

THE CANADA PRESBYTERIAN.

— PUBLISHED BY THE —
Presbyterian Printing and Publishing Company
(C. BLACKETT ROBINSON)
AT 5 JORDAN STREET, - TORONTO.

TERMS: \$2 per annum, in advance

ADVERTISING TERMS:—Under 3 months, 10 cents per line per insertion; 3 months, \$1 per line; 6 months, \$1.50 per line; 1 year, \$3.50. No advertisements charged at less than five lines. None other than unobjectionable advertisements taken.

EASTERN GENERAL AGENT.

MR. WALTER KERR—for many years an esteemed elder of our Church—is the duly authorized agent for THE CANADA PRESBYTERIAN. He will collect outstanding accounts, and take names of new subscribers. Friends are invited to give any assistance in their power to Mr. Kerr in all the congregations he may visit.



TORONTO, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 7, 1886.

It is always a pity to spoil a good story, but truth requires that somebody should knock the bottom out of the homilies that are afloat about Sam Jones and Sam Small. These worthy gentlemen are often described as very illiterate men, and their success as evangelists is compared with the work of the "regular clergy" for the purpose of showing how much more effective plain illiterate men are than educated ministers. We say nothing on the question of success at present, but it may be well to remind those who take a little fling at ministers over the heads of Messrs. Small and Jones that they are all astray on the facts. The Rev. Samuel P. Jones is a regular minister of thirteen years' standing in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, ten years of which were spent as a pastor and three as an evangelist. Mr. Jones was a lawyer before he became a minister, and is possessed of a good classical education. Mr. Small was for years on the editorial staff of the *Atlanta Constitution*, and used to write for the press, under the *nom de plume* of Old Si, papers that are well known to the world of newspaper readers. He is a college graduate, and has travelled extensively in Europe. Those who believe that ignorance qualifies a man for preaching better than a moderate amount of learning must find some other illustration of their theory than Messrs. Jones and Small.

THE working staff of our Church will be increased by about two hundred within the next few weeks. The Home Mission Committee of the Western Section send out about one hundred and fifty, and if we count the number in the Maritime Provinces the whole number will run perhaps over two hundred. It does one good to think that two hundred additional preachers will be at work in a few days. No estimate can be made of the amount of good they will do before they return to college. And here is as good a place as any to say it is a great pity matters cannot be arranged so that students might begin their labours in the mission field in May and end them at the first of November. April is one of the worst months for Home Mission work and October one of the best. In April the roads in many fields are almost impassable. There is neither sleighing nor wheeling. The mud in many fields is simply dreadful. By the first of May the student can get around fairly well and the people can attend service. There is another point of much importance. The transition in April from a warm room and overwork in college to a long, cold drive over a muddy road in Muskoka is far too great and too sudden to be healthful. Years ago we heard a student say he travelled to his field of labour by three kinds of locomotion in one day. He left Toronto by train, then went by stage a good many miles on wheels when he struck snow and finished up on a sleigh. That was a considerable amount of travelling experience for one day. We know there are other interests involved, but, so far as the health, comfort and usefulness of student missionaries are concerned, from May to November would be a much better term than from April to October.

REFERRING to the fact that the principal debates in the House of Commons consist of very long speeches delivered by a few members, the *Globe* makes the following sensible remarks:

Now, the consequences of the habit are bad in every way. Not to speak of losing the pleasure of listening to a cut and thrust debate—in which Mr. Blake always maintains his superiority to every other speaker in Canada—the education of the House is injured when the talk is limited to a small number on each side. The House should be the training ground of statesmen, and too few members get a chance to train. On both sides there are a number of fair speakers, who might become very good speakers and very valuable men, who might not only enlighten others, but themselves, as to their real power by speaking often and shortly. These men would work harder, post themselves better, stick to the issue more closely, and consequently be far better able to educate their constituents, if the rule of short speeches gave them a fair chance to participate in debate. Here is a reform worth the earnest consideration of both sides, and we hope to see it carried into effect.

This is precisely the reform that a goodly number of ministers and elders wish to see effected in our General Assembly. It is alleged that a few members speak on every question, that others who might speak almost, if not quite as well, are in this way crowded out, and therefore do not take the same amount of interest in the proceedings of the Supreme Court as they would if everyone had a fair chance to take part in debate. Whatever the cause it is an undoubted fact that a large number of ministers and elders who do most faithful and successful work for the Church in their own congregations, never open their mouths in the Supreme Court. We are not in search of grievances, but we do think there is considerable room for a reform in this matter. There has been a marvellous reform of late years in the way of shortening speeches in all our Church Courts. Let the next improvement be in the direction of calling out the latent ability and giving every man a chance.

THERE is something painfully humiliating in a remark that we often hear and read about the late Parliamentary fight on the Riel question. It is said that Mr. Blake made a bad "move," that the seventeen "bolters," as they are called, made a bad "move," that the Government made a good "move," that the Rouges made a good "move," for they will gain votes in Quebec, and that the Liberals who voted with the Government also made a good "move," for they will be able to hold their seats in Ontario. The shameful fact which underlies all this talk about good and bad "moves" is that politics in Canada is a game at which our representatives are playing. The corpse of the unfortunate Riel is a political chess-board on which our members make "moves." It never occurs to the people—and they belong to both parties—who speak and write in this way that Edward Blake may have such a thing as a conscience. It never seems to dawn on their minds that the seventeen "bolters" may have thought they were doing right. It is out of the question to suppose for a moment that the Government and those who voted with them may have had some regard to their duty when they acted as they did. All the parties in the controversy were simply making "moves." Well, if the political life of this country has become so degraded that two hundred of our picked men play a game over the corpse of a Half-breed, it might have been as well to allow the Half-breeds to take possession of the North-West, and it might be as well to allow some other nation to take possession of the remaining portion of the Dominion. A country that plays games over a corpse cannot last long anyway. We would fain hope that no considerable number of those who took part in the controversy were so lost to decency as to think they were playing a game. Many of them, we are certain, never thought anything of the kind. The worst feature of the case is that so many on both sides in politics, *not* in Parliament, considered the matter a mere game. If these people are properly represented, then it *was* a game. Their representatives may be better than themselves. We hope they are.

INDUSTRIAL PEACE OR WAR?

It is being generally conceded that strikes and the arbitrary closing down of industrial establishments are barbarous methods for the adjustment of disputes between employers and employed. Practically we are only beginning to see that a more excellent way is possible. Out of the conditions of the modern industrial world, with its ever-extending competition, the adaptation of marvellous mechanical invention, the tendency of capital to aggregation in the hands of vast corporations, and the all-absorbing and consuming desire for the speedy acquisition of wealth, has arisen that real antagonism between wealth and

work that makes even the least considerate pause and ask whether we are drifting.

"The rich are becoming richer and the poor poorer" is more than a mere political cry, or the aphorism of a professional political economist. Whether it is strictly true or not, the idea is making a deep impression on the minds of the toiling multitudes. They feel that they have not the same opportunities to better their position in life that existed twenty years ago. They have neither the inclination nor incentive to the exercise of a wholesome thrift, which was much more common formerly than it is now. Under the dull monotony of comparatively unremunerative toil people become dejected and spiritless.

Education has also an influence in promoting the prevailing spirit of discontent. The schoolmaster is abroad, so also is the demagogue and the socialistic theorizer. The industrial world is in immediate contact with the printing press. The progress of the struggle between capital and labour in the South-Western States and in Belgium was daily noted by workmen everywhere. Eager discussion of the labour problem and the tendency of events have given an impetus to what was supposed to be a vague dream, the organization of labour. The right of labour to combine for its protection is now cheerfully conceded by all reasonable men. Those who endeavoured to promote labour organizations were hard to convince that such a course was wicked when they knew that the very men who preached so emphatically against labour combinations were themselves members of protective associations, and who, when they thought their interests required it, were elbowing their way, not always empty handed, through legislative lobbies to plead for or against public measures as their fears or hopes inclined them.

It is easy to dilate on the folly or ruinous nature of strikes and the lawlessness attending them. It is no difficult matter to indulge in mutual recrimination and dismiss this, like every other troublesome affair, with the handy formula, "There are faults on both sides." Very true! But whose fault is it that there are faults on both sides? Capital has many resources. What resource has labour? Enlightened political economy, moralists in comfortable conditions in life, and learned judges complacently say to the discontented workman, "What you say may be all very true, but your labour is worth precisely its market value. If the rate is not high enough you can go elsewhere." Hitherto the strike has been the working man's last resort, out of which he invariably comes off worsted, though the object for which he struck may have been gained. Relatively he is the heaviest loser, for he stakes his all on the result.

Many large-hearted and generous employers of labour who can discern the signs of the times are voluntarily recognizing that between capital and labour there should be no antagonism. They are initiating a system by which producers can have a profitable interest in the products of their labour. Even a desire to consider the well-being of the toiler does much to soften the asperity which selfish exaction never fails to produce. Kindly feeling and generous treatment are sure to lubricate the wheels of industry and to prevent the friction that brings disaster.

The need of legislation to meet such emergencies as recent events occasion is fully recognized. Both parties in the conflict admit that fair, impartial and authoritative boards of arbitration ought to be instituted for the settlement of differences between employers and employees. Attempts at legislation in this direction both in Canada and the United States have so far been rather of a tentative character. Measures have been submitted in the United States Congress; but they are all permissive. Contestants may, if they choose, decline to invoke the aid of arbiters. During the recent session of the Ontario Legislature it transpired that such a permissive measure had been on the Statute Book for years, yet its provisions had never once been taken advantage of. So harmless usually is merely permissive legislation. Recent events surely make it plain that blind selfishness, passion and obstinacy ought to give place to reason and justice between man and man, whether millionaire or day-labourer.

Will this contest between the capitalist and the labourer lead to anarchy and bloodshed? Is the terrible revolution the fierce anarchist is prophesying about to burst forth? Not if the people in all ranks of life seek to do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with God.