

**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

#### EASTERN GENERAL AGENT.

MR. WALTER KEIR—for many years an esteemed elder of our Church—is the duly authorized agent for THE CANADA PRESBYTERIAN. He will collect outstanding accounts, and take names of new subscribers. Friends are invited to give any assistance in their power to Mr. Keir in all the congregations he may visit.



TORONTO, WEDNESDAY, JULY 21, 1886.

NOTHING in our Church work calls for more gratitude than the progress made by the Woman's Foreign Mission Society. This society originated nine years ago in a meeting of ladies held in Knox Church, Toronto, and addressed, we believe, by Professor McLaren and Dr. Topp. The attendance was not large, probably between twenty and thirty; but, though small in numbers, it was large in faith and courage. In the first year eighteen auxiliaries were formed; now we have 191, and next year will see the number considerably over 200. In the first year the societies raised \$1,005; last year they raised \$13,453. Next year we venture to predict the amount will be over \$15,000. In a short time the expenditure for missions in Central India and Formosa may be more than met by the Woman's Society. Some of the auxiliaries, we understand, help other Schemes of the Church besides the foreign missions. There is a fund for foreign mission purposes exclusively, and another which the members divide at the end of the year and send to the Schemes which they think the most needy. We see no possible objection to this method. Flexibility within certain limits is a good thing in such operations. At all events the ladies do the work and find the funds, and have a right to manage their affairs pretty much as they please. The main thing is to help on the work of Christ. How many more congregations are there in which there might be an auxiliary? A good many, and the congregations would be greatly benefited by their presence and work.

A MOVEMENT is being made in Brooklyn to give women seats on the Board of Education. If women can teach school successfully, as many of them certainly can, it would be very difficult to show why they could not with profit to everybody concerned have a voice in the management of schools. It seems to us that a woman who has taught successfully for eight or ten years should know much more about the management of schools than some trustees we read of not a thousand miles from the capital of Ontario. Dr. Storrs, writing on this subject to the Mayor of Brooklyn, says:

I need not remind you, my dear sir, of the superb exhibition which the women of Brooklyn have given for many years of their capacity for the management of great public institutions, many of which have been founded by themselves. Their successes in this direction have been too numerous and too signal to allow any doubts as to their competence for such an official trust as is now proposed. It seems to me only a graceful and just recognition of the vast services which they have thus been rendering to the city that a place should be officially given them on the Board of Education; and while I have no adverse criticism to make on the present management of our public schools, I do not feel the force of the suggestion that "what is well enough should be let alone." It appears to me entirely certain that the presence of some cultivated women in the Board would make all that is good better, by adding to the wisdom of the councils of the Board, to the generous and sustained enthusiasm of its spirit, and to the general vigour and efficiency with which public instruction is carried on in our city.

If a few sensible women were appointed to prepare examination papers in Ontario, probably we would not have such a semi-annual outcry about "catch" questions—questions that evidently were intended to avert the imaginary cleverness of the examiner.

GLADSTONE'S position to-day is a splendid illustration of the fact that character is indestructible. He has been beaten at the polls, but he is still the greatest living man. He may have been mistaken in his Home Rule scheme, but there is no mistake about the purity of his motives or the rectitude of his character. He may come down from the high position he occupies as Prime Minister of the greatest empire of the world, but when he crosses the floor as plain William Ewart Gladstone, he is still the greatest man in Great Britain. Some men whose names are well known resemble a small statue on a high pedestal. It is the pedestal that makes them prominent. Off the pedestal they are unseen. Gladstone does not need the Premiership or any other position to make him prominent. He is head and shoulders over every other man when he stands on the ground. There are several wholesome lessons here for young men. One is that nobody can injure your character but yourself. Ten thousand pens and tongues have been assailing Gladstone for the last few weeks. There is not a stain on his escutcheon. He comes out of the fight beaten but clean. He could have ruined himself by one act. One "dirty job" would have hurled him from his splendid position. His opponents could not injure him, but by one wrong act he might have ruined himself. Another important lesson is that a distinction should always be made between a man who is great on his merits and one who seems great and poses as a great man simply because circumstances may have put him on a pedestal fairly high. Hundreds of men seem prominent to their neighbours, and pose as very important personages simply because their position puts their names in the daily newspapers. The pedestal may be high and the statue very small. Intelligent people should know what makes the height—the statue or the pedestal.

FOR the past week or ten days the daily papers have teemed with letters expressing indignation at some of the examination papers set for the teachers and the pupils who desire entrance to our High Schools. Making all due allowance for the fact that some who fail are always sure to blame the paper or the examiner, we are forced to the conclusion that there is some cause for complaint. We have before us the questions in English History that the boys and girls desiring to enter the High Schools were expected to answer. They are good questions—very good questions indeed. That is to say, they would be very good questions if Dr. Daniel Wilson and Professor Goldwin Smith were the persons examined. Dr. Wilson could, no doubt, answer them fully if given a reasonable amount of time. Professor Smith could certainly clear the paper though, with his intimate knowledge of the subject, he would certainly need more time to give a full answer to some of the questions than the examiner gave the boys and girls to answer the whole of them. The only question to be considered is whether a paper admirably adapted to bring out the historical knowledge of such men as the eminent President of University College and the Professor of History at Cornell is suitable for boys and girls graduating in our public schools. Fancy a girl of ten or twelve wrestling with this question.

Explain and illustrate the meanings of any four of the following:—Party Government, Responsible Government, Government by the People, The Rule of the Whig Nobles, Federal Union, The Social Condition of the People, The Habeas Corpus Act.

Mr. Blake could no doubt handle that question successfully. So could Sir Richard Cartwright, or Mr. Mills, or Sir John—if they had time. But we submit that a paper well adapted to their capacity is scarcely suitable for public school pupils. Whose business is it to put an end to this semi-annual nonsense?

NOW is the time for good citizens of all political parties to make their influence felt in putting men of good character and clean record in the field as candidates for the House of Commons. Nominations are being made, or are being quietly arranged for, in many constituencies. Little or nothing can be done in the way of bringing out good men when the elections are brought on. The party candidates are then in the field, party lines are drawn, party feelings aroused, and there is little time or opportunity to scrutinize closely the character and record of candidates. The good men of all parties should make a peremptory demand of the party managers, Give us

a clean candidate. There is little use in this country, we fear, in asking electors to vote for good men irrespective of party considerations. Party feeling runs high, and when the election comes on, the majority of the electors will vote on party lines. It is quite possible, however, to find good men within the lines of all parties. Party government may or may not be a necessity, but it is an absolute necessity that this country should be governed by honest, patriotic men. If the rank and file of both parties should tell the caucus—for we suppose it must be admitted that the caucus does generally make the nominations—that none but men of good character and clean record would be supported, then good men as a rule would be put in the field. Let the watchword of every Tory be, "A Tory, but a good man," and of every Liberal be, "A Liberal, but a good man," and the caucus will soon nominate none but good men. The people have the matter in their own hands. If they refuse to support political scalawags, the party will immediately refuse to put scalawags in the field. And, by the way, we think that the character and record of a man are of more importance than any pledges he may make when before the electors. Pledges are easily made, and quite often the man who makes them most readily will break them most readily. Once more we say to every reader, Use your voice and influence in securing the services of men of clean record and pure character.

#### A GREAT AND GOOD MAN GONE.

It is generally supposed that a man of unique spiritual power and influence cannot remain for a lifetime in a comparatively limited and humble sphere. It is further supposed that individual ambition and the attractions of a metropolitan pulpit are irresistible, and that all pastors of prominent city charges are necessarily the best possible men to be found, and that all not in city charges are in general very excellent men, but—Well it does sometimes happen that a man of rare gifts and singular sincerity of character may be found doing a noble life-work far from the centres of intellectual and commercial activity. The recent death of the Rev. W. B. Robertson, D.D., of Irvine, has called general attention to one who was content to spend a ministry of about forty years in a quiet little seaport in the West of Scotland.

Dr. Robertson was born near the famous battlefield of Bannockburn. From his earlier years he was studious and devout. He was reared in a happy home from which other brothers entered the sacred ministry, the late Dr. Robertson of Newington, noted as a successful preacher to the young, was one of them. After graduating at Edinburgh University, William Robertson went to continue his studies in Germany, a course not so common in those days as it has since become. On returning to his native land, he was called to the pastorate of the then Secession Church in Irvine, where he was ordained in 1843. Though repeated calls to Edinburgh and Glasgow were addressed to him, he respectfully declined them all, and continued his relation with his Irvine flock till death a few weeks ago dissolved the tie. In 1870 he was prostrated by what for a time appeared a fatal illness, but from which he recovered, though from that time he was never able for full ministerial work. A colleague was appointed and he was left at full liberty.

Modest and retiring, his services and worth were generally recognized. His fame as a preacher was fully on a level with that of Norman Macleod, Thomas Guthrie, and John Cairns. From all these he was distinct, having his own proper gift. His was the possession of an eminently cultivated and sanctified imagination, fully consecrated to the illustration of the great truths of the Gospel. That supreme faculty was never permitted to run riot in wild extravagances. He had no pet theories, no fanciful crotchets, but was faithful to the essential doctrines of Evangelical Christianity, which he lovingly presented with a force and fervour peculiarly his own. Vast congregations listened with rapt attention to his glowing utterances. Sometimes his discourses transcended the limits set by modern exaction, but signs of weariness and impatience were never visible in his hearers. The regret was when he ended his sermon. He preached with great unction, he himself being mastered by his theme. His fine and expressive countenance, his large, dark, lustrous eyes, were aglow with spiritual beauty, and his devout soul was aflame with the truth which he loved to proclaim.