

Under these circumstances no Catholic would consider any representation to be justified.

The Spanish people are united in faith and religion, and are perfectly justified in preserving their country and their households from the miseries of religious conflict.

And believing as they do that this unity of faith and worship is a divine law, they hold it to be of the highest obligation to transmit it faithfully to their children.

On reflection, you will, I think, correct the opinions you have expressed in your letter.

If the Catholics in England were a majority to-morrow they would molest no one in matters of religion by civil laws.

In a pamphlet written by me last year in answer to Mr. Gladstone you will find this more fully treated than I am able to do now.

The principles on which I answered then, and answer now, are these:—

1. So long as the unity of a people, in faith and worship exists unbroken, it is the duty of such a people to preserve it from being broken by public law.

2. When once that unity is broken up by the religious conflicts of a people, no civil laws can restore unity, which can be restored only as it was created—that is by the obedience of faith.

3. The public law of such a country can do no more than protect the freedom and welfare of all its subjects, by restraining what is injurious to human society, such as the propagation of blasphemy, impiety, polygamy, &c., &c.

There is therefore no parallel between Spain and England, nor between a people united in one faith and a people unhappily and hopelessly divided—I remain, Rev. Sir, your faithful servant.

H. E. CARDINAL ARCHBISHOP,
The Rev. J. Swann Withington.

For the Christian Messenger.

The Synod and their Educational Policy.

The first Educational principle laid down by the Synod at their late meeting, namely, that the State is under obligation to support a non-sectarian College, we unhesitatingly reject. Good and sufficient reasons for rejecting it were mentioned, and others of great weight might be adduced. Their second principle, which is that Dalhousie is a non-sectarian College, is quite as inadmissible. The reasons for this decision may be found in the large, and we may say preponderating, Presbyterian influence in the Board of Governors,—in the interest in the College and the affection for it, which are manifested by every assembly of Presbyterians, whether large or small, and the entire absence of any such manifestation of affection and interest on the part of any other denomination,—in the fact that four out of the eight Professors in the Faculty of the College are Presbyterians,—and in the large contributions made from the funds of the Presbyterian Church for the support of the College. If all this were not enough to justify the assertion that Dalhousie cannot be regarded as non-sectarian, we shall find that the nature of the studies pursued in the College has prevented it from developing the character that is ascribed to it; and more than this, that the nature of these studies is such as to make it impossible for it to maintain this character in any circumstances, except by silencing some of its departments of instruction and seriously diminishing the scope and efficiency of others. In other words, it is impossible for a College, professing to be non-sectarian, to exercise freedom of instruction in the various departments commonly assigned for Collegiate study, without violating the principle on which it professes to rest. The term, non-sectarian, must be taken, in such a discussion, in its full and broad sense. A College may be considered to be non-sectarian by the three churches that are sometimes said to be in the Presbyterian Body, and to be justly called sectarian by all the rest of the people. All the christian portion of the community may accept it as non-sectarian, and it appear intensely sectarian to all others. By the Protestant it may be called non-sectarian, and be denounced by the Catholic as sectarian. All the liberals in religion and morals may cleave to it because it is non-sectarian, while all the godly may abhor it, as if it belonged to the sect of the Nicolaitanes. If it must be continually declaring itself to be non-sectarian, it has in some respect failed of consistency; otherwise it would no more be necessary for it to make such frequent and formal declaration of what it professes to be, than for an honest man to

send to his neighbors, every few days, some fresh testimonial respecting his character. If it is not non-sectarian, in this broad and fair sense, then its support by the State is the endowment of one form of religious doctrine, to the disadvantage of others. According to the principle laid down by the Synod, the College must be accepted as non-sectarian by the various classes and parties in the community, before it can be entitled to receive subsistence from the Treasury of the State. And we affirm, that when it has thus qualified itself to claim maintenance from the State, it has made itself incapable of exercising some of the most important functions of a College.

If any one wishes to see how difficult, and we may say impossible, it is for a College to be thus accepted by all classes and by the adherents of various creeds, as perfectly impartial in its relations to them; and yet properly fulfil all of its offices, let him reflect on the fact that Modern History is little more than a record of the conflicts between antagonistic principles, which were represented by opposing sections of the Church, or by the leaders of the Church and of the State, or of rival factions of the State who sought supremacy because they desired the establishment of one or another set of religious doctrines,—let him, also, note the fact that Modern Science sits in Moses' seat and assumes to judge of all history and to reveal the laws of religion and morality,—and let him consider the meaning of the maxim, that has been accepted by scholars for many generations, that no difficulty emerges in Theology that has not previously emerged in Philosophy; and then let him remember that it is among the highest functions of the College to teach, not the accepted facts merely, but the principles underlying Philosophy, Science and History. We may grant that the present incumbent of the Chair of History in Dalhousie would not intentionally transgress the limits that ought to bound his instructions? But what are those limits? Is he to rehearse the facts of History with no kindling of soul, no sympathy with right? Then his labors will be of little or no use to his class. If his soul is moved by sympathy with the right, as he judges, then his eloquence must be deprecated by many of the people who believe that he is putting good for evil. Suppose that a vacancy had occurred in that department, and the Archbishop had come forward and endowed the Chair, on the condition that he might nominate the incumbent, and had thus secured the appointment of a true and faithful son of the Church of Rome to teach the philosophy of the facts of the Middle Ages and of the period of the Reformation on the Continent and in England, is it possible to believe that such an appointment would have been acceptable to the Presbyterian fathers whose sons are in Dalhousie College? When one reads such subjects as these on the lists describing the topics discussed in the classrooms of Dalhousie, A Law of Nature, The Will on Scientific grounds, The power of contrary choice, The argument from design for the existence of God, The true nature of Virtue, The Oppositions of Science falsely so-called in the days of the Apostles, and what corresponds to them in modern times, Motive and Cause—Volition and effect, Philosophy and the Christian System, Our idea of Power, The Supreme Good to man, The relation between belief in the immortality of the soul and morality,—when one reads such topics as these, if he be at all versed in Theological studies, he must recognize in them the very questions on which Theological classes are instructed, and on which Ministers often preach. We have a right, as citizens, to know what is taught in our "non-sectarian" Provincial College. Does the lecturer explain how as having reference to a Lawgiver, or not? When he explains Will on Scientific grounds, does he show that it works like Gravity? or how is it? Is his power of contrary choice after the Edwardean or the fatalistic, or the Free-will theory? Is immortality taught in harmony with Purgatory or with the absence of all pains and penalties in the next world? Who of us is classed with the Opposers of the Apostles? Is the supreme good of man, to obey and love God and enjoy him forever, or is it something else? Is the doctrine of Motive and Volition discussed after the Arminian or the Calvinistic view? Is Christianity explained after the Ritualistic, the Evangelical or the Liberal view? Is the system of Metaphysics adopted at Dalhousie, pagan, Christian or infidel? We say, we have a right to know about

these things. But then, so far as the principle is concerned, it makes very little difference how the case stands, for if some are satisfied with our "non-sectarian College," some others must, for the same reasons, be dissatisfied. One thing is clear,—if the College is doing its legitimate work in connection with these subjects in a thorough and efficient manner, then the people cannot regard it as non-sectarian; if it pleases the Presbyterians in these respects, then it cannot be satisfactory to other people. If it is careful to maintain perfect impartiality towards all parties, so far as the departments named are concerned. Then so far as concerns these departments, it cannot be an efficient College. Nor can it improve, without violating the principle on which it professes to stand.

If we had a place in the Council of the Presbyterians, our advice would be to this effect:

You have tried for thirteen years to make the people accept your College, as the College of the Province, and you are as far from the consummation of such a purpose as when you began. You have managed your case with great wisdom and energy. If you have seemed at times to gain a little success, as soon as the fact became apparent, you were confronted by hostile forces, too numerous for you to overcome, and your seeming gain has become an obstacle in your path. There is not the slightest indication that the other Protestant Denominations will abandon their Colleges to co-operate in one common to all. Every year increases the difficulties in the way of such a change, and diminishes the probability that it will ever take place. No one can have the audacity to believe that the Roman Catholics, who constitute one fourth of our population, will ever unite with you in such a College. To persist in the purpose which you have held, will only perpetuate strife and contention, and extend indefinitely into the future the unsatisfactory condition of the past and present. If, by some cunning device of politicians, an Act could be passed that would be satisfactory to you, it must have the sympathy of the people, in order that it may accomplish its design; and this sympathy is the very element that you cannot command. The annual motion in the Legislature to grant money to your College, will be an annually recurring occasion for strife, ill-will and political corruption. We beseech you not to perpetuate such scenes. Men who tax themselves to support their own Colleges, will not submit patiently to be taxed again by you, for the support of your College. It has, indeed, been suggested that, in the last resort, you will always be able to carry your appropriations by consenting that the Catholics may have a grant for a similar purpose, thus providing for a Protestant and a Catholic University. We do not believe that you would accept such a suggestion; but the possibility of such a combination opens the way for political corruption.

Do not allow yourselves to suppose that the interest in the independent Colleges will decline. The Baptists are not cherishing old enmities and grudges but the conviction is setting more and more deeply into their minds, that the true policy is to keep the higher education of the country in direct sympathy with the people, according to principles of association that must assert themselves, whenever that subject is discussed. The same is undoubtedly true in regard to the friends of the other Protestant Colleges. You must admit, that it is difficult to make a College non-sectarian in the fair and full sense of that word; and still permit it to treat of certain subjects that properly belong to collegiate education. In a public address, recently delivered by a friend of Dalhousie, Mr. Gladstone's attempt to construct a University that should be acceptable to the various parties in a mixed population by omitting from its curriculum Philosophy and Modern History, was condemned. But does not the principle of non-sectarianism in the College, require you to remove the studies in respect to which these fixed differences of belief exist, rather than to endeavor to secure from the Public Treasury the endowment of the advocates of one set of opinions, and thereby attempt to suppress the advocacy of opposing doctrines? Our conviction is that your attempt to obtain from the State the endowment of Scotch Metaphysics and Scotch Philosophy, is essentially an attempt to obtain an endowment for Scotch Theology. According to your own principle of non-sectarianism in state institutions, we cannot do otherwise than firmly and persistently oppose the execution of your purpose.

We can accept a non-sectarian Medical College or Law School; but we pronounce an Arts College, that shall be conducted in harmony with the traditions inherited from the Arts departments of the universities of the past, and in harmony with the principles and methods that conform to the standard accepted at present, and at the same time shall be strictly non-sectarian, an impossibility.

But what shall we do? you may ask. The shortest and most consistent way for you to obtain the benefits you profess to desire, is to accept the privileges of the state University at Fredericton, within the borders of your Synod. There is a state College, already organized and equipped and ready to welcome all your young men. Its Corporation and Senate must be composed of laymen. The visitor that may be appointed by the Governor must be a layman. No clergyman is found in its Faculty. Senators are appointed by the Governor in Council and go out of office at the expiration of three years, making room for new men, if desired, to reflect more readily the popular will. Examiners are appointed to supervise the work of the Faculty. The Bible may be read in the public exercises of the College, but all its prayers must be approved by the Senate, before they can be used. Here is a College, that is evidently intended to be non-sectarian, and that derives all its income from the State and is controlled by the State. It is the very thing for which you profess to be waiting. Why not use it? It will cost you nothing, it is large enough to accommodate you, it will give to your young men the advantages of study in connection with larger numbers of students. Why not use it?

If this most easy, convenient and reasonable method of extricating yourselves from present difficulties does not suit you, we might suggest that you should use your abundant wealth in building a College of your own, and make it what you please. This would be manly and honorable, it would command the respect of all, and would do you good.

If this suggestion should not suit you, then we entreat you to adopt the third, that is, unite more closely the elements that have been affiliated in the support of Dalhousie, namely, the Presbyterians and the city of Halifax. The Governors of the College are installed for life, they are entrenched against all plottings of politicians or of any other men. Let them adopt some basis of agreement, and the wealthy men of the city will erect for them a new building, the Presbyterians, with the help of some of other denominations, will endow the College, it can then be withdrawn from the arena of political strife, and enter on an unobstructed career of usefulness and honor; and thus, at length, our conflicts on the College question will be composed. If our old men must die, with the din of this long battle still ringing in their ears, we pray that our younger men may be permitted to look into the future with some prospect of peace.

BAPTIST.

The Christian Messenger.

Halifax, N. S., November 8th, 1876.

We have a melancholy satisfaction in giving prominence to the following touching and beautiful narrative of the closing days of the life of our departed friend, and we give it precedence of editorial matter.

THE LAST DAYS OF THE REV. ARTHUR R. E. CRAWLEY, A. M.

A former communication contained a brief sketch of the life, labours, and missionary character of our beloved brother. We have now to watch his steps as he descends the valley and crosses the river. We seem to hear him say, "Though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death I will fear no evil, for thou art with me; thy rod and thy staff, they comfort me." And so it was.

The following narrative, prepared by the widow of the deceased, will be read with deep interest throughout our churches, and many prayers will doubtless be presented on behalf of the writer and her children, that "the good-will of Him that dwelt in the bush" may rest upon them.

NARRATIVE.

After we returned to Burmah, about three years ago, my husband was able at times to endure considerable fatigue, and to work in many ways with some degree of comfort and pleasure, taking

frequent and large part in evening street meetings—in preachers' classes—and in jungle travelling, as had been so long his wont—but all the time—I can plainly see now, his disease was making steady progress. As late as last January and February he was able to visit many villages adjacent to Henthadah and felt great comfort and satisfaction in doing so; but the dreaded hot season coming on, he decided to go to the seaside awhile, and with the strength he hoped to obtain there to carry on his work vigorously through the next rainy season; but the trip proved an utter failure. Even by the sea the heat was intolerable, and the fatigue of going and returning was excessive. After getting home again, some weeks before the rains set in, he became so prostrated that he was barely able to walk from his bed to his chair—no appetite—and a distressing cough. As soon as the rain fell he revived; his cough was better; his appetite returned, and he began to pick up flesh and strength. It was a deceitful lull; the weather became steamy and sultry, and he began to fail again. He pined for cold weather, and felt convinced that he could never outlive another hot season. Then we began to speak of returning home. The doctor advised it; and after some weeks of prayerful and anxious deliberation, we decided to return immediately, for no time was to be lost. After a few hours preparation we broke up our home and started for Rangoon. As soon as we arrived we consulted Dr. Crombie, one of the best physicians there, and he advised us to go as a last chance, saying that the sea air would undoubtedly strengthen my husband, and that any place was then better for him than Burmah; and so we started by the steamer *Irrawaddi*, then leaving Rangoon for Liverpool. The first fortnight there was, I think, a slight improvement; then diarrhoea set in, which was never checked, and proved the beginning of the end. A doctor was called in at Aden, but he did him no good; and during the voyage up the Red Sea his strength steadily declined; his feet began to swell, and his throat became very painful; he said himself at one time, "I do not think I shall live to get beyond Port Said"—but he did, and the cooler air of the Mediterranean revived him at first, but it was unusually hot even then. As far as Malta there was a slight improvement; but the day we spent there was a fatiguing and exciting one. He had longed for fruit, but we were disappointed in finding no good oranges; the grapes hurt his throat, and the apples and pears aggravated his complaint; and so he had to give up all; His parched throat had long tormented him with constant thirst, and he had found much refreshment in iced soda water. He now and then fancied a little solid food—though not often, but thought he could eat heartily of home food on shore. He took at times port wine and beaten egg, and it kept up his strength a little. The last week of our voyage he failed rapidly, having at last to be carried entirely from his bed to his rattan couch in the saloon (his chair or couch he had used all the voyage; he lay at full length upon it only his head and shoulders elevated, we brought it from our Henthadah home, where he constantly used it, and it was a great comfort to him). The last three days before reaching Liverpool he could take nothing to eat, but swallowed a little beer from time to time. He had not fancied it at all before, but unable to take anything else, it seemed in some measure to refresh and strengthen him. The night before we reached Liverpool he was very uneasy, wishing his position to be slightly changed every few moments. In the morning he felt very weary, and desired to get on shore, and we talked together with the captain for some time, planning how we should have him moved. I left the room for a moment; when I returned, he said, "I have a sharp pain in my side"—then, "I am choking—raise me up." This change of position gave no relief, and he asked to be laid down again. Then his countenance changed, and I saw that he was going. He said "Good-bye" to us all. I said to him, "Is Jesus with you?" He signified his assent. "Do you want to come back." He shook his head. His breathing slightly labored for a time: then a deathly pallor—and a spasm or two of the face and all was still!—peaceful! I have spoken at length of his bodily symptoms: but though so feeble and reduced in body he was strong in mind—happy and trustful all the time. For some months before his death his peace seemed to flow as a river. His bible readings were an ever new delight to him; and his feeling of his own unworthiness and of the fulness in Christ seemed to deepen every day.