

committee, about \$30,000 for a steam vessel. When the money was collected, and they then looked into the matter and found the cost of running such a vessel, no further action was taken, and the money has laid all these ten years in a bank in Australia.

Meantime trading steamers began running, rendering a mission ship unnecessary, and when Dr. Paton left for America, two years ago, there was no mention made by his Church of a vessel for the Mission. His commission from his Foreign Mission Committee, simply said: "that any money which may be sent to Dr. Paton during his American tour, be received, only on condition that it be sent to the Committee to be used for such Mission purposes as the Committee may approve."

At the meeting of the Commission of the Victorian Assembly, in May, 1894, nearly a year ago, it was reported that money was being collected by Dr. Paton for a mission steamer. Leading men such as Professor Harper strongly opposed it, and moved that "no such scheme has been sanctioned by our Church nor is likely to be, and to request him to abstain from pressing the scheme upon the British public." Nobody advocated the steamer, but at length it was resolved, "that any action with regard to Dr. Paton be delayed till his return to the colony." I quote from the official minutes which are before me.

When Dr. Paton after his return and seeking in vain the approval of the Federal Assembly, presented his own Church with sufficient to increase the amount previously collected, to \$50,000, to build a steam vessel and presented them in addition for their *ordinary Foreign Mission Fund*, the enormous sum of £25,000 (one hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars) which he had collected in Britain, Canada, and the United States; and then asked their sanction for building a new steam "Dayspring," it was agreed to, if on consulting all the churches supporting the mission a majority should approve of building her.

The Victorian Foreign Mission Committee then gave Dr. Paton a letter of approval and thanks, which was recently published in your columns, in which they state that the Assembly had acted along the lines of ten years ago.

They also sent out communications to the other Churches asking their approval of the scheme, but without waiting for an answer, at least from some of them, have gone for ward and ordered the steamer.

Why this has been done is best known to themselves. The only explanation I have seen, and which I simply quote for what it is worth, is a statement by the ex-moderator, to the General Assembly of New South Wales a few weeks ago, in which he gives it as his conviction, that the Victorian Foreign Mission Committee were "acting against their own better judgment, under pressure from Dr. Paton."

3.—THE DAYSPRING BOARD.

This board consists of a body of gentlemen in Australia, who have hitherto had the whole management of the maritime service of the mission. The Victorian Foreign Mission Committee asked them for their approval. They met Feb. 21 and 26. A sub-committee of the Foreign Mission Committee of the New South Wales Church met at the same time. The matter was very fully considered and in their official report they say "the following is our unanimous recommendation"

"Having duly considered the statements and figures re a mission steamer for the New Hebrides, and finding that the ordinary cost of such, per annum, will be about £4,166, sterling (\$20,000), regret that we cannot approve of the proposal to build a steamer," etc.

4.—THE CHURCH OF NEW SOUTH WALES.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of New South Wales, one of the leading churches in Australia, met in Sydney a few weeks ago, March 14th. The report of their Foreign Mission Committee and of the Dayspring Board was presented. In the presentation it was stated that the Committee and the Dayspring Board "considers such an annual cost for doing the carrying work of the mission most excessive; that it is

equal to the combined salaries of all the New Hebrides Missionaries, that the New Hebrides group is thoroughly overtaken by the present service, which gives more visits than the proposed steamer could give, and that it costs little more than one-third of what the proposed steam service would be."

The General Assembly after fully considering the report, and with the knowledge that the Victorian Foreign Mission Committee had cabled, a few days previously, for the steamer, resolved:

That while heartily acknowledging the indefatigable labors of the Rev. Dr. Paton and the great liberality of the friends of the New Hebrides Mission in Britain and America, regret that owing to the great expense which the maintenance of the proposed steamer would entail, they cannot approve of the proposed scheme. In view of the changed conditions of the Islands, and the increased facilities of communication now existing, and likely to increase, the Assembly recommend that full advantage be taken of these facilities for the service of the mission. The Assembly also declare that they cannot hold out any promise of increase in their annual contribution of £200, (\$1000) for the maintenance of the New Hebrides maritime service, and that they do not hold themselves committed to continue this grant for any definite term of years."

5.—THE FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

The Foreign Mission Committee of the Free Church of Scotland, when asked by the Victorian Foreign Mission Committee for their approval, resolved:—

"This committee have never regarded the proposal to build and maintain a steam vessel for the exclusive service of the New Hebrides mission as a missionary necessity; and have believed themselves supported in this opinion by the views of their own missionaries. They see no reason now to depart from it." "With regard to their annual donation of £250 to maintain inter-island communication, they have always acted along with the *Dayspring Board*, the *Federal Assembly* and the *N. H. Mission Synod*, and should these authorities approve of this scheme, they are quite willing that the £250 should be applied as proposed. It must, however, be carefully understood that the committee do not bind themselves to guarantee their grant for ten years, or for any definite number of years."

FACTS TO REMEMBER.

There is direct steam service between the Islands and Australia, and, in addition, a smaller trading steamer running continually around the group. By this the Dayspring Board say that "the New Hebrides group is completely overtaken," and that it "gives more visits than the proposed steamer could give," as the latter would have to run to Australia. This service costs less than £1,500 (seven thousand five hundred dollars) per annum.

For the luxury of a mission steamer which cannot give such frequent service, there will be the first cost \$50,000. There will be insurance (or risk), repairs, depreciation, and there will be for ordinary running expenses £4,166 (nearly twenty-one thousand dollars) yearly. The difference between these two sums is more than thirteen thousand dollars per annum, sufficient to support some ten mission families in almost any mission field in the world, enough to completely overtake the whole New Hebrides group and four or five to spare for some other heathen field.

In view of the hard times, the deficits in Missionary funds, and the piteous cry of the world's perishing millions, such wifful extravagance, no matter how sincere, earnest and devoted its advocates, is simply appalling. We are confident that our own Church will be no party to such waste.

E. SCOTT.

Montreal, April 29, 1895.

Some of the Hymns in our present Hymnal.

Editor PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW:

SIR,—I intend to review some of the hymns which have a place in our present Hymnal, and, no doubt, will have one in the new. I

shall chiefly point out passages in them which, I think, could be improved, whereby they would be more fitted for use in our service of praise, and suggest corrections. Unless for a very good reason, a hymn ought to be used only as it came from the author's pen. But if it can be improved in its religious teaching, its rhyme, or its rhythm, it should be. The Lord's claims are of the first importance.

I may here state what is my position with regard to the use of the Psalms in our service of praise. As will appear from the foregoing paragraph, I am not altogether opposed to the use of hymns in it. I am quite favourable to the use of good ones, as a supplement. But I contend for keeping the whole Psalter. On this point, I say, in the language of the Orangemen's motto: "No surrender." I wish no expurgated Psalter from which some of the Psalms are altogether banished, and in which some are more or less shorn. I believe that the Psalms were designed to be used by the Church as long as she is in the world. There is not one which she cannot now rightly use on one occasion, or another. It is a serious matter to say to the Holy Spirit: "Thou hast inspired psalms which are now as useless as a scaffolding is after the building for which it was put up, is finished." We hear a great deal said against what are commonly called the "cursing psalms," which proves only that the speakers "understand neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm." They take good care to say nothing about the "cursing" parts of the New Testament.

The Hymnal Committee of the General Assembly has decided to recommend it to urge on the congregations of our Church a greater use of the Psalter in the service of praise. I consider that ministers themselves are much to blame for the need of such recommendation. As a rule, we have in a Sabbath service, only one psalm. Sometimes, instead of that, we have a paraphrase. The rest of the singing is of hymns, hymns, hymns. The use of the psalm, or the paraphrase, looks very like as if it were only in compliance with the exhortation to the strong to bear the infirmities of the weak. At our "week-night" services, it is hymns, hymns, hymns, with, very seldom, an exception. In our Sabbath School hymn books, there are portions of, I think, not more than two psalms. Much more of the Psalter could very properly be used there. Many of our ministers, by their example, teach their people to make little account of the Psalms in the service of praise, as they, in the same way, teach them to sit during public prayer.

"Should Rouse's version of the Psalter be used?" is a very different question from the one, "Should the whole Psalter be used in the musical part of public worship?" If we can get a better version than the one mentioned, certainly let us use it. But till we can, let us not cast aside the one which our Church has used so long.

Here I shall pause, for were I to review any of the hymns above mentioned, I would make this paper too long. In my next, I shall begin to point out defects in some, and suggest alterations which, I think, would be improvements on them.

T. FENWICK,

Woodbridge, Ont

Principles or Votes—Which?

Born will be important in the coming elections. Both parties want votes; principles may come in later. Some people say that principles tell in the long run more powerfully and conqueringly than votes. Certainly, the principle, or root motive of Rigby, has told, convincingly all over the country. The old rubber waterproof is dead and buried. The problem was to produce a garment which, while being perfectly waterproof, should at same time, be unobjectionable as an ordinary overcoat. This dual character is admirably sustained in Rigby Porous Waterproofs. A Spring Overcoat; a waterproof garment; perfect ventilation; durable service. Don't be afraid of the rain or the chilly air; Rigby will protect you from both. Rigby is talked about, worn by thousands.