

Our Contributors.

HOW TO STAND THE HEAT.

BY KNOXONIAN.

Looking at the question from various points of view and founding our opinion on an experience of several hot summers we should say that the best way to stand the heat is to keep cool.

Does anybody say that receipt is too short. Well, in these days when there is such a craze for short sermons, short prayers, short speeches, short articles, short everything, it is pleasant to think one can say something that is too short. For one speaker or writer who is blamed for being too short about ten thousand are blamed for being too long.

And still it is possible to be too short. We once heard of a Presbytery clerk *pro tem* who took the minutes of the meeting in this way,—“The business was duly transacted.” Now that was a neat, compact way of making a record. But it was distinctly too brief. The minute did not say what the business was, nor how it was transacted, nor who transacted it, nor anything about it except that it was done. Presbyters of an enquiring turn of mind might be excused for asking something more about the business at the next meeting before sustaining the brief minute. Our receipt for standing the heat is just like that minute—it is too short.

It is easy to say keep cool but how can a mortal keep cool when the mercury is away up among the nineties. One good way is to go to

A COOL PLACE.

Portland, the Lower St. Lawrence, the North Shore and Lake Superior, are places in which even an Irishman can keep cool. It should not be necessary to say that we do not recommend anybody to spend all his holidays in the Lower St. Lawrence or in Lake Superior. We mean that if a man sails on these waters or lives on their banks during the hot season he can keep cool without any effort. Canada abounds in cool places. The Maritime Provinces are splendid places for an outing. The people down there are so kind and hospitable that a week's holiday among them leads one to wonder if they have suffered as much from original sin as other people have. Muskoka—that gem of summer resorts, that paradise of tourists—may not be quite as cool as some of the places mentioned, but the unsurpassed beauty of the scenery more than atones for lack of midday coolness. Nature intended Muskoka and the North Shore as a playground for all Western Ontario and a large part of the United States. There is no use in fighting against Nature. Go to Muskoka.

But, says Mr. Stay-at-home, that is all very well for people who can get away, but how is a man to stand the heat who cannot go to a cool place. Indulging in the luxury of another too short reply we say, “Stand it the best way you can.” Whatever may be the best way the worst way is to sit down and growl, and whine and say every now and again, “awful heat this,” “terribly hot day,” “roasting weather,” “enough to burn one up,” “terribly depressing,” “awfully debilitating,” and so on. There is another way almost as bad as this and that is to consume with envy because “other people” are sporting themselves in cool places. To sit down limp and envious and growl about the heat is a very unsatisfactory kind of business.

A good deal can be done to make hot weather fairly endurable if not enjoyable. One good thing is to

LESSEN THE AMOUNT OF WORK.

Most men can slacken a little during the dog days. There are always some things that can stand over until the weather cools. If a man works at his best during the heated term his best may not be good when the cool weather comes in. It pays to ease up a little while the weather is hot. Another good thing is to

AVOID WORRY

as much as possible. We say as much as possible because it may not be possible to avoid it altogether. Worry at any time is bad for the human constitution but it is specially bad in hot weather. A good man who was blessed with a worrying wife begged of her one day to allow the Almighty to have something to do with the government of his own world. Imitate that good man and allow the Almighty to have something to do with the government of His own world and His own Church.

AVOID EXCITING QUESTIONS.

It is not necessary to fight the elections over again. The people said what they wanted on the fifth of June and the people rule in this country. You may think the people are ignorant, or stupid, or wicked, but the people don't care one straw what you think about them, so you need not worry yourself over their verdict in any constituency. The men who get the honours in politics are not carrying on any exciting discussions just now. Mr. Mowat is cooling off among the White Mountains. Sir John is, or soon will be, resting in his beautiful villa at Riviere du Loup. Mr. Meredith is probably in some cool, quiet spot, pleasantly spending his vacation. Why in the name of common sense should neighbours who get no honours fight about politics in hot weather?

Give that much discussed lady the deceased wife's sister a rest. Probably after next meeting of Assembly you may be allowed to propose to her legally, if in a position to do so, but meantime keep quiet on the subject. Even our Equal Rights friends do not seem to be agitating at present.

AVOID DISAGREEABLE PEOPLE.

You know who they are. Above all things avoid the lovely characters who contradict and ask impertinent questions and want to argue out every matter. Avoid verbose bores who want to worry you with long stories about their sayings and doings. Avoid cranks, avoid hobby horse men. In fact it would not be a bad thing to avoid if possible people like these in all kinds of weather.

DIVINE HEALING.

MR. EDITOR,—In reply to a communication from G. M. Roger which appeared in your issue of July 16th, I shall make a few statements, which, so far as I am concerned, will close the discussion of the question of “Divine Healing.” G. M. R. asserts that it was because I did not understand that it was solely because believers in the faith cure system “believe bodily healing to be one of the blessings of salvation” and consequently “according to His will” that they have faith to believe that their petitions will be granted. This is a mistake. I knew that such was their claim, but it is one thing to promulgate a doctrine, and quite another to demonstrate its truth from the Word of God, which it appears to me G. M. R., and other believers in faith cure, utterly fail to do.

In the face of the undeniable facts, that for more than eighteen hundred years death, the saddest of all the physical effects of the fall, has come to all alike, and that multitudes of men and women, whose holy, consistent lives have borne ample testimony to the reality of their faith, have suffered, and so far as regards physical cure suffered hopelessly, from every form of bodily disease, most persons will see nothing but baseless assertion in the statement “that Christ's atonement for sin purchased salvation from its physical effects to the same extent and upon the same terms as it purchased salvation from its spiritual effects.” And here in passing, I may say that to my mind, one of the worst features of this false creed is the cruel wrong it does to God's suffering children, those whom he has “chosen in the furnace,” in that it makes their afflictions the result of their own faithlessness instead of God's all-wise and faithful dealing with each of His children in the manner best fitted to secure their spiritual well being and growth in grace. True G. M. R. admits them to be “Fatherly chastisements,” but claims that they are no longer necessary as such when the child has learned the lesson they were designed to teach. May I ask, who in his estimation is to decide when this desired end is attained? Is the sufferer to dare to say, Lord I am now “far taken in Thy holiness,” the end thou hadst in view in afflicting me is accomplished, therefore remove Thy chastening hand?

And here let me say that, taking the statement as quoted above as the basis of faith cure doctrine, it seems to me impossible on that ground to claim complete bodily healing without at the same time holding the false and dangerous doctrine, that it is possible, in this life, to attain to sinless perfection. As I have formerly stated the sense in which I understand most of the passages quoted by G. M. R. as Scriptural proofs of this doctrine, I will pass them by without further discussion, and go on to say that it does seem to me very illogical to draw any such deduction as G. M. R. does from Heb. xiii. 8. True it is that “Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, to-day and forever,” but is it a necessary inference that therefore the manifestations of his love and power are to be always the same? One might as well argue that because God has said, “I am the Lord, I change not,” His dealings in nature and in Providence are never to vary, but to be uniformly the same to the end of time. The passages next quoted by G. M. R., viz., Ex. xv. 26, xxiii. 25 and Deut. vii. 15, are evidently to be understood in a general, and not in a strictly personal sense. As a rule “Godliness has promise of the life which now is,” as well as of that which is to come, and people who are Godly, sober, temperate and industrious, are generally healthy and long lived, but in the many instances in which the general rule fails we are distinctly told not to attribute the failure to the sin of the individual. John ix, 1-3. Luke xiii. 1-5. G. M. R. claims that both under the old dispensation and the new, “bodily affliction was actually removed without the intervention of either physic or physicians as the result of faith and obedience.” That it was so occasionally all admit, that it was so invariably in the case of believers he does not attempt to prove from Scripture, neither is it possible to do so. The contrary can easily be shown either by direct statements or by passages which clearly infer that believers in every age have suffered from the various maladies to which the race is subject, which were not removed miraculously or without means.

For the sake of convenient reference I give the direct proofs I quoted formerly: Is. xxxviii. 21. 2 Cor. xii. 7-9, Gal. iv. 13-14, 1 Tim. v. 23, Phil. i. 26-27, 2 Tim. iv. 20. See also the case of David, who had long and painful illnesses; see in proof Psalms xxxviii and xxxix, etc. “He cried to the Lord and was healed,” Ps. xxx., but there is not the slightest evidence that the healing was miraculous or without the use of means. Of passages which afford indirect proof I give the following: Jer. viii. 22. “Is there no balm in Gilead? Is there no physician there? Why then is not the health of the daughter of my people recovered?” True it is spiritual healing that is meant here, but if the people had not been accustomed to employ both physicians and remedies for the removal of bodily ailments would the figure have had any meaning for them? Jesus also says, “They that are whole need not a physician, but they that are sick.” Luke v. 31. The inference from both passages is clear that the sick need and should employ a

physician, if possible such a one as “Luke the beloved physician,” Col. iv. 14, who probably travelled with Paul, that by his skill he might mitigate as far as possible the suffering resulting from the apostle's life-long infirmity.

It appears to me that Matt. xxv. 36 and 40 and Rev. xxi. 4, afford strong inferential proof that so long as they are in the body believers as well as others are not to expect exemption from sickness and pain. “Sick and ye visited Me.”—Me, in the persons of my afflicted brethren. There shall be “no more pain.” Why? “For the former things are passed away.” “The means and the miracles difficulties” are very real to most Christians, though few will think there is any analogy between them and “the giants and walled cities of ancient Canaan,” and “the believing minority,” who have been the subjects of faith cure is “very, very small,” and does not include the apostle Paul. Does G. M. R. venture to think that it was because there was in him “an evil heart of unbelief in departing from the living God,” in respect of not including bodily healing among the promised blessings of salvation that his “thorn in the flesh” was not removed? I cordially agree with him in thinking that “if bodily healing is revealed in the Word as one of the promised ‘blessings of salvation,’ we ought to be persuaded of it and embrace it,” but being thoroughly satisfied that it is not, I am content to leave that, and all other temporal concerns trustingly in my heavenly Father's hands, and not merely to submit to, but joyfully to acquiesce in, all such afflictions as in His wisdom and love He has, and may see it needful to lay upon me.

We discern not in our blindness
The seeming good from ill,
So we ask Thee, heavenly Father,
To work Thy perfect will.
And we lean with a childlike trust
On Thy strong arm of love,
Assured that Thy loving kindness
Will lead to Thy home above.

By a printer's error the signature affixed to my last paper was made the same as that of another of your correspondents, whose article appeared on the same page. I now correct the wrong initial and subscribe myself as formerly,

July 24.

J. F.

WHAT IS PERSECUTION?

MR. EDITOR,—From a good deal lately said in your columns and in those of some of your contemporaries about exemption from taxation and the due attitude of the State towards religion, I became more and more doubtful about what constitutes “persecution,” and about the respect due from the State, that is, from the majority of the community acting in its corporate capacity, to what used to be called the “sacred rights of conscience.” To be made to pay taxes, the objects upon which these are to be expended are not approved of by the contributors, is not “persecution,” as the *Christian Guardian* and others have shown in reference to city taxes and their outlay. I have to pay my frontage tax whether I approve or not, and experts tell me that in being so coerced I am not “persecuted.” I may have to pay my share of the taxes of others, and by the same authorities be told that I have no more reason for complaint than in the case of a sewer or sidewalk. The majority has settled that it is the right thing that such exemptions should be made, and all that I have to do is to pay and hold my tongue. Clergymen are, it seems, very “useful” a sort of moral police in fact, and their influence for good may very properly be recognized by letting them go free from municipal taxation. School teachers are the same, therefore “ditto, ditto.” So are all philanthropists, so are all Sunday school teachers, etc., therefore “ditto, ditto,” will carry out the principle, and where are you going to end except by making the “useless” pay the taxes of all the “useful?” And this, too, would not, we are assured, involve anything like “persecution.”

Religious teaching in schools is also very useful, therefore it ought to be in all public institutions of learning. Some might object on the plea that they don't think so. But then as it is all a matter of opinion, and as the majority views matters differently, the recalcitrant have no right to recognition, and must pay their school taxes all the same without having any ground for crying out about “persecution.”

But if this sort of argument justify “exemptions” of clergymen from municipal taxes, etc., will it not justify all that has ever been done by the State in the way of establishing one or more forms of religion whether Christian, Buddhist, Positivist or Agnostic, and in forcing individuals to pay their share of expense for the same without there being any ground for their pleading conscience or crying out about “persecution?” We pay the full wages of those who are merely “physical policemen.” Why not *a fortiori* those of the moral and presumably more influential? If a clear majority of the people in Ontario determine that “clergymen” of all classes, including Buddhist priests and Kaffir medicine men should, on account of their usefulness, be not only exempted from their due share of taxes, but be fully kept out of the public funds, why should not that majority have its way? And where would the “persecution” come in to any foolish minority any more than in the matter of “exemptions?”

The country is at any rate ruled by a minority, and by a very small minority at that. It is said that Mr. Mowat's popular majority is not more than ten thousand. In other words, Mr. Meredith's supporters are neutralized by the same number of Mr. Mowat's, and the surplus ten thousand rules the roost. Suppose these ten thousand thought the represen-