

The Presbyterian Review.

NOTICES.

(a) **Taxation**—In advance, \$1.00.
 (b) The number against the name on the tab upon the paper shows to what time the subscription is paid, and serves all the purposes of a receipt. Thus, "A. Jones, 61," means that A. Jones has paid to number 61. Review. At least two weeks are required after the receipt of money by us before the number on the tab can be changed.
 (c) When the address of a paper is changed, both the old and the new, including Post-office, County, and Province, should be given.
 (d) We do not hold ourselves responsible for the views or opinions expressed by our correspondents.

ADVERTISING RATES—Per line per year, \$5.00; 5 months, \$3.00; 3 months, \$2.00; 1 month, \$1.00. Special rates for contracts on application.

Subscribers failing to receive the "Review" promptly, will confer a favour by immediately notifying the Manager.

SPECIAL NOTICE.

We will supply for one year THE PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW and the CANADA LIVES STOCK JOURNAL, the chief agricultural paper of Canada, to all subscribers, old and new, remitting direct One Dollar and Fifty cents.

THE "REVIEW" FOR 1887

We invite attention to the inducements we offer to our old subscribers to renew promptly, and to all who are interested in the welfare of the REVIEW, to assist us in adding to its subscription list. We are happy to be able to state that the past few weeks have been a season of unexampled prosperity, and that in the ordinary course of business several hundred names of new subscribers have been placed on our books. With these inducements now offered we hope to have the list greatly augmented during the next few weeks. Will the friends of the REVIEW kindly exert themselves in its behalf by entering upon a vigorous canvass? Our advertising columns testify to the appreciation in which the REVIEW is held in the mercantile world. During the Christmas season we may be obliged to give up some of our usual reading space to the demands of trade, but friends will be glad to learn that we have completed arrangements, to go into effect with the New Year, for meeting these growing demands without abridging the space for reading matter.

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 16th, 1886.

A FEW OBJECTIONS TO REVIVALS CONSIDERED.

DURING the past few weeks further cheering reports have reached us of evangelistic meetings carried on by our ministers in city and country, and we earnestly hope that the Church is receiving only the droppings of what will yet become showers of blessing. There are, however, we fear, some earnest and successful pastors who look askance at all special efforts of this kind, and it may be well in pursuance of the subject to consider the objections usually urged against them.

1. It is said that special efforts have a tendency to degrade in the eyes of the people the ordinary means of grace; to lead both ministers and people to look for conversions and additions to the Church only at the stated seasons when such extraordinary means are adopted. In this connection we often hear cited the condition of the New England States where the revival method, as it is called, has prevailed for the past fifty years, and where it is said things have come to such a pass that neither pastors nor people expect any conversions or additions to their church membership but on such occasions. All we have to say is that if these statements really represent the facts, as far as the evangelical Churches in New England are concerned, these Churches are in a deplorable state of ignorance as to what a revival of religion really means, and as to what is the value of the ordinary means of grace. It cannot surely be suggested that the spiritual life of the churches in New England was hindered by the remarkable revivals under Whitefield, President Edwards, Nettleton, Finney and others. If there are ignorant or slothful ministers who imagine that soul-winning is possible only at a certain period arranged for by them, surely their work and its results should not be confounded with the work of God's Holy Spirit in the quickening of believers and conversion of sinners in the thousands of instances with which the whole Church is familiar. It is absurd to suppose that any devoted and experienced pastor could ever fall into the error suggested of looking for blessing to follow his ministry only during a few weeks of the year. Wherever there is a revival in the true sense of the word the minister himself receives such a baptism of power as makes him a more devoted and successful soul-winner for the rest of his natural life. Wherever there is a true revival the people also are stirred to greater diligence and faithfulness. When the Lord gives such blessing he never withdraws it. The reaction which is often lamented as the inevitable result of revival is not a reaction in the real meaning of the word. When the bones in the Valley of Vision stood up an exceeding great army we do not find Ezekiel shaking his head at them and saying "You will be dry bones again in the course of a few weeks. Where the work is God's work it lasts; where it is man's it does not last. Instead of this being a source of discouragement it should be a cause of profound thankfulness; for if men have deceived themselves it is well to be undeceived as quickly as possible. There is no reaction after a true revival. But there is a testing time, just as needful for the spiritual life of the Church, for it separates the wheat from the chaff, and

shows how far the work is genuine. The result of spurious revivals in New England may have been deadening to the Churches, but it is equally certain that these Churches would have long ago been altogether dead but for the timely blessing granted by the Lord of the harvest in former days. It must not be forgotten also that the ranks of the ministry and of the missionaries have been filled from times of revival in the Churches both in Britain and America. If the history of our congregations were known it would doubtless be discovered that a large percentage of our most devoted Church workers are the fruits of times of special blessing.

2. It is said also that the normal state of the Church ought to be such that every service would be a special service in its effects; every Sabbath, a time of revival. To this we say, Amen. But where are the Churches in this normal condition to be found? Go through this Dominion from the Atlantic to the Pacific and visit the most vigorous and active Churches, having the most devoted and successful pastors, and see whether any of these Churches have reached this normal condition. We have never heard of them; and if they exist anywhere the fact should be made known for the benefit of the whole Church. But what are the facts with regard to the spiritual condition of a large proportion of our churches? They are in anything but what these friends would call the normal condition. What lies at the root, we venture to ask, of the desire of so many ministers for change of sphere, so much so that every vacant charge is besieged with applications for a hearing? What is the cause of nearly all the congregational troubles, which so often occupy the time of our presbyteries? What is the source of our financial difficulties with regard to augmentations and other schemes of the Church? What, but the prevalence of a condition of things which only a great outpouring of God's Spirit upon ministers and people can possibly put right? We do not for a moment forget the bright side of this picture, the growth of the Church in zeal and liberality, every year since the Union, but we are sure there is the dark side notwithstanding, and that a genuine revival of religion in all our congregations would remove friction and develop our resources in such a way as to make us heartily ashamed of our past feebleness and coldness in the work of the Lord. It is all right to keep before us what ought to be the normal condition of the Church, but we had better both pray and work for a mighty revival in the meantime until that blessed condition is reached. We have a friend who often says that to a Christian every meal should be a sacrament, but he does not see his way on that account to giving up the quarterly communion. And he is of course right. In the same spirit, though we may hold that there should be a perennial revival going on in the Church, we would advise the taking advantage of every opportunity in the meantime to bring about a revival.

3. There are pastors who say, "We have had no experience in such work and prefer going on quietly according to use and wont." And there are sessions who refuse their sanction to any effort of the kind if proposed by the minister. Now we do not wish to say a word against such pastors or sessions, for they are in many instances as perhaps deeply interested in the spiritual welfare of the Church as those who urge a departure from slavish use and wont. But we might suggest in all humility to such pastors the advisability of seeking some personal experience in this matter. Let them, for instance, ask for the testimony of those who have experience in such work. Let them go to the help of some brother who is preaching to his people two or three times a day without wearying them or finding the attendance diminishing, and then let them decide what their own duty may be towards their own flocks. And to objecting sessions we would offer this advice: do not object to any proposal of your minister in the direction of stirring up the people to a truer consecration of heart and life to the Saviour. Do not frown upon any zeal he may exhibit for the conversion of souls. Is it not enough that the worldly people in the church should stand in his way and mock at his earnestness? Let him not feel that the godly men who are his colleagues in the spiritual oversight of the flock are stumbling blocks in the way of a true revival of religion.

"FIDELIS" LETTER.

ROMAN CATHOLIC ENCROACHMENTS ON THE SCHOOL LAW.

THE letter of "Fidelis," given in our last number, is an ably condemnatory of the course which this Journal has pursued in dealing with Roman Catholic privileges recently obtained by the Amendments in the Separate School Act, and apologetic for the Government. It also deprecates discussion lest injustice be done to the administration. We gladly gave it place in our columns, although its tone is far from free of political bias. Notwithstanding all the hard things which have been said of the REVIEW, we still aver that our only desire is to protect our liberty against the persistent attempts of the Roman Catholic clergy to interfere with our rights as Protestants. The Roman Catholic Church claims the *divine right* to educate youth. Any school system that does not acknowledge that right is consequently condemned by her, and her clergy are in duty bound to destroy, or, paralyse, or hamper such schools. We are, not surprised, therefore, to find the clergy tenaciously holding on to our Public and High Schools and insisting upon their right to interfere and, as far as they can, directly or indirectly, to control them and keep out of them everything distinctly Protestant; but we do protest, and shall

continue to do so, against any government recognizing that pretended right and allowing the Archbishop or his clergy to interfere with the education of Protestant children. Surely "Fidelis" must admit that with every liberty afforded to Roman Catholics to educate their children as they choose, without any interference from Protestants, we should enjoy like liberty free from Roman Catholic clerical interference. As to the effect our discussion may have on the pending elections we feel no responsibility. It is absurd in the extreme to aver that we entered on the Massie difficulty, or the school question for that purpose, as any one may see from the second issue of the REVIEW, to speak of no others. When we began nearly two years ago, the discussion of Roman Catholic encroachments upon our institutions, the Ontario elections were thought to be in the very distant future; and the Dominion elections cannot come off now until all the present excitement has passed away. Whatever party may be in power, we shall still warn our readers against the insidious, skilful and untiring efforts of the Romish hierarchy in this and other lands to undermine civil and religious liberty and make everything subject to Rome.

The letter of "Fidelis" really requires no answer. The argument resolves itself into this: If these enactments do give the Roman Catholic Church any advantage, they should not now be assailed as they were not challenged at the time of their passing the legislature; and the evil effects which may result from them have not during five years been realized. Now, these conclusions may be admitted (although we do not admit them) and nevertheless it may be true that the changes in the School Law have all been to the advantage of the Roman Catholic Separate Schools and against the Public Schools.

When in 1863 the Roman Catholics obtained the special privilege of having Separate Schools supported by a school rate just as Public Schools, and we thus favoured above all Protestants, we were told by Dr. Ryerson, that it was a "safety valve," which would allow our schools to work successfully; by D'Arcy McGee that now the Roman Catholics would not interfere with Protestants; by politicians and public journals that it was a "finality." Nevertheless in 1883, or twenty years after, Archbishop Lynch, speaking of what they had obtained, said: "Much advance has already been made and we hope for more." Nor was the hope unfounded. In three years more the present Act was adopted which gave them all they asked. But perhaps they asked for only what is fair and right? Whether right or wrong the amendments in many instances are encroachments on our Public School System, for,

1. Whereas in 1863 only such Roman Catholics as gave notice and desired it were accounted Separate School supporters—those who did not give notice supported Public Schools. Now, (by section 49) every Roman Catholic is such *prima facie*;

2. Whereas formerly they were able to withdraw from being Separate School supporters now it is most difficult to do so, if at all possible according to the letter of the law (clause 48 requires the application to be made in writing, that is before the name is put on the roll) This is surely against Public Schools;

3. All Roman Catholic property occupied by owner or tenant (section 49), unoccupied (section 47), held by a company of whom one or more are Roman Catholics (section 53), within three miles of a Separate School may be assessed in whole or part for Separate School purposes. This is a great advance and in many places as a fact has crippled public schools or led to the employment of a Roman Catholic teacher even where Protestants are most numerous;

4. All Protestant property tenanted by Roman Catholics *must* or may be taxed for Separate Schools and the owner cannot prevent it (section 52). "Fidelis" cannot deny that this is a great advance on 1863 and at the expense of Public Schools;

5. Roman Catholics may have Separate Model Schools; while at the same time they have equal rights with Protestants in the County Model Schools. What the effects of this may be we cannot as yet conjecture. This is one great advance surely;

6. Roman Catholic Separate School Boards may appoint a member on the High School Board. Can this be defended on principles of justice?

However much, therefore, some changes not referred to here were good, wise, called for, real improvements—and we readily admit there are many such—some of the above are wholly in the interest of the Separate Schools and affect the Public Schools injuriously.

But probably even these changes would have remained unchallenged had not the Archbishop put forth the claim of a right, *jure divino*, to interfere with our Public Schools; or had the Government refused to recognize that right. But when the Government acknowledges and, obeying the respectful suggestion of the head of the Church, puts our Protestant poets and historians out of our schools, because they state some things that reflect upon the Church of Rome, while at the same time things most offensive to Protestants are taught in Roman Catholic schools; when for the whole Bible is substituted selections from which is carefully excluded every passage that offends the Roman Catholic, while Butler's catechism is taught in Roman Catholic schools; surely "Fidelis" will admit that it is time for the "able and vigilant champions" to speak out even if they should not be M.P.'s, but merely "clerics." "Fidelis" knows what Scotland owed to her ministers even in matters of State administration. Scotland's sons have

still a little of the spirit of Knox and Henderson, and rather than submit to spiritual despotism or be deprived of civil liberty are ready for a struggle no matter how long or how bitter.

THE trial of the Andover Professors for heresy is making some progress. As already noticed complaint in due form was made to the Board of Visitors of the teaching of Egbert C. Smyth and others. On the 27th ult., a motion to dismiss the complaint was filed with the Board. The action of the Board was as follows:—"Voted, That the prayers of the respondents, Smyth, Tucker, Harris and Hincks, to dismiss the amended complaint be overruled; and the respondents excepted through counsel." "Voted, That the farther hearing be held in Boston, Tuesday, December 28th, at 10 a.m., in the United States Hotel, and that the complaint against Professor Smyth be first in order for hearing." On the 30th ult. the Professors filed their answers separately. They are a sweeping denial, alleging that the charges are too indefinite, irrelevant, wanting in plainness, etc. They deny that they hold any beliefs, or have taught doctrines or theories not in harmony with or which are antagonistic to the Constitution or Statutes of the Institution, or contrary to the "true intention" of its founders, as expressed in these Statutes, or that they believe or teach anything antagonistic or opposed to the Creed of the said Institution, or in violation of the statutory requirements or the "true intention" of the Founders as expressed in their Statutes. They urge that no Professor in the Institution is required to be "a man of sound and orthodox principles according to the fundamental and distinguishing doctrines of the Gospel of Christ as summarily expressed in the Westminster Assembly's Shorter Catechism." The further proceedings of the Board of Visitors will be awaited with much interest.

SOME estimable pastors are at a loss how to retain a hold upon the young people of the congregation. Without slavishly copying the method of Rev. Dr. Storrs, of Brooklyn, N.Y., they may gather some new ideas by observing his plan of dealing with the baptized youth of his church, as described in his fortieth anniversary sermon. "When the children have reached the age of seven years they are met by a service, arranged specially for them, to remind them that the church holds them in its remembrance and its affectionate hope, and that it desires to open before them, plainly and fully, the way of life. On the opening Sunday of each new year those who during the preceding year have passed from infancy into childhood are again assembled around the font at which they were baptized, and each receives from the hands of the pastor a copy of the Scriptures, in a beautiful and complete English edition, presented as it is on behalf of the church. One of the covers bears the inscription, 'The Church of the Pilgrims, to a child of the Covenant.' On the inside the name of the child is written, with the date of its birth, the date of its baptism, and the signature of the pastor. After the Bibles have been distributed, with a flower-token to every child, a prayer is offered, of thanksgiving for the continued life of those thus re-assembled, of renewed consecration of each of them to the Lord, with supplication for his blessing upon them, upon the households from which they come, and upon the Church to which they are bound by sacred ties, and with tender remembrance of those before whose tearful eyes the occasion brings up the vanished forms of children similarly consecrated as babes, and already gone to be with the saints."

THE sympathy of the Christian public will be with the hack and coupe drivers of this city in their application to the authorities for legislation with regard to Sunday labour in their business. We regret to notice that the excuse for much of this enforced Sunday labour urged by the employers is, that they are compelled to employ the men on Sunday, on account of the public demanding their services for church-going and funerals. There is probably some justification for this pretense, but it is one that should not be allowed to prevail for a single day in a Christian country. The men however, assert, and their view of the matter should carry great weight—that a great deal of the Sunday afternoon and evening work is for mere pleasure and pastime, and they do not hesitate to assert that by the facilities given to the general public, by allowing the indiscriminate use of their carriages, the evils of intemperance and prostitution are greatly abetted. They admit that there are cases of necessity, such as sickness, invalids to church, and works of charity—which they are quite willing to perform—but they consider one-third of their number would be ample for all legitimate Sunday business. There is a By-law which states that no trade or calling shall be carried on on Sunday, which they are seeking to have applied in their favour. And we trust that the most proper and reasonable request of a hard working class of men will be promptly supported by all who would honour God's law and make the Sabbath a day of rest for man and beast.

SPEAKING of the hack drivers' request, we take occasion to express again our unqualified disapproval of Sunday travel in general, and especially of that kind indulged in by some of our legislators who to fill political engagements obliterate, as far as they can, distinction between Saturday and Sunday. It is stated that on several occasions lately, Sir John Macdonald and some of his ministers in order to reach this city—not to go to church the *Globe* says, have made long journeys on Sunday, and—there business accomplished—have left again the same day to fill other appointments on Monday. It