

British American Presbyterian.

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY AT TORONTO, CANADA.

TERMS: \$2 a year, in advance. By mail, or by post, payable at the office of the Publisher.

Cheques and Post-Office Orders should be drawn in favor of the Publisher.

Onb Dates and List of Promissory for sale on application. All who are desirous to aid in extending the circulation of the Presbyterian should send for the List of Promissory at once, as now is the time to secure our names.

Address

C. BLAKETT ROBINSON,

The P.O. Box 284, Publisher and Proprietor

British American Presbyterian.

FRIDAY, MARCH 19, 1875.

THE NEW BRUNSWICK SCHOOL LAW.

We are gratified and thankful at the issue of Mr. Costigan's attempt to interfere with the Provincial Legislature of New Brunswick in its action on the subject of Public School Education. Constitutional rights were imperilled, and it would have been a dangerous precedent if the Dominion Parliament had yielded so far as to attempt coercion in a matter clearly within the sphere of the local Legislature. The resolution which has been adopted is clear in stating the grounds on which interference is declined, viz., that to do so would be an encroachment on the powers reserved to one of the Provinces by the British North America Act, and therefore would be an infraction of the Provincial Constitutions; and that to invite such legislation would be inexpedient and fraught with danger to the autonomy of all the Provinces. The proposal in the rider which has been appended is harmless. An address to the Queen may have the effect of bringing an influence—moral and kind, but not coercive—to bear on the New Brunswick Legislature. If that body sees fit to yield to Imperial suasion, there can be no objection to its doing so, and establishing Separate Schools. It is, indeed, to be hoped that such may be the settlement of this question in due time. It seems the only practicable issue.

The speech of the Premier, in support of the motion, is well worthy of more than a passing remark. His statements have the merit of being clear and intelligible; and even those who do not agree with all he said can understand the principles—as announced by the Premier of the Dominion—on which our educational system is based, and which he seems to think is the only practicable ground for a national system.

1. "Whenever any people laboured under the impression that they had a serious grievance, that grievance must be dealt with, whether it could be logically constructed to be a proper grievance or not. Logic had often very little to do with legislative action, and they were sometimes constrained to acknowledge one principle in action in one part of an empire which could not be enforced in another.

Here we are distinctly told that the opinions and feelings of any class of a community as to a matter of grievance, supposed or real, may properly become ground of Legislative action, even when such action is exceptional and inconsistent with analogous action at other times and in other places.

2. "He believed in a secular system, in free schools, and in non-denominational education; and if he could persuade his fellow-countrymen in Ontario, or Quebec, or the other Provinces, to consent to it, he would give the preference to that system above all others. For many years after he had a seat in the old Parliament of Canada he had urged a war against the principle of Separate Schools, because, being young and inexperienced in politics, he had hoped to be able to establish a system to which all would ultimately yield their assent."

We have here a statement of the Premier's faith in a secular system of education, and of non-denominational education; and of his preference for that system above all others.

3. "But he could not shut his eyes to the fact that in the whole of the Provinces there were a considerable number of people, and in Quebec a large majority, who believed that the dogmas of their religion should be taught in the public schools; that they had an intimate relationship to the morality of the people, and were essential to their welfare; that religious principles, according to their theory, should be instilled into the minds of children at school."

Here, we presume, the Premier has reference to our Roman Catholic fellow citizens, and the determined persistence of their clergy in claiming the right of the Church to educate the young.

4. "The opposition of this portion of the community was successful, so that a system under which all the children of every creed could meet in common school was found to be impracticable in operation and impossible to carry out in political exigencies; and when the Quebec resolutions were adopted in 1864 and 1865, recognizing the principle of toleration in this matter, he loyally accepted it, and supported it by speech and vote. The same ground which had led him on that occasion to give a loyal assistance to the Confederation project, embodying as it did a compromise for Separate Schools for Catholics in Ontario and Protestants in

Quebec, bound him to extend his sympathy—if not his active assistance—to those in other Provinces who thought they were suffering from the same grievance which the Catholics of Ontario had long complained of. Under these circumstances he had taken the action which he had taken up to this date."

Such is the Premier's position. Such are his reasons for desiring that the Roman Catholics of New Brunswick should have relief from their alleged grievance, as their co-religionists in the other Provinces have.

We agree with Mr. Mackenzie that the establishment of Separate Schools is a necessity. We do not need either age or experience in politics to know that the Church of Rome will never allow her children to be educated in Protestant schools. We know also that neither the constitution of the Dominion, the peace of our country, nor the safety of the British Empire would be considered, if they stood in the way of the Popish claim and alleged grievance. Each and all of them would be ruthlessly sacrificed in the interests of the Papacy.

But what of the grievance felt by a large majority of our Christian people by reason of the purely secular character of our schools. We know that the Church of England at one time demanded Separate Schools; we know that a large portion of the Presbyterian community desire Scripture truth and morals to be taught in the school, behoving as they do that these have "an intimate relationship to the morality of the people, and are essential to their welfare." We believe also that a large portion of the Methodist community agree in these sentiments. Now, what of this grievance?

Roman Catholics, fewer in number than those above spoken of, have agitated and restlessly assailed successive Governments, until they have got relief, and their children are taught religion in the way that they require. But Protestants cannot have that privilege.

We have shown at other times that schools may be undenominational and yet have the lessons of Scripture truth and morality taught in them. It is most unfair that the few, who think that religion should be excluded from our schools, should force their negatively religious and moral system upon the nation. If State money may be used for maintaining schools in which Roman Catholic dogmas are taught, why may not Protestant truth also be taught? Why are the highest and noblest subjects of education and the best of text-books excluded from our public school programme? Why is not the Bible a prescribed study? The answers to these questions which are generally given, we have weighed and found wanting. Scepticism and infidelity are fast taking hold of our community, and the chief cause of this is ignorance of revealed truth; and the only cure for it is thorough and intelligent acquaintance with the Scripture.

Mr. Mackenzie tells us that logic in legislation, and consistency, are only secondary considerations; and that a grievance real or imaginary, if persistently urged by a portion of the community, ought to have weight with the Legislature. Let then the Presbyterian community speak out; let our Episcopalian and Methodist friends who feel with us, speak out, too; let us insist upon having the Bible taught in our schools. By establishing separate schools, the Roman Catholic portion of our community has surrendered all right to interfere in the management of our Protestant schools; and as old, experienced politicians are now satisfied that, even by putting the Bible out, we cannot draw our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens into our schools, let us have schools in harmony with the wishes of nine-tenths of our citizens—schools in which the children shall read of the wonderful works of God, and be taught the most important of all knowledge—the knowledge of God, of themselves, and true righteousness. "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom."

HOSPITAL FOR SICK CHILDREN.

This excellent institution has at last got into full operation, thanks to the prayerful and persevering efforts of the leaders who have taken it in charge. It is meant to provide nursing and medical attendance to the children of the humbler classes, where the accommodation at home may not be such as could be desired, or where the parents may not be able to attend to the little ones. It is not intended as a mere charity. The self-respect of the poor is to be maintained by a charge being made of so much per day for each patient. No children suffering from contagious diseases are to be admitted. All other can have the benefit as far as accommodation and means will permit of the best medical skill and careful nursing, for we believe, some fifteen or twenty cents per day. We have no doubt this institution will speedily become a very popular one. No contributions are to be solicited. All is to be left to the spontaneous liberality of those interested in the suffering little ones. Many a poor struggling mother, both in town and country will take it as a great boon to have such a place to which to send the sick children. Contributions will be thankfully received by Mrs. S. McMaster, Toronto P. O.

BOOK REVIEWS.

HISTORY OF THE VATICAN COUNCIL. From the forthcoming "History of the Creeds of Christendom." By the Rev. Dr. Schaff. Toronto: A. S. Irving & Co. 20 cents.

In order to a right comprehension of the most prominent religious and political question of our day, every intelligent Protestant should understand the position of the Papacy, as defined in the acts and decrees of the late Council held at Rome. A full but admirably condensed statement of this position, will be found in the above named pamphlet. We commend it to our readers. Dr. Schaff gives a full list of books forming the literature of the subject, both Roman Catholic and Protestant; reviews the history of events which made those decrees a necessity for the Papacy; gives a full exposition of the diversity of opinion which existed in the Council, and the means which were used or tended to secure apparent unanimity, shows what makes that Council "the greatest event in the history of the Papacy since the Council of Trent;" and treats of the new departure to which it has given rise in the Old Catholic secession. The decrees are carefully examined, and their errors or defects are exposed, showing clearly "the fearful spiritual despotism of the Papacy, which overrules the stubborn facts of history, and the sacred claims of individual conscience. The doctrine of Papal Infallibility is next considered. In its connection with the doctrine of the immaculate conception, the latter, we are told, "perverts Christianity into Marianism, and the former "exempts the Bishop of Rome from error, and resolves Christianity into Papalism, or the church into the Pope. The worship of a woman is virtually substituted for the worship of Christ, and a man-god in Rome for the god-man in heaven. The nature of the claim is then examined, the difference between ultra-Montanism and Gallicanism is exhibited, and the "wholesale slaughter of the intellect and will, and the destruction "of the sense of personal responsibility," are shown as the unavoidable result of the blasphemous claim. The claim is further found to be an unadmitted lie opposed to all tradition, as well as contrary to Holy Scripture. The full text, both Latin and English, of the Papal Syllabus and the Vatican decrees is also given. This pamphlet will be found a very valuable addition both for information and as a guide for reference to authorities in all the aspects of the present Popish controversy.

QUARTERLY REVIEW for January is a more than usually able and interesting one. Its Toryism may be as pronounced and as indefensible as ever, though we scarcely think it is. Of its literary ability as in days gone by, there can be no doubt.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW for January is also a very able one. When the Westminster keeps off Christianity and the Bible, it affords its readers both pleasant and profitable reading.

BLACKWOOD for February completes "Valentino and his brother," in which so many have been deeply interested for the past year. Its other articles are of the usual style of those which Ebony still supplies to its readers.

DEAN STANLEY ON VESTMENTS.

Dean Stanley has in the Contemporary for February a very interesting article on Ecclesiastical vestments. The Dean insists that the various portions of dresses now worn by ecclesiastics were originally portions of the usual dress of laity and clergy alike in the early ages. If, he said, we stripped the ancient Roman to his shirt, it was found to be a woollen vest, called in the case of the soldiers, Camisia, from which the word chemise is derived, while as shirts with the ancients, as well as the moderns were usually white, the name came to be called an alb. This shirt was worn by the northern nations over a fur coat of sheep skin which was called a pellissie, hence arose the barbarous name for the shirt of super-pellicum or surplice. The Dean tells us that St. Martin, Apostle of the Gauls, and the first Bishop of Tours, when he officiated were also a sheep skin, a fur coat, as it would seem with no surplice over it and with no sleeves, consecrated the Eucharistic elements with his bare arms, which came through the sheep skin. Then there was a long over-all, known as caracalla, which became corrupted into casacalia, casaca and finally, cassock. On this point we have the following curious note:—

The same form of dress was also called casula, a slang name used by the Italian labourers for the capote, which they called 'their little house,' as 'tote' is—or was a short time ago—used for a 'hat,' and as 'coat,' is the same word as 'cote,' or 'cotage.' It is this which took the name of casuable, and was afterwards especially known as the outdoor garment of the clergy as the casagium was of the laity, and was not adopted as a vestment for sacred services before the 9th century. Another name by which it was called was planota, "the wanderer," because it wandered loosely over the body, as one of the overcoats in our day has been called 'zepl.' This was the common overcoat of the wealthier as the casula of the humbler classes.

After several other observations, almost equally curious, the Dean remarks:— This historical inquiry has a two-fold interest. First, the condition of the early Church, which is indicated in this matter of dress, is but one of a hundred similar examples of the secular and social origin of many usages which are now regarded as purely ecclesiastical, and yet more, of the close connection, or rather identity, of civil

and religious, of lay and clerical life which it has been the effort of fifteen centuries to find assunder. One of the treasures which King Edward III. presented to Westminster Abbey, were "the vestments to which St. Peter was wont to celebrate mass." What those medieval relics were we know perfectly well—it was a fisher's coat cast about his naked body. In like manner the Church of Rome itself is not so far wrong when it exhibits in St. John Lateran, the altar at which St. Peter fulfilled—if he ever did fulfill—the same functions. It is not a stone or marble monument but a rough wooden table, such as would have been used at any common meal. And the churches in which, I do not say St. Peter, for there were no churches in his time, but in which the Bishops of the 3rd and 4th centuries officiated, are not copies of Jewish or Pagan temples, but of town halls and courts of justice. And the posture in which they officiated was not that of the modern Roman priest, with his back to the people, but that of the ancient Roman praetor, facing the people—for whose sake he was there. And the Latin language now regarded as consecrated to religious purposes, was but the vulgar dialect of the Italian peasants. Eucharist itself was the daily social meal, in which the only sacrifice offered was the natural thanks-giving, offered not by the presiding minister, but by all those who brought their contributions from the kindly fruits of the earth.

Dr. Stanley proceeds then to show how gradually a doctrinal meaning came to be attached in the lapse of years to particular portions of dress:—

How early the severance from secular to sacred use took place, it is difficult to determine; but it was gradual, and by unequal steps. It is said that even to the 9th century there were Eastern clergy, who celebrated the Eucharist in their common costume. In the original Benedictine rule the conventional dress was so well understood to be merely the ordinary dress of the neighbouring peasants, that in the sketches of early monastic life at Monte Casino, the monks are represented in blue, green, or black, with absolute indifference. But now the distinction between the lay and clerical dress, which once existed nowhere, has come universal. It is not confined to Rome or to Episcopal Churches. It is found in the Churches of Presbyterians and Non-conformists. The extreme simplicity of the utmost desecration of Dissent, has in this respect, departed further from primitive practice than it has from any Pontifical or ritual splendour. A distinguished Baptist minister, one of the most popular preachers, and one of the most powerful ecclesiastics in this metropolis, was shocked to find that he could not preach in Calvin's church at Geneva, without adopting the black gown, and naturally refused to wear it except under protest. But even he in his London Tabernacle, has already fallen away from the primitive simplicity which acknowledged no difference of dress between the clergy and the laity,—for he as well as all other ministers (it is believed) has adopted the black dress, which no layman would think of using except as an evening costume. The clergy of the Church of England have either adopted the white surplice, once the common frock, drawn, as it has been seen, over the fur of our skin clad ancestors, or else have, in a few instances, retained or restored the shreds and patches of the clothes worn by Roman nobles and labourers. The Roman clergy have done the same, but in more elaborate form.

Change of the same nature continued to progress:—

Take for example the wigs of Bishops. First, there was the long flowing hair of the Cavaliers; then when this was cut short came the long flowing wigs in their places. Then these were dropped except by the learned professions; then they were dropped by the lawyers except in court; then the clergy laid them aside, with the exception of the bishops; then the bishops laid them aside with the exception of the archbishops; then the last archbishop laid his wig aside except on official occasions. And now even the archbishop has dropped it. But it is easy to see that, had it been retained, it might have passed like the fall into the mystic symbol of the archiepiscopate, patriarchate, or I know not what. Bands again sprang from the broad white collars, which fell over the shoulders of the higher and middle classes—whether Cavalier or Puritan—Cromwell and Bunyan, no less than Clarendon or Hammond. Then these were confined to the clergy; then reduced to a single white plait; then divided into two parts; then symbolized to mean the two tables of the law, the two sacraments, or the cloven tongues; then from a supposed connection with Puritanism, or from a sense of inconvenience, ceased to be worn, or worn only by the more old-fashioned of the clergy; so as to be regarded by the younger generation as a symbol of Puritan custom or doctrine. Just so, and with as much reason did the surplice in the middle ages, from its position as a frock or pinfore over the fur coat, come to be regarded as an emblem of imputed righteousness over the skins in which were clothed our first parents; just so did the handkerchief with which the Roman gentry wiped their faces come to be regarded in the 5th century as wings of angels, and in the 7th as the yoke of Christian life. Just so have the pouches and waterpots of the Roman peasants and labourers come in the 19th century to be regarded as emblems of sacrifice, priesthood, Real Presence, communion with the universal church, Christian or ecclesiastical virtues, &c.

The conclusion to which the Dean comes is that all wise men may look upon articles of dress as simply nothing. To speak of them as of importance, even in attacking them, is itself a species of ritualism. To speak of them as insignificant is the true translation of the great maxim of the Apostle—Circumcision availeth nothing, nor uncircumcision. The Dean thinks that, if there is to be any regulation about dress, it should be made matter of gentle ment by judicious authority. Once it was settled, it would have no practical doctrinal importance.

The Invariant System.

EDITOR BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN.

Sir,—In your issue of the 26th February, your correspondent IL wishes to have the matter of the removal of Presbyterian ministers from one church to another considered, and suggests that a change to the Methodist system, which he imagines may be as scriptural as ours, be adopted. I have no doubt that such a change could be brought about, but that it would be attended with any permanent advantages, I am not prepared to admit. The Methodists themselves to a large extent, both ministers and people, are tired of this system; and year by year memorialize Conferences for a change in this respect. I fail to see in any suggestion your correspondent has made any real advantage that the Presbyterian people or their ministers would obtain from the change referred to, that they cannot have under their own church regulations. In the constant change of pulpits necessary to carry out our own organization—abundant opportunity for a variety of gifts is given; and even in this respect it would not be difficult to show in many instances it is an hindrance rather than a help to real progress. It is not necessary in the Presbyterian church for a minister to remain all the years of his ministry in one place, though it has been done and is being done to the advantage of both minister and people in many places; and if a change is needed or desired, the minister and people have the matter in their own hands, and can dissolve their church relationship when circumstances call for such a change. And I fail to see that there is anything unscriptural in this, or that a change brought about by a conference of ministers, where the people are excluded, is either as scriptural or as reasonable; or that changes brought about in this are more conducive to the interests of Christianity, than where the matter of change and the choice of a minister is one of intelligent and mutual assent and consent by the parties concerned. If it is scriptural to have a minister placed over a church without its consent or against its wish, we had better go back to the good old times of Church and State, when the whole matter was under the control of parties who had no knowledge of the wants of the Church, and very frequently no sympathy with it no further than providing funds for its necessities. A stated Ministry subject to the regulations of the Church and the minister of choice conjointly with a reference to the Presbytery in matters of difficulty, is to my mind more in keeping with the genius of Christianity than a system where the important matters which church organization involves are left to a conference of Ministry, two thirds of whom are ignorant to a large extent of the wants and requirements of the churches for which they legislate, and in whose meetings the voice of the people is not heard, not even by a representative from among themselves. How a cast iron rule that moves a minister against his will and without the consent of the church he is taken from, and sends him to a church that may not want him every four years is to be conducive to the cause of Christianity, I fail to see, and what scripturalness there is about this method, which is not to be found in our own, I am equally at a loss to ascertain. The reason given by many Methodists for their course of action is that Methodist like changes. If this is a scriptural reason, why, then, the Presbyterians lack in this respect. But would it not be well for your correspondent to consider the impressive words of Solomon, "My son, fear thou the Lord and the King, and meddle not with them that are given to change." I am fully persuaded that if changes are necessary for the welfare of the church, there is in connection with the Presbyterian church all the elements necessary to effect the changes required without the introduction of a rule contrary to all reason, and which has done its part in times past in preventing the progress and establishment of true religion in the world. I do not deny but there are some apparent advantages in connection with the system of change which your correspondent wishes to have "ventilated a little," and I am more than half persuaded that they are of a negative kind. With reference to the advantage of change, as to a minister's children and their education, it might be a change for the worse. Does "E" know that in the Methodist system a minister has no choice as to where he shall go; and that the frequent changes, which occur at stated intervals, draw largely upon his material and mental ability, and leave him shorn of his strength to do for the cause of Christ and his own family what he would in other circumstances have been able to do. Upon the young people connected with the Church, frequent changes have a bad effect in many instances; and upon ministers themselves these changes not prejudicially. Young men are induced to enter the ministry without the preparation necessary to insure success; the prospect of changes gives them comfort. And in how many cases where neither moral worth or mental ability would commend them to a church which had opportunity of judging of their fitness for the office of a minister, are they placed over a church, or a member of churches "where hungry souls look up and are not fed." But the change all round at regular necessary periods, "enables them to pass muster, and they are permitted again to bring forth the crude and stunted efforts of past years as food for the church, whose necessities demand from the "treasuries of the Gospel things both new and old." If your correspondent has sympathizers with him, I hope for the sake of the Presbyterian Church, that they are very few, and that when this matter is ventilated a little more, they will become beautifully less. I should not, Mr. Editor, have troubled you with a communication on this subject, only that I fear there is danger of looking to, and relying on systems of church organization, more than in looking to and relying on the power of God, in the operations of his spirit in connection with the preaching of his Gospel, for that success which the churches of this kind other lands so much needs. J. Bradford, March 8th, 1875.