

Our Contributors.

HE IS A HADGITATOR, MA'AM.

BY KNOXIAN.

Some years ago an English family moved into a quiet corner in Ontario, and settled down. A neighbour woman asked the wife of the newcomer what occupation her husband followed. The reply was,

"HE IS A HADGITATOR, MA'AM."

The man had been a Chartist lecturer or something of that kind in England, and his wife thought he could carry on the agitating business in Canada. It is to be hoped that he found the business dull. What Canada needs is workers, not agitators. There may be room and business for professional agitators in some European countries where the rights of men are imperfectly understood, and hoary abuses keep poor men down, but in Canada and the United States where there is room and work and bread and fair-play for every honest man the professional agitator is not much needed. Generally he is a nuisance, an unmitigated, unalloyed, unrelieved nuisance. A citizen who clears a farm, or puts up a block of buildings, or erects himself a good house, is worth more to this country than a score of professional agitators. The boy who drives a canal horse does more for Canada than a dozen professional agitators. The farmer who raises a good calf does more for his township than all the noisy agitators in the municipality.

Of the seven men that the law punished the other day in Chicago only two earned their living by honest work. The sentences of these two were commuted, and it is quite possible that the Governor in considering their cases gave a great deal of weight to the fact that though they were agitators they were not professionals. The other five were professionals. They lived by agitating. Their business was to stir up strife in the community. The American people wisely concluded that they have no opening for that kind of business in their country. The ballots can give them all the excitement they want without the bomb. Why should there be professional agitators in that country? There is room for all, work for all, bread for all, liberty for all—liberty that comes dangerously near license at times; the people make their own laws and even elect the judges that administer them. Every man says pretty much what he likes, and writes pretty much what he pleases. What under the sun are professional agitators needed for? Every citizen can agitate on his own account if he feels like it. What is true of the United States is true of Canada. We need no professional agitators in this happy country, and when one appears he ought to be promptly sat upon. Canada needs men that can build up, not men who can do nothing but tear down. The fact is, we haven't very much to tear down yet. There are a good many things in Germany and Russia that should be pulled down. Turkey and one or two other countries should be turned outside in and thoroughly disinfected. There is ample room for the Hadgitator over there to put in his work. But in this bright, clean little Canada of ours there is nothing that even a decent Radical can think of pulling down except perhaps the Senate and Upper Canada College. What this country needs is men of constructive ability—men who can build up, men who can plan and carry out their plans, men who can devise and carry out measures for the development of our resources.

Other things being nearly equal, a community prospers in exact proportion to the number of men of this character that dwell in it.

You go into one town, and find energy, push, thrift, prosperity and rapid progress in everything.

You visit another and find everything dead as Julius Cæsar. Look around and you see nothing but dilapidated buildings; look down and you find that the real estate is gathering on your boots and trousers.

The difference between these two towns is mainly owing to the fact that in one there is a body of energetic men—men of constructive ability, who plan and push, while the other is blessed with a lot of brainless idlers who sit in the bars and corner groceries and gabble about taxes and manufactures and politics and kindred subjects. They are Hadgitators in a small way.

What is true of the State in this regard is equally

true of the Church. What the Presbyterian Church needs is men of constructive ability, men who can build up, men who can form good plans and work them. Mere Hadgitators are no use.

Who is this clerical stranger who has just arrived, who talks so loudly about revolutionizing the colleges, changing the mission committees, remodelling the General Assembly and overturning things generally? He is a clerical Hadgitator, sir. He is a small man from some big place where he was not much known and he is bound to make himself known now. So he goes into the "Hadgitating" business the moment he arrives. Professional Hadgitators hate a quiet time. Their business thrives on the worst passions of human nature. The Chicago anarchists took advantage of the strife between capital and labour, and thought to take possession of Chicago when men's bad blood was stirred. They didn't succeed to any great extent.

For centuries the feeling between Protestant and Catholic has been none of the best in many countries. The worst of Hadgitators, the vilest of demagogues, have all along been trying to make capital of some kind out of that bad feeling. They have traded in it as deliberately and systematically as a merchant trades in his store. When an empty-headed, conceited, notoriety-craving creature cannot keep his name before the public in any decent way he usually falls back on the differences between Popery and Protestantism, and booms himself in that way. Hadgitators who wish to be known as local heroes adopt the same plan. Hearing that Luther and Knox made their names immortal by contending against Popery, they seek immortality by burning the Ross Selections, or cutting the tail off their Catholic neighbour's horse.

THE INHERITANCE OF THE SAINTS.

MR. EDITOR,—While there is nothing new under the sun, yet it is somewhat noteworthy that all but under the shadow of Knox College, though not of its alumni, one of our ministers should have doubted, if not denied, that there was a hell for the sinner, and that another both holds fast and forth that there is no heaven for the saint. Some of the latter's public utterances published alike from platform and press, and quoted in my former letter, are, "Our inheritance is never said to be heaven but earth. It is now fallen into Satan's hand, and Christ comes to repurchase it for Himself and His brethren; having by His death redeemed it, He now proposes to give it to His younger brethren, joint heirs with Him. The common notion that death introduces the believer to his inheritance is totally false. On the contrary, it is only after the resurrection that the Church of the redeemed, the new Jerusalem, comes down out of heaven to take possession of earth for ever. The second coming of Christ implies the glorification of the earth. After death is paradise, then the resurrection, then the second coming of our Lord, who reigns over His redeemed on this earth, which forever will be enjoyed by man as his inheritance." These and other kindred notions are quoted more fully in my former letter.

Now, in a recent issue, "Another Presbyterian," with a kindly but uncalled-for sympathy for me, has endeavoured to show by sundry citations that such dogmas are not inconsistent with "the formulated system of Presbyterian doctrine," but after all I fail to find that he has succeeded in doing so. The first citation is from Dr. Hodge, jun., who simply says: "It appears not improbable," etc. Again: "It may be," etc. Of this same Dr. Hodge I read the other day that in 1884, during his visit to the Presbyterian Council in Belfast, he preached in Glasgow on the text, "In My Father's house are many mansions," and it is said that those who heard the sermon will never forget it. I wonder if he there proclaimed that these mansions were of "the earth, earthy." Further, I read that heaven was one of his favourite topics, and as if foreshadowing his approaching death, his last words, in a closing lecture delivered in Philadelphia, were these: "We part as pilgrims part upon the road. Let us take our way heavenward, for if we do we shall soon, some of us very soon, be at home with the Lord." These solemn and significant words imply neither a "probable" nor a "maybe" in regard to the matter. The next citation is from Dr. Hodge, sen., and it is this: "This earth, according to the common opinion, is to be the final seat of Christ's

kingdom, the kingdom prepared before the foundation of the world," but I nowhere gather from the citation that such was his opinion. The last and most lengthy citation is from Dr. Chalmers, but in the whole of it I fail to find that he held that earth is to be the final and forever home of the blessed.

I need not notice the mental and spiritual experiences that this great man passed through between the beginning and ending of his ministry, and would only add that the discourses from which the citation is made, while "probably the most sublimely intellectual and imaginative that had ever been preached in a Scottish pulpit," yet they were prepared at least thirty years before his "Institutes of Theology," and even then, without the slightest shadow of disrespect for the Christian character of the great and good man, I am not aware that he was ever looked up to as a model, a master theologian. I would only add further that on the evening preceding his sudden and unseen death it is said that "as he slowly paced through his garden at the back of his house, the ejaculations, 'O, my Father, my heavenly Father,' were overheard issuing from his lips, like the spontaneous utterances of an overflowing heart," all of which tends to show that "where the treasure is there will the heart be also." Such are the citations presented to solve and settle the assumption that the preceding and kindred dogmas are consistent with "the formulated system of Presbyterian doctrine."

In the same issue however, "Presbyter" very fitly and effectively shows that the aforesaid "formulated system" says on such subjects that "the souls of believers at death do immediately pass into glory." Again, "The communion in glory with Christ, which the members of the invisible Church enjoy immediately after death is, in that their souls are then made perfect in holiness, and are received into the highest heavens, where they behold the face of God in light and glory, and to this may be added 'At the day of judgment the righteous . . . shall be received into heaven, where they shall be fully and forever freed from all sin and misery, made perfectly holy and happy, . . . especially in the immediate vision and fruition of God the Father, of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit to all eternity.'" In heaven they are thus "made perfectly blessed in the full enjoying of God to all eternity." Further, from the same source, we learn that "after death, the souls of the righteous being then made perfect in holiness are received into the highest heavens where they behold the face of God in light and glory. . . . The souls of the wicked are cast into hell. . . . Besides these two places for souls separated from their bodies the Scriptures acknowledgeth none." For "the wicked shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous [shall go away] into life eternal."

In view of such quotations from the "formulated system of Presbyterian doctrine," "Presbyter" cogently and conclusively adds: "Clearly the dogma referred to is not Presbyterian doctrine." And to this I would only further add: "'Tis true, 'tis pity, and pity 'tis true," that any Presbyterian minister should hold and propagate such dogmas.

Now, I need scarcely say that one of the questions put to ministers at their ordination, in connection with the "formulated system of Presbyterian doctrine" is: "Do you believe the Westminster Confession of Faith, as adopted by this Church in the Basis of Union, to be founded on and agreeable to the Word of God, and in your teaching will you faithfully adhere thereto?" And the answer to be assented to and signed is: "I hereby declare that I believe the Westminster Confession of Faith, as adopted by this Church in the Basis of Union, to be founded on and agreeable to the Word of God, and that I engage to adhere faithfully to the doctrine of said Confession and to follow no divisive course from the present order established therein."

If then such dogmas as are above presented and others of a kindred character as quoted from my former letter, etc., it being wholly quotations, can be reconciled with the "formulated system of Presbyterian doctrine" "which our ministers solemnly pledge themselves, as above, to hold fast and hold forth, I fail to see that "Another Presbyterian" has succeeded in so doing. True, he may treat the matter lightly, but I regard it as no light matter if these formulated doctrines and, to me, somewhat fanciful dogmas cannot be reconciled, for a minister solemnly to pledge