

Our Contributors.

THE THING WE ALL WANT.

BY KNOXONIAN.

We have not heard a better address for many a day than the one Principal Caven delivered at the Synodical conference in Collingwood on the methods of training in our theological colleges. It was at once an exposition and a defence of the system and when the learned Principal finished there did not seem to be anything left for anybody else to say.

The department of elocution in Knox College, the Principal said, was not what he would like, but the authorities were doing all that their limited means would allow.

"GIVE US A LITTLE MORE MONEY, BRETHREN,"

said he, "and we will be delighted to strengthen that department." Yes, that is just what most of us need. If we had a little more money most of us could do a good many things for the Church that we cannot do now.

If the Home Mission Committee had a little more money they might take up a few more fields in the North-West and pay higher salaries to the missionaries at present doing Home Mission work. A little more money in the pocket of a student is a great thing for the young man. It would enable him to buy more books and it might save him from incessant worry over the problem of making financial ends meet. Poverty may have its uses—it may even be a blessing very much disguised, but for one student helped by poverty at least twenty are hindered by it.

A little more money for Augmentation would be an unspeakably great blessing for the pastors of Augmented congregations. Working a struggling congregation is hard enough under any circumstances, but working one when you don't know how much your salary is, must be a sore trial to a good man and a sorer one for his wife. It is easy to say a minister should cut according to his cloth. So he should, but if he does not know how much cloth there is how can he cut according to it. The annual threat that the little salary must be cut down if the funds do not come in must be painful reading for the pastor of a supplemented congregation. We would rather not say what his wife must feel when she glances at that kind of literature. There are some things even in the Presbyterian Church that it is as well to pass over in silence unless one is reasonably sure that one can remedy them.

A little more money for the Foreign Mission Committee would enable that excellent body of Presbyterians to find a balance on the right side of their account. A good deal more would enable them to do much more work. The committee might easily have had a balance in favour of their treasurer. All they needed to do was to cable to eight or ten missionaries to come home at once. In fact they might have saved all the money by doing no more at all. There is nothing easier than to save money in Church work. Just stop the work and the thing is done. Any congregation can easily put an end to its annual expenditure. Just stop working and paying and no more money will be needed. In fact most congregations could make a little money by turning their manse into a saloon and their church into a soap factory. But neither a congregation nor a mission committee exists for the sole purpose of saving a little money. They exist for the purpose of doing certain kinds of work and so long as the work goes on the money must be paid out.

If the colleges had a little more money they might do a great many good things that they cannot do now. A glance at the annual incomes of Princeton, Union and McCormick seminaries makes a thoughtful man wonder how ours do any work at all.

A little more money would enable many a pastor to do his work ten times as ef-

ficiently as he can ever hope to do it without a little more. One hundred dollars a year may make all the difference between reasonable comfort and genteel poverty. And by the way genteel poverty is the meanest and most humiliating kind of poverty. A little more money would help many a minister to add a few good books to his library every year. Trying to keep one's mind active and to keep up to the times without new books is as hard as canvassing a constituency without money to defray legitimate expenses. A little more money would enable many a minister to lay aside his old coat before the sleeves become so glossy that they can almost be used for a looking glass. Moralize about it as you may a good coat is a good thing. A good suit of clothes greatly helps to build up a man's self-respect. A shabbily dressed minister is often the outward and visible sign of a small-souled, close-fisted congregation.

A little more money would be a great thing for some of our politicians at the present time, or even a month's suspension of the election law would work wonders in some constituencies.

A little more money, brethren, and we could have just as good church papers in the Presbyterian Church in Canada as Presbyterian people have in any part of the world. But there is no use in enlarging on that point. It seems utterly impossible to make the average man believe that publishing a religious newspaper is largely a matter of money.

Yes, brethren a little more money would do a great many other good things in the church as well as strengthen the elocution department in Knox College. And we might have not only a little more, but a great deal more if all our people would do their share of the giving.

"HISTORICUS" ON THE MOS-LEMS.

BY REV. T. FENWICK.

IN THE CANADA PRESBYTERIAN of May 13th, the above named correspondent says that such titles as the following, which the Moslems apply to their god, Allah, "Merciful, Compassionate, Forgiver, Acceptor of Repentance, Pardoner, and Patient," are "certainly a very fair reflection at least of the Mosaic doctrine." That is certainly very beautiful, but in connection with it read the following: "In the 47th chapter of the Koran are these words, 'When ye encounter the unbelievers, strike off their heads until ye have made a great slaughter.' And a commentator on the Koran says, 'To violate the wives and daughters of Christians—dogs, infidels—is just; to ruin their churches a virtue; to plunder and pillage their property is the command of God; and for every Christian whose blood is shed by a Moslem, the reward is a nymph in the paradise of God.' The butchers of the Armenians, therefore, have only carried out principles instilled into them from childhood.

"Historicus" mentions some instances in which Moslems have treated Christians kindly. That only proves that they were better than their creed. He speaks of the persecutions of the Protestants by the Romanists, and of that of the Presbyterians by the English Government and Church in Ireland. To use a homely expression, "two blacks do not make a white."

The present massacre of the Armenians, as well as past evil actions of "the unspeakable Turk," is, and were, the results of the teachings of Mohammedanism. The Chicago Interior therefore reasons well when it says: "Mohammedanism, both in theory and practice, is earthly, sensual and devilish. It fills all the specifications of devil-worship. The Moslems are Monotheists—they worship one god, but that god is not God, it is the devil."

Woodbridge, Ont.

THE SINGLE TAX.

[Owing to press of other matter the publication of this article has been delayed.—EDITOR.]

MR. EDITOR,—Principal Grant, of Queen's University, Kingston, after hearing a debate on the Single Tax, stated as his profound conviction based on a thorough study of Henry George's theory and works, that "George was wrong as to his facts and wrong as to his philosophy." A few years ago the Principal delivered an address to the students of Trinity University when he accused George of advocating a doctrine of "theft." The reverend gentleman was asked for a reason for making such a charge; but from that day to this he has never done anything to justify the serious aspersion which he then cast on the writings of Mr. George. The advocates of Single Tax gave him every opportunity to show them where they were mistaken, without result. The following are a few extracts from an open letter to Principal Grant published in one of the city papers a marked copy of which was sent him, viz.:—

"You will surely admit that a man has a right to the fruit of his industry; that any denial of this doctrine would be immoral. And you will further doubtless admit that no one has a right to demand from the producer his product, unless he is prepared to offer produce or service in exchange. Are not these the principles that lie at the basis of property and are not these the principles that our laws should most sacredly maintain? When the farmer produces food, the clothier clothing, the builder houses, they establish an invincible right to product, for they have produced; but when a speculator obtains land and raises nothing but a lot of weeds by what right can he claim food from the farmer, clothing from the clothier, or buildings from the builder. From the earth he has brought forth nothing, and if he obtains produce from the farmer, the clothier and the builder, he obtains produce without rendering either produce or service in exchange. He has used land as an agent, not of production but extortion. So long, therefore, as we tolerate speculation in land we make it impossible for the producer to enjoy the products of his industry.

"And what difference would it make if the speculator, instead of selling out at a profit, were to retain the ownership of that land, and develop into a landlord, charging his fellows year after year for the privilege of occupying this earth? With every increase of population and consequent relative scarcity and dearth of land his power of appropriation would increase; his fortune would grow; he would acquire the power to take from his fellow men more and more of their product for which he would be under no obligation to furnish any service in return. Let a man do this and is he not relieved from all necessity to work? While the farmer must bring forth a crop every year and other producers must toil ten hours daily to maintain the needed supplies to support society. This man who charges his fellows for living on the earth, is exempt from this law of labor, and endowed by our social regulations with power to deprive the producer of his product. Our present law maintains this wrong, and you advocate its continuance for all time. What you try to justify is the perpetuation of a system that imposes the whole burden of production on one portion of the community, and then compels these producers—the farmer, the mechanic, the clerk, the merchant and the railroad man—to surrender a large portion of the results of their industry to the landlord and the land speculators who simply charge the producers for permission to produce.

"Whilst you charge us with advocating theft, you give no hint as to what delusion we are misled by. But we see the strongest reasons for believing that we are right. If we appeal to the Scriptures, there we find the statement emphasized again and again that the land is the gift of God, not the merchandise of the speculator. In Toronto

people are compelled to pay as high as 600 thousand dollars per acre per annum for access to land which the Bible assures us is the inheritance of God's children. When we claim God's gifts for God's children, we are advocating immorality and theft. When the Bible teaches that "the land shall not be sold in perpetuity," as it declared in Leviticus xxv. 23, does it refer only to some temporary expedient or to some eternal principle?

"If we appeal to the marked difference between trade in products and trade in land, we find equally strong confirmation of our conclusion. When one raises corn and another raises clothing and they exchange, the equity and justice of this transaction are at once apparent. Here the transaction is mutually beneficial, each serving and enriching the other. This is trade, and the righteousness of this is unquestionable. But when we see one set of men speaking to their fellows in this wise: You must pay us for access to the gifts of the Creator; you must bring forth from the mine, the forest, the land and the sea; you must be the hewer of wood and the drawers of water; and when you have fashioned the metal and the timber when you have procured the corn and the fish, then you must surrender a large share of these to us for the privilege of placing your home, your shop, your store, your factory or your warehouse on the land; for the land is ours for ever. To you inevitably falls the lot of doing all the toil necessary to maintain all the supplies needful not only to support yourselves and your families, but also to support us and our families, and to maintain the Government of the country. The same thing you must do next year and the next and so on for ever. For the earth with its potentialities belongs to us and our heirs forever. We ask you: Is this trade or is it tribute? Is this freedom or is it slavery? Because we say 'this must cease,' you say we advocate stealing. When then must honesty be?

"Again, if we observe what must be the inevitable effect of the present arrangement on society, we are still further confirmed in the opinion that we are right. The growth of population on this continent is one of the most remarkable phenomena in the world's history. Its rapidity is amazing. With every increase in population, the value of the land must necessarily increase; and as a fact it does increase. Every increase of this value now means an increase in the amount of product that the producers must give up to the landlord. It means a widening in the gulf that divides the house of Have from the house of Want. It means that the fortune of the land owners hall rise to fabulous figures, thousands yearly—for producing nothing; and it also means that the obligation of the producers shall also increase, their indebtedness shall grow—a residence more palatial for the landlord, and only a hovel for the producer. It means the terrible social phenomenon of one part of society sinking inevitably deeper and deeper in debt to another portion of society, paying year by year more and more, yet in spite of millions paid, the obligation grows larger, the debt more immense. The more that is paid the more there is to pay. The debt is continuous, increasing and irredeemable.

"Because we say this must some day cease, you charge us with teaching immorality and advocating stealing."

You will see by the above extracts that we do not content ourselves as does Dr. Grant by mere assertions, but we support our position by arguments drawn not only from practical experience, but also from the Word of God, of which Principal Grant is a professed teacher. This letter has never yet been answered and until it is, those who know of the circumstance must consider that the only reason for his ignoring it was because the learned gentleman found it unanswerable. However we now give him another opportunity to show if he can the fallacies he speaks of, or else to frankly admit they do not exist.

ALAN THOMPSON.

Toronto.