

# THE CANADA PRESBYTERIAN.

VOL. 3.

TORONTO, FRIDAY, DECEMBER 12th, 1879.

No. 6.

YOUNG LADIES can add a variety of pretty and useful articles to their personal effects, by spending a few hours in canvassing for THE PRESBYTERIAN. It is our own Church paper, and you can work for it as you would not feel inclined to work for any other journal. Read the Premium List, decide what you would like, and go to work. *You are sure to succeed.*

## NOTES OF THE WEEK.

THE Rev. Dr. Jardine on Saturday, the 29th ult., delivered the third of the Queen's College Course of Lectures in St. Andrew's Hall. The subject of lecture was "Divine Symbolism," which was treated in a very able and eloquent manner.

WE notice from exchanges that the person calling himself the "Rev." T. O. Roy who was somewhat notorious in Toronto a year or two ago and was convicted and imprisoned for bigamy, is still giving trouble in some of the States by representing himself as a converted Brahmin and anxious to get an education to fit him for becoming a missionary to his countrymen. His record in this quarter was not a creditable one, and the revelations made at his trial in this city were anything but satisfactory.

It is greatly to be regretted that every now and then, persons are induced to come to Canada, through the misrepresentations of some unprincipled agents of steamboat companies, who are totally unsuited for the country, and even without the requisite means of making in any case a fair start. These agents get a certain sum for every emigrant they secure for conveyance, and are little careful about the fitness or unfitness of those whom they can coax into their net. We are glad that the Dominion Government is about to make such a change of the law as will render the companies responsible for the representations or misrepresentations of their agents. This ought to have been done long ago. Parties in the Old Country thinking of emigrating cannot be too careful about the persons whose advice they take. Let them fight shy especially of the agents of steamboat companies. Some of these are no doubt both honourable and well informed, but not a few of them are neither, and in any case it is desirable not to depend entirely upon the information or advice they give.

MR. FROUDE, in a tolerably lengthy article in the "North American Review" for December, takes a very gloomy view of the future of the United States. He holds that it is absolutely certain the Roman Catholics will at no very distant date become a majority of the people, and that true to their instincts and to the spiritual instruction they have received, they will then abolish public schools, circumscribe if not altogether destroy freedom of opinion, and bring back the reign of spiritual if not also of political despotism. This is surely very unwarranted. The Roman Catholic Church in the States has lost and is still losing multitudes of those who were born within her pale. Instead of six millions of Roman Catholics in the Great Republic there ought to be ten or twelve, if all had been true to the Church of their fathers, and this without reckoning on a single convert from Protestantism. The triumph of Romanism on this continent is not at all so near as Mr. Froude anticipates; though there is cause enough in the outlook for Protestants being, if not anxious, at least active.

A LARGE and enthusiastic meeting was held in Edinburgh on the 18th November, in connection with the Scottish Disestablishment Association. Principal Cairns occupied the chair, and among those present were Principal Rainy, Rev. Drs. Adam, Wilson, McLaughlin, etc. The first resolution was to the following effect: "That any attempt to solve the Church and State question in Scotland, otherwise than by Disestablishment, is hopeless, and has now been practically abandoned." This was moved by the Rev. Dr. Adam,

Glasgow, seconded by Mr. Henderson Devanha, Aberdeenshire, and carried unanimously. The second resolution was in the following terms: "That the question in Scotland is one of practical politics, and that the leaders of the Liberal party have done well to acknowledge it as an existing question at present awaiting the decision of the Scottish people." This also was carried as the first had been. Principal Rainy moved the third resolution, which was as follows: "That the question of Church and State in Scotland is one on which Scottish candidates at the coming election ought publicly and fully to state their position for the careful scrutiny of the electors." Like the others, the resolution was carried unanimously. The leaders of both the Free and U. P. Churches are thus committed to the agitation.

THE following rather curious correspondence has been published in the English papers in connection with Mr. Gladstone's candidature for Midlothian and his definite committal to the disestablishment of the Church of Scotland: "Accrington, November 12, 1879.—Dear Sir,—On two occasions during the present year the following statement has been given in this district as your opinion on the Church of England: 'Those who contend that Church and State ought to be separated know not the acuteness of Satanic instinct.' This statement is said to have appeared in the 'National Church' for October, 1870. As this periodical is out of print, and consequently cannot be procured, will you oblige by saying whether you have ever made this statement, and, if so, whether you hold the same opinion now? If you would give me permission to insert the correspondence in the local papers I should feel greatly obliged.—I am, sir, yours respectfully, James Whittaker.—To Mr. W. E. Gladstone, M.P." Mr. Gladstone replied on November 14: "Dear Sir,—The words you cite, or others like them, were used by me in a work published forty-one years ago. They are probably true of all men, including, certainly, those who deny as well as those who assert that the Church and the State ought to be separated. But in these forty-one years I have learned something. I hope those who try to mislead you by the words can say so much for themselves.—Yours faithfully, W. E. Gladstone."

IN the course of his sermon last Sabbath evening, the Rev. J. K. Smith of Galt spoke "to the times" in the following direct and unmistakable terms: "We need to be aroused against the demoralizing influences of the present day. It will not do to go back to long past years and speak of the evils that existed then. We must raise our voices against existing evils—those on every hand. What a waste there is in tobacco! What a waste in intemperance! Christians should be abstainers. What a mass of pernicious, poisonous literature we have in our day! We have vice planting itself in the streets of our cities. And now we have something in our town that men call 'sports'—that I do not consider sports at all. The Church does not wage war against the manly sports, those which give health and exercise to the body—it would be wrong if it did. But, what is this coming in among us? Pedestrianism! A shameful thing, in which the stakes are money. It is not for healthful exercise, but the baseness of it is, that it is for money. And men spend their strength and health in such demoralizing and crushing influences. What are they? They are brutal and inhuman. They are disgraceful in the extreme. Now we have another thing. Men who could not find an arena in other cities and towns find an arena here, and Galt—of which we were so proud—what is becoming of it? When such disgraceful things occur it is time we see our duty and raise our voices against it."

QUITE a controversy is raging in many parts of the States over the school question. The word apparently has gone forth from headquarters that the Roman Catholics should make a charge against the public school system of the country "all along the line." Things have gone so far that Father Scully, a rather active Roman Catholic priest of Massachusetts, has refused the Sacraments to those who prefer the

public to the parochial schools, and his action has been endorsed by the Archbishop of Boston. This of course has caused a sensation and the controversy aroused promises to become co-extensive with the country and of even more than national importance. It remains to be seen whether the Catholic laity will implicitly obey the mandates of their spiritual leaders. In some cases there are symptoms of rebellion, but we very much fear that ultimately these will not amount to much. A good many of the more intelligent Roman Catholic parents, both in Canada and the States are painfully aware of the fact that the education which their children receive in the separate or parochial schools is very inferior to what they can have in the public, and that to condemn them to exclusive attendance on the former as to give them a poor chance in their subsequent life struggle with those who have had so many greater educational advantages. But when the alternative is put firmly to even these—give up public schools or your connection with the Church—we rather fear that in the majority of cases the school will be sacrificed. And yet what is to be done if people are willing to sacrifice secular advantage for, in their estimation, the spiritual well-being of their children? Is the struggle which Mr. Froude has been foreshadowing in the current "North American" already commenced?

A MASSACHUSETTS jury at Holyoke has given a verdict of \$3,433 against Father Dufresne, who had been sued by one of his parishioners that keeps a livery stable, for damages done to his business by the Rev. Father. The facts of the case are as follow: The Rev. Father Chiniquy some time ago came, among other places, to Holyoke and delivered a lecture. Father Dufresne ordered his flock not to attend or give any countenance to the renegade. In spite of this, a Mr. Joseph Parker concluded to exercise his own liberty, and not only went to the lecture but afterward refused to express any regret for doing so. For this he was excommunicated, and the other members of the church were threatened with the same treatment if they used Parker's cabs. Hence the prosecution and the verdict. The priest pleaded justification, urging that what he did was in the discharge of his official duty, but Judge Bacon held that the suit was based on the correct principle of law which says that "a man has a remedy if another interferes with his lawful business by fraud or by threats and intimidation, and so injures it." Further, the Judge declared in opposition to the priest's plea, that "It would be no excuse for him [the priest] if he did utter what is in fact unjustifiable, what is injurious to this plaintiff, that he had an idea that his ecclesiastical authority authorized him to do it. There is no ecclesiastical authority to be recognized under our Government which allows a wanton and unreasonable interference with a man's private business, not connected with the Church from which he has been excommunicated. Our institutions and our law recognize no such power. The Church may excommunicate him; but they must not pursue him further and interfere with his private business. If they do, they do a wrongful act. . . . In other words, our laws do not allow any ecclesiastical authority to interdict a man from pursuing his ordinary business or prevent even the members of the same denomination from which he has been excommunicated to deal with him.' And so the jury thought, by awarding Parker substantial damages. The lesson is a good one, not only for Father Dufresne, but for all who are inclined to follow a similar course of action. Spiritual authority has its limits under law, and the moment it invades the civil rights of others it is a trespasser. We commend the pluck of Mr. Parker in using his own ears as he pleased, and then in suing Father Dufresne for violating his rights as a citizen. A goodly number of such examples would make an important contribution to the emancipation of the Catholic laity from ecclesiastical domination. Catholicism or any other ism in this country as well as in the States ought to be taught the fact that the civil law rules priest and people alike, and that no powers or functions assumed to pertain to the former can excuse any violation of the law.