

Lord said on one occasion: "I am not come to send peace on earth, but a sword." Until sin is slain by the sword that goeth out of Christ's mouth, there will be war on earth. Peace is to be won by the triumph of truth. "First pure, then peaceable," is the law and order of the kingdom.

But there is no necessity or excuse for alienation and animosity among members of a Christian brotherhood. There is no "if" connected with the command in reference to them. It is: "*Be at peace among yourselves.*" You can, you ought, you must. "If ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another." This passage of Scripture anticipated by many centuries the well-known fable of the Kilkenny Cats.

It is a most deplorable thing that so many who call themselves Christians do not seem at all anxious to be at peace among themselves. Trifles create variance, coldness and unfriendliness. When they have a fall-out, it does not seem to make them uncomfortable. They put forth no effort at reconciliation. Indeed, they widen the breach by talking of their differences to others, until the entire circle in which they move is ablaze with their miserable dissensions. You would think if they had any vestige of a Christian spirit in them they would not let the sun go down on their wrath, but would hasten the one to the other, determined to be reconciled, and saying: "Give me your hand; you shall, you must. I love you as a brother."

If, in the case of the outside world, the law is "as much as lieth in you, live peaceably," how much more is it the duty of Christians to exhaust every endeavour before giving up the adjustment of a difficulty as hopeless? Will it be said by any one conversant with the facts, that every possible effort at healing the breach was put forth at Woodstock before secession was resolved on?

"Incompatibility" is the most frequent cause of those cheap and easy divorces which are doing so much to undermine the marriage institution in the adjacent Republic. Severance of the conjugal tie is deemed by many preferable to chronic contention. But, in the judgment of all the wise and good, it is thought better for the individuals themselves, and for society at large, that what cannot be cured should be endured, rather than that the Pandora's box of easy divorce should be permitted to empty its contents upon the community.

It is admitted that conscientious differences of opinion on important doctrines of religion necessitate and justify separation. This is the only valid apology that can be made for denominationalism. But, when there is full doctrinal agreement, and the trouble arises out of excited and angry feeling, secession is simply schism. Instead of encouraging separation for such cause, with a view to denominational gain, it were better far to use a conciliatory influence, and if possible restore harmony among dissentients who in conscience and heart are brethren.

That there was no conscientious preference for the Congregational polity on the part of the Woodstock seceders is a fact as well known to the general public there as the market price of wheat. It is readily conceded that, "with individual exceptions," there is substantial doctrinal agreement between Presbyterians and Congregationalists. But with what truth can it be asserted that "it is not the Independents who have swerved the farthest from the Confession of Faith," when it is undeniable that avowed Arminians and Universalists are in good and regular standing as members of Congregational Associations and Unions?

If there was anything in the former article implying that the author of it "was specially in Mr. Cuthbertson's confidence," it is cheerfully retracted. But he can say with his reviewer, "I had some conversation with him," and in the course of it he most distinctly stated that the proceedings were new and unexpected to him, and that if he had supposed the council claimed a veto power he would not have submitted to it. Those who were present at the installation know that more than once in the course of it he evinced embarrassment, and remarked that he did not know beforehand what would be expected of him on the occasion. The "rude awakening" to the actual state of things in Woodstock locally, and in Canada denominationally, is yet to come, and will not be long in coming. Locally, the task undertaken is that of building on the one foundation "wood, hay, stubble,"—combustible material—easily enkindled tempers,

feelings and passions. Ignited when mingled with less combustible elements, what is to hinder the inflammable and now smouldering particles from breaking out into flame again? "It must needs be that offences will come." Differences of opinion will arise, and will be maintained with pertinacity and warmth. Give place to the devil once, and he will elbow himself in again. The unclean spirit of dissension only goes out for a time, just long enough for the house to be "swept and garnished." It then returns with seven other spirits more wicked than itself, and there is "confusion worse confounded." Congregationalism gives a large liberty which all do not know how to use wisely and well. An angry word let fall in a church meeting is often like a spark dropped among shavings, and "behold, how great a matter a little fire kindleth," details the sequel. "The fire shall try every man's work, of what sort it is." It has been often demonstrated that "wood, hay, stubble," cannot be wrought into a building of God; but it is graciously put on record for the consolation of the workman who thus wastes his labour: "If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire."

AN OUTSIDER.

FRENCH EVANGELIZATION.

MR. EDITOR,—Some two months ago a circular came from the Convener of the French work, telling us that they were \$6,000 in debt, and asking for increased contributions to make up this amount to the Board.

The friends of the French work will remember that when the Board of French Evangelization was appointed, the arrangement was made that they should not go into debt. They should be governed by means placed at their disposal by the Church. Here, however, are \$6,000 debt in violation of that arrangement. This is rather serious, since the contributions for French work have been very liberal. Besides, the country financially is not in a healthy state. Prices for produce are not remunerative.

What, then, can be done in this crisis? Will some person of means volunteer to meet this emergency, and start the French work again free of debt? This can scarcely be expected, and the congregations of the Church are doing all they can be expected to do in this line.

This emergency, however, can be met by a little arrangement in the management. The Convener of the French Board employs an under treasurer to manage the funds. The Conveners of the Home and Foreign Mission business employ no sub-treasurer to manage their funds, and thereby save \$2,000 a year each, to help with the work. The funds in each of these missions are as large and the work as important as the French work. Why, then, can a deputy be necessary in French work and not in the others? This is no new thought, for I have written Dr. MacVicar more than once on this matter. I speak the minds of many ministers when I say that a deputy-treasurer is not needed for the French work.

Then dispense with the services of the treasurer, and you save \$2,000 a year, which in three years will pay off the indebtedness and start the work again free of debt.

This will be only placing the French work on the same basis as the other Schemes of the Church. Dr. Reid and Dr. MacGregor have been the Church's treasurers in all the other Schemes of the Church. They have ever had the Church's confidence. Why, then, should the French work be made an exception? They are really the treasurers, though there is a deputy in Montreal. Then why burden the funds of the French work with \$2,000 of unnecessary expense when the letter of credit from Dr. Reid is as good to the French missionary as to the home or foreign missionary? This would at once relieve the French work of this unnecessary burden.

But why not manage the French work as the Home Mission work, by the Presbyteries within whose bounds the work is carried on? This is surely the way in harmony with the principles of the Presbyterian Church. And I am happy to see an approach to this mode of working.

The Presbyteries of Glengarry and Montreal had each a full report of French work at their last meeting, which was fully considered and well received. Then why should not each Presbytery

where there is French work manage as they do the English work, and thereby save \$2,000 per year to pay the present debt, and help on the work of God in the French country? These suggestions I leave with the friends of the mission for their consideration, hoping that by the above or some other rearrangement of the machinery the French work may be relieved, and made even more prosperous in the future than it has been in the past.

JOHN W. SMITH.

REVIVALS.

MR. EDITOR,—There is a matter which has been causing some members of the Presbyterian Church much concern of late; and it is a matter on which I would be glad to receive information. I allude to the so-called "Revivals," which are creeping into our Church. Is it right, or is it wrong? Of course I do not mean the glorious work that comes in answer to the prayer, "Revive Thy work, O Lord." It is this system of hiring an evangelist, who comes into the congregation and gets up an excitement and makes up a list of conversions, and there the first part ends. The sequel is generally the resignation of the minister. Now I have attended some of those meetings, and felt at a great loss when I found that in our Church, with its grand fundamental truths and order of governance, they could be tolerated. The evangelist began the meeting with a short prayer couched in language that he would hardly dare to use to a human being holding an office of dignity in the land. Afterward he called upon saints to stand up, sinners to stand up; those who wished to be saved to do this, those who did not wish to be saved to do that. The foregoing proceedings were largely interspersed with anecdotes; and I assure you that one man positively did everything that was asked—he stood up with those who wished to be saved, with those who wished to be lost, and with those who were saved, one after the other. The sight was most grotesque, and exceedingly painful to those who wished to "worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness." I left such meetings—longing for the old-time religion, when men drew near to God with reverence and godly fear. Now, Mr. Editor, would those who are set over us in holy things tell me and other anxious inquirers whether we are old-fashioned and foolish? We would fain be put right.

AN ANXIOUS INQUIRER.

BISHOP WORDSWORTH, of the Scottish Episcopal Church, though High Church in proclivity, is nevertheless very anxious for Christian Union. He is going to publish a serial called *Public Appeals*, in fortnightly numbers, to be concluded with the twelfth. In it he intends discussing the desirability of ecclesiastical union between Presbyterians and Episcopalians in Scotland.

It is stated that the West Coates Church, Edinburgh, is agitated by a serious dispute. Several additions have been made to the eldership without consulting the members. The minister, Rev. R. G. Forrest, has issued a reply to a printed complaint in circulation, stating that the kirk session have simply followed the line of action adopted by St. George's, St. Andrew's, and other churches in recent elections, and that this course is in strict accordance with what is still the law of the Church. The complainers urge that their grievance is one which "should not be tolerated for a moment, more especially in these times when a large portion of the Scottish people are clamouring for the National Church to be disestablished." Mr. Forrest holds out the hope that the congregation will be consulted in future elections.

A CORRESPONDENT of the *New York Evangelist*, urging the adoption in congregations and Sabbath schools of the Tonic Sol-fa musical notation, says: The Presbyterian Church of Canada, in accordance with a vote of their General Assembly, have printed an edition of their Church Hymnal in the Tonic Sol-fa notation. We who live south of the St. Lawrence River are not in the habit of considering that we need to go to Canada to learn lessons of enterprise and progress. But it seems that in this matter, at least, the Canadians have set us an example in the line of progressiveness. The new system of teaching vocal music, which has revolutionized the church and school music of England in a single generation, has made considerable headway in our country; but no church or Sunday school hymnal has yet been printed in the Tonic Sol-fa notation—a notation, or method, of writing music which every one can understand, and from which all can read.