

The Presbyterian Review.

NOTICES.

(a) Terms.—In advance, \$2.00; after 3 months, \$3.25; after 6 months, \$4.50; after 9 months, \$5.75; after 12 months, \$7.00. (b) The number against the name on the tab upon the paper shows to what time the subscription is paid, and serves all the purposes of a receipt. Thus, "A. Jones, 9," means that A. Jones has paid for number 9. Review. At least two weeks are required after the receipt of money by us before the number on the tab can be changed. (c) When the address of a paper is changed, both the old and the new, including Post-office, County, and Province, should be given. (d) Subscribers wishing to introduce The Review to their friends can have specimen copies sent free from this office to any address. (e) Yearly subscriptions received at any time, and will date one year from time of subscribing. (f) To introduce the paper we will send it on trial to new subscribers three months for no cost. (g) No notice will be taken of anonymous communications. What ever is intended for insertion must be accompanied by the name and address of the writer, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee of good faith. (h) We do not hold ourselves responsible for the views or opinions expressed by our correspondents. (i) Persons desiring a return of their manuscripts, if not accepted, should send an addressed envelope with stamp.

ADVERTISING RATES.—Per line per year, \$2.00; 6 months, \$1.25; 3 months, 75 cents; 1 month, 50 cents; under 1 month, 25 cents. Special rates for contracts on application.

Subscribers failing to receive the "Review" promptly, will confer a favour by immediately notifying the Manager.

THURSDAY, JULY 29TH, 1886.

PUBLIC NOTICE.

In order to meet the requirements of their rapidly growing business, the Presbyterian News Co. Toronto, have changed their offices from 31 York Chambers, Toronto St. to 26 and 28 FRONT STREET WEST.

In consequence of this change it is particularly requested that in future all communications relating to the business of the Presbyterian News Co. and the "Presbyterian Review," be addressed to "Presbyterian News Co. Toronto."

All communications for the Editorial, Literary News and Miscellaneous columns of this journal should be addressed to the Editor of the "Presbyterian Review."

GEO. H. ROBINSON, Manager.

SHALL WE PATRONIZE THE CONVENT?

AS the season has returned when parents and guardians arrange their plans for continuing the education of their young people, the time seems opportune for drawing attention to the great and, we fear, growing evil in Protestant communities of Church members sending their daughters to Roman Catholic convents and institutions to be educated. This is even on mere intellectual grounds, so mistaken a proceeding that we might well doubt the intelligence of those parents who adopt it, but on religious and denominational grounds, it is so utterly foolish and distasteful, and so fraught with danger to the spiritual well-being of the young people of our Church, that we are simply amazed at the credulity and recklessness of those who for any reason patronize such institutions.

Before we proceed to state our objections to the educating of Protestant girls in Romish convents, we may for a moment consider the two reasons that are frequently assigned by Protestant parents for their action in this matter—the cheapness of the system as compared with Protestant schools, and the moral safety of their daughters when immured within convent walls. The first reason we doubt not is in many cases the determining force; and it is just here that Roman Catholic policy and subtlety triumph over Protestant principles. Instruction in convent is certainly cheap. The reasons for this are not far to seek. Nunneries pay no taxes; they have no teachers' salaries to provide for, they have a well-organized if not always dignified system of obtaining supplies at first cost, or even gratis; they are, many of them well endowed with enormous revenues and they are therefore able to offer tuition, board and lodging at very low rates, and frequently to Protestants at a specially low rate in order to secure patronage. As long as the Church of Rome keeps up a vast army of priests and nuns, whose special business it is to teach without fee or reward, so long will it be impossible for Protestants, not having such a system, to compete with them on equal terms. But cheap as instruction in convent schools undoubtedly is, the education given is, in the opinion of those most competent to judge, not of a very high order or such as, apart from its cheapness, would be considered very desirable in Protestant communities generally. Let it be granted that music and the so-called "accomplishments" are fairly well taught, and there with few exceptions their claims to public patronage on the score of furnishing a sound and liberal education would end. In fact, their business is not to furnish a sound and liberal education. Their system is not designed to foster acquaintance with literature and science, and to strengthen and develop the thinking faculties. The ideas entertained by Roman Catholics and Presbyterians respecting education are as opposite and as wide apart as the poles. And Protestant parents in sending their daughters to convents would do well to bear that fact in mind. The Church of Rome will teach according to her own notions. The very history your daughter reads will be tinctured with Romanism, the very music will breathe a prayer to the saints or to the Virgin, and her needle, or brush, will be trained to depict the crucifix, or a madonna.

But even if the education given in the convents were as sound and liberal as the well-being of the state and the instincts of our Church demand, our objections to sending Protestant girls to convents to be educated would not be removed, but the rather strengthened. The matter is not one of efficiency nor of economy. As far as efficiency is concerned, no Protestant

at least in Ontario, has any excuse for sending his daughter to a convent if he is in quest of a sound English or classical education. The high schools and collegiate institutes afford the amplest facilities for securing this, and the various denominational ladies' schools and colleges may safely be trusted to supply whatever else is supposed to be necessary for a young lady's mental outfit. The only inducement that the convents can offer beyond our ladies' colleges is the cheapness of the system. And this, where a question of principle is at stake, should have no weight. The bribe of cheapness should be resolutely spurned by every true Protestant.

The argument that convent life guards virtue, and preserves the bloom on the rose, has no weight against the securities offered by the institutions of the Protestant churches and many private establishments. It may well be questioned if the training of girls in convents fits them for taking their proper places as daughters, wives and mothers in Protestant communities. Parents, we think, cannot be too careful in seeing that every step in education, whether at home or in the school, tends to fit the growing girl for the place she may be destined to fill in a Christian home. They may be well assured that convents are not likely to be any better schools of the domestic virtues than our ladies' colleges. The life they lead there is wholly artificial.

But our objection to the sending of Protestant girls to be educated in convent schools and nunneries does not lie so much in the fact that the instruction given in these schools is often of the most superficial character, and along lines at variance with our ideas of sound and liberal education, and that such as it is, it is given by persons whose attainments have never been tested by competent authority to decide as to their ability to teach, but that it exposes children at a most impressionable age to the seductions and machinations of the most active, the most wily and the most unscrupulous propaganda in the world, and that if it does not succeed in making them good Roman Catholics, it succeeds in making them most effectually bad Protestants.

The Church of Rome, as all know who are conversant with her history and operations, sets herself deliberately and constantly to gain complete ascendancy over the young. In them is her supreme hope. The whole system of her training in the family and the Church, the entire paraphernalia of her ritual are calculated to fire the imagination of the young, to cast a glamour over the senses, to allure them by a witching softness and tenderness to the bosom of Mother Church. Every living missionary Church knows, that it is only by winning the young that progress can be made. Does any Presbyterian who will stop to consider the matter, fancy that Rome has yet to learn this lesson? Does any Protestant parent who is meditating sending his child to a convent school, imagine that the precepts of Loyola are forgotten, and that an effort will be made to wean his child from the Church of her fathers? If he does he labours under the veriest delusion and will if he dare the trial be surely undeceived. He may rest assured, however, that if on the score of cheapness he send his daughter to a convent her religious prejudices will not be rudely assaulted. This is not the plan of Romish aggression in such places. It is founded on a deeper knowledge of human nature. Without a single overt act on the part of any one, he will find his daughter growing enraptured with the place, and actually in love with the system, and passionately in love with the "sisters." The beautiful surroundings, the air of peace and happiness, the sensuous worship, the show of tender sympathy and affection on the part of the sisterhood, the air of solemn mystery, the general discipline, all tend to fascinate young girls at a most susceptible age, and so powerfully to affect their sensibilities that not one Protestant girl in a thousand ever leaves a convent without her Protestantism being injured and her native fear of Romanism effaced. We need not stay to enquire how many Protestants are every year won through the convents. We have the testimony of the Jesuits that, in fifty years they hope through the schools to be supreme in America. This is their mission, and we need not be surprised if they bend to their task with the utmost energy. We do not imagine that they will succeed. They will most assuredly fail, but in the meantime Protestants should not give them any help or countenance by patronizing their schools. For Presbyterians to do so is a crime against the family, the state, and the Church.

And even on the lowest ground on which education may be considered, Presbyterians at least in Ontario, have not the slightest excuse for sending their daughters to convents. With the Ladies' Colleges at Bradford and Ottawa, and the numerous private schools controlled by teachers of acknowledged ability, in sympathy with our Church, not to speak of the admirably conducted high schools and collegiate institutes open to all, there is nothing more to be desired. Our own colleges deserve to be patronized, and should meet with the heartiest support from all parts of the Church.

"GEMS FROM SAM JONES."

IN the daily papers just now we often meet with this heading and we have no doubt our readers like ourselves have examined these precious jewels with not a little curiosity. We, probably, are old fashioned or perhaps prejudiced through our having been trained to show some reverence towards sacred themes, but we are constrained to say that the "gems" of Sam Jones seem to us the most vulgar and contemptible pulpit utterances we have ever read. We are fairly at a loss to understand decent men and women rejoicing in them far less paying large sums for the privilege of hearing them. It is quite pos-

sible that these utterances have received the names of "gems" because of the sums of money paid by those who engage this man. For a single occasion Chautauqua according to the papers gave him \$1,000, and if the reports of the papers are correct the address delivered was as poor a production as ever a company of sensible people were asked to listen to.

Let us look at a few of these gems as specimens so that we may be somewhat prepared for the dazzling display to be expected when the manufacturer himself appears among us.

"Here is my theology; it is all I need. If you want to do good God will help you to do good, and if you want to do bad the devil will help you. That's enough theology for anybody."

Yes, we agree it is quite enough of Sam Jones' theology, but it will not show a man how he may cease to do evil and learn to do well, and it is neither the wiser nor the wittier for its bad grammar. This man is constantly making such shallow and unsatisfactory statements, and people, we fear, are so taken with the apparent smartness of them that they do not take the trouble to analyse them? But here is another: "Now some sinner I expect will turn up her nose at me because I am not dignified. Bless you, the devil has got a mortgage on that nose and he will foreclose it some of these days and get the old gal with it too."

How does that gem look when it is examined? Did the ladies profit by it, we wonder, and are the Christian women of this city anxious to have some more such gems offered them? Another:

"Dance all you want to, for where you are going it will be too warm to dance. Play cards day and night, for cards won't stand fire down there, unless you get asbestos cards."

We ask in all earnestness will such language as that convince or convert a sinner? There can be no more awful thought than of the doom awaiting the lost, but can a man who knows the terrors of the Lord, make hell fire the subject of senseless joking, and will the preacher who gloats and grins over the terrible prospect of hell-fire for card-players and dancers please the Lord Jesus?

We do not deny for a moment that there are many pithy sayings in the "talks" he gives, but we venture to say that his addresses apart from their slang and nonsense would never draw a crowd or a shower of greenbacks. The Toronto Telegram says that Sam Jones properly finds fault with the regular clergy for their want of earnestness and faithfulness; and we can easily believe that the "evangelist" finds this kind of talk helpful in tickling the ears of ignorant people. Our contemporary falls into error over these gems and forgets that Sam Jones delivers addresses, at the rate, say, to put it moderately, \$500 per week, and repeats these addresses in every town he visits, using over and over again the same jokes and stories, when it holds up as an example to ministers of the gospel who preach to, and teach the same people from week to week for long years together, and who visit from house to house, and attend to the thousand and one duties that Sam Jones would not touch with one of his fingers. It is time an end should be put to this idea of the superior earnestness and diligence of evangelists above ordained pastors. We have no hesitation in saying that the devotion of such men as Sam Jones or even Moody is not to be compared with that of many poor country pastors, who unknown and unnoticed by the newspapers are doing noble work for the Master. The Telegram thinks if the ministers were in earnest and thought men were actually on the way to hell they would not dream of taking summer holidays! Surely it must have been a very young member of the staff who wrote such rubbish. If the evangelists, whose work is so light, take a rest as they do very often, how much more needful must it be for a pastor who in a city, for instance like Toronto, is never freed from mental strain from one week's end to another. Surely it cannot help the cause of Christ, prematurely to waste the physical strength and weary out the brain. It is contemptible indeed for men like Sam Jones to slander the regular ministry, when they are well aware that their success is largely the result of the labours of the ministry, and that they are but the reapers of seed faithfully sown by the ministers they despise. But enough of such "gems" and such jewellery.

ANOTHER MISSIONARY FOR TRINIDAD.

A SHORT time ago we were obliged to chronicle the death of one of our most active and devoted labourers in the foreign field, the Rev. J. McLeod, of Princetown, Trinidad. The vacancy occasioned by his lamented death has not been allowed to remain long unfiled. Nova Scotia, which has sent forth many gallant soldiers of the Cross, again rejoices in finding one of her worthiest young men, willing and ready to take up the work laid down with poignant regret by Mr. McLeod. Mr. W. L. Macrae, of Pictou, was ordained on the 6th inst. for the work in Trinidad, and in a short time will have begun his labours there. The Halifax Witness thus refers to the event:

An event of more than common interest occurred at Truro on Tuesday of last week. One of our young men was ordained to the ministry and set apart for mission work in Trinidad. Mr. Macrae, we need hardly remark, is one of our best young men, an excellent student, an effective preacher, a devoted disciple. There are congregations and stations enough in this Dominion looking out for just such young men as he is, but he heard the call of the Saviour to go to the Foreign Mission field, and he obeys it. Our Church has given up numbers of her very best men for work in the foreign field. Since John Geddie went to the New Hebrides we sent out the two Gordons, Matheson, Johnston, Morrison, Robertson, Daniel Murray, Anand, Mackenzie, McCullagh, Morton, Grant, Christie, Macleod, Wright, McKay, Fraser, Junor, Jamieson, Campbell, Wilkie, Beidler, Wilson, Robert C. Murray. Nor should we forget the men who long ago went out to our lone wild North-West to labour among the Indians there; and the good, brave women who have gone from

among us to teach the heathen the Gospel of peace. Last year towards the end of June a young Pictou man—Robert C. Murray—was sent forth from among us to strengthen the Central India Mission; and now another young Pictou man, Mr. Macrae, is set apart to teach men of the same race in Trinidad. Let us thank God that He raises young men for this noble work. Mr. Macleod has fallen on the field of battle, and Mr. Macrae proceeds to the scene to take up the same good work for the same good Master.

We trust that God's blessing will attend Mr. Macrae in his labours, and that he will be cheered by the thought that we also in the west will bear him on our hearts. Mr. Macrae deserves well of his country, and Nova Scotia deserves well of the whole world.

THE promotion of Archbishop Taschereau to the rank of Cardinal, and his investiture with the insignia of his office, have been accompanied with all the pomp and circumstance, that could enhance the dignity in the eyes of the faithful, or impress simple-minded Canadians with the magnitude of the "honour" conferred upon them. The bearer of the biretta has been received by the Government of Quebec and by public functionaries generally, not to speak of the populace, as if he were the ambassador of some great potentate high in the favour of our Sovereign, and conferring some signal honour on her people. We fail to see in the booming of cannon, the prancing of gaily caparisoned steeds, the drawn swords, the gorgeous vestments and imposing ceremonies, anything to remind us of the humble life and unobtrusive majesty of the Prince of Peace, or anything for which as a nation zealous of its civil and religious liberties we should be thankful for. The attempt to give political and social eclat to a purely religious ceremony in a country where all religions are tolerated, is quite consistent with the usual policy of Rome; but the investiture itself was a demonstration in which the Dominion as such has no business whatever, and in which her public officers should have refused in their official capacity to take any part. Such pageantry as was lately seen at Quebec is ridiculous anywhere, but is wholly out of place in this country; and we cannot but wonder that good Protestants, through a mistaken idea of courtesy, should give any countenance to proceedings which, if they mean anything, indicate the growing power and prestige of the Romish Church and their own humiliation. We would like to know by whose authority the volunteers were directed to take part in this religious ceremony. Our rulers should be made to understand that the taxes of our people are not to be spent in providing the accessories for enhancing the glitter of Popish displays, and gratifying priestly vanity. The vanity and assumption of Roman Catholics are bad, but the weakness and subserviency of Protestants are far worse.

THE fall of Sir Charles Dilke from no mean social and political height, is another illustration of the great truth which had dawned even on the heathen mind that rarely does Justice, though lame of foot, fail to overtake the bad man moving on before. The tale of the revolting turpitude of Sir Charles Dilke's private life, and the enormous wickedness which the late divorce trial reveals of a certain section of London society, is too vile to be repeated, but it is to be hoped that the sight given in the daily press of the foul ulcer of impurity, which Canon Wilberforce asserts is eating out the moral fibre of society in London, will rouse all good men to lend a hand to those who are seeking to effect a cure. The revelations made at the late trial taker in connection with the disclosures made by Mr. Stead in the Pall Mall Gazette, show most conclusively that wickedness in the grossest forms does abound in high places, and that there is the greatest danger that the bad examples set by persons in exalted stations may be imitated everywhere. Impurity, when detected and exposed, is still generally sure of swift condemnation, and it is all very well to detect and expose it, and to drive offenders outside the pale of society, but what is needed is not so much the detection and exposure of licentiousness to be followed by social ostracism, as the cleansing of the social life and heart by such an inspiration of the Spirit as will render licentiousness impossible. While we heartily rejoice that Sir Charles Dilke's baseness and hypocrisy have at length been unmasked, we cannot but regret that his opportunities for usefulness to the state have been destroyed by his own disgraceful acts. There is in his life and fall a terrible warning that the possession of a great intellect and high culture, without the restraining influence of the Christian religion, are no safeguard against the assaults of the basest passions.

DR. LOWE, Secretary of the Edinburgh Medical Missionary Society, himself for some years a medical missionary in India, and now in correspondence with most of the forty men the Edinburgh institution has already fitted for the foreign field, has recently published a valuable work on the place and power of medical missions. To America belongs the honour of inaugurating this new departure in mission work, which has already won such favour and achieved such distinguished success. The Rev. Peter Parker, M.D., who laboured in China, was the first medical missionary sent to a foreign field. Dr. Lowe's book will extend the wide range of interest already taken in this most important branch of mission work. There is, we believe, no agency of the Church so effective as this, in reaching the class, who above all should have the gospel preached to them—the poor. And it is not in foreign lands only that there is work for the medical missionary, but in our own larger towns. Among the large numbers of suffering poor there are numbers of Christian heathens to whom the visit of the medical missionary would be a real God send.