

THE Presbyterian Review.

GENERAL NOTICES

(1) Terms in advance. \$1.00. No subscription received for less than one year. The Review is sent to subscribers on a quarterly basis...

TO CORRESPONDENTS

In order to receive prompt attention correspondents will please note: All letters relating to business should be addressed to...

THE MANAGER

All communications intended for insertion in the Presbyterian Review should be addressed to...

THE EDITOR

Advertisements are published at the rate of \$1.00 per line for the first month, and 75 cents for each subsequent month...

THURSDAY, NOV 22, 1888.

TO SUBSCRIBERS IN ARREARS

Subscribers are respectfully requested to examine the tab on their papers to ascertain if they are in arrears for subscription to the Review. Those in arrears will please remit without further delay.

ANTI-POVERTY SOCIETY.

In another place will be found "An Open Letter from the Anti-Poverty Society of Toronto," which has been addressed to the Ministerial Association. This letter has been sent to us with the request to give it to our readers...

It is not easy to discover exactly what the writers of the open letter wish. However, we shall do our best, and we trust they will attribute any error into which we may fall, not to want of sympathy, but either to our obtuseness or the letter's want of lucidity in expression.

- 1. Does the earth belong to the children of men—implying to all men equally, and not to a few exclusively?
2. Are the present arrangements concerning land according to law just and honest? Or do they constitute legal parasitism and legal spoliation?
3. Do the social arrangements prevalent among us make void the law of God?—presumably, the arrangements regarding land, although the letter introduces other matters in discussing this question.

Now there is no difficulty in answering these questions. As the letter quotes it, the 115th Psalm, 16th verse, says: "The heavens are the heavens of the Lord; but the earth hath He given to the children of men." In our opinion this text does not answer the question as proposed; it simply tells us that the earth, not the heavens, is the sphere in which man has dominion. Whether all men equally have a right to every part of the world or not, must depend on other considerations than

that text of Scripture. Nevertheless, we are at one with those who think that the monopolies in land, and the monopolies of railroads, as well as commercial and industrial monopolies, are wrong in principle and dangerous to society. On the other hand, if we are to be guided by the Bible, God gave a certain tract of land to a particular people, and subdivided it, so that each family could have perpetual and inalienable possession of the Lord's inheritance to the exclusion of other men, whether Jew or Gentile. Buying lands and houses, which secured the right to enjoy and use the property, is everywhere referred to—and the abuse of so purchasing is emphatically condemned. The tenure of land may be that of tenants of the king, as in Egypt, or the tillage system, where the land belongs to a community, and each man has his portion to cultivate, or any other; in any case it does seem not right to allow men to hold land unoccupied, while others are prevented from using it.

The second question has reference to the law which secures a "land value" to a certain man who is known as its owner. This question of the increase in value of land—the "unearned increment"—is an intricate one. While we have no objection to allow Henry George and his associates dogmatically to say how it ought to be dealt with, and to denounce the present system at will, we confess to have serious doubts regarding that theory, and are far from satisfied that it will be a panacea for all human wrongs or even prevent poverty. We leave the discussion of this question to political economists. But we venture to call attention to a fact which our friends seem not to weigh, that for some reason or other, while millions of acres of good land are waiting to be occupied, the workingmen of our cities prefer to live in rented houses,—nay, even our farmers, in many cases, sell their homesteads and go to live where the "land value" is excessive. Why is this? The reason lies deeper than some men suppose. There is not a doubt that under the law as it is, there is a "parasitism" produced. A class of men are found in all large cities who live on the vices of the community. But who is responsible for this? Is the Ministerial Association? If there is "spoliation" going on under law, is it not owing to the covetousness of men who enrich themselves by ministering to the vices and depraved tastes of the immoral and irreligious masses? Are not the men who support saloons, and bucket-shops, and sporting establishments, and impoverish themselves by thus wasting their earnings, more to blame than ministers? Why cannot we get the law changed? Who keep in power our legislators and municipal councillors? No matter who is the owner of the land, poverty will abide wherever vice flourishes. We have no hesitation in admitting that the present law is not just and honest in many respects. Christian men of all the Churches would like to see changes made. Many ministers in their place as citizens do what they can, but until the workingmen see that men of principle are elected for parliament and for councils, there will be no change in our laws for the better. So long as it is "every man for himself, and devil take the hindmost," there will be a crowd of the hindmost wallowing in vice and poverty. Put God-fearing men in power, not time-servers, and we shall have good laws. Till that is done, the laws will be like the law-makers, unprincipled and selfish, always giving the advantage to those who can pay for enjoining themselves.

And now, having admitted that every man has a right to own land if he chooses, and that monopolies are wrong; and that the law regarding land is in some respects oppressive and unjust, and that many of our social arrangements are not in accordance with the law of God, what more can we do for the Anti-Poverty Society? They have our sympathy and will have our help in putting the gigantic wrongs right, if the methods they propose commend themselves to us as just and wise. But it is in vain to think that such will be accomplished by asking such questions as "Does the denial of this right" (to own some land) "deny the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of man?" Certainly it does not. A man is God's son and my brother, whether the law of the land secures him in the possession of one or of a thousand acres, or prevents him from calling one foot his inheritance. "The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof." Such a question is aside from the point. Let us beware of confounding our duty to God with human law; and while we labour to let man's laws conform to God's law, let us not despair because some men do not see as we see; and perhaps taking a wider and deeper view of the legal and social wrongs under which our race has ever pined, ask to be excused from endorsing any one philanthropic and unproved theory as a cure for poverty. Our Lord laid down principles which, if embodied in our laws and social arrangements, would bring about virtue and prosperity, but he did not say a word about the proper tenure of land. Nay, when asked to look into a question regarding the rights of inheritance he declined (Luke xii. 14), saying, "Man, who made me a judge or a divider over you?" So, ministers in their official capacity, and Church papers, had better leave the decisions of such questions to the civil ruler, to men who, by their special training, are competent to deal with them, and rest satisfied with preaching the Gospel, insisting on a new nature and the practice of righteousness. Let men's hearts be right and their life will be right; get the majority of a community to love and fear God, then they will choose God-fearing men as legislators and rulers over us, the laws will be just and will be faithfully put in force, and God's kingdom of right, and truth, and love will come. We know no other cure for the sins and sorrows of poor suffering humanity.

THE HONG KONG PAMPHLET.

Uncommon with many others, we have received a copy of a pamphlet entitled, "Some Things that should be Known to the Ladies of the Woman's Foreign Missionary Society in Canada," consisting of statements and letters from Mr. and Mrs. Jamieson and Mrs. Mackay, of our Formosa Mission. The pamphlet, which consists of fourteen pages, bears the imprint of Messrs. Kelly & Walsh (Limited), Hong Kong, and we have been informed that it has been sent in large quantities to this country. It must have cost somebody no small sum to print and circulate. Although for some obvious reasons it would be desirable to pass without notice this extraordinary production, yet, inasmuch as the Woman's Foreign Missionary Society is recognized as a most important auxiliary of the Church, and its operations, so far as made public, are of deep interest to all in any way engaged in mission work, it seems proper to give expression to some thoughts that occur to us in the circumstances, lest injury should come to the cause by silence.

The "things" in the pamphlet that it is considered desirable the ladies should know, are briefly: (1) that Mrs. Jamieson has not done any mission work in Formosa; (2) that there are special circumstances which make North Formosa a field where the work of the foreign missionary lady cannot, with advantage, be employed; (3) that natives are the only women capable of rendering any assistance to the Mission, and that Mrs. Mackay is especially capable of giving such help; and (4) and chiefly, that grievous injustice has been done to Dr. Mackay in certain letters—one official, the other marked "private," of dates respectively July 24 and Oct. 7, 1886—sent to Mrs. Jamieson by the Secretary of the Woman's Foreign Missionary Society. The official letter, it may here be stated, while conveying sentiments of kindness and appreciation, refers to the difficulty the ladies had, from the distance at which they live and from the want of knowledge, in understanding "the special circumstances which make North Formosa the only field where the work of the foreign missionary lady could not be employed," and gives the reason why the Board decided not to publish Mrs. Jamieson's letter, "in case Rev. Dr. Mackay should desire to change his plans of labour in the women's and children's departments." The private letter of the Secretary, after setting forth, in encouraging terms, her high estimates of Mrs. Jamieson's Christian character, expresses the hope that in God's good time abundant opportunity will be given her for enlarged service in Formosa, and the belief that "the reason why she was not

even then actively employed, according to her own expectation and desire, was owing to the existing arrangements of the Mission.

Hereupon a dreadful man of straw, as it seems to us, is first constructed out of these kindly expressions of good will, sympathy and hope, and then demolished in eleven categorical statements, the animating spirit of which may be discerned from one quotation: "Any one who suggests to you that I do not work because 'the opportunity is not afforded me' as the business 'is arranged,' tells a direct lie."

It is also charged in this connection that portions of the correspondence of Mrs. Jamieson and Mrs. Mackay, giving the views of the whole Mission respecting the proper conduct of women's work in Formosa and intended for publication, have been suppressed by the Board. The omitted portions are restored and the letters given in full. With regard to the charge that an injustice has been done to Dr. Mackay through the letters above referred to, it seems to us that a perusal of this pamphlet fully justifies the conclusions, that the employment of foreign lady missionaries is not approved of by Dr. Mackay and his helpers as the best and most economical method of work; and also that Mr. and Mrs. Jamieson are not warranted in their assumption that an unfavourable reflection upon Dr. Mackay or his methods was either expressed or implied on the part of the Board or its Secretary. The whole pamphlet, it appears to us, betrays an over-solicitude to compel an unquestioning approval of the conduct of the Mission in all its details. It is also to be deplored that any one should think Dr. Mackay's policy in such need of championship as to require, in defiance of courtesy and honour, the publication of a letter marked "private," and evidently written from a full heart with loving intention and in the most liberal spirit. We cannot but conclude, after careful examination of the extracts given in the pamphlet, that a meaning quite foreign to the purpose of the Board and the Secretary is wrested from them.

With regard to the charge made against the Woman's Foreign Mission Board of suppressing portions of Mrs. Jamieson's and Mrs. Mackay's correspondence, intended by the writers for publication, a perusal of the pamphlet, we think, will here also justify the conclusion, that the ladies who revised these letters for the press showed much wisdom. The parts omitted, as may be seen, would, by their circulation, in no way have increased missionary interest.

A circumstance in connection with the subject under discussion ought not to be overlooked. Although Mrs. Jamieson has obtained great prominence of late in missionary correspondence, she has, strictly speaking, no official connection with any of our Missionary Societies or Boards. She is merely the wife of a missionary, and as such the fact of her active participation in mission work or declining to take part in it, could not properly come within the province of the Board. This being the case, the question of whether Mrs. Jamieson was or was not able to engage in mission work, or was or was not "hindered," could not regularly come before the Board, and could not therefore form any part of missionary intelligence to auxiliaries.

In view of these facts and circumstances it must be apparent that the grievances set forth in the pamphlet are fanciful and exaggerated, and its publication unnecessary, unbecoming, unjustifiable, and not calculated to inspire confidence in those who have sent it forth or increase zeal for missionary objects.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

It is announced that Mr. Hirschfelder, the well-known and highly esteemed Lecturer in Hebrew and other Oriental languages in University College, Toronto, retires from active duty, and that Rev. Dr. McCurdy, also Lecturer in these subjects in the college during the past two years, is to be advanced to the position of Professor of Oriental Languages in Toronto University. The University is to be congratulated on this appointment. It is a matter of much satisfaction that Knox College, now in affiliation with Toronto University, will share in the advantages to be derived from the establishment of a Chair in a department so intimately associated with the training of its students. The good wishes of a multitude of graduates who have enjoyed the benefits of Mr.

Hirschfelder's instructions will accompany him into his well-earned retirement. In common with all the friends of the University and of higher education generally, we rejoice in the selection of Dr. McCurdy as one eminently fitted for the position to which he has been appointed, and as a Canadian specially qualified both by gifts and acquirements to serve well the University and the country. The interest of Presbyterians in the University will not be diminished from a knowledge of the fact that Rev. Professor McCurdy is an active elder in St. Andrew's congregation in this city.

The sad news, not altogether unexpected, of the death of Rev. Joseph Builder of our Central India Mission, has reached us too late to permit of any extended obituary notice in this issue. Mr. Builder died at Asheville, North Carolina, Wednesday, 14th inst., while on his way South for the benefit of his health, and his funeral took place at Hamilton on Saturday last. It will be remembered that Mr. Builder returned from India a few months ago much broken in health, but with strong hopes that a sojourn in America would restore his strength and enable him to resume his much loved work. An over-ruling Providence has ordained it otherwise. He has been cut off in the midst of his days, when his work as a missionary was only well begun. His death is a loss to the Church, and adds one more to the list of our fallen standard-bearers in Central India. His widow and relatives will have the sincere sympathy of the Church at large, and especially of those interested in the Central India Mission, in their great loss.

It will be seen that our clever and racy contributor, the chronicler of the great debate, in the mythical Presbytery of Dominionville, on the Aged and Infirm Ministers' Endowment Fund, brings his report to a conclusion in this issue. Those who at the beginning of the discussion showed signs of alarm lest Messrs. Flint and other disaffected brethren would by their peppy remarks injure the prospects of the fund, will now have their fears dispelled. The obnoxious motion is withdrawn and the Agent may now visit all localities with assured prospects of a successful canvass. The whole Church owes a debt of gratitude to Messrs. Templeton, Banerman, Boulder, Love, Prince and others for their able advocacy of this most deserving scheme.

Literary Notices

What shall we do with the Sunday School as an Institution, by George L. Taylor, D.D., is an excellent essay on the subject. The Christian Union, in a recent review, says: "It ought to be made the subject of debate in every Sunday school teachers' meeting in the land. Nothing that has been published strikes so directly at existing evils and the remedy as this. The present management of our Sunday Schools is full of evil. Untrained teachers become the religious instructors of our youth, elect the officers of the school, often voting without thought, while the Church has no authority to direct, either by its pastor or by its governing body. This is all wrong. The Sunday School should be the Church teaching, as the prayer-meeting is the Church praying. Its connection with the Church should be vital, and the present independency be abolished. Dr. Taylor discusses this question very vigorously, and recommends some methods by which the desired end may be accomplished. [Cloth, 30 cents; paper, 20 cents. Wilbur B. Ketchum, Publisher, 71 Bible House, New York.]

The Homiletic Review for November has a critical article on Dr. Maclaren of Manchester, England, one of the greatest living preachers. Dr. Schaif gives the first of two papers on Chrysostom, "the greatest preacher of the Greek Church." Dr. Behrends ably discusses "Miracles" in relation to Christian evidences as affected by modern criticism. Dr. Lyman Abbott gives a very sensible article on "The Church and our Workingmen," while Dr. Pierson presents a bright "Cleaver of Gems," illustrative of "Truth." There are two fine sermons by Dr. Herrick Johnson of Chicago, and Dr. S. E. Herrick of Boston, the former on "The Influence of the Church of God," and the latter on "The Trial of Christ's Personal Virtue." Among the other six sermons is a very striking one by the Lord Bishop of Meath, reported for the Review. The other parts of the number are up to mark. [Funk & Wagnall, New York.]

The Youth's Companion will publish this year four holiday numbers, at Thanksgiving, Christmas, New Year's and Easter. Every family should have it.

Contributed.

ENDOWMENT OF THE A. AND I. M. FUND.

REPORT OF THE PRESBYTERY OF DOMINIONVILLE.—(Continued.)

REV. MR. WINTERS.—"I would ask Mr. Dandrough and his sympathizers, how long the ministers in the smaller charges have been enjoying the \$750 and more? What opportunity have they had of laying past something for the future? Will Mr. Dandrough kindly show us how it is possible for a minister with an average family of six children, to do justice to himself and these children, and yet provide for his own old age? How much will Mr. Dandrough allow for table expenses for eight members of a family? How much for clothing? How much for education for six? How much for books and magazines and daily papers? How much for furniture? How much for benevolent objects? Why, Mr. Chairman, board alone at \$1 per week for eight members of a family means \$400 per annum. Clothing at \$25 per year, means \$200 per annum. Then there are \$150 left for books, furniture, education and benevolent objects. Will Mr. Dandrough agree to board his minister's family for \$1 per week for each member? Will any respectable merchant tailor agree to keep the minister and his family well and sufficiently clothed for \$25 per year for each member? I challenge any to answer in the affirmative. How then can the minister himself do what nobody else can do? There must be pinching somewhere. Ah! little do these good elders know how much pinching in order to make ends meet. If they could only get a peep behind the scenes sometimes, they would become painfully conscious of the fact that ministers' families are not dandled in the lap of luxury. Two thousand dollars even will not make a minister's household burdened with wealth. Those who have the large salaries tell us that their expenses are equal to their incomes. As a rule, too, they are not the ones who have the bank stocks and mortgages in possession."

MR. BOND.—"I suppose, Mr. Chairman, that these elders who think that the ministers are so well paid by their people, are but echoing the views of many in our congregations. The spirit that prompts such feelings is miserable in the extreme. Too well paid, sir, when in any of the other professions they could multiply their income fourfold! As well paid as mechanics, indeed! Mechanics make the best of themselves, and they have a right to do it if they like. But ministers do not lay out their accounts to make the best of themselves. That is, they do not leave one profession and go to another, because it is more profitable—even when they have the opportunity. They are sometimes tempted—\$5,000 as a bait has been tried to move a minister to accept of secular employment—old minister having not much more than one-third the sum that was offered. That minister is still in the work of the Church. True, they do accept of higher salaries sometimes, but not out of the profession."

MR. FLINT (elder).—"The necessity for large salaries has been argued on the ground that education is so expensive. Now, this is in the view of the laity of the Church is very unreasonable—namely, to make them pay for what they don't want. They don't want the 'high talutin' preaching that they sometimes get from those ministers who have had to launch out so much money for education. Much less learning, we think, would do just as well for the people, and perhaps a good deal better. They would be more on a level with the people if they did not seem to know so much. What do the people care though their ministers knew all the Hebrew Bible and the Greek Testament by heart. The people cannot understand them when they talk to them in Greek and Hebrew. Paul didn't preach to the people in this way. He did not preach with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power. If ministers were to place themselves, in every respect, more on a level with the people, they would be more respected by them. Humble-minded men and women would not stand so much in awe of their ministers, if they did not pretend to so much learning. Then, again, they would not be such gentlemen and so hard to keep up. We don't read of colleges in the New Testament. The God-made minister is better than the man-made minister. The man of one book—the Bible—is better than the man who devotes so much of his time to science and philosophy and politics. It would be better for the congregations, sometimes, if the minister's library were not so full of trashy books. The first preachers under the new dispensation had not very large libraries. I believe the most popular preachers of the present day are those whose education has not been expensive—in fact who have never seen the inside of college walls. The people pay for the expensive education of their ministers, indeed! Time enough to compel them to do this when they ask for college-bred preachers. These, of course, owing to the action of Church Courts and College Boards, are the only ones available just at present in the Presbyterian Church, and the peo-