

THE CANADA PRESBYTERIAN,

— PUBLISHED BY THE —

Presbyterian Printing and Publishing Company

(C. BLACKETT ROBINSON),

AT 5 JORDAN STREET, TORONTO.

TERMS: \$2 per annum, in advance.

ADVERTISING TERMS.—Under 3 months, 10 cents per line per insertion; 3 months, \$1 per line; 6 months, \$1.50 per line; 1 year, \$2.50. No advertisement charged at less than five lines. None other than unobjectionable advertisements taken.



TORONTO, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 8th, 1888.

CLUBBING ARRANGEMENTS.

Canada Presbyterian, \$2, and Life of Rev. Walter Inglis, \$1, both, \$2.
 Canada Presbyterian, \$2, and the Weekly Globe, \$1, both, \$2.
 Canada Presbyterian, \$2, and the Weekly Mail, \$1, both, \$2.
 Canada Presbyterian, \$2, and Dr. Gregg's History of the Presbyterian Church \$3, both, \$4.
 Canada Presbyterian, \$2, and The Rural Canadian, \$1, both, \$2.

PRESBYTERIAN YEAR BOOK

— For 1888, —

Edited by REV. GEORGE SIMPSON.

The present issue of the YEAR BOOK contains, among other matter of great value, original articles, as follows:—

Home Missions. By Rev. W. Cochrane, D.D.

The Nova Scotia Centennial Year. By Rev. R. F. Burns, D.D.

The Early Ecclesiastical History of Picton, N.S. By Rev. George Patterson, D.D.

Woman's Foreign Missionary Society. By C. S. E.

Foreign Missions. By the Editor.

What we Owe the Country and the Age. By Fidelis.

The Schemes of the Church: 1877-1887. By the Rev. R. H. Warden.

Missionary Work in Manitoba and N.W. Territories. By J. K.

History of Congregations.

Presbyterian Colleges in Canada. By the Editor.

Mr. Croil, of the *Presbyterian Record*, says of the YEAR BOOK: It is one of the best thumbed periodicals in our office. Every Presbyterian should have it.

The *N. Y. Independent* says: It is one of the best ecclesiastical annuals published in the world.

For sale by all booksellers. Mailed free of postage on receipt of twenty-five cents.

PRESBYTERIAN PRINTING & PUBLISHING COMPANY,
5 Jordan Street, Toronto.

WHY should not the bill now before the Legislature, limiting the hours of labour in manufacturing concerns and other places of business, be extended to railways, so as to include the youthful telegraph operators who are sometimes compelled to work unreasonably long hours. At least two of the railway collisions that have occurred within the last few years were caused by the overwork of youthful operators. The lads had been kept at their instruments until sleep completely overpowered them, and they could work no longer. To compel a youth to work until he can keep awake no longer, and then send him to prison for allowing two trains to run into each other is treatment so brutally cruel that it cannot be properly characterized. There are no adjectives in the English language that can do it justice. If an individual did anything half as bad he would be sent to the penitentiary, and very properly. Mr. Fraser is not lacking in courage, and we see no reason why he should not insert a clause covering such cases as we have mentioned. No doubt vigorous opposition will be made by the railways, but unless we are greatly mistaken the Minister of Public Works is not a man who flinches on account of opposition when he knows he is in the path of duty. At any rate he will have the country at his back, and need not fear any railway.

DR. MACKAY, M.P. for South Oxford, has again introduced his bill to compel hotel keepers to provide rope ladders by which guests may escape in safety should egress be cut off by fire. This is one of the

most useful bills that has been introduced for some time and deserves much more attention than was given to it last session. Those who have read the harrowing accounts often given of guests leaping from four story windows, or of guests falling back into the flames who were afraid to take the awful leap, need not be told that that this bill is much needed. Many of our readers, we dare say, have had rather uncomfortable sensations when taking their room in some large hotels. You go up one stair, then along a hall, then turn, then go up another stair, then turn again, then perhaps go up another stair and along another hall. The thought that presses most heavily on one's mind on this journey is: "How on earth could I get out of here if the place took fire?" Dr. Mackay would render the travelling public good service if he could introduce a clause or two into his bill that would prevent the number of deaths in hotels by inhaling gas. It is said that in many such cases the gas is not blown out. Many people prefer to have a light in their room and leave the gas burning. The hotel people shut it off at the main meter after the guests go asleep, and let it on again before they awake. This, of course, means the poisoning of every guest that went asleep with his light burning.

COMMENTING on the overture now before the Presbyteries of the Free Church of Scotland on "Manifest Ministerial Inefficiency" the *Interior* says:

We might be in favour of such action if an edge were put on the other side of that blade, and churches could be just as summarily dismissed for manifest inefficiency. The church kills the minister about as often as the minister kills the church.

Yes, that is true; the church kills the minister just about as often as the minister kills the church; and the congregation makes the minister about as often as the minister makes the congregation. Dr. Ormiston has often said that the Central Church, Hamilton, did as much for him as he did for the Central, and, if we rightly remember, when he went to Hamilton, the membership of the Central was under fifty. Would Dr. John Hall be the man he is if for the last thirty years he had been pastor of a little knot of cranky people, with a salary of six or seven hundred a year? And this fact, that congregations can kill ministers, is painfully illustrated by the utter failure of many young men to accomplish what friends and professors expected of them. The student passes through his course in the university and theological hall with marked success. His trial pieces for license and ordination are exceptionally good. The Presbytery are as well pleased with him as the professors were. The young man settles down, and in seven years the life seems to have gone completely out of him. The explanation is easy. He had one of those congregations that can kill a minister as readily as some ministers can kill a congregation.

THERE has been a good deal written within the last few days on the manner in which the Local Legislature conducts its devotions. It seems that when the Speaker offers the opening prayer the press men and visitors are rigidly excluded. A goodly number of people would like to know the reason why, and we are free to confess we belong to the number. It is highly probable that the average of piety in the press gallery is just as high as the average on the floor of the house. In the opening exercises of the General Assembly the reporters are always present. The reporters of Western journals generally stop work during the exercises and join in the devotions, but some of the Montreal men usually go on with their work. A French Roman Catholic pencil driver can hardly be expected to join in the devotions of a Presbyterian Church court. Nobody would on that account think of putting him out. And why should the general public be excluded from prayer at the opening of the house? One day last session a number of clergymen were shut out in the lobby behind the Speaker's chair during prayers. They would gladly have gone in had they been permitted. Indeed, we are of the opinion that it would be no harm if visiting clergymen or laymen who pray in public were asked occasionally to conduct the opening exercises. One wicked writer suggests that the press and public are shut out so that the irreverent manner of our legislators may not be made known to the general public. We don't believe that such is the case, but we do believe that the mode of conducting the opening exercises might be improved.

THE Free Church overture on Ministerial Inefficiency has raised for discussion some very important questions. The question that meets one at the threshold is, What is ministerial efficiency? A score of fairly good men might give twenty different replies to this question. Some men consider every minister efficient that brings in the money. In fact, this is the only test that many people apply. Ministers are sometimes called simply because they are good at raising money, and if the church debt is paid off, and the balances come right at the end of the year the minister is considered highly efficient. Some consider any minister efficient who can keep the church full, apart altogether from the means used to draw the crowd. A number of people in some congregations would consider a minister efficient if he put on a spurt for one month each year and did next to nothing during the remaining eleven. Too many measure a minister's efficiency by the number of times he calls on them. Too many never distinguish between mere buzzing and real work. It is quite easy to say that ministers should be dismissed for inefficiency, but when you come to ask, What is inefficiency? the question is not so easy. So much depends on the field in which a man works. So much depends on the kind and amount of help he has. So much depends on a score of things, so subtle that even an able, candid Presbytery cannot weigh them, that it is not always easy to say who really is an efficient minister. The verdict of the final tribunal will very likely differ quite frequently from that of the Presbytery.

WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE UNION.

THE ninth annual report of this energetic association has just been issued, and its contents will no doubt be carefully scanned by many; at all events the importance of the work to which they relate entitles them to careful and respectful attention. There are so many distinct and separate organizations, all professing to have the same end in view, the suppression of the drink evil and the promotion of temperance, that suggestions have been made for their unification. When no good and sufficient reason can be urged for the existence of so many different societies it is plain that there must, to a certain extent, be a waste of energy and resources that could otherwise be utilized and concentrated by the union as far as possible of all such organizations. The question of their amalgamation has been already suggested, and is now receiving a measure of attention. It is clear, however, that the Woman's Christian Temperance Union has good and substantial reasons for its existence, and by the admirable and efficient work it is accomplishing it fully justifies its claims. It is well that women, whose class has suffered so many and so terrible things from the ravages of intemperance, should make their influence felt in the advancement of this great work of social reformation. The home, in which their best work is done and where their beneficent influence is most potent, has too often been desolated and its cheerful light extinguished by the curse that strong drink has caused. It is well, also, that they should adopt the distinctive term Christian, because the rescue of the perishing and the succour of the tempted is in itself a work distinctively Christian. Again the cause of Temperance has suffered not a little by the advocacy of those who have avowed themselves distinctly anti-Christian, and others in their red-hot zeal have given currency to extreme statements that Christian wisdom could never justify.

The work marked out by the Woman's Temperance Union extends over a wide field, but the one purpose runs through it all, the extinction of the liquor traffic. If some think such an aim Quixotic, they don't. There is no disposition to compromise with what is evil, no place for paltering with half-measures. The Scotch Act is good only as far as it goes, and only a doubtful good where it is not fully and strictly enforced. The licensing system exists, but they deem that, high or low, it has no right to exist in a Christian country. Prohibition, and prohibition alone, is the goal to be reached, and for this, along all the lines in which they work, they unswervingly strive. This straightforward declaration of principle and purpose is a strong point with the Union. No moral reform can make advances unless it boldly and clearly enunciates a distinctive principle, and holds firmly to it, through