

he can only take one; a lot of bovine men have come from the Southern Counties of England, but he must take one or two. No sane man in all Britain would undertake to form a Cabinet in that way. But that is precisely how we are doing it here. The Prime Minister may not choose the best men out of all those at his command, but must have the different Provinces represented. And a beautiful hotch-potch it makes, as any one may testify who knows the present Cabinet.

Sooner or later the position of Canada must change. The present condition of things cannot last for ever—perhaps cannot last long. Annexation to the United States need not be thought of, and is not worth discussion. Such a course would accomplish nothing beyond a settlement of the question of tariff. But to observant persons it must be plain that the connection with Great Britain must at some time or other be severed. England takes but small interest in Canada, and cares but little for her as a colony. The eyes of England are turned eastward and not westward. Under the guidance of the Earl of Beaconsfield, she is being committed to a policy which for the next century must turn her attention to the East. Her steps are oriental rather than occidental, and Canada must care for herself. The past is irreparable, but the future is ours to command. We can repair the blunders our fathers made. There is time enough yet to lay the foundations firm and strong. But they must be laid in equity, and with regard to the future. Our aim must be to abolish the Governments in the Provinces, and centralise our power; to make the honour of politics the only and sufficient reward; and to legislate in the interests of no Church, but for popular education, and industry, and enterprise, and prosperity, and peace. The task is great, and the man who shall set his hand to it will not find an early popularity; but it is worthy of a true man's effort. It is difficult, but not impossible. In spite of the differing races and faiths, by wise and just legislation this Canada may soon become a great and peaceful nation.

A. J. BRAY.

THE PROTESTANT PULPIT OF MONTREAL.

II.

From the Unitarian Church, of the Rev. Mr. Green, it is but a step across the road to St. Andrew's Church, which also has the distinction of being a denomination to itself, as far as Montreal is concerned. What that denomination is, is not very easy to settle, inasmuch as the matter is even now in the courts of law. The question to be settled involves some curious points, and a large amount of property. Readers of the CANADIAN SPECTATOR are getting a tolerably full presentation of one side of the case at the present time. It suffices here to say that St. Andrew's, with a few other churches in Canada, claims still to be the representative of the "Presbyterian Church in Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland;" while, *per contra*, it is claimed that this body is now non-existent, having been formally merged into the late union of Presbyterian Churches in Canada. The quarrel is a very pretty one as it stands, but whatever may be the result, there is no question that the Rev. Gavin Lang, the doughty and dauntless minister of St. Andrew's, has a firm conviction, both of the justice of his cause, and of its ultimate triumph. Mr. Lang is a man of note in Montreal, both from the social status of his congregation, and from his personal qualities. His broad geniality and stately courtesy make him a general favorite, his portly form and pleasant smile being always welcome. A firm believer in the rightful supremacy of the state, there is somewhat of the air of an "Establishment" about his own church. Its architecture is "churchly;" its musical service is full and florid; its sermons are brief and simple. It cannot be said that Mr. Lang is conspicuous as a preacher, but this is a distinction he does not covet. Still he preaches a gospel of grace and common-sense, which is not without its attractiveness and power.

Leaving now this group of churches, and still ascending the hill, the ecclesiastical atmosphere is changed. In front rises the stately English Cathedral, with its Chapter-house and Cross; a little to the right is a bizarre structure, occupied by one of the Baptist societies before mentioned, opposite to which are rising the walls of the new Wesley Congregational Church, whose minister—the Rev. James Roy—is now preaching in the Academy of Music, a little further westward. The unusual composite name of this church fairly describes it as an off-shoot from Methodism, grafted into the *omnium gatherum* of Congregational independency. The pastor is known as a man of amiable and irreproachable character. He is a scholar; and in his studies has drifted far enough away from orthodoxy to be charitable towards Unitarianism. Charged with himself holding Socinian views at the time he was pastor of a Methodist Church in Montreal, he wrote a pamphlet: which, according to Job, is what a man's enemy should want him to do! This pamphlet was generally and naturally supposed to express Mr. Roy's own views; but he claims it to have been only a plea for liberty of thought, on the ground of the difficulties attending the proof of the ordinary doctrines, and because John Wesley had allowed such liberty in his writings which were the legal standards of the Methodist Church. However, on the strength of this pamphlet he was quickly suspended, arraigned, and dismissed from the Methodist ministry. His congregation largely adhered to him; and—seceding in a body—formed a new society. A legal status was obtained under the wing of the Congregational denomination, and the building now rising is the outcome of the first year's successful work. Mr. Roy stoutly maintains his evangelical sentiments, and is quite able to hold his own in arguing his position. As a preacher he is interesting and attractive; tenderly affectionate in manner; choice in language and illustration; and, but for a certain absence of theological definition, would be a very strong man. This latter want probably arises from the fact that—unlike some others—Mr. Roy has learned enough to know that he does not know everything.

A few steps take us to the English Cathedral. And in dealing with the Episcopal Church one ought surely to begin with the bishop. But, alas! we have no bishop now in Montreal. Our late Metropolitan (good, easy man!) was fretted and frightened by the strong colonial spirits whom he was brought here to govern; and we saw the last of him three months ago, when the Quebec boat swung off from her wharf with the passengers for the English steamer. It is matter of some doubt when there will be another; it is not that we do not want to be bishoped, but there is uncertainty as to where the power of election resides. But if there be no Bishop, there are Canons and Deans; so the Church is not left comfortless. Of these, Canon Baldwin may be first mentioned. Rev. Maurice Baldwin belongs to an Upper Canada family, which stands identified with the history of that Province, and with that of the Episcopal Church within its borders. Always a low churchman, he has seldom been an episcopal favorite; yet, notwithstanding, has reached a high position. His evangelicalism is of the most pronounced order, somewhat of the "Ryle" type. Ten years ago he was an enthusiast, now he is simply an "earnest" preacher. He has large congregations, and still occasionally draws a crowd, which will listen patiently to an impassioned declamation of an hour long. His sermons are generally Biblical, and always practical, dogmatic and mildly dramatic. His elocution is almost *sui generis*, and is difficult to describe. While he is speaking, the whole man is at work: mouth, head, neck, body, hands, arms, and feet. If it be on a platform he is speaking, let those near him mind their toes; for he will traverse the whole space, bending and swaying and gesticulating violently; his features meanwhile twitching and working spasmodically. With all this, the matter of his discourse will be interesting, and will leave an impression. For, while he is somewhat artificial and solemn, yet his discourse will be full of a passionate force of argument and entreaty which it is difficult to resist, and which must try some people's nerves. He proves everything from the Bible, but seldom deigns to prove the Bible. Mr. Baldwin is a thorough-going temperance man, and readily identifies himself with the various movements. He is also prominent in the Evangelical Alliance and Bible Society; and sometimes shows his catholicity of spirit by appearing in a "dissenting" pulpit, when one is magnanimously offered to him. Yet it is whispered that he is not above making a "fluke" at the expense of his non-episcopal brethren when the occasion serves. "The Church is the Church, even if it be Low Church," is perhaps his sentiment.

The antipodes of Canon Baldwin is the Rev. Edmund Wood, of the Church of St. John the Evangelist, who is the embodiment of Sacerdotalism and Ritualism. That the same ecclesiastical body can hold two such men is a proof that it is a "broad" Church. Mr. Wood calls himself "a priest of the Church of England;" some would alter the last word to "Rome"—perhaps he would do so himself were it not for sundry weighty personal reasons! If only Mr. Wood's oratorical ability equalled his priestly pretensions, he might be a power in the city—if only for mischief; but the Montreal public have so much of the real article of Romanism that a mere flabby imitation of its millinery and its posturing, its candles, crosses and confession box, does not greatly attract them. Mr. Wood's new church (he has sold the old one to his Romish friends) is a perfect marvel of ugliness externally; the interior is not yet completed.

Between these two extreme types of churchmen there are various shades of opinion and ecclesiastical character. There is good Dean Bond, as evangelical and liberal as heart (of dissenter) could desire; a kindly, hearty man; a good plain preacher. His church (of St. George) has just lost an assistant minister who was one of the oratorical lights of Montreal. Rev. James Carmichael has, however, passed beyond the scope of the present paper; in the Hamilton pulpit he will doubtless soon make himself known. Then there is Canon Ellegood, of St. James the Apostle, who fills a good-sized pulpit, and fills it well. The Canon has good literary ability, good manner and delivery. His discourses are appreciated, and his congregation is large and enlarging. Rev. J. P. Du Moulin, of St. Martin's Church, is also popular as a preacher, having a good style and direct earnest manner, which gives weight to the good material of his discourses. There are also some suburban ministers of average capability, and a number of young men who have yet to be tried by time.

QUIEN SABE?

(To be continued.)

TOLERATION VERSUS CHARITY.

Your readers will, I trust, pardon any appearance of presumption in the remark that the article on "Toleration in Theory and Practice" gives, in some respects, almost as much pain as pleasure to the enlightened and liberal of this age. There is truth in the views presented, still, at best, it is but a half truth.

All honour to Locke for his noble defence of toleration. Viewed from the standpoint of his life and times and in the light of his experience, it excites admiration and sympathy in all advocates of progress who love humanity and seek the welfare of their fellows. Yet Locke, surely, of all men, had but little desire to limit and lock the human understanding within the comparatively narrow compass of his own perceptions. That wisdom which cometh down from above, penetrating unto the hearts and minds of all who, like that great philosopher, open themselves to receive it, has filtered through him into the minds of many, and enabled them to increase their capacity to receive in greater fullness a wisdom purer, and therefore more peaceable, than his.

Life has advanced—liberty has advanced—and truth now clothes the former with a grander mantle, while the latter takes a wider range, and, scarcely deigning to plead for liberty of *opinion*, directs its course towards the utmost possible liberty of *action*. Many among us had ceased to fear it would ever be needful again to struggle for liberty of opinion. Some enthusiasts had even hoped that the time when liberty of action was a principle that needed contending for had passed and gone. Your contributor is right in supposing that recent events show the latter conclusion to be somewhat premature.

The point of the article which commends itself is its insistence on the principle, that men have a right to exercise their faculties so long as they do not interfere with the like liberty in others. The much-abused Herbert Spencer is the chief contestant in this age for the absolute crystallization of that theory