

OCTOBER 31, 1866.

1st. Root crops, such as potatoes, carrots, beets, parsnips, &c. [turnips and also flax], and in cases where the land is not sufficient open for a crop of this kind, the field must be left in fallow.

2nd. Crop of Wheat or Barley.

3rd. Crop of Hay.

4th. Pasture.

5th. Pasture.

6th. Crop of Oats or Peas.

In beginning the application of this system, that field of the series which is in the best condition for a Root crop, should be called field A.

The best for Wheat or Barley
That which is actually in Hay
The Pasture fields

That which is best for Oats or Peas

Each field for the first year ought to be appropriated to the crops above mentioned. The culture of field A and of crop No. 1, come up together for the first year, and ought to be the object of special attention, as this is in fact, the key to the whole system; for the good culture of this field has for its object, and ought to have for its effect, not only a good crop for the first year, but also to improve the land for the five other years of this Rotation of Crops.

In the following year, the cultivation of the different crops will be according to the following order:

Crop No. 2 in the field A	
Do. 3	Do. B
Do. 4	Do. C
Do. 5	Do. D
Do. 6	Do. E
Do. 1	Do. F

and so on, changing each year until the seventh, when crop No. 1. will come back to field A, and the whole will then be in a good state of fertility, and free from weeds. The above system has been proved to be capable of restoring old land, and extirpating all weeds.—Canada Farmer.

Correspondence.

For the Christian Messenger.

Letter from New York.

Dear Messenger,

Only as a reader have I as yet known you. I anticipated sharing, with you, the hospitality of mutual friends in St. John, and from you learning a little of the Baptist-leaders of Nova Scotia, but was disappointed. A very humble bishopric needs its bishop; I returned home, not as I expected to preach Christ from the desk, but from a sorrowfully solitary sick-bed to draw out and prove the Christian sympathy of parishioners and friends.

I think we ought to be acquainted. I occasionally hear allusions to the personal history of Nova Scotians, and have somehow associated the Isle of Thanet with a venerable college president not distinctly related to yourself. Perhaps you, too, have lingering recollections of the sweet little isle on which Angles and Saxons first encamped,—a sharpener of their appetite for conquest, and earnest of the richer prize of their valor and cruelty. Well, I made childish forts and canals on Ramegate sands, climbed "Margate stairs," ate strawberries at Minster, and half-awake, crept through the gloomy crypts of Canterbury. Will this tie of a common origin overcome what disjunctive force there may be in our diverse loyalty—yours to a noble Queen, mine to as noble a Republic, or if you will have it, to an idea not yet developed? Or must I seek a stronger tie to bind our hearts in love, and conquer the confidence of your readers, in our common faith, our one Lord and one baptism?

This is only a common-place letter on current events; consign it to the waste-basket, or insert it as suits you.

Pick up a paper from either side of the lakes, or St. Croix; likely enough one paragraph will lead an unaccustomed reader to expect real danger from the Fenians, suppose them fostered by public favor, and to believe that "Annexation" is desired and determined on by Americans. Such an impression is dangerous to the good feeling which ought to exist between contiguous nations speaking a common language, owning a common history and Protestantism; and intimately, nay inextricably connected in commerce. And the probability of misunderstanding is the greater where there is a similarity of character and pursuits. Two of a family will quarrel while strangers will laugh.

That there is a Fenian organization is undoubted; that it means mischief is as certain. It needs to be watched like an unchained lunatic. There seems to be a method in the madness, too, the key to which we possess not. Trouble from them is as likely to arise in one place as another; for an Irishman is the same in his native land, and in the Provinces, as in the States. The difference is only in the circumstances and opportunities. At present there are indications to lead me to expect Mexico to be the next field for Irish activity.

Nor could one with absolute truth deny the existence of an annexation feeling on this side the

border; yet it is remarkably weak. I have met more, who at once thought it inadvisable, and yet inevitable.

Now a dislike, or a sympathy, or a desire founded on self-interest, might by the fostering care of a cunning leader become dangerous. I do not think that danger is to be expected from the Fenians or Annexationists. For, in the first place Americans do not sympathize with the Irish as Fenians, Fillibusters, and Romanists, but as the subjects of social and religious oppression, which an attack on Canada would never remove. Besides, such an invasion, not by, but from the States, would be a wrong which no demagogue could persuade the intelligent and conscientious masses to think right. Do you smile at the idea of a nation's action, and the U. S., being shaped to suit the conscience of its people. Yet I believe it. I have no more faith in politicians, as such, than I have in the correctness of a rum-seller's moral perceptions. But a demagogue can only influence the unintelligent crowds. These are indeed found in all large cities; but are far out-numbered by the inhabitants of the lesser cities, the villages, and farmers. These latter owing to segregation are less susceptible to passion, and more directly influenced by Christianity. New York city, thronged by foreigners and southerners is Democratic—New York State, Republican. Nor can single men have the influence they have in Continental Europe. No Napoleon or Bismark can control here. Caesarism will never be naturalized on this continent. Henry Ward Beecher attempting a cross-cut over the common sense and conscience of the people, is only endorsed by his life-long opponents; Pres. Johnson outraging every sense of propriety and right, largely contributes to the defeat of his own policy.

There is another reason for this conclusion to be found in the loyalty of the christianity educated to our common race,—a loyalty scarcely concealed by the petty animosities which have originated in the misconceptions and mistakes of the last few years. This may be the result of a common pursuit; but it seems to me to grow out of a conviction of the important part which the English speaking people are to take in the evangelization of the world. I remember how the large frame of our President (Bro. C., of St. J., will endorse me,) would dilate, and his eye kindle as he spoke of the English, as the people from whom, historically, American character and institutions are derived. And could common sense and christian courtesy, not selfishness and prejudice, prevail in editorial sanctum and public assembly, with diverse governments we might have an *Anglo-Saxondom*, united for human good, the extension of true religion, and the glory of God. God grant it.

TREMLIFT.

For the Christian Messenger.

Reply to Brother Skinner.

MR. EDITOR,

Whatever was Bro. Skinner's intention in referring to the *N. Cornwall* charge, it appears now that he might very well have spared himself and me the trouble of such reference. It is now evident from his own showing that he supplied mentally to the utterances it contained, such qualifications as he deemed necessary. And though it is now declared that in writing his design was not to fix on me a charge of inconsistency, but "to elicit an explanation as to the position taken by me, since it seemed to conflict with views previously expressed," I am still at a loss to understand why my brother should ask any explanation, or interfere in a matter, concerning which, it is now clear, he entertains precisely the same views as I do. Bro. S. could explain the whole matter, and as it seems, reconcile both views with the greatest facility. Why then was public reference made at all to the *N. Cornwall* charge, if not with the design to embarrass me? Or was it his aim to help the Rev. Doctor, whose able production called forth my animadversions on only a single point? Surely that learned bro. is fully competent to do for himself what Bro. S. is attempting to do for him. The brother's surprise, it now seems, was not so much as to the views lately expressed by me, as at my finding fault with Dr. Cramp's view which was so fully in accordance with my own view five years ago. "Five years ago!" Others may allege this, and I may confess it,—indeed I have done so, but surely Bro. S. cannot urge this point;—for according to his interpretation my present views and those of five years ago are identical, or, as he tells us, "the difference is so infinitesimally small that it would require the use of a 'metaphysical magnifying glass' of the most powerful type to discover anything more than a distinction without a difference." In other portions of his communication this agreement is ex-

pressed as follows: "Five years ago," says Bro. S. "we were perfectly agreed;" and "as to the Scriptural rule for ministerial support and the fact that individual exceptions to the rule exist, I am happy to say that we are perfectly agreed." And in conclusion, he says,—"I so far agree with him (Bro. A.) that I should not hesitate a moment if stern necessity demanded, to cultivate the ground, or do anything else that would be consistent with Christianity for the support of myself and family." People who were somewhat startled at the view lately presented by me, will hear perhaps without distrust the confession of Bro. Skinner, who it is evident, would fain help the other side, but is compelled by the force of truth to admit my position as Scriptural. Agreed we certainly are on the point; but I have yet to learn that the Rev. Doctor's view is identical with ours. But though agreed as to this matter, it seems my brother has discovered a difference in our views as to what constitutes a Scriptural charge. It is a mystery to me how Bro. S. can allege this, seeing he had already declared that the difference between the charge given at N. Cornwall and the outline of one in my last communication is infinitesimally small." Indeed, according to his own interpretation, it turns out to be a matter of mere taste,—it is whether the exception be expressed, or left to be discovered by the Candidate as circumstances may suggest, or necessity dictate. Now I am not going to dispute with him about this. Surely where the difference is in his view "infinitesimally small," he can accommodate his taste without troubling his conscience;—and he ought without questioning to allow others to do the same.

But I am very far from admitting that the two forms of expression are equivalent; and Bro. S. can hardly believe that they are. Indeed in the next paragraph he seems to have discovered even without the help of a most powerful "metaphysical magnifying glass," that they differ considerably in meaning. This difference could be made very palpable. Suppose my worthy brother should unfortunately receive a missive from an impatient creditor demanding payment of \$400 within 24 hours; and should also receive a similar one from another creditor demanding \$400 be paid, if possible, within the same time;—I am sure Bro. S. would not require a great "metaphysical magnifying glass" to discover the difference,—he would feel it. An embarrassed debtor would almost choke under the pressure of the former, while his breathing would be tolerably free under the latter demand.

I had said that "the Lord will not condemn us for not doing other people's duty." "True" says Bro. S.; but adds—"He may chastise us for doing other people's duty, and consequently neglecting our own. If a minister labours with his hands to procure the support which he ought to receive from the people, whose duty he is doing,—his own or the people's?" I am somewhat astonished that my brother should allow himself to write in this way. I had thought that Bro. Skinner would have seen, without the aid of a metaphysical magnifying glass of the most powerful type, that, if necessity, and not covetousness, drives a minister to such a course, he is doing his own duty,—and that he would also have seen that, do what he can, he can only do his own duty. The people's duty can be performed by none but themselves; and if not so performed, they remain undischarged.

Bro. S., says "the Lord may chastise us for doing other people's duty, and consequently neglecting our own." Certainly for the neglect of our own duty God will chastise us; but he will not chastise us for doing other people's duty; for the plain and substantial reason that it is impossible for a minister, church member, hearer, or any body else to discharge for another the duty which the latter owes to God and his cause. As far as a minister supports himself, his people to that extent, supposing them to have the ability to support him wholly, neglect their duty, and I doubt not God will chastise them for it, either in their souls, bodies, or substance, or in respect to their domestic and social relations and interests, or indeed it may be in all these. But he certainly will not chastise the minister whose people neglect or fail to support him, and who, while labouring in the ministry as best he can for their spiritual good, labours also otherwise to supply their lack of service due to him by divine appointment as the Lord's servant. But enough. After all Bro. S. has said, I do not understand what he wants to show except, it be that as he believes Dr. Cramp's view, and also entertains my view of the matter, there must be substantial agreement between us; and that it must therefore be very inconsistent and obtrusive on my part to object to any portion of the views expressed by the worthy and venerable President. If indeed my view and that of

the Reverend Doctor agreed as perfectly as do Brother Skinner's and mine, I should certainly deem it both inconsistent and obtrusive in me to utter even the gentlest word in the direction of what Bro. S. calls "fault finding." Though I fully agree with Dr. Cramp that it is exceedingly desirable that a minister should be wholly given up to his sacred calling, and therefore as little as possible burthened with earthly cares, or diverted from his work by their pressure; yet I have good reason to believe that my view, whether right or wrong, does differ from that of my worthy and venerable brother, the President of Acadia College. When I find a public document carefully prepared by the head of a learned Institution, a christian teacher and gentleman who thoroughly understands the force of language, and who is accustomed to great precision in its use, qualifying only one of its utterances on a particular subject, and that qualification very guardedly made at the close of the passage, I am not to be told either explicitly or by implication, by Bro. Skinner, or any other brother that the qualification applies to all the particulars preceding the one in which it is found.

Till the Reverend Doctor accepts Bro. Skinner's principle of interpretation, and such acceptance I regard as exceedingly improbable, I shall entertain the view already expressed of the learned production referred to.

I can of course have no objection to Brother Skinner writing on the subject; but as he needs no explanation as to my views expressed at different times, and as according to his own showing, he agrees with me on the only point in respect to which I differ from the Reverend Doctor already mentioned, I think it would be much wiser and better for my worthy brother to reserve his fire, and thus save his ammunition, till he finds a more worthy and substantial ground of assault than mere lame side issues.

Respectfully yours,

GEO. ARMSTRONG.

Bridgetown, Oct. 16th, 1866.

For the Christian Messenger.

Be Consistent.

We have often heard the expression, "one cause is dear to my heart." Is it? How dear? What does the language mean? I am a minister, and have noticed that frequently the persons who say so have not been at Conference or prayer-meeting for months; and although I am a charitable man, I cannot help thinking, when I hear this sentiment from the lips of such, that the speaker is labouring under a sense of christian shortcoming, and is making an effort to appear better than he really is. If "the cause be dear to your heart," my friend, your heart would prompt you to sustain the important means of grace just mentioned. The cause of Christ depends largely upon the prayer-meeting. Do you not know that, in proportion as it is attended and sustained, in every community the cause flourishes? It has been well called "the thermometer" of the church.

"I love religion," is another phrase quite common among us. It sounds well, sometimes, especially when the speaker "visits the fatherless and widows," and keeps himself unspotted from the world." No doubt it is often meant, too, but it is well to test ourselves occasionally. "I love religion," yes, but not enough to leave my business to attend one of Christ's meetings; not enough to give a dollar to help spread that religion; not enough to speak a word in its favour to a perishing fellow mortal; not enough to help me to pray with my brethren, or to erect a family altar. Be honest with yourself, my brother, and do not dare to make use of these expressions till you are willing to manifest that love in a tangible manner. The sharp eyes of the world are resting on you, and they are ready to twinkle with merriment if you fail to do as you profess. The eyes of young christians are watching, ready to imitate their elder brethren. Let us be honest in our professions.

SIGMA.

For the Christian Messenger.

OBITUARY NOTICES.

MR. EDWARD CHURCH.

Died on the 11th inst., Mr. Edward Church of Windsor Road, in the 51st year of his age. Twenty-seven years ago at Milton, under a sermon preached by the Rev. S. T. Rand, followed by an exhortation from the venerable T. S. Harding, he received deep religious impressions. Distress on account of sin continued for a few days, when he found peace in believing in the crucified Saviour. He did not, however, make a public profession of his faith till May of the present year. Although often impressed with the importance of taking that step, yet he had never