

Contributors and Correspondents.

ENGLAND.

ANADIAN HONOR IN LONDON. MEETINGS AT MISS McPHERSON'S HOUSE. LOSS OF LIFE IN THE GREAT CITY. "FIDDLER JOSE"—INCURRING PARTICULARS.

Faul's Family Hotel, King St. Cheap side, is a quiet place as you can expect to find in the heart of London, and very convenient both for business men and sight-seers. Somehow it has become the resort of many Canadians. Here I met several from Toronto and Montreal. One, an elder of the C. P. Church, hearing of the meeting at Miss McPherson's house expressed a desire to join me. It was quite dark as we threaded our way past the Bank to Bishop Lane St. without, choosing the back streets to avoid the throngs of vehicles and foot-passengers which choke the main arteries of the city, as its thousands of liberated toilers are occupying to the suburbs for the night. When we returned between nine and ten, the streets were almost deserted, though they show more life an hour later when the theatres and music saloons give forth their crowds of pleasure seekers. Taking a narrow street to the right (Brushfield) we soon come out upon Commercial St. Spitalfield, within a hundred yards of the Home—in the centre of one of London's most degraded districts. Measure a quarter of a mile each way into that mass of old tenements, and you will see into how small a space a population of over 120,000 may be crowded. A large proportion of these are paupers or criminal outcasts from society, perishing for lack of knowledge—in short entirely destitute of spiritual sustenance (as well as scantily furnished with bodily aliment) but for the self-denying labours of such as the band of hero and heroines we meet to-night. It is true the building which towers its stately form above the ragged rubble is a church, but being known to be such is carefully avoided by them. As we are rather early, we turn down the first alley for a little cruise of observation, but the odour of the low dirty archways and the sinister suspicious glance of their denizens are not encouraging, so we soon turn and having got safely past a rough crowd, watching a fight between a couple of drunken women, we are glad to put back to the comparative respectability of the main street. Another time I may give some account of a Sunday evening spent with a missionary band among these haunts of vice, meantime here is the great brick ex-warehouse which does duty as a Home of Industry, easily known by the texts which fill its windows, such as "Thou God see'st me;" "Be sure your sin will find you out," &c. Miss McPherson makes us welcome and while the company are gathering over head, she conducts us through her inner and outer offices, adorned with a marine picture with numerous of Canada &c into the work room, where some little match box makers still in and chit-chat give us a specimen of their skill. But the workers who are skill is concentrated to the gathering of gems for the Redeemer's crown now claim our attention. The quiet lady in black who meets Miss M. with a sisterly embrace is Miss Lowe, the daughter of the Governor of St. Helena, at the time of Napoleon's imprisonment, who first introduced Miss M. many years ago to her present sphere of labour. She has left the luxurious precincts of Court life an honoured attendance upon royalty here to do a lovely work of love for a higher sovereign than earth knows. In the hall we met with Mr. Them, who last summer made his first voyage to Canada in charge of a band of rescued Arabs, and is not easily tired of talking of the sunny land across the ocean.

The second flat is the schoolroom, almost the whole size of the house, rather low, unplastered and uncarpeted but whitewashed clean; as well ventilated as its shape will allow. Here a goodly company are gathering for the tea at six, increasing to about three hundred when the addresses begin at seven. The tea-hour is one of free and pleasant intercourse. That dark young man so assiduous with the tray is pointed out as one of the soldiers recently dismissed from the army of his country for preaching, now more fully than ever doing duty as a soldier of the Cross. A broad smile of recognition and welcome lights up many a face, as Mrs. Birt (Miss McP's sister) brings into the centre and introduces a bright-eyed little man, of middle age and somewhat prim figure. It is Mr. Peole, alias "Fiddler Josh"; once a strolling musician and reckless servant of the devil, converted in a prisonland now with the help of his wife holding nightly meetings in a tent in the East End and doing a most remarkable work among the degraded and neglected.

At seven sharp the chair is taken by Mr. Morgan of the Christian, who after a hymn and prayer by Miss McPherson, delivers an address upon Jonathan and his many brethren, appropriate to the subject of the evening. "Our Work." Then follows the most interesting man of the evening with a best address, Dr. Bernard. His bright features with his small stature combine to give him a youthful appearance, but as he proceeds to discuss the difficulties of the work and to set forth with clearness, freedom and power, how the love of Christ should strengthen for all things and especially for a larger self-denial and more abounding devotion, one can stand the searching test of "Lovest thou me more than these?" you feel that it is a man of no ordinary powers of mind, depth of feeling, and strength of purpose who speaks—one from whom, if spared, much may be expected. His work among the poor lads and others in Stepney Causeway has already yielded able results and in connection with the Home there, there is now being formed under his care a training school for home and foreign missionaries, intended especially to meet the case of those who have not the means of a collegiate course, and yet might with practical training soon become valuable assistants in needy mission fields. In connection with this department Mr. Grattan Guinness is at present visiting some of the larger towns of the kingdom, lecturing on "The world and the work," inviting recruits to enlist. Meantime Mr. Guinness, is here from headquarters at Bath, to tell us something of his mission work among the cabmen there, a much neglected and often prodigal class. With the co-operation of the master cab owners they have been able for some months to maintain a morning meeting at six, closing with hot coffee and bread and butter at seven. A marked improvement in the cabmen is already apparent.

But time and space fail me to tell of the work described by Mr. Ives of Gray's Yard Ragged Church in the West End, by the railway porter whose Mission Hall is a railway arch rented at £20 a year, and last though not least that conducted so patiently, prayerfully and perseveringly by Mr. Geo. Holland in George Yard. The old man's address was most interesting, but it was sad to hear him say that after 20 years of labour in which many individuals had been rescued, the locality was as bad as ever. The place is not far from Miss McP's home and the statement gives an idea of the strong faith required in such labours. Yet Mr. A. has declined more than on appointment in the Church of England for which he was educated. In such a state of things we can see good reason why foreign fields should not be left untouched till home heathenism has been eradicated. Will may Dr. Bernard say what we need above all is more power from above. God grant it to these noble workers!

CANADIAN ABROAD.

London, Jan 1873.

MINIATURES PRESENTS.

DEAR SIR,—It is no doubt pleasing to read in your interesting columns of so many tokens of love on the part of congregations to their devoted pastors for their work's sake. The page on which is found the caption "Ministers and Churches" is the first to which we turn. Every item of news relating to our beloved Zion ought to have a charm for souls that have tasted of heavenly grace. Yet there is surely a limit of propriety which should be observed in proclaiming to the whole world every thing that is done, and every little present carried to the manse. Were I at the side of some of your correspondents I would whisper, "Don't blow the trumpet on every occasion. When you wish to make known some worthy deed, or gift, for the sake of stimulating and provoking others to like zeal, take heed that you put it in a form worthy of a religious paper. Let your conversation be as it becometh the Gospel of Christ."

A flippant use of the Word of God is not to be tolerated in any case. One of your correspondents in a long and irreverent paragraph writes of his minister (newly married) having plucked "the Rose of Sharon!" and then attempts a pun about a present of which he says, "This will reverse the case of Lot's wife and make it pleasant to look back." I hope the writer will pause a little, and consider whose is that Word with which he takes liberties. I do not wish to be censorious. Friends may allow such expressions to slip from them without consideration, and would be very sorry to be guilty of it, but it is injurious tho' not so intended, and it may not be unprofitable to direct attention to it.

DR. ORMISTON VERSUS ORTHODOXY.

DEAR SIR,—In the last number of your paper there is a statement in an article written by Dr. Ormiston which ought not to pass unnoticed. It is, namely, "The grand mission of the Saviour into our world was to make this reconciliation here possible and easy." The reconciliation here spoken of, as appears from what proceeds, is reconciliation with God, and he affirms in the sentence quoted that the grand mission of the Saviour into our world was to make this possible and easy. Does he mean possible and easy for God to forgive and accept those who may repent and believe the Gospel? Then it implies the governmental theory of the atonement, and the great work of Christ, had no special reference to any persons but merely to the law. It only opened up the way by which God may extend to those who choose to repent and return to Him his mercy. Or does he mean that Christ's grand mission into the world was to make it possible and easy for Man to be reconciled with God? Then this is the Armenian theory by which Man is regarded as placed in a salvable state, so that if he will only use what good still remain in him he may repent and believe the gospel, be reconciled to God and saved. In other words on account of what Christ has done for the human race, it is now possible and easy for the sinner to save himself. Both these theories make man's salvation to hinge upon man himself make it uncertain whether any will be saved; for they make it only "possible," not certain.

How different are the statements of God's word on this point. "For if when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life." And not only so, but we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement. Rom. 5: 10-11—"He is our peace who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us, having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace; and that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby." Eph. 2: 14-16—"Who his own self bear our sins in his own body on the tree, that we being dead to sins should live unto righteousness; by whose stripes we were healed." 1 Pet. 2: 24—"So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many." Heb. 9: 28—"He hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." 2 Cor. 5: 21. There is no uncertainty, no bare possibility of reconciliation with God in such passages as these. For sinners he came, for them he suffered and died, that he might be reconciled to God. And all those whose sin he did bear in his own body on the tree will certainly, in time, have effectually applied to them the benefits of his mediation.

Founded upon such passages as the above, how very different and satisfactory is the statement made in the V. Sec. of the Conf. of the Confession of Faith; namely, "The Lord Jesus, by his perfect obedience and sacrifice of himself which he through the Eternal Spirit once offered up unto God, hath fully satisfied the justice of his Father; and purchased not only reconciliation, but an everlasting inheritance in the Kingdom of heaven, for all those who in the Father hath given him." Very different from merely making it possible and easy for them to be reconciled to God, or for them to reconcile themselves to God, God was not merely ready to reconcile, but fully reconciled by "the grand mission of our Saviour into our world;" and instead of making "this reconciliation here possible and easy," he has perfectly effected the reconciliation. If God were made then by only reconciling, the same acts of our own must be the proper ground of our reconciliation. But such a sentiment is substantive of the gospel, which everywhere declares, that Christ made reconciliation by his death. Rom. 5: 10.

To me it is really painful to read such statements as the above written by men occupying prominent positions in the Church of Christ as Dr. Ormiston does. They are calculated to do much mischief and ought not to be allowed to pass unchallenged. Is it that evil communications in the City of New York have corrupted those who were so recently prominent in the Canada Presbyterian Church; or was there a lack of soundness in the faith before they left? "Charity hopeth all things;" and I earnestly hope that those who have gone to that great centre of influence will maintain in all their fitness and purity the great and glorious doctrines of the everlasting Gospel of Jesus Christ. May God preserve them from uttering such base, unguarded, and unscriptural statements as the one under review is the play.

Yours truly,  
A LOVER OF TRUTH.

Feb. 11, 1873.

CONTROVERSIAL WRANGLING.

DEAR SIR,—I have observed with surprise and regret the uncharitable and unchristian spirit which pervades many of the controversial letters published from time to time in your columns. You have frequently censured the bitterness and rancour displayed in political contests, and deplored their disastrous effects on the morality of the country. But is it very surprising that party leaders and party organs should be coarse in their hostility and unsparring in their epithets when grave ministers of the Gospel and pious office-bearers in the church so sedulously copy their example; and this, not in the heat of a mere discussion, but in the tranquility of their studies? Perhaps the politicians have caught their tone from the church courts and the religious press! Are those correspondents of yours to whom I refer really jealous for the truth or do they simply wish to gain the victory and display their skill in controversy? For my part I cannot conceive how earnest men, profoundly believing what they advocate, and sincerely striving to make others also believe, can condescend to paltry verbal criticism and indecent personal abuse. Granted that a letter is absurd, is it not possible to expose its absurdity without making the writer feel that he is a fool? And granted that a man advocates usages clearly contrary, as some think, to the standards of the church and the oracles of God, may not his error be demonstrated and corrected without charging him with apostasy, or heresy, or perhaps, infidelity? I am neither a minister, nor office-bearer, nor member of the church; I am simply an adherent; and I freely confess that all this unseemly wrangling about organs and what not has been to me a great stumbling block. And it must be so to many others. Your paper goes every week, say, to four thousand families. It is read by old and young, members and non-members. The children read it—Sunday-school children who are taught that "God is love" and to love their neighbour as themselves. Who can estimate its influence and who can doubt that the influence of such controversies is evil and evil only!

N. N. N.

FAIR PLAY.

DEAR SIR,—J. S. in his letter in the Organ Question in your paper of Jan. 13th, refers to the services last Christmas day in St. Andrew's and Zion Churches in Montreal. I quite agree with him in regretting that Protestants should so far extol themselves to the "poor Papists" as to keep that day. But, I must say that he has acted very unfairly in finding fault with one portion of the Presbyterians and one of the Congregationalists for having done so, and taking no notice whatever of other Protestants who were equally guilty with them. I do not refer so much to the Episcopalians as to others whose observance of the afore-mentioned Epiphany festival is more wonderful. In the article in the Montreal Witness regarding St. Andrew's and Zion Churches, we are distinctly told that a meeting was held in Cote St. Louis church (a Canada Presbyterian) last Christmas Day, at which Dr. Burns preached a sermon suitable to the occasion from Malachi 1: 1. If I am not very much mistaken, the fact just stated is placed between the one relating to St. Andrew's and that relating to Zion Church, so that J. S. has "skipped over" it in passing from the former to the latter of the other two. At any rate, I know that it is in the article, and that it has a prominent place there. We are also told in that article that a Sabbath-school festival in connection with the American Church was held on the morning of Christmas Day, and one in the C. P. Mission Church, Nazareth street, in the evening. At the latter Dr. Burns and the Rev. Mr. Jones and several laymen of the C. P. Church took part. Now, Mr. Editor, suppose that I am a magistrate, and three persons are brought before me charged with, say disorderly conduct. One is a very near relation of mine, another is a distant relation, but the third not related to me at all. The charge is sustained. All are proved to be equally guilty. Well, I let the first go unpunished because we are closely related, but the second, because we are only distantly related, and the third, because we are not related at all, I make feel the lash of the law. Would not this be gross partiality? But this is just what J. S. has done, so far as I can see. I inter that he is a Canada Presbyterian from his writing on the Organ Question. Now the heathen proverb is a very just one, "Let justice be done though the heavens should fall." Surely professing Christians ought not, in the matter of justice, to be inferior to heathens.

Yours, Mr. Editor,  
A CANADIAN PRESBYTERIAN.

Feb. 11, 1873.

INFORMATION WANTED.

DEAR SIR,—I refer to your report of the late meeting of the Presbytery of Bruce that had been placed a resolution at the bar of the court without a moderator, and declared its action in a certain case ipso facto null and void. Is it in accordance with the laws of the church to place a resolution at the bar of the Presbytery without a moderator? If not, is not the action of the Presbytery in said case ipso facto null and void? Will some of those versed in church law answer?

Yours, &c.,  
Z.

THE PAPIST AND THE PROTESTANT.

DEAR SIR,—Permit me to say, for the benefit of "A Rich Protestant," that the point in his letter which I thought might possibly have excited a smile from the "Poor Papist," was his answering the epistle as if it were really written by a bona fide Papist, which, as I stated, I did not believe it was. Of course, however, I may be mistaken in this. I thought my meaning had been made sufficiently clear by the context, and it did not occur to me that he could have misunderstood it so as to imply that there was anything intrinsically laughable in his letter. That there was anything untrue in it, I neither said nor insinuated. I am very glad that he agrees so heartily with the substance of my letter.

Yours, &c.,  
A LOVER OF TRUTH.

Feb. 17th, 1873.

COLLEGE VERSUS COLLEGES.

DEAR SIR,—The College question is now being agitated among us and it is well that it is so. Your correspondent Index says "people continually ask why there are two Colleges belonging to our Church, when one could do the work," and he proceeds to add that "no person has ever given a reasonably satisfactory answer." It is evident that many of the warmest friends amongst us of an educated ministry are seriously considering whether or not two Colleges are necessary. To my mind this is an important question. If no satisfactory answer can be given for having two Colleges the conclusion is inevitable that they are unnecessary; if they are not necessary then the Church is justifiable in withholding its means from the support of two Colleges and compelling them to produce the best result.

I do not see that the fact of our having two Colleges at present necessitates the continuance of them, if we as a church decide that we do not need them.

What we need and must have is a Theological College that will be second to none in this continent. This much desired end I am convinced can only be accomplished by the concentration of our wealth and the bringing together of our ablest teachers. It matters little by what name this institution may be called or whether it be located in Toronto, Kingston, or Montreal; students will congregate wherever there are the best advantages. What we want is an institution which shall have the strong confidence of all our people, and whose efficient management, aside from all local and petty motives, shall be able to retain that confidence.

I am credibly informed that there are thirty Canadian students studying in American Theological institutions, nineteen of whom were once in connection with Knox College. I have conversed with a number of them and have invariably found that they left because they considered that the home church was not doing what might reasonably be expected from it in the matter of instruction. Now if when a few years ago our Church instead of founding a second institution had thoroughly equipped the one that it had, is it probable that her sons would now be found in foreign institutions?

The state of our mission fields demands that not only our men be retained but that our pecuniary means be applied to sustaining the Gospel in those fields, and not frittered away on unnecessary objects. We have no superfluous resources.

Let us by all means have a College, but one that shall in every sense of the term be the College of the Church.—P. S.

Thank you for your kind letter of the 11th.