

the various Presbyteries showed that a large deficit or shortage of the sum asked was far too common. Especially was this noticeable among the rural Presbyteries and rural Churches in other Presbyteries. In conclusion the speaker suggested the preparation of a circular by the Assembly, calling upon the people to make more exertion toward a better support for the retired pastors. It was a common claim among the men of the rural districts and among business men that the ministers should make provision for their old age as laymen had to do. How much justice was in that contention would be seen when he stated that thirty two of the sixty-one men now on the fund had incomes of \$600 and under at the time of their retirement. Mr. Macdonnell concluded by relating cases of hardship of ministers who suffered want through the lack of respect of the Presbyterian Church toward itself and the men who labored for it. The report was referred back for consultation with the committee having in charge the applications of ministers desirous of retiring from the ministry for their concurrence in the decisions arrived at.

The Galt case was resumed in the afternoon.

The Rev. Dr. Laing, in a speech marked by careful thought, and fine sympathy, clearly expressed, moved the following motion: Dismiss the appeal and sustain the decision of the Synod and the other courts by which the appellants are suspended from Church privileges. In terms of the judgment of the primary court. The Assembly affectionately beseech the appellants prayerfully to consider their peculiar views and position, in the light which has now been cast thereon, and express the hope that they will respect and yield obedience to the judgment of the supreme court, and submit to the authority of the Session, so that they may continue to live in peace and love as members of the Church, with which they have been hitherto associated, and the privilege of being connected with which they profess so highly to prize.

Chief Justice Taylor seconded the resolution in a brief speech, in the course of which he spoke in the most kindly terms of the appellants, and their demeanour since they had come into Court.

Dr. Ure made a brief address, and concluded by moving that the case be remitted to a committee. It was seconded by Dr. Laidlaw, but was subsequently withdrawn. President Forrest, Dr. Duval, Dr. MacVicar, and Dr. King, spoke briefly on the various phases of the case up to the hour of adjournment.

The first business in the evening was the appointment of the Standing Committee. The report of the committee appointed to nominate them being presented by Rev. Dr. Campbell, Montreal.

TEMPERANCE.

The main business of the evening was the discussion of the report on Temperance, presented by Rev. Peter Wright, B.D., Convener of the Committee. This report, one of the most important presented to the Assembly, contained a great deal of valuable information on the burning question of Temperance. Some of the statements made gave evidence of a close study of the whole matter at issue. The gradual growth of the conviction that in prohibition alone will be found the cure to the evils of drink is voiced in these sentences. Ontario has just passed through an instructive phase of her struggles with the rum power. For while she wages her grand moral warfare against this enemy without cessation or abatement of zeal, and has been brought to a rude pause in the more legal aspects of her conflict—a pause, however, which she will doubtless utilize in forging some more effective weapon with which to legally vanquish this inveterate foe of our country and of our race. Her net gain has been a large increase of valuable experience. Out of this has sprung the firm conviction that no legal measure can avail in this struggle that aims at anything less than the entire destruction of a traffic so palpably and inherently vice. That the question has assumed no new phase in Quebec, that in the Maritime Provinces, temperance principles have their strongest hold, are facts noted by the committee. A number of questions as to the extent of the evils of intemperance, etc., and the steps taken by the various congregations towards the enlightenment of the people, were sent to the various Presbyteries by the committee, and from the answers, it is apparent that the liquor traffic is a great cause for anxiety, and that to combat it, the Churches have established various societies in connection with their services. In answer to the questions as to the extent to which local option, or other regulations are enforced in the various districts, it appears that the complaints of the failure of the prohibitory and permissive measures are largely due to unfavorable political influence, the fear of offending the liquor party, a low moral tone which condones perjury in the interests of the traffic, and difficulty in obtaining detectives. From Ontario this year there have come a larger number of "No's" to the question "Do you think the People are Ready for Prohibition?" but from the other sections of the country, the replies are much the same as last year.

The report concluded with the following recommendations. (1) That we again declare our conviction that the traffic in intoxicating liquor is contrary to the Word of God; that our people should guard against any complicity with it in any form whatsoever; that its total suppression by the State is the proper goal of all true temperance legislation, and is one of the worthiest aims of an enlightened Christian philanthropy; and that sympathy with prohibitory legislation should be deemed an essential qualification in those who represent us in the parliaments of our country. (2) That we renew our testimony to the effect that the Gospel of Christ alone can uplift and bless the race, purify and save society, and make of us a temperate and prosperous people; and we would therefore express our gratitude to God that, in combating the evils of intemperance, the Church has kept Christ and his Gospel so conspicuously in the fore ground as the sole refuge of perishing men, and the sovereign remedy for every ill. (3) That this Assembly, recognizing the value of wise Christian teaching on this subject, would urge on the ministers and office-bearers of our Church the importance of taking a leading part in so moulding public sentiment, and in so educating the public conscience as to secure the early and total prohibition of the liquor traffic. (4) In view of the acknowledged fact that much of the wine of commerce is exceedingly impure, we would strongly urge on all the Sessions of our Church the duty of securing, as far as possible, the pure "fruit of the vine" for use in the sacrament of the supper. (5) That we express cordial approval of the provision made in so many Provinces of our Dominion for public school instruction in scientific temperance; our extreme satisfaction with the recent action of the New Brunswick board of education touching this matter; our grateful acknowledgment of the further advancement made in Ontario, in allowing value for this subject at the entrance examinations; and our hope that in all our Provinces, this subject will soon be inserted in the curriculum of the schools, and be placed in every respect on an equal footing with other important branches of study. (6) That while repudiating any sympathy whatever with the license systems, and guarding against any word or actions that might be construed into willing tolerance or approval thereof; yet, seeing the larger part of our Dominion is at present under license, this Assembly would urge and encourage the members and adherents of our Church to take the fullest advantage of each and every prohibitory feature of the license acts—such as reducing the hours in which liquor can be sold; banishing it entirely from any given locality; and generally, in so hedging in the traffic as to greatly promote public morality and domestic peace. (7) That we record our appreciation of services rendered to the cause by many of our most prominent public journals; by various temperance societies, and especially by the Women's Christian Temperance Unions throughout the land. (8) That we renew the recommendation of past years to form temperance societies and bands of hope in our congregations, under the supervision of Sessions and Sabbath school teachers; and that the Assembly's Committee on temperance be requested to draft a suitable constitution for such societies, and submit it to next Assembly. (9) That the committee be again authorized

to carry out, as soon as practicable, the instruction of the last Assembly as to petitioning the Dominion Parliament.

Mr. Wright made a forcible and earnest speech in presenting the report. Mr. Walter Paul, of Montreal, moved the adoption of the report. He said that, in his opinion, one of the greatest evils to be contended against by the Church was intemperance. As one of the young men whom they had heard on the work of their missionary life the other evening had told him, the greatest evil he had to fight against in the mission work was the drink evil. One of the troubles with this report in the past had been that a number of the members of the Assembly had been afraid of the word legislation in their recommendations. They were afraid of doing anything to compromise the Church, and he had no doubt that some of the objectors would be heard at this Assembly. Proceeding to view the situation in detail, the speaker gave a short resume of the recent temperance legislation in Quebec, and the repeal of that legislation consequent on the efforts of the liquor men. One of the most serious of the evils resulting from that appeal was that the Government had taken away the right of private prosecution, and the temperance people, having to leave all initiations in liquor prosecutions to the Government, were now almost helpless. Although in Quebec there was little intemperance in the Church, the fact that there was great deal in the community was a sufficient reason for labour in the cause. The Church had not exerted herself as much in the past as she might have done; in the future he trusted that such a thing could not be said. The youthful community were criticising the action of Church members, and watching for their example, and if evil were done a good deal of responsibility lay at the door of the man who refused to give a good example. Touching upon the repeal of the Scott Act in Ontario, Mr. Paul said that he did not consider that repeal an unmitigated evil. Already, as the report said, the congregations in Ontario that had watched the operations of that Act were beginning to state that the Act, inefficient as it was, still had done a great deal of good. In the future, when the time for decisive action arrived, they would be found ready to vote for a more strict measure than the Scott Act. The suggestion in the report, "Teach the people," was valuable, and the Church, as the most important educational institution, should give no uncertain sound on this subject. It would be well that all ministers, in denouncing this great evil from the pulpit, should be able to say, "I never use liquor myself."

Hon. Senator Vidal, in seconding the motion to adopt, said that he felt the elders did not take a prominent part in the discussion, and so when asked to second the adoption of the report, he could not refuse. He was thoroughly in sympathy with the cause, and could not see in the report a single sentence that could be taken up in an objectionable way. The influence of example he believed to be most important, and he trusted the members of Assembly would lay to heart the words of Mr. Paul. The great work of God's children on earth was to aid the extension of Christ's kingdom, and when all the Presbyteries of the Church joined in speaking of drink as the greatest barrier in the way of the spread of the Gospel, surely ministers might aid the cause by every means in their power by personal example as well as by precept. Continuing, the Senator gave a short history of the legislation that culminated in the Scott Act, and claimed that ninety-nine men in every hundred being now prohibited by the license law from selling liquor, it was only natural that the Prohibitionists should ask that the hundredth man be prohibited as well. A new feature had entered into the calculations anent the liquor question—the fees of the licensed ones. He regarded such fees as the price of blood, and surely when the chief priests and Pharisees had a scruple to accepting money that was the price of blood, the Assembly should not allow that to have any weight with them.

The first recommendation was then moved by Rev. R. Wright, and on the call for amendments Rev. D. J. Macdonnell stepped up, and after a few remarks, expressing sorrow that the committee continued to make recommendations that could not be endorsed by the minority, moved an amendment. He desired to point out that the report placed Prohibition first and the Gospel of Christ second. Whether that were done intentionally or not it did not look well. He would move in amendment that the second recommendation be placed first. Mr. Wright seconded the amendment, and it was carried amid laughter. Mr. Macdonnell evidently not being quite prepared for the easy acquiescence of the Convener of the Committee.

The matter having been disposed of, Mr. Macdonnell then moved the following amendment to clause 1, now standing as clause 2: We declare our conviction that the traffic in intoxicating liquor, especially the indiscriminate sale of liquor in saloons, is accompanied by enormous evils, and that it is one of the worthiest aims of an enlightened Christian philanthropy to reduce, and, if possible, extinguish these evils by wise legislation. Speaking to his amendment Mr. Macdonnell expressed his conviction that he could not acquiesce in the statement that the traffic in liquor was contrary to the Word of God. The preamble to be logically followed out should conclude by saying that the traffic being contrary to the Word of God, therefore no man should be admitted to membership who took any part either in buying, selling or using liquor. The Church was not prepared for that, and he hoped it would be a long time before such an illiberal motion would be carried in the General Assembly of the Church. They spoke of this question as one of the first importance legislatively. He believed there was one question of paramount importance at present, and to that question legislative action should be directed.

Mr. Carnegie, of Peterborough, seconded the amendment in a word.

Rev. Dr. Laing spoke to the amendment, and recalled the time at Montreal when only a few had voted against the Church taking any stand in regard to legislation. The drift of events had proved the wisdom of their course in dissenting at that time. He was a Prohibitionist, but he could not endorse the recommendations of the Committee. The amendment left them free to accept Prohibition or any other measure they might give. He took the position on the Temperance question that his representative in Parliament was better able to judge of the wisdom of legislation than he was, and so he left the matter in his hand.

Rev. G. M. Milligan sympathized with the resolution of Mr. Wright, but he could not endorse it. Although a Prohibitionist, who believed and hoped that Prohibition would yet be the law of the land, he could not endorse that resolution. He hoped that Mr. Wright would not divide the Assembly on this question when so many were with him on principle. He did not like to hear men on the floor of the Assembly speak of the liquor fees as the price of blood. They raised feelings that should not be brought up. Let them be wise and not cause discord and make new doctrines that were not in the word of God.

Rev. Dr. Kellogg said the Committee had done a wrong in forcing many of them to oppose this resolution, which declared "that the traffic in intoxicating liquor is contrary to the law of God." For his part he could not endorse a resolution which condemned the Holy Son of God, his Saviour who made wine, not sweet syrup, at Cana of Galilee. He believed the eating of meat and the drinking of wine to be neither right nor wrong in themselves but rather morally indifferent. Occasions were when under special circumstances they both became awfully wrong. He could not support the resolution because it made the refraining from the liquor trade a term of communion. He had not seen the last deliverance of the Presbyterian Churches of the States on the result of the Philadelphia meeting, but from the drift of events in certain Churches he would not be surprised if they prohibited all engaged in the liquor trade or having complicity in it from approaching the communion table. If that were so the Presbyterian Church of America had taken a course that would prevent the Lord Jesus Christ from taking part in His own sacrament. He stood

ready to give an account of his words to the Master, whom alone he desired to please. He spoke of the results of the high license law in Pittsburg, which had reduced the number of saloons from 1,553 to ninety-three and had changed the state of the city to such an extent that while in his former residence he could not go to church without meeting drunken men he had on a recent visit of weeks seen only one or two drunken men. He was enthusiastic over that result, as were all good men in Pittsburg. This reduction of the number of saloons was a good thing, but it would be better if they were done away with altogether. But he did not believe it wise to admit, without qualification, the sweeping statement of the report. While he claimed for himself a sincere desire to please the Lord, he claimed no more for himself than he conceded to others.

Rev. Dr. McMullen said he would rather have avoided speaking, but felt it his duty to say something. He quoted the statement of the report, "The Assembly again affirms the view that the liquor traffic is contrary to the Word of God." There was a difference between the liquor traffic in all possible forms and the liquor traffic as it existed. He referred to the debate in Halifax, in which this matter had been gone into, and showed that there was the qualifying word, general, as applied to the liquor traffic. He hoped the Assembly would pause before adopting a report that it "again" affirmed and asked the Convener of the Committee when the Assembly had ever before affirmed that the liquor traffic was contrary to the Word of God.

Rev. Mr. Wright, as Convener of the committee, said he was not aware of the reason for putting in the word "general." He believed that the Assembly had previously adopted the declaration unqualifiedly, but was not sure of it. He had no objection to the insertion of the word "general."

Rev. Dr. McMullen—Then I have gained my point.

Hon. G. W. Ross next addressed the Assembly. He said:—In carrying on to a certain extent with many able colleagues throughout the Province of Ontario an agitation in favour of prohibitory legislation, for the last fifteen or twenty years, I found it exceedingly helpful to me, in dealing with the question before mixed audiences, to be able to show that the Church courts had approved of Prohibitory legislation. We had in that respect, and in that respect I think they were the pioneers, the authority of some of the largest Methodist Conferences in favour of more restrictive legislation so far as the liquor traffic is concerned. I think later, but in good time, the Presbyterian Assembly declared its adherence to that view, and when I had a seat in the House of Commons I found the support and sympathy of these Church courts carried exceeding great weight, because, whatever may be said of legislatures, they have a very high opinion of the judgment of Church courts in moral matters. I would be exceedingly sorry if the great Presbyterian Church in Canada should recede one hair's-breadth. (Cheers.) I think, sir, it would be a calamity second to no other calamity that could befall this country. I say that as a Presbyterian, as an advocate of Temperance and as one who has done something during the last twenty years to cultivate a healthier state of public opinion on this question. I am not going to quarrel with Dr. Kellogg or Dr. McMullen—in fact, I would hate to quarrel with any of these doctors. The distinction was drawn with the liquor traffic as a whole and the liquor traffic as it exists. But I want that the Assembly should bring its whole influence to bear against the liquor traffic as it exists and let the public understand clearly what we mean. We cannot afford to be misunderstood on this question, if I judge the country aright. We cannot afford to let the young men of the country think that we are halting between two opinions. We cannot afford to let the House of Commons know that we have halted or taken back ground on this matter.

Rev. Principal MacVicar, stated that the Word of God being opposed to all evils, and the motion and the amendment being alike in speaking of the liquor traffic as an evil he did not see the necessity of dividing the house unless something was concealed under them. Referring to the statement of a distinguished member of a former Assembly that the Scott Act had been trampled under foot, the speaker said that he had lived long enough to see the whole decalogue trampled under foot. He was not prepared to say whether the failure of the Scott Act was due to inherent weakness or to the inherent weakness of multitudes who should have supported it. They had drawn a fine distinction between drinking and drunkenness, but he found that very often the first led to the other. In regard to the statement as to whether certain liquors were of a given nature he would not stay to pass an opinion, and agreed with the greatest Temperance lecturer he had ever heard, Dr. Hall, of New York, that the present was no time for casuistry, but for work that would put an end to this great evil.

Dr. Campbell, of Montreal, said he had begun his teaching in the belief that Scriptural wine was not intoxicating, but he had been led to change his opinion after great research. He could not endorse the opinion that the wines of Scripture were not intoxicating, but he believed with the others that this was not a matter to prevent work along Temperance lines. He desired to correct the impression of Mr. Ross that the men who dissented from the resolution did so on account of opposition to Prohibition. It was rather because they desired to oppose the passage of an extravagant resolution, and get one on which all could agree, that they had taken the action they did.

Rev. Principal King, in a few sentences, expressed disbelief in the statement that the liquor traffic was contrary to the law of God. How far would such a statement carry them? In favour of Ontario there were vineyards, and by a wide construction of the phrase, the men engaged in that industry would be ruled out as engaged in a traffic contrary to the law of God. Some years ago a Police Magistrate, in answer to a deputation that waited on him in regard to the traffic, had suggested this very thing, that the Church should prevent the men engaged in the traffic from taking membership. Although enormous evils flowed from the traffic he did not believe with Principal MacVicar that the traffic itself was an enormous evil. Well, he certainly believed what he said. Concluding, the Doctor said the matter was one more for the parliaments to deal with than the General Assembly as at present constituted. He was sorry that the resolution should be framed in such a way that they, most of them abstainers, and all of them recognising the evils of the traffic, could not support it. If the Church passed the resolution, the next step ought to be the ruling out of the Church of all men engaged in the traffic.

Professor Bryce objected to the logic that asked them to exclude certain men from the Church because the traffic they were engaged in was contrary to the Word of God. They should rather keep them in and try to lead them to a better and clearer light. He concluded by stating that he supported the resolution in the name of the people of the great North-West.

Mr. Wright replied briefly to the arguments which had been brought forward against the report and the resolutions.

Rev. Mr. Macdonnell's amendment was voted down, but over thirty voted in favour of it.

Dr. McCurdy moved in amendment, That we declare our conviction that the existing traffic in intoxicating liquor is contrary to the spirit of the Word of God. This was also voted down. The resolution was carried and the Assembly adjourned.

SEVENTH DAY

The first business of importance at the morning session was the reception of the resolutions on the Jesuit Estates Act.

Rev. Dr. King presented the report of the Committee on the Jesuit question, which he explained was of the nature of a deliverance for the Assembly, as follows:—Resolved, To express emphatic condemnation of the Act passed by the Province of Quebec incorporating the Order of the Society of Jesus, commonly known as the Jesuits, particularly on these grounds:—That the body thus incorporated is