

[PUBLISHED BY REQUEST.]

To the Baptist Church, Granville St., Halifax.

DEAR BRETHREN,—

In your fourth letter to the Baptists of Nova Scotia, the following paragraph occurs: "The Church never assumed the attitude of a prosecutor until it was, most improperly (as we think) forced upon us by the order of proceedings adopted by the Council."

Allow me on behalf of the members of the Council to explain the course we took.

In the resolution of the 12th of July, 1867, by which all our proceedings were regulated, you stated that the subjects for our investigation and adjudication were: 1. "The charges of immorality and all testimony having reference thereto which has been or may hereafter be adduced. 2. The charges of a pecuniary character in the accounts with Miss Vass, and 3. The action taken by the church in reference to each of the above cases."

You will observe that the very terms of your resolution required us to investigate certain charges; before we could proceed a step therefore, the necessary inquiry was, "what are the charges you wish us to investigate?" The members of the Council looked to me to tell them what it was they were met to investigate, and I looked to the representatives of the church to state the charges, in order that I might be able to inform them.

I submit that if it was not your intention for your representatives to lay specific charges before the Council, the resolution under which we acted ought to have been worded differently.

You will also observe, that in reference to the action of the Church, the phraseology is changed; no mention is made of charges; "the action taken by the church," became the subject of investigation; the pertinent inquiry then was "what action did the church take?" We would best arrive at the knowledge of this, by demanding a connected statement of the several steps taken by the church. This method we pursued in accordance with your own instruction.

It is true that the Hon. Judge Johnston, at an early stage of the proceedings, handed in a series of charges against the church, but these he subsequently withdrew, which left us free to carry out to the letter your wishes as expressed in your resolution.

The order of proceeding adopted by the Council was therefore not only proper in itself, but necessary for the accomplishment of the object for which you requested us to meet.

As the expression of your disapproval has been published in the Messenger, you will confer a favour on me by requesting that this letter be made public through the same medium.

I remain,
Dear Brethren,
Yours very faithfully,
C. SPURDEN,
President of the Council, &c, &c
Fredericton, 13th Feb., 1868.

New Brunswick Correspondence.

St. JOHN, N. B., March 6th, 1868.

Mr. Editor,—

I had a few notes jotted down for you last week but an extra push of business drove the matter from my mind till it was too late to mail it for your issue,—and so I will start afresh.

I see by the last Visitor that its Halifax correspondent returns the "shake hands" of your "occasional" in his first letter, for which he has my acknowledgements and thanks.

The state of our churches is not much improved since I wrote you before, although there are signs I think which indicate a moving among the dry bones at no distant day. In some of the prayer meetings which I have attended there appears to be a special burden upon the hearts of some of the members to pray unceasingly for the reviving influences of the Holy Spirit to be imparted to those who have a name to live but yet appear to be quite dead. The Brussels Street Church are being blessed with drops of mercy and in their meetings the voice of penitent ones have been heard, saying "Pray for us." This people as you are aware have been without a pastor since the death of Rev. S. Robinson. The pulpit ministrations however have been performed by the Rev. I. E. Bill, and they have not therefore lacked guidance and instruction. Last week he was made the recipient of a purse with \$200 as a testimony of the esteem in which he is held by them. It is said they have engaged and shortly expect Rev. T. Hurley, a pupil of Mr. Spurgeon to arrive and settle among them.

The Germain Street Church lately held a Tea Meeting in aid of their building Fund which was a great success so far as numbers present was concerned, and the amount realized thereby. But it was to be deplored that arrangements could not have been made for the addresses and music to be given in the School-room, instead of in the body of the church, as the effect on many minds of listening to humorous speeches from the pulpit was anything but satisfactory, and left the impression on some that as a denomination we attach no idea of sanctity to the house we dedicate to the service of our God. And though I am fond of fun, delight in jollity, and can take, appreciate, and relish a joke or pun, yet I must confess to an overpowering sadness of spirit as I listened to the funny anecdotes and witty sayings of the speakers from the "sacred desk," intensified perhaps by the recollection that it was on this same spot that the truth came like an arrow to my heart, and the Holy Spirit strove with and I trust conquered my rebellious will. I hear that the friends at Leinster Street Church are talking of a Tea Meeting also, but I sincerely hope they will make such arrangements as will give the speakers on the occasion a platform in the lower room.

I see your House of Assembly is adjourned till August next. Our is yet sitting, and the members being chiefly new to legislative duties and requirements have quite a severe attack of the retrenchment fever. They began with a resolution to do without official debates, and the result is that thousands in the country districts are left in entire ignorance of what is being done. Next they cut off some of the hangers-on and superfluous officials, which was a good move. In a generous fit of self-denial they next dispensed with the coaches which in former years have carried the servants of the people to and from the House. Not satisfied with this, they went on and cut down the salaries of the clerks employed in the House and the several departments of the Public Service. The aged clerk of the Assembly, who for more than half a century has most faithfully discharged his duties under every variety of government, gaining the goodwill of all, has had \$200 cut off from the amount formerly paid him; and the engrossing clerks, who on many occasions I have known to sit up all night doing work that rightly pertains to the members themselves, have had their small stipends considerably reduced. Even the chaplains were not spared, and so the large amount of \$80 hitherto paid them is curtailed to \$60. The salaries of heads of departments was formerly \$2400, henceforth they are to receive \$2000 only, save the Attorney General who is still to receive the full amount. But while all this has been done you will hardly be prepared for the fact that the amount put down on the list for travelling expenses to be allowed the Executive Council is \$2500. A series of resolutions have been passed to go before the Privy Council of the Dominion relative to the route of the Inter-Colonial Railway, and another set regarding the Tariff as it affects the material interests of the maritime provinces. Although the House has been sitting three weeks, yet the appropriations have not yet been made, nor is it probable they will be for some days, as the accounts of last year's expenditures have not yet been laid before them, and it is said that in consequence of the extreme dilatoriness of the officials in some of the Departments they cannot be audited for ten days yet. When these accounts are submitted they will get a very rigid overhauling by a Committee of the House, and it is very probable that if the House refuse to grant supplies in the meantime, which they now declare is their intention, the Government will dissolve the House and appeal to the people. There is quite a storm brewing, but the Executive as such have not done any open act that can be taken hold of to form an Opposition, although they have nothing that can be called a following in the House. Doubtless by next week I may have stirring news on this matter.

Business here is yet very dull. Many of our merchants or their representatives have gone to Europe to purchase goods, but the general impression is that importations will not be large this spring. Shipbuilding, our mainstay, is low, and till this branch of industry revives, we cannot look for brisk times.

Since Sunday last we have been visited with a remarkable cold snap, accompanied by severe snow storms. On Monday at Fredericton the thermometer stood at 34° below zero, and at Apohaqui, on the line of Railway at 39° below. Just outside the city it was at 27° below. Before midday, however, it moderated somewhat, and the snow for a time came down in quite an old-fashioned manner. The wind too rose and after night-fall held a regular carnival, rushing and tearing about, pelting the poor unfortunates who happened to be out, with little pellets of hard snow that was any thing but pleasant to face.

This storm continued till Wednesday afternoon, although not as much snow fell as appearances led one to judge would fall. There was, however, sufficient to block our roads and render railway travelling undesirable for a few days. From telegrams received, it appears the storm was general over the whole of Canada, the Middle and Eastern States. All the mails are very much delayed.

Yours,

MENDIP.

Christian Messenger.

HALIFAX, MARCH 11, 1868.

Prelacy.

Perhaps there was never a time when church principles were being more severely tried than the present. When troubles arise in connection with Congregational churches, we are told that they result from not having authority sufficiently concentrated—that there is too much power in the hands of the people, and, it is thought, that a Bishop would soon put things all to rights! whereas in the so-called Protestant Episcopal Church, there never before was such an exhibition of weakness for accomplishing the great purposes of Church organization. Prelacy is unable to suppress heresy, or maintain purity of doctrine, or to contend with Romanism, or even prevent its highest ornaments—clerical and lay—from passing over into that communion—the ultimatum of Episcopacy. It is not for Episcopals to speak disparagingly of other church organizations and now call themselves the bulwark of Protestantism, as they were wont to do a few years ago. Not only are there evils which it is impossible to suppress, but new barriers to mutual christian work with other churches are being raised, which cause no small stir on either side of the Atlantic. The Rev. Mr. Tyng—a devoted and popular clergyman of New York—is undergoing a trial for overstepping the boundaries of church law in an Episcopal Methodist Church. Others are placed under bans for ecclesiastical irregularities in connection with Presbyterians and Congregationalists.

The infidel Colenso, in defiance of the Church with all its Courts, Councils and Parliamentary power, wears his lawn sleeves and draws his salary without let or hindrance.

Sad would it be for the cause of Christianity, if this were the highest type of church government given us by its Divine Author.

The Service of Praise.

There are, perhaps, few christian duties more imperfectly performed than that of singing the praises of God. Christian men and women are most exemplary hearers of sermons; and perhaps devoutly join in the public prayer, yet when the subject of praise is to be attended to their mouths are closed. They fail to "praise God in his sanctuary"; or "teach and admonish one another in psalms and hymns, and spiritual songs." One of our exchanges has a short article which contains words of wisdom on the subject, which we commend to our readers:

That singing is one of the more important features of religious worship we are all agreed. But as to how this part of religious worship should be conducted, there is some disagreement. Shall we encourage choirs? One says, yes. Another says, no. Shall we have congregational singing in our churches?

I give my judgment after thirty years experience as a pastor.

Singing must have a head. If possible, let some one be selected as a leader. Let him by all means be one who loves the Saviour, and has the Spirit of praise in his heart, and loves to sing "praises." Where it can be done, associations of singers should be formed, and practice the application of tunes to hymns weekly.

I am persuaded that there are advantages from having a well regulated head to our singing. But let our singers be, if possible, those who love the Saviour, and love to pray as well as sing.

I imagine that some one is ready to inquire, Would your recommend an "organ" in our churches? I certainly would, and the best man or most devoted sister to play it. An organ aids greatly in getting a right pitch or start, and it, when it is rightly managed, hides discords, and carries the tune along, amidst various failures in human voices.

My own judgment is, that an organ, and a good religious organist, and one good treble leader in each congregation would be of great use in our churches.

In some places the choir is a mere quartette, and the whole congregation almost hushed to silence in reference to singing. What a drawback on Christianity!

Some choirs are fingering their tune-books while the minister and the congregation are praying. Oh, shame! Such persons ought to pray a good deal before they go to church.

All this must be carefully regulated by the

pastor and his official board, for there is just as much need of regulating our singing so as to make it accomplish what it is intended to, as there is any thing else. And instead of fighting against organs and choirs, let them be made to subserve the worship of God's house.

We were hoping that our suggestion, two weeks since, respecting Dr. Crawley's letters would have saved us the necessity of any more distinct utterance on the subject; and that after seeing it Dr. C. would have brought the discussion to a speedy close. Many of our readers have already had more than enough of it. Many more may think that his letter, No. 6, in our present issue is objectionable; and that, for several other reasons, besides its great length, it ought not to have been published. It promises to make the subject interminable. But that must not be. Under the circumstances of the case we have desired to give him the utmost liberty, and, in doing so have gone beyond what our own judgment would have dictated in allowing him to ventilate his views. We have done this to an extent which has even gone against our own interests. We cannot see that any good purpose will be served by continuing the discussion in our pages, and have come to the conclusion that here it must end. We think that all concerned will be able to understand the matter, and know their own duty respecting the question raised, if they should be called upon to act at any time in reference to it.

We have had remonstrances from a large number of ministers and other brethren—some of them the best friends Dr. Crawley has—against a continuance of these letters, one of them will, perhaps, be sufficient. The following is from a respected pastor of one of the Churches at some distance from the city:

MISTAKEN KINDNESS.

Mr. Editor.—It must be evident to most of your readers by this time that Dr. Crawley, although professing to be the firm friend of Dr. Pryor, has, indirectly, injured him very much. Who, I would ask, if not Dr. C. is justly blameable for the increased notoriety of facts which were known to but a few, comparatively, and which would have been soon forgotten? If it be asked how he can be chargeable with this, the answer is contained in the facts connected with the controversy between him and Granville Street Church. Dr. Crawley, as all are aware, accused the Church, before the whole denomination, of acting as they did for insufficient reasons. Was not the Church thereby compelled to state what those reasons were, in order that the denomination might judge whether or no they were insufficient? And in doing so they were obliged to give enlarged publicity to some painful circumstances over which they would gladly have drawn the veil of oblivion.

One would have supposed Dr. Crawley to be a man of more sagacity and forethought than he has manifested in this discussion; for surely it was evident, at the first of the controversy, that, if he proceeded far in the way he had begun, the Church would be compelled to reveal some things, the recital of which must be unspeakably painful to Dr. Pryor and his friends. Surely Dr. C. must have known that these revelations would be made, and if so, why did he provoke them? why did he not, through love for his friend, refrain from renewing and prolonging the discussion of a subject so painful?

There are many of your readers throughout the country who were totally ignorant of some of the circumstances which Dr. C. has, indirectly, forced to the light; and it would have been infinitely better if they had remained so. Why keep the case of a fallen brother before the public for months, harrowing up the feelings of all true Christians, whether personal friends of the accused or not? Let no one say, the Granville St. Church has done it: they would never have written a word on the subject had they not been compelled to do so by Judge Johnston and Dr. Crawley. If Dr. Pryor's case looks darker to day than ever before, and if there are any two individuals upon whom the blame of this especially rests, they are his two dear friends just mentioned above.

Then for the sake of Christ's cause, and for the sake of Dr. Pryor's relatives, whose hearts have been pained enough already, I would entreat Dr. Crawley to refrain from further compelling Granville St. Church to make such revelations as they must if he persists in accusing them as he has done.

Yours mournfully

TRISTIA.

Dr. Crawley's remark in his first paragraph that "the unprecedented privilege obtained of reading my letters before they appear in public," applies to ourselves. We suppose therefore it will be in place for us to make a remark or two in reference to it. This "privilege" surely ought not to be objected to. The party accused ought to be permitted to see their accusation before it is published to all the world. It were a strange kind of morality that would object to this. An individual has a right to this; how much more where a church is concerned. Dr. Crawley would not surely send forth an accusation all over the world—where it is impossible to know who may read it—and leave it to be answered, perhaps in another issue of the paper, which may or may not be seen by the