

aspect is not always prominent. Then what degree of prominence is required before the Church take cognizance of it? It will always be found when clergy and politicians begin to coquet with each other; the former are looking for material gain and the latter for support. With bargaining and political scheming will come in the spirit of gain among our clergy, and the dear old parson of a former day whose "pity gave ere charity began" will not be recognized among the babbling brood of political clerics.

Unskillful he to fawn, or seek for power
By doctrines fashioned to the varying hour:
Far other aims his heart had learn'd to prize,
More bent to raise the wretched than to rise.

A certain member of the clergy who admit the incongruity of claiming exemption from taxation, military duty, etc., while demanding the right of exercising active political influence, are now willing to accept these duties, that they may exercise political influence. But, in doing so, their action is an admission not only that they have been dishonest in claiming and accepting exemption from these duties during the past, but that these exemptions placed them among the non-political classes. It is very evident that they only forego these privileges now to carry out a political hobby. In doing so they invite criticism and cause disputation. They thus ignore the injunction of St. Paul: "Do all things without murmurings and disputings; that ye may be blameless and harmless, children of God, without blemish in the midst of a crooked and perverse generation, among whom ye are seen as lights in the world, holding forth the Word of Life." Yet these men who wish to show the wisdom of this world outside their pulpits, rush into their pulpits and shout: "Where is the wise? Where is the scribe? Where is the disputer of this world? Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of the world?" and thus destroy their pretensions as politicians by performing their duties as clergymen. Pretty imitators these, of the gentle Christ and liberty-loving Paul! The spirit of the teaching of Christ and His Apostles is love and liberty, and not political trickery and coercion. Any denial of this is a denial of the power of Christ. Love and liberty are written on every page of the story: "Let each man be fully assured in his own mind;" "Love worketh no ill to his neighbour; love therefore is the fulfilment of the law." But the political cleric would coerce a large number of the community by a law that the Scriptures say we should not submit to, namely: "Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink." They thereby assert that law is the fulfilment of love, not love the fulfilment of the law.

The command: "Let no man judge you in meat or in drink," is as strong and as binding as the injunction, "Thou shalt not steal." The former came through St. Paul, the latter through Moses. Why, then, do the so-called "temperance" people ignore St. Paul? The Presbyterian clergy should pause before they enter the political arena. They have the warnings of the early Reformers, the policy of their own Church as laid down in the Westminster Confession, and the history of the struggles of the Church, and they have also the teaching of the Bible before them. They can also see its result in the Methodist Church. There the church is turned into a political committee-room for the furtherance of absolute prohibition, for that is the ultimate aim.

Only the other day, Rev. Dr. Eddy delivered a political speech, the report of which took up a page of the *Globe*. This speech, based on a falsehood, was from beginning to end full of statistics, and was delivered on Sunday, 24th May. They carry on their political campaign by delivering speeches in churches, public halls and parks on the Sabbath. They quote commercial and criminal statistics and, after their fashion, touch on the physiological, economic and Scriptural aspects of the question. I assert that such disputations are not only creating unbelievers among their own following, but are driving and have driven men from the Church, and that they must create in the minds of a great number feelings ill-suited to promote the worship of the true God. I further assert that those who differ with these extremists are, by reason of their action, justified in holding committees and addressing public meetings in defence of their property, their vocations and convictions. And I assert that, according to the teaching and history of the Presbyterian Church, this is a shameful and blasphemous desecration of the Sabbath. St. Paul well knew that the clergy would lose their influence for good if

they entered the political field. Yet we might have expected the scheming sentimentalists of the General Assembly to have masked themselves for the moment and to have received the remarks of such men as Principal Grant and Mr. Macdonnell without hisses and laughter. Let them show their authority for such conduct from the Bible or Westminster Confession.

Let me notice here the extravagant claim of the Methodists that the American negro owes his freedom to the influence of the Church. This claim is made to show that the Church should enter the political field. It is true many of the clergy from all the Churches worked for abolition just as we find to-day evangelical churchmen opposing prohibition as contrary to the teaching of Christ. Nevertheless, the clergy, as a body, instead of opposing slavery supported it and their congeners of to-day are the prohibitionists who wish to enslave the conscience, which is worse than enslaving the body. I might write of the cowardly and illiberal clerics whose oratory and diplomacy became a powerful barrier to freedom for the slave and of the unscrupulous and diabolical zeal of these obsequious men who were as untruthful and diligent as they were scheming and dexterous. From the very lampoons and pasquinades which they circulated arose the grand inspiration against oppression. Detestation evinced itself against them in withering satire and extravagant caricature. Every kind of literary missile was hurled against them by a people who were at heart true. It was the generous and humane instinct of the American people that emancipated the negro. It was the powerful influence and sophistry of a demoralized Church acting in concert with the infidelity, superstition and immorality of the ignorant that retarded it. They appealed to the prejudices of a people who clung with ignorant zeal to ancient customs and usages. The Church was corrupt, the Bible was ignored, and new tenets introduced contrary to Scripture solely for pecuniary advantage. They flew to the writings of men who were liable to err, as divines always are, and cast aside the Bible. But a few great men arose with the valorous resolve of giants. These became the champions of freedom. Are not their names "enrolled in the Capitol"? Let me quote in support of these assertions a few passages from a speech by Hon. George Brown, delivered at an anti-slavery demonstration in Toronto in 1852. "But the great guilt of slavery lies at the door of American Churches. Truly did Albert Barnes say: 'There is no power out of the Church that could sustain slavery one hour if it were not sustained in it.' But nearly all the churches of the Union are steeped in its iniquities; ministers, office-bearers and people are alike its upholders. In every shape you can find it, from the smooth tongued parson who preaches that slavery 'is not a sin *per se*,' down to the bold denunciator of the 'fanatic abolitionist,' with stipend paid him from the toil of the poor slave. How can the state of the American Church be better described than by the fact that Dr. Spring, an eminent light of the Presbyterian Church, and minister of a large congregation in New York, publicly made this declaration: 'If by one prayer I could free every slave in the world, I could not offer it.' Labourers arguments are constantly coming from evangelical Northern pulpits palliating the system—nice criticisms on God's law in regard to it; but for my part I cannot listen to such arguments; I sweep aside all such theological humbug and find a solution of the whole question in the grand Christian rule: 'Do unto others as you would be done unto.'" The Methodist Church ministers and members held 219,563 slaves; Presbyterians, 77,000; Baptists, 125,000; Campbellites, 101,000; Episcopalians, 88,000; other denominations, 50,000; total slaves held by professing Christians, 660,563. In the churches it was a common thing to have a black-pew into which it was considered a degradation for a white man to enter. At the Sacrament table the Christian negro sat apart from the white man who was, of course, filled with brotherly love. And yet a number of clergymen in favour of prohibition, either ignorant themselves or wilfully falsifying the records of the struggle, endeavour to shed a gleam of light over their present nefarious schemes by claiming for the Church the glory which surrounds the emancipation of the negro. If the story of every misery that has been caused by drink could be inscribed on the firmament and the history of atrocities and persecutions done in the name of Christ placed beside it, the former would appear as a bright spot in the heavens.

WILLIAM T. TASSIE

(To be continued.)

WHY FATHER CHINQUY WAS RE-BAPTIZED.

[By request, the following communication which appeared in THE CANADA PRESBYTERIAN several years ago, is now republished.]

MR. EDITOR.—So many Christian friends have written to me to know my reasons for my baptism, that it is absolutely impossible for me to give an answer to every one. As the greatest part of them are probably among your readers, would you be kind enough to allow me to answer them through your Christian and valuable paper.

When I left the Church of Rome I was kindly advised by the Presbytery of Chicago to be re-baptized. But it seemed to me then, as it seemed to Luther, Calvin, Knox, and many others, that my baptism in the Church of Rome was validly conferred. And, after having heard my reasons, the Presbytery unanimously resolved to let me go free on that subject.

Since that time many venerable brothers in Europe, as well as on this Continent, have pressed me to be re-baptized; and, though they did not entirely decide me to do it, I confess that they much diminished my confidence in the baptism of Rome. I have had many hours of great anxiety on that subject for more than three years. And the dear Saviour knows that I have shed many tears at His feet, when imploring Him to give me more of His saving light on that important matter.

When I preached in Antigonish several years ago, the Romanists determined to kill me; and I was most cruelly stoned by several hundred of them. Bruised and wounded, and staggering, I expected at every moment to fall down and die by the side of my martyred friend, the Rev. Mr. Goodfellow, who was himself terribly cut on the head, and profusely bleeding, when I heard in my conscience, as a voice telling me, "You die! and you are not yet baptized!"

That thought distressed me much in such a solemn hour. I escaped from my murderers in a most providential way. I promised to God to study the question of my baptism more seriously, with His help, and He knows that I have done it. But though it seemed to me more and more every day that the reasons for being re-baptized were stronger than I thought at first, the reasons for considering my baptism valid, in the Church of Rome, were remaining the strongest in my mind.

On the 12th of August, having heard that many citizens around St. Anne were to meet to meditate the word of God, pray, and praise Him, it came to my mind that it would do me good to pass a few hours with them, at the feet of the dear Saviour, to look with more attention than ever to His bleeding wounds, and to all that He had done and suffered for me; that by His grace I might love Him more and more.

I had never seen a camp meeting before, though I had heard much said against, as well as in favour of, these gatherings. But God knows I went there only with the desire of drinking some drops of those precious waters of life, which our Saviour never refuses to the thirsty soul who goes to Him. When I went to that meeting the question of my baptism was absolutely out of my mind. I heard several very good sermons from various Protestant ministers; and Mrs. Vancott gave us some very touching exhortations. But not a word was said that I remember about baptism, except that at three p.m. we were invited to pray for those who were to be baptized at four p.m.

There were between 2,000 and 3,000 people on that most beautiful spot; they all knelt and prayed! It was a most solemn thing indeed to see that multitude prostrated at the feet of the throne of grace, and to hear their ardent prayers, their sobs; to see the tears of those penitent and repenting sinners crying "for mercy!"

There was no confusion, as I had expected; there were no ridiculous contortions, as I was prepared to see. But there was a most sublime and soul-stirring harmony as I had never seen in the humble and earnest supplications of the multitudes. The noise was grand and sublime, as the noise of the deep waters when the winds from heaven blow upon them. All was grand there, as the works of our God are grand and sublime everywhere.

In the midst of that multitude I was praying with all my heart for those who were to be baptized, when a thought flashed through my brain and chilled my blood in my veins: "You are not baptized, and you pray for