

## Our Contributors.

### CONSCIENCES THAT REGULATE THE LIVES OF OTHER MEN.

BY KNOXIAN.

The *Globe* went down into the depths of the bad side of human nature the other day to find out the origin of the "White Cap nuisance." This intolerable nuisance was found to spring from a "desire to meddle in other people's business and regulate other people's lives" plus "a good deal of innate rowdiness" veneered by modern civilization. Weak young men "of much leisure and scant means of recreation"—how would wicked young loafers do instead of this fine phrase?—"cannot resist the temptation to amuse themselves in a manner which gives vent to some pent-up blackguardism and at the same time allows them to pose as moral reformers." Hence the "White Cap nuisance."

Perhaps the real root of the movement may be found in the conscience, or rather we should say in the wrong use of what little conscience is left in a White Capper. Some one defines conscience to be the faculty by which we regulate the conduct of our neighbours. It is needless to say that the primary office of conscience is not the regulation of our neighbours' conduct. That, however, is the use, and in many cases the only use, which some people make of their consciences. They exercise their consciences every day in trying to keep other people right. While this exercise is going on they quietly assume that the neighbour they are keeping right has no conscience of his own. Of course he hasn't. And it is so very kind of them to lend him the use of their conscience. The readiness with which some people work their consciences for their neighbours would almost lead one to believe that they have no particular use for a conscience about home. Ask the man who, unasked and unthanked, willingly gives you the use of his conscience for nothing, for the use of his horse, and perhaps he will tell you that the animal isn't shod or something of that kind. Ask him for a day's work and he may tell you he is too busy to help you. Ask him for the loan of \$50 and probably he may say he hasn't any money. These things you cannot have even when you ask for them, but you can have the use of his conscience any time without asking. Manifestly he thinks he does not need his conscience about home as much as he needs his horse, or his time, or his money.

Consciencies that are kept for regulating other people's lives may be divided into classes. Prominent in the classes stands the conscience that regulates

#### OTHER PEOPLE'S CLOTHES.

"No Christian woman would dress that way." Indeed! how do you know? That woman may be a better Christian than you are. Who made you her judge? Has the Almighty given you the keys of the Kingdom? If her husband, or father pays for her goods, or if she earns them honestly herself, is it any business of yours what she wears? Can you find no higher sphere for your conscience to work in than the milliner's shop? In a world like ours, where there are so many real wrongs to be righted, so much suffering to be alleviated, so many tears to be dried, so much sin to be stamped out, surely a good man or good woman can find some nobler work than exercising conscience on the clothes of a neighbour.

Next comes the conscience that regulates

#### OTHER PEOPLE'S RECREATIONS

and tells them what they are not to do and where they are not to go. You should not curl, you should not skate, you should not play cricket, you should not play lacrosse, in fact, you should not play anything. You are not a Christian if you snuff, or smoke, or drink cider. You must not sing the "Land of the Leal," or "Scots Wha Hae," or the "Cameron Men." You must not go to a lacrosse match, or to a cricket match, or a curling match, or a concert, or a public dinner, or to an evening party, in fact, you must not go anywhere.

As this kind of a conscience lays down all these regulations and dozens more for other people, one cannot help asking if the "other people" have any rights of their own. What becomes of the Protestant liberty of conscience, the Protestant right of private judgment that we hear about in speeches and read about in books? Assuming, for the sake of argument, that it would be better not to do any of the things, or go to any of the places mentioned, is a man not to be allowed to exercise his own private judgment in such matters? Is there a Protestant kind of tyranny just as galling as the Popish kinds about which we hear so much?

There is a kind of conscience, too, that regulates

#### OTHER PEOPLE'S WORK.

This kind of conscience is often exercised in keeping the minister right. "The minister should do this, and the minister should do that and the minister should do some third thing." Consciencies of this kind often take a whole congregation in hand and kindly say what the elders and deacons, the choir and the Sabbath school people and all the societies and associations and everybody else should, and should not, do. Of course it is not to be supposed for a moment that people who fill these positions have consciences of their own, or judgment of their own, or in fact any rights of their own except the right to work and pay. Why should a minister or anybody else keep a conscience when there are so many people around willing to let him have the use of theirs for nothing?

A wonderful kind of conscience is the one that regulates

#### OTHER PEOPLE'S WORSHIP.

"Christians should not use hymns in public worship." Indeed! Is there not a remote possibility that a man might be

a Christian and sing, "Nearer my God to Thee," or "Jesus, Lover of my Soul," in public? Is there not a bare possibility that a worshipper might go to heaven who prefers to hear singing started and steadied by an instrument. Has the man who likes to sing, "Just as I am," or "Come, Thou fount of every blessing," necessarily no conscience? Has he no rights that anybody is bound to respect? Is he always so utterly destitute of moral instinct that a neighbour's conscience has to be called in to regulate his worship?

MORAL—Use your conscience to regulate your own life. When you get your own life square with the Decalogue and Sermon on the Mount if you have any surplus conscience power, use it for the benefit of your neighbours.

### THE SALVATION ARMY.

BY REV. JOHN DUNBAR.

As the above organization lives and labours in our midst, it might be interesting to some and instructive to others to present a brief historic outline of the origin and extent of its operations, without the necessity of either defining or defending either their principles or their practices.

The origin of the association seems to have been in so far incidental and somewhat insignificant and its aim was to bring under the influence of the Gospel those classes not generally reached by ordinary ministerial and missionary operations. It was originated in England by Mr. Booth, now General, a Methodist minister who in 1851 applied to the Conference to be employed wholly as an evangelist. This being refused, he withdrew from the connection and with Mrs. Booth devoted themselves to independent evangelistic work with evergrowing and gratifying success, till after several years they organized their converts under military form and designated the organization "The Salvation Army." In maximum manifestation this army is one of the most marvellous movements the world has ever witnessed. Not a quarter of a century has yet gone by since it began to be and now it is at work in thirty-two different countries and colonies, and preaching in thirty-five different languages. It has upwards of 7,000 paid officials wholly devoted to the work, besides thousands more who gratuitously give more or less of their time and their means for the furtherance of the cause.

In the United Kingdom 605 outposts have been established, 2,300,000 meetings are annually held, and 3,000,000 houses visited. In the specially home work 3,290 officials hold meetings every night in 1,380 localities, while in addition the Slum work in London is carried on from seventeen different centres. These unpaid workers live largely as, and among those to whom they minister, being often where even the police care not to venture and as the result of the last year's work about 800 have been hopefully converted. The Rescue work has also a kindred showing, having twelve homes in the United Kingdom and out of the 5,100 girls received 1,676 have turned out satisfactorily. The Home is always crowded and many have regretfully to be refused. A Food and Shelter Depot for the Poor in London has also been established, to whom help is given without pauperizing them, and although it has only been about nine months in existence, more than 470,000 have been relieved, a wholesome meal being supplied for a farthing, while supper, bed and breakfast cost only three-pence.

In the Foreign work many will be surprised to learn that it is now carried on in France, Switzerland, Sweden, Norway, California, Victoria, New South Wales, Queensland, Tasmania, New Zealand, India, Ceylon, South Africa, Germany, Italy, Holland, Denmark, Jamaica, Zululand and arrangements are being made for carrying it into China and Japan, while in Canada and the United States a location of agencies consisting of 757 outposts and 1,668 officials complete a connected chain from the Atlantic to the Pacific, being the latest yet now the largest Foreign Missionary Society in the world. It has now 3,550 foreign missionaries labouring in 1,666 different stations. These, let our officials mark and memorize, receive each from the Society on an average less than \$25 per annum and are otherwise supported by those among whom they labour. In South Africa they have been specially successful and although they have only been but five years in India yet they have more missionaries there than any other association. It is somewhat notorious, too, that all this is accomplished by means the very opposite of those ordinarily employed, for while they seek first to gain the converts and thereby get the means, others seek first to get the means and thereby gain the converts. Such is a lesson for the Church to look at whether they may learn from it or not.

The Booth family seem to be specially evangelistic, for besides the old folks with all their untiring energetic and effective zeal, there is the young Ballington in command in America, Catharine regulates the French and Swiss, Emma is in India, Herbert controls the Men's Training Home, and Eva is vice-president of the Woman's Training Home. In their world-wide operations they are materially aided by their literature, but especially by their bi-weekly periodical, the *War Cry*, printed in seventeen different languages and which some time ago had attained to 400,000 of a circulation. As to the results it is said that tens of thousands of the most depraved are now alike God-fearing and God-serving,—that during the last twelve months 154,000 have professed that they are Christians, while there is evidence to show that within the last twelve years one million individuals have been rescued from degradation and raised to newness of life as respectable Christians, while such has been the direct results of their efforts, the indirect has been to stimulate Christian Churches, as ministers and members, to greatly increased exertions in behalf of hitherto neglected ones,

to "go out into the streets and lanes of the city and compel them to come in."

Now without entering into the merits of the respective mission movements, theirs and ours, yet a brief comparison may not be unpardonable. In regard to the numbers and positions of our missionaries I have failed to find any table to show. According to last published reports our Church throughout the Dominion raised for all purposes, \$1,773,114, an increase of well-nigh \$200,000 over the previous year. Out of this sum \$86,866 were expended on Foreign Missions in all. From the latter sum Rev. Mr. Goforth received \$2,873 in connection with the prospective Honan Mission. Then \$23,625 to Dr. Mackay for the Formosa Mission, and then \$23,739 for the East India Mission. Now, while the Church here has last year contributed on an average \$11.23 for all its schemes, and over \$50,000 for these three missions besides some \$2,000 more expended here in the management of these missions and their money, the Church should be made more fully aware of what these missions have done or are doing for themselves. In regard to Honan more than a year has gone and what has been done? As to India, although there is a Presbytery, yet I failed to find a membership in a mission so mature in years, while their contributions for all purposes were some \$900. Then comes Formosa, a world of wonder in many respects. The mission, now sixteen years old, with its 2,650 members, made up last year for all purposes some \$491.80. Such Christians would seem to meet the Apostle James' requirement, "Show me thy faith without thy works." But *verbum sap.*

### THE JESUITS.

BY REV. R. F. BURNS, D.D., HALIFAX.

#### DIRECTION OF THE INTENTION.

The Direction of the Intention forms a fitting sequel to the principles already explained. By this the Jesuits understand that "actions intrinsically evil and directly contrary to the divine laws, may be innocently performed by those who have so much power over their own minds as to join, even ideally, a good end to the wicked action contemplated." If, when an act notoriously bad is committed, the party committing it has so much self-command as to admit of his diverting his mind from that act to another quite the reverse in its character, the act in question is purged from its inherent badness, and partakes of the nature of the opposite act. Is the end contemplated good in idea, or in reality? Then it matters not what the means are employed to attain it. Everything lies in the intention. Let that be right, the action must correspond. Here again, unbridled indulgence stares us in the face. There is no limit to such a principle. It allows a man to hide the most atrocious crimes beneath a mask of piety. Accordingly, we find the Jesuits under the shelter of it openly committing murder, perjury, bribery, and almost every species of evil.

[Take a single specimen, comparatively mild and modified under the head of that fashionable amusement (which happily in Canada is rare) Duelling, Pascal's Provincial Letters page 157] To shoot another, or allow yourself to be shot, is confessedly a wrong thing, but then to defend one's honour is right, and if you drive a bullet through the breast of another on that ground, there can be no harm in that. Or if you take a stroll into a field in form for a walk's sake, but in fact for the duel's sake—and you should chance to fall in with your opponent, though in reality it has been all arranged before hand—then for what follows you are not blameworthy. You were thinking of what was proper or, at all events, indifferent, and had the vindication of your own character in view—and this sanctions, nay, even sanctifies the deed. What is this but a revival of the old heresy, "Let us do evil that good may come?" And can it be uncharitable to pronounce on those who maintain it, the tremendous sentence—"Whose damnation is just?"

#### EQUIVOCATION AND RESERVATION.

The only other doctrine we shall at present mention as characterizing the Jesuits is that of Equivocation or Reservation. Here we summon as witnesses Sanchez, Escobar, and Cajetan, and Filiutius. The former testifies thus: "It is permitted to use ambiguous terms, leading people to understand in a different sense in which we understand them. A man may swear that he never did such a thing (though he actually did it) meaning within himself that he did not do so on such a day, or before he was born, or understanding any other such circumstances, while the words he employs have no such sense as would discover his meaning." The Jesuit Escobar goes the length of saying that promises have no force. "Promises are not binding (says he) when the person in making them, had no intention of binding himself. Now, it seldom happens that any have such an intention, unless when they confirm their promises by an oath, or contract; so that when one simply says 'I will do it,' he means that he will do it if he does not change his mind, for he does not wish by saying that, to deprive himself of his liberty." Escobar afterwards informs us, "All this is taken from Molina, and our other authors, and is therefore settled beyond all doubt." Even from the sanctity of an oath, a man may, with a little ingenuity, release himself.

The Jesuit Filiutius lays down—that "one may avoid falsehood if, after saying aloud, 'I swear that I have not done that,' he adds in a low voice 'To-day'—or after saying aloud, 'I swear,' he interpose in a whisper, 'That I say,' and then continue aloud, 'That I have done that,' and this is telling the truth."

Cajetan declares that a person when accused may answer that he had no accomplices, though he actually had—meaning in other crimes—and that he was innocent of the crime laid to him—meaning, "Since he had been in prison!"