

self, and they cannot move him out of the chair, nor appoint another, nor do any business without him.

Under the new rule that some seem prepared for, all this goes by the board! The pastor who labors in word and doctrine has no "double honor." If he will not put a motion that is in violation of some rule of the Church, he can be voted out of the chair, and another appointed who will put the motion, and who can hold the chair independently of the Presbytery. In all this I am bringing no accusation against the eldership, but merely pointing out what the proposed change would make possible.

4. It is through the minister specially that the superior courts of the Church have hold on and control of the spiritual affairs of each congregation.

The ordaining and inducting power can also remove, suspend or depose him. He has everything to lose at the hands of the Presbytery. The elder has not. He is ordained by the Session; and to the Session he is directly responsible. Sever the connecting link between the Session and Presbytery by the proposed change, let the Session have complete autonomy independently of the minister, and in proportion as an elder has less to lose at the hands of a Presbytery than a minister, you weaken control, and render government of the Church less efficient. Even now a fractious minister can give his Presbytery great trouble, how much more trouble could he give if relieved of the responsibility of presiding, or of even being present in the Session when some questionable motion or course of action was to be adopted? Some unifying provision at every point pervades Presbyterianism. The relation of each congregation to the whole Church is preserved, not merely as a sentiment, but by the system. There is no more vital part in the system than that connecting each congregation and Session with the Presbytery. The pastor ordained by the Presbytery is chairman of that primary court. Substitute for him one not ordained by the Presbytery, nor holding office from the Presbytery, and you weaken or dislocate a very important joint in the system. Presbyterian control is sufficiently weak amongst us already. Any change tending to further weakness will work damage to the Church.

Woodstock, July 2nd, 1895

#### GENERAL ASSEMBLY BUSINESS.

MR. EDITOR,—As an Elder-Commissioner to the late General Assembly in London, I would like to emphasize the closing remarks of the Moderator, anent the irregular methods so common in getting in reports of committees. As the Moderator with his robust common sense puts it, reports of committees should be given their place through the Committee on Bills and Ordinances. At present chairmen of committees have to watch their chances of interjecting their reports, often interrupting the Assembly's train of thought on some equally important subject. These chairmen of committees remind me of what I have seen among cows in a field—the most determined using their horns to get the preference of position.

Allow me now to refer to another matter, which I know is to many a grievance. Perhaps a "layman" can speak of it with better grace than a minister, the more so that I have personally no ground of complaint, but the opposite. It is the comparative fewness of those whose voices are heard in the deliberations of the Assembly. At the beginning of the three sittings of the last day of the London Assembly, there being much unfinished business, I moved, and it was resolved, "that, except where the Assembly chose to order otherwise, all presentations of reports or speeches should be confined to five minutes. The *Gleaner's* report says the resolution "worked like a charm." At the Kingston Assembly, on my motion, a similar resolu-

tion was adopted, under similar circumstances, and there, too, it "worked like a charm."

Now, the business on the closing day of the Assembly is neither less nor more important than the business of the preceding days, and that which admittedly worked like a charm at London and at Kingston in the closing days of the Assembly, would work equally well throughout the whole of an Assembly.

Why not? Leading men like Principal Caven and Principal Grant would be sure to be heard, as all would desire, and some extra time might be given to movers of important reports. But the great all-round advantage would be compulsory terseness of speech in the mass of those who took part; and several men might easily be heard in the time now often unfairly consumed by one. It is not necessary that any man should say it all on any subject. The General Assembly would incidentally get a little better acquainted with the rank and file, and see and hear for themselves what manner of men they are. One often hears of desire to know "the mind of the church;" and I know no better way than by limiting (as is done to advantage in the United States) the time, allowing the mind of the Church on various matters to be expressed by a larger number of commissioners. In thus writing I have some reason to believe I am not mis-stating the unspoken mind of the Church.

The rank and file of the Assembly have this matter in their own hands. It is a matter that should be brought up at an early stage of an Assembly, to the end that the common-sense and fair system of limiting the time of presentations of reports or speeches should be applied from the beginning of the Assembly until its close.

Very truly yours,

JOHN CAMERON.

London, June 24th, 1895.

#### KNOX COLLEGE PROFESSORSHIP.

MR. EDITOR,—Will you allow me also to express my opinion respecting the present vacancies in Knox College. Your correspondents and yourself seem to agree that, "other things being equal," Canadians should be appointed. But what is meant by the phrase I have put in marks of quotation? If it refers to prominence, it should not be forgotten that the theologians of Great Britain and the United States have greater opportunities of attaining prominence. Canada does not, and cannot, support theological journals which attain so wide a circulation or so great an influence as those of older and more populous lands. Do you think that Dr. Stalker would have attained his present well-deserved fame as a Canadian pastor? But perhaps it is to attainments that the well-worn phrase refers. In this case much depends on the matter of age, as any one can readily perceive, and I do not know that it should be counted a disqualification to be less than fifty years of age, indeed it is evident that a young preacher will have less to unlearn than an older one if it is *real teaching* he is to do. I daresay, however, that equal capacity is really meant, and with this understanding I am prepared to affirm that Canadians should be chosen, other things being *not too unequal*. I make very little of distinctions among our own ministers, but for two great reasons they are to be preferred to all others. It will not take years for them to get acquainted with the temper of our Church and the traditions of Knox College. And especially, their appointment will not give a slap in the face to every effort of our ministry to cultivate theological study. We have men among us who are seeking to keep abreast of the age in the departments concerned and surely we ought to encourage such pursuits by every means in our power. Moreover, we do not want eloquence in the classroom but aptness to teach, as you have

often pointed out, and we can decide whether our own men possess that essential quality much more readily than we can in respect to foreigners. Of course, if a foreigner has given proof of pre-eminent capacity, these considerations are outweighed, but for my part I do not believe that we can tempt a foreigner who would at once add prestige to our college.

ANOTHER KNOXMAN.

#### THE BIBLE IN THE SCHOOL.

MR. EDITOR,—The statement from the pen of A. F. McGregor, B.A., that "it is no business of the State in any sense to teach religion in the school," and which appeared in THE CANADA PRESBYTERIAN some time ago, is rather surprising to any one who has given the question a moment's thought.

The laws of our country are taken directly from the Bible. The enlightenment and liberty which we enjoy have come to us through the teachings of that Book. It is also well known that the teachings of that Book alone will produce a cultured man or woman.

Now, I, as a Public School teacher, affirm that the children of the public schools, as a class, know little or nothing about its teachings. Their ideas are vague and often wrong about the simplest things that go to form character and backbone.

What can a Sunday school teacher do in the line of teaching in about twenty minutes a week. The parents, a great number of whom are not able to guide their children, be they ever so willing, do not enjoy so uninterrupted intercourse with them as do the Public School teachers for about eight years of the formation period of a child's character.

It was easier for the Israelites when in Egypt to make brick without straw, than it is for a Public School teacher to build character without religion. Do we want a characterless population? If so, by all means put the Bible out. This is not any surmise or theory, I know whereof I assert.

ANNA P. MELDRUM.

Toronto.

MR. EDITOR,—We are at present in great need of homes for little boys from two to seven years, and feel certain that there must be a number of your readers who would open their hearts for these fine little fellows, and gladly take the responsibility of training them for Christ if they only knew where they could get such a little boy. Let them apply by letter to the society's office.

Among the children in the families of your readers there are probably a number of children who would like to give us a helping hand in saving the neglected little ones, and to any child who will promise to save, earn or collect not less than \$1.50 per year, and send it to us about Christmas time each year, we will send a neat iron box with lock and key. Let them write our office themselves. We have confidence enough in the children to believe that most of those who ask for a box will send us more than \$1.50 per year.

Yours truly,

J. STUART COLEMAN,  
Ass't-sec. Children's Aid Society of  
Toronto, 32 Confederation  
Life Building.

Toronto, June 28, 1895.

Judge Hughes. Here and there we do see well behaved children, but our schools do not turn them out, because religion and education do not go hand in hand. If religion is not taught at home nor in the public schools there is a poor hope of its being taught in the Sunday School. If children are not instructed in religion at times in the public school or Sunday school, where are they ever to get a proper sense of the duties of life and of love to God? If children are not taught religion they will grow up weeds, become weedier, and weeds continue to perpetuity, weeds beget weeds, and so it will go on.

## Teacher and Scholar.

BY REV. W. A. J. MARTIN, TORONTO.

July 21st, 1895. } HADAB AND ABIHU. } Exod. x. 1-11.  
GOLDEN TEXT.—Lev. x. 9  
MEMORY VERSES.—9-11.  
CATECHISM.—Q. 29.

Home Readings.—M. Ex. xxxiii. 1-23. T. Ex. xxxiv. 1-10, 28-35. W. Ex. xl. 1-16. Th. Ex. xl. 17-38. F. Ex. xxx. 22-38. S. Lev. viii. 1-36. Sab. Lev. x. 1-11.

The greater part of a year has elapsed since the event of the Golden Calf. The Tabernacle has been made after the pattern God showed Moses in the Mount; Aaron and his sons have been ordained priests, and the whole ritual service, as directed by God, instituted. Upon the brazen altar burns continually the sacred fire lighted by Jehovah Himself in token of His presence and of His acceptance of the Tabernacle and all the paraphernalia of worship, on the occasion when the first sacrifice was laid upon the altar. From this altar God had directed that all fire used in any part of the sanctuary service shall be taken. The sin of Nadab and Abihu, which issued so terribly, consisted, in part, in ignoring this direction. However as this is a temperance lesson, we shall not consider so much their sin, as the prohibition to the priest against using intoxicants in connection with their service, and our points shall be *prohibition and the reasons therefor*.

I. The Prohibition. Undoubtedly the deaths of Nadab and Abihu was the occasion of God's laying upon the priests the injunction against the use of wine and strong drink while on duty in the Tabernacle services. Throughout all generations this was to be a statute forever for Aaron and his descendants. The prohibition does not seem to have been a total one against the use of wine, but only against its use at such times as they were engaged in their official duties. Now-a-days there are no such officers as priests, in our Church at least, but in a sense every Christian is a priest. He ought always to be about his Lord's service. "Whether ye eat or drink or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God" is a command which raises every action to the dignity of God's service; and if the principle holds good that the use of strong drink is prohibited to God's servants when engaged in His service, surely it requires that all Christians at least should be total abstainers.

II. The Reasons for Prohibition.—Several are given in our lesson. The first is that the use of strong drink would so cloud the brain as to unfit for God's service. This seems to have been the state of Nadab and Abihu when they went in to offer incense. They forgot that they had no right to offer incense at all, since that right was confined to the high priest alone. They forgot the commandment which requires that God shall be worshipped only in such ways as He appoints, and therefore took other than the sacred fire which God directed should alone be used. They could not distinguish between what was holy and what unholy, between what was clean and what unclean; they had forgotten the statutes of the Lord, which they were supposed to exemplify and teach to the people. Surely Aaron and his sons would not need any demonstration of the reasonableness of God's prohibiting, further than that furnished by the conduct of the perished ones, for whom they were forbidden to mourn. Nor need any one to-day go far to seek proof that the use of strong drink unfits men to do whatsoever they do to God's glory. If men are to glorify our Father through seeing our good works, then surely our works require the exercise of the fullest powers of body and mind we are capable of, and not the maudlin efforts of the mind beclouded with drink. Then a second reason following from the first is "lest ye die." To make a travesty of God's service through strong drink is a serious thing, so serious that Nadab and Abihu lost their lives through doing it. To-day, just as much as in Aaron's day, God's desire is that He shall be sanctified in all that came nigh Him, and that He shall be glorified before all the people. It is a serious matter thus to stand as one through whom men are to learn more of God; so serious that men should have a care lest they stir up the wrath of that God through their misrepresentation. So jealous is God for His honor that Aaron and his surviving sons were forbidden to come near the dead bodies of their dear ones. They must not manifest any tokens of grief which would seem to call in question the righteousness of what God had done. They must not go outside the sanctuary, even to show respect for those who were slain for the iniquity. They were solemnly set apart for God and must do nothing which might lead Israel into rebellious thoughts toward God. If only we, who know God, realized how much influence our acts and words have in determining men's attitude toward God, how careful we would be; especially how careful to preserve our powers of mind and body in all the clearness and vigor possible. Now there is only one way to make it certain that we shall never dishonor God through strong drink, and that is never to partake of it. And it is sure that if we stop before we have taken the first glass there is no danger from the second one.