

# British American Presbyterian.

Vol. 2

TORONTO, CANADA, FRIDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1873

No. 96

## Contributors and Correspondents.

For the Presbyterian.

### "A Little While."

BY REV. J. CARMICHAEL, M.A., MANCHESTER.

"A little while," and ye shall see me;  
Succy Thou tarriest long  
Bedegroom beloved, when shall this night of weep-  
ing

Ho tursed to song?  
With heaven so far to lure us,  
And earth so near to lure us and beguile.  
How long? Oh, Thou didst promise but to tarry  
"A little while."

"A little while," The sorrowing and the sinning  
Are not for ever.  
These charms that earth and sense have wound  
around me,  
Thine hand shall sever.

How long ere I awaken  
Where nothing enters that can me defile?  
I hear the voice of my beloved say gently  
"A little while."

"A little while," my heart and flesh are falling  
So long the night,  
My feet are sore; mine eyes are dim with straining  
Towards the light.

Oh! when wilt Thou array me  
In glorious body no more weak and vile?  
Come quickly! Thou didst promise but to tarry  
"A little while."

"A little while," I say with wistful glances  
At you bright skies,  
Where is the promise of thy Master's coming?  
The world replies.

How long shall I be weary  
With hearing man thy name and laws revolve?  
Oh teach them that Thou didst but mean to tarry  
"A little while."

"A little while," the whole creation waits  
Thou in hope and fear;  
Surely the sound of that swift-driven chariot  
At length I hear.

O Earth! Earth! Earth! arouse thee!  
Wake from thy tears! put on thy glory! smile!  
Surely He cometh; and He will but tarry  
"A little while."

THE MANSE, MANCHESTER,  
Nov., 1873.

## HOME MISSION FUND.

CANADA PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

The last General Assembly appointed collections to be taken up in aid of Home Missions in all the congregations and mission stations of the Church (save where Missionary Associations are in operation), on the third Sabbath of December.

In view of the importance of the Home Mission Scheme, as regards the growth and prosperity of the Church at large, and the unusually pressing demands made upon the funds at the present time, the Committee have deemed it advisable to present a brief statement of the fields embraced, and the sum required to carry on the work entrusted to their care.

There is great reason for gratitude to Almighty God for the steady growth of our Home Mission work, and the numerous indications, everywhere apparent, that the efforts of our missionaries and the generosity of our people have been so largely blessed in recent years. In 1862, the year after the union of the two bodies which now compose the Canada Presbyterian Church, the total number of missionaries employed (probationers and students) was 44, while the number reported to last Assembly is 104. The amount of contributions for 1862 was \$4,614.23, while those of 1873 reach the sum of \$19,032.63. This amount is still very far below what should be given by the membership of a church so strong numerically and financially, and very far from the sums given by other evangelical denominations in Canada for the same object. Nevertheless, it shows an increasing interest in the work, and encourages the hope, that if our congregations are only regularly and fully informed of our progress and obligations, they will give most cheerfully of their means for the extension of the Redeemer's kingdom in our land.

The fields embraced in our Home Mission work are the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, Manitoba and British Columbia. Until last year, the work in British Columbia was under the care of the Foreign Mission Committee. The work in Manitoba has grown upon us so rapidly during the last three years, that a very large expenditure is needed for that Province alone. The town of Winnipeg contains a population of 2,500, while immigrants are constantly pushing on to the interior of the country. A very large proportion of the settlers in the new districts are Presbyterians from Ontario, having special claims upon the sympathies of the Church in Canada; and as these immigrants, for the most part, are possessed of but little means, and have many difficulties to contend with in that new country, but little can be expected from them for a considerable time for the support of ordinances, beyond the bare creation of churches and manse. The maintenance of our missionaries in that province must therefore be provided for almost entirely out of Home Mission Funds.

Without entering into minute details, it may be sufficient to state that the Home Mission Committee provide missionaries and help to maintain them in 100 distinct localities in the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario. In Manitoba, they employ missionaries and several catechists, and are under obligation to provide for the College established at Kildonan, but which is soon to be removed to the town of Winnipeg. Mr. Jamieson still labors in British Columbia, having four stations under his charge. As special fields demanding more than usual attention at the present moment, may be mentioned the large and destitute district in the Simcoe Presbytery, known as the "Muskegoe district," the mission stations on Lake Superior, consisting of Bruce Mines, Sault Ste Marie, Silver Islet, Prince Arthur's Landing, and Fort William; and the new Roman Catholic Mission in Glengarry, within the bounds of the Presbytery of Montreal. In addition to the support of missionaries, the Committee also supplement the stipends of 60 ministers, regularly ordained over congregations which are as yet unable of themselves to maintain the stated ordinances of religion.

The supplements granted congregations and the aid rendered mission stations are of necessity but limited. The funds placed at the disposal of the committee have to be carefully husbanded, and most sparingly distributed. Many necessitous fields are thus left unoccupied that loudly call for aggressive effort. It is also greatly to be lamented that brethren in the ministry, settled over non-sustaining congregations, are compelled to labor on stipends, altogether inadequate to maintain themselves and their families in comfort, and in some cases far below wages now paid to ordinary workmen in Ontario and Quebec.

The Committee might easily cite special instances that appeal to every Christian heart. They prefer, however, to rest the claims of Home Missions upon the liberality of the Church and the direct command of Christ, and the obligations that devolve upon every professing member to make known the Gospel to his more destitute fellow-men. Our past success in the work of Home Missions, and the vast territory we are called to occupy, God's great goodness to us as a Church, and the abundant means placed within our hands, all demand a conscientious consecration of our substance to the cause of Christ. As a writer in the Free Church Record says:—"Indifference to the work of Home Missions is simply death to us. We shall inevitably shrink up as a Church, if we do not expand. If we are not up and stirring, the ground will be occupied before us by those in whose evangelical teaching we cannot have entire confidence. Home Missions is really in a very important sense the great work of the Church; for if the fountain at home is not kept fresh and full it is impossible that streams abroad can be effectually fed from it."

The membership of the Canada Presbyterian Church according to last Statistics is 51,612, not to speak of the adherents, who are generally found willing to aid the benevolent schemes of our Church. With such a membership it requires but little calculation to see how easily at least \$40,000, instead of \$20,000, might be raised for Home Missions. Were each member to contribute on an average not more than one dollar a year, our Home Mission funds would at once reach the sum of Fifty Thousand Dollars! There is surely nothing extravagant in such a calculation, nor will any one presume to say that such a contribution to the cause of Christ in this land would impoverish the giver. There is that scattereth and yet increaseth; and there is that withholdeth more than he should, and his house shall be made full; and he that soweth sparingly shall reap also sparingly. He that hath pity upon the poor, lendeth unto the Lord, and that which he hath given will He pay him again.

Is thy cruse of corn empty? rise and share it with another.  
And through all the valleys anoint it shall serve thee and thy brethren.  
Love divides will be the cause, or thy handfull still renew.  
Scanty fare for one, shall make a royal feast for two.

For the heart grow weary, all its wealth; living gain  
Seeds which sowest in the garner, scattered, fill with gold the place.  
Is thy burden heavy? Do thy steps drag wearily?  
Help to bear thy burden; God will bear both it and thee.

In name of the Home Mission Committee.

J. C. COCHRAN, Convener.

Brantford, Nov. 29th 1873.  
P.S.—To enable the committee with us little delay as possible to wipe off their indebtedness to the Home Mission Fund, we are

is of the utmost importance that congregations should make their contributions at an early date. In every case the collections in aid of this fund should be sent not later than the 31st of March.

W. C.

## A Crying Evil.

Editor BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN.

SIR,—No one having the interests of our church at heart can look abroad, and not feel that things are not as they should be with our young people. We see the children of religious parents, the young of our Churches, and the Scholars of our Sabbath Schools, as they grow up, forsaking the ways of their Fathers and "no man layeth it to heart," or any rate the Church is evidently not awake to her duty in the matter. We have read with pleasure an article in the October Record taken from the London Weekly Review, headed "Our Children," and are glad to see this subject is claiming attention in England, let us hope that some action will be taken in this country to remedy the evil. It appears to us, there is by far too much inclination on this side of the Atlantic to perform our duties by proxy, and here lies a great part of the blame. This inclination displays itself very easily in the family, for the child or children must be handed over to the nurse, and the mother, forgetting the sacred trust reposed in her, must have her rest, or time for other duties, which of course take precedence of the care of the children God has given her! There is the Doreas Society has to be attended to, as winter approaches, and there are so many poor little ones must be looked after. Then there is this or that benevolent Society meeting must be attended, there were so few at last meeting. As to one's own children, oh, the nurse can look after them. And this inclination shows itself in the Sabbath School too. The Superintendent and some of the male teachers are too busy to visit their scholars, and it is very convenient to have their wives or sisters attend to this duty, the fact is "it is more in their line," "they can do that sort of thing better," and if the duty is done, what matter it who does it? Nor does the evil stop at the Sabbath School, for forgetful of the sanctity of the Church, and in spite of it, it enters there in defiance of the various courts that oversee the one and overlook the other. Ministers preach and teach and visit by proxy, and Elders following the example of their leaders, are perhaps more seldom seen at the homes of those living in their districts in person than by substitute. Nor is it only in their official capacity that these leaders often fail in important duties by having too much business on hand. With so many meetings to attend—prayer meetings it is true, or session meetings perhaps, or Missionary meetings, or Sabbath School meetings, or Church meetings of some kind or another, the home is left without a head, night after night, week after week, month after month, and year after year, until it would be a miracle if everything went as it should. Now is it possible that this is all right? We cannot think so. That bond of sympathy which should exist between parents and children, teachers and scholars, and ministers and people, is broken, and we see the result, we think, in the evil complained of. Parents and others show indifference to the interests of the young under their own immediate care, and they reap the fruit which this naturally produces. "Do men gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles?" Fathers who are out night after night, leaving their duties to be performed by proxy, if at all, can scarcely wonder that their boys are more at home, and who knows where they may be at night, or what influence may be brought to bear on them during the hours of leisure. Mothers that have so many engagements taking them from their homes need not surely be surprised, that their daughters should not turn out "keepers at home." Not very long since we heard a Minister in a strange pulpit (he having made an exchange for the evening) give an earnest warning to hearers against running from one Church to another. Need we say that with practice and precept so strongly at variance it would be wonderful if that good was accomplished which should have been. It was clearly a sermon prepared for his own church, and should never have been heard outside of it, as, so long as Ministers, and Teachers, and Parents forsake their parts, they can scarcely with any consistency blame people and scholars for following in their steps. Of course we know the family is a small field for a father and mother when so many other families want attention, and it looks very selfish to attend to one's own, but is it not a serious question whether the family is to be trained up for God or grow up for Satan? Is it a light thing that a congregation should be left frequently to the ministrations of proxies, and that the spiritual food should be so very uncertain—some times wheat, but many a time and oft only chaff? (But the question that staggers most people is, if we don't do certain outside work, who will, and here, we would say, is the place for faith to step in, not as is usually, or too often the case, when a man or woman, forgetting his or her first care, gives attention to what should be a secondary consideration, and has faith in God taking care of what should have been his first duty!)

We grieve when we think of so many families that have gone astray, and so many congregations and schools, that have been scattered to the winds, for want of proper care from those to whom God had committed the sacred trust. We do not coincide with the statement that Ministers and Elders' families always turn out worst, but yet how many turn out bad? We do not by any means say, Ministers should not exchange pulpits, but we have certainly seen enough to guard against too much of this, or undertaking too many duties, apart

from those pertaining to one's own congregation. And surely there is inducement enough to all, and especially to parents, to attend to their duties personally when they think of the termination to a life of devotion to duties in their proper order, when they will be able to say "Behold, I and the children which God has given me."

Of course there are other causes helping on the result we deplore and we can scarcely omit to mention one or two of these. Foremost among them are extreme views, enforced by the heads of families on their children. As Timothy Titecomb says, "there is so much of the pig in human nature," that extreme notions in one direction almost invariably drive the children into the other way of thinking. We would refer especially to extreme views in reference to religion, or the Temperance question, or amusements and recreation, or the Sabbath, or books to be read, or dress, or what should or should not be at table. It is very well when parents can have their children act as they think best even on minor points, and points not insisted on in God's word, but to lay down "cast iron rules," in reference to these, is likely to drive the children from rather than to draw them to the parents' hearts. Another cause we must refer to is the difference between the precept and the practice of parents, and here we do not refer to anything so bad as hypocrisy, for we do not think this difference is intentional, at least we would hope not. Yet who has not noticed many plainly dressed parents, with giddy over-dressed daughters whose chief end seemed to be to dress. It is true that these young ladies are regularly told that they must make sacrifices for Christ, but these parents well know that while a paltry dollar a year is given for missions, two or three dollars per month are spent on "trifles light as air," with their consent expressed or understood. And these are to be our future mothers! Truly did a young man say very lately, "It's no use expecting to get married, young 'ladies, now-a-days, must have a husband 'with from two to ten thousand dollars per annum."

There are other minor causes, but we cannot take more space to refer to these. Let us hope that what we have said may lead some to think and to "examine themselves," that we may see a change in respect to the treatment of the young, and more attention given to the subject in the pulpit and the home.

Yours,  
PHILOS.

28rd Novembe 1873.

## Union and its Basis.

Editor BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN.

DEAR SIR,—I shall not trouble you with a very lengthened reply to Mr. Middlemiss for, though he has said some very hard things about me, he has not in the slightest removed my difficulty or extricated himself from the position in which by his former acknowledgments he was placed. I did not intentionally misrepresent him, and I leave it with your readers to say if I did so at all, even unintentionally. In his first letter our friend says, "If a man's character is the best part of his estate, to damage it maliciously or even recklessly should bring down the penalty of the civil law on the head of the offender;" and Mr. M. also acknowledges that the extreme case supposed "would involve a breach of the law of the land," and a "very serious one." Now, all I said (and I say it still), was that in that case it followed that if any one chose to take the doings of a Church court before the civil tribunals, since the latter have a right, as Mr. M. acknowledges they have, to interfere in cases of "malice," or even "recklessness," the whole of the proceedings of the ecclesiastical court may be legitimately reviewed by the civil tribunal, for without this being done it is impossible in many instances to know whether there have been "malice" and "recklessness" or not. I at once acknowledge that a man is not responsible for the inferences which another may even legitimately draw from the premises he lays down. But here I did not draw inferences. I took Mr. M.'s statement as it stood. Wherever there is a "malicious" or "reckless proceeding, to the pecuniary injury of individuals, in a Church court, then there is, he says, a breach of the law of the land; and it is the law's prerogative to seek out and punish such a breach. Can Mr. M. make such a statement without acknowledging that the civil court is the final court of appeal, seeing he allows it to investigate and decide finally where there has been malice or recklessness, and where there has been none? The Church court is in that case neither co-ordinate with the civil, nor, even in what it claims as its own sphere, supreme. What though the civil tribunal decide that there has been no malice proved, and dismiss the case? It is notwithstanding investigated, and finally and supremely decided. What more difficult to determine than "recklessness?" yet here, too, the civil tribunal is allowed to sit and decide, which it could not do without jurisdiction being allowed it, by even such a stickler for Church independence as Mr. M. In his last letter Mr. M. says and unsays the same thing in the most delightful fashion. He says "no appeal" and

be made legitimately from the decision of an ecclesiastical court to a civil one, and he adds that if such an appeal is made, it ought to be instantly dismissed, "without examination." In that case, how are the "malice" and "recklessness" to be discovered?

Then in the case of deposition, Mr. M. says he would never appeal to the civil courts for protection. He would treat the sentence as null and void. Very good so far. But he goes on, "If my congregation, having the same views as I have, possessing property which they contributed to the acquisition of for one purpose, are unwilling that it should be alienated to what they believe to be a different purpose, and decline, though they adhere to me, to be dispossessed of their property until the civil authorities, with whom rests the final and irrevocable disposal of all property, shall pronounce they have lost their right to it." "Can any man say they are inconsistent?" To be sure he can. Is it not plain that, in the case Mr. M. supposes, the disposal of this property all hangs on setting whether or not the decision of the ecclesiastical court has been a righteous one or not? And does it require any argument to show that the civil court is, by the very appeal to it, made final judge of whether or not Mr. M. (say) was so deposed; for that brings the decision whether or not the congregation adhering to him as a deposed minister should be deprived of the property they only helped to create? Even as Mr. M. puts the matter it is manifest that I did him no wrong, and did not "misrepresent" his statements. But Mr. M. does not put the case,—shall I say?—fairly. According to Presbyterian ideas, a congregation is not a separate unit—it is part of a whole, and its church property is held on the same terms and has been accumulated simply on the same understanding. A church and manse, say, have been built. That church and manse, as Mr. M. would acknowledge, is not the private property of the present members of that congregation. It cannot be burdened with more debt without the consent of the whole church, as represented by the Presbytery. It is held in trust for the body as a whole, and if the congregation became defunct the assets from its sale would go to the Church as a whole. But supposing that all Mr. M.'s congregation did not adhere to him. Suppose only a minority did. That minority did not own a shilling of the church property as private individuals. It was for a particular purpose that it was contributed. Well, they, the minority, affirm that the majority has changed in reference to that purpose, and are in error about the Headship. The majority say, "No, we are the same." The supreme court of the church has, by an overwhelming majority, said that we are occupying our original ground, and therefore we continue to hold the property as formerly. Who is to decide between the disputants? The point of difference is purely spiritual. The Church courts have decided one way. Is the minority to say, "We feel we are right, the Church courts are wrong. Members everywhere are against us, and we bow meekly and suffer wrong and loss?" "No," says Mr. M., "they may drag the majority into the civil court, argue the spiritual point which has been decided by the supreme spiritual court, before, it may be, an ungodly judge, and take his decision in preference to that of the Assembly on that spiritual issue by which the possession of the property is determined! With this simple statement of what Mr. M. acknowledges, I leave your readers to say whether or not I have "misrepresented" him.

I am,  
A PRESBYTERIAN.

## Presbytery of Bruce.

The Presbytery of Bruce held a special meeting at Huron, on the 12th instant. Notwithstanding the bad state of the roads, the church was filled to its utmost capacity, with earnest and devout hearers. The Rev. Mr. Cameron, of Lucknow, preached an excellent discourse from Ephesians II. 1. Rev. Mr. Davidson addressed the audience in the school house. Public worship being ended, the Presbytery proceeded to moderate in a call to a minister to fill up the vacancy in the congregation, when it was proposed that Mr. McQueen's name be inserted in the call. It was proposed in amendment that the name of Mr. McKay, of Middle River, C. B., be inserted in the call. The vote being taken, ten voted for Mr. McKay, and thirty-seven for Mr. McQueen. Mr. McQueen was declared duly elected, and his name was accordingly inserted in the call, which was subscribed by 87 communicants, and 285 adherents, representing 150 families. A paper in opposition to the call was signed by those in favor of Mr. McKay, to the number of 232, representing 64 families. The Presbytery, in view of the strong opposition to the call, declined to sustain it. Rev. Mr. Fraser reported a call from Pine River, in favor of the Rev. Archibald McDiarmid. Mr. Fraser's conduct in moderating the call was sustained, and his diligence commended. After hearing commissioners from the congregation, the call was sustained, and ordered to be forwarded to Mr. McDiarmid.