London Morning Post, Nov. 3.)

One would have hoped that with a new Czar and the return of peace, a change would have come over the spirit of Russian diplomacy, and that, taught by disaster, the Emperor Alexander would have appeared a sadder and a wiser sovereign. But adversity, it appears, is without its "sweet uses" for kingly or imperial heads. The elder Bourbons, we know, "learned nothing and forgot nothing;" and it may be said of the house of Romanoff, that the son, with the benefits of increased experience, is no wiser as a sovereign, if he be any better as a man, than his imperial father, Nicholas.

A check, however, was given to the aggressions of Russia by the treaty signed between England and France in 1854, and now that, owing to the effect of that treaty, the schemes of Peter and his successors, for the possession and capture of Constantinople, are thwarted, the tactics of the Russian Cabinet have completely changed. Well aware that it was only by the union of England and France Constantinople was saved, the chief object of Russia now is to sow distrust between the two great Western Powers, and so to sever an alliance which stands in the way of future aggression. To achieve this grand object no expenditure of fraud, of treachery, of lying, of cajolery, of money, or of *Machiavelism* will be spared. Millions and millions of silver roubles have been, and will be, expended in every quarter of Europe, and in some quarters out of Europe—to wit, America and Africa; nor will a first or a second failure deter a cabinet which speculates so largely on the credulity and sordidness of mankind. There have been for months, and are now, scores of secret Russian agents at work in all the courts of Germany, in Spain, at Naples, in Sardinia, in Turkey, in the Danubian Principalities, in Greece, in America, and in Egypt, announcing that the alliance between France and England is dissolving, if not actually dissolved; and obscurely hinting that the unnatural union must give place to a more perfect understanding between France and Russia.

In Paris, and throughout France, Russian agents, male and female, from Madam de Lieven downwards, pursue a different species of tactics. There they are instructed to insinuate doubts of the fidelity and loyalty of England—to preach against English cupidity and sordidness, and that restless mercantile spirit so near akin to revolution. In England, on the contrary, Russian agents—and there are many in London, Manchester, and Ireland—declaim against the fickleness and perfidy of France, endeavour to revive the anti-Gallican mania, and seek to re-kindle the ancient rivalry and the extinct old anti-Gallican spirit. There are three or four sections of secret agents, spies, and *mouchards* at work, apparently with views altogether different; but yet the object of each section, or of the heads that guide each section, is only to cause first distrust and jealousy, and ultimately a coolness between two powers now happily in firm alliance—England and France. To persons who have not studied Russian history, or watched the secret diplomacy of Russia, the thing we allude to may seem incredible, or even impossible; but to those who are aware that Russia forced an ultra monarchic interference in Spain at the very moment she was openly exciting a democratic revolt in Greece, the policy now pursued will appear in accordance with the traditions and events from 1823 to 1827-8.

Though defeated in three battles, Russia still declares she is not vanquished, and still adheres to her traditional system of future aggrandisement. To the success of this system, however, disunion between France and England is an indispensable preliminary. No effort then, we repeat, will be left untried to sever a union which is an impediment to Russian success. Russia, to achieve her ends, will not scruple to create confusion or discontent either in France or England. In France she will unhesitatingly make use of Carlists, Orleanists, republicans, socialists, or even communists, to subserve her purposes; and in England or Ireland she will address herself with equal readiness to charists or repealers.

Failing in domestic intrigues in either of these civilized countries, there remains on the cards the game of exciting discontent in the British colonies in India, in Persia, or in Egypt, where the interests of France and England are supposed to be at variance, and the still more desperate remedy of exciting democratic revolution in central and northern Italy, simultaneously with the absolutism in the kingdom of the Two Sicilies and Spain. Any one of these objects may be attempted separately, or all of them conjointly, if the scheme of disuniting the Western Powers cannot be otherwise accomplished. Probably certain preparatory measures have also been previously arranged. For instance, M. Bounteneiff and his agents at the Porte, have been doubtless instructed to sow disunion between the English and French Ambassadors, whilst General Stackelberg, at Turin, M. Kokoschine, at Naples, and M. Benkendrof, at Madrid, have pursued a like course of unworthy chicanery. Amidst so many incentives to quarrel, so many provocations to a misunderstanding and a rupture, it would be astonishing, almost miraculous, looking at the weakness and the infallibility, and self-love of men, if Russia was not in some one instance successful; but we have firm faith in the wisdom of the people of England and France, whose instructed classes see through the *Machiavelian* policy of the Czar and his Cabinet, and, discerning the dishonest devices, are aware of their dangers.

By some it may be thought that we have dealt rather hardly with the Czar and his Cabinet. But the conduct of Russia in reference to the Isle of Serpents, to Kilia, to Ismail, to Kars, and to the frontier of Bessarabia, has been so discreditable, and in reference to the Bessarabian frontier, so dishonest, that one is entitled to presume any knavery or wickedness of a Power capable of so acting. Russia has not only refused to perform some of the articles of the Treaty of Paris, the ink of which is scarcely yet dry, but has evasively attempted to wriggle out of others of them. But this crafty and unscrupulous Power will fail to profit by her own wrong, and will find to her cost that all attempts to sow disunion between England and France will only serve the more firmly to unite civilized nations against falsehood, fraud, and diplomatic trickery.

LIGHTNING.

Arago has divided lightning into three classes. The first includes those where the discharge appears like a long, luminous line, bent into angles and zig-zags, and varying in complexion from white to blue, purple or red. This kind is known as forked lightning, because it occasionally divides into two branches before reaching the earth as if anxious to double its damages. It has also been seen to sever into three, Carpentier supplied Arago with a case of tricuspidate lightning, where the southern fork set fire to a house in the suburbs of Freiberg, the middle struck a build-

ing near the cathedral, at the distance of 3,921 feet from the first point of descent, and the northern division of the flash wreaked its fury on a cottage in a neighboring village, situate 8,531 feet from the cathedral. The same individual speaks of another instance in which five trees, standing at some distance from each other, were smitten, though not more than a single peal of thunder was heard. Still more numerous fureations are reported; for it is said that during a tempest at Landerneau, and St. Pol de Leon, twenty-four churches were struck, though three distinct claps only were heard at the time.

The second class differs from the first in the range of surface over which the flash is diffused. From this circumstance the discharge is designated sheet-lightning.

Sometimes it simply gilds the margin of the cloud from which it leaps; but at others it floods it with a lurid radiance, or else suffuses its surface with blushes of a rosy or violet hue.

Turn we to the third class of lightnings. These are not only remarkable for their eccentricities, but they have been made the subject of considerable contention. They neither assume the form of long lines on the one hand, nor of sheets of flame on the other; but exhibit themselves as balls, or globular lamps of fire. From Prof. Wheatstone's ingenious experiments, it has been shown that an ordinary flash, although darting, as it may seem, from horizon to horizon, does not occupy the thousandth part of a second in its transit. Nay, it has been calculated that the spark obtained from an electrical machine comes and goes in the millionth part of a second. Yet, spite of this characteristic velocity, lightnings of the third order have been seen strolling along at a leisurely pace, or traversing the air at an easy trot, such as the eye might readily follow, or the foot positively outstrip.

A striking illustration occurred to a M. Butti, at Milan:

One summer's day, while a terrible thunder-storm was raging, this individual was seated in his apartment, when his attention was withdrawn from the commotion in the heavens to a little human hubbub in the street below. *Guarda! guarda!* cried a number of voices. On looking out of the window he perceived a globe of fire moving along the middle of the street at some distance from the ground, but with an upward slant in its course. Eight or ten persons were in chase of the meteor, and by advancing at a quick step they were enabled to keep up with its motion. It glided past M. Butti's window. Anxious to know a little more about the strange traveler, he ran down stairs and joined the hue and cry. On it went for about three minutes more, still sauntering along at the same cool pace. But at length it came in contact with the tower of a church, and vanished with a moderate detonation. Here, then, was an instance in which a man might easily have overtaken, shall we say a thunderbolt, and, if necessary, have beaten it hollow!—*Fugitive.*

PROF. HENRY ON ACOUSTICS.

In the construction of buildings, and especially those intended for public purposes, very little attention seems to be paid to the principles of acoustics. We could mention several churches in the city who are faultless in architectural beauty and symmetry, and yet are so ill adapted to speaking, by their violations of all the ascertained principles of sound, that few, if any, of our ministers can fill them.

Prof. Henry, who has for several years devoted much of his time to the investigation of this subject,

before the Scientific Convention at its late session in Albany, read a very able and interesting paper, in which he gave the results of his experimenting in practical acoustics. After very succinctly reviewing the peculiarities of ancient architecture, and expressing a hope that every vestige of such architecture might be preserved with scrupulous care, he proceeded to treat of modern edifices. While the principles of sound, he said, have been studied with care for a half century, these principles have but rarely been applied to the construction of rooms, intended for public purposes. What is wanted is, a combination of scientific knowledge, the results of careful investigation, till the highest practical skill in determining the question of the application of acoustic principles to public buildings becomes necessary to institute experiments. Such experiments have been tried under his direction. One experiment proved that the voice, while a person reads a book in an open field, in the ordinary tone, is heard distinctly in front to a distance of a hundred feet, at the side to a distance of seventy-five, and in the rear to a distance of thirty feet. In experimenting in practical acoustics, it is, therefore, necessary to place the speaker opposite a wall, and to note the distance at which he ceases to take cognizance of the reflection of the sound of his voice. A wall lined with thin board will produce a reflection, loud, but short. A steel wall will produce the highest degree of resonance; so will a wall of glass. The principles of acoustics thus laid down, have been applied with success in the construction of the new lecture-room in the Smithsonian Institute. A committee, of which Prof. Henry was the hub, was charged with the duty of making this apartment as nearly perfect as a public room could be. The original plan was modified; the lower floor was forsaken, because of the heavy pillars which studded it, and an upper room was selected, into which a portion of the towers was thrown, so as to break up the sound. The speaker stands upon the rostrum in much the same position he would occupy if he stood in the mouth of a trumpet, and the rays of sound go from his lips straight forward, undivided by angles in the building. The room is one hundred feet by eighty, and fan-shaped, with a gallery in horse-shoe form, and a smaller gallery behind. In either of these latter, you may hear the slightest whisper from the stage. The walls are lath and plaster.—*Christian Intelligencer.*

From the New York Tribune.

COAL OIL.

The production of oil from coal is not a new discovery, but the discovery of coal beds in this country of a character to yield a sufficient amount of oil to pay the expense of extraction has but recently been made. In Scotland the Boghead Coal has for several years been used solely for distillation, being far too valuable for fuel. The oil from this coal is used upon the English and French railroads, and the demand is always in excess of the supply. Railroad managers prefer it to the best sperm oil. In Nova Scotia there is another deposit of coal at the Prince Albert Mine which also yields a good quantity of oil; and these, with the exception of the Breckinridge, are the only localities yet known where the coal yields a sufficient quantity of oil to pay the expense of manufacturing. Since the experiments of the Breckinridge Company were made with such a successful result, the whole country has been explored for oil-bearing coals, but thus far the experiments have resulted in disappointment. No coal has been yet found which could be made to yield much more than

one-half the results of the Breckinridge, and of course could not come into competition with it.

We have taken up this matter at this time to show the public what has been the progress of this Company during the last six months, and what may be expected for the future. These results are of manifest public importance, as marking the advance of a new branch of industry and an entirely new development of the mineral wealth of our country. When experiments with this coal had fully satisfied the parties engaged in them of its great value as an oil producer, a Company was at once formed under the management of the Messrs. Cairns, who made a contract for a series of years with the Breckinridge Coal Company for a supply of their coal, and commenced putting up works for manufacturing oil at Cloverport, Ky., the shipping port on the Ohio River of the Coal Company. The Company have now on hand 45,000 gallons crude oil, and 5,000 gallons refined, and are manufacturing at the rate of 6,000 gallons per week. The accumulation of crude oil is occasioned by the want of the stills detained at Louisville by low water. When these stills arrive, and the remaining eighteen retorts are brought into use, the product of the Company will be 15,000 gallons crude or 13,000 gallons refined oil per week. This would give 780,000 gallons or 19,500 bbls. per annum. The substances obtained by the distillation of each ton of this coal, are burning and lubricating oils, benzole, naphtha, paraffine, and a residuum of asphaltum. The coke left after the operation is used for fuel under the retorts and stills, and is ample for that purpose. Every ton of coal produces 90 gallons of crude, or 70 gallons of refined oil. The burning oil is used in lamps for all illuminating purposes. Its merits are cheapness, brilliancy, and entire absence of danger of explosion, which makes the use of camphene so hazardous. Its illuminating power and duration of combustion are equal to the best sperm, while it costs only half as much. The lubricating product has been tested upon machinery and found to be equal to sperm for that purpose. As it can be sold at about one-half the price, the saving to railroads, machine shops, &c., must be very great. The benzole is used for the manufacture of gas in portable gas machines. These are much used in isolated buildings, and in the country, where gas companies are not yet an institution. The naphtha is used for various purposes and is valuable as a solvent for India-rubber and gutta percha. The paraffine is a product exactly resembling wax, and is used for making candles. The amount obtained of this product is some 2,000 lb. from 100 tons of coal. This substance has been found very valuable in the dressing of tanned skins—putting on the fine face and softness which characterize the French-dressed skins.

AMOUNT AND COST OF TOBACCO.

It is well known for the common peace that the tax paid for this article is self-imposed. If its victims were compelled to use it, and pay for it, the world would be filled with a rebellion forthwith.

Many a young man in fashionable life pays more for this than for his board-bill. Many a mechanic will die and leave his family without a cent, who pays more for this than the cost of a Life Assurance of two thousand dollars.

Reader, you pay, for example, six cents a day for cigars. Continuing this forty years, with interest, amounts to \$3,373.22. Or, you pay twelve cents a day,—this amounts to \$6,746.44.

Says Professor Fowler; "A young man from,—wished to purchase books on Physiology and Health,

but he said that he was not really able. I asked him about his habits—if he chewed? No. Do you smoke? Yes. How much? He said that formerly he had smoked fourteen cigars a day, at about two cents for each, which made over eighty dollars per year, but that his health was so much deranged that he had reduced his allowance to seven. I told him this cost him forty dollars per year, which he expended not uselessly, but in those things that tended to shorten life as well as to destroy his usefulness while he lived."

Says Dr. Alcott; "I have known many a poor family that consumed, in smoking and chewing, at least twenty-five cents a week. This, in forty years, would amount to \$520; or, if placed at compound interest, from year to year, to more than \$3,100."

An editor of a public Journal observes; 'When we consider the universality of the use of tobacco, and the fact that some men spend \$40, \$60, or \$100 yearly for cigars—if this town uses twenty per cent less than the average, \$9,000 is devoted to the weed yearly; about twice what we raise by tax for Schools; about enough to build the High School house, about which we tobacco-chewers have quarrelled so much; enough to buy a twenty-five cent. delaine dress for each adult female in town, a pair of boots for each lad, and a five dollar bonnet for each lass in town; to pay the salary of all our ministers, and cover all our contributions for benevolent purposes.'

The City of New York, according to the authority of McGregor, consumes \$10,000 a day on cigars, and but about \$8,500 on bread.

NATIONAL COST.

COST OF CIGARS.—It is estimated that there are 1,400 cigar manufactories in this country, employing 7,000 hands. Assuming that each manipulator makes 2,500 cigars in a week, which is as few as he can live by, the total per week is 17,500,000; and in a year of forty-eight weeks, the number amounts to 840,000,000. At seven dollars per thousand, the valuation of this quantity is \$5,040,000, and adding fifty per cent. profit of jobber and retailer, the total is \$7,560,000. Adding the sum paid for imported cigars, \$6,184,364 (which is much below the mark), the whole sum is \$13,744,364. Putting the smokers at five millions, and giving each consumer but 225 cigars a year, it is safe to say that the annual expenditure in this country for this luxury is thirty millions of dollars! Add to this the amount spent for chewing and smoking tobacco, and snuff, five millions, and we see that there is an enormous expense in this line. This sum total would support more than one hundred of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. Says Dr. Coles, the American Churches pay five million dollars, annually, for this poison, in all its forms, and less than one million for the Gospel in foreign lands. At this rate, how soon will the Millennium come and bless our race?

THE AMOUNT ON THE GLOBE. The present annual production of tobacco has been estimated by an English writer at 4,000,000,000 pounds! This is smoked, chewed and snuffed. Suppose it all made into cigars one hundred to the pound, it would produce 400,000,000,000. Four hundred billions of cigars!

Allowing this tobacco, unmanufactured, to cost, on the average, ten cents a pound, and we have \$400,000,000 expended every year, in producing a noxious, deleterious weed. At least one and a half times as much more is required to manufacture it into a marketable form, and dispose of it to the consumer. If this be so, then the human family expend every year, one thousand millions of dollars in the gratifi-

cation of an acquired habit, or one dollar for every man, woman, and child, upon the earth!

This sum would build two railroads around the earth, at a cost of twenty thousand dollars per mile, or sixteen railroads from the Atlantic to the Pacific! It would build one hundred thousand churches, costing \$10,000 each; or half a million of school houses, costing \$2,000 each; or one million of dwellings, costing \$1,000 each! It would employ one million of preachers and one million of teachers, giving each a salary of \$500! It would support three and one third millions of young men at college, giving each \$300 per annum for expenses!

Friendly reader, consider the above basis of this calculation in some measure imaginary—call it conjecture, extravagance, just what you please! Cut these figures down one-half—cut them down to suit your own notions. Even then, if you are a Christian or Patriot, a friend of God or man, you will not trifle with this stupendous iniquity; but in some manly way do your part to arrest its destructive power around you.

(From the National Era.)

A FEW SIGNIFICANT FACTS.

Using the terms free and slave States in their popular acceptance, their relative progress in representative power in Congress is shown by the following table:—

	Free State Reps.	Slave State Reps.
1790	55	46
1800	77	65
1810	104	79
1820	123	90
1830	142	100
1840	135	88
1850	144	90

And under the new apportionment they will probably stand, in 1860, 148 free State representatives, to 85 slave State representatives.

Free State majority in	1790	9
Do.	1800	12
Do.	1810	25
Do.	1820	38
Do.	1830	42
Do.	1840	47
Do.	1850	54
Do.	1860	63

To check the power of this representative majority has always been the struggle of the slave interest, which saw in its steady growth an invincible barrier ultimately to its scheme of universal domination. True, it represented the danger to be one that threatened the independence of the South; but this is a mere *ad captandum* appeal to Southern pride. New England is constantly losing relatively in political power in the House of Representatives; but what statesman in that section apprehends peril to its independence? No matter what the representation may be in the House of Representatives, the sovereignty of each State and each section is pledged for the sovereignty of every other State and section. Delaware, with its one representative, is as secure against despotism in the United States House of Representatives, as New York, with its thirty-three representatives.

Not danger to the independence of the South, or its institutions, do the champions of the slave interest apprehend from the growth of the Northern majority in the House, but danger to their audacious schemes of conquest and domination, of filibustering and annexation. Hence their desperate efforts to maintain in the Senate what they are pleased to call an equilibrium between the free and slave States,

and to control the nomination to the Presidency.—They got us into a war with Mexico, for the purpose of obtaining a nursery of slave States, to prepare for entrance into the Union, *pari passu* with the new free States. Failing in their calculation in that adventure, they repealed the Missouri Compromise, so as to convert a portion at least of territory consecrated to freedom by it into a slave State. If they can but drag Kansas in with slavery, the equilibrium, as they call it, will be restored in the Senate. There will be thirty two slave State and thirty-two free State Senators. This, they hope, will give them enough power to interpose a check to the admission of any more free States, till the new slave State of Nicaragua is ready for annexation, or something favorable to their views "turn up" in Cuba or Texas, both regarded as nurseries of slaveholding States.

The next four years will witness a tremendous struggle on the part of the Disunionists or Slavery Propagandists of the South, for final and absolute supremacy, which can be defeated only by the continued organization and most determined action of the Republican Party.

THE MISSIONARIES.—SOCIAL REFORMS.

The missionaries have gone up to the central government (Calcutta) with a petition for a commission of inquiry into the social condition of the people of Bengal. The paper has been signed by every missionary of influence in Calcutta. It derives a peculiar importance from the fact that the body of this country are not Radicals. As a rule, they adhere strongly to the government, assist it in the matter of education, and contend earnestly and warmly for measures which, in Europe, would be called somewhat high-handed. Some of them have a personal acquaintance with the people, and they are the only class to whom the peasantry will speak openly. They have arrived, I believe, at the conviction that the time has come for them to express political as well as religious ideas, and they are beginning to stir actively in many social questions. Nothing perhaps ever expressed their views better than their address to Lord Dalhousie. They stood by him throughout his reign, and at his departure expressed an unqualified approval of his career. But they pointed out then, as they point out now, that not one effort has been made, for the century during which we have ruled Bengal, to improve, or even to understand, the position of the masses. A very remarkable address has been presented to Mr. J. P. Grant, member of council, by a large body of Hindoo gentlemen. In it they thank him for his exertions in behalf of the act permitting widows to marry, and urge him to continue his efforts for the abolition of polygamy. Petitions by the dozen reached the legislative council on this subject. They are all of one tenor, praying for the abolition of polygamy by penal statute.—*Time's Calcutta Correspondent.*

From the London Patriot.

POSTPONEMENT OF THE AUTUMNAL MEETING OF THE CONGREGATIONAL UNION.

After that consideration which such a subject deserved, the Committee of the Congregational Union, in Conference with their friends at Cheltenham, have come to the resolution of postponing the holding of the autumnal meeting in that town to a future period. In taking this step, we repeat, the Committee have exercised a wise and commendable discretion. They have hindered, we trust, no good. They have probably prevented some mischief. Best of all, they have afforded time for the operation of

influences, from which we venture, in spite of every discouragement, to augur happy eventual results.

It cannot be said that they have evaded any duty, unless, indeed, it was incumbent upon them to carry the Union to an influential town which it has not yet visited, and run the risk of its being exhibited to the inhabitants under an aspect not favourable, and, as we contend, not natural to it. Hitherto it has been a *Union*, and such we fervently hope, it will remain. But, in order to secure the redintegration of its parts, a tranquil pause is necessary. This season for reflection has, therefore, been wisely afforded by the committee, who, however, propose, in January next, to call a special general meeting in London, 'for the consideration of important business.' We will not now attempt to anticipate the nature of that business, nor further remark upon the circumstances under which this break occurs in the series of autumnal meetings. All we will venture to say shall be in the form of a devout and earnest hope that, in the appropriate season of a new year, the members having spent the interval in praying for the peace of Jerusalem, the Lord of peace himself will by his Spirit be in the midst, saying, 'Peace be unto you,' and, from that time forth, will 'give them peace always by all means.'

THE SALE OF CHURCH PROPERTY IN MEXICO —PERSONAL APPEARANCE OF THE ANTI-MONOPOLIST.

(Correspondence of the *New Orleans Bee*.)

Mexico, Oct. 5, 1856.

The law Lerdo has been fully carried out. Those tenants who were interested in becoming purchasers of the property occupied by them, have availed themselves of the privilege granted by the decree. Those who had no such interest naturally enough abstained from purchasing; but as the ecclesiastical property is now selling to the highest bidders, all will have an opportunity of buying. The entire landed property of the clergy will be offered for sale; of this you may feel certain. Thousands of new proprietors will spring up like magic, giving life and activity to the country, and rescuing it from the lethargy in which it has hitherto been plunged.

The grand result will be due to one man alone, viz.—Miguel Lerdo de Tejada. Mr. Lerdo is a man of small stature, lean in flesh, with strongly marked features, prominent cheek bones, and quick and lively in his movements. He possesses rare intelligence, is reserved in speech, and is highly practical in his views, far more than is usually seen in Mexico. He weighs every word before speaking and says not a syllable more than he wishes to say. Thus, his language invariably has a distinctive meaning, although his frankness amounts sometimes to boldness.

You would scarcely recognize a Mexican in his portrait, and hence it is that Lerdo has accomplished what no other Mexican would have ventured to attempt. Born in Vera Cruz, and reared in commercial pursuits, he has been all his life thrown into contact with foreigners, and has greatly profited by the intercourse. He speaks French and English, and is well informed upon politics, literature, and science. Add to this a thorough knowledge of his countrymen and a profound appreciation of the condition of things in Mexico, and you will form a tolerably correct idea of our Minister of Finance.

CALIFORNIA PRODUCTS.

Verily we live in a goodly land. Flowers decorate its valleys, snow covers its mountain summits, forest

clothe its hill-sides, gold glitters in its sands, cinnebar blushes in its rock-ribbed mines, and fruits of every variety enrich its plains. Who ever saw such pumpkins and turnips? Who ever beheld such majestic tree? Who ever tasted such luscious fruits?

Grapes! Why there are thousands of acres of them just ripening in the summer sun. Strawberries! pears! apricots! nectarines! apples! melons! above all, beyond all, who in this wide world ever luxuriated upon such PEACHES!—*True Californian*.

ON ATHEISM.—"I had rather," says Sir Francis Bacon, "believe all the fables in the Legend, the Talmud, and the Koran, than this universal frame is without a mind. God never wrought miracles to convince Atheists, because His ordinary works are sufficient to convince them. It is true, that a little philosophy inclineth men's minds to Atheism; but deep in philosophy bringeth them back to religion; for while the mind of man looketh upon second causes scattered, it may sometimes rest on them, and go no further; but when it beholdeth the chain of them confederate and linked together, it must need fly to Providence and Deity."

HOW TO HARVEST CORN.

Let the corn remain on the stalk until it is dry and fit for the crib.

Enter the field with horse and waggon, straddle every fifth row, with a man on each side and a boy in the rear. Break off the ears as rapidly as possible, throwing them into the waggon; this saves carrying or handling over, not being particular about taking off all the husks; secure your corn in any convenient place until winter; a pen of rails will answer. The husks that remain will keep the corn from spoiling in the crib. When you wish to market your corn put it on a floor, thresh with horses, the husks will not be in the way, rake off, run through a mill, and your corn will be bright and clean, and in first-rate condition. Two men and a boy can pick and crib two hundred and fifty bushels of ears in a day.

SNOW BREAD.

We find the annexed paragraph in one of our exchanges. It is curious if true:—All persons who snow abounds, are not perhaps aware of the value of the fleecy flakes in making light, delicious and wholesome bread. There is no raising in the world so perfectly physiological, as good, fresh, sweet snow; it raises bread or cakes as beautifully as the best of yeast, or the purest acids and alkalies, while it leaves no taint or fermentation, like the former, nor injurious neutral salt, like the latter. Indeed, it raises by supplying atmosphere wherewith to puff the dough, while the other methods only supply carbonic acid gas."

STILL RETURNING.—The Southern Kansas emigrants, it seems, are quitting the territory about as numerously as they flock to it. The steamer *E. A. Ogden*, which reach the city yesterday, had on board about two hundred of them, all on their way back to their old homes, and most thoroughly disgusted with a country so close to the North Pole.—*St. Louis Democrat*, Nov. 27.

SCHOOL OF DESIGN.—A most valuable institution in this city is the School of Design for Women, at 487, Broadway. Here at a low rate women receive instruction in drawing and coloring, and are almost sure to find employment in the coloring of maps and pictures for the press. Many are thus rendered quite independent of the needle.—*N. Y. Paper*