

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 4 lines. None other than unobjectionable advertisements taken.

NOW READY.

International Scheme of Lessons
FOR 1884.

Specially adapted for Presbyterian Sabbath Schools.

MAILED FREE FOR 60C. PER 100.

C. BLACKETT ROBINSON,

5 JORDAN ST., TORONTO.

PUBLISHER.



TORONTO, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1884.

A WRITER in one of our religious exchanges suggests that manufacturers, railway companies, and other employers of labour might do a great deal towards lessening the drinking customs of society by paying higher wages to abstainers. The suggestion is a good one. In fact there are public positions that no drinking man should be allowed on any account to occupy. A tippler or even very moderate drinker should not be permitted to run a locomotive on our railways for a day. Keeping trains from running into each other seems to give even sober men quite enough to do. Just fancy the safety of eight or ten carloads of people depending on such a circumstance as the number of glasses a railway man happened to take or the state his stomach was in when he took them. Of course it would never do to put men in places of responsibility simply because they were abstainers. The only good thing about some men is that they don't drink. Other things being equal, however, it would be an immense stride in the right direction if railway and steamboat companies, and other large employers of labour gave four or five per cent. more to men who abstain. Some allow no drinking during business hours. The Grand Trunk we believe, strictly forbids drinking during the time train-men are on duty. This is right. But a train man or any other man who causes at night may be very unfit to take charge of human life next morning.

MINISTERS cannot blame people for making very stupid comparisons between preaching and other forms of public speaking as long as they do so themselves. Nothing is more common than to hear ministers say, sometimes not in the best temper, "Oh, they can sit for hours and listen to political speeches, but they can't listen to the Word of God forty minutes." The comparison is most unfair. Would these same people listen to one hundred political speeches a year? No, nor fifty, nor twenty. Very few of them would get ten evenings to hear the best political orator in Canada. There is a vast difference between doing a thing regularly and doing it once or twice in a number of years. The same mistake is made in speaking of concerts and balls. "There is a crowd at the concert to-night and only a few at the prayer meeting." That proves nothing. Hold that concert once a week and in six weeks there would be nobody at it but the performers. We have often heard good people mourn over the fact that there were a hundred couples at a ball and thirty or forty at a prayer-meeting the same evening. That ball probably could not be held ever again. No power on earth could make it live for a year. The biggest fool at it would get tired in half that time. There is nothing that holds men like religious services when reasonably well conducted, and a minister never does a weaker or more foolish thing than when he asserts the contrary.

If Dr Tupper can hold the attention of his auditors for two or three hours while he speaks on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and Mr. Blake for three and a half hours while he discusses the same topic, if Mr. Pardee can make the Local Parliament and galleries listen for two hours while he discusses political

issues, how is it that ministers often have hard work to hold the attention of a congregation for forty minutes? Well, these gentlemen did *not* hold the attention of their auditors as the attention of people is usually held in church. Some members were reading newspapers, some writing, some talking and some moving about, while these speeches were being delivered. If people could write letters and read the papers and have a friendly chat, a good laugh, and an occasional round of applause in church, a half hour would go past very quickly. But this is not all the difference. Neither Dr. Tupper, nor Mr. Blake, nor Mr. Pardee nor any other man can command the attention of the same people on any political question one hundred times a year. These gentlemen address the same people on each public question but once a year—on many questions but once in two or three years. No fair comparison can be made between the preacher and any other public speaker. No other speaker is expected to address the same audience a thousand or more times in succession at the rate of two or three addresses per week. Just let Dr. Tupper, or Mr. Blake, or Mr. Fraser, or Mr. Pardee capital speakers all of them try a thousand successive speeches on the same audience.

ONE of the things that nobody can understand is why the public men of the great American nation nearly all read their efforts. All the principal speeches in Congress are read. Nearly all the ministers in the Presbyterian and Congregationalist churches read. We noticed the other day that an American lawyer read his address to the jury in a trial for a capital crime. This week we have four or five columns of a report of the opening of a new wing to the Presbyterian College of Chicago. The addresses are all essays, good essays certainly, but entirely lacking in spontaneity, fire, and everything that gives effect. Strange is it not, that the least bashful and most talkative people in the world should always take refuge in a paper when they "make an effort." Englishmen never think of such a thing. John Bright or Gladstone would never dream of reading a speech. There is an immense amount of labour in preparing as Bright and Gladstone prepare for special efforts, and probably the typical American reads because he is too busy and too weak to do anything better. An immense amount of nervous energy is required to prepare and deliver a really good speech or sermon. It is a great thing to feel that when you "have it on paper," your work is done. The orator's work however, is not done when he has his effort on paper. Burke and Chatham, and Pitt, and Fox, and Sheridan thought not, and they are good authorities. We should not be surprised if Canadians, as they gradually diminish in nervous force, and become more like the Americans, should also take to the paper in the pulpit, in parliament, and on the platforms. The tendency is that way now.

WHO SHOULD PAY FOR REPRESENTATION?

A CORRESPONDENT, "Equity," whose letter appears in another column, desires us to inform congregations of their duty to defray the expenses of their representatives while attending Church courts. The duty is plain enough, but in many cases, the habit of putting the telescope to the blind eye prevails. People will not see it. There is no well defined law in the matter, written or unwritten. In all well regulated and intelligent congregations, it is the practice to defray the expenses of minister and elder when they attend Presbytery, Synod or Assembly. In others not so well regulated, the minister's or the elder's expenses may be paid, but in those where liberality is the exception and not the rule, the congregations do themselves the favour of permitting their representatives to bear all the honour and expense.

"Equity" correctly shows that the burden is heaviest on those least able to bear it. Members of Presbyteries, etc., living remote from the place of meeting, find that regular attendance is not only a tax on their time, but a still heavier impost on the slender resources at their disposal. To a congregation, the sum required would be but trifling, while to a single individual it might occasion great inconvenience. The reason why there is not a more business-like method of dealing justly, not to say liberally, in providing for representatives' expenses, is most probably from want of due consideration. Ministers can and do plead eloquently and effectively for religious, charitable and

even congregational purposes, but delicacy prevents them from urging a claim that could be construed as personal. Thus the matter is overlooked and thus the country minister and others as well continue doing the work of the Church at their own cost.

Congregations as a general thing are liberal in these respects. They only need to have these and such like matters fairly brought before them. It is high time that those who can with effect urge upon congregations their duty in relieving their ministers and representative elders of an unnecessary burden should do so. We once heard an elder say it was right; that elder's expenses should be paid, and he ought even to be reimbursed for the time he lost by attending Church courts, whereas the minister had nothing else to do and as 't was his duty to attend to the business of the church, he could do so at his own cost. That, however, was an exceptional case, and it happened in the long ago. Elders and members have grown in liberality of sentiment and action since then.

Members of township and county councils have their expenses paid. The people's representatives in the Provincial and Dominion Legislatures get both their indemnity and mileage, and some people are uncharitable enough to hint that, in addition to these, "casual advantages" are sometimes obtainable. It is, then, neither fair nor reasonable that in giving a conscientious attendance in the courts of the Church ministers and elders alone should be sent "a warfare on their own charges."

NO LIQUOR IN GROCERY STORES!

THE question of separating the sale of liquors from that of groceries was promptly submitted to the new city council of Toronto. It was discussed by the civic dignitaries in a somewhat timid fashion. More attention was given to technicalities than to the merits of the proposed reform. Several of the aldermen taxed their ingenuity in finding excuses for shelving the matter for a time rather than by devising measures for the speedy removal of an acknowledged means of temptation and social danger. The Council are empowered to pass a law providing for the separation of the drink traffic from the sale of groceries. The collective civic wisdom did not care to pass such an enactment, neither did they care to meet the proposal with a direct negative.

It is noticeable that there was no attempt to meet the issue squarely. No voice was raised in defence of the existing state of things. By tacit consent it is evident that the reform sought must be conceded at no distant day. This is a plain recognition of the growing strength of the conviction that the facilities for obtaining liquor must be restrained. Our civic rulers not caring to take a decided stand yielded to the proposal for submitting the question to a popular vote, an expedient in which there is more caution than heroism.

The decision of the citizens will be watched with the greatest interest. Its influences will extend far beyond the city limits of Toronto. It will have an important effect on the progress of the temperance cause throughout Ontario. Defeat will to some extent hinder the work in which so many agencies are engaged. Its success would give strength and hope to all who are working earnestly for the salvation of the people from the ravages of intemperance. In any case there will be no relaxation of effort. Those engaged in this laudable work of social reformation are in earnest. There will be no diminution of energy till the great work ends in permanent victory.

All friends of temperance are united in support of the proposed measure for the separation of the liquor and grocery trades. The evils inseparable from their union are confessed. The special danger to women, in permitting liquor to be obtained where groceries are sold, is not imaginary. Experience in Canada and England and wherever else the combination has existed, show only too plainly that the results are most disastrous. Many grocers are on principle determined to have nothing to do with the drink traffic. They are placed at a disadvantage by others enjoying a privilege of which conscientiously they cannot avail themselves. Why should a state of things be continued that unfairly discriminates against a man who seeks to follow the path of duty?

It is tolerably clear that public opinion favours the adoption of the withdrawal of liquor licenses from grocery stores. This however does not in itself imply that there will be no strong opposition. To take