

the Presbyterians in the old country. So did they in our land in earlier days. But since the doctrine of a converted church membership has prevailed in this country, the Presbyterians have been wont to require a "profession" before admitting persons to the communion. Of course, the inconsistency of this has kept forcing itself upon their minds. "Why"—they have kept asking themselves—"why do we require a profession of faith as a prerequisite to the communion, and not as a prerequisite to baptism?" The inclination among them has been to find a consistent position, by abandoning infant baptism and requiring a profession of faith previous to both ordinances. They have been coming to the Baptist position.

But there is a party among them who are seeking consistency in the other direction—viz., by going back to the practice of the Churches of Rome and England, and requiring no change of heart as a precedent to either ordinance—admitting all "baptized" persons to the communion, provided only they are leading a good moral life. One party says, "As we require a profession of faith before one can come to the communion, we should require a profession of faith before one comes to baptism." The other party says, "As we require no profession of faith before one comes to baptism, we should require no profession of faith before one comes to the communion." Every Presbyterian of logical mind must attach himself to one or the other of these parties. And as to-day in the Episcopal Church there is a defining of positions and a sitting going on—each man being pushed towards the evangelism of Cheney and Cummins, or the sacerdotalism of De Koven and Ewer—so there is a separation commencing among our Presbyterian neighbors, turning some towards the Baptist doctrine of a converted church-membership, and others towards the doctrine that all baptized persons may be admitted to the Lord's Supper without any experience of a change of heart.

Which way will the bulk of our Presbyterian friends go—towards our doctrine that regeneration must precede both baptism and the communion, or towards the High Church doctrine that conversion is not a precedent to either? For a generation they have been coming towards our position. Infant baptism has been dying out among them. It seems hardly possible that there should set in a reactionary movement towards High Churchism. But we see that in the Episcopal Church the Low Church party, which was dominant a century ago, is now scattered to the winds before triumphant Ritualism. So it may be that our Presbyterian friends will go back to where they were a half century ago, admitting persons to the communion without any profession of a change of heart, making the essence of church life a matter of an ecclesiastical form. In the Presbyterian, as in the Episcopal Church the ecclesiastical precedents are all on the side of the High Church party, and this party may yet prevail.

It is often said that we differ from Presbyterians merely on the question of the act and subjects of baptism. But the difference is wider than this. It pertains to the subjects of communion as well as the subject of baptism. It goes down to the very depths of the whole idea of the church. As many evangelist Episcopalians have held ideas which substantially agreed with our own, while the doctrinal theories of the Anglican Church are such as we utterly reject, so, though Presbyterians may individually be thoroughly evangelical, the standards of their Church, making baptism (without experience of a change of heart) the only prerequisite to the Lord's Supper and full membership in the church, contain in them the germs of Anglicanism and Romanism, and must be held by us to be in direct conflict to the New Testament theory of church life.

N. F.

For the Christian Messenger.

CORRECTION.

Dear Sir,—

The statement of your correspondent that "the classes in College are at length open to young women," must rest on some misapprehension of facts. The relations of our various departments remain as they were at the meeting of the Governors in June last, and as they were explained at the Convention.

The necessity of carrying on such a variety of work on the same premises

creates confusion. But we are trying to make the best of things as they are, hoping that the proposed new buildings, which are imperatively needed, will be completed in a short time. All departments of our institutions can then be raised to a much higher degree of comfort and usefulness.

Respectfully,

A. W. SAWYER.

Wolfville, March 19, 1875.

For the Christian Messenger.

CONCERNING DALHOUSIE COLLEGE.

Mr. Editor,—

Probably you are aware that the salaries of some of the Professors in Dalhousie College have been increased of late by the Denominations that endow their chairs. It has been intimated to me that the Governors would raise the other salaries, but they have not the requisite funds; and some are advising them to appeal to the Legislature for an increase of the public grant. This mode of relief is of doubtful expediency. There are others more simple and consistent.

If the number of Professors, who draw their salaries from the general fund of the College, could be reduced, the income of the fund could be divided among a smaller number, and each of these would receive a larger portion. We are told that the Reformed Presbyterians, the Lutherans, the Independents and the Universalists have virtually adopted Dalhousie. The Reformed Presbyterians and the Independents might make up the salary of one member of the Faculty; or, if this should be too much for them, they could persuade the Lutherans to join them. The Universalists, who at present are displaying considerable activity and probably have come to be a strong body, would be willing, I presume, to adopt one of the Professors and provide for his support. In this way there would be opportunity for indefinite increase of salaries, and the growth of the College would be in harmony with the principle on which it is now organized.

FISCAL.

The Christian Messenger.

A REMARKABLE WILL.

The following from the *Illustrated London News* is an outspoken expression of opinion on various subjects in relation to church and state; given as the last Will and Testament of a Baptist minister to his family and to the world:

"The will, dated March 26, 1874, of the Rev. William Hill, late of Lansdown-villas, Springfield-road, Colham, Baptist minister, who died on November 11 last, has been proved at the District Registry, Bristol, by Emerson Gerrish and Thomas Bowbeer, the executors, under £3,000. After the death of his wife, he gives to the Society for the Relief of Aged and Infirm Baptist Ministers, instituted in Bath, 1816, and to the Baptist Foreign Missionary Society, each £100. The testator directs the payment of all my just debts, funeral and testamentary expenses, as soon as conveniently may be after my departure for heaven; but, as this is to be my final public document, I shall here record my de- testation of all State establishments of religion, believing them to be anti Scriptural and soul-ruining. I have for years prayed the King of Zion to overthrow the politico- ecclesiastical Establishment of the British Empire, and leave the world with a full conviction that such prayer must ere long be answered. I thirst to see the Church brought down—the Church by man set up—for millions are led by it on to drink a bitter cup. I desire all posterity to know that William Hill was a conscientious Trinitarian Baptist minister, that he believed infant sprinkling to be from his Satanic Majesty, the keystone of Popery, therefore the parent of unnumbered terrible evils; this delusion must also pass away at the Divinely-appointed time, and the immersion of believers, as plainly taught by the great Teacher, the Holy Ghost, and the apostles, shall one day universally triumph. Man says some water in the face, and that before the child has grace, is what is meant in Jesus' Word by being buried in the Lord. The deadly drinking customs of professors and non-professors are likewise doomed. Heaven dash all error, sin, and the devil from earth, and cause truth, holiness, and Christ everywhere to prevail. Amen."

RAILWAY EXTENSION.—The Joint Committee on the Railway extension and Depot into Halifax have published a statement of the history and present position of the case, together with the earlier correspondence on the subject for the information of all concerned. It also contains the Engineer's Report describing the estimated cost of the three

routes by which the railway might be brought into the city from its present location. If the Report had been accompanied by a small lithograph map it would have made it more intelligible and satisfactory. He says: "The entire excess of cost including value of property of the improved line following the Government route to the station at low level on Water Street with extension to West's wharf would be \$193,000."

We have received the following communication from a friend of the Infants' Home—but not a Baptist:

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER:

Dear Sir,—

You noticed in a recent issue the baptism of the Infants in the Halifax Infants' Home, by an Episcopal minister. I have enquired into the circumstances and find that the ceremony was performed as reported; but I find moreover that it was wholly unauthorized by any Committee connected with the Home. The officiating minister was no doubt misled. He is not to blame. It is not likely that such an unauthorized and surreptitious proceeding will occur again.

F. I. H.

Halifax, March 22, 1875.

THE BLIND ASYLUM CONCERT on Monday night was in itself very pleasing, but, when regarded as an exhibition of what can be accomplished on behalf of our fellow-creatures deprived of the sense of sight, was truly marvellous. The Teacher Mr. Fraser—himself blind—is a highly cultivated gentleman and deserves the highest praise. His musical taste and capabilities are of the first order. What a blessing he is being made to those similarly affected! Let the blind from all parts seek to receive the benefits of this institution—one of the ornaments of our city.

Some of our city papers seem afraid that Prohibition will be carried in the Dominion Parliament; and think "our Temperance friends are always disposed to take rather strong views of their subject," and yet they can but admit that "a wonderful advance has been made towards sobriety since the Temperance agitation commenced."

We would advise them to fall into line and advance the cause—the cause

We have to apologize for want of attention to some of our correspondents for the last few weeks. About four weeks since we were taken five days to serve on a Special Jury; and before we had been able to bring up our arrears of work arising from this, we had again last week the same imposition practised upon us by demanding us for five days more. This has put us to very serious inconvenience and is plainly a piece of injustice. We hope to be able in a short time now to overtake the accumulations of work.

STRANGE PROCEEDINGS AT OTTAWA.

Dear Sir,—

I have read the newspaper reports of the proceedings at Ottawa respecting the New Brunswick School law, and write to express my dissatisfaction and disgust. In my opinion, their proceedings were strange, disgraceful, and injurious.

1. Mr. Costigan maintained, in his resolution, that the Legislature of New Brunswick had "passed a law respecting Common Schools, adding the imparting of any religious education to pupils." Now, Sir, *this is true*. No such law has been passed by the New Brunswick Legislature. Under our School Law every Teacher may open a school every day by reading a portion of Scripture (either in the Authorized or the Douay Version) and the use of the Lord's Prayer, or any other form of prayer accepted by the Trustees of the school. Is not this "religious education" and that of the highest character? True, the Teacher must not "make any religious catechism," because all schools are to be "non-sectarian;" but affects Protestants as well as Catholics, and excludes the Church of England, the Assembly's Catechism, the Baptist Catechism, and every thing "sectarian." It is obvious that unless such an amendment existed the Schools could be "Schools for all."

2. Mr. Costigan in this law "causes much uneasiness to Roman Catholic population throughout the whole Dominion of Canada." But forgets that a large

portion of his co-religionists in Ontario, where Separate Schools are in operation, refuse to send their children to them, preferring the Common Schools of the country.

3. The establishment of Separate Schools for Roman Catholics would be contrary to the non-sectarian policy of the Act, and would involve the support of Roman Catholic religious institution out of the public funds. Such is the state of things at the present time in Ontario and Quebec. All the Schools are sustained in part by grants from the public revenue or the County funds. In the Roman Catholic Schools the tenets of Romanism are constantly and systematically taught. Consequently, Protestants help to pay for that instruction, and they unwillingly support Popery.

4. Separate Schools cannot be adopted, so as to prevent the evils adverted to in the last observation, without a complete revolution in the educational arrangements of the province, and the destruction of the existing School System, under which inestimable benefits have been and are enjoyed. The Protestants of Ontario and Quebec appear to be willing to pay for the religious instruction of Roman Catholic children in the doctrine of their own party; the Protestants of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick are not willing.

5. Religious instruction other than that provided for, and which meets the wants of all, may be communicated by authorized persons belonging to different denominations, Roman Catholic and Protestant, after school hours, as often as may be agreed upon, without interference from anybody, and that ought to be satisfactory. It is desirable, no doubt, that children should be early trained in religious principles; but it is equally desirable that the arrangements for this purpose should not interfere with the general policy of the country, and that no denomination should be taxed for the religious education of the children of any other denomination.

6. The proceedings in the House of Commons at Ottawa are open to the gravest censure. They cannot be otherwise designated than as an outrage and an insult to the Province of New Brunswick. Mr. Costigan's resolution pleaded for an Act to be passed by the British Parliament, in amendment of the Confederation Act, and securing to the Roman Catholics their demands. In his amendment to Mr. MacKenzie's amendment being carried.

Mr. Cauchon moved another, calling upon Her Majesty the Queen to "use her influence" with the Legislature of New Brunswick, so as to procure for the Catholics the desired changes. Mr. Cauchon's amendment was carried by 141 to 73.

This proceeding was strange in all respects. How the *Liberal* members of the House should so far forget their principles as to accept it, is greatly to be wondered at. It has always been reckoned as an essential part of the British Constitution that the Crown should not interfere with the action of the Legislature. In 1780, when it was held that "the influence of the Crown has increased, is increasing, and ought to be diminished," a resolution to that effect was passed in the House of Commons. Is it not passing strange, that at the lapse of nearly a century, and amidst the growing enlightenment of the ages, a Colonial House of Commons should actually request the Queen to "use her influence" with the Legislature of New Brunswick, to induce them to do what the people have told them not to do? This is going backward with a vengeance! It is an unconstitutional and unjust proceeding. Of course, the Queen will take no notice of it; but if her Ministers should, it is to be hoped and believed that the people of New Brunswick will stand up for their rights, and not allow their Legislature to be interfered with, directly or indirectly.

There are two reasons for earnestness in this matter. The first is, the unusual efforts now made to secure Roman Catholic ascendancy. Romish dignitaries are engaged in a conspiracy against all that is Protestant, headed by Pius IX., the Hildebrand of the nineteenth century. The second is, our position in this Province. If New Brunswick is overpowered, our turn will come next. So let us prepare—buckle on our armour—and be ready.

It may be serviceable to some to give a copy of the resolution which was passed, combining the amendments of Messrs. A. MacKenzie and Mr. Cauchon.

"That in the opinion of this House legislation by the United Kingdom, encroaching on any powers reserved to any

one of the Provinces by the British North America Act, would be an infraction of the Provincial constitution, and that it would be inexpedient and fraught with danger to the autonomy of each of the Provinces for the house to invite such legislation."

"That whereas, on the 29th day of May, 1872, the House of Commons adopted the following resolution:—That this House regrets that the School Act recently passed in New Brunswick is unsatisfactory to a portion of the inhabitants of that Province, and hope that it may be so modified during the next session of the Legislature of New Brunswick as to remove any just grounds of discontent that now exist.—Be it resolved that the House regrets that the hope expressed in said resolution has not been realized, and that an humble address be presented Her Majesty the Queen, embodying this resolution, and praying that Her Majesty will be graciously pleased to use her influence with the Legislature of New Brunswick to procure such modification of the Act as shall remove the present ground of discontent."

NOVA SCOTIA.

EDUCATIONAL RECORD.

HISTORY OF COLLEGES

IN NOVA SCOTIA.

A. D. 1787. A grant was recommended in the House of Assembly of Nova Scotia to establish a school in Windsor, "that the young men may not be endangered by being sent out of the Province into the United States." The sum of £400 was voted for this object.

1788. Academy in Windsor opened with seventeen pupils.

1789. The House of Assembly passed an act granting £400 sterling, *per annum*, in perpetuity towards the support of a college in Windsor; and voted to grant £500 to purchase a proper site for the College.

1790. £4000 granted by the Imperial Parliament to the College in Windsor, N. S.

1802. A royal charter issued to Kings College, Windsor, N. S., and a grant made to it by the Imperial Parliament of £1000 sterling. This grant was continued annually by Parliament to 1834.

1816. Pictou Academy incorporated.

1817. Lord Dalhousie's proposal to expend the larger part of the Castine Fund in founding a seminary in Halifax for the higher branches of learning, approved by the Imperial Parliament.

1819. £2000 granted to Dalhousie College. £500 to Pictou Academy by the Province of Nova Scotia.

1820. Corner-stone of Dalhousie College laid with imposing ceremonies. An act passed giving £440 *per annum* as a permanent grant from the Province to the College in Windsor; and also £500 for repairs on the Building occupied by the College. It probably was before this date that 20,000 acres of crown lands, carefully selected, had been given to the Governors of Kings College.

1821. £1000 granted by the Province to Dalhousie College, and £400 to Pictou Academy.

1822. £100 to Pictou Academy.

1823. £300 granted to Pictou Academy. The Province loaned to the Governors of Dalhousie College, "on the security of the College funds," £5000, to be repaid after five years. The members of the House stood on this motion, 23 for it, and 11 against it. (This loan has never been repaid, and interest for about fifty years is due on it.) In this year articles of union between Kings and Dalhousie were accepted by committees of the two Boards of Governors.

1824. The Archbishop of Canterbury, being the patron of Kings College, refused his assent to the terms and prevented the union from taking place.

1825. Pictou Academy applies to the House of Assembly for permanent endowment.

1827. £400 granted Pictou Academy to assist it in paying its debts.

1828. The Nova Scotia Baptist Education Society formed, and sixty five acres of land purchased for the use of an Academy.

1829, March. Horton Academy opened.

The Governors of Kings College, Windsor, are informed that the Archbishop had given his consent to the removal of all the restrictions that had debarred dissenters from obtaining degrees in that College. If the advice of the "good Bishop" had prevailed, all of these restrictions would have been taken away twenty years before, and the natural consequence would have been a single University for all the Protestants in Nova Scotia.

The question of the union of Kings