

## THE CANADA PRESBYTERIAN.

\$2.00 PER ANNUM IN ADVANCE.

C. BLACKETT ROBINSON, Proprietor.

OFFICE—NO. 5 JORDAN ST., TORONTO.

## CONTENTS.

	Page
ADVERTISEMENTS.....	449, 450
NOTES OF THE WEEK.....	451
OUR CONTRIBUTORS—	
Formosa: <i>Concluded</i> .....	452
Evangelistic Work—Infant Baptism—"The March Fence".....	453
Temperance Notes.....	454
PASTOR AND PEOPLE.....	454
EDITORIALS—	
Honour to the Dead—"The March Fence"—Supplications for the Young—"Inverted Christianity".....	456
BOOKS AND MAGAZINES.....	457
CHOICE LITERATURE.....	458
BRITISH AND FOREIGN.....	459
MINISTERS AND CHURCHES.....	460
SABBATH SCHOOL TEACHER.....	461
OUR YOUNG FOLKS.....	462
ADVERTISEMENTS.....	463, 464



Edited by Rev. Wm. Inglis.

TORONTO, FRIDAY, MAY 21, 1880.

## HONOUR TO THE DEAD.

WE all believe that the dead should be honoured by the living, but sometimes deeds shew grievous dishonour done to their memory by those from whom better things might be expected. A legal flaw in a will is taken advantage of; and the known wishes of the departed are set aside. In marked contrast to this disregard of the dead is the conduct of two ladies in Scotland, the sisters of the late Samuel Spreull, Esq., of Toronto, when they were informed of the intentions of their brother. Mr. Spreull has been for forty-six years one of the best known and most generally respected citizens of the Queen City. A man of modest, simple, truthful character, he shrank from notoriety, but all who knew him were ready to do him honour. He was the first secretary of the St. Andrew's Society, but though frequently pressed he always declined its presidency. When he died last December, it was found that he had left no will, and that his two sisters in Glasgow were his heirs-at-law. Some time before his death he had promised Principal Grant \$1,000, for Queen's College Building and Endowment Fund; he had also talked of giving \$500 to St. Andrew's Church, Toronto, of which he was a member; and of giving subscriptions to "The Home for Incurables," and "The House of Industry," in both of which he took an interest. But he had not put his name down for any of these sums or objects. There was not the slightest legal obligation. Representations, however, were made to his sisters respecting his promises; they immediately wrote out to the administrator, John Kay, Esq., Toronto, requesting him to pay the \$1,000 to Queen's College, and \$500 to each of the other three objects referred to. All honour to such honourable feeling, such extreme regard for the slightest expression of a brother's desire! It is in marked contrast with other cases of which we have heard, but it is none the less delightful on that account. The sisters have, by their action, erected the best possible monument, not only to their brother, but to themselves.

## "THE MARCH FENCE."

IT is not necessary to enter at any length upon the discussion of the question of "Church and State," as it is not a living question in this country, at least in theory. We have not a State-endowed or a State established Church in Ontario, and we are not aware of any who are anxious to begin an agitation in favour of a return to such an arrangement.

As, however, the question of exemptions from municipal taxation is a live one, and as, in our estimation, it so far involves the other, it may be well for those who, like our correspondent "R. J. L.," favour the one without, as far as we can see, absolutely committing themselves to the other, to exactly define their position. It may be our stupidity, but we frankly acknowledge that we cannot see the appropriateness of the "march fence" illustration and shall therefore be happy if our correspondent would enlighten our darkness by answering the following questions:

1st, What is the "Church," and what the "State,"

as coterminous with each other and yet not in any measure interpenetrating?

2nd, What is the "march fence" that alone is "common" between the Church and the State?

3rd, Are the church edifices "common" property in whose protection, repair and disposal the State has as much legal right and interest as the Church?

4th, If the portion of the fence which the Church has to maintain is wholly "moral," as "R. J. L." says it is, are we to understand that the State ought to charge itself with all the "material" part? If not, why not?

5th, In what respect does the State get benefit from the Church at the "march fence," so as to be under obligation to the latter, which it does not equally receive over its whole farm?

We have a good many other difficulties about this "fence," which bother us, but we don't like to ask too many questions at once, though according to our present condition of, it may be, judicial blindness, we frankly acknowledge that we cannot see at all the appropriateness of the illustration, or the possibility of carrying it logically through without landing us in the conclusion we have already indicated, and which, we understand, "R. J. L." repudiates. The "common march fence," in short, as separate from the farm is not to be taken for granted, but has to be proved and defined. We shall be only too glad to give our friend "R. J. L." any reasonable space for making everything in his theory plain, reasonable and proper, so as to secure exemptions from taxation, and to define the extent to which he would carry those exemptions without slipping, on the one hand, into the endowment by the State of all Churches, or, on the other, into the elevation of Cæsar to the position of judge of what is religiously true and what is the opposite. Archbishop Lynch has told us, under his own hand, that Protestant preaching never saved a soul, or did any "moral" good. The Rev. Mr. Milligan with equal firmness and equal courtesy returns the compliment to the Archbishop. Between them, at this rate, the way in which they build the "moral" part of the "fence" would appear not to be very encouraging or profitable. Is the State, notwithstanding, to supply the necessary "material" part of both those Churches which certainly cannot with much propriety be described, even in very strong figure, as holding one common farm?

## SUPPLICATIONS FOR THE YOUNG.

THE Synod of Toronto and Kingston, at its late meeting, adopted the following recommendation which was contained in the report of its Committee on the State of Religion, viz.:

"That at an early day (say last Sabbath of June) special supplications be offered for the baptized youth of the Church; and the subject of their Christian nurture, their early acceptance of Christ and open confession of Him, as great vital concerns of the parents in the home, and the elders and pastors in the Church, be distinctly and earnestly brought before each congregation."

The reasonableness and propriety of this recommendation are such that it requires no words of ours to commend it to the favourable attention of all concerned. In the present day there is very great danger of the attention given to Sabbath school instruction leading parents to the erroneous and most hurtful conclusion that they are, to a great extent, if not altogether, relieved from the obligation of imparting religious instruction to their children, and bringing them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. It is a fact, as much to be regretted as it is unquestionable, that a very large number of the members of Christian churches, in almost all denominations, think it sufficient to take care that their children shall attend some Sabbath school and give a decently fair attention to the instruction there imparted, while they make no effort either to assist or supplement that instruction, or by their personal influence and example to lead their children to Christ, and, as the result of this, to a deliberate and open profession of consecratedness to His cause.

In very many cases the members of our Presbyterian churches have dropped even the form of family worship, though every time they have a child baptized they practically engage to be much in prayer with and for their children and to allow no excuse for the neglect of the regular maintenance of family worship which they would be ashamed to plead before the judgment seat of Christ. In many more this worship is kept up formally only on Sabbath evening,

while all the rest of the week parents are either too busy or too tired to have even that form. Surely this is not as it ought to be. At this rate the Church cannot be prospering; and souls are not being built up in their most holy faith. What can the children think? They have keen discernment. They can draw very correct conclusions. Can we be surprised if sometimes, nay often, they think that their fathers don't believe in God at all, when they see what godless homes they keep, and how careless, irreligious lives they lead? Do parents professing godliness, but too often not practising it, consider what sharp eyes they have around their tables, how narrowly they are watched, and how speedily their inconsistencies and shortcomings are marked and commented on, if not in words, yet in thought and by and by in life? A child has often to say, "I never heard father pray in my life;" "I never knew of his doing or saying anything to give us children the idea that there was a God at all, or if there were that we had anything to do with Him, or that He cared anything for us." "I never even heard him thank God for our food; we have always set about our meals like so many hogs, without even the form of thanksgiving." When children have to say this, and notoriously in too many cases they have, what are they to think? Can they help coming to the conclusion that religion is a fraud, and that their fathers are humbugs? It is an awful process, that of sad, distressing, and final disenchantment on the part of a child who has revered and looked up to a father or mother and finds that this can be done no more. It is all very well to insist upon the child reverencing the parent. This cannot be done too earnestly or too frequently. But if the parent won't allow the child to continue under the conviction that he has any claim upon that reverence, what then? What can a poor child do that lives in a prayerless home, and yet sees father and mother go to the communion table? What is to be done or said if the father now and then comes home under the influence of drink, if not absolutely drunk? Can children help laying this and that together? They cannot—and more than that, they ought not. The memory of a father's prayers, of a mother's holy, loving, consistent life, has often exercised a restraining, preserving, and purifying influence amid the fiercest temptations, and the most corrupting surroundings of after active life. But has not a memory of a far different kind had exactly the opposite effect? How many have been hardened into unbelief and have tried to have a strange fierce encouragement in vice, by thinking of what they heard and what they did not hear, what they saw and what they did not see, in their early and professedly Christian homes? David said long ago, "Hold up my goings because of the watchers." Every Christian parent may well repeat the prayer with the full and awful conviction that they are "watched" as closely as ever David was, not only by those who may be eager for their halting, but by the little ones to whom, at first at any rate, they may have been in the very place of God, and to whom the subsequent process of disillusioning may be as painful as in many cases it is ruinous, complete, and inevitable.

## "INVERTED CHRISTIANITY."

THIS is the significant epithet which a satirist in "Blackwood's Magazine" lately applied to a type of so-called Christianity which is only too common, not only among those who are called Christians by courtesy, to distinguish them from pagans and Jews, but also among Christian congregations and "Church members."

The speaker is supposed to be a Turkish Effendi who is possessed of unusual culture and enlargement of mind, and who has travelled widely with a view to ascertain, if he can, which of all the religions of the world comes nearest to the truth. The principle with which he starts is this, that "the relative values of religion must depend, so far as our own earth is concerned, upon the amount of moral truth of a curative kind, in regard to this world's moral disease, which they contain, and upon their practical influence upon the lives and conduct of men." Judging by the first of these tests, he admits that Christianity stands superior to all other religions. But judging by the second, that is by its practical influence upon the lives of those who profess to believe it, as observed by himself, he finds it fall very far short.

Some of his reasons for this conclusion, however, arise from a misapprehension, for which, indeed, some kinds of preaching have given too much ground. He