

enco

At the social meeting of Dumfries street church, Paris, a feature of the evening was a representation of the various heathen countries of the earth. Each country was represented by a person dressed in character who gave a recitation describing the miseries of the heathen and their need of Gospel light. The local paper describes the affair as "a grand success."

QUEBEC.
 MET in Quebec, on the 25th September. Elders' commissions in favour of Messrs. W. McKelvie and Robt. Brodie for Inverness and Chalmers' church, Quebec, respectively, were accepted. Circular letters from the Conveners of the Home Mission and Augmentation Committees were read. Exercises by Messrs. K. MacLennan, H. Craig, W. J. Jamieson, and Narcisso MacLaren (students), were submitted, and, on the report of the committee appointed to examine the same were sustained. These students were certified to their respective colleges. The Rev. Angus MacLeod's induction to Winslow was fixed for October 9th; Rev. John MacLeod to preside, preach, and administer the minister, and Rev. D. L. Stewart the people. The ordination of certain elders at Winslow was recognized, notwithstanding the irregularities, to which exception had been taken. Rev. D. Macdonald (Glenarn) having declined the call from Lake Megantic, the congregation was granted leave to moderate in a call when ready. The following new grants were recommended—Scotstown, \$300 per annum, and Winslow \$200 per annum. Rev. Jno. A. Morrison tendered his resignation of the charge of Danville. The session and congregation were cited to appear, for their interests, at a special meeting to be held on the 14th October. Rev. James M. Whitelaw was appointed missionary to Valcarlos for three years. The attention of the Presbytery was called to the fact that the Protestant Committee of the Council of Public Instruction would, in a short time, be called upon to give their decision in regard to the \$60,000 set apart for Protestant Superior Education in terms of the Jesuits' Estates Bill. After consideration, it was unanimously resolved, that the Presbytery of Quebec be firmly resolved that the Protestant Committee should not offer. The attention of the Presbytery having been called to the loss of life and sorrow occasioned by the disaster caused by the rock-slides from Cape Diamond, Dufferin Terrace, the following resolution, moved by Rev. D. Tait, seconded by Rev. James D. Ferguson, was unanimously adopted. "That the Presbytery of Quebec having learned, with deep sorrow, the great calamity which has befallen the City of Quebec, by which a large number of its inhabitants have lost their lives, and many others have sustained severe bodily injuries, and many have been plunged into deep sorrow on account of the sad death of relatives, desires to express its sincere sympathy with the bereaved, and those who are suffering in any way in consequence of this disaster, and earnestly prays that the God of all grace and comfort may strengthen and comfort them in their hour of great trouble, and that this sad affliction may be overruled for His own glory and the spiritual well-being of the City of Quebec."—J. R. MACLEOD, *clerk*.

Met in St. Andrew's church, Petersburg, Sept. 20th, Rev. W. H. Jamieson, Pres. D. of Perrytown, was in the Moderator's chair when the Presbytery opened. Communications were received on behalf of the following elders as representatives of their respective Kirk Sessions and their names were added to the roll of Presbytery.—M. Sanderson, Springfield; W. H. Mann, Baltimore; John Clark, Ballyduff; Wm. Archer, Milbrook; R. bt. Boardland, Hastings; Andrew Fairbairn, Lakefield; Asaiah Thompson, Omeete. Rev. Mr. Carmichael, of Norwood, was then elected Moderator for the next six months. Leave was granted the Moderators of the Sessions of the First Presbyterian church, Port Hope, and the congregation at Campbellford, to moderate in a call. The pulpit of both of these churches were also reported vacant. Rev. Messrs. Hay, Torrance and McEwen were appointed a committee to strike standing committees. Rev. Mr. Carmichael submitted a report agent his visit to Janetville, Antypool and Ballyduff. The report was exceedingly favourable as to the condition of these stations and was received. Communication was received from the Rev. Andrew's church congregation in reference to the same.

At the public meeting of the Alumni Association of Knox, Wednesday evening, 2d inst., Principal Caven delivered an address on the question of the hour "The Duty of the Ministry and the Church in regard to Jesuit Aggression." The President of the Association, Rev. D. H. Fletcher, D.D., presided, and the Convocation Hall, where the meeting took place, was crowded. A large number of ministers, graduates of the College, and others who were present at the opening exercises in the afternoon, were in the audience. Following is *The Mail* report:

Principal Caven, who was received with cheers, said:—"I am not responsible for choosing this subject for the evening. I am almost afraid you may think that I have the Jesuits on the brain. (Laughter.) I want to say that the office-bearers of the society have the responsibility of the blame, not I, in regard to the choice of the subject. I suppose they were considerate enough to remember that I had been speaking about it several times, and possibly thought that I had disqualified myself from speaking about anything else. (Laughter.) You will find me to say in the outset that I do not intend—would indeed be utterly impossible in the time at my disposal, to enter into any full discussion of this subject—to deal, say instance, with the history of the Jesuit Estates Act or other matters that are cognate to that subject. I would say first that the Church of Christ, in her organized capacity, ought not to go into the subject of general politics. I suppose there is little difference of opinion amongst us on that question. The Church has her own commission, and her own domain, and these are extensive enough and important enough without travelling into regions that do not belong to her; and when her proper instruments and powers cannot be advantageously used, I think it is a very great mistake to turn a Church court, if this is ever done, into a political arena and to discuss questions upon which fair-minded and Christian men are honourably divided, as if these were to be regarded in any sense as tests of Church standing or of Christian character. I would be prepared to join with those who vindicate the largest liberty for the members of our Church in regard to political views. Our Church is not Conservative and it is not Liberal. It embraces members who hold both political creeds, and I should be extremely sorry that the time should ever come when a man's place would be made unpleasant because he held certain political views. (Applause.) There are cases, however, where

questions that are political so far and
 that are moral and religious so far, and
 in questions of this description, I think
 that the Church is not only at liberty to
 speak, but that it becomes her clear duty
 to speak. I might illustrate what I say
 by referring to the marriage question and
 the Sabbath question. There are many
 other questions, but these are two prom-
 inent ones of a mixed character which
 have on the one side moral and religious
 affinities, and which, on the other side,
 have certain political bearings. These
 questions will be dealt with by Pallia-
 ment, but it is also proper that the voice of
 the Church should be pronounced upon
 them. The Presbyterian Church, I have
 said, during her whole history, has taken
 a very clear view. I may go further and
 say that the prophets of the old dispensa-
 tion held that view. The Presby-
 terian church during her whole history has
 maintained the right to speak out, to prom-
 nounce her judgment clearly, upon all
 such questions as I have referred to—
 questions which, though affecting the
 State, are distinctly political in one sense,
 and, on the other side, are moral and
 religious questions. Whist men will
 offer as to this and that question, how-
 ever the Church should go in regard to it,

QUESTIONS THAT DIVIDE POLITICIANS

unless those questions be distinctly moral and religious. I have a perfect right to vote at an election, I have a perfect right as a citizen to take the stump—although I have never done it—but it will always be a matter of prudence or discretion whether a minister should exercise that privilege or not. I want to say this, that since this question of the Jesuits began, the ministers have been receiving a great deal of condemnation—(laughter)—and little well-meant censure, I dare say, in regard to the too prominent part they are supposed to have taken in the movement. I see a very eminent gentleman (Hon. Mr. Mills) in public life has been lately reading us a lecture, and is very authoritative upon the subject. He has said that this is a ministers' movement. I am not going to argue that point, but this able man thinks that he has said the most condemnatory thing about it in calling it a ministers' movement. I hope that ministers are not such unworthy representatives or specimens of the community that the movement is to be condemned simply because they have taken some part in connection with it. The ministers are simply voicing the opinions of the Christian people all over Ontario. I have so complete confidence in the intelligence and Christian principle of the people of Ontario that I believe the ministers could not trust that movement upon them. The same authority I have been pleased to tell us that religious liberty in all ages has been vindicated against the clergymen by the laymen. Now, surely I am not going to depreciate the laymen. It would be a very foolish thing to do that, because they are the great majority of society. I am going to put in a little word for the ministers, and beg to say that it is not correct, it is not according to fact, that religious liberty has been vindicated against ministers as a class by laymen as a class. The same eminent man has said that the Reformation was a clerical movement. Now I think he never made a greater blunder than that. I am amazed that a man whose voice has often been heard with authority in our Parliament should have ventured to say that the Reformation was a clerical movement. No doubt many of the clergymen were connected with it and leaders in it; but who does not know that the German princes and English princes and French princes were connected with that movement, and that the movement humbly could not have assumed the proportions that it did if it were not for the part these men took in it? It was a

but it was also a movement of the nobles and princes and scholars of Europe and of the great masses of Germany and England, and to call it a ministers' movement is simply preposterous. (Applause.) He has also connected it with that statement that being a ministers' movement freedom was not in it, but had been vindicated subsequently by the laity against the clergy. This again is a preposterous mistake. The truth is that, generally speaking, there has been no difference between the ministers and laymen with regard to their opinions on liberty. (Applause.) They have been unanimously the same, and how could it be otherwise? The ministers came from among the people. Hence I think it is not only historically incorrect but unworthy procedure to condemn a movement clerical and condemn on that ground. I am amazed that so able a man as the gentleman I have referred to cannot distinguish between two things—between letting the Jesuits have peace in the country if they want to live in the country, and endowing the Jesuits. Not only was the Hon. Mr. Millin failed to see this distinction, but I see that another eminent gentleman, who spoke a few evenings ago in this city, has fallen into the same mistake. The two things are entirely different. Freedom demands that we should not persecute anybody on account of his religious beliefs. If he lives as a quiet citizen, and does not disturb society, whatever his opinions may be, we shall let him alone; but when he comes to us and says that he is a public benefactor, "I am a public teacher and I ask the State to recognize that," then you have a different question before you. The reference to Germany and France as against England is entirely misplaced. Let the Jesuits remain in Canada. Let even a Province come forward and say, "These men are to be endowed out of the public funds and let an honourable standing stamped upon by the State," surely that is a different question. (Applause.) I want to say in regard to this Bill that it is not because the Jesuits are concerned in it, it is not on that account alone, that I would oppose the measure. I say that a measure which takes

and gives it to any religious body in Canada is not a measure to be approved of by the people of this country. (Applause.) I am not going to argue here the question of the duty of the State towards the church, and particularly so far as endowment is concerned, but almost every thoughtful man, that I have spoken to in Canada, says that in a mixed community like ours you have an end of peace and harmony if you are to bestow public money on the denominations. I maintain that that has been the policy of this country, and has been endorsed by both parties.

for more than thirty years. I am old enough to remember the passing of the Clergy Reserve Act, and it had a very different preamble to the preambles of the Jesuits' Estates Act. It is not simply that we dislike the Jesuits that we oppose that measure, but I freely confess that the character of the Jesuits is to me an element in considering the whole question. If it is a mistake and an error to take public money for denominational Churches it is worse than a mistake, it is a crime, to select a body whose principles are pernicious, and bestow the money upon them. Hence, while we must do no injustice to the Jesuits, it is perfectly germane to this subject, it is perfectly legitimate, to examine into the history and the doctrines of this remarkable body. The principles and maxims avowed by the Jesuit Society are many of them immoral and dangerous. I do not say the whole of their principles. By no means, because there is a great deal of precious truth which all classes of people, who call themselves Christians, hold. But I do say that the Jesuits hold principles that are extremely pernicious and immoral; they hold the doctrine of probabilism, the doctrine of direct intention and of mental suppression. Now I say that these doctrines strike at the root of morality, because if you do away with truth and integrity where is society; the very fundamental principles of the Jesuit Order, which is that of the entire submission of the individual conscience, and understanding even to the superior of a Jesuit body, indiscriminate submission, I hold that this principle is essentially immoral. I dare not, as God's creature, submit my conscience in this absolute way to any human being. (Applause.) The individual Jesuit has to be as if he were a corpse, has to be like the staff in the hand of an old man—no judgment, no will, no conscience of his own, but a simple instrument in the hands of his superior. I say that that is an immoral principle, and I can possibly conceive. (Applause.) Consider the aims and objects of this society. You all know how Jesuitism began and the history of the remarkable individual who was the founder of it. The burning intention of Loyola was to

to throw it back, not only out of Spain and Italy, but also in Germany and in England. That was the avowed object of Loyola, and in seeking to accomplish it he sought to establish an entire autocracy of the See of Rome, and not simply to make the See of Rome absolute in the religious sphere, but in the political sphere as well. It is here that Jesuitism touches us as citizens. He holds and avows that the Pope or the Church is not only the religious head, but the political and civil head. What is the meaning of that? It simply means this, that all liberty of opinion and liberty of State actions are to be destroyed. That is what makes it a serious question for the community. It is not simply a theological question; it is not a question about the Virgin Mary or about Transubstantiation, or the worshipping of saints and images, or is the civil question that we are discussing and this bearing on society. If this view is to be carried out, then liberty must disappear in Canada and elsewhere. I do not want to be counted as a narrow man, and I am not a narrow man, and I maintain that to oppose those who are the avowed enemies of civil freedom are not narrowness. (Applause.) This other point I would notice; that the history of the Jesuits in prosecuting this aim has been by the most infelicitous one; it has been marked by intrigue and by dishonesty and by cruelty. I am extremely unwilling to use these words, but I do so advisedly, and any one who will study the history of this society will have abundant proof of

what I say. It is a very easy thing to say, as has been said, that in the 19th century the Jesuits have behaved and are good citizens. I reply that if they behave and are good citizens let them alone, but if people who have their history are not to be endowed and cherished. I want to say that the manner and the circumstances under which this measure has been adopted before we have made it the imperative duty, I think, of all Christians and of all Christian nations, to recognize it and to speak out distinctly upon it. Looking at this piece of legislation, which is the latest and culminating piece, I can conceive that a challenge might be made to what I call the liberal principles brought out Canada. The gauntlet is flung down before you and you cannot avoid taking it up. It is not simply that Quebec will suffer, but the entire political future of Canada will suffer if this question is to have a wrong issue. The whole public life of Canada is in danger of being infected and vitiated by measures such as this. If our representatives in Parliament go wrong our constituencies will go wrong. I do not see any possibility of toning up and keeping the moral and political life of the country right unless the Churches do their duty. We must deal with this controversy in a spirit of truthfulness and perfect fairness. There must be no exaggeration on the platform or in the press. We do not need to exaggerate. We need simply to tell the truth, and there is no room for exaggeration in the matter. (Applause.) Some excited persons have said something about shooting down the Jesuits, and beheld the entire movement to be characterized as a movement to which approves of the words. We must be guarded and moderate, absolutely truthful, and not make a single statement or utter a single word that would lead to recall. I want to say more than that, not only should we deal truthfully and honestly with the Jesuits, indeed with all classes of people, but the question is one calling to be dealt with in a spirit of conciliation. I do not agree with Mr. Laurier in many of his statements, but I agree with him in this, that we in this large country, where we have a large variety of races, Church interests that are most diverse, if we are to live in harmony we must be very considerate of prejudices, and of each other's feelings. To that I say amen. The man who brings to the discussion of this question simply bitterness, or the assertion of men of right without seeking to understand our French-Canadian brethren, is not prepared to deal with the question. The last remark that I would make is this, that I believe the great force is to change the world, and that is never men from right to wrong, that is to bring happiness and peace to Canada, is the force and power of the Gospel of Christ.

153 YONGE STREET.
Best stock in the city. A suit of clothes made in
last style in 24 hours. A pair of pants in 4 hours.

+ BRITISH AMERICAN
 ARCADE,
 YONGE ST.
 TORONTO
 11
Business College
 The oldest and most reliable of any kind in the Dominion. All subjects pertaining to a business education thoroughly taught by able and experienced teachers.
 28TH YEAR. * C. ODEA, Sec'y.

Board, washing and tuition for any course including Ancient and Modern Languages reduced to \$102 per year; Tuition alone, \$35 per year, including Languages; \$12.50 without Languages; \$25.50 Preparatory Department.

FALL TERM Opens Tuesday, October 8th

Address, _____
Miss E. C. COOLEY, M.A.
Principal, 34 Bloor St. East

**Boarding and Day School
FOR YOUNG LADIES.**

a thoroughly good school, and to provide for resident pupils a refined Christian home. The Modern Languages, Instrumental and Vocal Music, Drawing, Painting and Elocution taught by competent teachers.

MISS HAIGHT, Principal

BARKER'S SHORTHAND SCHOOL,
48 King Street East.

Isaac Pitman's system. 700 pupils the best references.
Books for sale cheap. Circulars sent free.

(Presbyterian)

has been promptly re-opened under the Rev Dr
Cochrane as Governor, and Miss Mary F. Lee as
Lady Principal, with Classes and a complete
staff of experienced Teachers.

ELOCUTION,
Stenography and Type-Writing.

Applications for admission may be addressed to
REV WM COCHRANE, D.D.

Direct Importations of
NEW DRY GOODS.

oolery, Flannels, Blankets, Carpets, etc.
One of the Largest and Best Stocks of Goods

644 and 206 Queen Street East,
644 and 646 QUEEN STREET WEST.

AS FIXTURES

R. H. LEAR'S,
19 and 21 Richmond Street, West

**GRANITE & MARBLE
MONUMENTS,
TABLETS**

160 CHURCH ST. TORONTO
SAUSAGE CASINGS.

J. & S. PARKES & SON, Toronto.