

The Presbyterian Review.

GENERAL NOTICES.

- (a) Terms.—In advance, \$1.00; after 1 month, \$1.25; after 3 months, \$1.50; after 6 months, \$1.75; after 1 year, \$2.00.
- (b) The reader agrees to the name on the tab upon the paper above to what the subscription is paid, and serves all the purposes of a receipt. Thus, "A. Jones, \$1.00" means that A. Jones has paid for a number of Review. At least two weeks are required after the receipt of money by us before the number on the tab can be changed.
- (c) When the address of a paper is changed, both the old and the new, including Post-office, County, and Province, should be given.
- (d) Subscribers wishing to introduce THE REVIEW to their friends can have specimen copies sent free from this office to any address.
- (e) Yearly subscriptions received at any time, and will date one year from date of subscription.
- (f) To introduce the paper we will send it on trial to new subscribers three months for no cost.

ALL communications for the Editorial, Literary, News and Miscellaneous Columns of this Journal should be addressed to the Editor of the "Presbyterian Review," P.O. Box 2549, Geo. H. Robinson, P.O. Box 2549, Office, Rooms 31 York Chambers, Toronto St., Toronto.

No notice will be taken of anonymous communications. What is intended for insertion must be accompanied by the name and address of the writer, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee of good faith.

We do not hold ourselves responsible for the views or opinions expressed by our correspondents.

Persons desiring a return of their manuscripts, if not accepted, should send an addressed envelope with stamp.

ADVERTISING RATES.—Per line per year, \$5.00; 6 months, \$3.00; 3 months, 25 cents; 1 month, 20 cents; under 1 month, 10 cents. Special rates for contracts on application.

SPECIAL NOTICES.

1. We have to request persons writing to us to be careful to observe our proper address as given above.

2. We are desirous of securing Special Agents in every Congregation. Our terms to Candidates are most liberal.

3. Mr. T. B. Mallocks, an elder of St. Andrew's Church, of London, Ont., is the General Agent of the PRESBYTERIAN NEWS CO., and as such is authorized to solicit subscriptions for THE PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, to receive money, to grant receipts, and otherwise to act as agent of the Company.

4. Subscribers failing to receive THE REVIEW will confer a favour by immediately notifying the Manager.

City subscribers failing to receive the "Review" promptly, will confer a favour by immediately notifying the Manager.

THURSDAY, APRIL 15TH, 1886.

ROME IN AMERICA—SOME STARTLING FIGURES.

THE elevation of Archbishop Taschereau, of Quebec, to the cardinalate marks another step in the growth of Romanism in this country. As quietly and apparently as resistless as the rising tide Romanism is spreading over this continent every hour gathering new strength and volume until it threatens to inundate, if not submerge, everything. It is a tide, too, that has apparently no ebb. We do not seek to be alarmists, nor to foment dissensions between our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens and Protestants, nor to deny to Catholics the exercise of their just rights; but in the light of recent events and statistics we emphatically assert that Protestants must awake from their dream of security if they wish to preserve their preponderating influence on this continent. It is very generally assumed that however great may be the growth of Romanism it is not so great as the aggregate growth of Protestantism, and that whatever may happen politically Protestantism will be in the ascendancy. There is no ground for this assumption. Facts and figures given by trustworthy authorities show that the very opposite is true. A book recently published in the United States entitled "Our Country," shows by an array of figures which cannot be disputed that the Roman Catholic Church has grown since 1850 faster than any other church, and faster than all the Protestant Churches put together! Here is the startling statement, which we commend to the notice of the opponents of our French Evangelization scheme especially—

"In 1850, the Catholic Church was nearly one-half as large as all evangelical Protestant churches. From 1850 to 1880 the population increased 116 per cent., the communicants of evangelical churches increased 185 per cent., and the Roman Catholic population 294 per cent. From 1850 to 1880 the number of evangelical churches increased 125 per cent. During the same period Catholic churches increased 447 per cent. From 1870 to 1880 the churches of all evangelical denominations increased 49 per cent., whilst Catholic churches multiplied 74 per cent. From 1875 to 1880 the ministers of evangelical churches increased in number 46 per cent., Catholic priests 61 per cent. From 1850 to 1870 ministers increased 86 per cent., priests 204 per cent. From 1850 to 1880 ministers increased 173 per cent., and priests 391 per cent. In 1850 the Catholic population was equal to 45 per cent. of the evangelical church membership; in 1870 it was equal to 68 per cent., and in 1880 there is a slight loss, due to falling off of immigration during the latter half of the period. Examination shows that the growth of the Catholic Church corresponds closely with that of the foreign population, but is somewhat more rapid. Since 1850 there has been a marked increase in the Catholic population. The annual growth of the latter, from 1870 to 1880, was 176,733, while from 1833 to 1884 it was 231,322."

These are not very encouraging facts. But there are other features of this growth that are not any more inspiring. The great bulk of the vast number of immigrants pouring into the Western States are Roman Catholics. Already it is stated that the adherents of that church

are there in a majority, and the fear is openly expressed in the East that the Roman Catholic Church by massing its forces there for some years may be able to control the political and commercial interests of the land. It is in the Western States that the Jesuits, expelled from nearly every country of Europe on account of their intrigues and interference in politics, have found a refuge. How they are regarded may be seen from the following utterances in the *Presbyterian Home Missionary*.

"When the Jesuits," says the Rev. Josiah Strong, "were driven out of Berlin, they declared they would plant themselves in the Western Territories of America, and there they are to-day with empires in their brains; expelled for their intrigues even from Catholic countries, Spain, Portugal, Italy, Mexico and Brazil, and other States, they are free to colonize in the great West and are there gathering and plotting to romanize and control our Western Empire."

Writing from California, where there are four times as many Romanists as Protestant church members, the Rev. J. H. Warren, D.D., states that: "The Roman Catholic power is just becoming an overwhelming evil. Their schools are everywhere, and number probably 2,000 in this State. Their new college of St. Ignatius is, we are told, the largest, finest and best equipped of its kind in the United States. They blow no trumpets, are sparing with statistics, but are at work night and day to break down the institutions of the country, beginning with the public schools." And it adds: "Protestants may shut their eyes and feel indifferent for a time to the growing power in the United States, of this order of the Romish Church; but the time is not far distant when they will see that they have in them a powerful antagonist."

In Canada the danger of Roman Catholic ascendancy is even more apparent. In fact Roman Catholic influence in our political affairs is almost supreme. By taking advantage of Protestant dissensions, Roman Catholics have secured the balance of power and they are constantly on the watch to use their power for the aggrandizement of their own church and to strengthen their influence over the people. In the Province of Quebec they control through the pulpit the press, the bar, the bench and the legislature. From Quebec, as a basis of operation, they skillfully push their conquests into New Brunswick, Manitoba and the other Provinces. The last census returns show, as Mr. G. H. Clarke points out in the April *Popular Science Monthly*, that "over one-third of the population of Canada is of French origin, wedded to its language, religion and traditions, and controlled to an extraordinary degree by its astute and admirably organized clergy. While the great tide of modern progress and civilization is surging everywhere else through the continent the Province of Quebec is the one stagnant pool which is never supplied by a freshening current, and over which hangs the miasma of medieval superstition. The control of the church over the French population of the Province of Quebec is complete, and is constantly exercised to prevent their amalgamation with other races on the continent. Inter-marriage with Protestants is sternly denounced, and early marriages are earnestly advocated from the pulpit. Their faithful obedience to their pastors in these matters is proved by the census returns. . . . Baulked in their design to capture the great North-West, the French Canadian leaders turned their attention to the easier task of 'freezing out' the small English-speaking element in Quebec. The English speaking population are being steadily rooted out and their places filled by settlers of French origin. Not content with wresting Quebec from the conqueror, the French Canadians are spreading into New Brunswick on the east and Ontario on the west. In the latter Province they control two counties already and will soon have majorities in two others, and it is only a question of time when they will have possession of the capital of the Dominion, a consummation which the French-Canadian members of the Dominion Cabinet are endeavouring to hasten by filling every vacancy in the civil service, as far as they can, with their countrymen." It is almost unnecessary to add that French Canadian is synonymous with Roman Catholic.

Protestants on this side of the lines may also shut their eyes and refuse to see the stealthy progress of the most powerful organization the world has ever known. They may even join hands in imposing upon the country a most galling form of ecclesiastical tyranny, but most assuredly here as in the States, the now blind eyes will be opened. That the opening of the eyes may not be delayed until it is too late should be the peculiar care of the religious press of the country. The secular press is muzzled by party ties made by Roman Catholic hands, and little can be expected in this direction from it. A Protestant pulpit remains, and we urge it as occasion offers to declare the whole truth irrespective of the politicians. Let Protestant ministers and the religious press remember what Lafayette, himself a Roman Catholic, said: "If the liberties of the American people are ever destroyed they will fall by the hand of the Romish clergy."

CHRISTIAN INSTRUCTION IN OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

THE RIGHT AND DUTY OF THE MAJORITY

IN pleading for the communication of Christian instruction in our provincial schools, we are anxious that it should be fully apparent that it is open to no objection on the ground of principle. We admit that nothing is to be allowed in our schools that is inconsistent with

the most complete religious toleration, or that implies an endeavour on the part of the civil powers to aid religion by endowing it with public money. But while the principle of religious toleration is sufficiently guarded by the provision that no child shall receive Christian instruction contrary to the wish of his parents, the identification of the communication of Christian instruction in the provincial schools with State endowment of religion is founded, we believe, upon a mistaken view of the real question at issue. The endowment of religion by the State is with us a dead issue. We are all agreed that it is no part of the duty of our rulers to give any portion of the public money for the support of religion. It is an entirely different issue that we have now to deal with, namely, "Is a Christian people, as we assume ours to be, not at liberty, or are they not bound, with the convictions they have respecting the Christian religion, to make such use of it as they believe will promote their own well-being as a people?" The object in view in putting the Bible in our schools, and daily instructing our children in the distinctive principles of Christianity, is not to confer a benefit upon the Christian religion, but to derive benefit from it. It may be said, "You cannot do the one without the other. When you seek to promote the welfare of the community by teaching the distinctive principles of Christianity by salaried teachers, you are giving public money to support the Christian religion." But to make this a ground of objection to Christian teaching is surely a mistake, even conceding the voluntary principle. It is obviously a matter of course that we cannot get benefit from the Christian religion without thereby strengthening its position. But the fact that the Christian religion is incidentally strengthened in the hold that it has in the community by the good that it does, is surely no reason why the good should not be arrived at. If the great body of our people believe that the communication of Christian instruction in their schools is fitted to benefit the community, to say nothing of their conviction of its necessity, they cannot reasonably be required to forego the benefit, on the ground that the credit of the instrument that does the good is thereby incidentally increased.

The question runs up into that of the right and duty of the majority to do what they believe to be for the advantage of the community. We are not to be imposed upon by abstractions. Let it be granted that the province of the State is distinctly secular; but do not let us imagine that, on that ground, it is debarrd from making use of the Christian religion to further its own interests. Let it be borne in mind that the State is composed of the same individual units that compose the Christian Church, and that the action of the State is just the action of the people—the Christian people—acting in their civil capacity. The civil authorities are with us supposed to represent the people, and to express the mind of the majority; and, while it may not be incorrect to say that their sphere of action is distinctively secular, few, if any, will say that they are not bound to have regard to the moral interests of the people, and to seek the promotion of those interests, were it for no other reason than that even material and secular interests are essentially dependent on the morality of the community. If, then, when we speak of the action of the State, we simply mean the action of the people, i. e., the majority of them, in their civil capacity, who will deny them the right, or say they are not bound, to use what they believe to be the best means of promoting the welfare of the community, because a minority, larger or smaller, happen to think differently? No theory about the separate functions of Church and State can stand in the way of the right and duty of the majority to do what they believe best for the general well-being; it being always understood that there shall be no interference with the religious convictions of any one. Majorities are unhappily too often in the wrong, but their right to rule is not, on that account, to be questioned, while they are bound not to use their right oppressively, the minority can only, in such cases resort to persuasion, yielding submission unless conscience forbids, and taking to themselves the comfort that the responsibility for evil consequences is not theirs. In the case before us, in which we are glad to believe the majority are in the right, the minority have all they are justly entitled to, if the majority can say, "In carrying out our convictions respecting what is best for our children and the community, we do not seek to impose them on you. While we take the responsibility of the line of action which our convictions indicate, we leave you to take the consequences of withholding from your children what we believe is fitted to benefit them. You cannot expect us to go further and withhold the benefit from our own children; for that were to make your convictions our guide in opposition to our own."

THE *Dominion Churchman*, with the object of getting a blow at its special aversion, Wycliffe College, which stands as an affiliated college in the same relation to Toronto University, as University College and our Knox, thus expresses itself regarding a recent occurrence.—

A COLLEGE IS KNOWN BY ITS TEACHERS.—That a man's friends tell us what he is, is admitted. It is no less true that we can judge well what people are by those they select as their teachers. A few evenings ago, a well-known infidel, who is, as they usually are, a Communist, and a foe generally to social order, delivered, by invitation, a lecture before the University College Literary (sic) Society. As this individual is utterly illiterate, has merely set up as an agitator of the revolutionary order on the strength of a very clumsy gift of the gab, and a few scraps picked up second or third hand from newspapers, there was not the slightest propriety in asking such a wind bag to address a body of students. If he could teach them anything they are in a "perilous case." If they could endure his vile twang and vulgar English, they are indeed blind of sensibility, and if they, as it appears they were, anxious to proclaim ostentatiously their sympathy

with an infidel, communist agitator, then we may indeed, doubt whether it is a cent for a Church Divinity College to have such intimate association with an institution which honours ignorance and vulgarity, because they are exhibited by a notorious atheist and scoffer.

We would heartily join the *Churchman* in expressing surprise and regret if the Literary Society of University College, Toronto, had actually found itself in such poor case as to need enlightenment from such a person as it describes; but from what we happen to know of the matter we are warranted in stating that our contemporary is in error in making it appear that the college authorities had anything to do with the visit of the "infidel communist agitator" to the precincts of the University, or that his visit had the countenance of the Literary Society, or was acceptable to the students as a whole. The "agitator" was, we understand, invited to address a so-called Political Science Club on the sole responsibility of a little knot of students, led by a graduate whose sympathy with agitation and revolutionary measures sometimes overmasters his judgment. The *Churchman* should inform itself better and should not judge of a great institution of learning by the vagaries of a few students and a single graduate who, in choosing to act independently of the College authorities unfortunately set well-understood rules of college etiquette at defiance. The *Churchman* must not be unduly alarmed. Wherever Presbyterians lead in educational matters Anglicans may safely follow. Wycliffe is not in bad company. It would not be amiss, however, for the students of all the colleges grouped around the University to note, in their zeal for knowledge, what a vigilant eye is upon them, and to observe how the ill-advised action of anyone connected with her may be construed to her disadvantage.

THE chief event of the week, perhaps the most momentous event of the century in British politics, is Mr. Gladstone's bill proposing the granting of a measure of Home Rule to Ireland. Whether the bill deserves to become law remains to be seen, but it must be regarded as an heroic attempt to provide a remedy for certain acknowledged grievances, and a preventive of their recurrence. Until discussion shall have made apparent the full meaning of the proposed enactments it would be idle to speculate on the wisdom or equity of the bill, or its value as a panacea; but it is not difficult at this stage to discern that the decision to leave the Protestant minority to make the best of their altered circumstances is a most unsatisfactory proposition. In no country where religious animosity prevails would it be wise to leave any minority to the mercy of the majority, and least of all in Ireland. We would greatly fear the danger of a revival of religious bigotry. We do not hesitate to agree with the London *Spectator*, that if Orangemen were ever at the head of affairs we should look for a very harsh treatment of the Roman Catholic Church, and we would have more serious anxiety as to the sort of use which the Roman Catholic priesthood would make of their victory, if they found an Irish parliament completely under their control. The remark quoted from Friar Behan in Dr. Maguire's recent pamphlet, "England's Duty to Ireland," "From the topmost to the bottommost man, we'll have a man of our own," has the genuine Irish Catholic ring about it, and shows what is to be feared. It is perfectly obvious that in Ireland, at least, it would be the gravest dereliction of duty to abandon any minority to the will of the majority, without proper safeguards.

A FULL report of the closing exercises of the Presbyterian College, Montreal, is held over till next issue.

OUR THEOLOGICAL HALLS.

KNOX COLLEGE, TORONTO.

CLOSING EXERCISES, CLASS LISTS, SCHOLARSHIPS, GRADUATES, ETC., ETC.

THE closing exercises of Knox College for the session of 1885 took place on Wednesday, 7th inst., afternoon and evening. At three o'clock a large audience assembled in Convocation Hall to witness the presentation of diplomas and the conferring of degrees in divinity. Rev. Principal Caven presided, but owing to a severe cold, which prevented him speaking above a whisper, was unable to make an address. There were seated on the platform with Dr. Caven—Rev. Professors Gregg and McLaren, Dr. Daniel Wilson, President of University College, Toronto; Rev. Dr. Sheraton, Principal of Wycliffe College; Rev. Dr. Reid, Rev. Dr. Laing, Dundas; Rev. Dr. Broadfoot, London; Rev. Dr. Torrance and Wardrop, Guelph; Rev. E. D. McLaren, B.D., Brampton; Rev. F. R. Hebble, B.D., Brantford; Revs. J. A. Middleton, Elora; John Thompson, Sarnia; and Messrs. W. Mortimer Clark (Chairman of the College Board), and Thomas Kirkland (Principal, Normal School, Toronto), members of the Senate.

Among the audience we noticed Rev. W. Fraser, D.D., Barrie, Clerk of the Assembly; Rev. W. Barra, Agent of the College; Rev. Prof. McCurdy, Rev. J. A. R. Dickson, B.D., Galt; R. Ure, D.D., Goderich; W. McKinley, Inverkip; R. Pettigrew, M.A., Glenora; W. G. Wallace, M.A., Georgetown; R. D. Fraser, M.A., Bowmanville; J. H. Gilchrist, B.A., Cheltenham; J. A. Alayham, Whitby; S. H. Eastman, B.A., Oshawa; Alex. Tait, Mono Mills; A. McKay, Erasmosa; S. Lyle, Hamilton; W. A. Duncan, Chatham; A. Henderson, Hyde Park; J. F. McLaren, B.D., Rocklyn; J. A. McDonald, Haring's Mills; R. M. Grant, Orillia; P. McF. McLeod, H. M. Parsons, J. Cameron, J. Mutch, Joo. Smith, A. Wilson, A. Gilray, G. M. Milligan, B.A., D. J. Macdonnell, B.D., W. Feizell, Wm. Beattie, T. McGuire, Toronto, etc., etc., and many prominent elders and laymen. The Hon. J. W. Ross, Minister of Education, was also present, but was unable to remain throughout the proceedings.

The proceedings were opened by the singing of a psalm, the reading of a lesson by Rev. Dr. Gregg, and prayer by Rev. Dr. Sheraton. Rev. Dr. Gregg said it was a matter for great thankfulness that professors and students had been blessed with an unusual exemption from sickness during the session. There had also been an unusually large attendance in the theological classes. The number of regular students in the three classes in theology had been fifty, but in consequence of affiliation with Toronto University, nine students of University College had attended the theological classes, making the total number in attendance fifty-nine. During the past year, as a result of the pec-