

funny, dignified and sprightly, logical and rhetorical, profound and pithy; write elaborate leaders and spicy paragraphs defend their sect, and be catholic in spirit; flatter their friends and slash their enemies, and be candid and truthful; be true to conscience and hurt nobody's prejudices; revise correspondence, review books, answer scores of letters daily, condense the news, report the markets, talk to every one that comes into the office, trust subscribers, pay cash to the printers; and, by way of recreation, preach sermons, deliver lectures, and attend to public gatherings of interest, to report proceedings. Nearly enough is it not, to keep one busy? Our judgment is, in view of all we have learned of our burdens and perplexities of such a life—unavoidable until religious journalism is more completely organized—that the religious papers of this country are generally marvels of industry and ability. We look to them with the greatest interest as the truest conservators of the highest interests of society, and rejoice in all the evidences that abound of their great influence for good—*Christian Guardian*.

Christian Messenger.

HALIFAX, MAY 4, 1870.

MORE MINISTERS WANTED.

One of the most pressing necessities of the Churches of Christ in these provinces, at the present time, is, we believe, an augmentation of efficient ministers of the gospel. Believers may have full confidence that the Great Shepherd will not leave his people, nor allow his cause to fail; yet there is great reason to fear that a spirit of unconcern, and an inadequate appreciation of the under-Shepherds which have been commissioned by the Head of the Church, will cause him to withdraw his approval and delay the sending forth of more laborers.

Our Saviour's injunction, "Pray ye the Lord of the harvest that he would send forth laborers, &c.," implies that by restraining prayer and corresponding action, the results will be of a contrary character.

The diminution of ministers by removals, deaths, &c., may well lead to the enquiry as to what may be done to fill up the broken ranks, and provide for the destitute churches; as well as others to go to the regions beyond, which are calling so loudly for help.

Whence is the supply of ministers for the churches to come, but from the churches themselves?

It may be supposed by some that their regular contributions towards sustaining the ministry, and assisting to support our Collegiate Institutions and make them thoroughly efficient, is all that has to be done by them in the matter of seeking to replenish the number of "faithful men, able to teach others." A little consideration will show that such an idea is erroneous, this is only doing a part of what ought to be done, and leaving a large part of the duty undone.

Encouragement is given in the word of God to those who desire to fill the office of a bishop. The Apostle Paul pronounces that such an one "desireth a good work." A desire to labor on behalf of Christ may be existing in a latent form in the heart of many a young convert, or in those more advanced, and needs but grace bestowed in answer to the prayers of the church to bring it forth into active life. It must not be supposed that such a plant will become full grown and vigorous, without due care and cultivation on the part of the church of Christ. Forwardness and self-sufficiency, however, are not the most favorable indications in one who would teach others, and it should therefore be regarded as the work of the Church to seek for the gifts bestowed in answer of their prayers. Some churches are accustomed to think that all other churches are more likely than their own to send out young ministers from among their membership. As it was in former days, so it is now, "a prophet is not without honor, except in his own country, and among his own kindred." And because of this the desire to be so entirely devoted to the work of Christ, is often not recognized or not cared for. These things ought not so to be. The most highly gifted and useful minister had a commencement of his career, and perhaps it was with fear and trembling he first appeared in public that to obey the Master's call. Perhaps there are some who have had one or two talents entrusted to them, but because they have not ten, they fear to make use of what they have, and so lay themselves open to the

charge of the Master, "Thou wicked and slothful servant." This then becomes a serious matter, and calls for serious enquiry. A lukewarm slothful church may have something to do with this, and may fail to bring forth the talent, or to give it right direction. How many churches there are which have never sent out a minister, or even a student for the ministry; and that afford no encouragement to young men to think favorably of the work of preaching the gospel. Perhaps in some cases this may arise from defective views of the claims of the office, and of the necessity for the ministerial office. We hold that the administration of the ordinances is properly committed to the ministers of Christ. The Chief Shepherd instituted the Lord's Supper; and the Apostle Paul presided in dispensing that Supper on a subsequent occasion, Acts xx. 11. So also in the administration of baptism. The minister is ordained to these duties. For advancement and growth in a church of Jesus Christ, there must ordinarily be the preaching of the Word more or less regularly. If there be a state of indifference in securing these advantages and profiting by them, there can be expected but little inclination in young men to give themselves to the work.

Since we commenced writing the foregoing, it has occurred to us that there are several of the Acadia College Students having the Christian ministry in view, who, in a few weeks time, will have a suspension of their studies for two or three months, and might be willing to spend that time with churches desirous of engaging their services in preaching the Gospel.

The Home Missionary Boards have sometimes secured the labors of those brethren during their summer vacations, and have sent them to destitute localities. These Boards would be glad to do so again, but at the present time the appropriations which have been already made of the funds at their disposal will not allow them.

We doubt not that Dr. Sawyer, the President of the College, would be pleased to render any assistance he could in this matter.

If applications were sent to him he could lay them before the students, and, if acceptable, correspondence might be had so as to make all needed arrangements, and thus avoid loss of time. Dr. Sawyer will pardon us if we have taken too great liberty in thus referring to him.

This we would suggest is one way by which the brethren could give effect to the above recommendations, and render essential service to the cause of Christ and his ministry.

THE RIGHT TO EDUCATE.

The education of a whole people is a matter of transcendent moment. It must ever be of commanding interest. Our system of public education is neither a charitable institution, nor an institution for the advancement of private or party purposes. It involves the interests of all, not only of this generation but of posterity.

The Roman Catholic influence which, we still believe, indirectly deprived the province of the educational services of Mr. Rand, and which up to this time has prevented any impartial investigation of the conduct of the trustees and teachers of the Arichat Schools respecting text-books and religious exercises, must be exceedingly powerful with our rulers.

Some of the city schools too are conducted in violation of the leading principles of a system of public education. A determined attempt is being made by the Roman Catholic priesthood, not only in Nova Scotia, but all over this continent, to destroy, or, failing this, to enervate, the systems of Public Schools now in operation, and to rear on their ruins Ecclesiastical or Separate schools. This is a bold and huge undertaking—wherever successful it will not only multiply immensely the cost of education, but must subvert the recognized principles of government. Ours is a civil government only, and has a right to tax the people for civil purposes only. It is not a union of Church and State.

On what grounds is this sweeping change urged upon our acceptance by the Church of Rome, and those who to secure place or power echo her wishes? Simply that the education of the people belongs to the Church; and the Church has the right to control this education. But our readers know that there are two other claimants to this right to educate: the parents, and the State. Has any one of these parties an exclusive right to control this important matter; and, if not, to what extent are their rights co-ordinate?

The right of the parents is first, in the order of nature and of time. Surely if any party may claim the right to direct the education of the children of a family, it is the parents, to whom they owe existence, by whom they are supported, whose love for them and interest in them are greater than that of others can be, and on whom God has plainly devolved the first and chief responsibility of the case. The fact of parentage creates the closest and strongest of ties. The institution of the family, ideally and chronologically, precedes that of Church and State, and its sanctity must in all respects be preserved, or the foundations of both civil and sacred society are gone. Every thoughtful reader of history knows the unnatural folly of the Spartan idea, that children belong exclusively to the State, and are therefore to be taken from their parents and brought up together by the State. The somewhat similar conception of socialistic theorists, who would break down the family in favor of a "community" in which all the children should form a common group under the general care, has properly been rejected as fundamentally vicious. But equally unnatural and evil would it be for the church to override the family in any similar way, gathering the children into ecclesiastical nurseries or asylums, and trying to be a mother to them. The idea of "mother-church" was never meant to be so literally taken. We hold, then, that the rights of parents are first and paramount as to the education of their children, and that whatever is done by other parties in this direction, whether by Church or State, must not invade parental responsibility and liberty. Parents must be allowed to provide for their children the very best education which their opportunities will allow, free from civil or ecclesiastical dictation.

We acknowledge next a certain religious right in Churches to educate. It would be strange, indeed, if a church had rights in this respect, seeing that children are so large a part of its charge, and that the character of adults is usually so dependent upon influences brought to bear in childhood. There must be a responsibility of some kind in a church to see that the children of its members are not left in ignorance, and especially that they are trained in religious knowledge. But this obvious truth gives no countenance whatever to the extreme and absurd claim put forth by the Church of Rome as to the jurisdiction of the church over the subject of education. The *Tablet*, a Roman Catholic organ, says:

Education itself is the business of the spiritual society alone, and not of secular society. The instruction of children and youth is included in the Sacrament of Orders, and the State usurps the functions of the spiritual society when it turns educator. The organization of the schools, their entire internal arrangement and management, the choice and regulation of studies, and the selection, appointment, and dismissal of teachers, belong exclusively to the spiritual authority.

It was the refusal of Austria longer to admit and carry out this claim of the Roman Catholic church, which, in part, produced the late breach between the Pope and the Emperor of that country. The national schools were taken from under ecclesiastical control, and were placed under civil control; and the Pope declared this to be a violation of the rights of the church! But on what is such a monstrous claim based? On the two-fold fallacy that the church embraces all the families of the nation, and that whatever it is under moral obligation to promote and secure, it must itself do directly and exclusively. Plainly, at the present day, no branch of the Christian church includes all the children of the State; nor yet are all the children included within all the Christian denominations. Moreover, while the church in its various branches should throw its influence effectively to secure the education of the children, it by no means follows that this must be done in Church schools, any more than the duty of the church to secure industry in its members implies that all business must be carried on in Ecclesiastical shops, factories, and offices; or, than that the duty of the church to promote justice among men implies its right to carry on civil government by church officers and ecclesiastical courts. The church must do many things, yea, most things, indirectly, using the agency of the family, of society, of the State, and of special voluntary organizations, contenting itself with being the animating spirit of all good, and with providing supplementary agencies. Thus it should promote general intelligence and education through the common schools of the Province or State, through academies and colleges, and through family instruction, adding, for more direct religious train-

ing, Sunday schools and family visitation by the pastors. Against any exclusive management of the schools by the Church stand the rights of the State, of the part of the community not in the church, and of parents in the church.

We come now to the right of the State to educate. How can this be denied? The State is a divine institution equally with the Church, though for a different purpose. If to preserve its existence, and to maintain its best character, the church has a certain implied and Divine right to give its children religious education, then, for precisely similar reasons, the State has a right to give its children the education required for making good citizens. The family relation is recognized by both, and both must co-work with parents to educate the children. No prosperous State can be based on ignorance, which always debases mind and heart, and makes men the victims and the tools of tyrants. A free country demands a common school system as essential to its being, and still more to its well-being. It was the very instinct of freedom which led to the establishment of schools for universal education. Hence the State must make definite provision for educating all its children. But in doing this, it must remember that its work is co-ordinate with that of the family and the church, and it must refrain from an infringement of their rights. Consequently the parent may demand that the common schools, which he is taxed to support, shall not have lessons or exercises which will educate his children in religious views contrary to those in which he feels conscientiously bound to train them; and, also, that the State shall not monopolize education, and forbid other schools which parents may wish to use at their own expense, at any stage of education. Similarly, each branch of the Christian church may properly insist that the State shall not introduce into the schools common to the whole people, books and methods of training which oppose the peculiar tenets and practices of that or any other distinct church. The Province or State must act in good faith for the moral and intellectual objects common to all, leaving to supplemental parental and church agencies those special religious influences with reference to which citizens honestly differ. This is the basis on which our system of public schools is founded. Subserviency to the dictation of ecclesiastical for the destruction of this basis, would destroy, and has already largely imperilled the educational interests of the country. The end is not yet.

"AN AGGRIEVED PARISHIONER!"

We copy the following from the *Church Chronicle* of Thursday last:

DEAR SIR:—Will you be kind enough to allow an aggrieved parishioner to bring his grievance before the public through your column, and also inform me whether any redress is to be obtained, and if so, from what quarter.

I am a Churchman, Mr. Editor, and love my Church and her services, consequently attend our public worship whenever I can by any possibility do so. A few Sundays ago however I went as usual to our parish church, with my family, at the proper hour of afternoon service. I waited patiently for some time, but you may imagine my surprise when I saw our respected Rector march past the door of the church and enter the Baptist meeting house. Upon enquiry I learned that a Baptist funeral was going on, and that as a necessary consequence we were to be deprived of the privilege of the "church service," as our clergyman had entered the Baptist pulpit and was employed in conducting the service in connection with the Methodist and Baptist ministers. I started for my home Mr. Editor with a heavy heart and had not proceeded far before I met an old and respectable member of our Zion who had travelled five miles in order to be present at the usual afternoon service, but had to turn back as I had done. Now, the above is a simple narrative of facts which I am prepared to prove. Will you therefore kindly publish this short letter and advise me how to act to prevent a repetition of such a proceeding which you must confess is a disgrace alike to pastor and congregation and an outrage upon the feelings of all true churchmen.

Believe me dear Sir,

Yours truly,

WILMOT.

[We presume the proper authority to apply to is the Ordinary.—ED. C. C.]

We have no knowledge of the facts further than as here stated, and shall be interested to see the Rector's explanation of the grave offence.

JAMAICA.

The following resolution, passed at the late Annual Session of the Jamaica Baptist Union, received by the Rev. Dr. Cramp from the Rev. J. M. Phillippo, will give our readers a pleasing view of the piety and