

British American Presbyterian  
PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY AT  
TORONTO, CANADA.

TERMS: \$2 a year, in advance  
Entered by mail, 50 cent per year, payable at the  
office of Joliver  
Cheques and Post Office Orders should be drawn  
in favor of the Publisher.  
Subscribers and List of Premiums furnished for  
application. All who are desirous to aid in extend-  
ing the circulation of the PRESBYTERIAN should  
send for the List of Premiums at once, as now is  
the time to secure new names.

C. BLACKETT ROBINSON,  
F.O. Straws 2481 Publisher and Proprietor

British American Presbyterian.  
FRIDAY, JUNE 19, 1874.

THE LATE REV. DR. JOHNSTONE,  
LIMEKILNS, SCOTLAND.

Many of our readers will regret to hear of the  
death of Rev. Dr. Wm. Johnstone of Lime-  
kilns, Dr. Johnstone was taken ill while at-  
tending the United Presbyterian Synod in  
Edinburgh, and never got home. He was  
in the 74th year of his age, and had been  
minister in Limekilns for the long period  
of 51 years.

MANITOBA.

The tide of emigration to Manitoba is  
rising every week. Hundreds of well-to-do  
farmers and others are continually pressing  
on to the prairie province. The churches  
are accordingly bound to show at least  
equal activity. As formerly, a very large  
proportion of those who are moving west-  
ward are Presbyterians. A great duty and  
a great opportunity are thus set before the  
Presbyterians of Canada. The expense  
may be large just now, but the returns will  
in due time be abundant. Let us show  
that we are alive to the opportunity and  
can avail ourselves of it to the utmost.

THE ANTI-PATRONAGE BILL IN  
SCOTLAND.

The bill, as prepared by the British  
Government, has been accepted by the  
General Assembly of the Kirk, with the  
single exception that the electorate has  
been extended so as to take in female as  
well as male communicants. The Broad  
School leaders were anxious to make the  
electoral body much larger. Perhaps they  
were more consistent, but if their views  
had been carried out they would only have  
made the idea of an Established Church  
more glaringly absurd. As the matter now  
stands the Church of Scotland will under  
the proposed change be more manifestly  
than ever a more sect; and why one sect  
should be kept up at the public expense  
more than another, is not very manifest.  
The Scotch people will, we are persuaded,  
not rest till they know the reason why;  
and if no satisfactory reason can be given,  
will not be satisfied till the anomaly is re-  
moved. The success of the Duke of Rich-  
mond's measure will only be the beginning  
of the end. Instead of reconciling the  
people of Church Establishments it will  
only hasten the downfall of these "vener-  
able institutions."

THE SANGSTER CASE.

The more this painful matter is stirred  
and the more the conduct of a very con-  
siderable number of the teachers of the  
Province in reference to it is marked, the  
more it is seen that it is not simply Dr.  
Sangster that is on his trial. The whole of  
our Public School Teachers are being tested.  
It is a matter of the most important de-  
scription that our teachers should be per-  
sons in whose character and honour the  
community have perfect confidence. They  
are put in charge of our girls at a time of  
life when these are very susceptible of im-  
pression and in circumstances which give  
the teachers very great influence over them  
for either good or evil. Are we to believe  
then that a very large number of our  
Public School officials think it quite right  
for teachers to take advantage of their po-  
sition and influence to make love to young  
girls and to use liberties with them com-  
patible neither with honour nor decency;  
and that married men may, with perfect  
impunity, get up most ardent flirtations  
with those put under their charge and be  
found in the most questionable positions  
with their pupils and all be regarded as  
right and proper? It would appear that  
this is the idea very generally entertained,  
"Dr. Sangster has done it," and we, cry the  
teachers in chorus, "may do it also." We  
know of nothing more calculated to shake  
the confidence of the community in the  
honour and integrity of our teachers than  
the way they are working and arguing for a  
man who has broken both the laws of God  
and the law of the land. The mere ques-  
tion of whether Dr. Sangster is to be elect-  
ed or not is becoming comparatively insignif-  
icant when put side by side with one  
which now presses for an answer. "Can  
we trust our daughters to the care of men  
who go through their organs of the press and

by their spoken speeches, profess such loose  
principles of morality and seem to fancy  
school girls fair game if the teacher happens  
to be inclined that way?" The excuses,  
palliations, and defences of Dr. Sangster's  
conduct are in short more painful than that  
conduct itself, and will force Trustees in  
future to ask candidates for their Schools  
how far they reckon themselves justified in  
taking liberties with their female pupils  
without expecting to be called to account?

NEW BRUNSWICK SCHOOL LAW.

Our readers know that for some time  
past the Roman Catholics have been making  
a determined effort to secure in one way or  
other Separate Schools in New Brunswick.  
According to the Confederation Act all edu-  
cational matters are left to the local author-  
ities of each province with this reservation  
that minorities are to retain all the rights  
and privileges they proposed at the time of  
Confederation. It so happens that at and  
before Confederation there were no separate  
schools in New Brunswick. The Roman  
Catholics, however, have ever since  
been moving heaven and earth to have  
these secured, and have been invoking the  
interference of both the Federal and Im-  
perial authorities to secure this object. We  
are all aware of the course pursued by Mr.  
Costigan and his supporters in the Federal  
Parliament and how it has been declared  
that the Federal Act must be so amended  
as to secure separate schools not only in  
New Brunswick but in every new province  
that may in coming times be erected in the  
Dominion. All this is quite in keeping  
with the Roman Catholic programme, but  
there will be a good deal of discussion and  
hard work before it is in any measure real-  
ized. The fact is that even the greatest  
worshippers of expediency among our so-  
called Protestant politicians are beginning  
to discover that the Romish hierarchy are  
unsuitable, and that nothing short of a com-  
plete supremacy both in secular and sacred  
matters will satisfy the so-called sovereign  
prince of the Vatican with his petticoated  
soldiers all the world over. For this these  
ecclesiastics are fighting, and with this alone  
will they be satisfied. In New Brunswick  
the recent local election has lingered en-  
tirely on this Separate School business, and  
has resulted in an unparalleled victory for  
the local ministry and unsectarian educa-  
tion. The priestly party has been all annihi-  
lated and the New Brunswickers have  
shown that they are not going to give up  
the local rights which they know have  
been guaranteed to them by the Act of Con-  
federation and are as little inclined to be  
dictated to by an Italian priest or his sub-  
ordinates in reference to how they are to  
regulate the internal affairs of their country.  
We are rejoiced to see the manifestation of  
such a spirit, and can assure our brethren  
down by the sea that the Protestants of  
Ontario cordially sympathize with them in  
their resolution and rejoice with them in  
their victory. We do not believe the Roman  
Catholic parents of the Dominion as a  
general thing have any desire for separate  
schools. Notoriously at any rate is it the  
fact that in Ontario, separate schools make  
no progress and far more Roman Catholic  
children attend the public schools than  
those which the priests declare to be indis-  
pensable. While hundreds of Roman  
Catholics are teachers in these "godless in-  
stitutions" which are declared to be the  
well springs of all evil.

THE CHURCH QUESTION IN GER-  
MANY.

When so much is said by professed  
Liberals in the condemnation of the course  
taken towards Germany in opposition to the  
Church of Rome, it is as well, now and  
then, to hear the other side. The following  
able and moderate sentiment by Berlin cor-  
respondent of London Daily News puts the  
matter in a somewhat new light, and will  
amply repay an attentive perusal. It is all  
very well for outlookers to talk glibly about  
persecution, but when a great ecclesiastic  
co-political organization like the Papacy  
after preaching a crusade against Germany  
which issued in the Franco-Prussian war,  
still claims the right of releasing subjects  
from their oath of allegiance, and syste-  
matically sets itself against the very exis-  
tence of the German Empire, very decided  
measures in defence are abundantly ne-  
cessary. The writer in the Daily News  
says:—  
In the absence of our news I should  
like to present a few observations on the  
Church question. They shall be brief,  
and addressed more particularly to what  
seems to me a grave error of method into  
which the English writers on the subject,  
friendly or hostile, are prone to fall. In  
Germany the argument closed when the  
fight began. But in England the literature  
of the day is producing something worthy  
of the subject, and it could be as unjust  
to yourselves as to Germany to start from a  
false position.  
The Edinburgh and the Quarterly, as  
well as some pretentious periodicals, seem  
to assume that the Bismarck policy can be  
tried by an exact historical process, and ac-

quitted or condemned, after looking at the  
fact through certain obvious rules of toler-  
ation. I am bound to say that this  
method is very well applied. The facts  
bearing on the case seem to be collected  
with a great deal of diligence, and the  
principles of liberty laid down are in  
general unexceptionable. The trouble is,  
that this method of treatment is inadequate  
to the case. It is too specific; and though  
it does not shut out generalization, in gen-  
eralizes only from the facts in hand, and  
takes no account of certain social forces,  
without which every political reform, and  
even political government itself, would be  
impossible. An example will make my  
meaning clear. An English periodical  
which has given much attention to the sub-  
ject is fond of demanding proof of offence  
on the part of the Church. "We under-  
stand," it says now and then triumphantly,  
"the general constitution of the Romish  
Church, but we also understand the past  
relations of the Church to Prussia, and we  
demand that the State shall provide some  
new offence justifying it for disturbing  
those relations in 1871." The point has  
undoubtedly puzzled many English Lib-  
erals, trying to reconcile hatred of Rome  
with love of religious freedom. Some of  
them, as I have said, try to meet it by  
elaborate historical indictments of the  
German Church, by essays on the conse-  
quences of Infallibility, and the like. This  
is quite useless. The best, and in my  
opinion the only, way to untie the knot  
is to cut it. No specific crime can be named,  
because there is none; and the selection of  
the present epoch for the movement  
against the Church was governed by con-  
siderations with which the conduct of the  
Church herself had nothing whatever to do.  
Indeed, how many reforms could be just-  
ified against such criticism? Of what par-  
ticular offence was the Irish Church guilty  
in 1868, that she should be disestablished  
at that time, after existing for so many  
years? What crime was brought home to  
the Russian proprietors in 1864 that the  
serfs should be set free at that time? There  
are very few accomplished reforms which  
would survive this test. No! Prussia, or  
rather Germany, began the movement in  
1871 because she had never before been  
strong enough to begin it. It was purely  
an affair of means and opportunity. Since  
the time of Stein, who was the original foe  
of ecclesiasticism, it has been morally cer-  
tain that Prussia would seize the very  
earliest opportunity to throw off the shackles  
of the Bishops, and reduce the Church into  
proper subordination to the civil power.  
That opportunity could not come so long  
as two powerful Catholic States frowned  
down upon a weak and disunited Germany.  
It did come after the defeat of Austria and  
France, the resurrection of Italy, and the  
union of the German States. The fact of  
the strife at this time signifies only that  
Germany's hour is come, and it would be  
simpler and franker if all friends of the  
State would admit this at the outset.

It will not do, moreover, to associate  
Prince Bismarck too closely with the new  
clerical policy. The late publication of the  
Von Arnim correspondence proves clearly  
enough that the Prince was not in 1870  
disposed to make the dogma of Infallibility  
a *casus belli*, and I have likewise been un-  
able to discover in his career anything  
which would stamp him as an original foe  
of ecclesiastical pretensions. But he had  
the sagacity to appreciate, and the courage  
to adopt a great popular aspiration, and  
this I take to be his chief merit in the case.  
Nor will it avail to reply that he did no  
more than this in consolidating the Ger-  
man Empire. It is true that the longing  
for unity was a national passion, which the  
end of Bismarck's work gratified; but the  
method was distinctively his own, and it  
was not the method of German Liberals.  
There is therefore paltry praise to say that  
the author of German unity obeyed a  
popular cry. But with the present move-  
ment everything is different. Here the fact  
itself of the conflict is the main thing, and  
the measures are mere matters of detail.  
There is but little scope for the choice of  
means, and that little has, perhaps, not  
always been wisely used. At any rate the  
credit for details belong to Dr. Falk. Bis-  
marck himself, if my observations may be  
trusted, is rather behind public sentiment  
than the contrary. The nomination of  
Cardinal Hohenlohe was a distinct offer of  
compromise, and the Prince resisted the  
introduction of obligatory civil marriage  
till the resistance became futile. I do not  
intend by these representations to explain  
away Prince Bismarck's responsibility, but  
to relieve the State from the suspicion of  
making war on the Romish Church, in  
order to gratify one ambitious and auda-  
cious man—a suspicion which appears to  
be shared in England by many who are not  
friends to the Papacy. The Chancellor is,  
I repeat, the leader, but from the necessities  
of his position not less than from choice.  
They at least are on the spot, and have  
opportunities of watching the current of  
public opinion, know that after the late  
war had put Germany into possession of her  
full powers, the emancipation of the State  
from sacerdotalism became a national de-  
mand with which no statesman could afford  
to trifle. It was a political necessity in the  
broadest sense of the word.

This leads to my last suggestion, namely,  
that the foreigner who tries to learn the  
nature of the pending struggle by analysing  
the Falk laws squanders his time. It is  
a fruitless labour, first because in most  
cases the critic is obliged to weigh the legis-  
lation of another country in the scales of  
his own social surrounding—a process  
which must lead to fallacious results; and  
second, because the main issue is independ-  
ent of and above any particular measures  
that have yet been adopted. Let me recur  
to the case of the emancipation of the serfs  
in Russia. He would be called a trifler  
who, asked for an opinion of the Imperial  
decree, should make his answer turn on the  
number of acres which were given to the  
freemen; yet that would be but little  
more absurd than to make Dr. Falk's  
measures determine one's judgment on the  
merits of the main question. Who is pre-  
sumptuous enough to draw a fixed line,  
and say all up to this line is a vindication  
of the rights of the State; all beyond is  
persecution of the Church? Or who shall  
say that the general cause defended by the  
State is to be condemned for one or two  
errors of detail? There is probably not a

single specific measure taken by Henry  
VIII against the Church of Rome that a  
liberal English Protestant justifies to-day.  
Mr. Froude to the contrary notwithstanding,  
yet all English Protestants accept the  
Reformation as an inestimable public  
blessing. So I think the Germans have a  
right to ask a favourable judgment even  
from those Englishmen who, out of liberal  
scruples, may shrink from certain details of  
the struggle. For the issue is not a paltry  
one about the education of priests or their  
nomination to parishes, nor even, as is  
often represented, one between the inde-  
pendence of the Church and the subjection  
of the State. The unique aim of Prince  
Bismarck's policy is the destruction of the  
Church in Germany as a political factor,  
and the ingenuity of the sharpest critic may  
be challenged to name a single law or a  
single order inconsistent with this aim.  
The object itself is certainly a fair theme of  
discussion. But that is an abstract ques-  
tion, and if foreign critics would confine  
themselves to that, they would simplify the  
argument, and arrive at conclusions not  
less friendly to the cause of Liberal Ger-  
many.

DISCUSSIONS IN SCOTTISH ASSEM-  
BLIES ON THE DUKE OF RICH-  
MOND'S PATRONAGE BILL.

On the report of the Committee on Pa-  
tronage being presented to the General  
Assembly of the Established Church, Dr.  
Pirie, seconded by Lord Balfour of Bur-  
leigh, moved:—

"That the General Assembly express their  
great obligation to the Government for the  
introduction of the Bill which has now been  
laid upon the table, and generally approve  
thereof, as affording the means of a satis-  
factory solution of the question of patronage  
in the Church."

Dr. Cook, seconded by Dr. Selkirk,  
moved in amendment:—

"That patronage has been for long exer-  
cised by the Crown and lay patrons of  
Scotland with great judgment, discretion,  
and conscientiousness, with an earnest de-  
sire not only to promote the spiritual inter-  
ests, but to consult the feelings of the  
people; that the recent demand for its abo-  
lition, which has led to the introduction of  
the Bill now on the table of the House, did  
not originate with, and has not the sym-  
pathy and support of, a large proportion of  
the educated and intelligent members of  
the congregations of the Church; that the  
total abolition of patronage, as hitherto  
vested in the Crown and in the landed pro-  
prietors of Scotland, puts an end to the in-  
direct but most salutary influence which  
the Government and property of the  
country have hitherto exercised in the  
Church; that the vesting of the appoint-  
ment of the ministers of the Church in the  
male communicants of the congregation is  
likely to lead to heats and divisions in  
parishes, and to prove unfavourable to the  
independent position of the minister so ap-  
pointed as regards the body among whom  
he is to labour and as regards the parishion-  
ers generally, and places him in the po-  
sition not of the minister of a parish, but  
in the position of a minister of a denomina-  
tion within a parish, and so affords a  
species of argument to those who are hostile  
to the Church for the withdrawal of its  
national support."

In the course of his speech, Dr. Cook  
said that the first notice of Patronage the  
said is connected with the early Reformers  
of the year 1560, when they drew up the  
first Book of Discipline, which we may call  
a sort of speculative theory of what should  
be the constitution of the Church. There  
they laid down very distinctly the doctrine  
that it pertained to every congregation  
to elect their minister—but they limited  
that doctrine in a remarkable way: they  
went on to state that if the congregation do  
not within forty days elect their minister,  
then the election of the minister should go  
into the hands of the Presbytery, or super-  
intending body, then, into the hands of the  
superintendent; and that whosoever was  
presented to them by the godly and learned,  
meaning the superintendent and his Pres-  
bytery, the people should be bound to re-  
ceive, upon pain of being held contuma-  
cious. Very well. At the time when the  
book was drawn up, the Reformed Church  
of Scotland stood in the peculiar position of  
being a Church supported by the great body  
of the people, but not being the Church  
established as the Church of Scotland. The  
Established Church of Scotland continued  
to beat that moment the Roman Catholic  
Church, and the patronages to benefices  
were then exercised by the Roman Catholic  
Church as the Church of Scotland, and by  
the lay patrons, and they were entitled to  
exercise them in favour of Roman Catholic  
proselytes. It was natural that under these  
circumstances, resting altogether upon the  
support of the great body of the people, and  
supported by the great body of the people  
as far as regards their own personal com-  
fort and support—it was natural, I say,  
that in these circumstances they should all  
back upon the people, and that they should  
express, as they did express, that it per-  
tained to the people to elect the ministers.  
And so I say it does appertain to the people  
to elect their ministers in every circum-  
stance in which the people are the persons  
by whom the minister is supported and  
maintained. (Hear, hear.) Very well.  
But the Reformation progressed, and the  
Estates of Scotland came to the resolution  
that they were to substitute the Reformed  
Church as the Established Church of the  
country for the Roman Catholic Church;  
and I pray you, Moderator and brethren,  
to attend to the negotiations which then  
took place between the fathers of our early  
Reformation and the Legislature of the  
Scottish Estates. They were men of signal  
ability, and their signal ability was mani-  
fested in the way in which the Church was  
established by them. When the Reformed  
Church became aware that it was proposed  
that they should be placed as an Estab-  
lished Church in place of the Roman  
Catholic Church, they came forward to the  
Queen with the following declaration of  
what their mind and sentiments were:—  
"Our mind is not that Her Majesty or any  
other patron should be deprived of their  
just patronages, but we mean, whosoever  
Her Majesty or any other patron do present

any person to a benefice, that the person  
presented should be tried and ex-  
amined by the judgment of learned men of  
the Church, such as are for the present the  
superintendents; and as the presentation to  
benefices belongs to patrons, so collation  
by law and reason belongeth to the Church,  
of which collation the Kirk should not be  
deprived, more than the patrons of their  
presentation, for otherwise it shall be le-  
gitimate to the patrons absolutely to present  
whomever they please without trial or ex-  
amination. What, then, can abide in  
Kirk of God but mere ignorance without all  
order." Now the Estates met the Re-  
formed clergy on that platform. They  
knew well what it was to give an absolute  
and uncontrolled power to any body of  
clergy, for they had just been delivered  
from the domination of the Church of  
Rome; but they were perfectly prepared,  
as sound members of the Reformed Church,  
to give the Church the privilege which, as  
a Christian Church, it was entitled to possess  
in the fullest and most absolute sense—the  
right of collation—that is, as it has been  
interpreted, and as it has been embodied in  
Lord Aberdeen's Bill—the right, not only  
to try them on life and doctrine, but the  
right to adjudicate on every objection that  
might be brought forward by any com-  
municant to any minister presented to a  
benefice, and to say whether that objection  
was an objection that should be sustained  
or not to the effect of finding that he was  
not a suitable presentee to be presented to  
the living. And on that impartial platform,  
with two exceptions—the Church of Scot-  
land has continued to stand to the present  
day. It is virtually by the law of 1567,  
excepting as slightly modified by Lord  
Aberdeen's Act, that the inductions of  
ministers have been regulated in the  
Church of Scotland up to the present day.

The amendment of Dr. Cooke was after-  
wards withdrawn and Dr. Pine's motion  
carried unanimously on the understanding  
that it committed the Assembly only to the  
principle of the measure not to its details.  
Dr. Cooke subsequently recorded his dis-  
sent from the finding for the following  
among other reasons:—

"Because the allegation so generally  
made that the existence of Patronage has  
been the cause of all the secession from the  
Church of Scotland, and that its withdrawal  
would at once open the way for the reunion  
of the Dissenting Presbyterian bodies with  
the Church, is not founded on historical  
fact; that the secession of the Erskines,  
the founders of what is now the United  
Presbyterian Church, originated in the re-  
fusal of the Church to allow them what the  
called ministerial liberty—that is, permis-  
sion to testify in their pulpits against what  
they considered the defections of the Church  
including under the acquiescence of the  
Church in the Toleration Act the cessation  
of the persecution of Roman Catholics for  
celebrating mass, and of the burning of  
witches; and that the secession of the Free  
Church originated not in their objection to  
Patronage, which the leading men of their  
party in the Church powerfully defended,  
but in their assertion in 1838 of what they  
called spiritual independence—in other  
words, the right of the Church to interpret  
for herself the way by which she was estab-  
lished, and to act on that interpretation—a  
position which they found it impossible to  
maintain by the authority of the supreme  
civil tribunals of the country, and which  
compelled their withdrawal from the  
Church.

At a subsequent seditum the details of  
the Patronage Bill were considered and  
various amendments proposed. It was  
moved and carried unanimously:

"That it be an instruction to the commit-  
tee that they in no wise compromise the  
liberties and privileges of this Church; and,  
in particular, that they take care that no  
enactments be sanctioned which may ap-  
pear, directly or indirectly, to throw doubt  
upon the supreme authority and jurisdiction  
of the Church in regard not only to the trial  
and admission of ministers, but also to all  
matters of doctrine, discipline, and govern-  
ment in the Church, as the said liberties,  
privileges, authority, and jurisdiction are  
ratified and secured by the "Act for Secu-  
ring the Protestant Religion and Presbyter-  
ian Church Government," and Acts therein  
confirmed, and by the Act ratifying the  
Treaty of Union."

The result of the discussion was that with  
the exception of extending the franchise to  
female communicants "of full age" the Bill  
was left as introduced in the House of  
Lords. Dr. Wallace of Edinburgh, was  
very anxious to have the following resolu-  
tions carried, but had little support:—

"2. That the General Assembly are pre-  
pared to accept legislation by which, where  
two-thirds of the electors above designated  
are professed Presbyterians dissenting from  
the Establishment, the choice of ministers  
shall be extended to licentiatees or min-  
isters recognised as such by the Dissenting  
Church to which they belong; and their  
admission and settlement, subsequent to  
their election and appointment, may be the  
act of such Dissenting Church, and they may  
continue the matter subject to its govern-  
ment; which legislation may be ob-  
tained by prefixing the words 'provided  
that the sentence above quoted, and an-  
nexing it to the third clause of the Bill.

"3. That the General Assembly authorize  
the Committee, if they shall find it neces-  
sary to consent to such legislation in modi-  
fication of the formula ordered to be sub-  
scribed by all preachers and ministers, in  
forms of the Act of Parliament of 1690, for  
settling the quiet and peace of the Church,  
and other Acts, as shall extend the selection  
of ministers to all persons otherwise qual-  
ified, whose doctrinal professions embrace  
the fundamentals of Christianity, provided  
that the acknowledgement of Presbyterian  
Church government shall remain as in the  
Acts specified.

In urging this proposal Dr. Wallace ac-  
knowledged that in the whole country  
north of the Caledonian Canal, out of every  
100 of the population 17 only belong to  
the Established Church, and 78 to the Free.  
It was therefor moved and carried to  
petition Parliament in favour of the Bill  
and to instruct the Committee appointed  
to manage the matter to use all diligence  
to have the measure in full operation be-  
fore next Assembly.