

religion and in not a few cases the undecided and easily impressed.

Fidelity to one's convictions and loyalty to one's allegiance, then, without obtrusion or ostentation, have often ere this gained over the openly hostile as well as won the undecided, whereas a want of these graces has resulted in untold injury to the cause of Christ.

It were well for Christians at all times and especially when absent from home to stamp the cross upon their daily lives, and remembering that their Master is upon trial in their persons, endeavour by holy, consistent, Christ-like living to commend Him to all with whom they come in contact. To seek for bodily strength during the summer vacation is not by any means incompatible with getting spiritual strength for ourselves or endeavouring to give it to others.

#### ROMISH INTOLERANCE IN ST. LOUIS DE GONZAGUE.

WHEN Britain, by conquest, obtained possession of the Province of Quebec, the Government of the day, with that liberality which has characterized the nation ever since it became Protestant, guaranteed to the inhabitants the free exercise of their civil laws and religion. With a greed and arrogance which is as characteristic of Romanism as liberality is of Protestantism, the Lower Canadian hierarchy took this generous concession to mean—and they instructed the laity of their Church so to understand it—that the Roman Catholic religion was to be the supreme and exclusive religion of the country, even to the extent of being privileged to appropriate the public highway solely to its own use and occupancy whenever it chose to flaunt its superstitious ceremonies in the face of the world. The Protestants of the Province of Quebec, being in the minority, and desirous of peace, have generally yielded the point, and thus encouraged these idolaters in their unreasonable and unjust pretensions. These pretensions we regard as not only unreasonable and unjust, but also illegal. Is it not the spirit if not the letter of English and of Canadian law—and has it not as a general rule been acted upon—that no one, no power, not even Her Majesty in person, can take sole possession of the public highway, to the exclusion of ordinary traffic and the stoppage of legitimate travel? That we should permit an infraction of this rule, even in one of our provinces, is not creditable to us as citizens of the Dominion of Canada.

The events which transpired in the neighbourhood of the village of St. Louis de Gonzague, Que., on the 15th of June, and the legal action connected with them are not of mere local interest and import. We, in Ontario, are not, even after all the political changes which have taken place, entirely dissociated from the sister province. If we do not belong to the Province of Quebec we belong to the Dominion of Canada, and Quebec forms a part of that Dominion. The matter therefore concerns us, and we ought to give it the attention which it deserves.

The neighbourhood referred to is not wholly given to idolatry. Here and there the eye of the passer-by is caught by the

well-cultivated farm and neat homestead of some staunch Scotch Presbyterian, forming a striking contrast to the weed-cumbered fields and squalid cabin of his priest-ridden neighbour. These Presbyterians attend the ministry of the Rev. C. Brouillette in St. Louis de Gonzague. On the morning of the 15th of June a number of them were on their way to attend divine service at their ordinary place of worship, and under British law they ought not to be obstructed by any person or power whatever—be it pope, be it pagan. At the same time they had no right to the sole use of the highway, and they would never think of advancing such an absurd claim. But it so happened that that was the day set apart by the Romanists for the adoration of their wafer-god, and as usual on such occasions, they were proclaiming their folly by a public procession. The priests, carrying out their mistaken ideas of right of way, had detailed some fifty men of the baser sort—such, it may be supposed as were not respectable enough to take part in the procession—to stop all travellers and keep the Protestant Queen's highway clear for the sole and absolute use of the myrmidons of the pope. These ignorant and bigoted rowdies, proud of their appointment and keen for employment, were no doubt sorely disappointed when they found no one upon whom to play their cudgels, so they waited for some time after the procession had passed, and by and by they saw approaching in the distance a number of those Presbyterians of whom we have already spoken as being on their way to church. They were driving at a walk, being in good time for service and quite content to allow the Roman Catholic procession to place as great a distance as possible between itself and them. They had their wives and children along with them in their buggies, and had not the remotest thought of obstructing the thin-skinned processionists, whose rear-guard had passed the end of the concession on which they were. But this last opportunity was too good to be lost by the priests' hirelings. They had to do something to render themselves important in the eyes of their co-religionists. So they attacked the unoffending Protestants, cursed them, seized their horses by the heads, threw them into disorder, tried to overturn a buggy containing an old lady and some children, and unmercifully belaboured a man who alighted to parley with them.

Is this bad enough? The worst is yet to be told. Within a week after the occurrences just related, one-half of these Protestants who had been so much abused by Romish bigots were summoned, at the instance of the priests, before a magistrate—subservient of course—on the charge of obstructing the procession, and four of them were committed for trial at the October assizes. In the meantime they are at liberty, for no doubt greatly to the chagrin of their persecutors, the required bail was forthcoming.

Is there any parallel to this in history? Yes, there is one example—that of Potiphar's wife.

This case ought to be made a test case, and appealed, if necessary, to the Supreme Court

of Canada, or to the highest court in England; and we are sure that the funds necessary for the purpose can easily be obtained by subscription in the Province of Quebec—if not, then in the Province of Ontario.

#### "ARE YOU SAVED?"

THIS serious and searching question was so put the other day, in our presence, by an earnest Christian man to a person whose attention he wished to call to the things that concerned his everlasting well-being. In our judgment it was not a wise question. The intention was good. The appeal was one of the most momentous character. In some sense it was according to the Apostle's direction, to be "in season and out of season." And yet it grated upon our sensibilities, and made us doubt more than ever the propriety of such a mode of address. The person to whom it was put was an entire stranger to the person who put it, and it was addressed to him in the presence of a third party—both circumstances, in our opinion, grave objections, unless in exceptional cases, to such a method of seeking to do good. We can scarcely conceive of our Lord, or of the Apostle whose words we have quoted, adopting such an abrupt mode of dealing with those whom they incidentally met upon the highway. We are enjoined to be "wise as serpents, and harmless as doves," and to us such a question addressed to a stranger in such a way seems far from wise.

But we object to the terms of the query as much as to the manner of putting it. To be "saved" is nowhere used in Scripture as the equivalent of believing in the Lord Jesus Christ, or of being forgiven. It means much more than that. It means the deliverance of the soul from sin and its defilement, as well as from the curse of the law, and therefore is used in the New Testament generally in the future tense—"He that believeth shall be saved"—"through the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ we shall be saved, even as they." The exceptions to this use of the phrase are few, and quite consistent with the view we have expressed.

We believe in the final perseverance of the saints. The Saviour himself declares that he that believeth "hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life;" but He did not ask the blind man to whom He had given sight if he were "saved," or if he were "converted," but, "Dost thou believe on the Son of God?" His enquiry directed the sinner's attention to the *object* of faith, not to the *subject* of it, or to the feelings within, which for the moment possessed him.

No doubt there is altogether too little of direct personal appeal to the unconverted to receive the Gospel, and we would not say a word therefore that could be construed into an apology for the guilty silence of many Christian professors in the presence of their friends. But let us carefully guard against giving occasion to any who may desire it, for resisting our entreaty, because of the unsuitable time or manner of our efforts to do them good.