

Gentle reader, do you love the Lord Jesus Christ? Then are you rich beyond expression, then are you prepared to give up the brightest joys of earth at the master's bidding. In youth, manhood's prime, or tottering age, you are ready to exclaim,—My Father's time is mine. Oh may we all, through eternity's countless ages, join the full chorus in glory, "Worthy is the Lamb." H.

For the Christian Messenger.

Letter from Rev. Mr. Freeman.

MESSRS. EDITORS,

I perceive an article in the *Presbyterian Witness* of March 27th, headed "Protestant Alliance," in which my name is involved. When I wrote the letter of March 17, for the *C. M.*, it was partly to defend the church with which I am connected from an unwarranted assault, for which I believed some of the leading parties in the Alliance, were, or ought to be responsible. But since nothing is now involved, but my own private character, I would not attempt a reply, if it did not afford a convenient opportunity of stating some views which may be of importance. Your readers will pardon me, however, if I do give some attention to the article alluded to, although it may involve a question of private reputation.

On reading this article one fond of controversy would almost covet to be the subject of an attack, infused with such a spirit as it displays. As an illustration of the animus of the piece the following passage will suffice:—"Can it be possible that Mr. Freeman attended meetings without his knowledge?" Such a resort as this brings discredit upon the cause vindicated. It might be used by reckless politicians, but coming from ministers of the gospel it hardly suits the meridian of Nova Scotia. The same is true of remarks in the same paper, with respect to an excellent brother in the ministry, the Rev. Mr. Jardine.

The Rev. Mr. Hunter publishes this statement also, in direct violation of a special agreement. He and the Rev. Mr. England left my study a few days ago with the express understanding, that I should correct some wrong impressions that had been received from my note of March 17th, against the society, and himself in particular. But the *Messenger* had then gone to press for the week, and before the next issue he, himself, as Secretary, undertakes what he had asked me to do. But as to myself I do not regret his course. It is, perhaps, best for him to state his own case. If he had done this, however, a little more impartially, he might have made it wholly needless for me to reply. He might have done this by stating all the facts; or by putting those which he did state in a right position; or by explaining some things which still remain obscure.

Let me present these points more fully. Supposing, as he insists, that I knew of being on the Committee, why did he not state also the express indication in one of my notes to him that I did not wish to hold office but merely to become a member of the society. The reason obviously is, that if he had stated this, the reader could have judged for himself that I had not the least ground for thinking that my name was flying about the country in the Manifesto.

Again as to partial statements, the writer says: "Can it be possible that Mr. Freeman attended meetings without his knowledge?" Why did he not put in the short word, *twice*,—the number of times to which he alludes? Again he says, "that he wrote resolutions: spoke in their favour." Why did he not admit that I wrote and spoke on one resolution only? Further he says, "Mr. Freeman was appointed one of the Secretaries—he was present, &c." Why did he not also say, he protested against it at the time? Evidently because he could not then have added, "He accepted office there and then." Again, "He acted for a time in this capacity." Why did he not say what my onerous duties were in this capacity? The Secretary certainly knew. And that was once or twice to sign circulars sent to me by him, which was done out of courtesy to himself, as during this period, at least, two letters were sent by myself to him, refusing the office. This is the sum of my labours as Secretary. Again he says: "Did Mr. Freeman write his own name and pay his subscription without knowing it?" But why did he not state all the facts, and say, that when Mr. F. did this he plainly and frankly declared to the Secretary that he wholly disapproved of the principles of the Society, and joined for a special object sought to be accomplished by the resolution. He concludes this strain by certifying that the Alliance did not know of my dissatisfaction till my letter appeared in the *Messenger*, whilst he at the same time was aware that members of the Alliance knew, and himself especially. Other quotations might be made, but these are enough. The query is, why the writer did not make at least some of these admissions. Evidently because if he had, it would have destroyed the effect of his rhetorical language.

The writer also leaves some points connected with the subject unexplained. Some of which are the following:—It might be asked, why, in forming this society, the principles of a society were violated. I believe these to be, that the members shall qualify themselves, and then appoint their officers, instead of the Committee becoming such by self-appointment. The departure from this simple rule, I believe, has deceived others as well as myself. This involves many queries. Another point unexplained is, why the Circular was not sent to all whose names were on it, and their consent or disavowal obtained before it was sent to the coun-

try. No member of the society was bound to sign the manifesto, since, by the admission of the Secretary, it is different from the original documents which members endorsed. I, for one, if I had been a member of the committee by choice, could not have been willing to send such a document to my brethren over my signature. Another enquiry arises as to the statement in the *Witness*, said to be made by the Committee, and to which I am now replying. Was that statement in which my name is used so unceremoniously, authorised by all those persons whose names are given in the previous column, as the members of the committee? I can think of several who, I believe, would not authorize the publication of such an article. Only in a partial degree has the writer explained how my name came on the committee. He says, "The minute book records that he took share in the formation of that committee." I have this day called on the Secretary and examined the minute book, and find no such statement. But I am glad to say, for the sake of the Secretary, that there are statements from which he might have drawn the inference. It was the first evening of my meeting with them, at the period referred to. I find a vote recorded to this effect, that those who had heretofore attended should be members of the Committee. The same evening I was voted to be one of the Secretaries. Of this last fact I was aware: but of no other. I had no reason to suppose that my name was included among those who had attended the meetings, which the Secretary says had, from the beginning—nine months or so before—been regularly held, as during that time I had received no notice to attend. I went for a special purpose, and, so far as I remember, had no knowledge of being on the general Committee, nor did I take any part in appointing such committee. The facts are these. About last June I met the Rev. Mr. Hunter, gave him my views as opposed to the principles of the Society, and added that still there were some practical measures which they might effect, and proposed one. He approved of it, and said that I should be notified of some meeting of the society, at which I might propose it—which took place in November, the occasion just referred to. That evening being filled with business my motion was deferred to another meeting, when it was adopted by the society. My work was done. But still, in the circumstances, I was willing to remain a member, as above stated, and did not suspect that I was any more, until about the first of March, to my astonishment I was informed by a letter from the country, that a Circular was sent to all parts of the Province over my name, which I never saw, and of the construction of which I was entirely ignorant. I feel for the above reasons, that in sending out this document as they have done, some members of the Committee have exceeded their powers.

I am also charged with inconsistency for approving of the objects of the Society; while I condemn its principles. But a moment's reflection must show the weakness of the charge. The avowed object of the Society—the repelling of Popish aggression—I heartily endorse: but the means taken to effect this I disapprove. This is no more inconsistent than it would be to approve of a building, and yet to condemn, as unsafe, the scaffolding on which the workmen must stand. And if some of the workmen should be cautious enough to escape from the rickety structure, this it seems to me, is no reason why the others who choose to endanger their lives should throw brick and mortar at their more prudent brethren. If all are to stand together let such a platform be made as that all can occupy with safety.

It is said that Popery is a politico-religious institution, and that it must be met by the same sort of organization. But I cannot embrace this doctrine. I do not believe it is necessary to set up one popedom because another already exists. Such an institution may, perhaps, do in England, where a State church prevails; but is altogether unnecessary in this country where such an anomaly is not found. And even in England it is questionable whether Lord Shaftesbury is not promoting rather than retarding puseyism. The Gospel is promoted not by titled patronage, but by divine power. Dr. Barnes says on Acts v. 38:—"It is doubtless right to oppose error in the proper way and with the proper temper, not with arms, or vituperation, or with the civil power, but with argument and kind entreaty."

I believe that most of the members of this Society, and especially the excellent christian ministers embraced in it, are free from political designs. But recent developments have more fully convinced me that mischief lies concealed in its basis. It is a religious Society, as its name indicates, while its object is, in part at least, necessarily political. The christian minister is thus brought unawares into conflict with the fiery politician. He has Saul's armour while he thinks he has that of the shepherd of Israel: Thus he is liable to share the fall of Saul, who was slain at last, and his armour hung up as a trophy in the house of the gods, and his head placed in the temple of Dagon.

When Popery makes political aggression it may be opposed on political grounds, but its religious aggressions on religious grounds. And as the gospel is the only basis of liberty, the Christian is able to lay those foundations deep and broad. The followers of Christ have all the power at their command, which is needed to destroy the man of sin. The sword of the spirit, the principle of love, and the arm of God are all sufficient, if we will do our duty.

Let us then increase our efforts tenfold, to repel the tide of evil. We have already made a few breaches in the wall. Let us press into these, and make others also, until the adversary is cast down. Let us, by divine assistance, carry forward the branches of our Home Missions among the various classes of this province, in which we are now engaged more

vigorously than ever. As we succeed in these, new ways will appear by which the gospel may destroy the kingdom of Antichrist. But above all things, let each christian live near to God, and so bring his individual influence to bear upon those with whom he meets. The salvation of the world depends upon Christian devotedness. Knowing this, we have no ground for discouragement, though we have abundant reason for greater Christian zeal than has ever yet been displayed. D. FREEMAN.

Halifax, March 29, 1858.

Christian Messenger.

HALIFAX, MARCH 31, 1858.

Religion Established by Law.

WE have hitherto but rarely referred to the subject of State Religion, considering it a settled question; on this side of the Atlantic, and that no one denomination is recognized as having any exclusive claim to state patronage; therefore, to make the matter a subject of discussion would be like beating the air, or fighting with a shadow. When, however, we find a combination of Protestants, and amongst them some of our own friends, under the guise of a zeal for the Bible in Schools, with other things, demanding on behalf of Roman Catholics, that a law shall be passed providing for the support of their schools on condition of their using their own version of the Bible—the Douay with the Apochryphal books—we think it high time to speak out, although it be at the risk of being charged with becoming political.

The Roman Catholics have hitherto been accused of demanding Separate Schools, and for aught we know they may have done so; but here we have a combination of Presbyterians, Methodists and others, so blinded by their zeal for Protestantism that they are actually seeking to distinguish Roman Catholic from Protestant Schools, by introducing two versions of the Bible, and thus, more effectually, endowing Separate Schools, and making them the means of teaching the peculiar religious dogmas of each body than by any other measure which has yet been projected.

We hesitate not to record our strong protest against any such measure. We hope Baptists will allow no sophistry to mislead them in this matter, but stand forth boldly against any fallacy which would cheat them out of their birthright.

If the Bible is to be a subject of legislation we suppose we shall require a permanent Ecclesiastical body in one or other branch of the Legislature. Our New Brunswick neighbours would require, as a preparatory measure, the repeal of the law which was enacted for the purpose of excluding our late Venerable Father Craudall from their House of Assembly. Whilst we perfectly agree with the spirit of that Act, and consider that ministers of the gospel are far better employed in their own appropriate work than in the enactment of laws, or in the discussion or agitation of party politics, yet we think such an enactment places a ban on the profession which should be done by no legislature on earth.

By such an enactment as the one referred to above, to compel the use of one or other version of the Bible, not only would we have Separate Schools with all their evils but we conceive that they would be in the most objectionable form in which they could be established. Supposing, for instance, in a district where the majority of the people are Roman Catholics, they would of course have their version of the Bible in the school, and the Protestant children would be compelled to use it or be left without education. Would Protestants be willing to have their children taught from that book, as the Word of God, by the authority of the legislature? What would be said if the Church or Assembly's Catechism were also demanded as part and parcel of the School Act? This would not, however, be more objectionable. Less evil would, perhaps, arise from the latter than from the former.

We have hitherto looked on the State patronage afforded to Christianity, in the fourth century by Constantine, as one of the greatest calamities that ever befel the Church of Christ, and yet we have here in the 19th century an attempt to re-enact a law of the same injurious tendency. However much we value education, we have no hesitation in deciding that sooner than receive aid from the State at this price, it would be far preferable that the government should refrain from interference. This, however, is not necessary, if the legislature content itself with making provision for other branches, leaving that for religious instruction to the trustees, parents, and teachers.

Legislative.

THE published reports of the Legislative Council for the past two or three weeks have consisted pretty much of speeches on questions which have been some time since decided, and as the same business had been previously disposed of and reported in the proceedings of the Assembly, we have thought it better to occupy our Parliamentary space in bringing up the reports of the lower House, from the official Daily Summary, so as to give the latest news.

The Debate on the "Appointments and Dismissals," which has engaged the attention of the People's Representatives for the past week or ten days, has called out more of the spirit of the two opposing parties, than any other question during the session. Some pretty sharp encounters have been witnessed. It is, however, impossible to give our readers anything like an outline of the speeches delivered on either side, further than to say the opposition have endeavoured to sustain Mr. Young's Resolutions; by condemning the appointments as improper and the dismissals as unnecessary, while the government have justified them by the delinquencies of those dismissed, or the public service requiring their removal; and the parties put into office as being those suitable for the offices in which they have been placed.

The galleries have been crowded to such an extent that one had great difficulty not only in forcing himself in, but when there of getting a place to stand. As to anything like taking notes it has been out of the question. The press, generally, seem to have made no attempt at giving more than a passing notice of the speeches they happened to hear or the side they most approved.

The speeches as taken by the Reporters employed by the House have been published up to March 3rd. We may expect therefore to see those just delivered about a month hence. We shall not care to offer any comments on the action of either side, as we have no desire to partake of the triumphs or defeats of either party. It is sufficient for our readers to learn that a large portion of the time occupied in mere personal or party strife, might have been spared to advantage. The revenue of the province would have suffered less and the real work of legislation have been none the less efficiently performed.

If legislation were the only object aimed at, we think the speeches might have been very materially curtailed. The example set by the legislators of Maine might be copied with advantage by our own "assembled wisdom." If the cultivation of the vocal powers of honorable gentlemen be a part of legislation, as one would suppose by some of the long speeches, why not employ them together in the performance of morning concerts? If a portion of the afternoon were so occupied in the intervals of debate, the audience in the galleries would doubtless be gratified, and the feelings of honorable members soothed. The Sergeant at-Arms would make a first-rate leader, and might, by such means, be saved the necessity of so frequently demanding "Order in the gallery."

The House, under such a mode of proceedings, would soon present quite a different aspect, and instead of its being slanderously called a "bear garden," it would soon, under these meliorating influences, become famed for the lessons in manners and morals there inculcated.

LIFE ASSURANCE is now an established fact, and commands the attention of prudent men of almost every class. Of all the Companies formed for this purpose we believe none offer greater advantages, or have a more extensive business than the COLONIAL LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY. Their Prospectus and SPECIAL NOTICE will be found in our advertising columns.

THE HARMONIC SOCIETY gave their second concert on Tuesday evening last. The programme was well arranged with chorusses, trios, duets, recitatives and solos. The performance was of a very high character: each part was well sustained. About 40 performers were on the platform. The whole entertainment was a rich treat for the lovers of good music. The new grand Pianoforte, manufactured by Phillips expressly for the Hall Company, was used for the first time. It is a fine-toned instrument, and will be a great acquisition to the Hall. We think the character of the society should have been a barrier to ungenerous criticism, and prevent allusion to individual performers when they come forward as amateurs for the gratification of their fellow-citizens.

Provi
We lea
friend at
connected
Normal Sc
and Thurs
to a thoro
fication of
their prof
retical an
occasion
extent or
an acqui
of their
School so
nished by
pability i
tion of th
The in
seems ne
More vi
former c
room wa
get near
Model S
tance of
The f
who rec
1st Cl
bald, Col
bella McK
nie McK
ro. Mes
doeh Me
2nd C
Johnston
Thirza L
Hannah
bell, do
Delaney,
chester;
Kinmon,
Macarty
Pietou;
Neil, In
2nd
Whidde
ter; Ma
A. Holl
chester
do.; E
Keen,
Eliza N
M. A. G
Halifax
At
dents
Forres
ings to
deep in
them
had r
School
Dr.
hollar
Addr
much
By
obtai
Th
had
mem
had
stitu
mers
bequ
seve
the
Lor
ther
of
dep
the
this
Ref
Bill
the
hav
pas
ber
fou
Po
a s
res
ha
Si
wi
hi
ag
ge
ki
ar
ti
st
ro
ar
g
s
T
p