

British American Presbyterian.

VOL. I.

TORONTO, CANADA, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1872.

No. 38

Contributors & Correspondents.

DAY OF THANKSGIVING—THURSDAY THE 14TH NOVEMBER.

Last year, as Convener to the Committee of the General Assembly of the Canadian Presbyterian Church, I was requested to communicate with all the Protestant denominations as to secure concerted action in the matter of a Day of Thanksgiving. The response given was very cordial, and the day recommended was unanimously observed. This year the same course was pursued. The season recommended is the same as last year, Thursday, the fourteenth day of November. The various denominations have through their supreme courts signified their approval, and it is to be hoped that the day will be observed in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec as generally as before.

It would be very pleasant if all the members of our confederated family united on one day in such a solemn service. It would tend to draw closer those cords of love which should bind us together. The special Thanksgiving Day appointed by the Dominion Government on the recovery of the Prince of Wales, had a very happy influence. We doubt not that if the Government took similar action in the matter of an annual Thanksgiving Day, and made it one of our standing institutions, their course would meet with general approval.

Our Republican neighbours have greater diversity of creeds, and are more oppressed to State intervention in matters of religion than we, yet they find no difficulty on the subject.

We have reason to know that the esteemed Church of England Metropolitan has brought the subject under the notice of the Government, in the most earnest manner, and has been unwearied in his efforts to secure a public and united observance of the day. We have this year communicated with the Local Governments of the two Provinces as well as with the Dominion Government. We hope, even yet, a favourable response. At all events, that, in future, the authorities at Ottawa may take the initiative, by formally endorsing a day which has met with the general approbation of the Churches. It is not the best season for us or for some other sections of the Dominion, but no single day would in every respect, suit all. If the Government saw fit to select one a little earlier, or even later in the season. We presume no one would object, if only the notice be made sufficiently public and in time. To leave it to each Province to select its own day, besides losing the advantages of the union, would lead to confusion. Some Provinces (as was the case with our last year) might, from the want of concert, inadvertently select a different day, and Churches which stretch into more provinces than one, would have no uniform observance.

If our coming thanksgiving be observed as well as the last, it may influence the Dominion Government to move in the matter next year.

R. F. BURNS.

THE ORGAN QUESTION.

Editor BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN.

Sir,—Your correspondent "B." has come forward with a criticism upon one of the answers to the dissent on the subject of Instrumental music. I must protest against his applications, and interpretations of Scripture. I am the more sorry for the necessity because I happen to be on the same side as he. When we bring against opponents arguments that are unsound, we give them the vantage ground; and when they have demolished our premises, it is readily assumed that, not only our polemics, but our principles are gone, and no escape left but to acknowledge theirs. There are several slips in the article. I only notice the following:

"If the ordinances of the Jewish Church are to be held as still binding where not expressly repealed like statutes of the realm, then has not the Gospel dispensation freed us from the bondage of the Law. This, we know however has been done, not by abrogating the several enactments, but by the enunciation of the general principles, Heb. X. Acts XV."

"Ordinances," says Gardner—are institutions of Divine authority relating to the worship of God. "Though it be but a man's covenant," says Paul, "yet if it be confirmed no man dissannulleth or addeh thereto." It is bad logic and worse theology to say that ordinances of the

Jewish Church are not binding where not expressly repealed. If we admitted that doctrine, where would be our authority for infant baptism, or the enforced observance of the sabbath day? Mr. "B." commits a dangerous mistake when he assumes that the teaching of Heb. X. and Ac. XV. abrogates, generally, the enactments of the Old Testament economy. There is no abrogation or repealing in these chapters. I presume Mr. "B." is conquered unregard to the different kinds of ordinances. Those that are typical are neither abrogated nor repealed, but fulfilled. E. G. The daily sacrifice was typical and is fulfilled in Christ, so that now "He that sacrificeth a lamb is as if he cut off a dog's neck." Circumcision and the passover were sealing ordinances, designed to help the faithful in their growth in the life of God. These are perpetuated, in a new dress, in Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Prayer, preaching and hearing the word, &c., are ordinances continued in the N. T. as in the time of the Jews. Mr. "B." will do well to keep a clear distinction between an ordinance of divine authority, and those services which were added with out any Divine precept or sanction. Instrumental music probably belongs to the latter.

—CASALS.

Oct 23rd, 1872.

A DENIAL WANTED.

Editor BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN.

DEAR SIR,—I see in the *Witness* a statement that a Presbyterian Church in Kingston, disposed of surplus goods by *Raffle* and *Lottery*. Can that be true? I hope not. In the name of Religion and morality, I trust it will be corrected.—PURITY.

"B" AND THE ORGAN QUESTION.

Editor BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN.

SIR,—Your paper last week had a letter from a correspondent on that exciting question, the organ. With your permission, I should like to ask B if he has read and tried to understand the passage he quoted from Amos. If he is not college bred, and professional, I hope he has common sense and Christian honesty. I hope he has read the last verses of the first chapter of II Peter. Now, Mr. B., if you are pronounced against instruments of music, it is also pronounced against the items mentioned in the previous verses. Let us look at the 4th verse:—"Woe to them that have fine, soft beds, that eat lambs and calves." You press your argument upon the organ men—by incense, &c. Now, sir, what kind of a bed have you? If not ivory, is it black walnut? Further, have you the luxury of a fine, soft, feather pillow? Poor Amos knew neither the one nor the other, but stretched himself on the hard ground, like a simple herdsman, and drew his sheepskin or rough coverlet over him. Have you ever eaten any lamb? Do you like it? And calf? If so, woe unto you when the day of battle comes, and destruction in the land.

Now Mr. B. don't console yourself by supposing I am one of the brawlers of our Zion with the organ, I prefer the violin, fiddle if you will, and the bag-pipes. I have enough of billious solemnity in me by nature. Further, I believe you have had the misfortune to be badly trained in the interpretation of Scripture—There has been there is a miserable amount of spiritualizing of Scripture amongst us. Many very wrong, far-fetched applications of the old Testament. Why, sir, I have heard Isaiah 66, 15-16 applied to railways and cannon. I wish Professor Cavan would publish the outlines of his clear and pointed lecture, delivered a year ago on closing Knox College. Now, dear sir, if you neither sleep on a soft pillow, eat lamb or calf let me hear, then I shall leads you into another and stiffer lesson. If you see that you have missapplied, a passage of Scripture, say so like a man. There is the company of scorers—but there is also the company of stubborn men that will not retract—no not a hairbreadth.—C. to B.

WONDERFUL CASE OF LONGEVITY.

A woman, called Ann Campbell, died in Kenyon, County of Glongarry, on the 18th day of September last, who arrived at the patriarchal age of 130 years. She was born in the Isle of Skye, in the parish of Bracondals, in the year 1742—two years before the defeat of Charles Stewart and his army on the famous field of Culloden-moor.

At the age of 30 years, she engaged as chief dairy maid with John Murray, Esq., Grishornish, and remained in his family for a period of 50 years. When her services

were no longer required by Capt. P. Murray, who succeeded his father to the estate of Grishornish, she left the family of Murray and engaged in the same employment with Mr. Nicholson, of Ardmore, father of Mrs. Dr. Bethune, of Toronto. She continued in his family for seven years. She was then in the 37th year of her age, but was as active and lively as most men and women are at the age of 30 years. At this advanced age she emigrated to Canada, where she lived for 43 years. This brings her to the age above mentioned, and these periods are given to enable the reader to see the correctness of the statement made respecting her more than marvellous long life. Of late years she became the wonder of all that knew her, and was visited by many, not only from the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, but by not a few from the United States of America. In Feb. 1872, she had a visit from Dr. Burns, of Montreal, who had a long and interesting conversation with her respecting the long life, also about her hope and views regarding eternity. She felt quite happy, and expressed much satisfaction with the Dr's visit, who, at his departure, offered her some money, (not that she wanted anything, for she lived quite comfortably) which she accepted, and in return she gave him a pair of stockings, which, we believe, shall be kept by him as an object of curiosity for many years to come. She was in full possession of her faculties to the last. She was never sick. She never tasted medicine of any description. She was quite active up to the last two days she was on earth. All this Summer and Autumn she was milking six cows every day; this was her favourite pursuit. Her illness was short, and seemingly without much pain. She lost her speech a day and a night previous to her death, and her friends knew that her end was near. She died without a struggle. Sept. 18th, 1871, in the 130th year of her age.—COM.

THE LATE COLONEL KENNETH CAMERON, OF THORAH.

We clip the following brief biographical notice of a worthy man, well known to many of our readers in the counties of York, Ontario, and Victoria, from the October number of the *Presbyterian* :—

The death of this gentleman took place at his residence, situated on the shore of the beautiful lake Simcoe, on the 20th of last June, in the 85th year of his age. The Colonel had been ill for six months. His disease was in the chest. His friends were fondly hoping that, the severity of the weather once past, he might recruit; he himself thought otherwise. "If it be," he said, "the will of the Lord, I will recover, but I do not much expect it." He judged aright. With the return of the warm season, he sunk rapidly. He patiently bore his lingering illness.

Colonel Cameron was born in Lochaber, in the year 1787. He was descended, by both his parents from old and well connected Highland families. His father was a commissioned officer. He had four brothers, commissioned officers. The time devoted to his education could not have been very long, for he entered the army at an early age. He once remarked that the proficiency made by him in his studies was limited. If so, this defect was certainly remedied afterwards. The Colonel was a man of varied, accurate, and extensive knowledge. Few, indeed, were the subjects, in the discussion of which he could take no part.

A good observer of human character, were he intimate with the Colonel, would, we are persuaded, say of him that, as a soldier, his watchword would be *duty*, that he would be calm at the approach of danger, and a hero in the hottest of the battle. Our observer, in making this statement, would in effect say that the Colonel was a soldier after the mould of his mighty Captain "The Iron Duke," and our observer would say right. In a company of superior officers, one of whom was General Lord Hill, some remarks were passed on the Colonel. "That is an officer," said his lordship, "of distinguished merit." This is no trivial praise, when it is considered that the personage who uttered it was not apt to bestow undeserved encomiums; while he was, perhaps, as competent a judge of a good soldier as any man of his time.

After the Colonel had retired from the service, he was for a short time Sheriff of Niagara, and for a short time Surveyor General. These periods excepted, he made Thorah his home from his leaving the army to his death. He took interest in the affairs

of the Township. He was prepared to advance whatever he considered to be for the benefit of the Township. He was able to give sound advice in almost any matter. That advice asked, it was always freely given. He would labor to help a person out of difficulties. His deeds of kindness to the poor were many; while all of them were performed on the principle that the one hand was not to know what the other did. He had a friendly eye towards the young. Himself without either wife or child, he evinced more concern for the intellectual and moral training of the rising generation, than scores whom God had blessed with large families. The Colonel was a man of strong will, ready to pay deference to the views of others, he claimed the right of thinking for himself. He could be a formidable opponent. He feared no human being. Few indeed, however, were they of whom he had nothing good to say. Often was he observed to throw in a kind word for the individual whose conduct he had felt it his duty, the moment before, to censure.

The attachment of Colonel Cameron to the Church of Scotland was very strong. That attachment was as free from narrow-mindedness and prejudice as it was strong. One who knew him intimately, and knew him long, cannot this moment tax his memory with his having ever heard him utter a disrespectful sentence of a single denomination of the Christian Church—of a single Minister of the Christian Church. The Colonel was a mainstay in the congregation to which he belonged—he stood by it in trying times. The Congregation honoured him; but the place of honor he never sought—the farthest from it possible. One evening, during his illness, a certain friend was by his bedside. Among other things he made remarks to the Colonel on those precious words of our Lord: "I am the resurrection, and the life: he that believeth in Me, though he were dead, yet shall he live. And whosoever liveth and believeth in Me, shall never die. Believest thou this?" Observing that the patient was exhausted, he said—"Am I engaging your attention too long, sir?" With difficulty, but with solemnity, he answered. "By no means." In a few moments the friend left the sick chamber and returned home; sadly suspecting that he had seen the last of him whom he loved so well. Nor was he mistaken. A little longer, and the noble heart ceased to beat.

A number of years ago, Colonel Cameron, Miss Cameron, and Mrs. Bethune, his sisters and Robert Bethune, Esq., his brother-in-law, all lived under the same roof. A virtuous and elegant little circle this was. Alas! the last enemy has made wide roads on it now. Mr. Bethune died in 1864. He was the youngest son of the Rev. John Bethune, D.D., once minister of Dornoch. Miss Cameron died in 1867; and now the Colonel, a few weeks since. Thus Mrs. Bethune alone survives. They are not the few who deeply sympathize with her. By faith in her compassionate Redeemer, may it be hers to say:—"It is good for me that I have been afflicted!" May the Lord long spare her to go in and out in a neighbourhood, in which she is so very highly and deservedly esteemed!

ARCHBISHOP MANNING ON THE PERMISSIVE BILL.

On the 25th of September Archbishop Manning spoke in Glasgow on the Permissive Bill. In the course of his remarks he said:—

It was quite true that they could not make men sober by Act of Parliament. Within the circle of those moral and religious duties which attached to each one of them by the deepest convictions of their hearts and minds, they were compelled to act as conscience dictated; but outside of that circle, in all things which related to the social and political welfare of the commonwealth, he held that the man deserted his duty who was not ready to unite with all his fellow citizens in working for the welfare of his country. Having laid down this principle, the Archbishop proceeded to argue that Parliament was the chief culprit in the creation of this evil of drunkenness, and he protested that moral and religious efforts to save men from it would be unavailing so long as the Legislature year by year profusely multiplied the temptations to drink. Already, he feared, the drink traffic was beyond the control of Parliament. While the cotton and iron trade of Great Britain might be represented by eighty millions sterling, there were no fewer than a hundred and ten millions sterling directly

or indirectly involved in the drink traffic, and he asked whether Parliament dared touch the great monopoly. In these circumstances, how were they to undo the evil that had been done? His answer was, let it be done by the local and popular vote of the people. (Loud applause.) He thought that to take the popular local vote on the question was most reasonable, for who knew the wants and evils and miseries of a particular locality so well as the people who lived in it? (Applause.) If a noisy and disorderly public-house were set up in one of the grand squares in Glasgow, a month would not be over before the wealthy people of the neighbourhood would have it suppressed as a nuisance, and he claimed for the working men that they should have the same power which the rich possessed of putting away this pestilence from their doors. No legislation on this question could be otherwise than permissive. They could only bring a measure into operation by the spontaneous acceptance of the people, they must proceed locally, and must allow that every locality which was sufficiently matured and sufficiently advanced should begin to use its freedom before other towns which were not in the same position. It was quite true, as some said, that the Permissive Bill was a violation of the liberty of men. Well, all he could say was that they were encompassed round about, behind and before, by legislation which interfered with personal liberty. By majorities, by a majority even of one, could be secured a measure which might seriously affect his liberty; but here it was asked that a majority of two-thirds should be necessary before such a measure could be passed. It was a principle of the British constitution that no man should be taxed who was not represented. Well, he said, the magistrates did not represent the ratepayers, upon whom the evils of the drink traffic fell as a most odious and onerous tax, and, therefore, the ratepayers had a right to speak on behalf of their own interest. As to the position of working men in regard to the question, he knew that class intimately, and he would make a fair proposal to those who said they were in favour of the traffic. Let them get their working-men together, and assemble meetings as numerous and as frequent as those which the friends of prohibition held. But they heard of nothing of the kind. Sometimes a meeting of those who desired to put down drunkenness was disturbed by half-a-dozen, who might perhaps be called working men, but whom he did not believe to be so. In conclusion, he advocated the suppression of the traffic on drink on the ground that it was paralysing the industry of the country and sapping and undermining the political foundation of the State. (Great applause.)

The Dublin papers state that the new Roman Catholic Association has already been formed, under the presidency of the Earl of Granard. It adds that the Association has no political party object of any kind, being purely Roman Catholic in its drift and design.

A series of Protestant lectures, on the doctrines and principles of Romanism and Ritualism, are being delivered at Bourne-mouth by Mr. T. G. Owens, of London, in connection with the Protestant Educational Institute.

The *Echo du Parlement* says that a new form of penance is now imposed upon Catholics going to confession in Germany. They are forced to subscribe to some clerical journal in order to expiate their sins.

The *Westminster Gazette* says:—"Dr. Pusey has been seen at Amiens, on his way to Rome; and it is said that the Doctor is about to become a Catholic. May this report be true! The prayers of the Church are ever petitioning the mercy of God to restore strayed sheep to the fold of Christ."

Several new Methodist Societies have been organized in Sweden the past season, and fourteen new chapels have been built.

Father Gavazzi, the eloquent Italian evangelist, has returned to his native country, encouraged by the responses to his appeals for the enlargement of his enterprises for the diffusion of the truth among his countrymen.

The Rev. Dr. Guthrie is progressing slowly to convalescence. He is still weak, but no apprehensions as to his recovery are entertained.

The *New York Independent* says:—"We are not disposed to stickle for high art in ecclesiastical architecture; but we do prefer a church that can be distinguished without a label from a rink or a circus."

It was a candid and appreciative estimate of an Irish distiller who remarked to a strong temperance man, "I tell you, James Haughton, we'll put the folly of mankind against the wisdom of mankind, and we'll bat you teetotalers ten times over."