

British American Presbyterian.

VOL. I.

TORONTO, CANADA, FRIDAY, MARCH 13, 1872.

No. 7.

Contributors & Correspondents.

NEW BRUNSWICK.

Congratulatory—British American Presbyterian will help to make Presbyterians better acquainted—The Union Question in New Brunswick—A Pleasing Case of Union on a Small Scale—Numerous Settlements in St. John's Presbytery—Substantial Growth.

From Our Own Correspondent.

In opening this correspondence, it will not be out of place for me to congratulate you on your efforts to provide an organ for the Presbyterians of the Upper Provinces, and in some measure for the Presbyterians of the Dominion. I rejoice in the fact that some one has ventured on the undertaking, and hope that an abundant success will crown the effort. One reason why I rejoice is, that it will be a means by which the several Churches now contemplating union will be enabled to know one another. At present I am afraid ignorance of each other prevails to a very large extent. There are some exceptions, and these for the most part confined to such ministers and people as have gone up from here to visit you, and have come down from you to visit us. In the nature of things not a great many have been so highly favoured. Nor have we had any common literature as Churches, the *Records*, so far as I know, having very little circulation outside the bodies whose interests they severally subserve. The *Advocate*, published in Halifax, and the *Witness*, published in Halifax, were they read in the Upper Provinces, would help to make us known somewhat, but the readers of these journals up there are, it is to be presumed, few and far between. If the *BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN* supplies the want, or even but partially supplies the want, I will feel happy, and many others will rejoice for the same reason.

As to the Union question, which is now one of the most prominent, as well as the most important, there is considerable dissatisfaction in this quarter with the proposal that has been made to hang it up for three years. I grant the force of the reason that is set forth by the Canada Presbyterian Church—namely to allow the members to raise a sufficient amount to endow the Theological Halls of Montreal and Toronto, as well as to allow the members of the other to complete the endowment of Queen's College, Kingston. There is an appearance of chivalry in the proposal that I admire very much; but I question if that be sufficient to stop union for so long. I agree with much that was said by one or two of your correspondents in an early issue on that point. The very same reasons operate in the Lower Provinces, reasons that demand union at as early a day as possible. I trust the Churches, when they assemble in their supreme courts in a few months from this time, will express their views in such a way as to show that such a delay will not be endured. So imperative are the reasons for co-operation in our country districts that we have begun to forestall the completion of the bond that is to bind us all together. I deem the incident of such importance in connection with this subject that I proceed to give you some details. The two Presbyteries of St. John embrace substantially the same territories in this part of the Province. About 120 miles from the city there were, some years ago, two very weak congregations some six miles apart belonging to the one Presbytery, and one just as weak with a station in each belonging to the other. Woodstock, the seat of the one is a thriving town on the River St. John, and Richmond, where the other is located, lies near the border of the State of Maine, and is one of the most prosperous farming districts in the Province. Because of the division, no one of them could raise half support for a settled pastor, and the consequence has been that years have elapsed since a settled pastor has been in any of them. The inevitable result of such a state of things all know. Some year and a half ago the Presbyteries came to an understanding that they would work the field in common, letting one man do the labour where two were before required. There was no definite agreement about a settlement, simply that it would be wrought

as a home mission field. The members of both Presbyteries felt, I believe, that if the people would agree to call a preacher from either side there ought to be no opposition raised. The result has been most happy, and it is all the more so that the action of the people was entirely spontaneous, there being no manipulation necessary to bring it about. The members of both sections at Richmond gave a call to a young man belonging to the one church, and he has just been settled over them in the most harmonious manner; and I learn that the members of both sections at Woodstock have just presented a call to a young man belonging to the other church, and he will be settled over them in a short time. Some of these people have been without a pastor for seven or eight years, while others have had none for three years. This proves, if any proof were needed, that the people are as ripe for union as the ministers are, in some cases perhaps more so. Had they remained apart they might have been without pastors until the congregations would have dwindled away altogether.

The Presbytery of St. John, in connexion with the Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces, have made great strides within the last few years in filling up the numerous vacancies that were then within her bounds. Since the beginning of 1869 there have been no fewer than seven settlements made, six of the seven having been vacant at that date, and a call has just been forwarded from the eighth which it is believed will be accepted, and it also was vacant at that time and has been ever since. It is believed that church life has, in most congregations under its care, kept pace with the growing number of settled pastors. There has been a constantly increasing interest taken in the schemes of the Church, and the rate of support given to the pastors has also increased. I may be able by-and-by to give you some figures as a report on statistics is under preparation. This growth is all the more pleasing when it is remembered that there is very little immigration into this Province—what-ever increase of population there is almost altogether dependent on natural causes. A few young men come to fill places of business in the city each year, but very few besides. Whether we shall benefit by the stir that is now made on that question remains to be seen.

H.
St. John, N.B., March 4th, 1872.

ON FREQUENT GIVING.

Editor BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN.

Sir,—A very heavy shower of rain may do good, it may tend to purify the air, it may arrest the fires in a drought like last summer; but in general we who have gardens or fields prefer the gentle continuous shower—not the "big rain that comes dancing to the earth," but the "wetting" rain that soaks into the ground—there is apt to be more of it, and more good done by it. What has rain to do with giving? Just about as much as a shower of snow—that helped to illustrate the advantage of many givers, this may enforce the present object of frequent gifts.

An annual subscription may look a large affair on the list, and the annual list may look large; and when the season comes round, perhaps when we are selling our barley, or better still our wheat, as it puts the evil day a little further off, the annual gathering of these annual payments, we say of them as an old lady said of her visitor's "when it rains it pours." What a large list of large sums, and yet the money does not go far. No wonder it is only once a year. Now sir, an illustration from real life. A congregation that held an annual missionary meeting and took up a collection for missions, raised \$7, and by Sabbath day collections for the schemes of the church \$10—total \$17. Not a very heavy shower. The pastor started lady collectors to take a monthly contribution from every one for the same objects and the first year raised \$109, so much for the continued dropping. One may be deceived by appearances, as one of the collectors was. When she brought in her first month's gathering, from 5 to 25 cents each—what cheered her most was \$2 from one rich member for the year—she thought that was good. She had never thought that she had from poorer members much

more than that, 25 cents per month, equal to \$3 a year. The appearance of the \$2 bill deceived her. And I believe that the givers sometimes deceive themselves by the size of their annual gifts also. Let us take the case of a family of four members, an annual subscription \$10. Reduce it by the mode of individual giving, \$2.50 each, then again by weekly offering, not 5 cents each. Sometimes an annual collection is in itself small, and when regarded as annual, a miserable pittance. I once counted the coins in a Sabbath annual collection for the combined objects of the Widows' and Orphans' Fund and Aged and Infirm Ministers' Fund, and how do you think it stood? I know not how many gave nothing—not many; but the collection consisted of 76 coppers, 24 5-cent pieces, 10 10-cents, one 20 and one 25: thus 112 givers, total collection \$8.41—that is about 8 cents each, or 14 cents each annually for each fund. What a poor, paltry sum for such Christian claims on Christian love!

In regard to frequent giving the question may be put—how often should Christians give? Some say quarterly, some monthly. Quarterly is better than annually, and monthly better still; but surely the best is "on the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store as God has prospered him." Weekly giving; it has been tried by many congregations, and is found a complete success. The envelope system, which I need not explain, is such a trial, and works well. I know one small congregation where each individual gives, and the poorest gives 12½c every Sabbath. It may be objected to this weekly offering: "What a trouble." Oh, Christian! blush at your own feeling. A trouble to you! anything whereby you can serve the Lord Jesus Christ. Be thankful to have the privilege of serving Him with the money He has given you! I am not sure if the envelopes are absolutely necessary to the system of weekly giving. If all connected with our congregations were faithful to Jesus, if the Church were what it ought to be, we would need no envelopes. Each one would put his gift into the Lord's treasury without any check from elders or deacons. Faith in their Lord "sitting over against the treasury," beholding how the people cast money into the treasury, would lead to honest, faithful giving.

Intending to apply these modes of giving to the Church, and grateful for your open columns,

I remain, yours truly,

IRIS.

ARCHBISHOP TACHE IN 1859.

Editor BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN.

Sir,—A letter from Archbishop (then Bishop) Tache accompanies Dawson's report on the exploration of the country between Lake Superior and the Red River Settlement, &c., which was laid before the Legislative Assembly in 1859, and printed by order of that body. Taken in connection with the late rebellion in the Red River settlement, it is a very interesting one. It shows that the writer was strongly opposed to any coming into that place but French Canadians, and these, of course, Romanists. Many look on him as one of the foremost in the rebellion. Of course, they look on it, to say the least, as a perfect farce, the act of the Dominion Government in bringing him from Rome, where he was helping to make the Pope infallible, and sending him to Red River to quell that Rebellion, giving him, as the reward of his labours, a large portion of the public money. These who hold such views have in the letter to which I refer, good grounds for so doing. Very few of the readers of the *PRESBYTERIAN* have, I suppose, seen it. I shall, therefore, lay before them a few extracts from it to which I shall take the liberty of adding a word or two of comment. It takes up not fewer than three pages of book: the referred to. The printed matter of each page is 8 x 10 inches. Of course, the cost of printing it was paid with Protestant as well as with Roman Catholic money. Yet, though it is so lengthy, the whole substance of it consists of only two things. The first is a minute account of what his church is doing in the settlement. The second is an expression of his great love to the French Canadians. But, I proceed now to fulfil my promise.

Towards the beginning of his letter, the Archbishop speaks of the care of the missions in the interior of the country, as "yielding to the evangelical husbandman a rich harvest of merits." Such teaching is utterly opposed to the Bible. The latter teaches that the very best of our doings possess no merit. Isaiah says, "All our righteousness are as filthy rags." Christ says, "When ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants, we have done that which was our duty to do."

The doctrine contained in the extract from the Archbishop's letter just given, he again teaches where he says, "The faithful at Montreal, at the instance of their chief pastor, in order to appease by their good works the anger of Heaven, shown by so terrible an affliction (the great fire of 1852) * * * made a collection for the benefit of Red River, which produced the sum of £364." As the Archbishop says nothing against the motives which led "the faithful" at Montreal to make this collection, I do not judge him uncharitably in believing that he approves of them. Well, Mr. Editor, the Roman Catholics of Montreal acted on the occasion referred to just as Hindoos, Hottentots, or Zulus would have done in like circumstances. It is painful to see a "master in Israel" manifesting such ignorance. We have in him an instance of the blind leading the blind. It is not to be wondered at that the Romish clergy are so much opposed to their people reading the Scriptures. "The faithful" at Montreal must have thought that the favour of Heaven was to be had very cheap, if they thought that they could buy it with a collection, however large.

His Lordship is highly displeased with Prof. Hind for a grievous sin of omission. He says of him "I am sorry that the learned professor, in speaking of this convent found nothing to speak of more interesting than the cultivation bestowed on the garden in front of it. The cabbages and other vegetables produced in it are, no doubt, very fine, nevertheless the interior of the house, and the extensive benefits dispensed by its inhabitants, are matters still more worthy of admiration and comment." Further on, he cannot refrain from again laying the lash on the unfortunate professor. He says, "The internal decorations of the church and other objects of art and taste, are the work of the inmates of this vast convent, around which certain persons can see nothing but well cultivated vegetables."

Speaking of the nuns in the convent referred to, the Archbishop says, "These heroic followers of Christ, animated by a degree of courage and devotion which Catholicism alone can inspire," &c. On this passage I have two remarks to make. The first is that it contains an indirect slander on Protestantism. Be it remembered that Protestants as well as Roman Catholics had to pay for the printing of it. If language of a like nature were used regarding Protestantism in a work printed at the public expense, Romanists would soon raise an uproar about it. But, the Romish Church does not do to others as she would have others do to her. The justice which she wishes to have, is of the jug-handle kind—all on the one side, and that, of course, her own. My second remark is that Protestant women have, at least as often, shown a degree of courage and devotion, at least as great, as any professing the Romish faith have done.

In his work on the Arctic Searching Expedition, Sir John Richardson says:—"In character the half-breeds vary according to their paternity; the descendants of the Orkney 'labourers' being generally steady, provident agriculturists of the Protestant faith; while the children of the Roman Catholic Canadian *royaueurs* have much of the levity and thoughtlessness of their fathers, combined with that inability to resist temptation which is common to the two races from whence they sprung." This, as may well be supposed, grievously offended his Reverence, who devotes not less than a column of his letter to a reply, which, of course, was printed at the public expense. In the course of this reply he says that if he could not have resisted temptation, he would have published certain memoirs relating to the history of the Red River settlement, which would, indeed, be the saddest page in French Canadian history. These, according to him, would prove most clearly that, even as regards yielding to temptation, his fellow countrymen have played but a secondary part, and that his race has "never been sufficiently favoured to enjoy a monopoly of crime, any more than any

other monopoly. It is, of course, not difficult to see at what the Archbishop hints.

I shall now give some extracts relating to the tide of immigration which was beginning to pour into the Red River settlement when the Archbishop's letter was written. To these I would ask special attention. He says—"I am a French Canadian in heart as well as by origin, and I should undoubtedly prefer to see our lands occupied by some of our brave and respectable inhabitants from Lower Canada." This is plain speaking. The persons here referred to are French Canadians—of course Roman Catholics. The word "inhabitants" is in French, the Archbishop's mother tongue—"habitants," the name commonly given to the French Canadians. But let us go on. He is opposed to his fellow countrymen leaving their homes, "but," he says, "if, owing to special and exceptional reasons, they are compelled to remove from their native land, if they are determined to take up the pilgrim's staff—rather than see them take the direction of the United States, I prefer to have them come here. There their faith, at all events, will not be exposed," &c. If a large number of Protestant strangers should come into the settlement—which was likely to be the case—the faith of the French Canadian half-breeds would be exposed. It was, therefore, very natural for the Archbishop to wish to have them kept out if possible. But, let us go on. He says; "There children will here find masters and mistresses to enlighten their minds, and at the same time to train their hearts to virtue. Daily experience enables me to promise them zealous priests, who will be true fathers to them, and who, here as they did at home, will preach to them in their own mother tongue, the goodness of their God, and the love which they owe Him. Another thing which I can promise them is the affectionate interest which is, and ever will be, entertained for them by the pastor whose flock they will come to join. The Bishop of St. Boniface, a Canadian like themselves, their brother, therefore, and their friend, will be really rejoiced to have it in his power to assist them, and willingly engages to devote to the welfare of the new comers, as well as that of the rest of his people, everything at his disposal. Besides, no one has a better right to occupy the valley of the Red River, or even the valley of the Saskatchewan, than the Canadians of French origin." "Evil days have since come upon the beautiful portion of the American continent which they (our fathers) reclaimed from barbarism; but after a century of struggles and constancy, our nationality shines out before an astonished world, and nothing can be more natural than that our brethren should once more take possession of the land discovered by their ancestors, and consecrated by them as destined to witness at a future time the regeneration of the unfortunate tribes whom they found inhabiting it. Besides, the chain which connects Canada—and especially French Canada—with the Red River, has never been broken. Ever since the occupation of our country by the power which protects us so well to-day, the intrepid and skilful *royaueurs* have still continued to be recruited from amongst our fellow-countrymen."

To any one who reads the last four extracts with any degree of attention, it must, I am sure, be quite plain that the writer is opposed to any but French Canadian Roman Catholics going into the Red River Settlement. He never once, throughout the whole of his letter, though it is a very lengthy one, makes the slightest reference either to British Canadians, or to Protestants. It, therefore—as I have already observed—gives those good reason for so doing, who look on him as a ringleader, though a hidden one, in the late disturbance at Red River.

I am, Mr. Editor, yours very respectfully,

METIS.

This world and the next resemble the east and the west; you cannot draw near to one without turning your back to the other.

As it respects general habits, a parent can scarcely teach a child a more valuable art than dispatch without haste; nor can any one that values his time cultivate a more valuable one for himself.

A clergyman once said: "When I come to die, I shall have my greatest grief and greatest joy, my greatest grief that I have done so little for my Lord Jesus, and my greatest joy that my Lord Jesus has done so much for me."