

party.' At times, however, the tumult rose like the noise of many waters, drowning the preacher's voice. He would then call upon his brethren near him to unite with him in singing, till the clamorous host were again charmed into silence. He was determined not to retreat defeated; preaching, praying, singing, he kept his ground till night closed the strange scene. It was one of the greatest of his field days. He had won the victory, and moved off with his religious friends to celebrate it at night in the Tabernacle; and great were the spoils there exhibited. No less than a thousand notes were afterwards handed up to him for prayers from persons who had been brought 'under conviction' that day; and soon after upwards of three hundred were received into the society at one time. Many of them were 'the devil's castaways,' as he called them.—*Stevens's History of Methodism.*

Dr. Franklin, in his Memoirs, bears witness to the extraordinary effect which was produced by Mr. Whitefield's preaching in America, and relates an anecdote equally characteristic of the preacher and of himself:—"I happened," says the doctor, "to attend one of his sermons, in the course of which, I perceived, he intended to finish with a collection, and I silently resolved he should get nothing from me. I had in my pocket a handful of copper money, three or four silver dollars, and five pistoles in gold. As he proceeded, I began to soften, and concluded to give the copper. Another stroke of his oratory made me ashamed of that, and determined me to give the silver; and he finished so admirably, that I emptied my pocket wholly into the collector's dish, gold and all. At this sermon there was also one of our club, who, being of my sentiments respecting the building in Georgia, and suspecting a collection might be intended, had by precaution emptied his pockets before he came from home. Towards the conclusion of the discourse, however, he felt a strong inclination to give, and applied to a neighbour who stood near him to lend him some money for the purpose. The request was fortunately made to, perhaps, the only man in the company who had the firmness not to be affected by the preacher. His answer was, 'At any other time, friend Hodgkinson, I would lend to thee freely; but not now, for thee seems to be out of thy right senses.'"

WHITEFIELD AND WESLEY COMPARED.

"Why was it that Whitefield had such power over the masses, and preached the gospel with such success? Because, as a man of great natural force, and called of God to the work of the ministry, he conformed to the Master's model. He had clearness—a clear conception of his points, arguments, and illustrations, and hence presented them clearly. He had earnestness—a soul of fire, thrilled with 'the burden of the Lord' to perishing sinners, and the tidings of mercy for stricken hearts. He had naturalness. He used to say that he talked to the people in their 'market language.' He had literalness. He brought great gospel principles to light through literal facts and figures, and had but little to do with metaphysics in the pulpit. He wisely adapted the truth to the condition of his hearers.

"The same is true of Wesley. He had greater clearness than Whitefield, equal earnestness of soul, though less physical force and vehemence of manner. He also possessed an equal degree of naturalness and literalness. Wesley used many literal figures of illustration, but more literal facts. Metaphysical abstractions in the pulpit were out of the question in his ministry. His wise adaptation of truth to the occasion and circumstances of his hearers was a leading feature of his preaching."—*Taylor's "Model Preacher."*

A shipbuilder used to say that under most men's preaching he could build a ship from her keel to the mast-head; but under that of Whitefield, he could not lay a single plank.

Though the name of George Whitefield is a household word, his sermons are little known and still less read. They owed much to his inimitable delivery. The following specimens fairly represent his method:—

When he was preaching from the text, "Therefore glorify ye the Lord in the fires?" Isa. xxiv. 15, he said, "When I was some years ago at Shields, I went into a glass house, and standing very attentively I saw several masses of burning glass of various forms. The workman took one piece of glass and put it into one furnace, then he put it into a second, then into a third. I asked him, 'Why do you put that into so many fires?' He answered me, 'O, sir, the first was not hot enough, nor the second, and therefore we put it into the third, and that will make it transparent.' O, thought I, does this man put this glass into one furnace after another that it may be rendered perfect? O my God, put me into one furnace after another, that my soul may be transparent, that I may see God as He is."

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE QUEBEC LABOUR DISPUTE.

SIR,—When you remark that the Provincial Premier had no right to intervene in the dispute which had arisen on the works of the new Parliamentary Buildings, I must take the liberty of differing from the dictum, believing that under such circumstances the First Minister was in principle the proper mediator.

Whether the men had already gone so far in their reprehensible proceedings as to put them out of court before appealing to the Premier for his action in the question, is a point which can only be decided by a study of the facts as they actually occurred, and the point of time at which Mr. Joly's good offices were tendered.

QUEBEC.

THE CORPUS CHRISTI PROCESSION.

SIR,—Your correspondent "Fair Play" writes in a somewhat commendable tone and spirit, and I should suppose belongs to what is called the liberal school of the Roman Catholic Church. He, however, defends the Corpus Christi procession neither wisely nor well. It may not be that they purposely march always by the Protestant Churches during the time of public worship, but that they have often done so, I should think no one will deny. In consequence of this their congregations are always much smaller on that day, as ladies are

afraid to venture out on the streets, and many young people go to see the procession. The bands of music also greatly disturb Protestant congregations during service. On these and other grounds Protestants have some cause to complain.

It is affirmed that they regard the Corpus Christi procession as an act of public worship and as a means of grace. But why occupy and obstruct the public thoroughfares, to the inconvenience and offence of good citizens of another creed? Could they not, as on other Sabbaths, worship in their churches and thus avoid, in the spirit of Christian charity, if not from a sense of justice giving offence to thousands of their fellow-citizens! Suppose Protestants were to take the liberty of marching in thousands through the streets on the Sabbath day once a year, and call it worship, what would they think about it? We know pretty well what they would think and also what they would do. A few years ago a good minister of our Lord Jesus Christ and a few Christian people attempted to hold a religious service on the Sabbath in one of our city squares, but they were soon scattered, and put in jeopardy of their lives. Things are not one whit better now. Should any good Protestant friends think otherwise, let them try it! The minister just alluded to shook off the dust of his feet against the city and went to China. He found that the "heathen Chinese" gave him a thousand times more liberty than the good Christian people of the City of Montreal.

To say that 20,000 people are kept from drinking and other sins by the Corpus Christi procession is rather a poor compliment to the people and to the teachings of the "infallible Church." If "Fair Play," and his Roman Catholic friends really believe in the infallibility of their Church, I don't, and therefore I think, for that, and other good reasons, they have no right to tread on my toes, or to deprive me of my equal rights and privileges on the Sabbath Day.

In the procession of Sunday last I tried hard, and without prejudice, to find something—anything—like the religion of Jesus Christ, but in vain. While on my way to church through the French Square before the procession had started, I came in contact with armed soldiers, in the Queen's uniform, who attempted to prevent me passing, until ordered to do so by a polite officer. Then there were bands of music, with showy uniforms, like many of the processionists. Also arches in many of the streets of a most imposing and somewhat expensive character, and one of which at least, was taken down by workmen on the Sabbath. All this reminded me of several incidents and passages in the life of our Lord, such as "The Kingdom of God cometh not by observation;" "My Kingdom is not of this world;" "Them that take the sword, shall perish by the sword." Everything in the procession seemed to me to be about as unlike the religion of Jesus Christ as anything could be.

If it be a religious procession, as they claim, then in the name of religion—the religion of Jesus Christ—which consists in "righteousness and peace," I hold that they are in duty bound not to give offence to any, but to live, as much as possible, in peace with all men. They affirm that they have a legal right to walk in procession through the streets. Possibly, but that which is legally right, may be morally wrong, and is it not so in this case? I am not writing against the Corpus Christi procession because it is connected with the Roman Catholic Church, for I am opposed to all processions, except perhaps those representing trades and benevolent societies. But in a mixed community like ours, it would doubtless be better to prohibit all processions. It would be interesting to know what is meant by party processions in these days.

But while we have to submit to them, let us have "fair play," and as good citizens live in charity with all men.

Montreal.

MARCUS.

"THE FUTURE LIFE."

SIR,—The letters of "Charity" on this question are no doubt full of interest to such as can see from his point of view, but he takes too much for granted. Ordinary people cannot see through his doctrine or types and resemblances. What appears plain to him, is to others very obscure. He says, "The change from the present life to the future state of existence is not so great as some suppose; the one is simply an expansion of the other." And that "the Bible, nature and experience, each bring their quota of information" on the subject, and yet he neither quotes a passage, nor gives an example, nor states a fact by way of illustration. He simply begs the question.

"Spes" in like manner writes an excellent letter, but it is a mere exposition of his feelings on the subject. Indeed this is all he professes. He says at the outset, "How can I do more than set down what I feel on this question." But he should bear in mind, inquirers do not ask what he feels, but what he knows, and how he knows it. He may be quite correct in adding to the summary of natural and Christian duty, "Love to God and love to man," the farther element of "the immortality of humanity," but this, I presume, is only another expression for the "future life," which is just the thing we are in quest of.

"J. F. K." repeats the request of "Quartus," that writers on this subject should confine themselves to Scripture proof, but he forgets to comply with it himself. He quotes the single passage, "In my Father's house are many mansions," asks what the Saviour means by it, and then takes for granted it is the place prepared for the saints to live the "future life" in, and that the mansions will far exceed anything in nature, but he does not suggest a word of proof nor explanation what they are nor where they are. He fails to discover much light from my first letter. I did not pretend to be anything more than a very faint taper. But if it served to show that the expression, "the world to come," does not furnish any basis for the theory of a future life, it has done all that was intended by it.

I now proceed to look at another phrase, which, no doubt to many appears to cover the whole ground, namely, "eternal life." This, with its cognate, "everlasting life," which occurs only once in the Old Testament, appears so often in the New—about forty times—that it would take too much of your space to quote them all. But let me call attention to a few.

John v. 24.—"Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth My words, and believeth on Him that sent Me hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life."