

# British American Presbyterian.

VOL. I.

TORONTO, CANADA, FRIDAY, JUNE 21, 1872.

No. 19

## Contributors & Correspondents.

### NEW BRUNSWICK.

Superior Courts of the Churches—Ecclesiastical Interchange of Courtesies—Interesting Literary Re-union—Contributors to Stewart's Quarterly.

(From our own Correspondent.)

I have been thinking why it is that the several Churches in these Provinces are so late in holding their annual meetings as compared with the Churches in the States and in the Upper Provinces. There seems to be a regular gradation. In the States the ecclesiastical assemblies all meet in the last half of May; then in Canada they meet in the first half of June, no less than four being in session while I am writing these words, two in Montreal, one in Kingston, and one in Hamilton. Down here we wait to the end of June, the two Presbyterian Synods, and the Wesleyan and Baptist Conferences, all gathering about the same time. I suppose it is the difference of climate that does it, though there cannot be so much between the Lower Provinces and the Upper, as we are almost on the same latitude. Being on the seaboard, our climate is more equable than further west, we have neither the extreme of heat nor of cold that our inland brethren experience. At all events May would be quite too early in the season for us to attempt meeting, travelling some years would hardly be possible there.

Speaking of ecclesiastical gatherings, I see that the Lower Provinces are represented at three of these now sitting in the Upper Provinces, part of my knowledge perhaps has been derived from personal intercourse with some of the deputies that are now making the fraternal greetings. At all events deputies from three churches are there just now. The Wesleyans are represented, the Congregationalists are represented, and the Kirk Synod is represented. The Synod of the Lower Provinces is not represented, and it seems a pity that it is not, since it is a much larger body than two of the three that are. The inquiry as to why that is so is a natural one. For the past three years no delegates have gone, so far as I remember from that Church. It cannot be said that it is through any disinclination on the part of the Synod to be social, nor is it altogether because of the expense involved, though the latter may have something to do with it. There used to be deputations to and from the Canada Presbyterian Church, but they have fallen through of late. Perhaps the prospect of a close relationship had something to do with the matter. However, a deputy was appointed last year to the American Churches, but I cannot see that he was present at Detroit. I understood that the father named for that duty passed through this city a week or two before the meeting of the Assembly at Detroit, since then I have heard nothing of him. The American Assembly seems disposed to keep up the intercourse now the ice is broken. The first named deputy appointed this year is the Rev. Dr. John Thomson, of New York, who was pastor in this city for some years about a quarter of a century ago. He was the founder of St. David's congregation. Not having paid a visit here for many years, he will be all the more welcome now, both on his own account and on that of the Church which he represents.

There was an interesting literary re-union in this city on Monday evening last, in a dinner that was given, and a presentation made to the Editor of Stewart's Quarterly, the management of which he was lately compelled to relinquish. The name of George Stewart, jun., is a well known one now, not only in the Dominion, but also in literary circles in the States, as well. It was an ambitious undertaking for a young man in his position to start and conduct a Quarterly, but he succeeded in a wonderful way in the design. It is affirmed that it was the only serial entirely original published in the Dominion so far. The Canadian Monthly, well worthy of support as it is, is not all original, there is a department in it made up of selections. Mr. Stewart gathered around him a staff of writers that would do honour to any literary journal in the world. They are among the most original and best informed men to be found in the Dominion. I need but refer to Rev. Moses Harvey, of Newfoundland, whose pen graces everything he touches, and what has he not touched upon at one time or other; to Professor Lyall, of Dalhousie College, Halifax, whose philo-

sophie and literary taste is of the highest order; to Principal Dawson, of McGill College, Montreal, whose acquirements in science it would be impertinence to flatter, who is known as a master in geology and kindred subjects; to Mr. Spencer, whose poems and sonnets under the nom de plume of Erylla Allyve have deservedly called forth the praise of the veteran critic, William Cullen Bryant, and to a host of others that I cannot wait to mention. Many were present on the occasion, conspicuous among them being the President and Vice-President of the dinner party, William Elder and Wm. P. Dole. The speeches made were worthy of the occasion. The presentation consisted of a splendid bound copy of the British Essayists and some other volumes. I have said the Quarterly which lived for five years was a success, there was but one exception to the use of that word if it can be considered an exception in a real sense. It did not pay. It was conducted throughout at a pecuniary loss. This combined with delicate health for a time and the increasing cares of a growing business forced Mr. Stewart, though with the utmost reluctance, to give up the struggle, at least for a time. From what was said by some of the speakers it would seem as if a determined effort is to be made to re-constitute the undertaking under more favourable auspices. It would surely be a much less difficult task now than it was five years ago, the experience which the editor and his co-adjutors have had in that time cannot all have been lost. The re-union owed much of its success to Mr. J. L. Stewart, of the Telegraph, who filled the onerous office of secretary.

St. John, 12th June, 1872.

### MONTREAL.

Wesleyan Temperance Meeting—Position of the Presbyterian Church on the question—Plea for Total Abstinence.

(From an Occasional Correspondent.)

On Tuesday evening, May 11th, in the Great St. James' Street Wesleyan Church, was held a large and enthusiastic meeting, the first of its kind ever convened in Canada. It was a Temperance meeting under the direction of the Wesleyan Conference, which devoted that whole evening of its valuable time to this assembly.

The Wesleyans of Canada have always taken a well-defined and consistent position on the question of Total Abstinence. No one who either uses as a beverage or deals in intoxicating liquor of any kind is admitted into their communion. Liquor drinking, and liquor selling are matters of discipline.

By this meeting the Conference has done honour to itself and borne clear testimony to its sense of the vast importance of the Temperance Reformation movement. It is reported that the majority of the members of Conference have agreed, as soon as possible after their return home, to form Congregational Temperance Societies, which cannot fail to give a wide spread and powerful impetus to the good cause. Indeed this one large and influential meeting, as was remarked by the Venerable Archdeacon Bond, of St. George's Episcopal Church, and the representative of the Quebec Temperance League, "will certainly have a great effect in advancing the cause of Total Abstinence." The same Reverend gentleman, himself at the head of a most active and flourishing Temperance organization in his own congregation, expressed his heart-felt desire "that all sections of the Church of Christ might soon awake to a sense of their duty in respect to this work."

These remarks, and in fact the whole proceedings, naturally led me to ask:—What position does our Canada Presbyterian Church take on this question?

I believe, from what I know of our ministers, that by far the greater number of them are total abstinents, and very many of them able advocates of the principle of total abstinence. To their especial honor be it said, most of the fathers of the church, as, for example, the venerable Moderator of the General Assembly, and the Rev. Dr. Taylor of this city, have been temperance men ever since the inauguration of the movement in this country, nearly forty years ago. While the ratio of total abstinence ministers is increasing, it is sad to know that we have still a few moderate-drinking clergymen; but, I may tell them in confidence, that the people are very impatient of what they believe to be their bad practice.

To attain the full confidence of our people, and to occupy anything but a false position before the Church and the Christian community at large, our ministers must be total abstinents. To speak plainly, I believe the ministry is in advance of the laity on this subject. Not that our church is a drunken church. By no means. By far the larger number of our members refuse to have anything to do with intoxicating liquor, but we are still weakened by many, I believe, conscientious men, who have been trained to moderate drinking from their youth, and who still persist in the more than questionable habit.

At almost every General Assembly a resolution is adopted commending and enjoining in general terms the principle and practice of total abstinence, and recommending ministers to bring the subject before their respective congregations; but the action of the Church, as a church, stops here. Is this right? Cannot something more be done? Ought we not to put forth a united, energetic, determined, Church effort in favor of Total Abstinence? A full answer is evidently impossible here. Permit me to suggest a few points for the consideration of the people generally, and of ministers and office-bearers in particular.

1. The Bible directly condemns drunkenness, and plainly reveals the certain perdition awaiting all drunkards.

2. General moderate drinking infallibly produces public drunkenness.

3. The great principle of Christian expediency, self-denial for the good of others, demands, in our day more than ever before that Christians should be total abstinents.

4. As fashions "travel downwards," Christian ministers and office-bearers, as well as the followers of Christ in general, are certain to have multitudes of imitators, who cannot stop at moderation, but rush headlong into the excess which ruins body and soul.

5. Congregational organization of the temperance element would give those holding these principles more power and courage. "Union is strength."

6. Such organization would be more aggressive within the congregation than separate, disunited and individual effort ever can be.

7. It would also be more influential outside the congregation. Make men sober and there is a better hope of their conversion.

8. A distinct and united effort of the whole church against the hydra-headed monster, strong drink, would greatly strengthen her hands in her conflict with other forms of sin and in the spread of the gospel of salvation.

9. A Presbyterian Temperance Society, with a branch in each congregation and a membership burning with zeal against this form of iniquity would not only do much to increase public morality and advance true religion, but would be able to exercise a very decided and powerful influence on Legislation in regard to the whole question of the manufacture and sale of alcoholic liquors, which all who have given attention to the present position of the Temperance Reformation, acknowledge is, if not the principal, at least a very important element in the final triumph of the movement.

### CONVERSIONS FROM PROTESTANTISM TO POPERY.

Editor BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN.

Sir,—As I promised in my last letter, I now proceed to give a sketch of Father Dumas, the curé of L. Assomption, who, of course, presided at the ceremony of the reception of George and Mary Meikle into the Romish Church. The writer of the article there referred to, terms him "our good pastor," and says that everything proved how much that ceremony affected him. Well, this "good pastor" is a noted swearer. He is, also, a Bible-burner. To an acquaintance of mine he once boasted that he had burned several copies of Martin's translation of the New Testament. I felt it to be my duty to write to him about what he had done. I directed his attention to the case of Jehoiakim who burned the roll. I also spoke of the woes pronounced on those who add to God's word and on those who take from it, which prove that he will not suffer those to go unpunished who burn it. These things were, most likely, quite new to him, for he is very ignorant of the Scriptures. I desired him to prove

that Martin's translation is a falsified one. I did not for a moment suppose that he would reply and I was not deceived. He found it easier to hold his peace, than to justify his God-defying conduct. At the election of a member of Parliament, he goes to the poll and does all in his power to obtain the return of his favourite, often to the disgust of the more intelligent of his fellow Romanists.

A word or two, now, regarding the heathenism of the Romish Church. At vespers, George and Mary Meikle solemnly consecrated themselves to the Holy Virgin and St. Joseph. In like manner, some Hindus dedicate themselves to Vishnu and others to Siva. We read in the Book of Acts of a ship whose sign was Castor and Pollux. If either the Virgin or St. Joseph is able, singly, to perform all the duties of a patron saint it is quite unnecessary for one to have both. If they cannot, singly, perform the duties referred to, I am afraid that, in this instance, union will not prove to be strength. The conduct of George and Mary Meikle is in direct opposition to the Bible. Paul tells us that the Corinthian converts gave themselves to the Lord before giving themselves to the Church. He beseeches the Romans to present their bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God. The Psalmist says in the 91st Psalm, "I will say of the Lord, He is my refuge and my fortress: my God; in Him will I trust." (Read the whole of that Psalm). The opposition of the Church of Rome to the Bible is a very natural thing.

In the article under consideration, the scapulary is called a "powerful weapon against the enemy of our salvation." The scapulary consists of two pieces of cloth on which are certain devices. These are fastened together by two cords. After they have been blessed, they are worn around the neck, next the body. What better are they without scapularies than those poor savages who think that they can defend themselves from evil spirits by rags tied to sticks? We have in the word of God a full description of the armour which we must use against the Devil. (See Ephesians VI, 11-18). But, we do not find the slightest reference in it to the scapulary. The opposition of the Church of Rome to the Bible is a very natural thing. The scapulary instead of being a powerful weapon against Satan, is a plain mark of subjection to him. It is said of a certain priest at a late election in Ireland, that he had a badge on him wherever he could put one. Well, though a person should be as well provided with scapularies as that priest was with election badges, the Devil would not be at all sorry.

I come now to an instance of hypocrisy in the Church of Rome. The writer of the article referred to, says that it always pleases Catholics to see separated brethren come within the pale of the Catholic Apostolic and Roman Church. This term that Church often applies to us Protestants. Now, I must say that such use of it is most abominable hypocrisy. Many who call themselves Protestants, but who are miserable specimens of such, I know would characterize what I have said as "most harsh—uncharitable—un-Christian." But I can prove it, and I now proceed to do so. Multitudes of proofs could be brought forward, but I must limit myself to a few. Let us notice, first, what the Church of Rome says about her "separated brethren." Peter Deus one of her standard writers says "The cause of unbelievers is not to be tried or approved but extirpated, unless there may be some prudential reasons which may induce us to tolerate it." "Unbelievers can be compelled by corporal punishments to return to the Catholic faith and the unity of the church." St. Thomas says "Heretics are justly punished with death." Maldonatus, another standard writer, says that Heretics are among the chief species of the children of the Devil. He teaches that they are more worthy than thieves, yeats, than even murderers, to be put to death. According to him, they are the tares of which our Lord speaks. When there is no danger that the wheat be rooted out along with them, they are quickly to be plucked—up they are quickly to be burned. He says that if Calvinists and Lutherans are not heretics there never can be a heretic. Not long ago, Chiquiquy compelled the Bishops of Chicago to declare in a Court of Justice that, according to the Romish Church, heretics have no right to property, or even life. A very strange way, certainly, of speaking about separated brethren! The conduct of the Church of Rome is in perfect harmony with her teaching, in this respect. Once every year the

Pope curses all kinds of heretics. Among these, our Calvinists have the honor to be expressly named. According to the oath in the Pontificale, every Bishop when he is consecrated, swears that he will persecute heretics to the utmost of his power. Cardinal Wiseman said to Dr. Cumming that this clause is not in force where the Roman Catholic religion is not established. He gave no proof, however, of this; but—admitting for the sake of argument that his statement is correct—he virtually acknowledged what his Church would do there if she had the power. See how Popery treated her "separated brethren" in the days of Bloody Mary; see how she has treated them by means of the Inquisition. Because thousands and thousands of "separated brethren" had been butchered in the St. Bartholomew massacre, Pope Gregory XIII gave thanks to God in the most solemn manner. He also caused the event to be commemorated in paintings and a medal which are still in existence. A strange way certainly of treating separated brethren! Yet, His Infallibility Pius IX, lately had the impudence to speak to the Prince and Princess of Wales in complimentary terms of the piety of the people of Great Britain. Sir George Cartier terms protestants "fellow-Christians." We ought, certainly to cherish kindly feelings toward Papists and be on as friendly terms with them as we rightly can. But, let us ever bless God that their church has not full sway in our land and pray that she never may. Removing the teeth and claws of a lion will not change his nature. Gavazzi very truly says that when Rome is without power, she is full of "nods and becks and wretched smiles," but when she has it, she tears and devours those who differ from her. If she had full sway we would certainly be "separated brethren" if we did not submit to her. The joints of our bodies would, very probably be separated from one another. Or, very probably, our limbs would be separated from our bodies. The fire wherewith the Church of Rome in bygone days consumed alive the bodies of the "separated brethren" was but a feeble emblem of her love to their souls.

Yours truly,

T. FENWICK

The Manse, Metis, Que.,  
June 7th 1872.

### THE FISHERMAN'S SON.

A GENTLEMAN walking on the beach came across a little boy sitting on the road all by himself, looking out on the great ocean.

"You like the sea, my boy; do you not?"

"Yes, sir; and I hope to follow it when I get bigger."

"It is a hard life, besides being dangerous," said the gentleman.

"Yes, sir; but Jesus Christ went to sea, and he knows the dangers; and sometimes he preached out of a ship. I am sure he loves sailors," said the boy.

"But that will not hinder you from meeting with storms, and perhaps getting shipwrecked."

"Jesus Christ rules the winds and the waves. He stopped a storm once."

"It does not now," said the gentleman.

"No sir; but he will help us to trust in him; and, if we hold on to him, nothing can much harm us," said the boy.

"You might be drowned."

"Yes, sir." The boy stopped. "But, you know, my soul would then fly up to God; and it is all fair weather up there."

"Why my little man, you are quite a preacher!" said the gentleman.

"Father and I often talk these things over," said the little boy; "and when he is gone out fishing, and leaves me all alone at home, they are company for me."

"The sweet, quiet, happy face of the little fellow pleased me," said the gentleman; "and I felt that he had the best of company."

Is the dead of night, I am frequently awakened by a little hand stealing out from the crib by my side, with the pleading cry, "Please take my hand, papa!" Instantly the little boy's hand is grasped, his fears vanish, and soothed by the consciousness of his father's presence, he falls to sleep again. In the same spirit of child-like trust, the Christian may stretch out his hand toward his Heavenly Father, and find peace.