

apply with equal force to all the schools established for Catholics in districts peopled in part by Protestants.

(2). Of Districts peopled by both Protestants and Catholics.—These now form a large portion of the school districts of the Province, and may in a few years comprise the entire number. If the Bishops' demand were granted, one of the following results, or some combination of them, must follow in nearly every one of these large class of districts:—(a) Greatly increased taxation of both Catholics and Protestants. The cost of two school sites, two school houses, two sets of furniture and apparatus, would be nearly double that of one. The yearly outlay for fuel and for teachers' salaries would be double. The amount received by the Trustees of both schools from the County Fund in aid of two teachers, would, of course, be just equal to that received for one Common School teacher, in respect of the attendance of pupils. As a result, the yearly district taxation would be increased for this object. Or—(b) poor, weak, fitful schools for both Catholics and Protestants. For either each portion of the district must submit to greatly increased taxation, or else have ill-equipped school-rooms, inferior teachers, or schools but three or six months a year. Or (c) no school at all for Catholic or Protestant minority. For if the majority were able by heavy district taxation to support an inferior or fitful school, the minority would be quite unable to support a school at all. Or (d) no school for either the Catholic or Protestant majority, or for the Catholic or Protestant minority. If the united resources of all the people of the district were required to support one school, it is clear that two schools could not be set in operation, or if set in operation, could not be sustained by the people.

(3). Of districts peopled exclusively by Protestants. If Separate Schools are established for Roman Catholics, they could not be denied to any other religious denomination. Justice and equal rights to all, partially to none, must be the aim of the Legislature! No church can be allowed exceptional privileges in this country—Thus the school districts peopled exclusively by Protestants would be turned into hives of Separate Schools, or there would be poor, weak, fitful schools or no schools at all. The moment education is made a denominational question, the self-interests of the different denominations will be brought into play and the schools suffer disintegration.

2. Consider the result of the establishment of Separate Schools upon the County School Fund and the funds of the Provincial Treasury. We have already referred to one result that would ensue in respect of the amount that would be received by any school district from the County fund, on account of the attendance of pupils. The result on that portion of the fund paid on account of the number of teachers employed in any district would be that two (or more) grants instead of one must be paid. But every such grant beyond the number of teachers needed to teach the children would be a waste of public funds. The consequence of this waste would be to lessen the amounts to be received by all other school districts on account of the attendance of children at school, and by so much further increase the local taxation of all the districts in each County.

The result on the funds of the Provincial Treasury would also entail a great waste of money, for wherever two teachers were employed in the school district where one could educate all the children, the Provincial Treasury would be required to pay two grants instead of one. The inevitable result of this waste would be that the amount now granted to each teacher would soon be cut down, for the treasury of the Province, with the increasing demands of other services, could not long provide the amount now given. But any diminution of the amount of the Provincial grant to each teacher, would cause an equal increase in district taxation in every school district in the Province, or else the employment of inferior teachers.

3. Consider the religious strife which a provision for Separate Schools is obviously adapted to engender. Distrust and jealousy between the people of the same district, and the people of the Province at large, in respect of schools, can only retard the progress of education. It is the duty of the Legislature to place all on a common ground, that their mutual aims and responsibilities in behalf of education may be promotive of the common good, and that the virtues of citizenship may be cultivated without partiality and without injustice.

But the refusal of the Bishops' demand, it is said, would be the signal for religious strife. We cannot believe it, but if so, the responsibility of that strife would not be chargeable to the School system, as in the former case. By its refusal the Legislature would simply say to all those who thus threaten:—"If you want more than we claim for ourselves and for all citizens, you are unreasonable, and we will not yield to your demands. If you are not satisfied with the doctrine of equal rights and religious liberty, you are the enemies of human freedom and equality, and your unjust clamor for unequal right will be silenced by the world's sense of universal justice."

II. THE DEMAND OF THE BISHOPS IS OPPOSED TO THE RIGHTS OF CONSCIENCE, AND THE PRINCIPLES OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.

1. Baptists, in common with the great majority of the Christian denominations of this Province are conscientiously opposed to being taxed, directly or indirectly, for the support of a system of education to teach a religion in which they do not believe. The modification demanded in our Free School system, by which Roman Catholic Separate

Schools shall be established by law, cannot be granted without trampling under foot the conscience rights of the great majority of the people of New Brunswick. It matters not, whether such schools be supported by Provincial grants, or by Provincial and County grants combined, or by the three-fold mode by which the Common Schools are now sustained. Whether the funds be procured directly or indirectly from the people, there would be equally a violation of the rights of conscience. Nor is it any answer to this objection to the Bishops' demand, to say that schools for each denomination may receive like aid from the public funds. This, in addition to being an aggravated violation of the rights of conscience, would be to force upon the people the degradation and ethical corruption of concurrent endowment—the promotion of religion at the expense of morality! So it comes to this: our children must receive their denominational teaching elsewhere, than in the schools supported by public funds.

2. The Province of New Brunswick—unlike some of the other Provinces of this Dominion—is not an ecclesiastical, nor a politico-ecclesiastical corporation, but is, in its essence, a political organism. Perfect freedom of religious opinion and worship is here enjoyed as a vested right of the individual conscience, and not as a grant of the Legislature. The Legislature may not prescribe any form of religious belief or worship, nor may it tax, in any form, any inhabitant of the Province for the support or teaching of religion. Nor, on the other hand, may the Legislature proscribe any form of religious belief or worship, simply as such, though for reasons of public morality, and for the safety and order of the Province, it may justly forbid and punish acts done in the name of religion, as, for instance, polygamy as practiced by the Mormons, the infanticide of the Chinese, the establishment of the Inquisition, or the interference of ecclesiastics with any of the rights and privileges enjoyed by persons as citizens of the Province. And upon the same grounds, though not as having any religious function, the Legislature may enact laws for the general welfare, which have also, in other relations, the sanction of religion. In view, therefore, of the purely political character of the Province of New Brunswick, and of the God-given right of religious liberty enjoyed within her borders by every individual, it is clear that the demand of the Bishops for establishment by law of Separate Roman Catholic schools in this Province, involves at once the subversion of our unwritten constitution, and the greivous invasion of the principles of religious liberty. Before New Brunswick shall thus change her purely political constitution and adopt the politico-ecclesiastical constitution of Ontario, or the quasi ecclesiastical constitution of Quebec, let us have this momentous question plainly and squarely submitted to the people at the polls,—for we were "free born."

III. IN CONTRAST WITH THE SEPARATE SCHOOL MODIFICATIONS DEMANDED BY THE BISHOPS WE INVITE YOUR ATTENTION TO SOME OF THE CHARACTERISTICS OF OUR FREE SCHOOL SYSTEM AS IT IS.

1. It assumes that denominational teaching is no part of the duty of the Province, or the county, or the school district. It, therefore, confines its formal instruction to matters of secular education, while it secures that the conduct, intercourse, and discipline of the schools shall be regulated in accordance with the principles of Christian morality.

2. It assumes that secular education is a matter of public concern, and all the schools are subject to that responsible public control and supervision which is necessary to their elevation, sustained progress, and permanent growth.

3. Its means of support are derived from the people of the district, from the people of the county, and from the people of the Province. Thus the resources of all the people contribute to the support of the schools, education is placed within the reach of the people of every district, taxation is rendered as light as possible, and provision for the continuous operation of the schools is secured.

4. It does not engender a waste of county and Provincial grants, but all those from the county and a portion of those from the Province, which would be wasted under a separate system, it applies a special aid to all the poor districts of the country.

5. It does not encourage the introduction of the self-interests of the different religious denominations into the efforts of the people to educate their children.

6. It respects the rights of every man's conscience, and secures these rights to him and to his children, on the basis of the common rights of citizenship, while it avoids the vice of concurrent endowment.

7. It is in perfect harmony with the principles of religious liberty,—the right not of sects and minorities merely, but of all men everywhere.

8. It educates the children of our common country together: they assemble under the same roof, play in the same grounds, and learn the rights and duties which they have in common. Thus prejudice is lessened, respect and sympathy increased, and all are led to value and preserve those common rights and virtues of citizenship which are essential to the peace and well-being of the people at large.

9. It does not in any way prevent children from receiving denominational instruction elsewhere than at the day schools. All the time devoted to common education is required for the purpose.

Brethren and fellow-citizens: We have, as briefly as clearness would permit, pointed out some of the results that must certainly follow the granting of the demand of

the Bishops. We have also added a brief outline of the chief characteristics of the Free and Non-Sectarian School system of New Brunswick. The school system of the Bishops, and the common school system of New Brunswick, are antagonistic to each other. The one is in the interests of Ultramontanists, the other is in the interests of all the people. In their Pastoral, the Bishops set forth their demand as the commissioned servants of the Roman Pontiff, Pius the Ninth. They inform us that he, as the Supreme Oracle of the Church, has settled the question of education for ever. It is something new for the people of this province to be told that Pius the Ninth can settle for them a matter which belongs exclusively to our Legislature. But mark the claims of the Pope as set forth by his own Archbishop Manning of England: "I acknowledge no civil superior. I am the subject of no prince, and I claim more than this—I claim to be the Supreme Judge and Director of the consciences of men—of the peasant that tills the field, and the prince that sits on the throne—of the household that lives in the shade of privacy, and the Legislature that makes laws for kingdoms—I am sole last Supreme Judge of what is right and wrong."

This was not the type of thought that won the liberties of the Reformation, or established Free Governments among the peoples,—that unbought the thoughts of men by the liberty of the Press, or acknowledged the freedom of religious worship. But it is the type of thought of the Bishops' Pastoral. They boldly speak to free men in the name of Pius the Ninth, and inform them that it is the will of the Roman Pontiff that their school system be moulded to suit his desires. We ask thoughtful men to ponder well the responsibilities thrust upon them by these bold declarations of Ultramontanists, in their very midst. Lovers of civil and religious liberty can never be parties to the establishment of any system of schools designed not only to teach the Catholic religion but also to imbue the youth of this province with the belief that the enactments of its Legislature are not binding without the sanction of the Church, that ecclesiastical law is above all civil power, and that whenever Ultramontanism has it in its power it may exterminate all who refuse to acknowledge the divine rights of Pope, Bishops, and clergy to be superior to the divine rights of humanity, resist all progress, and make all Parliaments and peoples bow down before the authority of the Church. Let us prove ourselves worthy of FREE INSTITUTIONS, by accepting fearlessly this wager of battle between ULTRAMONTANISM AND FREE GOVERNMENT. And may God defend the right!

By order of the members for New Brunswick, of the Committee on Education of the Baptist Convention of N. S., N. B., and P. E. I. I. E. BILL, Secretary.

REFORMED PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

Dear Mr. Selden,—

The Ottawa Times of 13th inst., brings a report of the Rev. Dr. Gallagher's address delivered recently at Ottawa preparatory to his organization of a reformed Church there, under the auspices of Bishop Cummins. I am sure many of your readers will be deeply interested in its perusal, I have therefore abstracted it and give the pith of his remarks for republication. I may here remark that private intelligence has been received of an organization and the formation of a Church at Ottawa, promising to out-bid the Ritualists, and largely to possess the land.

A large audience assembled in the Court House on Monday night to hear the address promised by the Rev. Dr. Gallagher with regard to the Cummins Reform movement in the United States, and the principles upon which it is based, and the aims of the actors concerned.

The chair was taken by Mr. Z. Wilson, who, in a few appropriate remarks introduced the Rev. Doctor, who opened the proceedings with prayer. He then informed the meeting that his physical powers had been subjected to a great strain since his arrival in Ottawa, and he consequently felt in no condition to do justice to the important subject in hand. He said he felt like a Canadian from the fact that three of his grand parents were born under the British flag, and that he had friends and relatives in this country, for whom he entertained a very high respect. It gave him great pleasure to stand before a Canadian audience to talk on a theme of such vast importance—one which he deemed had a bearing not only on the present Episcopal Church in Canada, but which would affect its whole future being, and that of every branch of the Church of all time, in the most salutary and beneficial way. Bishop Cummins had told him he desired to make only such changes as were absolutely necessary for the preservation of the faith, pure and entire. They desired only to lop off such excrescences as were endangering the vitality of the faith. The guiding spirit of their movement was entire love. They did not desire controversy with any of their brethren. It was only where the interest of the faith required it they would answer any attacks. A specimen of the assaults upon him had been furnished very near the audience. Bishop Cummins, in his sermon on the consecration of the first Bishop of the new Church, Cheney, of Chicago, observed. The only principle on which we reply is love; not a word of recrimination

not a hard answer, not a hand lifted to strike back. When reviled, we shall not revile again. If any hears a word of retaliation from his lips, let him proclaim me false. In such ways would they obey the teachings of the Master, and build up the Reformed Episcopal Church. Opprobrium was sought to be cast on the colleagues of Bishop Cummins because they were deposed and degraded ecclesiastically. Now the Protestant Episcopal, the English and the Roman Catholic Churches were the only ones that employed this discipline in the case of ministers receding for conscientious reasons. All other Churches, when character was good, kindly gave such receders a friendly letter of dismission, wherever they may choose to go, and then treat them as Christian brethren. Those three churches however, acted in the most unkind, un-Christian and discourteous manner towards outsiders, much to their own injury. Now, one-half the ministers of the Protestant Episcopal Church came from other churches, and would be branded as degraded and deposed did they act like the former. The Episcopal would, in that case, be regarded as the most degraded church the sun ever shone on. There was no force in this argument of deposition. Dr. Gallagher, proceeding, stated that the Laity of the Protestant Episcopal Church were seriously contemplating the errors and abuses that had crept into the Church; the subject was so far down in their hearts as not to make it much worse, but there would be an explosion, like that of a volcano, which would startle this whole continent. Stewart Bros. & Co., one of the most influential laymen of the Protestant Episcopal Church and a Warden of the Church where Bishop Bedell, formerly officiated, had written—"If things remain, as they are in the Church, every bishop ought to follow the example of Cummins.

The Rev. doctor said he believed that if reforms were not made, there would soon be a large secession, and the experience of Bishop Cummins in two Conventions of the Church forbade the hope of any beneficial changes. But for his brave step, there would be no hope. We ought to thank him for opening up a place of refuge, should we be driven out of the Church. The speaker then proceeded to show cause for withdrawing from the Protestant Episcopal Church. Describing the services and practices in some of the English Churches, as almost if not quite Roman Catholic in form and meaning. In one a requiem mass was celebrated for the soul of Mr. Purchas, in others were confessional-boxes. At Clifton, the Minister officiating at Holy Communion, insisted on putting the bread into the mouths instead of into the hands of ladies, and so forth. He instanced a church in Newark, N. J., where the pastor commanded people to kneel on the floor at the communion rails, as it was unseemly to be standing in presence of the King of Kings, and to take up every particle of the sacramental bread with the tongue, as every particle contained the whole body of our Lord. He (Dr. Gallagher), could give many similar examples of such teaching and practices, had he time. He read an extract containing the following passage:—"Go into any of the Ritualistic Churches, and see whether you will not be reminded of Rome—whether everything does not tell the same tale of Romish celebrations, and services having overloaded everything in the English Church service. When extreme unction is administered to the dying and mass is said for them, when veepers were made a function in the Blessed Virgin's bosom, when we see a yearning towards Romish tenets, practices and institutions, and a desire to conform our services to the Romish type, the result being that we cannot recognize our own clergy, silence becomes no longer possible. The Doctor next described the furniture and practices of the three New York Ritualistic Churches. The Bishop of New York consecrated the altar of one in memory of a deceased lady, the service being so like that of the R. C. Bishop in a similar service at St. Stephens, the same afternoon, singularly enough, that the account of the one might have been taken for that of the other. The description of the service at St. Albans, N. Y., on Christmas Eve, showed that at 12 o'clock began the celebration of the Holy Eucharist; then came a procession round the Church, composed of the incense-bearer in a black cassock, the cross-bearer in a purple, and others in different colors, including the chorister-boys, followed by the Banner of the Nativity, etc. [Laughter.] All that was seen and done without any rebuke whatever from the Bishop. Then St. John's was presided over by Dr. Emer, who had declared that Protestantism was a failure. He did not think that his audience, especially the large number from Ireland, who knew what Romanism there was, would grant that Protestantism was a failure while they had their senses. [Applause.] Had he not shown good reasons for quitting the Episcopal Church? They had a bold, fearless leader, and men determined to stand by him to the end. They wanted to arouse the Protestant conscience of the country, and the United States, and put a stop to the evil things, and compel men to say whether they were Roman Catholics or Protestants. [Loud applause.] He had no faith in this milk and water moral theology. It was neither one thing nor the other. It could not be respected of God or honest men, and none more derided it than the Roman Catholics. As to the priests spoken of in some, it was all falsehood and imposture. There was no Priest but Christ. Priest was an idea hostile to the liberties of the people. The priesthood was striving to secure power over the minds and consciences of the people, and when it could not get the men it got the

women. [Laughter and applause.] If they wanted their children to be Protestants, they must step out of the Episcopal. If they condemned Cummins for leaving the charmed circle of the Episcopate, they must censure Luther, and the great Wesley whose transcendent merits were cordially acknowledged by Dean Stanley, of the Church of England. The Reformed Episcopal Church believes in the Old and New Testaments as the Word of God and rule of faith, and in the Apostles' Creed and doctrines set forth in the thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England. Second, it recognises Episcopacy, not as of divine right, but as a very ancient and desirable form of church policy. This idea of apostolical succession was being found out to be a mere ecclesiastical fable or assumption. [Laughter and applause.] The ablest scholars and writers in England are now admitting that this notion is unwarranted by the facts of history.

The Reformed Church plucked the doctrine out by the roots; but it had no roots. (Applause and merriment.) It did not go back to the Apostles, reaching only Bishop Cyprian, of Africa, 250 years after Christ was born. Dean Stanley gave it up, and Lightfoot, of Cambridge, and Riddell, author of the Greek Lexicon, and Harrison, Mossman—all learned and able. The doctor again controverted the doctrine of the divine endowment or right of bishops, which would have come through a very muddy source—that of the Roman Catholic Episcopate—contending that the Holy Spirit could not have been likely to select such a medium. He wondered how any sensible Christian man could retain such a doctrine. He once believed it, but had abandoned it wholly. Like the Apostle, when he became a man, he put away childish things. While having the settled form he presumed they would have the right to introduce and extempore prayer if they saw fit. He thought they had erred in keeping too closely to a rigid rule. He thought the new church would adapt itself more fully to the genius of this grand western continent. This Church condemned the doctrine that Christianity existed in only one form or order of Ecclesiastical polity, and that Christian Ministers were priests in any other sense than that all believers are a priesthood. That the Lord's table is no altar on which the Body and Blood of Christ is offered anew. We oppose the doctrine of transubstantiation and consubstantiation. We deny that Christ is present in the bread and wine. We believe He is present in the heart of the worthy recipient, in the living spirit. We reject the belief, that regeneration is necessarily or inseparably connected with Baptism. Ministers in good standing in other churches should be received into this one, on presenting letters of Dismission, without reordination. Ministers as well as Bishops would take part in the Episcopal and other ordinations. He went on to condemn the practice of erecting altars in churches, saying three-fourths of the Episcopal edifices in the United States were provided with them. The policy had been to draw towards Rome and prevent Communion, Christian intercourse or cooperation with Protestant denominations. Bishop Cummins, and others seeing no prospect of relief, determined to leave the Church, being the first Protestant Bishop who had taken this manly and laudable course. He (Dr. Gallagher), had just received a letter from the Bishop, who took a great interest in this Ottawa movement; expressing great sorrow at his inability to come here now. His wife's ill health obliges him to accompany her to the South. He said, that as soon as he could, in the course of a few weeks, he would come to Ottawa. (Applause.) He (the Dr.), thought when Parliament was here, would be a good time for the visit; for he thought Ottawa a great centre of influence, and he trusted that as its citizens had the honor of commencing the work in this part of the Dominion, they would see its influence go forth with great power to every part of the country. (Applause.) The Rev. gentleman concluded with the following, among other announcements; that a meeting would take place on Thursday night, to organize the Reformed Episcopal Church. The proceedings were brought to a close by the singing of a Doxology and the benediction, pronounced by the Rev. Dr. Gallagher.

For the Christian Messenger.

"BY WHOM IT MATTERED NOT."

DEAR EDITOR,—

The above appeared in a communication in the Christian Messenger of the 18th inst.

Such may be the sentiment of your correspondent, and the church with which he stands connected, but the expression, "our churches," gives the impression that such is the faith and practice of the denomination. That we are not "Anabaptists," in the sense in which that term is used by pedobaptists, is very certain, but not so very plain in the sense in which your correspondent uses it.

Can we regard it as a matter of consequence who administers the ordinances of Christ's church, or make the validity of the ordinance of Baptism depend upon the opinion of candidates for church membership? The article of our venerable brother, Dr. Tupper, on the order to be observed in administration of the Supper, throws considerable light upon this subject. But let us have no misunderstanding, only let us understand that it is not, at least, the unit-