

Our Contributors.

MR. OLDTIME ON THE TARIFF AND OTHER MATTERS.

BY KNOXONIAN.

If Mr. Oldtime could come back from his grave he might be supposed to make a speech something like the following:—

Men of Canada, I notice on my return that you are very much exercised about your tariff. Three members of your Government are going about the country hearing what you have to say about protecting your business and helping you on generally. In my day members of the Government never came round except at election times when they wanted our votes, and as few of us had votes in those early days we did not see much of our rulers. We had a *Chopping Association* in our township, but we never sent any deputation to the Government to ask that the duty be raised or lowered on our axes. We just kept pegging away at the trees until they fell. Our arms were often sore but they were not made sore by shaking hands with members of Parliament. Our backs often ached but the pain was not caused by bowing and scraping to tariff commissioners. We chopped hard every winter and soon made as big a hole in the forest as you would make in the Dominion revenue or in Mr. Hardy's surplus if you got a chance. We also had a

LOGGING ASSOCIATION.

The Chopping Association and the Logging Association stood in about the same relation to each other as you Grits and Tories stand when you want to make a haul of some kind—they worked together. Logging was rather hard work but it had to be done and we did it. We worked as hard as some of you moderns do when you are saving the country at an election or looking for an office after the country has been saved. The Loggers' Association never appeared before any tariff commission nor waited on any Government. We just worked away and cleared up the land. Had we understood modern methods we might have asked the Government for help of some kind, but we were ignorant of those modern improvements; we were simple-minded bushwhackers without any knowledge of political economy and we just had to go on and help ourselves.

It will surprise you to hear that we had a

SUGAR TRUST

in those early times. Most of us were manufacturers of sugar. The process was simple except when the snow was deep. We just went out to the woods, tapped the maple tree, and let the sap flow into a home-made trough. Then we boiled the raw material into the manufactured product. We were all sugar barons in those good old days and many of our wives and daughters were baronesses. We never went to the Government and asked them to put a prohibitory tariff on Muscovado. If any of our citizens preferred Muscovado and could afford to get it that was none of our business. Besides the leading politicians of those days were nearly all Free Traders in principle. They believed in a tariff for revenue purposes only. Their minds had been poisoned in their youth by British Free Trade heresy. George Brown was fairly ruined in that way when he was a young man in Edinburgh. Our public men had not learned to sit at the feet of Yankee tariff manipulators and receive from them chunks of fiscal wisdom. So we just had to go on and manufacture sugar as best we could, take it to the nearest corner store and exchange it for goods. We also manufactured molasses and the young people sometimes made taffy. I notice that the politicians give you lots of taffy at election times and that you often give the Government taffy when you want favours, but yours is not the kind of taffy we used to make. Yours is another kind of industry.

In those early days we had

A GOOD ROADS ASSOCIATION

in nearly every township. There was not much style about these associations. We had no brilliant editors writing up "good roads"—no conventions about good roads—no Government inspector coming round to inspect our roads. We just went into the woods and got timber and made a corduroy bridge across the swamps. It was corduroy or no road, and we said corduroy. I notice some of you dudes turn up your imbecille noses at the mention of corduroy bridges. Better men than you will ever be made corduroy roads and drove over them for years. Better women than you will ever marry carried their babies over corduroy roads. Better babies than you will ever own were rocked in a sap trough and carried over corduroy bridges. In fact, I hope you may never own any kind of a baby. There are too many of your kind in the country now.

I notice you modern citizens are making a great fuss over what you call your

MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION.

I suppose you think we old-timers knew nothing about schools because we did not make such a noise about the matter as you have been making. You very likely think that we had no religious exercises in our schools because in our day there was not a man on every stump shouting about religion in the schools. I tell you we old-timers were just the men who did know a good deal about schools. We built the first school-houses with our own hands. If the building of school-houses had to be left in the hands of many of the men who have been shouting about the Manitoba School Question there would not be half a dozen school-houses in any county in Canada. Why, even Sifton and D'Alton McCarthy and Laurier and Tarte and all the rest of them could not build a school-house such as we old-timers built when the country was new. Not a man of them could "build a corner," if the effort were to save his life. And we had religious exercises too. The children read the Bible and the teacher often explained it, and no one made any fuss. School was always opened and closed with prayer. There was more religion in the schools then than there is now and no one objected. Clergymen often dropped in and said an encouraging word to the children without having their visits regulated by Act of Parliament. I tell you—and here Mr. Oldtime showed some temper—this bad feeling about schools has been worked up mainly by priests and by politicians who would rather ride on a wave of sectarian hate than not ride at all. I suppose you think we did not learn anything in those early schools. I can tell you one thing we did not learn. We never learned to put two l's in until. That achievement was left for a college man of modern days. Our girls did not learn to write that they took a glass of "ail" before dinner. That triumph in orthography was left for modern times and a fashionable institution. Yes, we did learn a little, and correct spelling was one of the things that many of the old dominies made a specialty.

Mr. Oldtime discussed several other matters and took his seat amidst painful silence. The dudes present said "Oldtime's speech was in bad form." The intelligent, thoughtful people went home acknowledging, some of them, rather reluctantly, that Oldtime had given them something to think about.

UNIFORMITY IN PUBLIC WORSHIP.

BY REV. JOHN LAINO, D.D.

The report of the committee on this subject was received by last General Assembly; but as it had not been reached until late in the last evening, and as a subject so important ought not to be disposed of by a small remnant such as was then present, consider-

ation of the report was postponed till next Assembly.

It seems unnecessary to enlarge on the several points of the report; but it may not be amiss to say a few words by way of removing certain misconceptions of the action of the committee which I have met with in private conversation. In what follows I wish it to be understood that I am writing my own individual sentiments, and that the committee is not responsible for these.

The design of the original overture was not to consider "the whole question regarding uniformity of worship;" as the Assembly of 1895 instructed the committee to do. It was merely "to afford direction to the Church, so as to secure the reverent and edifying observance of public worship, with due regard to Christian liberty on the one hand and general uniformity on the other, throughout the entire body." This seemed desirable and attainable without the prescription of any particular liturgical forms; and the overtureists thought this could be brought about by a revision of the Westminster Directory, adapting it to the changed circumstances and needs of the Church at the present time. The proposal did not originally come from those who feel a need of "enriching" our Church services, as they express it, although such men at once fell in with the proposal, and have rendered good service to the committee. Even the most enthusiastic Liturgists never dreamed of introducing a liturgy either obligatory or optional into this Church.

The third section of the Basis of Union provides that "the worship of this Church shall be in accordance with the recognized principles and practice of Presbyterian Churches as laid down generally in the Directory for the public worship of God" (Westminster). At ordination our ministers and elders "acknowledge the purity of worship at present authorized in this Church and promise to conform thereto." Now at the date of the union many usages obtained which are not referred to, nay, in some cases, as we shall see, were virtually objected to by the Westminster divines, such as singing of hymns, instrumental music, anthems, funeral services with prayers at the grave, dedication or consecration services for buildings, etc.; so that we must interpret the following statement from the Westminster Form of Church Government by the light of the Basis of Union when we seek to ascertain what was "the purity of worship authorized by this Church" at the Union. "The ordinances in a single congregation are praying, thanksgiving, and singing of psalms, the Word read, . . . the Word expounded and applied, catechizing, the sacraments administered, collection made for the poor, dismissing the people with a blessing."

It will be admitted that the Westminster Directory is not now generally followed; indeed, many office-bearers scarcely know that there is such a book, and not a few have never seen it, nor do they care to read it. Those who do know its provisions are convinced that these are not in many respects suitable to the present time, hence they think the book should be revised and adapted to the present needs of the Church. A return to the practices of the seventeenth century is not to be thought of.

The reasons given by the Westminster divines for setting aside "the liturgy used in the Church of England" have not certainly lost their cogency, and the foresight of these men has been and is to-day fully vindicated when they "resolved to lay aside the former liturgy with the many rites and ceremonies formerly used in the worship of God." We also must admire their "care to hold forth such things as are of divine institution in every ordinance; and to set forth other things according to their rules of Christian guidance agreeable to the general rules of the Word of God. Their meaning or aim also commends itself, "that there may be a consent of all the churches in those things that contain the substance of the service and worship of God; and the ministers may be directed in their administrations to

keep like soundness in doctrine and prayer, and may, if need be, have some help and furniture . . . and may be careful to furnish heart and tongue with further or other materials of prayer and exhortation as shall be needful on all occasions."

When this Directory was approved by the General Assembly of the Scottish Church, an important proviso was added regarding the usages of that Church in which the Scottish or Genevan Common Service Book had a place, viz.: "This shall be no prejudice to the order and practice of this Kirk, in such particulars as are appointed by the books of discipline and Acts of General Assemblies, and are not otherwise ordered and appointed in the Directory."

From this it is clear that in our Canadian Church there is nothing to prevent each individual minister, session and congregation to have the service such as may be deemed for edification. This present liberty it is not proposed to abridge; but to set forth for the guidance of all concerned such an order as in the opinion of this Church is suitable to its present circumstances and requirements which may be followed by any who are seeking direction.

But it may properly be asked: Is there any need for this being done at this time? Not a few, both of ministers and earnest, intelligent laymen are strongly of opinion that there is such need; and that the sooner such direction is afforded the better it will be for the Church. I may not enter fully into the reasons for they are many, but a few statements will suffice.

In the second part of the report, "The committee finds,"—our readers will see the state of matters as reported to the committee. In the third section we read, "that additions to the services hitherto obtaining have already been introduced." And reference is made to the effect these must have in time to come. Is the tendency towards ritualism and formality? Should these new usages be encouraged or discouraged? In the fifth section we find: "In the administration of the sacraments, the solemnization of marriage, and the burial of the dead forms of service are generally used." It might be added that there are also in use services for the dedication of churches, for admission to full communion, and for the baptism of adults as something different in its nature from that of infants. A great variety of forms are in use, some as given in *Elogia* and other books prepared for the Scottish Churches, others are taken from the American Churches, prepared by such men as A. A. Hodge, Herrick, Johnston, etc., while some forms are taken from Churches not Presbyterian, and others have been prepared by the minister himself. Now it does seem advisable that this Church should guide ministers as to the use of such forms, or if expedient even prepare forms which may be used by those who desire to do so.

It is to be observed just here that however good some of the forms in use may be, there are things found in them which are not in accordance with the Westminster Directory, and some things are ignored which that formulary requires. For example: In baptism some forms do not recognize the federal relation of children to the Church; and ignore the corresponding duty of parents to the Church, and in this and other ways fail to give the solemnity and importance of the ordinance due prominence. The same may be said regarding the Lord's Supper when celebrated according to some forms. In the solemnization of marriage, also, the minister, according to many forms, declares that the parties are married "in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost," using the baptismal formula which certainly is not in accordance with the Westminster Directory. In the burial of the dead our general practice of "praying and reading at the grave" is in direct contravention of the Westminster Standard, and if it is permitted, our revised Directory should not forbid it. In the Appendix to the Westminster Directory we find: "As no place is capable of any holiness under pretence of whatsoever dedica-