

British American Presbyterian.

Vol. 2

TORONTO, CANADA, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 1873

No. 93

Contributors and Correspondents.

HOME MISSION FUND.

URGENT NEED OF CONTRIBUTIONS.

LETTER FROM THE CONVENER.

EDITOR BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN.

DEAR SIR,—Many of your readers will observe in the Church Record for the present month a statement regarding our Home Mission Fund. Let me earnestly call the attention of my brethren in the ministry and the office-bearers of our Churches to the necessity of immediate contributions, in order that the Committee may be able to liquidate existing obligations, and thus keep faith with ministers and missionaries, who have a right to expect prompt payment of the supplements and grants made for missionary work during the past half-year.

The gratifying increase in the funds reported to last General Assembly, gave the Committee increased confidence in the ability and willingness of our people to contribute liberally to this most important cause. Nor are they in the least doubtful that the contributions for the present year will exceed the past. But the state of the fund at present is such as to cause serious alarm lest before the end of the ecclesiastical year, great inconvenience, if not positive suffering, may be felt by many brethren, who are now looking for remittances which our empty treasury cannot send.

There was left in the treasury at the close of last year, after all claims had been met, some \$200. This, no doubt, was a more comfortable state of affairs than having a debt of a similar amount, as in the preceding year. But before the Committee met in October, instead of having a surplus, the funds were overdrawn to the extent of \$2,000! At the meeting in October, grants (promised in April) were passed amounting to upwards of \$7,000, leaving the Committee in debt over \$9,000. Since that date drafts from Manitoba have been presented, raising the present indebtedness to \$10,000.

It is very hard for the Convener of the Committee and the Agent of the Church to receive letters from ministers and missionaries, who expect prompt payment of the small amounts due them from the fund, and who naturally feel that they are not treated as they deserve. But unless money is borrowed at a high rate of interest it is simply impossible for the Committee to meet existing obligations. In former years a small amount has been borrowed until the beginning of the year, when the congregations begin to send in their contributions. But we do not feel justified at the present moment to borrow \$10,000 or \$15,000 to tide us over the crisis that the Committee have now to face. The money paid for interest on such a sum would be spent to far better purpose in supplying ordinances to neglected districts that appeal to us for aid.

We urgently appeal to the members of our Church to help us out of our present financial difficulty. Will not the pastors of our wealthy congregations (who only divide their funds in March or April) present the case to the membership of their churches, and ask for a special collection before the end of December? and may I not confidently appeal to individuals whom God has largely blessed in their business during the present year to give us speedy and tangible evidence of their interest in the progress of Home Missions in connection with the Canada Presbyterian Church. I am convinced that very much depends upon brethren in the ministry laying the claims of this fund before their several congregations. We should not so frequently have to lament the smallness of our contributions, and the tardiness with which they are made, if ministers were in every case loyal to the different schemes of our Church. Instances have come under our notice, not infrequently, where indifference on the part of ministers has acted most injuriously, as regards the contributions of large and wealthy congregations. It only needs, we feel assured, that Presbyteries cordially take up the matter, and that ministers make common cause with their brethren in districts where hard missionary labor is as yet but poorly requited, to ensure a generous response to our present appeal.

I trust my anxiety for the success of Home Missions will not be regarded as seeking to lessen the contributions to other funds of the Church. Experience has already proved that, in proportion as we enlarge the sympathies of our people in Home Missions, the Foreign Mission funds, the College funds, and every fund of the Church, will receive a common benefit.

Yours faithfully,
WILLIAM COCHRANE,
Convener Home Mission Committee.
Brantford, Nov. 1st, 1873.

Presbyterial Deputations.

EDITORIAL NOTE.—From having had to go sooner to press last week than usual on account of Thanksgiving day, we could not get Mr. Cochrane's first letter inserted in last issue. The importance of the subject, however, is such that we prefer having both letters given to day to holding one of them over. What Mr. Cochrane says about the failure to secure supply for the winter to the Stations on Lake Superior, will, we doubt not, be read with great regret by all interested in the progress of the Canada Presbyterian Church.

EDITOR BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN.

DEAR SIR, In my communication of the 1st inst., I omitted to mention the appointment of Deputations made by the Home Mission Committee to visit and address congregations in several Presbyteries. It is as follows:—

PRESBYTERY.	DEPUTATION.
Guelph,	Messrs. Donald Wright, and Hugh Young, Elder.
London,	Messrs. McCaig and Tolmie.
Kingston,	Messrs. Traver and Joseph White.
Ontario,	Messrs. McTavish and S. M. Cameron.
Hamilton,	Messrs. Warden and Farries.
Simcoe,	Messrs. Burton and R. N. Grant.

In Presbyteries where no deputations are sent by the Home Mission Committee, it is confidently expected that steps will be taken to bring the claims of this fund before the several congregations within their bounds. I trust that the Brethren appointed will receive a cordial welcome from the Presbyteries above mentioned, and that all necessary arrangements will be made in good time for the successful prosecution of their work.

I regret to add that our efforts by advertising and personal communications to secure suitable ministers and probationers, to supply the Stations on Lake Superior during the winter have most signally failed. The Missionaries who laboured at these points during the summer months, viz:—Sault Ste. Marie, Silver Islet, and Prince Arthur's Landing did much to re-establish Presbyterianism in the confidence and affections of the people, and left these little congregations hopeful in the prospect of having gospel ordinances continued regularly during the winter. I need not enter into details regarding appointments made and declined, or after having been accepted, receded from. Suffice it to say, that the General Assembly must either decide to abandon these important fields entirely, and leave them in the hands exclusively of other denominations, or give the Committee power in some way to make appointments that will not be set aside. I very much fear that our inability to hold these places during the present winter, has lost them to our church.

Yours faithfully,
WILLIAM COCHRANE,
Convener of H. M. C.
Brantford Nov. 8th, 1873.

Presbyterian Union.

EDITOR BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN.

SIR,—Suffer me, in again animadverting on the proposed basis of Union, to assure my reviewers that I desire not to meddle with them, but with the documents, and that in dealing with these I wish the sovereignty to be rather of facts than of language.

I make no apology for my remarks on the 4th article, as it came to my hand, nor can I speak well of it yet. I do not suppose such an article has ever found a place in a basis of Union, and I would like to know who wished it inserted in the proposed basis, and what it is designed either to promote or guard against. We are not making a general union of all Churches, and should not, in our basis, bind ourselves in relation to any except those which are negotiating, while we should be ready to take our ministers (as we do now) wheresoever we find suitable men prepared to join us. I think Mr. Ure will likely say of this article, as he does of the 4th resolution, that it is useless: and as I say that they are both offensive to me, I hope that he will, in kindness, agree to have both obliterated. The "Member of the Union Committee" says that my statement, that the Union Committee did not attempt, even though enjoined by the Assembly of '72, "to endeavor to secure in some way such a deliverance as shall meet the views of all parties in this Church," "is simply incorrect;" "that the Committee were not instructed to formulate, in concert with the Committees of the other negotiating Churches, something now on the important doctrine, but in some way to secure a satisfactory deliverance;" "that it seemed, indeed, for several reasons, better not to attempt any

new statement, should it be found that there were already, on either side, statements which might be deemed satisfactory by the other." I, Sir, had no means of knowing what the Assembly of '72 ordered, or the Committee did, except from the printed minutes of the Assembly. I concluded from these that the Committee were to endeavor to get from the Joint Committees some deliverance on the Headship of the Lord Jesus, which would be in some way connected with the basis, and I was confirmed in this opinion by the fact that one Committee resigned their office when the resolution was adopted; and when I turned up the last report of the Committee, I did not find the ordinary evidence that they made the attempt to implement their instructions, as I understood them. There is no deliverance of the Joint Committees reported; there is no evidence that such was asked; but that the authoritative documents of the Churches bearing on the subject were produced and read, and spoken about, and that everybody was pleased. Was that like trying to secure a deliverance? He says the Committee were only told to endeavor to do so in "some way." I ask how they secured that in "any way?" He admits that they "were charged with securing a deliverance," and adds, "they thought they could not do better than to report to the Assembly the documents and statements submitted by the Committee of the Church of Scotland." I do not wish to prove, if I could do so, that our Committee did not attempt to get a deliverance; my reviewer should know better, and he says they did, and that, in the end, they agreed to present to our Assembly "documents and statements" given in by the Committee of the Church of Scotland. What I complain of chiefly is, that instead of a deliverance such as the motion passed in the Assembly of last year led us to expect, and we are entitled to, in virtue of our last Union, we are now called on to accept the "Act of Independence," as being, in the words of our Committee, a "clear and distinct statement of the practical bearing of the Headship of Christ over His Church, viz., the entire freedom of the Church to regulate its own affairs, its uncontrolled power of jurisdiction, discipline, and government, in regard to all matters ecclesiastical and spiritual" and that this is made a justification for not giving us any statement on the Headship in the basis. I call the attention of the members of the C. P. Church to this Act. It was passed in 1844 to neutralize, as far as possible, the unanswerable and unanswerable protest of the Free Church. Its preamble is a misstatement of facts: See Dr. Boyne's pamphlet entitled, "Was the recent disruption of the Synod of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland called for?" pages 48 and 49. The language of the Act is unguarded and wild. It leaves no room for the Head himself, but before it closes, it declares the Church which uses that unmeasured language in ministerial and Church fellowship with the Established Church of Scotland. This statement in the Act is equivalent to a declaration that Union with, and therefore, that the position of the Church of Scotland, does not conflict with the strong assertion of independence previously made. If it sought to make it impossible for me (and I am not alone) to go into the proposed Union the proper course is taken. The Act, indeed, is not put into the basis or resolutions. I do not know that the Joint Committee have any deliverance regarding it, but the C. P. Church is expected to take it as a statement of the doctrine of the Headship. Articles 3rd and 4th of the basis of the last Union read: "That the Lord Jesus Christ is the only King and Head of His Church; that he has made her free from all external or secular authority in the administration of her affairs, and that she is bound to assert and defend this liberty to the utmost, and ought not to enter into such engagement with anybody as would be prejudicial thereto. That the Lord Jesus Christ, as Mediator, is invested with universal sovereignty, and is therefore King of nations, and that all men, in every capacity and relation, are bound to obey His will as revealed in His Word, and particularly that the Civil Magistrate (including under that term all who are in any capacity in the Legislative or Administrative action of the State) is bound to regulate his official proceedings, as well as his personal conduct, by the revealed will of God." These articles are now to be taken from us in violation of our present covenant; and every effort which we made to get some equivalent in the new basis, has been sternly opposed by our own brethren, and at last, as if to confound and silence us, the Act of Independence is presented to us. If then we accept of it as satisfactory, and as removing an objection to the basis, and any one asks of us—What removed your objections to the basis? we must answer, "the Act of Independence." What are your principles on the Headship? we must say, "Those of the Established Church of Scotland, of course. Don't you see that we, to please the Church in connection with the Church of Scotland, dropped the articles on this subject which we had in the former basis, and approved of the Act of Independence, though it declares the Church that passed it in Ministerial and Church fellowship with that other Church. We found, on looking carefully over it, that we and the Churches with whom we had been associated had been guilty of schism." While if any future struggle arises on the Headship (and rise it must, for that is the most hated doctrine of our religion), these minutes of Committee and of the Assembly of '73 may well be adduced to prove that we departed from our old position. And is this all we have got, after the sacrifices and struggles of so many years, and as the result of the resolution of the Assembly of '73? My reviewers profess respect and re-

gard for us, and I, in the name of those with whom I act, desire to do so towards them, and we will be glad to get some practical proof of that regard which has been lavished on others. Hitherto all the proof we have had of their feelings towards us is their resignation in a body when the Assembly of last year ordered them to get a deliverance to satisfy us. Meanwhile we must withstand to the face, because they are to be blamed, those who are making concessions for union which ought not to be made, and need not have been spoken of. We do not ask the Church in connection with the Church of Scotland to make any confession of wrong; we ask in the new basis such recognition of the Lord as we have in the present basis. They say they hold the Headship as we do, and will pride make them refuse what we ask from conscience?

I, Sir, am not an enemy to, I also wish union; and though I confess I do not care for the proposed one, unless it is preceded by an outpouring of the Holy Ghost, yet I have not taken my position for the purpose of thwarting it, but for the purpose of securing in its basis a proper recognition of my King and Lord. And as some seem in ignorance of what we aim at, I may say, in conclusion, I, and my associates in this struggle, recognize both God and Caesar. We have no wish to withdraw civil matters from the control of the State under any pretext; we cannot do so, and we are not such fools as to try; but on the other hand we wish to shut Caesar out from all meddling with the arrangements of the House of God. And I ask, are our brethren prepared to wound the consciences of some who will follow them, but with pain, into the Union, if it is pressed on the present basis—to rend the Church, and encounter all the pain and trouble that will engender, rather than grant us a decided statement in the basis of what they say all the Churches negotiating, believe as we do?

I remain, yours truly,
JOHN MAC TAVISH.
Woodstock, Nov. 8, 1873.

Union.

EDITOR BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN.

SIR—It would appear that we are reaching a crisis with respect to the Union Question when it is the duty of every one, and especially of every office-bearer, to give out his yea or nay on the subject. And it is the growing conviction of a number that except the basis be amended by the addition of a distinct and specific deliverance on the Kingship and Headship of our blessed Redeemer, there can be no union with other churches, or if there be it will be at the expense of a disruption in our own body. If people belonging to the Old Church in this country hold by the great doctrine they cannot object to its insertion, if they do not believe it then further negotiation should be broken off.

The number might have been comparatively small, who met some weeks since in Toronto, about Union, but they gave no uncertain sound, and a moral influence emanated from them, putting some in remembrance of what the ancient Church said long ago "The Lord is our Judge, the Lord is our Lawgiver, the Lord is our King, He will save us." People are getting afraid now that the work of 30 years and more will be in a measure overturned and they are anxious to see if our church will commit herself as a body to the finding of the General Assembly on the topic of a Union.

A Rev. Dr. from Scotland, who has been lately in Ontario, and who is well known to the church and world by authorship, &c., gave it as his opinion that if the Union was consummated on the present basis we would be treating the Free Church of Scotland as if they were schismatics. Now is the time for Sessions, Presbyteries and Congregations to speak out. I can never be an obsolete duty to contend for the Crown-Rights of the Redeemer. Churches will be blessed by keeping up this testimony, and the world requires still to hear it. Well was it said in one of the papers read at the Evangelical Alliance in New York, "Ought not Christians in the times in which we live, the people and the pastors, to attach themselves more and more to the person of Jesus Christ? We must do so in order to contend against infidelity and still more against Popery."

Would it not be well, like the Free Church, to pause and to make a halt, to wait for more light from God in his grace and providence, encouraged by the assurance that he can hear and answer the cry of a community for Christ's sake as well as of an individual when in perplexity. We hear in our days of a High Church, a Low Church, and a Broad Church. Let us take care lest in Canada we get breadth at the expense of depth, and if we do it will be gaining a loss.

The brethren who met lately in Toronto, have nailed the flag to the top of the mast and I do not expect that they will be like the sons of Ephraim who fainted and turned back in the day of battle. By all means let us seek after Union in a Scriptur-

al way out, and means do let our own Church stand together in unity.

I close with the following extract from a late master in Israel, delivered many years ago, and may we all be enabled by Divine grace to ponder deeply its solemn lesson. "Gentlemen, in a nation there are many conflicting opinions, many different parties, and the factions are ranged against each other in the Parliament, and among the people, but if the King—if his own be attacked by a foreign power, all divisions cease, all factions are silent, all hands are stretched out to preserve the crown and maintain independence. Thus it is with the Church, there are many different opinions, sects and parties, but if a foreign power touches the honor of our Divine King, all divisions cease, all sects unite, all hearts join in one, and all hands are raised together to support His Crown."

Yours truly,
WILLIAM GRAHAM.
Edmondville Nov. 5th, 1873.

Rev. John Laing.

EDITOR BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN.

Your correspondent of the 31st ult., "Spero," is very anxious to know on what principle the Rev. John Laing is eligible to a call in our Church? My answer in brief would be on every principle, gratitude, honesty and fairness. Mr. Laing did leave for one year the active duties of a pastor, but he never left the family, and can scarcely be said to leave the ministry. During the year of absence he did good service in the pulpits of the Capital and no neighborhood. In many cases there might be occasion for enquiry, but in Mr. Laing's case there is none. Does "Spero" know that Mr. Laing is one of the first and best fruits of Knox's College? That he spent the best part of a lifetime in the active service of the church? That to him we are indebted for that wondrous scheme of Home Missions that has been crowned with such amazing success? To his patient unwearied labors given almost gratuitously, we are principally indebted. It is not beyond the truth to affirm that there is not a man in our ministerial ranks has done more for the C. P. Church than Mr. Laing. Would our friend "Spero," overlook the labors of more than twenty years in the Church service—valuable service for which Mr. Laing has been so often publicly and deservedly thanked! True, Mr. Laing's name is not on the roll of a Presbytery Synod, or Assembly for one twelve months, but what is more and better, it is written on the feeling hearts of a grateful community.

The Church does well not to forget "the work of faith, the labor of love, and the patience of hope" of a worthy servant. The C. P. Church well gave Mr. Laing a thousand welcomes to any pulpit in her bounds, but none more sincerely and heartily than

ANDREW MELVILLE.

THE NATIONAL LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—chartered by Congress—issued in October \$1,115,000 of new insurance, a larger amount than in any previous month, save one, since July, 1869. This shows the public appreciation of this strong stock Company.

The £50,000 bequeathed by Sir David Baxter to the Free Church of Scotland has been paid over to the different committees, the sums when apportioned being as follows:—Sustentation Fund, £26,995 18s 1d; Foreign Missions, £6,750; Colonial Missions, £6,750; Home Missions, £4,500; and benevolent schemes within the limits of the church, £4,500—making a total of £49,495 18s. 1d., the whole of which is to be invested as capital, only the yearly interest being allowed in each case. The sum paid to the Crown in the shape of legacy duty was £5,504 1s. 11d., and hence the decrease in the total sum received by the church.

Dr Burns preached and presided on the occasion. The sermon, from the 21st chapter of Proverbs, 1st verse, was an excellent one. The usual questions were addressed to Mr. McDonald, and satisfactorily answered, after which the Rev. Mr. Paterson, of Martintown, addressed the newly-inducted minister in suitable terms, and also spoke to the people on their duties to their pastor, to their fellow church members, and to the Church at large. The Rev. Adam McQueen delivered a similar address in Gaelic, with which this most harmonious and happy meeting came to a close. We sincerely hope that this union, formed in circumstances so auspicious, will long continue, and will result in much spiritual good to the whole Glengarry district.