

## THE CANADA PRESBYTERIAN.

\$2.00 PER ANNUM IN ADVANCE.

C. BLACKETT ROBINSON, Proprietor.

OFFICE—NO. 5 JORDAN ST., TORONTO.

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.

NOW READY.

THE INTERNATIONAL  
Scheme of S. S. Lessons for 1882.

Specially prepared for Presbyterian schools.

60 cents per 100 copies. Mailed free on receipt of price.

C. BLACKETT ROBINSON,

5 Jordan street, Toronto.

Publisher.



TORONTO, FRIDAY, MARCH 3, 1882.

By referring to our advertising columns it will be observed that the firm of Alexander & Stark, so long and favourably known to the public as stockbrokers, etc., in this city, has been changed to that of John Stark & Co. The members of the new firm are Messrs. John Stark, George T. Alexander and Frederick J. Stark.

We understand that the meeting of Toronto Presbytery on Tuesday next will be an important one. Among other things, the call from Cobourg to Rev. R. P. McKay, of Scarborough, is to be taken up and disposed of. Commissioners to the General Assembly are to be appointed in the afternoon, and report of a committee on the State of Religion will probably be read in the evening, and a conference held in connection therewith.

REFERRING to the late meeting of the Synod of the Church of Scotland in Canada, and the measures that are being taken by that militant body to secure the Temporalities Fund, our neighbour, the "Baptist," says:

"On the other hand, the 'Old Kirk' party in the United Church are invoking legislation in their interest. If they should be unable to retain possession of the Fund, it is thought that some of them, attracted by the 'loaves and fishes,' will go back to their old ecclesiastical connection."

Thought by whom, please? Those who think so may be as far astray in their thoughts as the "Baptist" is when it says that 100 delegates were present from the different "congregations and churches" in the Dominion! Does our neighbour know that there are not a dozen such congregations in existence? Mr. Macdonnell, in a letter to the press the other day, asked for a list of these churches, with the number of members and adherents in each, but the statistics were not forthcoming. One might as well look for the grave of Moses.

THE correspondent of an exchange, in alluding to a St. Louis minister and his congregation, says:

"It is always interesting and animating to hear the notices given out in his church. There is some service for every evening in the week, and often two or three meetings during the day. He usually begins the year with a three months' protracted meeting."

And this is just the weak point in much of our Church life. People who go to "some service every evening and two or three meetings during the day" are almost certain to be as lean in the soul as Pharaoh's lean kine were in body after they had devoured the fat kine. In such a life there is no time for solid reading, and meditation, or household duty, or the enjoyment of family life. A woman who goes to "some service every week and two or three meetings during the day," must neglect her family if she has one. A man that pursues such a course must be placed in a very exceptional position if he does not neglect some duty by so doing. Probably a minister in St. Louis can keep up his study and attend two or three meetings per day. We all know what happens ministers in Canada who try to get on in that way.

THE American Presbyterian Church is not ready for a liturgy. In the January number of the "Pres-

byterian Review," Dr. Hopkins, of Auburn, had a leading article on the subject. In common with a good many others, we watched with some interest how it would take. In a very short time all the Presbyterian weeklies had articles on the subject, or rather, on Dr. Hopkins' article. These able and popular journals reflect public opinion far more accurately than an Auburn College professor is likely to do. Though they represent various opinions on the liturgy question, it is easy to learn from the whole discussion that the Church is not ready for a liturgy. Still, we venture to predict that this question will come before the Church Courts, in the American Church and our own, in the not very distant future. Those who do not wish to have a liturgy, or an agitation on a liturgy, can keep the agitation back by giving more attention to praise, prayer and Scripture-reading in public service. Just as good singing keeps down the organ question, so a well-conducted service other than the sermon will keep down the liturgy question. Beyond all doubt, the weak point in Presbyterian worship is the idea that the sermon is everything, and praise, Scripture and prayer merely "INTRODUCTORY."

IN his admirable address at the funeral of Dr. Ryerson, Dr. Potts said:

"The doctor belonged to a class of men rapidly passing away. Most of his companions passed on before him. But few linger behind. Grand men they were in Church and State. Canada owes them a debt of gratitude that she can hardly ever pay. Let us revere the memory of those gone to their rest and reward, and let us treat with loving reverence the few pioneers who still linger to bless the land for which they have done so much."

These are noble words. Would that congregations in all religious bodies had more of this "loving reverence." The treatment too often given to ministers in advancing years is not only unchristian, but simply disgraceful. Let the minister dare to differ with a section of his congregation about the employment of an evangelist, the introduction of a hymn-book or organ, the formation of a union with some other Church, or any other question, and they turn him and his family out on the road with as little feeling as they would turn out a tramp. This, too, is often done by an unscrupulous minority. The really Christian people stand quietly by and say nothing until the dastardly work is done. When the minister is turned out, then they speak, but it is too late. A farmer turning out an old horse to die in his barn-yard does so with more feeling than some kinds of professing Christians turn out their minister. There is this difference, however. The good people always turn out the old minister for "the glory of God and the good of the cause."

## THE GOAL REACHED.

THE Rev. George C. Miln, at one time a Congregationalist Minister in Brooklyn, N.Y., but more recently a Unitarian pastor in Chicago, has been going on from one stage to another in his journey toward "a religion of scientific exactness." According to last accounts he has reached the goal, which must evidently be a very advanced one, for its attainment has led even the "liberal Unitarians of Chicago to declare that they cannot stomach such proceedings, and that therefore Mr. Miln must resign. In his pursuit after truth Mr. M. has gone great lengths. He has, it seems, found out that the Bible is not inspired; that there is no God, no heaven, no hell, and no individual immortality. No doubt he is fully convinced that he is an honest truth-seeker, and that he ought, as such, to be allowed to retain his position and enunciate anything and everything that he believes to be true. This is the favourite doctrine with many in the present day, and with Mr. Miln among the rest. But though Unitarians in general pride themselves on their "breadth" and "liberality," and though they are very ready to denounce the "narrowness" of supposedly creed-bound bigots, and to speak of these compassionately as the enemies of free inquiry, etc., yet there is, it seems, a point beyond which even they cannot go. And as far as those liberal friends of progress in Chicago are concerned, Mr. Miln has reached that point in his search for truth; so that he must prosecute his further inquiries *outside* of the Unitarian Church, whose pulpit he has for some time occupied. They don't give reasons. They have not prosecuted their late pastor for heresy. But they frankly ask him to go away, and intimate at the same time that he knows the reason for this just as well as

they do. Mr. Miln, it seems, had ceased to pray. Instead of the usual formula in public worship, "Let us pray," he said "Let us hold communion together." Of course, when there is no God to address, prayer becomes a manifest impertinence. And so in the illiterate and preposterous jargon of the day, this poor lad is reported to have said, "We would take counsel, at this time, of our holiest impulses and of our serene philosophy. We would give free rein to all that is best within us." The enterprising ubiquitous interviewer who has given a new terror to life, and has added an additional attraction to the grave, as his place where this troubler ceases to trouble, and his victim is at rest, has of course been upon the trail of this new apostle of sweetness and light, and has been assured by him, who ought to know best, that his "evolution of thought during the last five years, and especially during the last twelve months, has been rapid," so that his belief is "now pure naturalism—that is, that men should only accept such evidence as is given them by their senses." It is, of course, to be believed that Mr. M. was conscientious in all this, though why he should wish to "commune with his tenderest and purest thoughts" is not very evident, since his senses could give him no evidence worth a straw that he had any thoughts at all, whether tender or the reverse. How could his senses tell him what was "best" in him, or how he was to give that "free rein"? Consciousness might tell him something about intellect and spiritual aspirations, but certainly not the senses. All this, however, is a matter of very small consequence, for when most of those "advanced thinkers" who are haunted with the strange delusion that they know a thing or two out of the common course, start on an effort either of definition or declamation, they speedily sink into such childish, unintelligible jargon that it makes no appreciable difference whether they speak of the "pleroma of the Universe," the "differentiation of the thinking faculty," or the "mediatization of the incognoscible, all-pervading entity which is at once undefined and indefinable."

It is very likely that Mr. Miln will pose now as a martyr, and some of the Chicago papers, we observe, are already tuning their trumpets to make proclamation of this sad and humiliating fact. The manner in which the Chicago "Times," for instance, wrestles with the subject is perhaps as grotesquely odd as can well be imagined. We wish we had room to give a specimen, but unfortunately we have not. There is something intensely amusing, were it not that the general result is rather depressing than otherwise, in the serene, confused, sesquipedalian imbecility that passes so often in these days for philosophic profundity and marvellous insight. We can scarcely say that we hope Mr. Miln will continue in the happy state of mind in which it seems he has been since he cast aside his old beliefs, and could frankly and fearlessly say that there is no God; for surely a man's happiness must rest on a very slim foundation when he has parted company at once with his God and his own soul. One thinks, on such occasions, when presumptuous sciolists solemnly utter their flippant and yet supposedly philosophical conclusions in reference to the mysteries of existence, and the impossibility of a personal God, of the grandly solemn and argumentatively unanswerable words of John Foster:—"But indeed it is heroism no longer if he *knows* that there is no God. The wonder then turns on the great process by which a man could grow to the immense intelligence which can know that there is no God. What ages and what lights are requisite for THIS attainment! This intelligence involves the very attributes of Divinity while a God is denied; for unless this man is omnipresent, unless he is at this moment in every place in the universe, he cannot *know* but there may be in some place manifestations of a Deity by which even *he* would be overpowered. If he does not know absolutely every agent in the universe, the one that he does not know *may* be God. If he is not himself the chief agent in the universe, and does not know what is so, that which is *may* be God. If he is not in absolute possession of all the propositions that constitute universal truth, the one which he *wants* may be, that there is a God. If he cannot with certainty assign the cause of all that he perceives to exist, that cause *may* be a God. If he does not know everything that has been done in the immeasurable ages that are past, some things *may* have been done by a God. Thus, unless he knows all things—that is, precludes all other Divine existence by being Deity him-