

## Our Contributors.

### CONCERNING THE MAN WHO WOULD SAY SO ANYWAY.

BY KNOXONIAN.

Years ago a young minister was sent into a Western Presbytery to lay before the congregations a scheme that the Supreme Court of that time had devised for a very good purpose. At the close of his address in one of the meetings a surly looking Scotchman got up and pitched into the scheme in a style that was more vigorous than Christian. From the particular scheme in question he passed on to the church in general and dressed down the colleges, standing committees, conveners and various other useful persons and things. The young minister was taken by surprise and perhaps showed the least bit of temper. He did not then know as well as he has since learned that the first, second and third thing in doing public business is to keep cool. When the meeting broke up a fine matronly looking woman—one of those mothers in Israel that are the salt of Presbyterianism—shook the young man by the hand and said: "Never mind, he would say that anyway." The surly brother had no doubt made the same speech a great many times and the people knew "he would say that anyway."

There is a vast amount of valuable time lost and much temper spoiled by the man who would say that anyway. You find him everywhere—in Parliament, in municipal councils, in the church courts, at public meetings, in all places where men congregate for business. We have never had much experience in meetings of women and cannot say whether there is a woman who would say that anyway. We hope there is no such woman. We men do not amount to much in these modern days but we may always be safely trusted to find some representative of our sex who will say that anyway.

Some people allow themselves to contract the abominable habit of finding fault with everything and every person that comes under their jaundiced eye. We remember seeing in our boyhood a biped of that kind sitting in a farm house looking at a newly published local newspaper. He held it in both hands, looked up and down the columns with a stare that he meant to palm off for omniscience and in a kind of contemptuous tone said—"poor paper," "poor paper," "miserable paper." We strongly suspected the fellow could not read, and on looking a little more closely discovered that he was holding the paper upside down. He was a representative man. He represents a large but not intelligent or influential constituency. His constituents are the people who find fault anyway.

A man of that kind might go into a store filled with the finest goods manufactured the world over. Either from instinct or habit he would find fault with everything in the establishment from end to end and from cellar to garret. Nobody should pay any attention to him. He would say that anyway.

There are people in almost every community who find fault with the church, the school, the council, the agricultural show, the newspapers, the neighbours, the doctors, the members of Parliament, the business men, in short with everything and everybody. Their unpleasant words have no more effect on the community than castor oil has on a marble statue. Why? Because everybody who knows them knows they would say that anyway. Sometimes they rope in a new-comer but when the new man and the new family find out how badly they have been sold they generally turn and rend the unpleasant fellow who sold them.

People who oppose everything soon come to have little or no influence beyond their power to make unpleasantness. Why? Simply because everybody knows they do

oppose everything. When they speak in opposition to any project people say, "Oh never mind, they would say that anyway."

One of the penalties a vindictive man pays for continually speaking against people he hates is the contempt with which decent men soon treat his malicious attacks. They say "Oh he hates that man, pursues him like a sleuth-hound—he would say these vile things anyway."

We once knew a fellow who used to say at the end of every sermon he heard "There was nothing in it." If Paul had risen from his grave and condensed the whole Epistle to the Romans into a thirty minute sermon the fellow would have said "There is nothing in it." No sensible person minded what that fellow said about sermons. They knew there was nothing in him but the colossal ignorance and conceit that led him to say that anyway.

Many attacks on Popery and Protestantisms go for absolutely nothing—some of them for less than nothing—because everybody knows the people who make them would say that anyway.

Charges of extravagance against Governments, municipal councils and other bodies that disburse money often fall flat, because the men who make them would say that anyway.

A newspaper that singles out a man for attack and keeps a running fire on him injures itself and helps the man. People soon learn to sympathize with the man and to meet every attack the paper makes by saying, it would say that anyway.

Are you one of the men concerning whom the neighbours always say, he would say that anyway. If so your influence for good will soon be as hard to find as the trousers of an ancient Highlander. Put yourself on a diet of silence for a year or two; meditate on the fact that a man has only one life to live and that he should try to do some good while passing on to the unseen line; surprise the neighbours once in a while by saying something they never expected you to say. Die rather than have your neighbours say, "Oh he would say something ugly anyway."

### WOMAN IN THE FOREIGN MISSION FIELD.

BY REV. CHARLES DOUMER.

Thanks to "Home Worker" for having thought it worth her while to notice my remarks on "Foreign Mission Work." Granted, "that the position I have taken in regard to women workers in the foreign field is rather sweeping." My paper was written when the news of the Ku-Cheng massacre were fresh; like many others in the Church, I may have spoken hastily at such a time. When we read of the late Mrs. Stewart "fighting like a tigress against her murderers," we are apt to wish that summary vengeance had been possible there and then. And as, from the nature of the case, this could not be done, the next best thing seems to advise Christian ladies to leave such dangerous posts to men. It is heroic for them to go, but is it wise? "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord Thy God," is not an obsolete command. It may be said that the Ku-Cheng outbreak was unexpected, and therefore that the women thought themselves safe. But a recent item tells of two missionaries in another part of Southern China barely escaping with life by driving an angry mob from the compound by covering the assailants with Winchester. There must be either a certainty of mortal danger, or else great cowardice, to make missionaries add rifles to their equipment. And thus, after calm deliberation, I cannot but reiterate my conviction that women have no business in those dangerous fields. "Home Worker" seems to have taken it for granted that I opposed women's missionary work altogether. All I claimed was that the Church "incurs a grave responsibility by allowing women to go and work among

heathen populations, where such outbreaks are not only possible, but probable." And thereupon I asserted, and assert still, that in the early ages of the Church men, not women, were sent as missionaries. The whole field was dangerous then; it is not so now, except in some parts of it? There is probably sufficient protection in India, under British Rule, to open that interesting region for women's work so indispensable owing to the seclusion of numbers of their sex in Zenanas. But China was the place I specially had reference to, and the inland stations are far from affording that security to missionaries which might justify the employment of women in the work. My plea for single male missionaries seems amply justified by Paul's advice in 1 Cor. vii. The apostle did not teach obligatory celibacy, but certainly held that it was good "for the present distress." Such a distress now exists in China. As to "Home Worker's" claim that Phoebe was a missionary I can only say that Theodoret considered her only as a deaconess, and thought that Paul lodged at her house in Cenchrea. (See also Barnes' notes on Romans xvi.)

I still claim that the missionary commission was given to the eleven—"To teach all nations and baptize them," etc., whilst the 14th and 16th chapter of John, with contain exhortations and consolations are addressed to all Christians. (See John xvii. 20). It remains true that the appointed teachers were men, not women, and that all the missionaries that we know of from the New Testament were also men. That many noble Christian women have since then gone to the Foreign Mission field, and done good work there no one denies. God will bless earnest work, whether done by male or female. But surely this does not make it a duty for the Church to send women to posts of danger, where men alone should go. Some of the great missionary associations of modern times have come to the conclusion to have only single male missionaries in their fields, as readers of Church news well know. What have been their reasons I have not heard. Possibly only the vulgar one of "less expense," but perhaps also the imprudence of allowing refined and cultured Christian ladies with more courage than judgment to sacrifice health and life uselessly. The time to show those inland Chinese by an object lesson what a Christian home is, is not yet come. They do not understand the position of woman in our civilization, as the Hon. G. N. Curzon states in his "Problems of the Far East," and they make of that which their benighted and evil minds cannot conceive, an additional reason for persecuting our heroic sisters.

Buckingham, Que.

### THE ANGLICAN PROVINCIAL SYNOD.

BY T. P.

The Provincial Synod of the Anglican Church met in Montreal a few days ago. The following are parts of what was done at it, during one of its seditious.

1. A large committee to promote the restoration of the unity of the Church, and to confer with representatives of any other denominations willing to confer on the subject, was appointed. It is altogether likely that this attempt to restore the unity of the Church will fare no better than did the Pope's for the same end. The two are of the same nature. Rome says to other churches: "You must come the whole way to Rome." Canterbury says: "You must come the whole way to Canterbury." The other churches reply: "The way is too long for us." Our Anglican friends have, with reference to the "historic episcopate"—so called—hoisted the flag of "No Surrender." Dr. Langtry moved the resolution in accordance with which the afore-mentioned committee was appointed. Fancy him consenting to the hauling down of the afore-mentioned flag! Why is it that, say Prin-

cipal Cavin, Principal Grant, or Principal MacVicar is never asked to preach in St. James' Cathedral when the General Assembly meets in Toronto? Why? Echo answers: "Why?" If either were asked to do so, there would be an explosion among the Anglicans, like that of a bomb of five hundred million horse-power. Former committees of the Anglican Church on Church Union in Canada have just "ended where they began."

2. A message was received from the Upper House to the effect that they desired to put no difficulties in the way of increasing the episcopate. This is a step in the right direction, provided that our Anglican friends go to the end of the road. We, Presbyterians, are not against bishops—yea, even diocesan ones. We are ultra-Episcopalians. We find fault with our Anglican friends, not for having bishops, but for having so few of them. With us, every pastor is a bishop—an *episcopos*—and his charge is his diocese. That is the true "historic episcopate," for it is the Scriptural one. It is to be hoped that our Anglican friends will increase their episcopate to the extent of making every pastor in their Church a bishop.

Woodbridge, Ont.

### HAVE ELDERS THE RIGHT TO BE MODERATORS OF PRESBYTERIES?—I.

MR. EDITOR,—This is a question that has often been asked in the past, and now it has been answered in the affirmative by the Presbyteries of Whitby, Hamilton and Owen Sound. Another question. Have these Presbyteries exceeded their powers, and violated any Law of the Church, or rather, any scriptural teaching on the point involved in the matter at issue?

The true answer to this question is to be found, neither in the usage of the Church nor in its order; but apostolic practice and Scripture teaching. So far as usage and church order are concerned it is answered now by existing practice, and need never have been raised. Let us here ask another question. Is it not a fundamental Presbyterian doctrine and Presbyterian, because it is founded on the Word of God, that the Church of Christ on earth consists of the whole body of Believers, those who profess the name of Christ, and are one with Him through faith in Him, and being one with Him are one in Him, without distinction of rank, color or condition, members of His body, of His flesh and of His bones, and thus members one of another, a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people, kings and priests unto God and His Father, through washing in His blood.

Is it not another foundation principle of Presbyterianism, and sanctioned alike by apostolic practice and the teaching of God's Word, that under God all inherent power rests in the body of Christ, or, in other words, that the Church, the body of Believers, is the fountain of power, and the source from which under God, all legislation, administrative and executive power issues, and by which it is determined and conferred? Neither in Session, Presbytery, Synod nor Assembly does inherent power exist. Their powers are delegated powers. These courts are the creatures of the Body of Christ, called into existence by the Church. The body of Believers voluntarily divests itself of its sovereign powers, and although inherently its own, vests them as delegated powers in the hands of these courts, to be used by them for the wise conduct and orderly management of its affairs, and for its spiritual oversight and edification. Thus we have first of all, and next to the fountain of power, the Session of each congregation, called into existence by the congregation, and which it is placed for its orderly government, its spiritual oversight and edification. This court in its own sphere is supreme in the exercise of its own peculiar functions.