

ch. for-
Alfred
cepted,
s pastor

rth, is a
ate of
r being
v. D. J.
me, and
call to

ve been
s attend
prayer
indier's
already
future.
he con-
out 100
year of
raised

ful city
Lieut.
orn in
d was
of the
scend-
ntified
anters.
town
ith, of
supply
d the
resid-
re are
ed to
Wilson

are of
efore
wish
d sar-
As a
I had
rival-
seen
an-
with
yter-
but
ser-
sist-
yres.
K.

ION

sion
ver-
ant
vers
ici-
sia-
lia,
in-
al's
the
his
in
he
he
for
il-
ly
ut
In
a-
c-
er
s,
s,
c.
ig
d-
ey
so
e.
e.
t
s
s
e
s
o

301. That the Presbyterian people of the west contribute so liberally for the support of ordinances, and supply so large an amount of the funds for building churches and mansees, is good evidence that the policy pursued meets with their approval; and being on the spot they ought to be good judges. But if the church occupies new ground and builds, and is sooner or later followed by another denomination, is the Presbyterian congregation to be disbanded and are we to leave the field? One might get tired repeating the process, for he would have to reckon with Anglicans, Methodists, Baptists, Plymouth Brethren and others. But what about building two churches or three in small villages where there are not enough people to make one congregation? If there are three churches they are, likely, Presbyterian, Anglican and Methodist. The Anglicans are exclusive, and will not give their churches to other denominations. Union churches have been built at a few points, but experience has shown that these come to be controlled and possessed, so that the Presbyterian people find it advisable in the interests of peace and the maintenance of self-respect to erect a building of their own. But such villages as are referred to are only the headquarters of the missions, the missionary supplying the people of his own church for 12 or 15 miles on each side of the railway. In any case two missionaries would be needed; and if they belong to different churches the local support is more generous. In over 30 of the towns and villages on the railways east of the Rockies the Presbyterian congregations are self-supporting, and in a few years the number will be largely increased. The conditions that obtain in a new country differ greatly from those in an old. The small village of to-day will become a town in five years hence, mayhap, and early neglect will leave its imprint for the future. While the relation of the denominations is such as now exists, the church that looks after its own people is the one which will secure the respect of its people and most speedily gather strength. The church might ask its people to unite with other churches, but they might refuse and their friends in the east, because attached to the church of their fathers, might refuse to contribute to the Home Mission Fund. Such things have already happened. Is the present state of things, then, quite satisfactory? No, but it would scarcely be improved by any of the methods that have so far been suggested. The Presbyterian church is holding services to-day—there are no other Protestant church conducts service and other churches hold services where we have not deemed it advisable, although asked, to begin work. Where Presbyteries and Synods—Home Mission committees control this work and know the ground, and where missionaries who are interested in saving the Home Mission Fund form so large a proportion of these courts, the church may rest assured that there is no needless extension or overlapping. And any lurking doubt would be driven out by considering the extent of the field and the modest measure of support given the Fund. J. R.

THE JERUSALEM CHRISTIAN UNION MISSION.

After spending a delightful fortnight in Scotland, where the Rev. A. Ben-Oliel preached in Dr. Alison's Church in Edinburgh, and the Rev. R. McMillan's and the Rev. Alex. Andrew's in Glasgow, and addressed a most enthusiastic meeting at the Rev. Dr. Kerr's, we had to hurry our return to London, as a meeting had been arranged by Colonel Morton and Mr. Wilkinson at the Mildmay Conference Hall for Oct. 19th. Our daughter remained behind to take a drawing-room meeting kindly got up for her at Mrs. Elliott's, in Edinburgh, when Mrs. Scott Moncrieff, who was in the chair and the Rev. Dr. Teape spoke most warmly of our work in Jerusalem, which they had seen when in the Holy Land. The Rev. George Wilson also spoke. At Glasgow a meeting for Jews was held, when Dr. Kerr took the chair, and the Rev. R. McMillan was present and offered prayer. There were fully 120 Jews present who listened attentively to Mr. B. for three quarters of an hour and afterwards asked questions. He also spoke to the Jews at Mr. Wilkinson's Central Hall in London.

On Nov. 4th, at the urgent desire of our friends in this great country, we left England, and arrived in New York, after a very stormy voyage, on Nov. 13th, to find to our surprised joy that our dear friend, the Rev. D. M. Stearns, was about to hold his first Bible Class in that city in the Hebrew Christian Church. He introduced Mr. Ben-Oliel and asked him to speak a few words.

Our spirits have been refreshed by coming among the earnest Christian workers in New York, and especially those who are engaged in work among the Jews. At Mr. Freshman's on Friday and Sunday evenings we found delightful fruit of his earnest work for years past patiently persevered in when he stood alone amid much opposition. Mr. Ben-Oliel was asked to address the Jews gathered by one of the converts, Dr. Faust, and he gave them some of the prophetic proofs of the Messiahship of Jesus. It was delightful to see the attentive and decorous behaviour of the audience, both there and at Mr. Warszawski's, where we went afterwards.

The first meeting was just closing and a crowd were pressing into a side room for an after meeting. Mr. Warszawski quickly recognized Mr. Ben-Oliel and begged him to come to the platform and address the meeting. Later on we attended a prayer meeting to ask a blessing on the work of the day, and then Mr. W. and his fellow-helper, Mr. Cruckshank, invited us to the home for persecuted Christian Hebrews, where we met a number of Christian workers. It was a joy to see God's answer to prayer in the presence of Mrs. Warszawski. She much feels the separation from her children and asked our prayers that they may soon be restored to her.

At the Rev. A. B. Simpson's also we were cordially and hospitably welcomed and Mr. B. requested to address the gathering.

Wherever we go people say they have heard of our work and longed to see Mr. Ben-Oliel. He is invited by the Rev. D. M. Stearns to join him in his week of work at 14 Bible classes who are already interested in his work and accordingly has accompanied him to his classes at Brooklyn, Bethlehem, Stroudsburg, Belvidere, Easton and Allentown, in all of which the attendance was remarkably good, and all manifested deep interest in what they heard. Last evening he assisted the Rev. George Needham in the week night service here and to-morrow he continues the round with Mr. Stearns to Philadelphia, Coatesville, Pottstown, Baltimore, New York, Wilmington and Harrisburgh, and on Sunday is to preach in Mr. Stearns' Church here on Prophecy fulfilling in the Holy Land.

We ask the prayers of God's people for us in this work of rousing interest in the cause of His ancient people, especially those in Jerusalem, to whom we hope to return shortly, encouraged and better equipped for carrying on the work amongst them, and also that his message to the Jews in this country may be greatly blessed to them.

We ask especially the ministers who have visited Jerusalem and worshipped with us in the "Upper Room," which the Lord enabled us to provide for Christians of all denominations in the Holy City, to give opportunities of presenting the cause of Jerusalem before their congregations while we are in this land.

AGNES BEN-OLIEL.

Germantown, Nov. 23rd, 1893.

Please address, care of the Rev. Dr. Rice, 150 Nassau Street, New York.

REV. D. D. MACLEOD AND THE PRESBYTERY OF VICTORIA.

Sir,—Would you allow me a few words in reference to the resolution of the Presbytery of Victoria, which appeared in your issue of this week, and which had reference to two letters written by me and appearing in the *Globe* of the 10th and 16th of October last. These letters contained the view taken by me and others of the proceedings of that Presbytery in the case of the Rev. P. McF. MacLeod. These proceedings as reported, and as known to me from accurate information, appeared not only unjust and oppressive, but calculated to prejudice the interests of Mr. MacLeod before the church. Therefore in his defence and in the defence of justice I sent the letters complained of to the "secular

press." Of course I considered the statements made in these letters "true" and "just," and do so still, and that they were much more "charitable" in spirit, though they made no profession in that direction, than the actions of the brethren referred to. I have not so learned Presbyterianism as to believe that a Presbytery, however unjust its procedure, is above criticism. A Presbytery may be made a very effective instrument of oppression under the protection of ecclesiastical forms. And if ever the whole proceedings in this case are laid before the church I do not think that I will be judged as having gone beyond the limits of legitimate criticism in the letters referred to. When the actions of a Presbytery are honorable and dignified there will be no shield required for its "dignity and honor," and while there is no one more willing than I am to give "honor to whom honor is due," whether it be an individual or a court, I will not from regard to what may be imagined to be the "honor and dignity" of a court, refrain from defending a brother whom I regard as having been grievously wronged, or from condemning as strongly as I can what appears to me irregular and unjust proceedings on the part of a Presbytery. Does not our Confession of Faith say that "all Synods or councils since the Apostles' times, whether general or particular, may err, and many have erred?" The Presbytery of Victoria therefore should not regard it as impossible that they should err, or as a serious misdemeanor to assert that they have done so.

Yours, etc.,

D. D. MACLEOD.

Barrie, Jan. 11th, 1894.

Dear Sir:—The discussion at the last meeting of the Presbytery of Toronto in regard to the "Book of Praise," seems to require some explanation when such conservative men as Drs. Gregg and Caven appear as if on opposite sides of a great question, such as the maintenance of the use of the Psalms in public worship assuredly is.

The difference, however, is only apparent. The great lament of Dr. Gregg, in his speech at the last Assembly, was that the use of the Psalms was passing away, and that frequently meetings for worship were held where no Psalms were used, and Dr. Caven as strongly opposed any step which would serve to put the Psalter out of use. On reference to the Assembly Minutes, however, it will be found that the Hymnal Committee brought in a report meditating a re-modelling of the "Hymnal," but no word of touching the Psalter; in fact, it was stated during the discussion that difficulties existed in the way of publishing the Psalter in this country, on account of old country copyrights of music, etc. Statements were made as to the desirability of having one book only, but no formal resolution was arrived at to that effect, and no decision was come to, having only one book in view; many supposed, and do so still, that the Hymnal Committee had to do with the "Hymnal" only, and that the question which they presented was, shall any of the Psalms be incorporated in the "Hymnal"? The affirmative of this question was held by many who desire the use of the Psalms and would not by any means lay hands on the Psalter as we have it, and believe now that the whole matter was sent down for the consideration of Presbyteries.

The real questions at issue in this matter appear to be, first, shall we have one "Book of Praise" alone, in which the entire Psalter will be bound up, and no part of the "Book of Praise" allowed to be sold without the other; in other words, that no Hymnal be published that has not in connection with it the entire Psalter; or, whether the Psalter shall still be sold, and a Hymnal also which might contain certain selections from the Book of Psalms, two books as we now have them.

Mr. Editor, this seems to me to be the point of difficulty as between the different parties in the Presbytery of Toronto, and not, as it first appeared, a desire on the part of any one to do away, or minister in any sense to the doing away, with the use of the Psalms.

Excuse me for trespassing upon your space, but it has occurred to me that a statement in this direction might serve to explain a seeming difference of opinion in regard to the use of the Psalms themselves.

Yours, M. S.

Toronto.

Christian Endeavor.

IN WHAT ARE WE OUR BROTHERS' KEEPERS?

BY REV. W. S. M'AVISH, B.D., ST. GEORGE.

Jan. 21.—Rom. xiv: 13-25; xiv: 1-3.

The gospel of selfishness is squarely opposed to the gospel of Christ. The selfish man considers that he is not in any sense his brother's keeper; that he has enough to do to take care of himself; and that if he cannot take care of himself he deserves to fall. He cannot rejoice when he sees mercy extended to another—rather, indeed, is he likely to be envious when he sees the prosperity of another. But the example and teaching of Christ show how vain, how foolish, how sinful is the spirit of selfishness. In the parable of the Good Samaritan, Jesus taught us that we are our brothers' keepers?

We are are our brothers' keepers inasmuch as we are responsible for evil done to them by any stumbling-blocks we put in their way (Rom. 14: 13). As this is a temperance topic the thought may be illustrated in this way. The great stumbling-block in the way of some men is a bar-room. Now, a new bar-room cannot be opened in any locality without the sanction of one-half of the ratepayers in that ward or polling sub-division. And yet, when a petition is circulated for the opening of such an institution, there are some professing Christians who are so thoughtless that they sign it. There have been cases where bar-rooms could not have been opened without the consent of professing Christians, and yet they have been opened. Then, too, when an opportunity is given of saying, by means of the ballot, that these stumbling-blocks shall be removed, there are some who call themselves Christians who are so indifferent that they either remain away from the polls, or else vote for the continuation of the license system. They vote in favor of a traffic which all the churches have declared to be evil. God has said, "Take ye up the stumbling-block out of the way of my people" (Isa. lvii: 14), and yet many who claim to be followers of Christ seem to be forgetful of this command. If we realize our responsibility in this regard we should put forth every effort to remove this terrible stumbling-block.

Connected with this, there is the thought that if the stumbling-block be immediately removed, it is our duty to help a brother who has fallen or is likely to fall. We should bring to bear upon him all the good and helpful influences in our power. Joel Stratton might have left John B. Gough to stagger on in his sinful career, but he brought all the influence of his loving, generous heart to bear upon the almost hopeless wreck and from that day Gough became a sober and better man. When Mr. J. J. Woolley entered the office of Stephen Merrit in New York the latter might have said "Am I my brother's keeper? If you through your intemperance, have lost your home, blasted your prospects, and become a physical and moral wreck, who is responsible? You should have seen your danger and guarded against it." Had he been a man of a Cain-like spirit that is what he would have said. But he is a man in whose heart love reigned, and when Mr. Woolley entered the office Mr. Merrit, instead of thrusting him into the street, sent him to a camp-meeting on the banks of the beautiful Hudson. Woolley stands to-day a living monument of what the grace of God and Christian sympathy can do for a fallen man. Around us there may be some who are already wrecks, and others who are plunging headlong to where they shall become such. What are we doing for them? As followers of Him who went about doing good, it is our duty to try to help and save them.

Again we are our brothers' keepers inasmuch as we are responsible for the example we set before them. One man may be able to drink moderately, another because of his natural temptation, or because of his acquired appetite, cannot. The man who can drink moderately may try to justify his moderate use of strong drink by saying, "If my neighbor must drink to excess I am not responsible; he should take care of himself." But if prompted by a spirit of Christian love, he will say, "If drink make my brother to offend I shall not touch strong drink while the world standeth."