

stituted courts of the Church. The Presbytery has supervision over the work within its bounds and the wise exercise of its authority now and again can scarcely be detrimental to the welfare of the individual congregations while the unity of the Church at large is strengthened.

### A Cholera Lesson.

**A**N incident in connection with the cholera scare in the United States is worth reproducing. In the Episcopal church prayers were ordered for the prevention of the cholera. The orders of the Bishop were disregarded by Dr. McConnell, of Philadelphia, who gave the following explanation of his conduct: "I have been instructed by my ecclesiastical superior to use a prayer to the Almighty God to avert the cholera. But cholera is a dirt disease. It is therefore a preventable disease. To prevent the cholera we have only to remove the dirt. If you leave the dirt you invite the cholera. This city of Philadelphia is full of filth which nobody is trying to remove. To let the filth remain and pray God to keep away the cholera is to trifle with the cholera and with God. While that filth is allowed to remain I refuse to offer up such a prayer." Here Dr. McConnell teaches a lesson not only to the American bishops and the city of Philadelphia, but to Christians everywhere. Sin is a "dirt disease." To a great extent it is preventable. Many of our most trying troubles are "dirt diseases," also preventable. Yet we do not remove the cause. We go on sinning, we invite trouble and then are despondent and disbelieving and disheartened because our prayers are not answered. We cannot eradicate sin—God has provided the means—we cannot escape all trouble, nor would it be for our good, but when we do not avail ourselves of the means, when we live contrary to the divine law of justice and love, we are like the Philadelphians who let the dirt remain. Let us do our duty in single-hearted sincerity with faith in God, and our prayers acceptable to Him, will not be in vain.

### Politician and Pastor.

**P**OLITICIANS are often charged with allowing party interests to divert them from their clear path of duty in dealing with great principles. The question of temperance is a bone of contention between the politician who temporizes and the enthusiast whose eye sees only the goal of his hopes and his efforts. The two elements came into conflict at the recent temperance camp in Toronto when a clergyman scored the government for promising much and doing little to bring about prohibition. The ready M.P. retorted that ministers of the Gospel were not united on the question of prohibition; that it ill-became clergymen to censure politicians, while the Church was divided; that when the Church was a unit on the question, and had aroused public opinion, then politicians would do their duty. This defence has been applauded in many quarters, and considered a reasonable one in many more. Yet a moment's thought will show that it is altogether inadequate. Such a reply does not exonerate the politician from blame, if blame there be in the trimming of sails to catch the popular breeze. Suppose a different case. Suppose the legislature engaged, as it occasionally is, in enacting laws to reduce juvenile crime, and the Churches either are apathetic or disunited as to the wisdom of the proposed laws. The politician charges the clergymen with dereliction of duty and the clergyman replies that the legisla-

ture is divided on the question, that members of parliament and their committees have not aroused a public sentiment sufficiently strong to make it safe for clergymen to speak out. Would not the reply be regarded as absurd. Yet the clergymen are by very many in influential positions, regarded as the servants of the people, as much as the servants of God. They are told what their duty is, and are reminded that they must keep strictly within the sphere measured for them without their consent. It needs a courageous minister of the Gospel to go against the popular will, just as it needs a courageous legislator to do so. And if the clergyman's reply is absurd, why is the politician not equally absurd? Why should it be the special duty of the pastor to leaven public opinion so that it may be safe for the politician to act? Does it not suggest the parasite or the habits of the hermit crab? The highest civil responsibilities are placed upon our legislators. They are supposed to know the distinction between right and wrong. They ought to be men, who, knowing the right, will cleave to it to the last ditch. Having opinions and convictions of what is right it should be their work to educate public opinion to their views; it is certainly not their right to shelter themselves behind others who may not have done their whole duty. The country will be best served when it sets a higher standard of public duty than now obtains, before its public men. That standard cannot be too high. Character, moral sense, sound religious convictions, not shibboleths, should be the test of fitness for all the walks of public life, from the township councillor to the prime minister. The reply of the member of parliament, meant to crush the minister's criticism, only serves to show how politicians have become slaves to circumstances or party needs.

*Rome at Work* SAYS the Catholic Register (August 10th):—"In the autumn the Paulist Fathers are to try a new plan of campaign in their work of making America Catholic. Hitherto they have given missions to Catholics to make them more Catholic, hoping to hold them in the faith by its practice, and to use them as examples of religion wherewith to convert their neighbours. Now they will go direct to Protestants and put before them the claims of the Church and the need of membership in it."

*U.S. Seminar;* PRINCETON Theological Seminary is regarded as the seat of conservative orthodoxy, Union of liberal and progressive theology; and the current questions are often referred to as a strife between the two. In this aspect it is a straw to note the figures of the two as presented in the Summaries, on page 205 of the Assembly Minutes. In 1871 Princeton had 110 students, in 1883 it had 209. Union in 1872 had 120, in 1883 it had 150. In 1873 Princeton graduated 36, 1883, 51; Union, 40 in 1873, and 40 in 1883. Thus Princeton had in the latter year 99 students more than in the former, an increase of 90 per cent; Union 30 more, an increase of 25 per cent. The graduates in Princeton the latter were fifteen more than in the former, in Union, the same. It is further to be noted that the great increase in Princeton has been in the last four years, the years of trial—agitation—in 1890, it had 171, this year 209; whereas Union has fallen off from 164 in 1890 to 150 in 1893. The total students in all the seminaries as reported last May was 917; the graduates this year 239.