

## Our Contributors.

### CLEAR THE DECKS FOR ACTION.

BY KNOXIAN.

In the peroration of an eloquent speech Principal Willis once asked, "Would men fight for the Bible who never read it? Would men die for Christ who never pray to Him?"

These questions constantly come up as one thinks over the present Jesuit controversy. Could men be relied on to fight against Jesuit aggression who practise Jesuitism themselves? Can any one be trusted to lead in a fight of this kind who does not fight from genuine principle? Ought men who merely wish to make capital of some kind by shouting against the Jesuit Bill be allowed to come to the front? Most decidedly not. If the contest is to be carried on by people in whom the Christian people of this country have no confidence it will be a contemptible fizzle. Nothing more.

It seems to be assumed on all hands that a stop must be put to Jesuitical aggression in this Dominion. Heaven knows it is high time. If these Quebec people would stop even now perhaps it might be as well to "cry quits" all round. A strife of races is a serious business in any country. A religious war, if the term can be allowed, is the most horrible of all kinds of war. Canada is a young country and is deeply in debt. We need all our strength and all our money to develop our vast natural resources and make both ends meet. Our constitution is only twenty-one years old and is largely an experiment. If possible the experiment should be made in peace. We have more than our share of charlatans and demagogues who mount every wave of excitement and try to make money or office out of the passions of the people. Having nothing to lose they can lightly talk about a revolution. For these and many other reasons, some think it might pay to allow the Jesuits to take their \$400,000 and be done with it.

But would they stop there? They claim that their escheated estates have a present value of over \$2,000,000. Are they likely to take \$400,000 in satisfaction of a claim of \$2,000,000? Are Jesuits the kind of people who take one-fifth of their alleged claims as payment of the whole? Is that their style? Has that been their habit in other days and in other lands? To ask these questions is to answer them. Before the \$400,000 are long in their treasury they will say something about their balance or some other claim equally imaginary. The Quebec government will of course recognize their claim and the Dominion Government will not apply the veto power. The question for Protestants is—How long? How long is this thing going to last? If resistance must come in somewhere—and who denies that it must—may it not be as well to begin now? If the line must be drawn, is it not as well to draw it at this Jesuit Bill as at any other place?

Another question crops up here. If this Bill has been submitted to the Pope for approval how many more bills may be sent to Rome for approval? Is his Holiness of Rome to have jurisdiction over the civic affairs of a Canadian Province? We have not long escaped from Downing Street rule. The escape was not worth much if we are now to be ruled from Rome.

Two years ago there was an immense fuss made because the proof sheets of the Ross selections were shown to Archbishop Lynch. A large number of Roman Catholic children attend the public schools and as the Selections were prepared by Protestant divines representing the different churches, it was considered nothing more than an act of courtesy to show the Selections to the head of the Catholic Church. The Archbishop merely suggested that the word "which" in the Lord's prayer should be exchanged for "who," a change made by nearly every minister who uses the prayer in public. But oh, what a fuss was made about this matter? Some of the men who made the fuss are as dumb as oysters over the refusal to disallow the Jesuit Bill. To show the Selections to Archbishop Lynch was an unpardonable sin; to condone the submission of an Act of Parliament to the Pope for approval is right enough! The trifling changes made in the School Act were an outrage upon Protestants, but sanctioning the taking of \$400,000 out of the Quebec treasury for the Jesuits, most of which Protestants will have to pay, is a perfectly proper proceeding.

It is reasonably clear that Jesuit rule in Canada must be stopped, and it is equally clear that the work must be done by men who are Christians as well as Protestants. The decks must be cleared of those people who have been well described as more Protestant than Christian. From the days of Adam down to the present hour every good cause has suffered more from its professed friends than from its opponents. The fools within have been more troublesome than the foes without. The knaves within have been more dangerous than the assailants without. The demagogues who try to mount every wave of excitement and exhibit themselves on its crest, must go. The Protestants who are Protestants for revenue only must take a back seat. Those lovely Christians who think that the way to convert a Catholic is to break his skull must be sent to the war. Those men who talk about the battles fought for religion in by-gone days and hide behind a wood-pile when the missionary collector comes round must get off the deck.

The men who can successfully resist Jesuitism must be men of faith; men of prayer; men who love their Bibles and read them; men who love their churches and work and pray for them; men who love Christ and make sacrifices for Him; men who are Protestants, not because they hate Catholics, but because they believe that Protestantism is Scriptural and

that as Protestants they can glorify God more than they could as Catholics.

Why is the opposition of men who do not act from pure motives and high principles worse than useless? Because the Jesuits and politicians understand them. Does anybody suppose that Sir John Macdonald or Mr. Mercier cannot "size up" a Protestant who is a mere agitator? People who labour under that delusion don't know Mr. Mercier and Sir John. United, vigorous, determined, and sustained opportunities from men who are known to act from principle might soon check Jesuitism, even in Canada.

### THE MODERATOR OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

The Rev. William Thomas McMullen, Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, was born near Newbliss, County of Monaghan, Ireland, on Sabbath, the 9th of January, 1831. His blood is of the true blue Presbyterian kind. His father, Mr. Archibald McMullen, and mother, Mary Jane Moorhead, were devotedly attached to the doctrines and polity of Presbyterianism. Both his grandfathers were Presbyterian elders. Several of his relatives on his mother's side were well-known ministers of the Irish Presbyterian Church. Among others might be mentioned the Rev. Dr. Moorhead, who for fifty-one years was minister of Loughaghery. He was succeeded by his son, the Rev. Robert Moorhead, who occupied his father's pulpit for forty-nine years. The latter was also succeeded by his son who occupies the pulpit at the present time. The Rev. Dr. James Moorhead, of Dour-chlony, was also another near relative of the family. The Rev. Robert Moorhead, a brother of Mr. McMullen's mother, visited him in 1868, and preached several times in Woodstock with remarkable power.

To his own mother, however, Mr. McMullen owes more than to all his other relatives. She was a woman of strong faith and an earnest student of her Bible. Her ability in quoting and expounding the Scriptures might well be envied by many a preacher. She loved the sanctuary and greatly enjoyed listening to sermons. She was a very lenient critic, and weak indeed must have been the discourse in which she could not see some good points. Her memory for texts and sermons was something remarkable. Years after hearing it she could without any difficulty, give the divisions and principal points of a sermon. Next to her Bible she always put the Shorter Catechism. She could repeat the catechism backwards, or any other way, and her children, the future Moderator included, were drilled on Sabbath evenings until they knew the little book as well as their teacher. Who can tell how much the teaching and influence of these Sabbath evenings had to do in qualifying the coming Moderator for the discharge of his duties.

In 1843 Mr. McMullen's parents emigrated to Canada and settled in Fergus. Mr. James McQueen was then, and for many years afterwards, teacher of the Fergus school. He was a man of marked individuality and force of character. A generation of Fergus people were educated in that school, many of whom have made a good mark in the world. One of Mr. McQueen's specialties was Bible reading, and to this day Mr. McMullen's pupils, wherever you find them, are very likely to be noted for good reading,—an accomplishment, by the way, not so common as it might be. Having spent four or five years under Mr. McQueen, during which he began the study of Latin, young McMullen left school and took private lessons from his pastor, Dr. Smellie, and afterwards from Dr. Mair, pastor of St. Andrew's Church, Fergus, who taught a class of young men preparing for college. In 1849 he entered the college and pursued his literary studies in the Toronto Academy and in Toronto University. One of his classmates in the academy was the late Chief Justice Moss, a gentleman for whom Mr. McMullen always cherished feelings of affection and esteem, feelings that were heartily reciprocated by the distinguished jurist when he rose to the highest place in his chosen profession. His theological studies were pursued mainly under Dr. Willis, and it is not necessary to tell any one who knows the history of Presbyterianism in the western part of the Dominion that, to the day of his death, the late Principal never had a warmer friend, a more enthusiastic admirer, or a more chivalrous defender than the present Moderator. Nor has the admiration and esteem ceased. A few weeks ago, when discharging duties as Moderator of Assembly, Mr. McMullen informed a friend that he found Dr. Willis' notes on doctrinal points, and his homiletic hints, more useful at the end of thirty years' work than anything else in his study.

Having finished his college course in 1856, Mr. McMullen was soon afterwards licensed, and on the 5th of November of the same year was ordained, and inducted into the pastoral charge of Millbank, in what is now the Presbytery of Stratford. Here he laboured for about three years, struggling bravely against many of the difficulties that usually attend the building up of congregations in new parts of the country. Early in 1860 he was called to Knox Church, Woodstock, his present charge, and accepting the call, was inducted on the 19th of April. Under his ministry Knox Church has steadily grown in numbers, liberality and influence, until it ranks among the first in the denomination.

Mr. McMullen is what is usually called a doctrinal preacher. His early home training and his profound admiration for Principal Willis tended to create in him a taste for theological discussion. He is at his best in the pulpit when preaching on the doctrines of grace. No uncertain sound on any fundamental point ever issues from the pulpit of Knox

Church, Woodstock. In applying truth to the hearts and consciences of men he is often very impressive. Like all good preachers, Mr. McMullen loves preaching. Throughout life he has always kept a high pulpit ideal before his mind, and laboured earnestly to come up to it. Be the congregation large or small he never belittles his Master's work. Like his favourite professor, Dr. Willis, he always holds that the size of the congregation should have nothing to do with the merits of the sermon.

On the platform Mr. McMullen is clear, incisive, and to the point. Fortunately for himself and others he is one of those men who cannot speak at all unless they have something to say. To him ideas of some kind are absolutely indispensable to speech even at a tea meeting. He has no fatal facility for using words with nothing behind them. His platform addresses are always well received and seldom fail to enforce some important truth or teach some useful lesson.

Throughout the whole of his ministerial life the Moderator has had a marked liking for church courts, and has attended them with praiseworthy regularity. He keenly enjoys a good debate and has never shown any disinclination to take part in the fray. In ecclesiastical proceedings he is transparently, conspicuously honest. Agree with him or not, you cannot fail to admire the transparent candour with which he always takes and defends his ground. Though a little impulsive, perhaps, at times, he is utterly incapable of cherishing ill-feeling towards an opponent. His personal popularity with his brother ministers was not the least potent factor that led to his unanimous election as Moderator of the Supreme Court.—*Presbyterian Year Book for 1889.*

### TESTIFYING FOR CHRIST.

MR. EDITOR,—I observed with much interest and pleasure in your issue of December 12, notice of a remark made by Professor McLaren, in the Presbytery shortly before, accompanied by your own comments thereon, to the effect that Presbyterians, as a rule, were too backward, with all its detrimental consequences, both to themselves as individuals, or to the cause of Christ in general (though negative, rather than positive) to confess, on seasonable occasions, their present enjoyment of safety in Christ and that for good, by simple faith or trust in Him alone. What he has said alas! is only too true, and I am glad it has come from one of such weight in the Church, though late in the day, and I hope it will be discussed and the cause of it discovered and removed—for certainly it can be.

It has always seemed to me ever since the Holy Spirit led me into the truth regarding this all important matter, some forty years ago, that we Presbyterians, with our grand, sound, logical creed, should be the most intelligent, the most steady and active, as well as the brightest and happiest of all Christians. But the creed must be known first, well known, intellectually and experimentally, and the whole life must tally with it, before a firm and confident, though humble and modest confession of eternal security in Christ be made.

Let us call up three witnesses. First, The Word, Luke vii. 50; John iii. 16, v. 24; 1 John v. 13, etc. Perhaps that is enough passages, though I would like to add 2 Timothy i. 12., in the following shape: Last clause, "For I know whom I have believed (the glorious Person I have given myself up to) and I am persuaded that He is able (I'm not) to keep that which (my precious soul) I have committed to Him against that day" (and not as long merely as I behave myself; for that would not be long). Second, The Spirit, Romans viii. 14, 16; 2 Corinthians iii. 17, last clause; 1 John v. 10. Third, The Fruits of the Spirit, Romans xiv. 18; Galatians v. 22-25.

Man's way is: Faith, works, salvation. God's way is: Faith, salvation, works. Again, Man's way is: Feel, believe, and you are saved, or feeling, faith, fact. God's way is: The Gospel is true, believe and feel, or fact, faith, feeling.

What are the benefits which in this life do either accompany or flow from justification, adoption and sanctification? The benefits which in this life do either accompany or flow from justification, adoption, and sanctification, are assurance of God's love, peace of conscience, joy in the Holy Ghost, increase of grace and perseverance therein to the end; *Shorter Catechism*. The Rev. Thomas Adams, the well known Puritan divine says: "Blessed is the man whose sins are forgiven; but where there is no remission of sins, there is no blessedness. Now, there can be no blessedness but that which is enjoyed, none is enjoyed unless it is felt; it cannot be felt unless it is possessed. It is not possessed unless a man knows it; and how does he know it, who doubts whether he hath it or not? Hath Christ said "believe," and shall man say "doubt"? He that doubteth God's word and God's love, cannot heartily love Him. Again, If this love be wanting, it is not possible to have true Scriptural peace."

### DISCIPLINE AND GOVERNMENT.

MR. EDITOR,—I quite enjoyed the leading articles in a late number in which you "surrounded" the Episcopalian joker on Presbyterian Church government. No one who knows anything of Dr. Reid, Dr. Caven, and others whom you name would for a moment put them second to the best bishop who ever wore lawn—in Canada, at all events. Nor can it, I think, be contended that our Presbyterian Church is behind any other in the matter of doing things decently and in order. But is there not lots of room for improvement, nevertheless?

There seems to be abroad in the Church a spirit of looseness (miscalled "liberality") in the adopting or tolerating anything, however questionable, which is not condemned in set terms in the Standards. The old routine—public worship,