

The Dominion Presbyterian

IS PUBLISHED AT

323 FRANK ST., - OTTAWA

AND AT

MONTREAL AND WINNIPEG

Terms: One year (50 issues) in advance, \$1.50.

SPECIAL OFFER.—Any one sending us FIVE new names and \$5.00 will be entitled to a FREE copy for twelve months.

The date on the label shows to what time the paper is paid for. Notify the publisher at once of any mistake in label.

Paper is continued until an order is sent for discontinuance, and with it, payment of arrearages.

Send all remittances by check, money order, or registered letter, made payable to THE DOMINION PRESBYTERIAN.

When the address of your paper is to be changed, send the old as well as new address.

Sample copies sent upon application.

Letters should be addressed:—

THE DOMINION PRESBYTERIAN,
P. O. Drawer 563, Ottawa.

C. BLACKETT ROBINSON,
Manager and Editor.

OTTAWA, WEDNESDAY, AUG., 19, 1908.

The Christian whose inward eyes and ears are touched by God discerns the coming of Christ, hears the sound of his chariot wheels and the voice of his trumpet, when no other deceives them.

ARE MANNERS OUT OF DATE?

It is a common saying that manners, in the old-fashioned sense, are out of date. Courtesy is a "back number," a fit accompaniment for fancy dresses, in keeping with powder and patches. Many people think themselves too busy to take time for good manners, and women, unfortunately, are the worst offenders. Mothers do not teach their sons to be gentle and courteous with all women, at home as well as abroad, and girls seem to fancy that men will like them better if they are hail-fellow-well-met with them, to the sacrifice of old-world deference.

The man who has been brought up among women who neither expect courtesy nor resent the absence of it will soon drop the surface of politeness which he felt obliged to assume during his courtship. He will backslide into the casual, unintentionally rude behaviour which marked his conduct at home. He will monopolise the most comfortable chair; he will take all the waiting on which he can get as a matter of right; he will read the paper all through breakfast, and expect to smoke all over the house.

A reasonable, practical woman will not break her heart over this, but will tell herself that he means no harm, and that his bad manners are the fault of his bringing up. But the thin-skinned, sensitive woman will bitterly resent the change in his ways, and there will be distressing scenes which easily might be avoided by the gentle courtesy which thinks and feels for others.

THE PRINCIPAL CAUSE OF CLERICAL RESTLESSNESS.

(By Knoxonian.)

The principal cause of clerical restlessness is genteel poverty. Any man feels restless when he is pinched. Any man with a heart in him feels restless when his wife is weak and overworked and his children are in rags. Any honest man feels restless when he is in danger of getting into debt. A man that could feel perfectly restful under these conditions would be more or less than human. Most ministers are human, and therefore they feel restless in genteel poverty and some of them look out for a better place, who dare say that there is anything wrong in so doing?

No generous, large-hearted, humane Christian will say that a minister has not as good a right as any other man to do the best he can for his family. There is no law, human or divine, which tells a minister he must pinch his family on \$400 a year if he can get \$1,000, and do as much good when receiving the larger salary as when receiving the smaller. The synod of Dort never said so. The Westminster Assembly never enacted that Calvinistic ministers must wear greasy alpaca coats. There is nothing in the Confession of Faith about living on gruel. The men who made the Confession lived on more substantial diet, or they never would have made such a substantial book. There is nothing in that noble compendium of theology—the Shorter Catechism—which teaches that a minister must work without a library if he can put himself in a position to get one. If the men who made the Shorter Catechism had all been compelled to live on \$600 or \$800 a year and drive twenty miles every Sabbath over a mud road, behind a lean horse on an old sulky, we never would have had a Shorter Catechism.

There is a higher authority than any of these. The Good Book says: If any man provides not for his own, and especially for those of his own house, he has denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel." The minister, like every Christian, is bound to make suitable provision for those dependent upon him. Paul says he would be no Christian if he didn't, and yet there are canting hypocrites who say he is no Christian if he does! Paul did not belong to that class. Some ministers prefer Paul as a guide, and when they cannot provide for their own in one place they look out for another. Paul would say they do exactly right.

The same high authority tells us to "provide things honest in the sight of all men." How can a minister do that if he has not a sufficient salary to support his family? Providing "things honest" requires a good deal of money these times, and if a minister cannot get the wherewithal in one place, so that he can live as an honest man, he must just look out for another.

But what is the use of hammering at a point that every generous man admits. Scores of times have we heard large-hearted Presbyterians when losing their minister, say: "Well, we are sorry he is going. He was a good, faithful

man, but a minister has a right to do the best he can for his family as well as any of the rest of us." One might go a little further, and say he is BOUND to do the best he can for his family as well as the rest of us. The obligation to provide arises naturally out of the relation of the head of a household to his wife and his children. The marriage contract implies the obligation to provide for the wife. It is also implied in the relation of parent to child, and the man who does not recognize this obligation as binding is unfit to be a minister. Recognizing the obligation and feeling unable to meet it makes a poor minister restless, and being restless he tries to get a place where he can meet his family obligations like a man and a Christian. In the name of everything sacred, is there anything wrong in that?

There are a few people who think so. Here is one of them.

Mr. Skintint is selling a bushel of peas. The scales are so evenly balanced that one pea does a little more than bring down the beam. Mr. Skintint takes a pea off, spite it, puts one fall on the scales and takes the other home. Mr. Skintint always did contend that it was wrong for a minister, however poor, to move to a place where he was promised a larger salary. Of course he did. The skintints are spiritually unclean men, far removed from such carnal considerations as salaries—but they split a pea all the same.

Here is another who always contends that it is a grievous sin to accept a call with a larger salary. He had some potatoes so small that he could not sell them on the market. So he presented them, generous soul that he was, to a minister. When the treasurer asked him for his pew rent he credited himself with the small potatoes, and in this way squared his account with the church. This esteemed brother often groans over the increasing worldliness of the clergy. His heart is deeply pained when he hears that any minister has been offered and has accepted a larger income. The increasing worldliness of ministers exercises him almost as much as the operation of turning his small potatoes into cash.

A third representative man who abuses poorly-paid ministers for seeking an income on which they can live decently is almost beneath notice, but we may put him in here to keep company with the two friends already described. We refer to the roving Plymouth evangelist who throws dirt at ministers when conducting his meetings. This gentleman sometimes begins his work in the spirit and ends in the flesh; but however he begins or ends he is always sure to have a fling at the hiring clergy. He takes no stated salary, but he always keeps his dish held out so that if anything falls he can catch it. Don't mention salary to him. Oh, dear no, but if you give him \$500 at the close of his term he'll take it like a little man. Of course he says it is not a stated salary, it is just what the people give. Any salary, large or small, is just what the people give. There is no moral difference between taking money as a co-called gift, as this gentleman does, and taking it in stated sums at regular intervals. Some of these gentlemen travel incessantly, cross the Atlantic oftener in five years than most ministers do in a lifetime, and yet they expect people to believe that they take no money. They ride over the continent