

British American Presbyterian.

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY AT
TORONTO, CANADA.

TERMS: \$2 a year, in advance.
Postage, by mail, 20 cents per year, payable at the
office of delivery.

Club Rates and List of Premiums furnished on
application. All who are desirous to aid in extend-
ing the circulation of the PRESBYTERIAN should
send for the List of Premiums at once, as now is
the time to secure new names.
Cheques and Post Office Orders should be drawn
in favor of the Publisher.

Address

C. BLACKETT ROBINSON,

P. O. Drawer 988 Publisher and Proprietor

GENERAL AGENT FOR THE

BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN

REV. A. MILNE, M.A.

P. O. Address, Draw 1988.

British American Presbyterian.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 1878.

NEW SUBSCRIBERS.

Now is the time to subscribe for the
PRESBYTERIAN. We shall mail to all who
now send in \$2, a copy of the PRESBYTER-
IAN from this time to the end of 1874.
Those who are getting up clubs will please
notice this. A list of premiums will be
published next week. In the meantime
all who are inclined to canvass for the
PRESBYTERIAN will please to communicate
with this office without delay, when all par-
ticulars will be learned.

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS.

While we desire as far as possible to
make the business of the BRITISH AMER-
ICAN PRESBYTERIAN a cash one, yet at first
starting it was necessary to send out to
some on credit. We did not reckon on
these continuing to take the paper without
paying, but we have been mistaken. Both
ministers and elders not a few have con-
tinued taking the PRESBYTERIAN from the
beginning without remitting one cent.
Now this is not fair or right. The sum
owed by each is small, but the aggregate
is very large to us, and is particularly
needed at the beginning of such an enter-
prise as the PRESBYTERIAN. We shall take
care henceforth that when the cash is not
sent and renewals are not made the paper
shall be stopped, but with those now in
arrear we shall by-and-by be forced to
collect in the usual way according to news-
paper law. We hope this will not be
necessary in any case. We send out this
week a considerable number of accounts.
Let our friends remit immediately. In a
great number of instances we believe it is
only necessary to give this reminder to
secure what we want. To conduct a news-
paper, money is absolutely needed, and
while commendation is good, and we have
received a good deal of it, commendation
with cash is better.

HOME MISSIONS.

The financial year is with most of the
Missionary Societies coming to a close, and
the disposal of the year's funds has to be
made. We should not like to say any-
thing that would withdraw any portion of
the resources of any Church schemes. All
are important and all ought to be liberally
supported. At the same time there can be
no doubt but that Home Missions have
special claims upon the liberality of the
Canadian Churches. Our ever-extending
new settlements must be occupied, and oc-
cupied at once and efficiently if the Presby-
terian Churches of Canada are to be living
and progressive agencies in the evangelis-
tic work of the day. There is no alterna-
tive. If there is not progress there will be,
there must be, retrogression. Never was
there a time when wider and more in-
viting fields lay open before the Churches.
If these are occupied with alacrity and
vigor, good and well. It will be at once a
sign of spiritual life and a means for that
life being fanned into still greater power.
If the opportunities are let slip and the
openings be neglected by congregations
resting satisfied with maintaining ordi-
nances among themselves, then it will be
manifest that spiritual languor and de-
cay have already set in; so that "holding
forth" being neglected, "holding fast" will
soon be impossible. Mere stagnant con-
gregationalism will never do. However
weak and struggling it be, every congrega-
tion of professed Christians in the country
ought to have its machinery for aggression
organized in the shape of a Missionary So-
ciety. Even those that need assistance
from central funds ought not to be excep-
tions to this. Indeed they specially re-
quire it. Some have foolishly argued
against such an idea, on the plea that it is
absurd for those who cannot meet their

own claims to be engaged in general mis-
sions. The very fact of their not being
able to get along without assistance is the
strongest reason for their having among
them Missionary Societies in action and
healthy operation. It keeps them ever in
mind of the fact that they are not isolated
units, but parts of the great "sacramental
host of God's elect,"—in sympathy and co-
operation with all the other parts—inter-
ested in all missionary movements—bear-
ing their fruit in the work—sharing in its
trials and difficulties, and rejoicing in its
progress and triumphs. It is worse than
stupid for any one to say, "What good is
there in a congregation sending \$20 to the
mission funds of the Church and receiving
out of those funds perhaps a hundred or
two?" It is good every way. It trains,
it encourages, it stimulates and blesses to a
far greater degree than might at first be
thought possible by merely looking at the
sums actually raised. So much is this felt
to be the case that in some of the most active
missionary Churches of the day it is made
a standing rule, which is constantly and
rigidly acted upon, that no congregation
gets any assistance, either in the way of
supplement to stipend or any other kind
of occasional or regular help, unless there is
a Missionary Society in active and regular
operation within its borders. Such an ar-
rangement is both wise and meritorious,
and the more generally and systematically it is
acted upon in Canada, so much the better
will it be for all concerned, for the rich and
the poor, for the weak and the strong.
And while the weak and the struggling
ought to give "as God has prospered
them," surely the members of our strong
and wealthy congregations will remember
this as well, and in the time of their great
prosperity, as the present is, remember
their recognized stewardship, so that they
may devise liberal things and by liberal
things stand. We have not as yet in Can-
ada very many professed Christians who
are rolling in wealth like what is notorious
on the other side, but we have many who
are remarkably well-to-do. If these were
doing anything like their duty the Lord's
treasury would be filled to overflowing.

WICKEDNESS IN HIGH PLACES.

While the Ministry of Canada has been
changed, those who have fallen are very
far indeed from confessing their guilt in
the matter of the Pacific Scandal. They,
on the contrary, assume an air of injured
innocence, and claim a clean record such
as few, we fear, of the general public out-
side of either political party are prepared
to give them. They have, however, a
right to demand that all which their oppo-
nents can adduce in support of their charges
should be forthcoming. Those now in
power are bound by what is due to them-
selves, their opponents, and their country,
to prosecute the investigation into the
whole business of the Pacific charter to the
end. They have said the Commission failed
to bring out the most offensive features of
the case. The country expects them now
to bring out what is still lacking of that
condemnatory record. It would shock all
our ideas of consistency and honour if this
were not done. We hope that as soon as
Parliament re-assembles this enquiry will
be proceeded with. The country has a
right to know all that is to be known on
that painfully disgraceful subject.

Some strange, sad stories, we must add,
have also been put into circulation about
the amount of drunkenness prevailing among
our legislators during the recent meeting at
Ottawa. If half of what is said be true it
was simply in the last degree disgraceful.
The time has gone past for the deprecating
apologetic cry that the public has no right
to enquire into the private lives of its pub-
lic men. The public has a right to enquire
about this very thing simply because these
persons are public men. Are we to be told
that it is not a matter with which the peo-
ple have anything to do to know whether
or not the persons who represent them in
Parliament, and transact for them the most
important national business, are personally
respectable, or are ostentatious drunkards
and notorious debauchees? We know very
well that the characters of public men are
often traduced, and that sins are sometimes
laid to their charge of which they are en-
tirely innocent. We should hope for the
credit of our country that to some extent at
any rate, this may have been the case in
the present instance. But the accounts have
come from so many and such different
sources that there must be a certain amount
of truth in them. At any rate we utterly
protest against the idea that all such con-
duct, when it does take place, is "privileged,"
and that no one can say a word either in
exposure or pity without being charged with
intruding into "private affairs and assail-
ing 'private' character in a way which no
possible shortcoming on the part of the ac-
cused can either justify or excuse. The
rumors of the drunken orgies of members
of Parliament at Ottawa are not of yester-
day, and are too well authenticated either
for denial or explanation. If the people of
Canada are determined not to bear the dis-
grace of Ministers selling railway charters
they are equally determined that the repre-

sentatives that they send to Ottawa shall
be at any rate outwardly decent, and shall
not henceforth disgrace the Halls of Legis-
lature with maudlin and obnoxious drunk-
enness, or with language and behaviour if
possible more disgraceful still. In this, as
in the matter of electoral corruption, the
one political side is not all pure and the
other all foul. A good many of both parties
had better look to their ways. The time is
not far distant when it will be settled by
universal consent that a drunkard or a de-
bauchee is just as unfit to be a member of
Parliament as any one that will either give
or take a bribe. And if any fancy that
M.P.s. and Ministers of State cannot have
their personal conduct criticised, and, if
necessary, condemned, they will find them-
selves very much mistaken before they are
very much older than they are now.

THE EMPEROR, POPE AND ARCH-
BISHOP.

The struggle in Germany involves a
wider question than some very intelligent
persons are inclined to allow it. Because
the opponents are a Protestant Caesar and
a Roman Catholic Pope we are not to take
it for granted that Caesar must be right
and the Pope evidently wrong. The trou-
ble evidently arises from the State
support given to the functionaries of the
Church. The Roman Catholic priests
and bishops are the stipendiaries of the
State, and where Caesar pays Caesar will
always insist upon controlling. The Dog-
ma of Papal Infallibility has been promul-
gated. A very large number of German
ecclesiastics have refused to acknowledge
it. They are threatened, nay, visited with
deposition by their ecclesiastical superiors,
and as far as the Church is concerned, are
deprived of their incomes. Caesar, in the
shape of the German Emperor, says "No,
you shall not turn them out. I pay them
and shall continue to do so, and if any of
you ecclesiastics attempt to meddle with
them, on your heads be the consequences." Now,
what business has Emperor William
to interfere except that he holds the purse
strings and pays? What has he to do to
say that bishops shall not possess refractory
priests? Is he to be judge whether or not
the Dogma of Papal Infallibility is a
novelty? The Church authorities say it is
not. Has this secular person a right to
say that it is, and to protect refractory
ecclesiastics from Church censures and
their consequence? We don't think he
has. Of course the old Catholics are per-
fectly right to follow their conscience and
treat excommunications as nothing. But
William does not appear to have anything
to do in the matter except on the ground
of the broadest Erastianism. When Ro-
man Catholic priests break the law of the
land, indict them like other people before
the ordinary courts, but why meddle in
their theological strifes? Cut off the
endowment from all, and let all
on a perfectly pecuniary level, develop
their church life as they best may, and
let them all have legal protection so long
as they break no law. It is not enough to
suspect persons of being disloyal. There
ought to be proof first before condemna-
tion, else no man is safe. Archbishop
Manning puts the case very plausibly. We
don't say that he is right in all his state-
ments. Very much the reverse. But it is
only Protestant to hear both sides, and not
to conclude that everything that comes
even from Rome must necessarily be wrong.
On the 18th of Oct. the Archbishop, in a
sermon on the Emperor's letter, said,
among other things:—

In the letter of the German Emperor I
find two grave assertions—one, that the
Catholics of Germany have for two years
conspired against the peace of the empire
and against the peace of other denomina-
tions; the other, that nothing in the laws
which have been passed, nothing in the
sentences which have been inflicted, touches
the Catholic religion, and that therefore
in no way is the Catholic religion affected
by what is now passing in Germany. Here
are two broad assertions, and with them I
will now deal. First, I would ask, did not
the Catholics of Germany shed their blood
on all the battle fields of France? Did
they not lay the foundation stones of that
Empire with their life-blood? Were they
not in the foremost of those conquering
hosts that laid the first basis of that im-
perial power? Where was there any evi-
dence or sign of hostility to imperial Ger-
many in the men who laid down their
lives for it? What man is there that has
either openly or secretly conspired to undo
the work that he has thus helped to accom-
plish? What bishop, what priest (for
they are accused by name) has in any way
by act or word manifested himself to be an
enemy of that empire which was founded
on the blood and the lives of the Catholics
of Germany? No such thing is to be
found. It does not exist in any record.
I say that for this reason. When the great
Minister of the empire, standing up before
Parliament, was challenged to produce
the proof of his accusation, he could pro-
duce no documents. Challenged again
and again to bring proof of these allega-
tions, he brought none but this: "You
must trust my word." I say then, first,
that the charge that there has been con-
spiracy or hostility upon the part of the
Catholics of Germany to the empire is up to
this moment without a shadow of proof.
And when men ask for it in the light of
day they are told to take it on trust. I
can well understand that a great power,
absorbing the lesser sovereignties of the

country, may awaken jealousy. There
may be princes and politicians and sov-
ereigns, however small, who do not like
the process of absorption, who are im-
patient of being annihilated, and there may
be those who, being politically on their
side, may have thwarted this great politi-
cal action. But that was not the Catholics
of Germany. It was not the work of re-
ligion; therefore was not the work of Catho-
lics. Nay, I believe it was more the
work of Protestants than of Catholics. It
was not a matter of religion at all. But
the whole charge is laid against the Catho-
lics, and why? Because the name of
Catholic means that they believe in a
"kingdom, not of this world"; that they
own a supreme authority—the Vicar of
Jesus Christ; that there is a head on earth
higher than the imperial head in all mat-
ters touching the faith and all matters
relating to the conscience of man, and
that no man can with a high hand touch
those things which belong to the soul and
the kingdom of God. The day is past
when that old saying which, if I am not
mistaken, had its origin in Germany,
"Cujus regio ejus religio"—that is, "The
lord of the soil is lord also of the faith of
his subjects"—can any more prevail. The
civil authority over men has no power to
prescribe what is to be their religion; what
are to be their articles of faith, whether they
shall be thirty-nine or forty, and what is to
be their form of worship; whether it shall
be a book of common prayer or an extem-
poraneous effusions. The Catholics are
accused because they hold that Caesar's
power has its limits, and that beyond those
limits it has no existence. Let us take the
other assertion, namely, that the ecclesi-
astical laws which have been passed in no
way touch religion, in no way touch the
conscience. Well, in order fully to appre-
ciate the meaning of this point, let me re-
mind you of our great St. Thomas of Can-
terbury, one of the greatest martyrs—the
martyr for the liberties of the Church;
and for what did he die? The King of
England, exceeding the limits of the Chris-
tian and Catholic sovereignty of King
Edward, violated the liberties of the
Church in these particulars. He took its
goods. But that was the least wrong he
committed. He forbade the Church to ex-
communicate those who deserved excom-
munication without his leave. He forbade
the Church to choose its bishops without
his leave. He forbade the pastors and the
people of England to appeal from his
judgment to the Holy See. There were
other things in contest, but these three are
enough. These were three violations of
the divine authority and liberty of the
Church, for any one of which any man
ought to lay down his life. What has now
been done in Germany? The other day
men who refused submission to the defini-
tion of an Ecumenical Council, and there-
fore to a definition of faith, were justly ex-
communicated by their bishops. These
men who were excommunicated for heresy
were taken up and supported and encour-
aged by the civil power, and placed in of-
fices of trust. By that act two liberties of
the Church were violated at once—the one
her supreme doctrinal authority as the
judge of truth and heresy. Next it was also
a violation of the supreme judicial authority
of the Church to determine who are or who
are not faithful, who are or who are not
heretical, who are or who are not worthy
of her communion. Does not this touch
religion? But, next, laws were made with-
drawing from the bishops the training and
the formation of those who are to be her
future priests. Thirdly, the supreme au-
thority of the Church in the cure of souls is
this, that it will never intrust the teaching
of a flock nor the hearing of the confessions
of the people to any man whom she has not
herself chosen, tried, and approved. The
laws at this moment made in Germany for-
bid the bishops to appoint parish priests
who have not received the sanction of the
civil power. This touches religion in its
most vital part. Lastly, there is constituted
in Germany a supreme tribunal of appeal to
which all cases arising in matters ecclesi-
astical are to be carried, and there to be decided
in the final resort. This is the very liberty
for which St. Thomas died. If these laws
do not violate the supreme power of the bi-
shops in judging of heresy, in excommuni-
cating the unworthy, in training their own
clergy, in giving cure of souls to pastors,
in barring appeal to the highest authority
of the Church in all spiritual things, then I can
only say that my reading and the represen-
tations I have received have misled me not
into twilight but into midnight. But if
these things be true, and if I have been
rightly informed; if the documents are trust-
worthy and my reading has been right, I
say, then, boldly, that the liberties of the
Church are violated, and that for any one to
say that these laws do not touch the religion
of Jesus Christ is to contradict evident fact.
We are accused of treason, of perverting the
nation, and forbidding to give tribute to
Caesar. If this be so, let the accusation be
proved. But let the witnesses speak plainly
and then we shall know the grounds of their
accusation and be able to make answer to
the charge.

TOASTS AND DRAM DRINKING AT
PRESBYTERY AND INDUCTION
DINNERS.

The whole system of toast drinking is
heathenish and demoralizing. It has no
sense in it except on the old heathen
ground of worship, and it encourages and
gives respectability to the drinking cus-
toms of society, which every Christian man
and especially every Christian minister
ought most resolutely to set his face against.
We are accordingly pleased to see that the
Rev. Dr. McLeod, of Birkonhead, Liver-
pool, lately made and carried a motion in
the Lancashire Presbytery of the U. P.
Church, utterly condemning the practice of
such drinking of toasts at presbytery and
ordination dinners, and pledging the Pres-
bytery to discontinue the practice in
every way in its power. The vendor is
not that such a course should be taken now,
but that it should have been delayed so
long. Of course Dr. McLeod has been as-
sailed by the Edinburgh Scotsman and

other papers for his "bigotry," "fanatis-
m," and so forth. All that abuse, how-
ever, comes as a matter of course, and no
one at all acquainted with the personal
habits of too many members of the fourth
estate can be at all surprised at their
stupid, insolent outcry against those who
are opposed to habits and practices which
should not be even so much as named
among those "professing godliness." Hap-
pily we on this side of the Atlantic are not
so afflicted with toasting toast-drinking ec-
clesiastics, and presbytery and ordination
dinners of the kind condemned by the Lan-
cashire U. P.s. are with us almost if not
entirely things of the past—condemned
alike by saints and sinners, and thought of
even by those who are far from being total
abstainers as anything but right and be-
coming. The toast-drinking ordination
dinner naturally gives countenance to the
political "banquet" debauch, and those who
solemnly "drink to" the prosperity of the
Church and the health and happiness of the
"young minister," will find it all the
easier to become somewhat enthusiastic
over the health of political leaders, and at
last to hiccup out their indignation against
all "bribery and corruption," or their un-
feigned disgust at those who could "steal
letters" and "tell lies."

SECESSION OF BISHOP CUMMINS.

Our readers will remember that among
those who at the meeting of the Evangeli-
cal Alliance in New York, joined in the
celebration of the Lord's Supper, was
Bishop Cummins, of Kentucky. This pro-
ceeding on the part of the Bishop has since
been a subject of keen discussion and much
angry denunciation. At last matters have
come to a crisis, and Dr. Cummins has
done what the Evangelicals in the Anglican
communion ought to have done long ago:
he has left that Communion and now pro-
poses to organize another Church with
Episcopal government in which the "Com-
munion of Saints" will be fully recognized
and practically acted upon. The step
taken by Bishop Cummins is a very bold
one, but one in taking which he will be
strongly supported. The movement is some-
what similar to that of the Old Catholics in
Germany and is a protest against the offen-
sive and exclusive spirit of sacerdotalism by
which the Church of England in all its
branches has been too generally character-
ized. The following is a copy of Bishop
Cummins' letter of resignation:—

"New York, Nov. 10, 1878.

"To the Right Reverend Benjamin Bos-
worth Smith, D.D., Bishop of the Pro-
testant Episcopal Church in the Diocese
of Kentucky.

"*REV. AND DEAR BISHOP.*—Under a
solemn sense of duty, and in the fear of
God, I have to tell you that I am about to
retire from the work in which I have been
engaged for the last seven years in the
Diocese of Kentucky, and thus to sever the
relations which have existed so happily and
harmoniously between us during that time.

"It is due to you, and to my many dear
friends in the Diocese of Kentucky and else-
where, that I should state clearly the
causes which have led me to this determina-
tion.

"1. First, then, you will know how heavy
has been the trial of having to exercise my
office in certain churches in the Diocese of
Kentucky where the services are conducted
so as to symbolize and to teach the people
doctrines subversive of the 'truth as it is in
Jesus,' and as it was maintained and de-
fended by the Reformers of the Sixteenth
Century.

"On each occasion that I have been called
upon to officiate in those churches I
have been most painfully impressed by the
conviction that I was sanctioning and in-
dorsing by my presence and official acts,
the dangerous errors symbolized by those ser-
vices customary in Ritualistic Churches.

"I can no longer, by my participation in
such services, be a partaker of other men's
sins, and must clear my own soul of all
complicity in such errors.

"2. I have lost all hope that this system
of error now prevailing so extensively in the
Church of England, and in the Protestant
Episcopal Church in this country, can be or
will be eradicated by any action of the au-
thorities of the Church, legislative or execu-
tive. The only true remedy, in my judg-
ment, is the judicious yet thorough revision
of the Prayer Book, eliminating from it all
that gives countenance, directly or indi-
rectly, to the whole system of Sacerdotalism
and Ritualism; a revision after the
model of that recommended by the Com-
mission appointed in England under royal
authority in 1689, and whose work was en-
dorsed by the great names of Burnet, Pat-
rick, Tillotson, and Stillingfleet, and others
of the Church of England—a blessed work,
which failed, alas! to receive the approval
of Convocation, but was taken up afterwards
by the fathers of the Protestant Episcopal
Church in the United States, and embodied
in the Prayer Book of 1785, which they set
forth and recommended for use in this
country.

"I propose to return to that prayer-book
sanctioned by William White, and to tread
in the steps of that saintly man as he acted
from 1785 to 1789.

"3. One other reason for my present ac-
tion remains to be given. On the last day
of the late Conference of the Evangelical
Alliance, I participated in the celebration
of the Lord's Supper, by invitation, in the
Rev. Dr. John Hall's Church in the City
of New York, and united with Dr. Hall, Dr.
William Arnot, of Edinburgh, and Prof.
Dormer, of Berlin, in that precious feast.
It was a practical manifestation of the real-
unity of the 'blessed company of all faith-
ful people' whom God 'hath knit together.'