

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

SPECIAL NOTICE.

Correspondents are particularly requested to be careful in addressing all correspondence to
THE PRESBYTERIAN PRINTING AND PUBLISHING CO.,
C. BLACKETT ROBINSON,
5 Jordan Street, Toronto.



TORONTO, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 11, 1885.

WE notice that some of the Presbyteries are nominating a Moderator for the next Assembly. This is, no doubt, intended as a practical protest against the College of Moderators. Other Presbyteries will doubtless do the same thing before the meeting of the Assembly. A straight issue would be raised on the question if the Presbyteries would nominate a man of equal ability and standing and set him against Dr. McKnight, the nominee of the College. Such a course, however, would scarcely be practicable this year, as Dr. McKnight is highly qualified to fill the chair, and there is a pretty general feeling that he should be the next Moderator. So far he has been nominated by all the Presbyteries that have moved in the matter. Perhaps some church lawyer can draw up an amendment by which Dr. McKnight, the nominee of certain Presbyteries, will be pitted against Principal McKnight, the nominee of the College of Moderators. That would test the question and elect Dr. McKnight.

MANY a good thing has been said and written about preaching in the last fifty years, but we know of nothing better in the literature of Homiletics than the following, given by the late Bishop of Cork to a class of divinity students in Dublin.—“There are three things to aim at in public speaking. First to get into your subject, then to get your subject into yourself, and lastly to get your subject into your hearers.” If a preacher does these three things, the manner of his doing them is of little consequence. If he gets into his subject, the way by which he gets in is his own affair. If he gets his subject thoroughly into himself and is so saturated with it that he *must* discuss it, what difference does it make to anybody how he got it into him? If he gets the subject into his hearers, then the grand result has been attained, and the manner of attaining it is quite a secondary consideration. Whether he reads it, or rubs it in by words selected at the moment, or by words written the week before, or in any other way, is not a matter of the slightest consequence. The main thing is to get the subject into the minds of the hearers so as to influence their hearts and lives. The day may yet come when no sensible man with ask how a preacher prepared his ammunition, or how he fired, with or without a rest, or how loud his report was or how long—but whether he struck anybody or anything.

OUR neighbours across the lines have no dead-line of fifty in politics. With two exceptions, all the members of Cleveland's Administration are over fifty years of age, and two of them are about sixty. Our neighbours are said to be very fond of young preachers, but they take good care that none but men of experience are allowed to take charge of their national affairs. It is not a little strange that people there and elsewhere, who always employ the most experienced lawyer to manage their business, and the most experienced doctor to treat their bodies, should prefer an inexperienced young man to take charge of their spiritual interests. One reason, no doubt, is that, in the case of a young man, there is always room for the imagination to work up a brilliant future. The imagi-

nation is a very lively faculty, and there is no difficulty in imagining that a promising young man may become a Spurgeon or a Guthrie in a few years. You see an elderly man at his best, and in his case there is no room for the imagination to work. The same reason holds good in regard to preachers who reside a few thousand miles away, especially if they reside in a large city. It is impossible for minds of a certain type to believe that the minister who preaches in the next town or on the next concession can be as good as somebody who preaches in a large city a thousand miles away. There is room for the imagination to work on the distant brother, and quite often it works vigorously enough.

ALWAYS go from home to find out what your neighbours are doing. The last issue of the *Homiletic Monthly* has the following from a correspondent:

Churches paying \$3,000 as a regular salary have been known to give only \$12 a Sunday to their supplies. One such church, in Toronto, Canada, paying the salary just referred to, was in the habit, for years, of allowing only \$12 a Sunday for supply, and it wanted a very good one at that price. But a ministerial member, who related that fact to me, said that he was ashamed of his church on account of such parsimony, and begged the pulpit committee to increase the amount; and after awhile it was raised to the generous fee of \$15!

We know of no church in Toronto that paid for supply “for years” at the rate of \$600 per year, while offering five times that amount as regular stipend; but if any church in Toronto or elsewhere did so, it must have been trying to make money out of a vacancy. It goes without saying that a vacant congregation cannot usually raise as much per Sabbath as one that has an efficient pastor, but the difference should not be so great as it often is between the amount paid for supply and the amount paid as stipend. A congregation injures its own standing very materially by dealing too closely with those who supply its pulpit during a vacancy. A really efficient man is not likely to take a call to a congregation that has put him in debt for preaching to it. The large number who do not get the call have their friends, and are very likely to tell them if the allowance has been short. That kind of economy does not pay in the end.

SOME weeks ago we remarked that the present law against bribery at elections scarcely ever fails to punish the wrong party. The unseated member may be one of the best men in the country; he may have honestly tried to conduct the election purely; he may have warned his friends against violations of the law and may not have known that the law was violated until weeks or months after his election, and yet the law punishes him by taking his seat from him and saddling him with costs that in many cases are utterly ruinous. We are glad to notice that one of the judges expressed the same views at a recent trial, from a report of which we clip the following:

Mr. Justice Rose said if candidates who honestly conduct themselves in elections were to be ruined by election costs, honest men of substance would never run. His idea was that a petitioner was always protected in the matter of cost, and a respondent was left to pay everything. A candidate would find plenty of friends to propose, but very few to assist him even if a case ruined him.

We want to see the best men of both parties in Parliament. There never was a time when the country needed the services of able, honest, patriotic, Christian men more than at present. How can such men be expected to give their time and labour to the country if they are practically at the mercy of any venal scamp who is willing to sell his vote for a dollar. Surely, public life in Canada has terrors enough already without laying down the principle that the innocent must suffer for the guilty. That which is wrong in principle can never do much good in practice. Bribery should be stamped out; but it never can be stamped out by making the innocent suffer for the guilty. Punish the men who sell and who buy votes by all means. The sum total of public morality would be increased by driving them out of the country.

DIRECT GIVING FOR MISSIONS.

WHEN the Rev. William Taylor was appointed Missionary Bishop to Africa by the Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States, it was expected by some that a new departure in sustaining missions was about to take place. The new Missionary Bishop is possessed of strongly marked individuality. He says striking things that under certain circumstances might

be fairly termed original. His friends were not astonished when he announced that his mission to Africa was not to cost the parent Church in America anything. In the light of events this may be described as the economic use of language. It is not necessary to impute insincerity of motive. He is zealous and devoted, and before leaving for his field his imagination was buoyed by the brightest prospects. He declined a salary from the Missionary Committee, and was satisfied that he and his numerous assistants would be able to maintain themselves in their new fields of labour.

Now that the Congo affair has been definitely settled, and the International Society is in possession, matters might be expected to meet the hopes of the new Bishop. Whether reflecting on matters during his long journey to his mission field, or having in some other way received additional light, it is certain that he has changed his mind to some extent. Dr. Taylor has applied to the Book Committee of his Church for a regular salary. They do not feel at liberty to entertain the proposal, since it is according to them—the duty of the Missionary Committee to provide his support. The difficulty will no doubt be satisfactorily adjusted, and the good bishop will be relieved of anxiety as to ways and means.

Now the Bishop is a somewhat voluminous author. In making the announcement that his mission was to be self-supporting, he appealed to friends willing to help him in his work, and stated that they could best do so by investing in his books. This was an indirect way of obtaining money, chiefly from Methodists, for the maintenance of his mission. In this we do not see anything necessarily wrong. If he, or any labourer in the Gospel field, resolves to consecrate whatever resources he possesses he is at perfect liberty to do so and he will receive credit for disinterestedness and generosity. At the same time, though followed by many good men, the habit is open to criticism when they publicly announce that they decline ordinary and regular means of support while, availing themselves of certain recognized channels to intimate that gifts and offerings, royalties on publications, and the like, will not be refused.

Plain honest directness in the matter of pecuniary support for the means of grace, whether at home or abroad, is always the best. To depart from what is straightforward and aboveboard is injurious to individuals and the cause they represent. Unreflecting good people attribute to them a sublimity of faith and disinterestedness to which they are not fairly entitled, and unreflecting people who are not so good mutter considerably about scheming calculations, cunning, etc., which is also an injustice.

The great cause of missions is not helped forward by enthusiastic but impractical sentiments and theories, however attractive and alluring they may appear. Declarations like those made by Bishop Taylor will readily be taken advantage of by people whose sense of duty as to Christian giving is only in a rudimentary stage of development, and others who lay stress on their possession of common sense take shelter behind the excuse, for the most part unfounded, that the Church does not appoint practical men to the high places of the mission field. It is, however, being more fully recognized that the faithful missionaries of the cross in heathen lands are deserving of a generous support in their important and self-denying work. It is generally believed that the Church should make adequate and direct provision for their maintenance, and that earnest, steady and systematic contribution of means is the best method yet devised for the accomplishment of this end. Other unobjectionable methods may be discovered, but that of Bishop Taylor, not having justified his own expectations even, can hardly be regarded as satisfactory.

INSANE ASYLUMS OF ONTARIO.

Since the great dramatist made Macbeth ask the Physician, “Who can minister to a mind diseased?” the treatment of the insane has made wonderful advances. The heartless cruelty with which persons of unsound mind were treated not so very long ago would not now be tolerated. Occasionally we hear of cases where gross cruelties and grievous wrongs are inflicted on defenceless victims, and instances do occur in which persons whose presence is undesirable are incarcerated in asylums in the United States. A short time since a case of this kind was brought to light in the Province