

most satisfactorily answered, I took him before the congregation, and said they should listen to his declaration of faith in Jesus. This done, we went down into the sea, and there again he testified as to his hopes for eternity, and, being baptized, he, like the eunuch of Ethiopia, was filled with joy.

The impression made was so profound that several others present at the conclusion of the service expressed their desire thus to follow Christ, and among the rest another subaltern officer in the navy. May God in mercy give us many such seasons of refreshing!

EDWARD CLARKE.
Albert House, La Spezia, North Italy, June 17.

For the Christian Messenger.

“REMOVED MEMBERS.”

I have been much interested in the action of the Western Association, and the remarks of “D.” with reference to the very important matter of dealing with the members of our churches, who change their residence but not their membership. I am one of the many who heartily adopt “the 1st and 2nd suggestions.” But I must acknowledge myself among those who question, “the wisdom and propriety of the 3rd.” I notice that “D.” in his last paragraph, places himself in the same category.

My objection is this—the “suggestion,” makes a distinction between non-resident and resident members, which, it appears to me, does not exist, the consequence is that a mode of treatment is proposed which, however much it may possess of human wisdom, is, so far as I know, no scriptural warrant.

“D’s” article, including the report of the Association’s action, goes to show that non-resident members are as really under the watch-care and discipline of their churches as are other members. This I too believe. But if it be true, can any one tell me why there should be any material difference in their treatment if delinquent? If, an absent member should write to the church, why is not the church bound to write to him if he neglect it? If thy brother shall trespass, go and tell him his fault,—or make the nearest approach to it the circumstances allow. If he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, and send him a joint letter. If he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church, who will then be in a position to speak to him through their Clerk or a Committee. But if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican—not a dead man. Verily I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall [thus] bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.

I do not agree with what appears to be “D’s” belief, that no one should be excluded from a church except for “gross immorality or the adoption of other religious sentiments.” As I understand the Scripture, we are just as much required to “withdraw from every brother that walketh disorderly,” as from the immoral or heretical. And this being so, I seriously question both the wisdom and the propriety of introducing into our statistics a column either for “cancelled,” or “withdrawn,” or the recognition in any way of such side doors out of the church. And while it is a question, whether the 3rd suggestion of the Association will, “if followed prevent or remove the trouble,” the plan I suggest, being scriptural, must succeed. It is no untried and doubtful experiment,—it has succeeded.

For the Christian Messenger.

Dear Sir,—

Your readers will be glad to learn that Mr Tufts, late of Harvard, has been appointed as Principal of Horton Collegiate Academy. Mr Tufts’ reputation as a Teacher is too well known to need any proclamation of mine. Mr. Coldwell, who has proved himself a successful Teacher, will be Mr. Tufts’ first Assistant. Other assistants are also to be provided.

It is not certain that the arrangement indicated in the accompanying notice (See Advertisement) will be strictly adhered to. Such modifications will be made as the necessities of the case may require. The Committee believe that Horton Academy will be second to no school of the kind in the Lower Provinces, and they trust that great numbers of the youth of both sexes will avail themselves of the Educational advantages thus provided for them.

D. M. WELTON,
Chairman of Committee.

For the Christian Messenger.

Dear Editor,—

It is said that a gentleman once asked the celebrated Curran how he liked a speech he had just been listening to in the House of Commons—“Oh,” he replied, “it was a complete parenthesis.” “Please explain,” said his friend. “Well,” replied Curran, “a parenthesis is something that can be entirely omitted without any injury to the sense. It was just so with the speech.” As we read the Hon. Judge McCully’s letter in the last issue of the Messenger, we thought “it was a complete parenthesis.” It could be entirely omitted without any injury to the sense. But as it would not be courteous to allow the letter to pass without being reviewed, we must give it a brief notice. As we view the letter, it contains unjustifiable severity—misapprehension, and “unmerited insult.”

1. Unjustifiable severity. If we misapprehended the writer’s language, and his letter was not written before he left Halifax, what grievous wrong did we commit? According to the writer’s own showing, his letter was written in June, and it was not published until the second week in July. As the Anniversary of the Home Missionary Union was to take place immediately after the publication of the letter, and therefore before any reply could be made to it, does not this fact carry with it the presumptive evidence that the letter appeared just at that time for a particular purpose? It requires no “mean insinuation” to convince the public that such was the case. We believe with H. W. Beecher, that “insinuation is the devil’s language,” and we never intentionally use it. We inferred from what the Judge wrote, and from the date of his writing, that he withheld the publication of his letter until just before the meeting of the Union, so as to influence, if possible, the action of that body. That is the point on which we laid stress. And that is the point on which the Judge does not touch, but he dashes off into side issues and seemingly loses his temper because we supposed he wrote his letter a few days before he did. Inasmuch as he noticed our letter, it would have been just as easy to answer our questions contained therein as to offer insult. There is not an entire “death of charity” with us, and therefore we are ready to suppose after all that it was only a “lapsus penne” for which the Judge is somewhat noted.

2. The letter contains misapprehensions. The Judge says,—“what I did write and which is strictly and literally true, the mean insinuation to the contrary notwithstanding—and you Mr. Editor are cognizant of the fact, is this—about leaving Halifax to preside,” &c. Now we did not attempt to throw discredit on this statement. We did not doubt its truthfulness. There was no “mean insinuation to the contrary.” With due respect, therefore, to the critical acumen of the Judge, we think he must have misapprehended the meaning of what was plainly written.

Again, he says that our “communication is specially and abortively devoted to proving me capable of dissimulation, if not of something more.” We attempted nothing of the kind. We merely inferred that his letter written for some time, as the date of it shows, was withheld until a certain period for a special purpose. It has not been denied that our inference was correct. The writer of the letter referred to labours, therefore, under a second misapprehension. Farther, he observes,—“The logic which charges the author of a letter, published since the date of the meeting of an Association, with having thereby checked the spirit of benevolence and decreased the liberality of the churches represented, is characteristic of the Cor. Sec. of the Union.”

We never use such logic as that—Ours is the logic of facts and of common sense. The following is what we wrote, and the public are invited to decide whether it has any such construction as the Judge puts upon it:—

“It seems exceedingly unfortunate when the spirit of benevolence in the churches requires to be fostered and developed, that a person occupying an influential position should take such a stand as to encourage a withholding from the treasury of the Lord.” Such it seems to us—and we think the public are of the same opinion—would be the legitimate tendency of the stand taken by our Hon. friend in his caution and invitation to pause.

Then we state a fact and argue from it! “When it is remembered that all the churches in one of our Associa-

tions have sent less to their Association for Home Missions than either one of two churches I could name has contributed for that object. I think no caution or invitation need be given to the outflow of benevolence to the cause of Christ.” Where is there in these sentences one word that justifies the statement that we charged “the author of a letter, published since the date of the meeting of an Association, with having thereby checked the spirit of benevolence and decreased the liberality of the churches represented?” How dare men, in the face of an intelligent public, make such reckless statements? The Judge evidently makes a third mistake.

Again, he says,—“The debt incurred and remaining unpaid on one Meeting house alone, would more than absorb all the balance claimed to be in hand.” It should be remembered that it is no part of the work of the Board to build meeting houses. A reference to the constitution of the Union is proof of this. But if our missionaries are successful in building or carrying to completion new meeting houses, we shall rejoice in the fact and feel justified in placing the results of their efforts to the credit of the Board. But as the Board are in no way responsible for the debts of building committees, their debts should not be set against our balance in hand. There was thus a fourth misapprehension.

3. The letter contains “unmerited insult.” With regard to our use of “the Royal pronoun” we, instead of the plebeian I, it seems almost too childish to need even a passing notice. We may remark, however, that in our early years we were taught that in writing for the public eye, to use the first person plural instead of the first person singular, except where the latter seemed to be necessary for distinctness, was a mark of modesty and good taste. We have observed in our reading that many writers from the days of Cicero to the present time have pursued this course. Especially is this true of editors of newspapers. We are surprised, therefore, that one who sat for some time in the Editorial chair should be ignorant of the fact. In following the example of great and good men, we were not aware that we were trenching on the prerogatives of royalty. But we must live and learn.

The letter contains such epithets and expressions as these:—“In such a presence,” “his Majesty,” “mean insinuation,” “this plural personage—venturing out with a lofty air,” “lacking in the essential element,” “mean coarse insinuation,” “headed by a doctor who writes himself we,” “spitfire sentiments, &c.”

After the use of such gentle epithets and expressions as the above, the Judge might have spared himself the pains of telling the public that his criticisms will be “in the spirit of a gentleman and a Christian.” We hope when he refers to us again, he will have something to say and that he will say it in the proper spirit. At the present time we are trying to do “a great work” for the denomination and for the cause of Christ. Would it not be better for those that profess attachment to the same cause to help forward the good work, rather than throw themselves across the track of denominational advancement and the progress of truth? But to his own Master each one must stand or fall.

G. R. DAY,
Cor. Sec. of Union.
Yarmouth, July 24, 1874.

Educational Record.

The meetings of the Associations have passed, and we naturally inquire what they have effected. Though these assemblies have no power to legislate, they are useful in helping the minds of the people in sympathy with great public objects. These meetings help in forming opinions, and they give opportunity for bringing representative men of different sections to common views and united action. These are results that cannot be reached by legislation, and are really more valuable than the work of any legislative body that might exist among our people.

An earnest discussion of practical questions by men of different opinions, often seems to jar on the susceptibilities of many good brethren; but such discussions are not out of place, provided the hearts and purposes of all concerned are rightly moderated. An open expression of doubt is better than secret distrust and dissatisfaction. Men who have each other’s opinions fairly and strongly criticised, need not

have less respect for each other; in fact such criticisms often lead to more respect and courteous treatment. Good men sometimes say, let there be no differences; but they forget that where many individuals think, some must inevitably have some opinions not accepted by all. Strict agreement can be found where one man thinks and decides for all the rest. But if every one must think for himself, as Baptists are wont to hold, this mental activity will show itself in some differences of judgment; but these will be a more hopeful indication of healthful progress, than thoughtless conformity to the wishes of a leader.

One of the great hindrances to advancement in the department of education, has been that so many have been ready to vote a hasty approval of any measure proposed. In consequence of this, measures the most contradictory have been approved by the same men in successive years, and our history has been largely a record of brilliant schemes, magnificent speeches and inconsiderable intelligent work. When men begin to study the subject, compare systems and ask for reasons of plans proposed, some inconveniences will arise from such a condition of things, but it is certain that a good cause will gain by this agitation. The events of the last few weeks have made it clear that our educational institutions never had a firmer hold on the people than at the present time. The solicitude, that has found earnest expression, lest something may be done to impair their efficiency, is evidence of the strength of the conviction that the success of these institutions is vitally linked with the prosperity of our denomination and of the country. It is something gained, when the question is no longer raised, whether the Academy is needed. Much has been gained, when time is no longer occupied in attempting to prove that our people cannot and will not support a good College, but instead of this the committee on Endowment are admonished publicly and privately that their plans and efforts may fall below public expectation. There has been great gain, when the large majority of our people are ready to admit that something more must be done in the way of special Theological training, and so many are ready to show the sincerity of their convictions by generous contributions for this object. On the whole the record of the year reveals no cause of discouragement, but on the contrary stronger grounds of hope and fresh incitement to harder, and if possible wiser, labor for the years to come.

The earliest distinction in university communities was that of master and scholar. The master was the same as doctor—magistri et doctores being used as early as the ninth century to denote the same persons. The proficient in a course of study was recognized as such by his ability to teach. The degree of bachelor—a term of disputed etymology—was of later origin, instituted, it is said, by Gregory IX, 1227—1241. Masters and Doctors came afterwards to be distinguished, so that the three gradations in classic honor were familiarly recognized in the faculty of arts—bachelors, masters, and doctors. In the faculties of law, theology, and medicine, only the two gradations of bachelor and doctor were common. In different countries and in different institutions different conditions in some respects were prescribed for winning these honors. The distinctions of degrees in course and honorary, are generally recognized—the first being conferred on proficiency in a prescribed course of study, the second being given simply in honor of recognized eminence of learning. But the degree ad eundem gradum is also sometimes conferred on those who have received the degree at another institution, without new examination and not in causa honoris. Recently, moreover, the practice has been growing of granting degrees on mere examination, the candidate having prosecuted his studies elsewhere. We have thus these four kinds of degrees distinguished in respect to the way in which they are attained—in regular prescribed course of study, in the way of honor, in the way of courtesy to other institutions by admission ad eundem, and by examination in certain prescribed studies.

Honorary degrees have been sometimes conferred on women of great attainments in learning. Of late years the granting to women of degrees in course and also on examination has become common.—College Courant.

The Christian Messenger.

HALIFAX, N. S., JULY 29, 1874.

P. E. I. BAPTIST ASSOCIATION.

On hearing the Clerk read the Minutes on Monday morning, we were struck with a remark in them, that the addresses on Saturday afternoon “bore particularly on the revival now spreading among the churches.” This we thought the true spirit of revival. We should always regard a revival, as “now spreading.” The following resolution was unanimously adopted in reference to said intelligence:

Resolved, That in view of the unexampled success that has attended the faithful preaching of the gospel in this our own beloved Island, during the past year, this Association desires to return its heartfelt gratitude to Almighty God, and to offer its humble prayer for still greater blessings.

The title of the Circular Letter—sent by telegraph—was not quite correctly given in our last. It should have been “The import and importance of Baptist History.” Subsequent to its being read and adopted, the following resolutions passed the Association.

Resolved, 1. That a Committee be appointed to collect materials from our churches in order that an historical sketch of the origin and progress of the Baptist cause on this Island, may be prepared and published.

2. That said Committee consist of Revs. W. B. Haynes, J. Davis, M. Ross and Jas. Desbrisay, Esq.

A resolution was also passed for the establishment of an Infirm Ministers’ Fund to which the churches were invited to contribute.

The report of the Committee on Sabbath Schools showed quite a large increase in the number of scholars.

A resolution was adopted to form a Baptist Sabbath School Convention to meet at Summerside on the first Wednesday of October next.

The Report of the Committee on Missions recommended a combination in Home Mission work with the Nova Scotia Baptist Home Missionary Union. After the reception of which a resolution was unanimously adopted to carry such union into effect.

The evening meeting was addressed by Revs. W. B. Haynes, W. B. Boggs, D. A. Steele, W. A. Corey, H. Morrow, J. B. McQuillan, and D. McDonald. At the close of which a collection was taken up for Foreign Missions, amounting to \$100.

The arrangements for reaching the Island and returning from it are very convenient. Leaving Halifax on Monday, Wednesday or Friday at 8 o’clock, enables one to reach Charlottetown about 6 o’clock the same evening. To return, one may get on board the steamer in the evening of either of those days and retire at any hour he may choose. The steamer leaves the harbor at 3 o’clock next morning, reaching Pictou for the railway at 8 o’clock, and Halifax at 3:25 p.m.

Our visit to the Island was most pleasant in every respect. The most considerate kindness was shown to all the delegates. The earnest attention of the people at the meetings shewed that deep interest was felt in all matters which came before the Association.

Of the four Associations of this province and P. E. Island, three have been at new places, and only one where a similar gathering had been before held. This enlarges our bounds and affords some evidence that Bible truth is becoming more firmly embedded. Each Association is large enough to render the meetings highly attractive and not so large as to become specially burdensome to the people inviting the several bodies. With vigorous working of the Home Missionary Union we have reason to hope that still greater good may be done in each succeeding year in bringing souls to Christ, and rendering the churches more efficient and successful.

People often fail to appreciate their own homes, and fancy that something they see in other people’s, renders them more desirable than their own, whereas if they properly valued those they have they would be saved from a large amount of discomfort. A paragraph in the London Building News gives a fine illustration of this common fact: An English country gentleman recently became tired of his house, and determined to sell it. He instructed an auctioneer, famous for his descriptive powers, to advertise it in the papers for private sale, but to conceal the location, telling persons to apply at his office. In a few days the gentle-