

THE CANADA PRESBYTERIAN

PUBLISHED BY THE

Presbyterian Printing & Publishing Co., Ltd.

AT, 5 JORDAN ST., TORONTO.

Terms, \$2.00 per annum in advance.

ADVERTISING RATES.—Under 3 months, 15 cents per line per insertion; 3 months, \$1.00 per line; 6 months, \$1.75 per line; 1 year, \$3. No advertisement charged at less than five lines. None other than unobjectionable advertisements taken.

The Canada Presbyterian

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 22ND, 1893

Bishop Brooks has gone to heaven, said a Boston lady to her little five-year old daughter. "O, mamma," replied the little girl, "how happy the angels must be." That was perhaps the highest eulogium passed upon Phillips Brooks.

Professor Briggs is credited with saying that if Christ should come to the world now he would not be any better received than he was two thousand years ago. Something would depend on the part of the world he came to. Should he come as a carpenter to those friends of Dr. Briggs in New York, who estimate the worth of a pastor by the wealth of the congregation he preaches to, his reception would no doubt be somewhat cold.

A farmer writing in The Globe says that a certain wealthy manufacturer of agricultural implements instead of endowing a University chair and building a grand hall in the City of Toronto should build a wing to one of the lunatic asylums for the special accommodation of farmers who support the present tariff. That farmer should have a seat in Parliament. If he can make points like that one often he would be a grand man to enliven a debate on the tariff.

Commenting upon the frequency of pastoral changes The Interior says: What is needed is a return to the true pastoral idea. The people should, if they desire to go to heaven, take their pastor as their spiritual guide, confide in him, love him for his works' sake, and because he stands in Christ's stead to them, as Christ's called and sent ambassador. There is no relation outside of the family so helpful, comforting, cheer and joy giving as that between pastor and people. We lose a large element of the comfort of Christian life by neglecting it. If you would enjoy your pastor's ministrations, give him your heart.

That is good, old fashioned, orthodox doctrine. If many people exerted themselves half as much in the way of helping their pastor as they do in trying to effect a "change" they would greatly benefit themselves and no change would be thought of.

There are two stalwart Presbyterians on the bench of the Supreme Court of Canada now—Mr. Justice Patterson, one of the founders of Cooke's Church, Toronto, and Mr. Robert Sedgewick who was appointed last week. Mr. Justice Sedgewick is a son of the late Dr. Sedgewick of Nova Scotia and brother of the honoured minister of that name so well known in our General Assembly. Should Dr. Sedgewick be appointed Moderator of the General Assembly in June, as most likely he will be, one manse family will have its full share of honours and another nail will be driven in the coffin of the old slander that ministers' sons never amount to anything. They amount to a great deal in Canada at the present time. Three of the judges at Osgoode Hall are ministers' sons and at the bar they do more than hold their own. We congratulate Mr. Justice Sedgewick most heartily on his well-deserved promotion. Nova Scotia boys are brainy.

A paragraph is going the rounds in which it is stated that Dr. John Hall's congregation made a collection of \$10,500 for

missions the other Sabbath. That sum looks generous but considering the size of the pile it was taken from it is nothing to write about. One of the Harriston congregations gave nearly half that amount in a collection a few Sabbaths ago and we venture to say there are fifty men in John Hall's Church any one of whom is worth more money than the whole town of Harriston would bring if put up at auction with one of the neighbouring townships thrown in. The liberality of a man or of a congregation should always be measured—not by the amount given, but by the amount left after the gift is made.

The statesmen of France are chiefly engaged in putting one another in prison. The statesmen of Germany are increasing their standing army and making preparations for the butchery of some of their neighbours. The statesmen of the neighbouring Republic—or some of them—are making trade regulations that do not seem any too friendly. Most of the others are devising measures to enrich the powers that be and oppress the people. While all this is going on Gladstone is risking his life at eighty-three, and the life of his Government to give Ireland a constitution that he honestly believes will bring peace and prosperity to that unhappy island. Who would not rather be Gladstone even if he fails, than any other statesman in the world? Gladstone even though wrong on Home Rule is the grandest man on earth.

Now that Home Rule is to the front again we shall be asked to believe that the United Presbyterians and Free Churchmen of Scotland, the Nonconformists of England and the Dissenters of Wales have combined to crush the Protestants of Ulster and put them under the power of Rome. We shall also be asked to believe that Salisbury and the bitter, exclusive, and often tyrannical Episcopalians by whom he is mainly supported are the only real friends of the Ulster Presbyterians. Stories of that kind are believed only by those who want to believe them. Salisbury's love of Ulster may be shown by the fact that six hundred Episcopallians hold Government offices in Ireland and nineteen Presbyterians. If anything more is needed read his furious speech delivered the other day on disestablishment in Wales.

The following paragraph from Mr. McLeod's sermon will touch the heart of many an old friend who knew how conscientiously the venerable Doctor Fraser always did his work:

"Some months ago, when parting with him before going to attend the meeting of the General Assembly in Montreal, he spoke as if we might not meet again, and among other things said: If you are called upon to speak of me after I am taken away, see that you do not speak of me in terms of praise! Because when I look back upon my life I see it to have been marked with many imperfections and I do not deserve praise for anything I have done."

What a striking contrast with the men who begin every sentence by some reference to what "I did." We happen to know of another venerable minister—one of the most honoured, influential and useful that ever served the Presbyterianism of Canada—who modestly refused material for a sketch of his life in almost the same language as that used by Dr. Fraser. Vanity, egotism, self-consciousness and invincible cheek were not the qualities displayed by Dr. Fraser and the gentleman referred to. They were so far behind the age as to be modest!

A sign of the times is the defensive, apologetic and wavering tone of the Finance Minister of the Dominion in delivering his budget speech. The old defiant air of the government is gone, gone mainly because public opinion is changing, and because Mr. Dalton McCarthy and the other supporters have had the courage to take an independent position on tariff matters. A venerable minister once said to a young brother who had gone into the pulpit with an air of triumph, broken down in his sermon and had come down with his

lip hanging, "If you had gone up as you came down you might have come down as you went up." If the Finance Minister had not been so bumptious a few years ago he might not need to be so apologetic now.

We have just read an excellent sermon preached by the Rev. D. D. McLeod on the occasion of the death of the Rev. Dr. Fraser. Mr. McLeod does two things remarkably well. His discussion of the difficulties, privations, and discouragements of a faithful pastor labouring in a small rural charge, is true and sympathetic and will find an echo in the heart of every pastor who knows what it is to endure isolation, lack of help, lack of sympathy, lack of adequate support and of a score of other good things enjoyed by the pastor of a large city congregation. The sketch of Dr. Fraser's life and the estimate of his character and work are also true and faithful. Altogether the sermon is wholesome and stimulating and contrasts most pleasantly with the fulsome post mortem panegyrics that too often pass for funeral sermons.

A good many people are beginning to ask if Mr. Van Horne and his company rule this country. Of course everybody knows that Van Horne is king from Winnipeg to the Pacific, but everybody is not quite prepared for his reign in Nova Scotia. That he is in or behind the company that has secured the principal coal mines of Cape Breton is generally understood and nobody seems to be sure that he has not designs on one or two of the Provinces down by the sea. How would it do for everybody to stop talking about constitutional government, responsible government, annexation, independence, Imperial Federation and all that sort of thing and allow Van Horne to "run" the Dominion a few years on purely business principles. One thing is clear. He and his associates have made the Canadian Pacific Railway one of the most successful concerns in the world. Perhaps he could make the country a success, too. But seriously speaking we need many Van Hornes rather than fewer. That is to say, the country needs more of his splendid business ability and less party.

A PROTECTIVE TARIFF IN ITS MORAL ASPECTS.

In their wide sweep morals embrace every department of life whether private or public. No one will deny that the commercial legislation of a country has many and important relations with morals and ought in every case to be regulated by just and sound moral principles. Much is said and heard just now on the tariff question both in Parliament and out of it, but little or nothing is said about it from a purely moral point of view. This is one which a religious journal may well discuss, for the province and duty of such a paper is not simply to furnish items of ecclesiastical news, extracts from sermons, and good religious reading generally, but to help every cause or party seeking to extend and build up righteousness and truth and permeate the body politic with their spirit.

A few quotations from speeches on the tariff within and without the walls of Parliament, and from articles in the press, will help to show at once the moral character and bearings of a protective tariff wherever it exists. "It carries on some kinds of business at the expense of the great body of the people; leads to combines; creates unnatural barriers in the way of trade between different countries." "The farmer is oppressed for the benefit of a few manufacturers." "It is legalized robbery." "Behind tariffs vested interests are likely to entrench themselves to advance their own interests to the injury of the country." "Of the duty paid on binder twine only \$7,932 went into the treasury of the country, and \$94,755 went into the pockets of the monopolists." "Only \$1.00 went into the public treasury for \$20.00 that went into the pocket of a protected manufacturer and member of a combine." "It lays a heavy burden upon a single special portion of the people. By

means of a protective tariff provision is made for organized political corruption." "It promotes exorbitant duties and combinations." "Tariff reconstruction would do much to promote peace and good will between the United States and the rest of the world." "It encourages private interest and greed." "A fiscal system based on injustice to the class which produces the wealth of the nation cannot be a benefit to any one."

These are the statements of men some of whom are and have always been opposed to a protective tariff, and of some who have not only been in favour of it, but even taken credit for it, as it exists amongst ourselves, who are yet to some degree in favour of it, but who from the practical results which they now see flow from it, and it is to be feared from the history of protective tariffs must always and everywhere flow from them, have been constrained by facts thus to speak. This is unfortunate for the tariff.

The first thing which strikes one in these statements about a protective tariff, looking at it from a moral point of view, is their agreement as to its manifest and gross injustice. It is not simply an incidental defect of such a tariff that it is unjust. It is to be feared, it is affirmed by the opponents of it, that it belongs to its very nature, for in the nature of things it can directly benefit only a very few classes in the whole nation. This is all that the framers of such a tariff ever claim for it. Until protection reaches and benefits all, every class, it is manifestly unjust. It is said that it benefits indirectly those whom it does not benefit directly. But the many in Great Britain and the United States after long experience have pronounced this pretended indirect benefit a delusion and so have condemned it, for the reason that it does not benefit them. In this country also, although slowly, the mass is beginning to find this to be true. If then a protective tariff can only benefit a few at the expense of the many, and it may justly be questioned if in any large and worthy sense it benefits even the few, it must be unjust and therefore a violation of sound and true morality. And further, the tendency admittedly of a protective tariff is to make the few whom it benefits fewer still because of its tendency to encourage, what have come to be called, combines. The recent history of tariffs has shown this to be unquestionable. Conspicuously has it been so in the U.S. and our protected interests are learning the lesson and following the example set them with an aptitude and fidelity which would be commendable were it not so fraught with danger. For unadulterated, shameless, cruel selfishness, greed and rapacity in their most aggravated and exasperating form commend us to a combine. If there is anything more unchristian or even anti-christian than another, and therefore, a violation of morality, it is this spirit of unmixed selfishness which a protective tariff both arises from and to the uttermost fosters.

Nothing in the indications of Providence can be plainer than that it is for the benefit of mankind in every way than that they should freely trade and exchange commodities with each other, and so the abundance of one part of the earth or the superior skill of one part of the human family make up for the lack of some other part and so the happiness of all be promoted. A protective tariff raises up barriers in the way and so counteracts this clear design of the Creator, and the more protective it is the greater the number and difficulty of the barriers which it raises. These tend to multiply indefinitely and greatly to aggravate the causes of irritation and ill-feeling between nations and to lead to war and bloodshed. Surely everything which tends to alienate nations from each other, to increase mutual hatreds and the risks of strife and war is to be not only deplored, but must be wrong and dangerous in its moral character. If there is any connection whatever between morality and patriotism, it would be a libel upon patriotism to say that a protective tariff is a patriotic thing. These observations on the moral aspects of a