

think so. Now, if I may be allowed a small space in your valuable paper, I would like to express my opinion in regard to the words in question. As a Sunday school teacher I have often thought this, that if my class were to ask me to criticise or point out to them any true meaning of the words, I should be unable to do so—as I cannot conscientiously say I approve of or that I see clearly any earnest devotional teaching in them. (I may be wrong). It seems to me absolutely an insult to the Church for those who are true upholders of the faith and true teachers of that faith, to sing those words Sunday after Sunday when they do not and cannot explain or give to others a sacred and holy meaning. This is not sincere or truthful worship. May I ask C.A.D. is it not the tune alone for which he has so great an affection? Until I can procure enlightenment on the true teaching of the words (if any), I must say I would think it better to have the hymn put aside, both for the teachers and those who look to them for sacred instruction. One who is not yet "weary waiting here."

A SUNDAY SCHOOL TEACHER.

Scripture Interpretation.

SIR,—Will you kindly allow me, through the correspondence column of your esteemed paper, to ask some of the more favoured readers, who are the fortunate possessors of the Scriptures in Greek or Hebrew, to give the literal translation of the assertion or prophecy made in this sentence, "See thou a man diligent in business, he shall stand before kings." What I want to get is the sense in which the word "before" is used here, whether it means in point of importance, or popularity, or that he (the diligent man) shall appear at court in audience with the king. To any lover of Scripture interpretation and application to the course of events, having in view the present prominence of millionaires and eminent business men, it strikes me the observation in question presents an interesting feature, and any information and explanation, if any can be obtained from the original, will be interesting. There must be many among your subscribers to whom these enquiries, and consequent "searching of the Scriptures" are a pleasure, and I hope I may not be out of order in asking that no effort be made to "squench" the subject by assuming each correspondent wishes to maintain his or her interpretation as the only right one, but that those who are able and willing to expound may be accorded a fair field, and much good will accrue, for assuredly the commandment to "Search the Scriptures" is just as valid and binding as any of those ten written on the tables of stone.

H. HAMMON.

Oswego, N.Y.

The Hymn "O! Paradise" Should be Wiped Out.

SIR,—In your issue of the 25th, I find I am attacked from both sides; C.A.D. is evidently a woman—her femininity leaps out from every line. I am glad to learn that she is devotional and educated, both desirable qualities, especially when a little politeness is added thereto. Her idea of my "revelling in gastronomic delights" is excessively funny. And when she brings Scripture to colour her conjecture, she verifies my suspicion of her sex. She puts me a good deal in mind of the man who attributed his inferior fiddle playing to the maker of the instrument. She defends her position by calling me names.

Referring to the hymn, I would say that I first knew it in 1870, and that my feeling with regard to it then was just what I have expressed now. My contention is, that it is poor in quality and unwholesome in its teaching. Take the lines,

"Who does not crave for rest?"

and

"'Tis weary waiting here."

Now this is cowardice pure and simple. To work while it is called day, and to be found at work when called, constitute the very gist and marrow of the whole New Testament's teaching. Addison in his noble hymn says:

"Thy mercy sweetens every toil,
Makes every region please."

In the second verse we get:

"The world is growing old."

Whether this is a scientific fact or not, would be a difficult question to answer. That it is getting older, one would readily admit, but that is no reason why a truth so familiar and so unimportant (as far as we are concerned) should be proclaimed in song every Sunday.

"Look on man:

His past is not of longer span than ours,
Though myriads of ages intervened."

Another line:

"Where love is never cold."

The inference here is deplorably weak. Love is not cold anywhere. Coldness can only exist where love is not.

Southey says:

"They sin who tell us love can die;
Its holy flame forever burneth,
From heaven it came, to heaven returneth."

Love is no more cold on earth than in heaven, and he who only experiences the divine glow by anticipation, is to be pitied. In the other verses the fact "that to be sown in dishonour" is the inevitable lot of mankind, seems to be forgotten, or else they breathe a querulous desire to quit the sphere where the Almighty has placed one.

Poor Chatterton says:

"Oh, why, my soul, dost thou complain,
Why drooping seek the dark recess?
Shake off the melancholy chain,
For God created all to bless."

Just a word in reference to the refrain. Of course I give both your correspondents credit for perfect earnestness, and their apparent horror at my criticism of some popular rhymes seems childish or idolatrous. I must confess to "Subscriber for the last eleven years" that I am totally unacquainted with the heraldic eccentricities of the Princes of Saxe Cobourg and Gotha, and would remind him that the mottoes emblazoned on their escutcheons are not sung in churches. He says he feels pity for the poor soul that does not share the rhapsodies which animate himself. I fancy I have heard this kind of thing before.

Milton, I think, on the creation of light, has:

"—and with preamble sweet
Of charming symphony, they introduce
Their sacred song, and waken raptures high."

Here the employment of the word is dignified and unaffected, while the incident and reflective use to which the writer of the hymn puts it makes it just the contrary.

R. P. C.

Why do Our Clergy Leave the Canadian Church?

SIR,—Permit me to say a few words in regard to the controversy *re* the exodus of many of the Canadian clergy to our sister Church across the border. Why do so many leave the Canadian Church for the American? Simply because it is almost an impossibility for a clergyman to procure anything beyond the barest necessities of life on many of the salaries offered by Canadian parishes. Why should a man, simply because he has consecrated his life to God's service, be compelled to live from day to day on a wage less than that earned by an ordinary mechanic? A clergyman can scarcely be expected to devote his mind wholly to the spiritual needs of his flock when his coal bin is empty and his pocket likewise, or when one of his family is lying sick and he is unable to procure the little delicacies which are so necessary at a sick bedside. A clergyman expects to live in a great measure a life of poverty, but there is a very great difference between voluntary and enforced poverty. Many people seem to forget, when making up their clergyman's salary, that it is his house to which all the tramps and beggars from the country side go for assistance, and no man has so many charitable calls made upon his slender purse as the parish priest. There are many who look upon the clergy in the same way as did an old churchwarden upon his rector at one time. The churchwarden, when approached by his rector on the subject of the payment of his stipend, said: "Why, I thought your duty was the care of souls and not the care of money." "True, my friend," was the answer, "but I cannot eat souls, they will not feed my family." The average Canadian is very close in his gifts towards his Church. A very brief glance at the various synod records will prove this. But with the American such is not the case. The American congregations do not say to a clergyman, as do many of the Canadian—"Come to us and minister to our spiritual needs: Come to us and be ready to obey any calls which we may place upon you: Come and preach good sermons and conduct many services, raise your family and educate it in a fitting manner, and buy your horse and keep it. In return we promise you six hundred dollars a year, but will not guarantee to pay more than two-thirds of it." No, sir! the American Churchman realizes fully the fact that his clergyman, in order to fill his duties faithfully, must be free from financial cares, and makes provision accordingly. That is the reason why so many Canadian clergy cross the line, and I do not blame them for taking advantage of opportunities which allow them to do their work more fully than when burdened with cares. A clergyman has no more right to neglect the needs of his family than he has those of his parish. Then again, a young doctor or lawyer strives to rise to the head of his profession, but what guarantee has a clergyman that there is preferment for him when he advances in years? The Canadian Church, if it stands in need of a Bishop or a governor for one of its colleges, politely passes by her own sons and looks to England for men to fill these offices—a decided reflection on the ability of the Canadian clergy, an ability which the American Church is quick to recognize and take advantage of.

Remember this please, Mr. Morton, when you may be tempted again to attribute the call of Canadian clergy by the American Church to her "craze for long distance calling." I admire the zeal of the Rev. J. H. Ross for our Canadian Church, but I find that he is in possession of what may be justly styled, for a young man, a comfortable living with chances of preferment, and consequently does not feel the need of a change as much as many of his less fortunate brethren. I cannot close without referring to Mr. Morton's statement regarding the old clergy across the border—"They are not wanted." No, not if Mr. Morton means by this that the old clergy are not called to new livings. But, Mr. Morton, are they in Canada? I think not. If he means, however, that clergy are put out of their livings when they grow old, then I have, after a very close experience with clergy in all parts of the United States, yet to learn of such cases. I am fully aware that the widows and orphans are not provided for in all the American dioceses as they are in Canada, but provision is made in another way. The salary of an American priest enables him to do what most business men, rich or poor, do, namely, insure his life for his family's sake. Nearly all the American clergy do so. Such a course is beyond the reach of many of the Canadian clergy, owing to the want of funds. Asking pardon for intruding to such an extent on your space.

"LAYMAN," Montreal.

Down-grade Progress of Dissent.

SIR,—General Booth lately paid a visit to Montreal, and it is reported that grave Methodist divines sat at his feet to be taught concerning the necessity of the sacraments. His teaching, though remarkable, is quite in accordance with the essential principles of Sectism of every name; and Mr. Booth's dogmas are the logical results of all separatists from the Apostolic Church and ministry. He told his disciples "that the sacraments were not essential to salvation. When at the gates of heaven, the saved would not be asked whether they were regular communicants;" and a vote of thanks was accordingly tendered the speaker on the motion of Rev. J. B. Silcox, seconded by Rev. Dr. Hunter. Notice the furtiveness that lurks in the statements, "the sacraments are not essential to salvation," and "the saved would not be asked whether they were regular communicants." How, when or where, did Mr. Booth obtain the revelation? On what authority does he assume that the saved will include those who wilfully and habitually neglect and despise the ordinances appointed and commanded by the Lord who is the Head of the Church, and will be the sole Judge as regards entrance into heaven? The Saviour commanded: "Do this," and make disciples, baptizing them, and places baptism on an equality of necessity to salvation, with faith and belief. Mr. Booth's position is clearly a wanton rebellion against the plain mandates of the Almighty Sovereign of the Kingdom and the Judge of all men; and rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness as iniquity and idolatry.—I. Sam. xv. 23. Mr. Booth and his sect, while by no means unmindful of themselves in sharing bountifully in the good things of this life provided by the contributions of the public for his schemes of philanthropy, claim much consideration and credit for self-sacrifice in their efforts to ameliorate the condition of the suffering and erring; but they ought not to forget that "to obey is better than sacrifice and to hearken (to the Lord) than the fat of rams." Surely Mr. Booth could do such work effectively, without wantonly assailing the institutions of the Divine Master, and exhibiting his wantonness of spiritual pride, and an assumption of infallibility out-doing in blasphemy the pretensions of the worst days of the Vatican. How extremes do meet! Such terrible exhibitions of spiritual pride, depravity, and treason are germane to the policy of Dissent in its every form. It begins by despising and disparaging the true teaching of the Saviour and His Apostles. It ignores the gospel institutions of the Apostolic Church and ministry, the one the body, the other the authorised ambassadors of Christ; then it ignores or openly rejects the plain teaching of Scripture, and ends by casting out the divinity of the Lord that bought them. This is no imaginary picture. Look at the down-grade of Presbyterianism into Unitarianism or Socinianism in Belfast, Berlin, Geneva, Boston and New England. They reject the Church, the ministry, the sacraments and institutions of the Gospel, and erect man-devised churches, ministry and institutions; they frame them to catch the popular ear and pander to the instincts of the same carnal mind of which all schisms are born. After a time they realize that such are not after the teaching of Christ, but after the rudiments of the world; that the wisdom evinced in their construction and procedure "descends not from above, but is earthly, sensual and devilish." Theirs is not the teaching or the practice of Christ and His Apostles; they proceed by rejecting the officers, government and statutes of the Kingdom, and finally dethrone the King Himself. Methodists, *e.g.*, construct their