

people," he says, were sprinkled with water. It is apparent, then, that men and women, and adults and infants were baptized, or, otherwise, Paul's record is not true.

Thus do Ezekiel and Paul both show that "God's authority" has been given in favor of the sprinkling of water in religious ordinances, and that all the people, adults and infants, may be sharers of its benefits.

Other scripture proofs might be given, but the foregoing are deemed sufficient to entitle me to the fifty dollars reward. Will Mr. Garraty please remit to me the amount promised by Post Office Order?

H. HARPER.
Charlottetown, P. E. I.
ELDER GARRATY RIGHT.

To the Editor of the DAILY NEWS.

SIR,—I have just read Mr. Harper's letter in your issue of the 26th ult., and am satisfied he has failed to establish his claim to the fifty dollars, offered by Elder Garraty for the Scripture proof that mere water was ever sprinkled or poured on any person or thing by Divine authority, for any moral, ceremonial, or religious use.

1. The washing with water of Aaron and his sons (Exodus xl. 12-15.) was not done by sprinkling, as Mr. Harper would lead us to infer by his reference to Numbers viii. 5-7, but by washing their hands and feet at the brazen laver, made and set up in the tabernacle for that very purpose, as any child may see who will read Ex. xxx. 17-21. and xl. 12-15, 30-32. How Mr. Harper could confound this washing of hands and feet in the brazen laver with the sprinkling of the Levites with the water of purifying (Num. viii. 5-7.) is more than I can imagine; he ought to know better if he is a clergyman whose business it is rightly to divide the word of truth. If the water of purifying, spoken of in Numbers viii. 5-7, was mere water, Elder Garraty would have to pay up; but both he and Mr. Harper probably know that the water of purifying sprinkled on the Levites, according to Numbers viii. 5-7, is identical, not with the water in the brazen laver, but with the water of separation, mentioned in Numbers xix., which was not mere water, but water mingled with the ashes of a red heifer, the sprinkling of which was to be followed, in some cases at least, by bathing in water. See verse 19.

Mr. Harper's two texts, Exodus xl. 12-15; Numbers viii. 5-7, thus afford no proof whatever of mere water being sprinkled or poured by divine appointment.

2. The washing of Aaron and his sons at the brazen laver being proved to be not a sprinkling, it follows that if, as Mr. Harper argues, it behoved Christ to be similarly washed he was not a violator of the law, although he was not sprinkled.

But, O what ignorance of Christ's priesthood to argue that he was baptized of John preparatory to entering upon his office of a priest. Christ could not be a priest while on earth, or until the law was changed. It is evident our Lord was not of the tribe of Levi, or of the family of Aaron, but of the tribe of Judah, and so could not be a priest under the law of Moses. See Heb. viii. 4; vii. 11-15. Christ's priesthood dates from his resurrection and ascension to the right hand of God; not from his washing in Jordan. Not Moses' law but "the word of the oath," Heb. vii. 21, made Jesus "a priest forever after the order of Melchisedec;" not Levitic nor Aaronic.

3. Mr. Harper's attempt to quote Lev. xiv. 7, to prove the sprinkling of water on lepers by divine appointment, is simply dishonest. Read the context, and you will see that blood, not water, was to be sprinkled on the leper. Read verses 6, 7: "As for the living bird he shall take it, and the cedar wood, and the scarlet, and the hyssop, and shall dip them and the living bird in the blood of the bird that was killed over the running water: and he shall sprinkle upon him that is to be cleansed from the leprosy seven times, and shall pronounce him clean, and shall let the living bird loose into the open field. Fancy a man so eager for Elder Garraty's fifty dollars as to quote a part of the foregoing to prove the sprinkling of water upon a leper.

Not only so, but he has the audacity to argue in like manner Naaman, the Syrian, must have been sprinkled in Jordan seven times. "He must have been sprinkled seven times," says Mr. Harper, "because in no other way could a cure have been effected. Mr. Harper seems to be under the impression not only that lepers under the law of Moses were sprinkled with water seven times, but that their cure was effected by his imaginary water-sprinkling. The truth is, the leper was cured or healed before being sprinkled by the priest as prescribed in Lev. xiv. He was sprinkled with the blood of the slain bird, and subsequently washed in water (verse 9) to cleanse him legally or ceremonially. Naaman, on the other hand, was commanded to wash seven times in Jordan, in order to be cured of his leprosy. Never before was leprosy cured by water. Naaman's cure was miraculous; and as irrespective of the law as the cures effected by Christ's touch, and saying: "I will, be thou clean."

4. As for Ezekiel xxxvi. 25, it is an unfulfilled prophecy concerning God's nation, and I pity the ignorance of the man who can understand it of the sprinkling of mere water in order to cleanse God's people, as set forth in that

prophecy. Does Mr. Harper, I wonder understand "out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water," literally, or, of the Holy Spirit which they that believe of Him should receive? "I will pour water upon him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground." Does Mr. Harper believe this is prophetic of water or of the outpouring of God's spirit and blessing? Isaiah xlv. He will hardly, I think, claim the fifty dollars because of the future sprinkling of Israel with clean water. Ezekiel xxxvi. 25, does not come within the category of what has been done by the authority of God.

5. "Our bodies washed with pure water." Hebrew x. 22, is a *fortiori* hope surely to be quoted by a sprinkler of mere water!

6. "Blood and water;" Hebrew ix. 19, with which Moses sprinkled the people is not "mere water," and therefore that text any more than the "divers washings" of verse 10 gives Mr. Harper no claim whatever to the promised reward. Yours respectfully,
A BIBLE STUDENT.

P. S.—The first and a portion of the second paragraph of my reply to Mr. Harper, as furnished herewith, is no doubt slightly different from what appeared in the St. John Daily News of the third inst., owing to the only copy I have been able to obtain being defectively printed in the two first paragraphs and I had no manuscript copy.

It occurs to me that the great Nova Scotian reciter of immersing in water by Divine authority, may feel inclined to try for Elder Garraty's fifty dollars. I would respectfully and in all good faith here say that I stand prepared to make good to any one Elder Garraty's offer, on seeing the requisite scripture proof, Old or New Testament, in the columns of the Christian Messenger.

A BIBLE STUDENT.

Feb'y 11.

The Christian Messenger.

Halifax, N. S., February 16th, 1876.

THE PRESBYTERIAN WITNESS AND THE COLLEGE QUESTION.

Writing on this subject our contemporary, says:

"We understand that an effort will be made to secure large additions to the grants to several denominational Colleges on the ground of the increased grant last year to Dalhousie College. We hope the Legislature will think twice, think often, before they take any step that will tend to fasten upon our country an exclusively denominational education."

This is recommending a marine law to our Legislature for their government in the matter of encouraging and supporting College education. We do not mean a law enacted in the interests of the tonnage upon the ocean, but we refer to a law that governs the fish of the deep blue sea—the big fish have a perfect right to eat up the little fish. How calm our neighbour was last year when \$1800 of the people's money, in addition to the five or six thousand dollars of public money already enjoyed annually, was swallowed by Dalhousie, to nourish Presbyterians withal, while Acadia and other institutions were left to the mean sum of four hundred dollars each.

Such advice, too, comes a little late in the day, seeing that from the days of Kings College being established; and from the Dalhousie Governors refusing Dr. Crawley a professorship, because he was a Baptist, so much excellent work has been done in denominational institutions in Nova Scotia. It is absurd to talk of "fastening upon our country" what is already so firmly fastened in the affections of the religious bodies of the province.

Baptists and others may blister and harden their hands, and chafe and wear their brains to sustain their own institutions, and the Presbyterian Witness has no warnings, no prayers to the Government and Legislature to hold its hand when it takes the hard earnings of these wronged people to help a single denomination, numerous enough and able enough to take care of itself.

Let us look at the concealed policy of this Dalhousie enterprise. The christian denominations were going quietly along in College work, each having its own institution, till about 1864. At this time a scheme was suddenly sprung upon the country, and it became evident that it was the result of plans quietly and skillfully laid. Political embarrassments and denominational manoeuvres were ingeniously turned into the same channel, and upon them Presbyterianism was carried into the midst of the property and funds—public property and funds—of Dalhousie; and there the Presbyterians have been ever since, illustrating the old saying in law, that possession is as good as nine points of the ten. The indication that scruples are troublesome is manifest in the increasing cry, "Provincial University"! While the most rigid in faith and practice of all the

sects, the Plymouth Brethren, never tire in denouncing sectarianism; it is done to relieve the gnawings of the sectarian worm in the religious conscience; so Presbyterianism, feeding upon a disproportionate amount of the people's money, must cry something to keep up a delusion or counter irritation, and nothing so natural or taking as, "Provincial University!" We have, indeed, a Provincial University, emphatically beyond anything that exists in Fredericton, Toronto, or Montreal, but its Alpha and Omega is in the cry and only in the cry "Provincial University"! "Provincial University"! In any other and in every other respect except in a dead letter-law, it is a Presbyterian College just as much as Acadia is a Baptist, Kings an Episcopalian, or Sackville a Wesleyan College. Would it not be better to call things by their right names. Let us say spade when we mean spade, and hoe when we mean hoe.

The question now is, so far as the Baptists are concerned, Shall Baptists be compelled to give their hard-earned grants to a grant of \$2800 for Presbyterians, while they themselves receive but \$400 from the common fund? Yes, worse than that, the \$2800 is an annual addition to an advantage, worth not less than five or six thousand dollars; and to this other denominations have just as much right as Presbyterians.

We hope the Legislature will think twice, think often, before they take any step that will tend to fasten upon our country the continuance of this grievous, shameful, monstrous injustice.

Again the Witness says: "As Presbyterians we ask nothing from the government of the country!" Remarkable! for its inconsistency. The Memorial so urgently pressed upon our Parliament, no longer ago than last year, rested claims in one place for more help to Dalhousie on denominational grounds. We scarcely think the Witness is authorized to stultify in this fashion the great body of which it is the recognized journal. It must be a careless statement! It is remarkable for the touch of absurdity that rests on the face of it. We have heard of an influential church member who inflicted a public reprimand upon his minister, and the brethren remonstrated with him for speaking so hard to the pastor; but he was ready with just such a defence as our neighbour puts out in this Dalhousie business. "I did not," said the accused man, "reprove him as a minister but as a man." Come now neighbours, whatever Presbyterians do alone, in this College matter, they had better do it as Presbyterians.

The old Romans would have justice done, if it brought the heavens down. We Christians ought to advocate justice and mete it out to each other without the heavens being brought down.

"We" also "implore the government to act with caution and with courage" and to consider the claims of the present as well as of the future. The people in the Legislature, and the people out of the Legislature, should all have courage to do right in this matter.

OUR NORTH-WEST AND SEPARATE SCHOOLS.

In calling attention to this matter in a former issue, it was shewn conclusively, we think, that the Parliament of Canada; during its Session of last year, had been guilty of a most flagrant and unjustifiable Act of legislation in connexion with the North-West Territories. And now, looking at the matter dispassionately and seriously, we cannot forbear to sound again the note of alarm; for bad faith and usurpation of power on the part of our rulers, cannot be lightly regarded by any true lover of freedom.

At whose dictation the majority have acted, year after year, so defiantly, overriding the Constitution, disregarding their most solemn stipulations, and violating the most sacred rights of the people, commencing with the celebrated "Costigan Resolution" and culminating with the legislation under review—we care not. It is enough for us that their action has been unjust, oppressive and unconstitutional; and now that the spirit, which went forth in abortive resolutions to harass and annoy New Brunswick, has grown bolder and embodied itself in an Act of Parliament fixing Separate Schools in perpetuity, upon our Great North-West, we are imperatively called upon to exercise that "vigilance which is the price of freedom," and expose the outrage.

There need be no difficulty about this matter. Indeed, the case is a very simple one and may be stated briefly, as follows:—

Previously to the year 1867, the several Provinces then erected into the Dominion of Canada, enjoyed all the rights and assumed the responsibilities of self-government, as dependencies of Great Britain. At that date, however, representatives of the different Provinces met together and entered into a solemn compact by which it was agreed that a federal union should be effected, and that certain rights and interests should be placed under the control of the general government, while certain other interests should remain under local control and be dealt with exclusively by the several local legislatures.

This mutual compact subsequently received the sanction of the several local Parliaments on whose behalf it had been effected, and, shortly afterwards, at the request of the high contracting parties, was confirmed by the Imperial Parliament,—the British North America Act of 1867 having been passed expressly to define and limit the powers of the General Parliament as well as to secure the rights and liberties of the several Local Legislatures. This Imperial Act provided, too, for these North-West Territories; enacting that they should be permitted to come into the Union fettered in no way other than the several Provinces of which the Dominion was originally constituted; and on the 15th of July, 1870, by order of the Queen in Council, these Territories did "become a part of the Dominion of Canada" and "subject to the provisions of this Act" of 1867, in all respects.

Now, this compact, so solemnly and deliberately entered into and confirmed, reverts the subject of education exclusively to the local legislatures of the several provinces now existing, or which may hereafter be created, and excludes the Dominion Parliament from all interference therewith except only in certain cases of Appeal. When, therefore in 1871, the "Costigan resolution" was entertained by the Parliament of Canada, not only was a grievous outrage inflicted upon the people of New Brunswick, whose liberties were immediately imperilled, but the act was pregnant with painful significance to free born citizens everywhere throughout the Dominion. It meant that our legislators were prepared to disregard and violate a most solemn compact, and were willing and ready to trample the Constitution beneath their feet and compel, if possible, the local legislatures to submit to their dictation in matters wholly beyond their jurisdiction.

This outspoken contempt for civil and constitutional rights clearly demonstrates the presence of a most dangerous principle in our Legislative Halls at Ottawa, and we are forced to conclude that thus early in our history Ultramontanism has become strongly entrenched within the walls of the Parliament of Canada.

Too frequently has the scene of 1871 been repeated. High Constitutional Authority, and the decision of the highest Court of the realm—the Privy Council of England—alike, have been disregarded, and year after year since 1871 the "Education question" has been brought forward with as much assurance as if Parliament had a right to deal with it; and each year, we regret to say, a majority of members has been found really by their votes to violate the Constitution of the country. Last year an advance step was made in this direction and while temporarily legislating for the North West, a clause was inserted in the act to fasten Separate Schools upon these Territories, thus trenching upon the legislative rights of the respective Provinces which in the near future will be carved out of this vast region. That the obnoxious clause is unconstitutional and beyond the power of Parliament there can scarcely be a doubt, and there should be no hesitation in wiping it from the Statute book.

We are glad to learn that petitions prepared under the direction of the Nova Scotia Evangelical Alliance, are now in course of signature demanding its repeal. Prince Edward Island is already actively and determinedly at work in this direction, and Nova Scotia should promptly do her duty. We commend these Petitions to the thoughtful consideration of our readers. If the repeal is refused, Her Majesty must be requested to disallow the Bill.

The Illustrated London News, of January 15th, 1876, refers to the article which we lately noticed in Macmillan's Magazine, in the following terms:—"A Chapter of Canadian History" describes the awkward hitch which has arisen from the resolution of the New Brunswick

people to abolish sectarian teaching in public schools, and the endeavour of the Catholic party in the Dominion Parliament to put pressure upon them in a matter with which the Dominion Parliament has nothing to do. The moral is the old one, that Catholic legislators esteem the law but lightly in comparison with the Church.

Startling figures from the Day of Rest, Nov. 27th. 1875.—"The annual revenue derived from the duties upon spirits, malt, beer, wine and tobacco, in the United Kingdom; as given in a return, just issued, amount to nearly £40,000,000 sterling.

This is but one item, and that the smallest, connected with the terribly destructive evils of the use and sale of intoxicating drinks. The cost of the articles, the men employed and money invested in its manufacture, the idleness arising in its use, and the trouble, crime and poverty which follow in its train, make up a gigantic whole that may well be called "the Devil's chain," and should make every thoughtful, well-disposed person forswear forever any participation in making, selling or using intoxicating drinks.

DESECRATION.—The Christian Messenger says the ice on the Second (Dartmouth) Lake is to be desecrated by horse-racing. Our contemporary desecrates the word "desecrate."—Morning Chronicle.

Our morning contemporary may have a very nice appreciation of the word here used, and wish to wink at the abominations that have ever been linked with horse-racing. There are but few things purer than the beautiful crystal which covers the lakes at this season of the year; and to have upon it the drinking and profanity which are commonly connected with such contests is surely a desecration.

NOTICES.

Table with columns for names and amounts, including RECEIVED FOR FOREIGN MISSIONS and RECEIVED FROM WOMEN'S MISSION AID SOCIETIES.

ERRATA.—Dear Brother,—In your next, please notice for me that three were baptized last Saturday and one previously, making four, not five, since our last notice. I hope to baptize again next week.

LETTERS RECEIVED.—D. Archibald, 1 sub. W. Frizzle, \$2. L. Fields, \$2. W. L. Bars, 1 sub. D. Webber, \$2. T. J. Seman, \$4. G. P. Sabean, \$2 and for Foreign Mission, \$2. J. C. Anderson, Esq., \$2. Rev. J. Brown, S. Wentzel, \$4. Rev. J. A. Stubbett, \$5. D. Reid, \$6. Jas. E. Lockwood, \$12. H. E. Payson, Esq., \$10. L. C. Layton, \$7.50. J. Stevens, \$2. E. M. Chesley, \$2. E. York. J. B. McNutt, Esq., \$4. A. P. Shand 1 sub. R. Delap, \$4.

FOR THE INTERCOLONIAL.—The bargue J. W. Holmes, of Windsor, Capt. Holmes, arrived on Sunday from Cardiff, with a cargo of 13000 tons of rails for the Inter-colonial Railway.