

THE CANADA PRESBYTERIAN,

—PUBLISHED BY THE—

Presbyterian Printing & Publishing Co., Ltd.

AT 5 JORDAN STREET, - TORONTO.

Terms: Two Dollars Per Annum, Payable in Advance.

NEW SUBSCRIPTIONS may commence at any time during the year.

SUBSCRIPTIONS are understood as continuing from year to year, unless orders are given to the contrary. This is in accordance with the general wish of subscribers.

TO MAKE PAYMENT. The printed address label on your paper contains a date, which indicates the time up to which payment has been made. The money for renewal of subscriptions should be forwarded as early as possible after that date.

REMITTANCES should be made direct to us by Postoffice, or Express, Money Order, or in a Registered letter. If none of these precautions be observed, the money is at the risk of the sender. Local Cheques should not be sent unless at par in Toronto. Write names very plainly. Give the Post office address with every order.

RECEIPTS. We do not send receipts for subscriptions unless the request is accompanied with stamp. The change of date on a label will indicate within two weeks that the remittance was received.

CHANGES OF ADDRESS. When a change of address is ordered, both the new and the old address must be given, and notice sent one week before the change is desired.

ORDERS TO DISCONTINUE should always be sent direct to us by letter or postal card. Do not return a paper with something written on the margin. To do so is contrary to law, and unintelligible to the publishers. Accompany the order with payment of arrearages.

ADVERTISING RATES. Under 3 months, 15 cents per line per insertion; 3 months, \$1 per line, 6 months, \$1.75 per line, 1 year \$3. No advertisement charged at less than five lines. None other than unobjectionable advertisements taken.

—: COMMUNICATIONS SHOULD BE ADDRESSED :—

The Presbyterian Printing and Publishing Co., Ltd.,
5 Jordan St., Toronto.

The Canada Presbyterian.

C. BLACKETT ROBINSON, MANAGER.

TORONTO, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 22ND, 1894.

IT is rather unfortunate that the jubilee of Knox College should come so near the time when many ministers are taking their vacation. When the holidays are over there will be but one month to finish the raising of the \$26,000 needed to pay off the mortgage debt. Of course the work can be done in a month if the friends of Knox go at it in real earnest, but there is no use in disguising the fact that a month is but a short time in which to raise twenty-six thousand dollars. Why should any congregation wait until the pastor returns before taking the necessary steps to collect the funds. The college belongs to the church and has done much for the church. It is not a minister's affair particularly. Knox has always had generous friends among the people, and we hope they will see that the old institution begins her 51st year without one dollar of debt. Times may be a little hard at present but they are not half as hard as when our fathers founded the institution, and in proportion to their means gave much more for its maintenance than their sons are expected to give.

WE hear and read a good deal about the increased liberality of the church. Contrasts are drawn between the total sums given for church purposes by the last generation and the amounts now given, and the comforting conclusion is drawn that we are growing in the grace of liberality. The conclusion may be utterly foundationless. Totals show nothing but the amount given. The man who gave one dollar for the support of Knox College when the institution was one year old may have been a more liberal man than his son who pays ten towards the public fund. A hundred dollars given fifty years ago may have represented more self-denial, more self-sacrifice than is represented by thousands given now. Some of the friends of Knox well remember the enthusiasm with which the early settlers—poor though many of them were—went into the work of theological education in Toronto. Money was scarce and the country was poor, but the founders of Knox determined to provide an educated ministry for themselves and their children. A few weeks will show whether the children are as liberal as their fathers were.

SOME of our newspaper neighbours seem to think that a religious journal or "church paper," as such journals are usually called, should confine itself strictly to the discussion of purely moral and religious subjects and scrupulously avoid any reference to public men or public questions of a secular nature. We do not subscribe to any such doctrine. There is a moral element in every public question. A religious journal should have the welfare of the country as much at heart as any other kind of a journal. Incalculable mischief has been done in the United States by the theory that people

who take much interest in church affairs should have nothing to do with politics. With Chicago and New York under his eye, a man must be either intensely stupid or something worse, who holds that ministers and other people closely connected with churches should pay their taxes meekly and say nothing about the way they are expended, or the people who expend them. Of course a "church paper" that comments on public questions always runs the risk of being accused of partizanship, but the risk must be taken if the paper does its whole duty.

OUR neighbor, the *Globe*, has opened a vigorous campaign for law reform. Some of the reforms advocated may be brought about at an early day, some will require time and some may never be obtained. Determining the rights of men has always been difficult work. The suitor who loses his case is never satisfied with the administration of justice. Judges are human and like all the rest of us have their peculiarities. Some lawyers have manners that might make a cow-boy or mule-driver blush. As Mr. McCarthy says, human nature shows itself in the courts as well as in any other place and a long purse tells in a law suit as in most other things. Still, the fact that reforms are difficult is no reason in the world why they should not be attempted, and no doubt jurists of learning and experience could make many reforms in the administration of justice. The right of appeal is most cruelly used by some wealthy corporations to wear out and eventually defraud individual suitors. It has almost passed into a proverb that an individual man need not sue a railway or insurance company. "They hire their lawyers by the year," was the reason we once heard given by a prominent man of affairs why a friend of his did not bring an action against a well-known corporation. One large corporation in Canada is said to have for its motto, "appeal everything." We respectfully suggest that the *Globe*, while advocating law reforms that years may be needed to accomplish, should lay its powerful hand on a gross evil that might be materially lessened if not done away with in a few months. We refer to the brutal and cowardly manner in which witnesses are often treated by certain members of the Bar. Why should any decent citizen summoned and compelled to give evidence be grossly insulted for giving the evidence that the law compels him to give. Why should a coarse, bullying lawyer be allowed to abuse decent citizens in a court room in a manner that he dare not adopt anywhere else? Why should a court sustained by the people's money be used as a means of accusing decent citizens of the crime of perjury? The abuses complained of by the *Globe* for the most part touch only the pocket; the abuse of the legal bully touches the reputation and feelings. There are some things worse than a bill of costs, and a dirty, cowardly insinuation that you are committing perjury when telling the truth, is one of them. We have often wondered that the press, and especially the *Globe*, has not made a determined attack on this scandalous abuse which even the judges do not seem inclined to correct.

ON THE RIGHT SIDE AND ON THE WRONG.

OUR editorial columns last week were too much crowded with other matter to allow us to refer to the late action of the Roman Catholic church on a matter of wide general interest, and that of a kind which may ultimately be fraught with very great public benefit. It is well known that a vast majority of all the liquor-dealers in the country, in the United States, it is said two-thirds, claim connection with that church. This in itself is far from creditable to it; it has been little less than a scandal and has put it in the power of its enemies to point at it the finger of reproach. It must besides have made the work of all its clergy, and of other orders laboring for its good, difficult and discouraging. It has had within its pale many noble advocates of total abstinence, from Father Matthew in Ireland to the late Father Stafford, of Lindsay, Ontario, the memory and the results of whose labors still survive as a blessing. And the stand of this church as a whole on the subject of total abstinence has been steadily advancing. An illustration of this has been given in the recent action of the Roman Catholic Bishop of Columbus, Ohio, Bishop J. A. Watterson, whose name, when the cause of temperance has triumphed, as we believe it is destined to do, will rank high and be held in grateful and honored remembrance.

During the last Lenten season this bishop address-

ed a letter to his clergy and ordered it to be read to their several congregations, part of which is as follows:—"I hereby withdraw my approbation from any and every Catholic society or branch or division thereof in this diocese that has a liquor-dealer or saloon-keeper at its head or anywhere among its officers; and I suspend every such society itself from the rank and privileges as a Catholic society until it ceases to be so officered. I again publish the condition, without which for some years I have declined to approve of new societies or new branches of old organizations in this diocese, namely:—That no one who is engaged either as principal or agent in the manufacture or sale of intoxicating liquors can be admitted to membership."

"If there are saloon-keepers in your parish who call themselves Catholics, and yet carry on their business in a forbidden and disedifying way, or sell on Sundays, either openly or under any sort of guise or disguise, in violation of civil law, and to the hurt of order and religion and the scandal of any part of the community, you will refuse them absolution . . . unless they promise to cease offending."

We can easily fancy what a bomb-shell this would be to all the liquor-dealers in that diocese. Appeal was taken from it to Mgr. Satolli, the head of the Roman Church in the United States, who fully sustained Bishop Watterson in such clear and decisive terms as these: "Bishops have the right and duty to guard faith and morals within the limits of their dioceses. They are the divinely appointed judges in such matters, and hence no mere society or individual layman has the right to set such a decision at defiance. The mere fact that such a decision may be the cause of temporal loss does not justify opposition, as the temporal must give way to the spiritual good, and private good must give way to public good."

"The liquor traffic, and especially as conducted here in the United States, is the source of much evil; hence the Bishop was acting within his rights in seeking to restrict it."

"Therefore the Delegate Apostolic sustains Bishop Watterson's action and approves of his circular letter and regulation concerning saloons and the expulsion of saloon-keepers from membership in Catholic societies."

Over the whole country, the whole continent we might say, attention has been drawn to this action, and while its immediate and direct effect is local, yet the moral effect will be felt over the entire continent, not only in that church but in every other, for Protestant churches which have so long and valiantly been combatting the great and deadly foe of all good, the liquor traffic, the fruitful parent of vice in every form, not only cannot afford to take a lower stand with respect to it than the Roman Catholic Church, but will find in it over the length and breadth of the land, very soon we believe, an active and powerful ally in this war with liquor.

The *Wine and Spirits Gazette*, the official organ of the liquor business in New York, was foolish enough to challenge and dare Archbishop Corrigan of that city "to enforce in letter and spirit the decree against the liquor traffic just issued by Mgr. Satolli, the papal delegate. Let the archbishop do it, and watch the consequences."

The archbishop has promptly taken up the challenge in a letter addressed to the editor of the *Wine and Spirits Gazette*, in which he says: "In reply to your expressed wish I have the honor to say that I loyally accept the principles laid down by his Excellency, Mgr. Satolli, both in the spirit and the letter. More than this, no Catholic can refuse to accept them. As to the fear of consequences, I have yet, thank God, to learn what fear is in the discharge of duty. Please remember, however, that acceptance of principles is not to be confounded with the blind application of the same on all occasions and under all circumstances."

The qualification contained in the last clause cannot with any regard to decency, or to his official character and authority, be allowed to go too far, so that the Roman Catholic Church in New York city, in the person of the archbishop, and the liquor-dealers may be said to have declared war against each other. To all appearance the dealers have "waked up the wrong man," and if he is firm as he promises to be, and at the same time wise, the issue will not be doubtful. We rejoice in the attitude taken in this great conflict, in which there can be no quarter, by the Roman Catholic Church, in the person of Mgr. Satolli, because of the effect it must have in leading to the overthrow of this gigantic evil and all others bound up with it on this continent. This church on the liquor question is on the right side.