

## Our Contributors.

### THE FRANCHISE AS AN EDUCATOR

BY KNOWNAN

One of the arguments in favour of government by the people is that the Franchise is an educator. It is contended that by hearing and reading speeches on public question, by thinking them out and conversing about them the people increase their knowledge, and qualify themselves for the duties and responsibilities of citizens help.

There is much truth in this contention provided the questions discussed are large and the men who speak and write on them are men of light and leading. Something more is also needed. The people who hear and read and discuss, must be capable of learning something. If a man thinks he knows everything already, even Gladstone could give him no education. There must be receptivity on the part of the people as well as power to communicate ideas, and stimulate thinking on the part those who speak and write. There is no use in giving a man an idea if he has no place to put it.

Large and difficult questions have been discussed in Canada. The adoption of responsible government fifty years ago, involved the discussion of many large and vital questions. The extension of the Franchise and collateral issues, were questions large and important enough for the highest statesmanship to wrestle with. The confederation of the colonies that now form this Dominion, was a brave attempt at native building. Whatever may come of the Dominion every one will admit that the Confederation Fathers made a noble and patriotic attempt to lay the foundation of a nation. If their sons cause the superstructure to topple over, impartial history will not blame the men who did the work on the foundation.

Fifteen years ago the people of this country were asked to grapple with a new, large and most difficult question. Free Trade and Protection problems were quite familiar to well informed British minds, because the problem had been thoroughly threshed out in Great Britain, but many Canadians knew very little about them. Truth to say, a good many do not understand them very well even yet. After fifteen years discussion the question who pays the duty, will bring diametrically opposite replies. Professor Young used to give Protection vs Free Trade, as an illustration of the fact, that something can be said on both sides of almost any question. The learned Professor handled a fiscal problem scientifically, just as he handled the Ego and Non Ego, and all other problems. The handling of the N. P. during the last fifteen years has not been strictly scientific everywhere and always.

There is not much education in the campaign at present raging in Ontario. All, or very nearly all, the questions are either old or small. Separate Schools were discussed forty years ago, with very much more intelligence than many people discuss them now. Densely ignorant, or worse than ignorant must the man be who says that the Separate schools of Ontario were established by the present government. How the old settlers must wonder when they hear a budding orator bring up the Separate school question, with as much freshness as if he had discovered something new. That was an old question forty years ago. Our fathers—grand old men many of them were—discussed it before many of us were born. A large proportion of them did not like Separate schools, but after wrestling with the problem for many years, they concluded that it would do the country less harm to establish them, than keep aglow the fires of Sectarian strife. They were intelligent men, patriotic men and had sense enough to see that society cannot exist unless each member yields something and puts up with something he does not like. If the exhibition were not so humiliating, it would be decidedly funny to see a would be instructor of the people bring up the Separate school question with the air of a man who had just made a discovery.

Principal Grant seems to think that the sixth commandment is an issue in this campaign. If so, that is another old question.

In order to form some conception of the size of some of the new questions, try and imagine a British statesman making speeches about them. Imagine Lord Salisbury discussing the number of eggs that should be consumed by an asylum official at one meal. Fancy Gladstone growing eloquent over a consumptive calf. Just think of Rosebery putting a paragraph into his speech about saving a few cents on the daily allowance of a lunatic.

This campaign is out of all sight the worst that has ever taken place in Ontario. Many of the questions are either so old or so small that there is no education in them. Many of the appeals are to the worst and most dangerous passions of our nature. It is just such a campaign as makes thoughtful people ask after all whether this country is capable of self-government, and wonder whether it would not be better to have a closer connection of some kind with the Imperial government. Annexation is not to be thought of. The people do not want it, and if they got it matters would speedily become worse. Independence would mean the worst kind of war. Take away the wholesome restraining influence of John Bull, and we would soon have reproduced in Canada the worst scenes of Cork and Tipperary with the physical courage of the Irishman left out. What we need is more British toleration and statesmanship. We must have it or die.

### PRESBYTERIANISM OF THE C.E.S.\*

BY REV. J. MACGILLIVRAY, D.D., MONTREAL.

This is a Presbyterian rally; and it means that we believe in our own church, and are proud of her. I confess I have always been suspicious of a man who tells me that he loves all churches alike. Of course I believe him; but I believe also, that his love is so sickly that it is not a bit of use to any of the churches. Show me a man who is so dead in love with his own church that he will put his life on her altar, and you show me a man who rejoices at the advance of Christ's cause in every other church. It is with this love in our hearts we meet to-night. Therefore, not the shadow of an unkind word to other churches will fall from our lips. We rejoice in their victories, for they are the victories of Christ.

We meet, then, as Presbyterian young people, to look a little into our system, and the Society of Christian Endeavor, to see if their principles and spirit are in accord. We take up this investigation all the more eagerly, because assertions are sometimes made about the un-presbyterian character of the Endeavor movement, that I hope to show you are wide of the mark. But before doing so, permit an observation or two, just to clear the way.

When we speak of determining the Presbyterianism of the Society of Christian Endeavor, we do not take the position that other denominations could not find features of their system in the society. Indeed, this is the very glory of the Endeavor Society, and proves its splendid catholicity, that it has incorporated the fundamental truth of all the Christian churches. It is a witness to its Christianity that, after all, rises far above its denominationalism. Further, suppose that this evening we were unable to discover a single Presbyterian principle in the movement, should we as Presbyterians condemn and reject it? No; a thousand times no, for that would be acting clearly against the history and spirit of Presbyterianism. For no church has been so ready to take up and assimilate practical Christian movements, to wit: the Sunday-school, Woman's Missionary Society, and this Endeavor movement in which she is proud to be the "banner" church. Besides, it is forgotten that our standards provide for this progressive spirit. In the Confession of Faith, Chap. 1, sec. vi, we read: "There are some circumstances concerning the worship of God and government of the church, common to human actions and societies which are to be ordered by the light of nature and Christian prudence, according to the general rules of the word which are always to be observed,"—

\* An address given at a rally of Montreal Presbyterian Christian Endeavor in St. Gabriel Church, May 31st.

a clause that Dr. A. A. Hodge speaks of as relating to "detailed adjustment to changing circumstances."

But in very truth, our difficulty is to make a wise selection out of the number of Presbyterian principles that crowd upon us when we begin to look into the Society of Christian Endeavor. Let us, first, look at the form of the society, and see how Presbyterian it is. A society of Christian Endeavor is simply a miniature Presbyterian congregation in full blast. The President of the society corresponds to the pastor of the congregation: the Look-out Committee, or, if you like, the Prayer-meeting Committee to the Session, looking after the spiritual interests; the Executive Committee to the Board of Management, or Deacons' Court looking after the secular interests; the Missionary Committee to the Missionary Society, or Woman's Missionary Society of the congregation; the Temperance Committee to the Temperance Association; the Charitable Committee to the Ladies' Aid; and so on. "A church within a church," do I hear an objector say. Why not? If Presbyterian principles are good for a congregation, why not for a society within the congregation? If they can be successfully applied on a large scale, why not on a smaller? That is a disloyal objection. But let us pass by the form. For it is of least importance. Principal Caven put this matter of form and spirit very clearly in a paper read before the Presbyterian Alliance at London: "There is no charm in the form of church government, so that of itself it should secure not only activity and harmony, but also spiritual life. If the essential teachings of the Gospel are compromised, there can be no compensation for so great a defect, and should forms of church government, less scriptural than ours, prove more faithful to evangelical doctrines, they will bear better fruit. To deny this were to be not merely sectarian, but utterly unchristian." We pass on, therefore, to the spirit and principles of the two movements.

1. Presbyterianism exalts Christ, and so does Christian Endeavor. One of the fundamental positions of Presbyterianism is that the Lord Jesus Christ alone is the Head of the church (Conf. c. 25, sect. 6). This means no pope as God's vicegerent, and king or queen controlling the church. No only so, but the Presbyterian church has kept emphasis on the truth: Christ alone a sufficient Saviour, Christ the only mediator between God and man. Christ the only Priest, King and Prophet of His people. These are doctrines dripping with the very life-blood. Christian Endeavor exalts Christ. Her motto for service is "for Christ and the church," and her doctrine for inspiration in service is "Trusting in the Lord Jesus Christ for strength." Clearly they are one on this great fundamental.

2. Presbyterianism stands for an open Bible, so does Christian Endeavor. The glory of our church is her insistence on the right of every man to read the Bible. It was the very stone on which her noble founder split with Rome. Presbyterianism is very old. We believe the Old Testament church to have been Presbyterian, and also the New Testament Church. But as a distinct church, it took shape in the city of Zurich, and its father was Zwingli, the noble leader of the Swiss Reformation. His statue in Zurich is an inspiration as you look into his strong, fine face, and see the Bible in his hand: the book in whose defence he fought such great battles, and from which he preached so fearlessly in the cathedral church, dying on the field of Kappel with it in his hand as he sought to comfort a wounded soldier. With such an origin and founder, we understand the Covenanters and Huguenots dying or banished by the thousands, rather than give up an open Bible. Here the Christian Endeavor is Presbyterian. Its glory is Bible study. The Bible is its daily text book, its "infallible rule of faith and practice."

3. Presbyterianism maintains the universal character of the church of God, so does Christian Endeavor. No church has inscribed on her standards a broader catholicity: a communion with saints of every name and race and clime. Look at her definition of the church on earth: "The visible church which

is also catholic or universal under the Gospel (not confined to one nation, as before under the law) consists of all those throughout the world that profess the true religion together with their children..." (Conf. c. 25, sect. ii.). Put along side this statement the motto of our society "One is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren," and not only the motto but its grand manifestation throughout the world. This claim for the church of God, as confined to no sect or denomination, rang out at the very inception of Presbyterianism, as Zwingli, rising up before 900 deputies, exclaimed "The universal church is spread over the whole world, wherever there is faith in Christ, in India as well as in Zurich"; and I can hear the shout of Christian Endeavor throughout the world crying "Amen," to that magnificent Presbyterian principle.

4. Presbyterianism stands for pledged service, so does Christian Endeavor. Presbyterians believe in covenants. Covenants and covenant ideas fill a large place in her Standards. Look at Scotland's Presbyterian covenants, to wit, the National Covenant and "the Solemn League and Covenant" that bound those noble men "to endeavor the extirpation" of every form of evil "that the Lord may be one, and His name one in the their kingdoms." We can see their banner with the inscription, "For Christ's Crown and Covenant," carried into the field of battle, and their lives given beneath it. Let us be as true to our pledge that is brimful of Presbyterian doctrine. In it you find Christ exalted, the Bible honored, prayer commended, conscience developed, and the perseverance of the saints inculcated.

### HAS HINDOOISM BEEN "SCRATCHED" BY CHRISTIANITY?

BY REV. S. H. KELLOGG, D.D.

Among the Oriental delegates to the Parliament of Religions in Chicago, was Babu P. C. Mozoomdar who may be regarded since the death of Keshub Chunder Sen, as the leader of the "New Dispensation" party of the Brahmo Samaj in India; a most affable and pleasant gentleman, whom, since his return, I have had the pleasure of meeting, when last winter in Lahore he attended, with much apparent interest, lectures which I was giving on Christianity to the educated native gentlemen of that city. His presence on that occasion in the fine audience which again and again assembled in the Mission College to hear what I had to say for the Christian faith, brought to my mind what he had given forth in America concerning the success—or, rather, the failure—of Christian Missions. He is reported as having spoken to this effect: "Properly speaking, so far as we are concerned, the Protestant Christian Missions are the most important missions. For nearly a hundred years they have worked. The native Christians number two millions and a half, more than one-half of these being Roman Catholics. If you go to India will you find any scratch on the surface of Hindu society by Christianity? No. . . . Your missionaries are hard and fast and dry, surrounded by the native Christians, who, with few exceptions represent neither the culture of Europe nor of India. The success of Christianity is eminently unsatisfactory both to Christian communities and to our people at large."

I confess that I am somewhat puzzled by such words as I have italicised. For there can be no doubt that Babu Mozoomdar is an observant and very intelligent gentleman; nor would it be fair at all to impute to him wilful misrepresentation. It is true that the actual numerical result in conversion, although, if looked at with reference to the number of workers, and the amount of money expended, among the 287,000,000 of India, is truly remarkable; on the other hand, when looked at from the standpoint of our desires, is small. But while fully admitting this, it is none the less surprising to hear a man of Babu Mozoomdar's intelligence affirm that as yet Christianity has made "no scratch on the surface of Hindoo society." It seems to me that, inadvertently, he has even needlessly thus belittled the significance of that Samaj, of which he is a distinguished member. For what is the