

READY 1st DECEMBER.

## International Scheme of Lessons

FOR 1883.

Specially adapted for Presbyterian Sabbath Schools.  
MAILED FREE FOR 60c. PER 100.C. BLACKETT ROBINSON,  
5 JORDAN ST., TORONTO. PUBLISHER.

TORONTO, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 6 1882.

MR. MCKAY in his able pamphlet on Immersion exposes the misrepresentations of immersionist writers in their dishonest attempts to make Calvin and some of the Westminster divines favour their views. Such misrepresentation, however, is not by any means confined to the views of distinguished men. It extends even to figures. A writer in the "Baptist Review" tries to show that infant baptism is on the decline in the Presbyterian Church of the United States. His method is short and easy—that is to say, *easy* for a man who has so much regard for facts that he uses them economically. Making a comparison between 1870 and 1880, he says the number of baptisms in the Presbyterian Church in 1880 was 12,960. The number was 18,060. Last year the number was 19,026. Wonder if that writer ever read about Ananias and Sapphira. The "Review" article has been published in pamphlet form, and will no doubt be quoted by immersionist writers to prove that infant baptism is on the decline in the Presbyterian Church of the United States. It proves something else very conclusively.

THE statistical report of the Stratford Presbytery shows that our friends there have not quite agreed as to the standard of Christian liberality. For example, one congregation paid last year for all purposes at the rate of \$93.75 per family, while another paid \$67.77. The difference between these extremes is extraordinary, even if one did pay a church debt during the year. Another paid as high as \$44 per family, but this one, we are told, has the rent of \$200 acres of land, which leaves the amount really paid per family untold. In a congregation composed of two stations, one pays \$14.95 per family, the other \$8.59. In the membership column for all purposes there is every grade of liberality from \$67.82 down to \$4.04. We never saw such variety in a column before. Fifteen of the eighteen congregations provide manse or rented houses for their ministers. This is well. The report states that Mrs. Gordon, of Harrington, teaches a very large Bible class. We have no doubt that this class is both large and admirably taught, and join the report in hoping that many others may exist by the time the next report is made.

THE endowment of the Presbyterian College, Montreal, and the opening of Morrice Hall show in a most striking way the rapid stride that Presbyterianism is making in Canada. It seems but yesterday that the Montreal College was established, and it will be remembered that any number of good men thought the institution unnecessary. It would be rather interesting to turn up some of the gloomy predictions about failure, and read them alongside of the report of the proceedings the other day when Morrice Hall was handed over to the Church. The men of Montreal are men of faith and works. They believed in this college and they generously supplied the funds to make it a marked success. The Presbyterians of Montreal always were a liberal people, and they know how to do a big thing now better than they ever did. All honour we say to the men of the commercial capital, who have erected and endowed that Presbyterian landmark on McTavish street. A few have given princely sums, and a good many more whose names are not so familiar as the names of the McKays, Redpaths, and Morrices have done very well. We congratulate our Montreal friends in general, and the college authorities in particular, on the splendid position which the college now occupies. If we were quite certain our friends would be able to keep humble we could even wish them a few more endowments.

THE reporters tell us that when Mr. David Morrice handed over Morrice Hall the other day to the Church, his speech consisted of a very few words. We can quite understand that. Mr. Morrice belongs to a new school of oratory which we hope to see mightily increased—the school that speaks by deeds. So far as we can remember, Mr. Morrice never started at a convention. He never bores long-suffering audiences with commonplaces, or makes himself conspicuous on public occasions, but he *did* build a wing to a college. Mr. James McLaren, who put down his \$50,000 for Knox college the other day, is an orator of the same class. We don't remember that he ever "ran" a convention, but his \$50,000 do run up the endowment handsomely. Mr. Edward McKay belongs to the same school of oratory. The Church needs more orators of this same class. Who will make the next speech of the kind on behalf of Knox College? There is a gentleman in the county of Oxford not much given to speech making of the ordinary kind that we would like to see join the new school. Probably he would allow THE PRESBYTERIAN to introduce him. All we ask our friend to say is "HERE ARE \$50,000 FOR KNOX COLLEGE." That is about how Mr. Morrice or Mr. McLaren would put it. Now let us have a few more speeches of this kind.

OUR neighbour, the "Mail," had an article not long ago warning young men against political life, because in politics it is necessary to "treat every loafer as if he were a familiar, and every ruffian as if he were the salt of the earth." In our opinion the advice is unpatriotic, and the reason on which it is based incorrect as a matter of fact. Not only should every young man, but every man in Canada, take an active interest in politics—at least to the extent of understanding political questions and voting at every election. The very best men in the community are just the men that should make their influence felt in politics. This country of ours cost too much money and muscle to hand the government of it over to the "loafers" and "ruffians" of the community. We have little sympathy with those people that are too pious or too refined to vote. That kind of piety may do for a Plymouth Brother, but it is not sturdy enough for a Presbyterian. Religion that won't stand the strain of going behind the curtain and marking a ballot a man is better without. We know some excellent men who can even go on the hustings and make a speech without losing their religion. Nor is it necessary for a public man to be on friendly terms with "loafers" and "ruffians." Taking representatives from both Parliaments and both sides, may we ask the "Mail" if Sir Leonard Tilley and Mr. Blake, Mr. Mowat and Mr. Morris, are on familiar terms with "loafers" and "ruffians?" A pleasing address is no doubt an element of success in public life, and so it is in business or in any profession. Companionship with "loafers" and "ruffians" injures a public man.

## THE HOLY CARPET.

IT used to be a matter of just and vehement complaint that British soldiers in India were made to take part in the heathen rites of Jugganath and other Indian idols, and to present arms when the Host was carried past (in Malta). Nay, often to take part in the procession. Under the pressure of public opinion in Britain such tyrannical enforcement of conscience in the name of policy was abolished. Our most recently manufactured hero in Egypt, however, has revived the custom in making his soldiers parade at the religious ceremony of the Prophet's "Holy Carpet." Not so much condemnatory notice has been taken of this as it deserves, still it has been protested against, and that by even some of the chaplains of the army itself. Indeed, the senior chaplains of the Roman Catholic, Anglican, and Presbyterian Churches attached to the army affixed their names to a formal protest addressed to the commander-in-chief, and received a somewhat sniffing supercilious reply from the hero, who evidently wished them to understand that he would suffer no one to meddle with such matters. If he in the might of his power and policy were to think it necessary to require his soldiers to perform the *Kotu* before the Emperor of China or the Grand Lama of Tibet, they would, it seems, have no choice but to do so, and their religious teachers would be very impertinent if they interfered. Now this sort of talk may be all very fine, very high and very

mighty, and no doubt coming from the hero of Tel-el-Kebir (who by the way is rather high salutin' in his sentence making) may be thought by many to be all as it ought to be. But let that gentleman just do his spiriting and magnificence gently, for there will be a good many things to be said and done before the old time salutations to Indian heathenism and Maltese idolatry shall be revived in honour of the false prophet in Egypt, and shall be forced to be rendered by British soldiers on pain of their being punished for disobedience of orders, or sneered at as fanatics and fools.

By the way Sir Garnet's reply is described by some as a "gem" in its way. Perhaps it is, but we confess to being unable fully to appreciate either its "neatness" or its contemptuous sarcasm. Here is part of it: "While acknowledging their reverences' zeal for the spiritual welfare of Her Majesty's forces, the general commanding reserves to himself the right of arranging such worldly matters as regimental musters in the manner which appears to him best. I see," he adds, and evidently he intends to be exceedingly heart-cutting and caustic, "that an English newspaper says that no Presbyterian chaplains were at the front or even near it during the battle of Tel-el-Kebir. I can only say that I saw them there." Terribly short, sardonic, and significant, of course, but what its bearing upon the question of British troops being paraded to take part in the religious ceremony of the procession of the Holy Carpet, and of the propriety or impropriety of Christian chaplains, protests against such violence to the conscientious religious convictions of some, at any rate, of the soldiers is not so easily perceived. Some phrases look all the grander from their occult references not being fully understood.

## WHY DO PEOPLE GO TO CHURCH?

THERE is nothing more frequently heard from a certain class of the community than that Christianity is either already dead or at any rate rapidly dying, and that the pulpit has become so effete and unattractive, that it is quite likely in a short time to disappear altogether. Now where is the evidence for all this? After all has been said, we fail to see anything whatever which seems to have more attractive power than this same despised pulpit. A very "broad," perhaps a very decidedly anti-Christian lecturer comes round, has a full house, and awakens quite an amount of interest. People cry, "Just look at that! What success! Oh, if the pulpit could do as well!" Well, just look at it and think over the whole matter for a minute or two. That lecturer takes good care not to visit the same place above once in twelve months, if so often. Supposing he were to settle down and give any one community a twelvemonth of his attractiveness, unbelief, and agnosticism. What would be the result? We venture upon no extraordinary prophecy when we say that long before the year was over he would be left high and dry to propound his views to empty benches. He could not find any number of hearers to wait week in week out on his ministrations of doubt, difficulty, and denial, and still less would he find any or many willing to pay him for such negative teaching. They would say, "We can do our own doubting very well without your assistance, and have no idea of giving you a fat salary for your services in this respect." But now look at the Christian churches after all the outcry about the weakness of the preachers, and the indifference of the people. Thousands, millions, fill those churches during fifty-two days in the year, and every year as it comes round. Why? They want to hear the Gospel. Who forces them? Nobody. They come of their own proper motion. Are they specially stupid, ignorant and hypocritical who do so? Folly itself if measurably honest would not say so. They are on the contrary among the shrewdest, most clear-headed and energetic people going. They know the value of money, and are not likely to throw it foolishly away. And yet they not only attend religious services, but they build costly churches, and pay often handsome salaries. Not only so. They are found doing what an unbeliever or Agnostic never does or can do—contributing large sums in order to keep up a system of propagandism in other lands and among alien peoples. Why is this? Is it not that cold as religion may be thought to be, and too often is, it is after all the one thing that lives and burns in the hearts of multitudes, and therefore to all carpers and objectors who are so ready with the inquiry, Why *don't* people go to church? We have a previous inquiry which calls for a satisfactory answer.