

proclaiming the glad tidings in the destitute parts of New Brunswick, and suffering the privations and hardships which are incident to a thinly settled state of country, poor accommodations, and roads almost impassible. Many conversions were the fruits of these labours. When he had been preaching in this way about four years he went to the United States, where he received ordination as an evangelist. On his return, he resumed his beloved employment. In 1809 he visited Nova Scotia, and preached with much acceptance in various places. In the following year he removed to this province, and became pastor of the Upper Granville church, then vacant by the removal of T. H. Chipman to Nietaux. He fixed his residence on a farm near Bridgetown.

I hope to complete the memoir, and to bring this period of the history to a close, in my next.

Feb. 1, 1862.

Yours truly,  
MENNO.

To the Editor of the Christian Messenger.

DEAR SIR,—I have just read, with a good deal of surprise, the extraordinary production, in the last issue of your journal, over the signature "A. H. Munro"; a surprise which I doubt not will be shared by many of your readers, when they learn that the writer, the Rev. A. H. Munro, is a member of the Associated Alumni of Acadia College, and is therefore bound, by the action taken by the Society at its last meeting at Nietaux, in reference to sustaining Dr. Pryor as a Professor of the College, that action of the Alumni, and the resolution of the Governors based thereon, "extending a cordial invitation to Dr. Pryor" to fill a Professorship in Acadia College, was, in the absence of Mr. Munro, *unanimously* approved of by the Convention; and Dr. Pryor has signified his acceptance of the appointment, and intimated that he will be prepared to enter on the duties of his office in April next,—an offer made by parties properly authorised, and its acceptance is all that is ordinarily necessary to complete an engagement. And I am at a loss to know what more Mr. Munro would require in the present case. Or why Dr. Pryor, having accepted the appointment, is not as much entitled to be considered a Professor, as Mr. Munro is to be considered the pastor of the North Halifax Baptist Church, if he should happen to be for a time absent from his post.

It is true that the acceptance by Dr. Pryor, of the invitation, has thrown the large responsibility upon the Alumni of providing for his support. This, however, is a separate matter, and results from the acceptance. This responsibility, Mr. Munro, as a member of the Alumni, shares equally with any other member of the Society. It could easily be discharged were every member cheerfully to assume his portion of the duty. And I deeply regret the tone and style of Mr. Munro's effusion, as I had hoped that the officers of the Society might at least have counted on the sympathy and aid of the members of the Society and the professed friends of the College, instead of being obliged to contend against their apathy or covert hostility.

Mr. Munro says "I am told \*\*\* that there are most serious reasons why, at present, no engagement should be made with him" (Dr. Pryor) "or any other gentleman, however competent, to take a professorship in the College." I could have wished that Mr. Munro had condescended to state these "most serious reasons," in order that we might judge of their potency; or at least have given us the name of the person to whose bright genius he is indebted for these "most serious reasons." As possibly the personage who claims their paternity, may set a higher estimate upon his own reasoning powers, than a discerning public might be disposed to accord them.

From his letter I must assume that these "most serious reasons" have recommended themselves to Mr. Munro's own serious judgment, but has it never struck him as strange that a man as astute as Dr. Cramp, and justly holding by Mr. Munro's own concession a high position among the denomination, should have strenuously urged the appointment of a tutor, and failed to discover these "serious reasons"? why no "present engagement should be made." The Governors of the College are men selected for their foresight, prudence and discernment, yet no "serious reasons" prevented them from extending a cordial invitation.

The Baptists of three Provinces met in Convention, and in that numerous and intelligent body not one man arose to urge any "serious reasons," against the invitation extended by the Governors. Should not these considerations have led Mr. Munro to hesitate before he allowed his own judgment to be carried captive by these "most serious reasons"? And should he not doubt their infallibility when Dr. Cramp the Governors and the Convention failed to discover them. I forbear, Mr. Editor, to remark upon the expression "flagrant misstatement" use by Mr. Munro, as I charitably presume that these "serious reasons" had so terrified him, that for the time his judgment refused its proper office.

And in conclusion allow me to assure Mr. Munro that no man connected with the Baptists has warmer and truer friends in the denomination than Dr. Pryor, of which I have received renewed assurances since this movement at Nietaux was made, for persons not connected with the Alumni have come forward and offered their services as agents, pledging themselves to raise in their locality a certain sum towards that gentleman's salary. And it only needs a hearty co-operation among the friends of the College and of Dr. Pryor, and the object is easily accomplished, and I mistake the temper of the Alumni much, many of whom were Dr. Pryor's pupils, and know best how to appreciate him as a man and a friend and to value his labours as a Professor, if opposition does not nerve them to a more vigorous exertion, and render them more determined than ever to shew that they know no such word as fail.

Apologising for trespassing on your space,

I remain

Yours &c.,

J. W. JOHNSTON JR.,

President of the Alumni.

Feb. 3rd.

MR. EDITOR,—

When previous to your last issue you requested me to consent to my letter, prepared for that paper, to stand over, in order to make room for the Rev. Mr. Munro's second epistle, I cheerfully acquiesced, hoping that there would be no further occasion for its publication. Having, however, carefully read Mr. Munro's last letter, I feel constrained to request that you will allow mine to appear; and though I must congratulate Mr. Munro on the somewhat improved tone of his last letter, I am wholly at a loss to conceive what prompted him to indite either of them, or what good results he anticipated from their publication. Was it out of regard to Dr. Pryor? He adopted a somewhat strange method of testifying his regard. If that is his friendship, Dr. Pryor may well exclaim, "save me from my friends." Was it from fear that the appointment would militate against the interests of the College, and hamper the Governors? Surely Mr. Munro might allow the Governors and the Convention to manage their own business. He may depend upon it, that the Governors knew how far they might safely go, when they passed the resolution they did at Nietaux, making the appointment.

Without, Mr. Editor, impugning the general accuracy of your reports, I regret that Mr. Munro, passing other and more reliable sources, should have obtained his information from some remarks I am alleged to have made at the Convention, and from an anonymous letter that appeared some time back in your columns. Although I cannot at this distance state my remarks yet I venture to think, they will not bear the construction attempted to be placed upon them. Mr. Munro is in error in two or three other positions which he has taken in his second letter. There was no condition that the resources of the College should not in any way contribute to Dr. Pryor, so far from it, the Governors pledged \$200 to his support if necessary.

Mr. Munro seems greatly alarmed lest the funds of the College should go towards paying the \$200 promised by the Governors, and says it must be paid out of the private resources of the Governors. I think he may safely leave that matter to be decided by the Governors themselves, who are probably as capable as himself of determining from what source to pay the amount. Mr. Munro will remember that last June the Alumni paid into the funds of the College nearly \$200, and now that they have an object of their own to sustain, the Governors may not have felt indisposed to look upon a gift in the nature of a loan, and be not unwilling to return it if required. The statement made by Mr. Munro that "many joined the Alumni with the avowed object of providing a salary for a Professor of Modern Languages in Acadia College, and are not willing to have their subscriptions devoted to any other object," is not, as far as I know or believe, correct, the question of employing a Professor of Modern Languages, was once partially discussed by the executive Committee, but I do not remember that it was mooted at the public meeting of the Society, however, the Society paid away their funds to a different object and have now unanimously devoted their energies to another object. I trust the result may shew Mr. Munro how groundless are his "fears, that the Associated Alumni will be able to do but little towards raising the \$800 required."

I regret, Mr. Editor, being obliged to occupy so much of your space with this matter, but filling the position I do, I felt I should not have discharged the duty I owe to the Associated Alumni, had I allowed Mr. Munro's remarks to pass in silence.

I am yours,

J. W. JOHNSTON, JUNR.,

President of A. Alumni.

Feb. 8th.

[Since the above was in type we have received two other letters on the same subject, but as our columns were filled before their reception, we have been obliged to defer their publication.—Had we perceived the inconvenient length to which this matter would have grown, we should have declined to give it publicity; even at the risk of being charged with unwillingness to allow free discussion and the possibility of its being taken to some other newspaper. We recommend our brethren to allow the matter to rest here, as we cannot see that good will arise from pursuing it further.—Ed. C. M.]

## Christian Messenger.

HALIFAX, FEBRUARY 12, 1862.

SUBSCRIBERS who are in arrears, but are uncertain as to the amount of their indebtedness, and have no other opportunity of sending to our office, will greatly oblige by forwarding to us any convenient sum by letter, through the post office. We shall be happy, in acknowledging the receipt of the same, to inform them to what date the sum sent will pay.

### American Barbarism.

We do not pretend to understand all the ins and outs of the United States Constitution and Government, but the sin of shutting up the ports of the South, which by treaty belong to Nova Scotians, as well as to all British subjects for the purpose of trading, we not only fully comprehend, but feel most keenly. The following article from *The Times* will shew that those who are perhaps less interested than ourselves, look on that part of "the course" of the U. S. Government as a piece of barbarism.

"Satisfied with our deliverance from the war which threatened to arise out of the affair of the Trent, we would gladly leave the Federals and Confederates to their own devices, and think as little as possible of them and their doings. But the vindictive hostilities which prevail on American ground force themselves on our notice. Not only do they affect our interests as a nation, but they move our feelings as men. Wonder, pity, indignation, beset us when we hear of those immense armies, that ruinous expenditure, that desperate finance, that incessant partisan warfare without a result, and seemingly without a motive, the burning of towns and villages, the breaking down of bridges, the tearing up of railroads, and still worse tales, which, it is to be hoped, are in the main the exaggerations of fear or animosity. All those old reflections on the horrors of civil war which were the commonplaces of our boyhood recur to the mind, and we realize how bitter and how sad were the words of the ancient historian and poet who spoke from the fresh memory of what his country had undergone. The ferocity and vindictiveness which has become in the present generation part of the American character, as shown by duels and assassinations, and atrocities on board ship, that almost pass belief, are now in full play in this unhappy strife. And as yet the passions of the combatants have hardly had scope. When the half-million of Northern soldiers are launched against their adversaries, we may look for deeds such as the warfare of hereditary rivals like England and France would never know.

"It is plain that the war for empire has already begun to be a war for vengeance. The design, as it appears at present, is twofold.—There is the old theory that the South is merely for a time in the power of a band of traitors, who must be crushed, and then all will be well. To this the President and his advisers formally adhere, and will suffer no act to be done which seems to recognize a constitutional change. But a stronger and deeper current is setting in, which must soon sweep away these fictions of legality. The conquest, and, failing that, the destruction of a detested foe, succeeds as a design to that suppression of insurrectionary movements which a few months ago was the dream of the Federal Cabinet. If any one would learn the character which this war is assuming, let him read the accounts of the destruction of the port of Charleston as given in the latest news from America. Among the crimes which have disgraced the history of mankind, it would be difficult to find one more atrocious than this. The mind is astounded and appalled to learn that men who have been reared under the influence of religion, morality, and law, who have practised self-government, who have deified opinion, who have made especial pretences to enlightenment, and even to refinement, should perpetrate a crime which barbarians acting only by the light of nature and the instincts of their own hearts would shrink from. Even the fierce tribes of the Desert will not destroy the well which gives life to an enemy. But here we have a Christian nation and a Government which professes to act from sentiments of the highest virtue, ruthlessly pronouncing the destruction of the principal harbor of a dangerous and stormy coast, choking up the outlet of a vast commerce, dooming one of the richest regions of the globe to ruin, and, as far as they can, cutting off millions of people from communication with the ocean which washes their coast. But, that we may not seem to misstate the act which has just been accomplished by the Federal commander of the 'stone fleet,' we will shortly describe what has been done at Charleston and what it is intended to do at Savannah and, if possible, at Mobile.

"An eye-witness writes,—The main channel of approach to Charleston harbour has been destroyed. Sixteen stone-filled hulks, placed checkerwise across the passage, in the deepest water, just at the inner and outer edges of the bar, are the mediums through which this righteous retribution has been meted out. The wrecks are not ranged in a right line across the channel. That arrangement might prove an effective blockade for a time, but not permanently. The scientific mind of Captain Davis devised a plan to prevent the water from cutting another channel. The hulks are placed in three lines, checkerwise. This arrangement not only does not prevent the passage of water, but forms a series of shoals, around which the tide will whirl and eddy, making an intricate labyrinth which no vessel could navigate. We forbear to speak of the hideous ploys in which this writer indulges while describing the vengeance of the

Federal Government. We will confine ourselves merely to the fact which he narrates—that the main entrance to the port of Charleston has been destroyed by sinking hulks filled with blocks of granite on the bar. This is the 'deed without a name' on which the world has now to pronounce its opinion. Let not any one say that the effect of the operation has been exaggerated, and that the 'stone fleet' will not do the permanent evil that is anticipated. We fear that the ingenuity of the Federals will succeed but too well. The Southern harbours are at all times subject to be blocked up by deposits of sand and mud. From this defect the harbour of Charleston is not free, and the navigation is as intricate as in the other ports of this low and swampy coast. What, then, must be the result of sinking vessels filled with masses of granite? Plainly it will be what the exulting Northerners expect—that wherever a ship has been sunk a shoal will be formed, and that the channel will be made permanently useless. As long as the hulks last, the entrance will be impassable, and, should they even be blown up or otherwise destroyed, the stones will sink in the bed of the channel, and be as irremovable as the foundation of Plymouth Breakwater.

"Against this violation of all the laws of war, we cannot but protest. No belligerent has a right to destroy the great features of nature, to choke up the avenues by which populations communicate with the world without, and to deprive the mariner for ages of refuge from the perils of the sea. Charleston is the best, and, indeed, the only good harbour on a long line of coast, and to destroy the main entrance to it is a deed which calls for the reprobation of every maritime state. When has such an act been perpetrated by any European Power? In the war against Napoleon it was declared that the English were the 'tyrants of the seas,' because they prohibited intercourse with the nations with which they were at war. But at least this was honestly done by the laborious blockade of the enemy's ports. During years of harassing warfare, Toulon and Brest and the other ports of the French Empire were watched by our squadrons, and, though the task was difficult and dangerous with the old sailing ships of the time, though for days an effective closing of a port might be prevented by a contrary wind, yet it never entered into the thoughts of men like Jarvis, and Nelson, and Collingwood that they could save themselves trouble and their country expense by totally destroying the port, they were set to watch.—Yet what might not England, with her undisputed supremacy at sea, have effected, had she suffered herself to meditate such an iniquity? It is plain that every second-rate harbour on the continent, from the Elbe to the Bayonne, might have been thus destroyed forever by the British navy. But, though struggling for years against a gigantic adversary, we never thought of ruining the cities of Europe by a 'slight blight.'—The savage innovation has been left to Republicans of our own day, and is first put in practice against a city, the people of which the officer who does the work would a few months since have addressed as citizens and countrymen.—The fate which the Romans adjudged to vanquished Carthage, which one or two conquerors of the Middle Ages have meditated for some obstinately defended city, is now, in the 19th century, awarded by the north Americans to a community joined to them not only by the ties of race, language, and institutions, but, in hundreds of cases, by absolute relationship and family connexion."

### New Publications.

SERMONS ON SOME OF THE PRINCIPAL DOCTRINES AND DUTIES OF CHRISTIANITY, BY JOHN G. MARSHALL, Halifax. pp. 296. Price 2s. 6d.

The active mind and pen of Judge Marshall has here produced a neat volume of fifteen Sermons on various subjects, commencing with Divine Revelation all through the process of conversion, the character and personal duties of the Christian, ministers and people, civil government, resurrection, final judgment, the everlasting happiness of the righteous, and the everlasting misery of the wicked. Each sermon is preceded by a number of texts of Scripture on the subject, and is then discussed in a vigorous practical manner, which shews the writer to be, as he is, a man of good deeds as well as a sermonizer. This is but another practical exhibition of the philanthropy which has so long characterised Judge Marshall. The publication of this volume has been an outlay of which we believe the sale of the book will pay but a small fraction.

In his own way the Judge treats of all subjects, relating to manners and morals, sparing neither minister nor people, male nor female. On "Christian self-denial" with regard to dress he says:—

"Indeed, for many reasons which might be mentioned, it is more especially needful, that these inspired directions, should now be strictly regarded and obeyed. But, not only at ordinary times, are they utterly disregarded and violated, by religious professors, but, even, on the Sacred day of the Lord, if we look into any assembly of professed worshippers; and of the most evangelical denominations, we see, an almost universal profusion, and varied display of merely vain, ornamental, and extravagantly attractive female dress and appendages. These, plainly manifest, the inward pride and vanity, which have prompted and produced, the gaudy and forbidden exhibition. So universal, is this display, that the Christian member, the professedly converted one; and the mere congregational attendant, can but