

THE CANADA PRESBYTERIAN,

— PUBLISHED BY THE —

Presbyterian Printing and Publishing Company

(C. BLACKETT ROBINSON),

AT 5 JORDAN STREET, - TORONTO.

TERMS: \$2 per annum, in advance

ADVERTISING TERMS:—Under 3 months, 10 cents per line per insertion; 3 months, \$1 per line; 6 months, 1.50 per line; 1 year \$2.50. No advertisements charged at less than five lines. None other than unobjectionable advertisements taken

SABBATH SCHOOL PAPERS.

THE SABBATH SCHOOL PRESBYTERIAN, GOLDEN HOURS and EARLY DAYS will be continued for 1885, greatly improved and at reduced prices. Illustrations of a very high character have been secured in England; the size of the type will be reduced in the case of the SABBATH SCHOOL PRESBYTERIAN; and no efforts will be spared to make all the papers more attractive and useful than ever before. The price of each has been reduced to \$10.00 per 100 copies for one year; \$5.00 for 50 copies; and \$4.00 for 40 copies. Special rates for smaller quantities. EARLY DAYS is published twice a month, and is a favourite paper for Infant Classes; the other two are monthly, and suited to more advanced scholars. In the SABBATH SCHOOL PRESBYTERIAN will be found, from time to time, interesting missionary matter from the Home and Foreign Fields. Send for specimen copies. Address THE PRESBYTERIAN PRINTING AND PUBLISHING CO., 5 JORDAN STREET, TORONTO.



TORONTO, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 14, 1885.

WE club THE CANADA PRESBYTERIAN and *Rural Canadian* at \$2 per annum. Already a large number of our readers interested in agricultural affairs have signified their desire to have the *Rural Canadian* along with THE PRESBYTERIAN; and we are still willing to enter the names of thousands of subscribers for both papers. This low clubbing offer places an excellent family paper and a first-class farm journal within the reach of every one at a merely nominal price. Please mention this offer to your neighbours.

IN a somewhat scathing article on the manner in which calls are given to ministers the *Globe* says: The whole thing is generally arranged by cliques and wire-pullers, and the great mass of the people have no more to do with the affair than have those who get their pastors by the good-will of a bishop, the arrangements of a "stationing committee," or the presentation of a lay patron. Sadly true in many cases but just a trifle too sweeping so far as the Presbyterian Church is concerned. Ministers are occasionally, even now, called by the great mass of the people. It must be confessed, however, that too many calls are arranged for by "cliques and wire-pullers," and the means used by these people are often very similar to the means used at ward elections. To such an extent does wire-pulling and caucussing prevail that it would be well to drop the old phrases used at induction services about "getting a minister from the Lord." Such a phrase is mere cant, disgusting cant, when it is well-known that two or three men in the congregation, co-operating with two or three outside, plotted and wire-pulled until they worried or wearied the people into calling their man. It won't make the methods of the ward politician any better to put a thin veil of hypocrisy over them.

THE pastor of a Baptist Church in one of our Ontario villages writes a gloomy letter to the *Canadian Baptist* and gives the following as one of a number of reasons why his congregation dwindles: The indiscreet zeal of some of our ministers has raised barriers between us and the other denominations, so that it is a rare thing for a person of another denomination to be seen at our meetings. This is not by any means the only case in which "indiscreet zeal" has had the same effect. Such zeal may occasionally secure a convert or two for immersion purposes, but it hinders in the end rather than helps. The great majority of the Christian people of any community like to see Christian manliness and honourable dealing. They despise the methods too often adopted by proselytizing Baptist ministers, and those who assist them in such work. Even on the low ground of policy proselytizing does not pay. Roman Catholics may gain by such arts but a Protestant denomination never can in the end. A congregation that does not possess the respect of the right thinking people of the community in which

it is situated dwindles sooner or later. There is nothing that pays in the end for a man or a congregation like fair, honourable dealing. A minister that willingly puts barriers between his congregation and the other congregations around him does not know his business.

MR. FENTON, County Crown Attorney, deserves the thanks of every decent man in Toronto for putting an end to the slugging matches that have recently disgraced the city. And this leads us to say something that has been on our conscience to say a good many times during the past year or two. Than Mr. Fred. Fenton there is no abler or more conscientious or more plucky official in the Province. He attacks every kind of lawlessness and rowdiness with an amount of pluck and follows it with an amount of perseverance that is really refreshing. If his efforts were seconded by all the officials connected with the administration of justice in the city, as they should be, Toronto would be the most law-abiding community in the Dominion. There are officials and officials. It is quite possible for an official to secretly encourage various kinds of lawlessness and yet do nothing that can be made apparent on investigation. Mr. Fenton is one of those who aim at keeping the spirit of the law as well as the letter. He is a terror to the sluggers, gamblers, roughs, and general scoundrels of the community. While the law officers of other cities seem to wink at the brutal exhibitions of the sluggers it gives good citizens here no small amount of pleasure to see our indefatigable Crown Attorney take the ruffians by the throat. If these brutal exhibitions are not abolished in Toronto the fault will not be Mr. Fenton's.

THERE was a time in this country when it was unsafe for a minister or session to introduce any kind of change if the thing desired was in use in any other denomination. Hold continuous services and the cry was at once raised by a certain class of people, "You are imitating the Methodists." Change the form of service a little and somebody was sure to shout, "You are becoming like the Episcopalians." If nothing else could be said the old cry, "That is an innovation," was always pressed into the service. The great majority of our people are fast becoming of the opinion that the true policy is to examine everything on its merits. Are we never to adopt a good thing simply, because some other denomination may have used it before us? That would be the very essence of stupidity. The real and only question about any proposed change should be, "Is it a good thing for us?" Just here we might learn a most important practical lesson from our Methodist neighbours. Anybody that ever attended a Methodist conference knows that the one question he hears about every proposal is, "Will it suit our work." And the one question about every man is, "Can he do our work?" Many congregational meetings are being held at this season of the year. The real question about any proposal should be, "Is it a good thing,—and a good thing for us?" Never mind where it comes from. "Is it a good thing for our congregations?" That is the real question.

IT is painfully evident that the base practice of buying and selling votes has not been stamped out. The present law may have lessened the iniquity, but it has not put an end to it. It has almost passed into a proverb that any election can be set aside. This is not true because a good many elections have stood the ordeal, but we fear it is too true that any election in at least one county can be voided. We are strongly of the opinion that the present law has this serious defect—it punishes the wrong party. Why should the whole or the principal part of the punishment come upon the member. He may be a strictly honourable man, he may have tried his best to conduct the election purely, he may have known nothing of the violations of the law for months after they took place, but yet he is put out of his seat and mulcted with heavy costs. Why not punish the man who sells his vote? A creature that sells his franchise for a dollar or a glass of whiskey, is no more fit to have a voice in the government of the country than he is fit to be a Foreign Missionary. He is unworthy of the privileges of a free man. There are as good citizens as he in the penitentiary. If all the so-called electors who might have been caught selling their votes since the new law came into operation had been disfranchised,

the electorate would be fairly pure by this time. We believe the law does provide for the punishment of the buyer. Why in the name of common sense, should the seller escape? Then it might be a good plan to disfranchise a whole constituency where bribery has become general. By all means strike every saleable voter off the list. He is not fit for citizenship.

ECCENTRIC MISSIONARY AGENCIES.

THE movements of the Salvation Army in various parts of Canada naturally suggest some reflections on this subject. All Christian workers are more or less eccentric. The best of them have a strongly marked individuality which at once arrests attention. This is true of Spurgeon, Moody, Talmage and thousands of men of less note, and it would betray the utmost ignorance, wantonness and folly to attempt to destroy this originality, this naturalness. The monotonous sameness and professorial mannerism cultivated by some ministers greatly aggravate their weakness. If they could rid themselves of conventional tones and methods and of all efforts to be what they are not and persist in being themselves—not rude or vulgar, no, but cultivated and elevated in thought and speech and withal natural, it is surprising how much it would add to their power for good. But this in passing. What of eccentric missionary agents? Are they to be tolerated and encouraged, and what limits should be set to their movements? Some answer, suppress them at once. Well, this opinion has at least the merit of definiteness; and if one were a lover of Romanism or even an admirer of Anglican Episcopacy in its days of intolerance he could easily support this view from the pages of ecclesiastical history. He might easily show that Calvin and all the leading Reformers of the sixteenth century believed in keeping heretics right by sharp civil penalties as well as by clear doctrinal statements. The notion of using the sword for this purpose they carried with them out of Rome. But these days are happily gone, and we have learned a good many things since. It is well for us in this matter of toleration to go back to the teachings of Christ and His apostles. The decision of the Master in a memorable case is truly instructive. When the loving John and his companions reported that they had interdicted one whom they saw casting out devils, but who did not belong to the Apostolic college, Jesus said: "Forbid him not." When Paul found the disorderly Corinthian Church fairly suffering from a plethora of gifts, men and women praying and prophesying and speaking in unknown tongues and creating the utmost confusion, his method of dealing with them was not by total suppression of their activity. No. He rather sought to regulate and utilize these spiritual forces, and enjoined that all things must be done decently and in order and with a view to edification. Here we have a principle which is applicable to Salvationists and others. It will manifestly not do to say that all must be silenced whose methods are widely different from our own or may seem wholly erratic. It is well known to philosophers, doctors and jurists that it is a most risky thing to pronounce any one insane. Witness the Lytton case in Montreal, and probably many similar ones exist. According to a certain part of John Locke's philosophy we are all more or less insane. Sanity and insanity are only matters of degree! And as to methods of religious work it is obviously unsafe to be too definite and dogmatic. Methods cannot be the same with all classes in all parts of the world and in all ages. We know that they have changed and are likely to do so in future. And as Presbyterians we should remember the fact that we solemnly declare in our Confession of Faith that we believe in the Holy Catholic Church, and our definition of the Church is sufficiently broad and generous to include branches whose forms of Christian activity cannot be brought within the limits of decent sobriety observed among us. Yet we do not on this account excommunicate them from the fold of Christ and doom them to "outer darkness." We grant that it is quite another thing—and something we are very far from being prepared to do—to homologate all their doings and to incorporate them in our creed and church life. But we may, and we do, tolerate much respecting which we cannot go this length. Besides, to attempt the suppression of what we cannot fully approve often intensifies the evil. Some, for example, openly declare that the Salvation Army should be put down. They allege that this disorderly body of men