

building up of the Church in Canada. Is there not too much assumed here? If careful inquiry were made it might be found that, as regards Ontario, at least, the Ulstermen, or Scotch-Irish as they are called, are much more numerous than some suppose. In the last census of the somewhat less than two millions of the population of Ontario, I find 627,000 and over, set down as of Irish origin—that is almost one-third of the whole. The Roman Catholics of Ontario numbered only 320,839, and of these, 100,000 are French. Considerably more than the half of those of Irish stock must be Protestant—say not less than 400,000. Those that count their origin from Scotland are set down as 378,536, but not a few of these are Roman Catholics. These figures will warrant the very modest conclusion that so far as the Presbyterians of Ontario are concerned, the Scotch-Irish equal the Scotch. It is well known that in many rural districts, at least in the Midland part of Ontario the population is largely from Ulster. Not long ago, the writer was privileged to conduct on a Friday, a preparatory service for a worthy brother. Having arrived a little early he took a look at the tombstones and monuments around the Church, and not being previously aware that the neighbourhood was largely peopled by Scotch-Irish, he was surprised to find so many of the surnames of that nationality. Of one, the monument testified that he was born in Donegal County, of another in Tyrone County, of another in the County of Londonderry, of another in Antrim County, and so on.

It is not so clear that ministers from Ulster have at any time in the history of the Presbyterian Church in Canada been as numerous in comparison as the people appear to have been. Possibly, if there had been a leader from Ulster, somewhat like old Dr. Burns, it might have been different. We are all ready enough to render the honour that is due to the brave old chieftain for the great work that he did during the latter half of his ministerial life, spent in Canada. At the same time, the Scotch-Irish have never been without their representatives in the ministry in this Province. In the pioneer days, say between 1815 and 1840, there were such men as Boyd, of Prescott, Harris, of York, (now Toronto), Rogers, of Demorestville, Johnston of Chinguacousy, Anderson of South Gower, and others who did their fair share of the breaking up of the fallow ground. I need not speak of those of later years, they are known to the present generation.

All things considered then, it is deeply to be regretted that Canada was not represented at the meeting held on the 4th of July. We have men that could have presented the matter in a proper light. For some reason or other very few of the professorships in our numerous colleges have fallen to Ulstermen, but we have one Professor who would have been equal to the occasion. I need not say that reference is made to Professor Gregg, D.D., whose historical powers will soon be more manifest than they have yet been.

ONE OF THEM.

GRATITUDE.

A TRUE STORY.

A minister of our Church has for many years laboured in a very peculiarly situated field. He received a call from the people. It was not formally sustained, but virtually it was. This, of course, gave him a perfect moral right to be treated as if he had been inducted according to use and wont. At length, some of the people cried out for a change. They gave no reason whatever for doing so, but this—the Methodists have their ministers changed frequently. They thought that they had as much right to a change as their Methodist brethren. They should have respected their word, and as they had called him, given a reason why they wished a change. Their sense of honour was not however sufficiently keen to lead them to do so. Not one of his enemies gives any evidence of being truly pious. Some are not free from gross sin. Some are fugitives from discipline. Some do not even profess to be Presbyterians. Not one expresses the least desire for a change of heart. A change of minister will satisfy them. The Presbytery, taking advantage of the fact that he was not formally inducted—a mere quirk, though I do not suppose it knows that—has yielded to their wishes, and “sacrificed” one whom it, in effect, calls “a reputable, Christian

minister,” to “the unreasonable desires of a party in the congregation.”

A short time ago, the congregation began to build a new church. The pastor drew the plans for it with very great care. The style is Gothic. He gave, himself, a good deal to the building fund, and collected for it several hundred dollars, a considerable part of which he obtained from relations and acquaintances in distant places. He superintended the work. Even in its present state, it is admired by competent judges. Well, next Sabbath, the church is to be opened, though it be very far from being finished. Of course, the late pastor, as he has been in plain English—kicked out, will not be present on the occasion. Yet, had it not been for his labours, the new church would still have been only an imaginary thing. Had he been allowed to remain, the congregation would, by-and-by have had a prettier little church than any within a great distance. He would have done most of the ornamental work himself. Well, what is the result of the change? Persons who have not the least taste, now direct the work. Already, they have begun to alter the plans. When the church is finished, it will be a mixture of majesty and meanness. The Building Committee has not met for more than six months, and it very likely will not meet again. The pastor's enemies should have been a little more cunning, and waited till the church was finished, letting him superintend the work and collect money for the Building Fund. He has done a very great deal more for the new church, as well as for the good of the congregation in other ways than the whole of them put together. But though his enemies have succeeded, he has many warm friends in the congregation. They call the treatment which he has received from the former, infamous. So do many not in the congregation, even some Roman Catholics. What the people paid him was a very small sum. His enemies, however, have put on as many airs as if the congregation had been giving him “ten thousand a year”

RECORDER.

Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott.

(FROM THE GERMAN OF LUTHER)

This is sometimes called “The Marseillaise of the Reformation.” Its main feature—trust in God in the midst of the greatest trials—is taken from the 46th Psalm. It is said that the author, when his circumstances seemed most hopeless, was wont to say to his friends, “Come, let us sing the 46th Psalm, and then let our enemies do their worst.”

A strong-walled city is our God,
A sure defence and weapon;
Though troubles now upon us crowd,
He'll let no ill us happen.
The old malignant foe
Seeks eagerly our woe;
Great pow'r and countless snares
Are the dread mail he wears.
On earth he has no equal.

By our own strength naught can be done,
Right soon we'd back be driven;
But on our side fights the Right One,
Whom God Himself has given.
Would'st thou know who is this?
His name Christ Jesus is,
The Lord of Hosts is He,
No other God shall be
The conqueror in the battle.

Although the world with devils swarmed,
Aye seeking to devour us,
We'd not at it be sore alarmed,
They could not overpower us.
He who o'er this world rules,
However fierce he scowls,
Can do to us no ill;
His pow'r is as God's will,
A word can cause his downfall.

The word they suffer shall to stand,
But for that no thanks merit.
All things He for our good hath planned
With His own gifts and Spirit.
Though they should take our life,
Goods, armour, child, and wife,
Let these all pass away,
Thereby naught gain shall they,
God's kingdom we still shall have.

Methu, Que.

T. F.

FRENCH EVANGELIZATION.

MR. EDITOR.—The report submitted at last Assembly, page 11, gives a summary of things as they are, and asks a comparison with things as they were ten years ago. In making the comparison, I find by careful reading of the Reports of this Committee from 1877 to 1884, the following facts which any one may test for himself, by very careful examination. Taking

the method of computation used in the last report, viz.: Counting main stations with branches, and fields occupied by colporteurs, there have been occupied since 1877, 102 fields, of which but seventy-eight are at present occupied—loss twenty-four fields.

There are no tables from which a comparison can be drawn again till 1882. App. 1882—from which we learn by comparing, that the last year presents a gain over 1881 of forty-seven attendants at schools; but in church members there is a loss of 180 since 1882, or over thirty per cent.; but as the last report overstates the number of French members by at least seventy, there is a farther loss in all of 450. In Sunday school scholars there is in these two years a loss of 377, or the same per cent. as in 1882—there were sixteen students for the ministry, now only twelve. In 1882 there were circulated 1163 more copies of Scripture than in 1884.

These facts may surprise those who have believed we were doing a great work among the French, and who have been contributing under the idea that Lower Canada was just ready to turn Protestant.

I shall in my next show the causes which have produced this alarming state of things.

Iderton, July 7, 1884.

W. S. BALL.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF TORONTO vs. THE ARCHBISHOP OF ST. LOUIS.

MR. EDITOR.—In his letter to the late meeting of Assembly, Archbishop Lynch said: “No sane man with a respect for truth would attribute to Catholics the belief that ‘it is no sin to murder Protestants, to break with them or to injure them in any way,’” etc. The following extract went the round of the papers two or three years ago, and is taken from “The Shepherd of the Valley,” published at St. Louis under the immediate supervision of Archbishop Konrad:—

“We confess that the Church of Rome is intolerant—that is to say, that it uses all the means in its power for the extirpation of error and sin, but this intolerance is the logical and necessary consequence of its infallibility. She alone has the right to be intolerant, because she alone has the truth. The Church tolerates heretics where she is obliged to do so, but she hates them mortally, and employs all her force to secure their annihilation. When the Catholics shall here be in possession of a considerable majority—which will certainly be the case by-and-by, though the time may be long deferred—then religious liberty will have come to an end in the Republic of the United States. Our enemies say this, and we believe with them. Our enemies know that we do not pretend to be better than our Church, and in what concerns this, her history is open to the eyes of all. They know therefore how the Roman Church dealt with the heretics in the middle ages, and how she deals with them to-day everywhere where she has the power. We no more think of denying these historic facts than we do of blaming the saints of God and the princes of the Church for what they have done or approved in these matters.”—*Christian Intelligence*.

The above extract is different from the statement of the Archbishop of Toronto. Which speaks the truth?

J. B. S.

Essex, July, 1884.

THE SCOTT ACT.

Friends of temperance—soldiers of Christ, arise!

The greatest hindrance to the cause of God is strong drink. The evil cannot be remedied by license. We must have prohibition. The government will give it when we are ready for it. Our present duty is to use what we have.

The Scott Act kills the treating custom, thereby saving multitudes, and is a stepping-stone to prohibition. It has been carried in thirty constituencies in the Dominion, and is about to be submitted in as many more. What an opportunity! What a responsibility! Ministers, preach about it, hopefully, and lead the congregations in believing prayer for success.

Women of the Christian Temperance Union, concentrate your efforts. Voters, stand in readiness. One and all, pray and work—work and pray. See that every section is aroused. Get a copy of the Act, or what may be better for many, McKay's “Appeal,” and Brethour's “Wonderful Success of the Scott Law.” Read them—study them—carry them about among your neighbours. Help in forming committees, Help in raising money. Help in getting out voters. If you cannot work in any of these ways, cheer on the workers. “Whether losing—whether winning, trust in God, and do the right.” “The night cometh, when no man can work.”

J. GREENE.

Chesley, August, 1884.