

## THE CANADA PRESBYTERIAN.

PUBLISHED BY THE

Presbyterian Printing &amp; Publishing Co., Ltd.,

AT 5 JORDAN STREET, TORONTO.

Terms: \$2 Per Annum in Advance.

ADVERTISING RATES.—Under 3 months, 15 cents per line per insertion; 3 months, \$1 per line; 6 months, \$1.75 per line; 1 year, \$3. No advertisement charged at less than five lines. None other than unobjectionable advertisements taken.

## The Canada Presbyterian.

TORONTO, WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 27th, 1889.

OUR typos make "Knoxonian" say last week that "the majority of the men who own our splendid farms owned little more than an acre when they began farming." What our contributor wrote was, that the majority of them owned little more than an "axe." A man who owned an acre in those good old times would have been considered fairly well provided for. An axe to fell trees with was usually the entire estate.

IT is always difficult to say what a deliberative body may do with any given question, but we are of the opinion that if the Convener of our Home or Foreign Mission Boards were to become the head of a political party and go upon the stump in the interest of his party, the General Assembly would very likely ask him to resign. If the Assembly did not, the people very soon would. Our Methodist friends are said to be able to turn anything to their advantage from the Book Room down to the taffy social. It remains to be seen whether they will get gain or glory by allowing their Mission Secretary to take the stump as leader of a political party. If they gain anything in connection with politics they will be the first Church in Ontario that ever did.

THE most inveterate pessimist cannot deny that in one respect at least the world is improving. The people of Brazil changed their form of government the other day from a monarchy to a republic without pulling a trigger. Not long ago a change of that kind would have involved an immense expenditure of blood and treasure in almost any country. The principle is now being recognized in all civilized nations that governments exist for the people, and that the people have a right to select whatever form of government they prefer. Sir John Macdonald puts the matter in a very striking way when he says that the people have a perfect right to misgovern themselves if they see proper. Whether the people of Brazil did a wise thing or the reverse when they dispensed with Dom Pedro and formed a republic is a question that time alone can answer. Wise or unwise, no one can deny that the revolution was pleasantly brought about if compared with the manner in which revolutions are usually effected.

A LONDON clergyman, who is known to be the literary critic for a number of leading journals, acknowledges that in twenty years he has reviewed not less than twenty thousand volumes, and probably more. The *British Weekly* says that in addition to his work as a reviewer, this gentleman acts as a professor, writes sermons and preaches them, and has written many books of his own during the last twenty years. The *Weekly* thinks that, allowing for interruptions, he must read and review on an average five volumes a day! These facts throw a flood of light on what may properly be called the review business. Making all due allowance for the rapidity with which an expert can skim an average book, we may well ask what is the criticism of a man worth who, besides lecturing to students, preaching and writing many books of his own, reads books and reviews them at the rate of five a day? The reader who says, as many do, "I never read that book, but I have read several reviews of it," does not always wait to think how little the reviews may be worth.

A SUBSCRIBER asks the *Herald and Presbyterian* the following question, and receives an answer which we think is not the best one that could be given:

Our minister has been openly seeking another field for nearly two years, and it is hurting our church very much. Our people feel their minister has lost heart for his work among them, and are discouraged, and the work lags. Would

it be right for us to look around for another pastor, and when we find him, bring him on and displace the one we have?

This is a perplexing question, and would better be answered by the Presbytery in which both parties are.

Everything would depend on the kind of Presbytery. Some Presbyteries would make the matter worse every time they touched it, and then rupture the pastoral tie for the sake of peace. The usual remedy of a weak Presbytery is a rupture of pastoral relations. How would it do to ascertain the causes that made the pastor "discouraged," and try to remove them? That kind of a remedy might not be very attractive for a church lawyer, but certainly it should commend itself to a Christian. Perhaps it was no wonder the minister "lost heart." The causes that discouraged "our minister" would very likely discourage "another pastor." And there would be nothing gained by the change. A little kindly encouragement might so help the minister in his work that he would not have any desire to seek another field.

A PROMINENT member of the Baptist Congress, which met in Toronto the other week, maintained that "a government, as such, ought not to know any difference between a Baptist Church building and the lecture hall of an atheist. This sentiment was heartily applauded by the Congress. And yet there are people sanguine enough to think that if Separate Schools were abolished, Catholics and Protestants would have little trouble in agreeing upon the amount and kind of religious instruction to be given in the public schools. Supposing the Catholics and some Protestants could agree upon a "middle course," what about the Protestants who hold and teach that in a Christian country the government should know no difference between a building used for the worship of God and one used to propagate Atheism? The Baptists who applauded this sentiment will probably be found much more difficult to deal with than Roman Catholics who contend, and, as Dr. King said, rightly contend, that there should be religious instruction in our public schools. It is easy to say, Abolish Separate Schools, but those who use that phrase very flippantly have no idea of the question they are opening up. The man who assumes that none but Catholics are involved has never studied the problem.

ELDERLY clergymen and politicians must be amused, if not disgusted, at the air of freshness with which not a few men, young in knowledge and experience, if not in years, discuss the Separate School question. Many of them speak and write as if they had made some original discovery. It never dawns upon their minds that the question was thoroughly discussed in Ontario before some of them were born. Statesmen just as wise, just as patriotic, just as capable as any we now have; clergymen just as pious and devoted, as learned and as truly Protestant as any that now minister in this Province, went over the whole ground—threshed out the whole question—long before some who think they have struck a new question were able to read a primer. Principal MacVicar scored a good point in the General Assembly last June when he gravely assured the fathers and brethren that the Galt people had not discovered anything. The points were nearly all centuries old, and the people who thought they discovered new truth merely advertised their ignorance of Church history. Men who talk about Separate Schools as if the issues were new, merely proclaim their ignorance of Canadian history, if facts only thirty or forty years old can be called history. There has not been a point raised on either side that was not familiar to every intelligent old settler thirty years ago.

IT should not be assumed that the adoption of a purely secular system of education will obviate all difficulties in a community composed of Protestants and Roman Catholics. Abolish religious instruction, strike out the very name of God, and serious, if not insuperable, difficulties meet you the moment you begin to select a text-book in history. The use of Swinton's history caused the trouble in the Boston schools. Anderson's was substituted, but a committee of Protestants who were asked to examine the book find that while it speaks of "what is called the Reformation," it makes no mention of indulgences nor of the Inquisition. Commenting on the situation the *Christian-at-Work* says:

The situation is not an attractive one as it exists, and it is difficult to see where it is all to end. Of course the introduction of a book which treats history from the standpoint of the Protestant will be as offensive to the Romanists, and it will help their parochial schools: it will give them a grievance of which they will unquestionably make the most. It seems to be decided, though, that Anderson's history "must

go," and from the extracts reprinted from the book we should think it had better "go." The question now is whether it is desirable to teach Church history in the public schools. The Protestants and Romanists seem to be agreed that it is necessary. So long as they both hold to that opinion, the chances of an agreement would seem to be as distant as the marriage of oil and water without the services of the officiating potash. The plain English of the matter is that it is impossible to teach history in a school in a way that will please Roman Catholics, and teach it truthfully. Nobody wants to teach "church history" in the schools in the sense in which that term is usually understood. English History cannot be taught correctly without stirring up opposition on the part of Roman Catholics. It is the facts they object to, and history is not history without the facts. Secularism is no remedy unless you abolish history, and when history is abolished the difficulty will come up in some other form—in text books on literature perhaps. The one thing clear is that secularism does not solve the problem, though as Principal King observes, it does seem to remove some difficulties.

## THE ANGLICAN JUBILEE.

AN event of much importance and significance in connection with the Anglican Church in Canada is being celebrated in Toronto. It is half a century since its first bishop in Upper Canada was consecrated. Properly enough that circumstance was seized as an occasion for a survey of the past and anticipation of the future. Gratitude for the blessings vouchsafed the Church found admirable expression in the appropriate sermon with which the Jubilee services were opened. The Bishop of Huron, an excellent representative of the evangelical school, preached a discourse that could not fail to be thoroughly acceptable to those who heard it, and, judging from the published outlines, it is well fitted, in many particulars, to touch a responsive chord in the hearts of those belonging to other communions.

Naturally enough, the expansion of the Anglican Church in Canada formed a pleasing theme to all who took part in the celebration. As is the case with the other Churches, it has kept pace with the growth of population, and its prospects to-day justify the bright anticipations in which most of the speakers indulged. Naturally, also, the services rendered the Church by the indefatigable perseverance, the shrewd Scottish tenacity and the indomitable will of Bishop Strachan received eulogistic recognition. Whatever estimate posterity may form regarding some of the public acts of the sturdy prelate, no one will be disposed to question his desire to further the interests of the Church and country of his adoption to the best of his ability in accordance with the views he entertained. The praises bestowed on the memory of the energetic proto-bishop were a virtual canonization of one who, by his strong personality will long retain a distinct place in the history of Ontario. His dream, which at one time did not seem altogether impossible of realization, of securing for the Episcopal Church in Canada the position of a national establishment was the subject of more than one reference. From the published reports of the proceedings it would appear that such a position would have been very pleasing even to the churchmen of this generation, and it seems equally apparent that its unattainability is admitted with a degree of cheerfulness that is highly becoming in those who have a secret fondness for ecclesiastical exclusiveness. The fact is also admitted that State endowment is, at least, not essential to the prosperity of the Church. The history of the Canadian and Irish branches of that Church has amply demonstrated that true godliness and Christian helpfulness are not hampered, but promoted, when the appeal for support is directly addressed to the sons and daughters of the Church rather than to such statesmen as are ready to seek returns corresponding to the favours they care to bestow. Professor Goldwin Smith's remarks bearing on the comprehensiveness of the Church and the wide scope for the philosophic and scientific training of its ministry were worthy of the speaker and the occasion.

Advantage was taken of the presence of so many distinguished clergymen and laymen at the Jubilee services to lay the corner stone of the new wing of Trinity College. The proceedings were interesting and imposing. Hon. Chancellor Allan, an exemplary churchman and a warm friend of Trinity, fitly presided, and Professor Clark's appropriate and scholarly address was from his standpoint a clear exposition and defence of a denominational university. The honorary degree of D.C.L. was worthily conferred on Bishop Courtney, of Nova Scotia; Canon Dumoulin, of St. James; Dr. Geikie, of Trinity Medical College; and Rev. Dr. Potter, President of Hobart College, Western New York. This