

## THE CANADA PRESBYTERIAN,

PUBLISHED BY THE

Presbyterian Printing &amp; Publishing Co., Ltd.,

AT 5 JORDAN STREET, TORONTO.

Terms: \$2 Per Annum in Advance.

ADVERTISING RATES.—Under 1 month, 15 cents per line per insertion; 1 month, \$1 per line; 6 months, \$1.75 per line; 1 year, \$3. No advertisement charged at less than five lines. None other than unobjectionable advertisements taken.

## The Canada Presbyterian.

TORONTO, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 18th, 1891

THE *Interior* has this to say about the installation address of Dr. Briggs, which has raised such a storm:—

When Professor Briggs took the prescribed oath or affirmation of office, every fair and candid man was put upon the obligation to construe whatever else he said on the occasion as not in conflict with that solemn avowment, unless there were irreconcilable conflict between the two statements. For a man to rise before such an audience as that which attended the installation of the Professor, and solemnly take the affirmation of office, that he accepts the subordinate Standards, and promises to teach nothing contrary thereto, and then immediately to face about from the Moderator to the audience and attack the doctrines of the Standards, would be an act of self-stultification impossible to a man of sanity and self-respect.

True, but that is exactly what a large number of people neither fools nor heresy hunters think Dr. Briggs did.

THE utter folly of becoming wild over political questions may be seen by a backward glance at some of the old issues. There was a time when it was declared that secularization of the Clergy Reserves would put religion to an end in Canada. The Reserves were secularized, but there is a good deal more religion in the country now than there ever was before. Middle-aged men can remember when "Abolition of the Court of Chancery" was a prominent plank in every Radical platform. The Court of Chancery is now the most popular, most trusted and most useful court in Ontario. It is quite easy to be mistaken about the merits or demerits of any political issue and that is one among many reasons why rational citizens should keep cool even in election contests.

WOULD it not be a generous thing to allow Sir John Macdonald and the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie to be elected by acclamation? Both of these distinguished statesmen have spent their lives in the service of their country. Both are well advanced in years and in the ordinary course of nature neither can engage in many more election contests. The election of both by acclamation would do something in the way of lessening the asperities of party warfare and would prove to the world that party politicians can do a generous thing even in the midst of election excitement. It is said that all is fair in war and politics but chivalrous things are often done even in war. Why should not a chivalrous thing be done occasionally in political warfare. We venture to say that the election of Sir John and Mr. Mackenzie by acclamation would raise both parties in the estimation of all right-thinking people.

A FEW days ago England's Grand Old Man delivered half-a-dozen political orations in and around Edinburgh. There was no election on. It was a campaign without the polling. The audiences were magnificent, the speeches of the best the empire can produce and the order and dignity worthy of the modern Athens. There was a veritable campaign in Kilkenny the other day. It was conducted in such a way as to prove most conclusively that Kilkenny was the right place for it. The motto, "Wherever you see a head strike it," was literally carried out in more places than one. In order to throw light on some tremendous national problem somebody threw a bag of lime in the eyes of a prominent party leader. Perhaps the idea was to disinfect him. How will this campaign in Canada be conducted? Which will it resemble most the one in Edinburgh or the one in Kilkenny? Do Canadians conduct themselves like first-class Edinburgh citizens or like the Parnellites and anti-Parnellites of Kilkenny? The conduct of parties between now and the 5th of March will tell.

DR. CUYLER'S retirement from the pastorate seems to give him even more point and strength in the use of his pen. In a recent paper in the *Christian-at-Work* he touches up idle Church members in this way:—

Every member of Christ's blood-bought flock is under just as strong obligation to labour for souls as any pastor possibly can be. Your promise to be a witness for your Master is just as solemn and binding as his promise. It is your Church just as much as it is your minister's Church; Christ's claim on you is the same as His claim on your pastor. What General ever gained a victory without the aid of his army? What could a Spurgeon accomplish without his great, zealous, praying Church behind him? Aaron and Hur are as important in their places as Moses.

A practical recognition of the fact that every member of the Church is under as much obligation to work for Christ and deny himself for Christ as the pastor can be, would bring about the millennium in a few years. Why wander over the universe for new truth when this old one would do so much good if believed and acted upon.

THE following from a recent article in the *Illustrated Christian Weekly*, by Dr. John Hall, will afford some food for reflection until the 5th of next month.

To glance at the state for a moment—how often we hear of "corrupt politicians," of men whom companies and individuals can buy, and of the bribes accepted in the lobbies! "Ah! but politicians of that class do not go to Church." Granted, as partially true, and those who do go appear to be little benefited. But it takes two parties to make a bribery case—the giver and the receiver. Who are they who create the demand for sordid politicians who can be bought with dollars? Are they all outside the reach of the Church's ethical teaching? Or are we compelled to own that in the state and municipal elements of our life there are venal office-holders chosen by the people, and there are many outsiders, individuals and companies that trade upon, and are parties to, this venality?

If there is one venal member in the Ontario Assembly that met last week, the electors of his constituency, many of them professing Christians, sent him there last June. If there will be one venal member in the new House of Commons, the people will send him there on the 5th of next month. The talk about "corrupt politicians" is mostly unalloyed cant. The people are partners in every bribery case.

IT is just possible that some of the union sentiment floats at a high altitude and in an atmosphere much more rarified than pertains to true Christian charity. Contact with actual Church life and work too often dissipates the cold but beautiful sentiments that cannot withstand the rude shocks of the Church militant. It is pleasing to learn that up in the Owen Sound region there has been a hopeful experiment in practical Christian union. A correspondent states that the Congregational Churches of Wiarton and Hepworth have formed a union with the Presbyterian Church. The former, having been deprived of their pastor who accepted a call to another charge, have united under the ministry of the Presbyterian pastor, while the Congregational school superintendent has taken charge of the united Sabbath school. There is no difficulty anticipated as to the fusion of Presbyterian elders and Congregational deacons in the same session. This beginning of practical union of sister Churches is significant, and now, that the good friends up north have shown the way, it is probable that others will in due time follow, where they have had the courage to lead.

JUST now the good Christian man who does not cultivate the habit of looking all round questions is heard saying: "Five hundred people at a political meeting and only fifty at the prayer meeting! Ah me." The good man does not reflect on the fact that the prayer meeting is held every week while the political mass meeting comes only once or twice in four or five years. There is a great deal of nonsense talked by pessimists and thoughtless people about the drawing power of different kinds of meetings. Taking into account the number of times religious meetings are held they are much better attended than any other. Mr. Macdonnell, or Dr. Parsons, or Mr. Patterson, or Dr. Kellogg, or in fact any pastor of a large congregation addresses, taking both Sabbath services into account, well up to a thousand people nearly one hundred times a year. Is there a political orator in the Dominion—is there one in the world—who can find an audience of from seven hundred to a thousand people in Toronto nearly a hundred times a year and take from ten to twenty-five thousand dollars out of them every twelve months. The fact is no kind of meeting is half as well attended as a religious meeting if you take the number of meet-

ings into account. No kind of speaker address half as many people as a good preacher if you reckon the number of times he addresses them. People who try to belittle religious meetings held every week by contrasting them with political gatherings that come only once in four or five years are not wise. As Dr. R. F. Burns said on a memorable occasion: They speak unadvisedly with their lips.

IN his short speech on the Premier's motion to make Mr. Ballantyne speaker of the Legislature—a speech by the way as credible to himself as it was to Mr. Ballantyne—Mr. Meredith described Mr. Ballantyne as a party man who never allowed the asperities of party warfare to come into private life. No doubt the compliment was as well deserved as it was handsomely paid. Those who have the pleasure of knowing the Hon. Thomas Ballantyne, know that he is a gentleman far above any such petty conduct as allowing politics to interfere with his private relations. Why should any man do so? The Government of the country is only one thing—a most important thing no doubt, but only one thing. We must meet in business, in the social circle, in our churches and in a dozen other ways, and if the asperities of election warfare are to be introduced everywhere it would soon be necessary to find some other mode of political existence. The bare suspicion that party politics may sometimes be traced even in courts of justice does an immense amount of harm. Keep politics out of the social circle, out of business, out of the schools, out of the Churches, out of the courts, in fact out of every place but the political arena and then the evils incident to party warfare will be reduced to a minimum.

MR. THOMAS SINCLAIR, of Belfast, writes an able but temperate letter in the *British Weekly* against Home Rule. Mr. Sinclair takes ground which we think every fair-minded Briton may take. In substance he says: I am opposed, strongly opposed, to Home Rule, but Ireland suffers from wrongs that should be removed:—

But behind the demand for Home Rule we see the universal land hunger, the skilful adaptation of which to the Home Rule agitation has really made the latter a living question. The agrarian question we propose to grapple with in the Land Bill now before Parliament. There is also a cry of the congested districts for improved locomotion, development of their resources, and other forms of material relief. This great question is also being seriously dealt with. There is also the natural desire of increased control over our own local affairs, a desire which Ulster Liberals have long demanded shall be met, by giving to Ireland a measure of local self-government framed on the same principle as that enjoyed by London or Lancashire. Once these reforms and a few minor ones have been granted, who can say that Irishmen are not the most favoured section of the British Empire?

Every patriotic Briton will say: Let these reforms and the few minor ones be granted at once. Why should Ireland be denied reforms any more than any other part of the empire? Home Rule may be dead. Some of the Home Rulers may be fools and some of them knaves. Parnell is unclean and not half as wise and able a man as he was supposed to be when he kept his mouth shut. All that and much more may be true, but Ireland should have justice. If, as Mr. Sinclair argues, reforms in certain directions are needed, let them be granted at once. No one has a right to contend that because Ireland shouldn't have Home Rule Ireland shouldn't have justice.

## CHRISTIAN ENDEAVOUR CONVENTION.

IT is now ten years since the first Society of Christian Endeavour was formed. Its birth-place was in Portland, Maine, and its founder, Dr. Clark, is a native of Canada. The tenth annual convention of the movement was held last week in the city where it originated. Among those representing the work in Canada was Dr. Wells, of the American Presbyterian Church, Montreal. During the time the Society has been in existence great advances have been made. Its numerical growth has been phenomenal. In 1881 there were two societies with sixty-eight members, now there are 13,500 societies with a membership of about 800,000. It is not the exclusive outgrowth of any one denomination. Every section of the Evangelical Church is represented in it. At the Portland convention, thirty-two separate denominations sent delegates. In other respects besides numerically the Society has made great advances during the first decade of its history. Its experience and expansion have enabled the leaders of the movement to consolidate it as well as to extend its scope.

A two-fold benefit results from this, one of the