

their antagonism forget that such examples may be and continually are found coincident with numbness and even extinction of a moral sense; and intensity of devotion to a cause renders neither the cause nor the devotee, a whit better. If the advocacy of the cause imply a dereliction of the first principles of truth and justice, then in the guilt of that dereliction are all its advocates involved, let their personal sacrifices to the cause be what they may. This, we said, is often forgotten; but not usually with the most intelligent of the English laity. They see the situation and appreciate it. They see men who with the will seem to have lost the power to discern the fair meaning of plain words, roughriding the Church of England. They see the spiritual rulers of that Church wanting in some cases the will, and in all, the power, to deal with this treason in the camp. They see the great part of the clergy busy and on the stir to uphold the mere temporalities of the Church, and by public documents, and even sometimes from their pulpits, identifying these temporalities with the evangelization of the people. They are reminded of one whom the satirist represented as saying—

"Populus me sibilat; ast mihi plaudo
Ipse domi, quando nummos contemplet in arca."

It is to them a sad and sickenng spectacle.—Their love is cooled by its continuance; and their trust is long ago shaken. At such a time, we owe thanks to the writers who have come forward,—at the risk of the personal abuse which all who oppose the party receive from its unprincipled and degraded organs,—and have helped to draw broader and plainer the line which separates the so-called Ritualist from the Church of England.—*Dean Alford in the Contemporary Review for December.*

For the Christian Messenger.

PRAYER FOR COLLEGES.

Dear Brother,—

Thursday, the 25th Inst., will be the "Day of Prayer for Colleges." It is extensively observed on this Continent, and has been often followed by the bestowment of spiritual blessings on the Institutions of learning.

The observance of the day may also have a happy tendency to revive the zeal of the Churches for the advancement of our educational interests. There is great need of such a revival.

I trust that the day will be devoutly kept throughout the Province, and in Prince Edward Island.

Yours truly,
J. M. Cramp.

Acadia College, Feb. 5th, 1869.

For the Christian Messenger.

"WEEK OF PRAYER" OFFERINGS.

MR. EDITOR,—

Owing, partially, to hard times, &c., in these parts, and believing it my duty to be "just before being generous," I have not contributed as much, during the past year or two, towards different objects as formerly, except for the support of our pastor, and the relief of the poor.

When the "Week of Prayer," was announced, I resolved to attend all the meetings, which were to be held in the evenings, and to appropriate all the earnings of the days of the week to such objects as I felt to be most important. I therefore take the liberty of enclosing the amount to you (less two dollars for "College fund" which I pass over to our Pastor), and request you to dispose of as follows, viz.: (withholding my name).

Home Missions, \$2.00; Foreign, do \$2.00, to Dr. Tupper.—Mic Mac, do., S. T. Rand, \$2.00; French, do., \$1.00. Grand Division Agency Fund, \$1.00, to Patrick Monaghan. College Agency, \$2.00, (kept back) in all \$10.00. The above not to interfere with ordinary contributions during the year.

I can truly say the first week of 1869, was the happiest of my life in spiritual matters.

There are but few of your readers who could not spend one week of the year to visit friends, then why not devote at least that small portion of time, in the cause of the Master. Farmers might set apart (as some have already done) one or more of their best fruit trees, a patch of well cultivated ground, or a sheep or two, for God's cause. It would not seem too great a sacrifice for them to appropriate the proceeds of as many fruit trees, as the objects they wish to contribute towards. Then our Lawyers, Doctors, Merchants, Mechanics, and Clerks, O so easily, give the "fees,"

"profits," or "earnings," of the first Week of each year, or any week, as an extra offering. Not, however, for a vain show, but from pure motives—love to God and his cause. If such were the practice the cry would not be as now, "No funds, no funds," to replenish the exhausted Treasury of the Lord—but that Treasury would overflow with willing offerings, and the heralds of salvation would be enabled to "go on their way rejoicing." And the work of the Lord would prosper in their hands, especially if those free-will offerings were followed, as doubtless they would be, by the earnest prayers of the givers. The harvest is indeed white, but the laborers (for want of the necessary funds) are few, and far between. May the Lord of the harvest supply the laborers, and incline the people to furnish the means to support them.

That your christian readers may do their utmost to spread the Saviour's name abroad, by contributing freely of their means is the wish of

A FRIEND OF MISSIONS.

Christian Messenger.

HALIFAX, FEBRUARY 10, 1869.

"If two of you shall agree on earth as touching any thing that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven."

This promise, first given to the Apostles, may be taken as generally applicable to the followers of Christ, when explained by other Scriptures, especially when the prayer offered, be in subordination to the will of God.

The note from the President of Acadia College in another column is of the nature of an agreement amongst many believers and churches on this behalf.

For several years past there has been the agreement required, and the prayer offered, and the blessing has been sent in accordance with the promise.

With the most skilfully arranged plans, and the most profound and best considered course of instruction, and with the ablest minds for instructors and professors, we still feel that all is insufficient to accomplish the highest purposes of education, without the quickening influences of the Holy Spirit. After the best possible means are employed we are warranted in offering prayer for the Divine blessing. It should be well considered what are the obligations resting on the churches to labor and pray for institutions, having for their object the educational training of the future ministry as well as that of other students.

The Roman Catholic advocates of Separate Schools have an accession to their strength in the utterance of the *Church Chronicle* of last week. It comes in the form of an editorial in that paper, the organ of a portion of the Episcopal body. After stating, somewhat unfairly, the arguments *pro* and *con*, making it appear that Separate Schools mean religious teaching, whilst Common Schools are without any religion, the article proceeds, hypothetically, as follows:—

"If these issues are at stake, the question is certainly an important one, and it becomes the duty of a paper such as this to speak plainly upon the matter. While then, we are sensible of the many difficulties that stand in the way of establishing Separate Schools, and feel that nothing is more to be deprecated than sudden and hasty action, we believe that we should be false to our duty as members of Christ's Church, to which He has committed the guardianship of man's highest interest, if we shrunk from declaring, that for the honour of God, and for the good of the souls of those to be trained in our Schools, some place must be found in our educational system for definite religious teaching, and that the best way for securing such teaching is by Separate Schools. But we also maintain that the law must not allow one denomination the slightest advantage over another; all must stand precisely upon the same footing, so that any denomination of Christians—Church of England, Roman Catholics, Presbyterians, or any other, upon establishing a school, shall have a right to their share of the provincial and county funds according to some definite plan."

We do not think the writer of the article in the *Church Chronicle* is quite correct, when he says, that in the present educational arrangements there is "a complete ignoring of real religious training." If he had said that there is an absence of sectarian training he would have been nearer the truth. We do not think it essential that an ecclesiastic shall be placed in the office of teacher before "real religious training" can be given to our youth. The argument produced by putting religion and physiology on a level is scarcely respectful to the former. We are not of

those who would "deny that Separate Schools are needed to give instruction in the fundamental principles of our Holy Religion," under a supposition that "on these all Christians are agreed." Far from it. All Christians are not agreed, either on the fundamental principles, or the minor details of our Holy Religion; and this very fact is a reason for excluding these matters from the legal enactment.

The conclusion to which our contemporary comes would indicate that the writer is not friendly to schools, provided by the people for the people, without regard to their religious peculiarities or the denomination to which they severally belong. He says:

"Taking as our watchword 'Equal rights to all,' let us demand that the fact of religious instruction being given in a school, shall not cause it to be thought unfit to receive public money in a Christian land. Let us gain the right to have such schools aided from the public funds, and then set to work and establish as many as we can and not grudge others to do the same."

We take the same ground as our contemporary "Equal rights to all," and we assert without fear of successful contradiction that with Separate Schools this cannot possibly be. There must and will be injustice done to some parties by such an arrangement.

What would be said to the Presbyterian, the Methodist, or the Baptist who should employ the same argument, and should demand "public money" for the school in which their several denominational views were taught, as a part of the regular course of instruction. The most superficial consideration will shew that such an arrangement, would make demands on the people so enormous that all Public Schools would soon be at an end.

Religious teaching is the work of the parents not of the State; and the parents may, through the Trustees, make arrangements, under the existing law, for all the religious instruction required during the hours allotted for teaching. Special and "real religious training" should be given in addition to that of the Public Schools. The freiside, the Sunday School and the Christian ministry all supply opportunities for this.

The *Monthly Record*, the organ of the Church of Scotland, makes an allusion to these clerical "hankerings," and in its January No. says:—

"The 'Separate School' Act is a combined movement, which is agitated in the U. States as well as here. Our religious press has spoken out to some extent. Episcopalian people wish for no change upon our common school system, though many of the clergy have hankerings after Episcopalian schools. Our common school theory does not teach that common branches are more important than religion, but only that we are agreed upon the usefulness of the former, and can combine to that extent. The bill of the last year and the vote upon it, were a shameful insult to the country. People are more burdened already than they can bear, and when burdens are increased, it should not be to teach and propagate a system which has been a misfortune to the world."

We think the number of the clergy in the Church of England who would ask for Separate Schools is small, and of the laity much smaller. They know well that such a change would be detrimental to all concerned.

It may please the advocates of Separate Schools to rest their demand on the supposition that they have a greater regard for religion, than others; and to charge those who oppose such demands with being "arrayed against the cause of religious training of youth," but when we consider who are comprised in the parties opposed to such a change in our educational institution, we think it might be well if the said advocates would put into practice a little more of the virtue of modesty.

POLITICAL.

The Repeal League lately formed in Halifax published their Constitution and list of officers a few days since. On Wednesday last, Jeremiah Northup, Esq., M. P. P. for Halifax, formally withdrew from the organization. The following letter to the Secretary of the League, published by his request, gives Mr. N.'s reasons for so doing:—

DEAR SIR,—Since the formation of the Repeal League the position of the party has materially changed. The despatch from Earl Granville, giving the answer of Gladstone's Cabinet, (of which Mr. Bright is a member) to the resolutions of the Assembly, is so decisive against us, that it leaves no room for any success from our further agitation of the Repeal movement. And as I do not wish to appear to aid in any agitation that I believe cannot produce any useful result, but which I fear may only be successful in further unsettling the business of the country, I

beg leave respectfully to ask you to remove my name from the roll of membership of the League.

Dear sir, yours truly,

JEREMIAH NORTHUP.

The following is the Despatch, which we take from the *Chronicle* of Wednesday last, to which Mr. Northup refers:—

DOWNING STREET, 13th Jan., 1869.

SIR:—

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your despatch of the 12th ult., transmitting copies of certain resolutions addressed by the House of Assembly to the Lieutenant Governor of Nova Scotia, respecting the Confederation of the North American Provinces, and of a statement on the same subject addressed to the Lieut.-Governor by the Executive Council. The statement of the Executive was forwarded to the Secretary of State in Lord Monck's despatches of the 8th of September, which was acknowledged by the Duke of Buckingham and Chandos, in his despatch of the 8th December. The resolutions of the Assembly appear not to have been before His Grace when that despatch was written, but they do not call for any lengthened observations from me.

I greatly regret that a majority of the House of Assembly should entertain and express sentiments embodied in some of the resolutions, but I can hold out no expectation that Her Majesty's Government will propose, or that Parliament will entertain, any measure for the Repeal of the Act of 1867. That Act was passed at the desire of the three Provincial Legislatures; its operations have not hitherto been unsuccessful, and, on the faith of it, important transactions are already in progress.

Further, I have reason to believe that the Government of the Dominion is disposed, liberally, to fulfil the expectations expressed in my predecessor's despatch of the 10th of June last: that the Government and Parliament of Canada would modify any arrangement respecting taxation, or respecting the regulation of trade and fisheries, which might prejudice the interests of Nova Scotia and of the Maritime Provinces of the Dominion.

I most earnestly hope therefore that even those inhabitants of Nova Scotia who are not convinced of the expediency of Confederation, will see it to be their duty and their interest to abandon any agitation which is only calculated to perpetuate disunion, to arrest progress of settlement and commerce, and divert the efforts of the Government and Legislature from those objects of general utility to which they ought to be steadily directed.

I have the honor to be, sir, your most obedient and humble servant.

(Signed)

GRANVILLE.

To Governor-General

Right Hon. Sir JOHN YOUNG.

The result of the negotiations of Messrs. Howe and McLellan with the Dominion Government, appeared in the form of a Report from Mr. Rose, the Finance Minister, addressed to His Excellency the Governor General. This Report was given in full in the *Halifax Reporter* of Thursday evening last. It was sent on by telegraph. In consequence of the stormy weather it took five hours for the message to be transmitted. It was the longest message ever sent to Halifax by telegraph.

The following are the seven points presented by Messrs. Howe and McLellan.

1st. That a just apportionment of the debts of the several Provinces, of the amount of assets which each contributed, would entitle Nova Scotia to enter the Union with a debt of \$9,980,874.

2nd.—That an allowance should be made for the New Provincial Building erected since the date of the Quebec Conference at a cost stated to be nearly \$250,000.

3rd.—That an allowance should be made for the Provincial Note circulation of Nova Scotia, amounting to \$662,458, on the ground that it bears no interest, and that a portion of the circulation may fairly be considered to have been lost, and that it will not be presented for redemption.

4th.—That a deduction should also be made from the Savings Bank deposits, amounting to about \$657,610.40, or such an amount as it may fairly be supposed will never be called for by depositors.

5th.—That an allowance should be made to Nova Scotia for stores on hand at the time of union.

6th.—That the debt of Nova Scotia being a different currency should be brought to the same basis as that of the other provinces.

7th.—That Nova Scotia being subjected to an increased taxation under the Union, to an extent which, it is contended, would have been sufficient to have met the interest on her increased debt, and also made adequate provisions for her local expenditure had no union taken place—is entitled to ask that these services shall be provided for by a grant from the Dominion.

These points are severally discussed and explained. After shewing the practical difficulties to be met, the following is given as the proposed solution of them:—

In view of these considerations, the undersigned is of opinion that the most equitable solution of the present difficulty would be to submit to the favorable consideration of Parliament, the propriety of placing the Province of Nova Scotia, as far as practicable, on the same footing as the Province of New Brunswick, and to allow it to come into the Union with the same debt per head of the population as established by the last census, on terms stated in the British North American Act, and to pay for a limited period of