

# British American Presbyterian.

VOL. I.

TORONTO, CANADA, FRIDAY, MAY 2, 1872.

No. 12

## Contributors & Correspondents.

### NEW BRUNSWICK.

Liquor Bill defeated—Induction of Rev. Wm. Wilson—Irish Delegate—Dr. J. L. Porter, of Belfast.

From our own Correspondent.

The Liquor Bill which I referred to in a former letter as being promoted by the Evangelical Alliance, the Young Men's Christian Association, and the Temperance bodies, failed to pass the House of Assembly. A delegation of the leading wholesale liquor dealers went from here to Fredericton to lobby against it, and the result shows that the lobbying, however done, was eminently successful. Hints were freely indulged in by the daily press, as to the form the persuasion took. It was said that cases of champagne were freely distributed among the members, and perhaps more than that. It is plain that the wholesale bodies will stick at nothing to defeat any attempts to restrict the traffic. Petitions signed by as many as 3,000 of the best citizens of St. John were sent up in favor of the Bill, but it was rejected by a large majority. It was not treated with courtesy even by men whom we used to esteem respectable and cultivated. The expressions that were used in speaking of the Bill will not soon be forgotten by the petitioners, and prominent among the opposers of the Bill was the Attorney General who sits for the city and county of St. John, and from whom better things were expected by his constituents. Wedderburn who is one of the representatives of the city, and Willis who is a colleague of the Attorney General for the city and county, did yeoman service on behalf of the Bill. I see that a Bill quite as stringent in some respects as the one proposed here was triumphantly carried by the Nova Scotia House of Assembly, but it was defeated in the Legislative Council.

The Presbytery of St. John met in St. Stephens a week ago to-day and inducted the Rev. Robert Wilson, late of Chatham of this Province, into the pastoral charge of the Border Town. St. Stephen is one of the most growing and prosperous towns in New Brunswick. It is pleasantly situated on the River St. Croix, on the opposite bank of which is Calais, Maine. A great deal of lumbering is done in both towns, indeed it is almost wholly to that trade that they owe their prosperity. The history of Presbyterianism in St. Stephen does not go back much beyond 20 years. Rev. Andrew Stephens, now of New Zealand, laboured there for a time. A brother of his who is a judge still resides there and dispenses princely hospitality to the members of Presbytery when they go to the town. He is also an elder of the congregation. Some 17 or 18 years since William Elder, who is now editor and proprietor of one of the leading daily papers of the Lower Provinces, was settled over the St. Stephen congregation and it was by his exertion that the handsome church in which they now worship was built. Mr. Elder started and conducted with great power the *Colonial Presbyterian* which a few years ago was merged into the *Presbyterian Advocate*. Since he resigned the charge some eight or nine years ago the congregation has had many vicissitudes to pass through, the worst of which was that a settled pastor did not stay long enough to build it up, and often there was none at all. Mr. Wilson is a man of large experience, and of great and varied ability. He is a native of Scotland, and was long in the ministry of the Congregational body, having labored for a time in England before he came to these Provinces. About two years ago he sought and obtained admission into the Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces. Though somewhat advanced in years, he is in the vigor of life both in body and mind. His settlement was quite harmonious, and there is every reason to hope that the congregation of St. Stephens will now enter on a season of growth such as has not been experienced for a long time past. There is one encouraging feature in the settlement—the salary furnished is larger than that which is received by any of the ministers of our Province outside of St. John.

The delegate that will represent the Irish Presbyterian Church this year at the American and Canadian Assemblies and Synods, is a man of very distinguished ability. Dr. J. L. Porter is widely known as an authority of the highest class in all that pertains to Scripture lands. His residence for many years in the ancient city of Damascus gave him opportunities which he

improved to the utmost. It would seem as if there is not a spot in Palestine that his eye has not gazed on, so thoroughly did he explore it. For ten years past he has filled the Chair of Biblical Criticism and Exegesis, or, as it is sometimes styled, that of Sacred Literature, in the Theological Hall, Belfast. He is son-in-law of Dr. Henry Cooke, whose biographer he also is. Some of your readers will see an article in the last *Presbyterian Quarterly*, which purports to be a friendly review of this biography. The only regret there will be is, that the time is necessarily so short that Dr. Porter can stay on this side the Atlantic. A summer vacation is not enough now to see the States and the Canada. With the experience he has as a traveller, he will doubtless do the best possible, considering the time, that will be at his disposal.

H. St. John, April 23rd, 1872.

### UNION IN CONNECTION WITH THE COLLEGES.

EXPEDIENCY OF RECEIVING QUEEN'S COLLEGE—VIEWED APART FROM ITS THEOLOGICAL DEPARTMENT—INTO THE UNITED CHURCH.

SIR,—A great deal has been said on this subject, and sometimes without due regard to good taste and brotherly courtesy. To apply to Parliament for such legislation as shall bring Queen's College into the same relation to the United Church in which it now stands to the Kirk, plainly means to take the necessary steps to acquire a legal right to the College and its Endowment. This is the only way in which it can become the property of the United Church. Some say that it implies also the perpetuating of the College in its present form, even if, at some subsequent period, it should be found to be a serious injury to the Church. This I cannot see. If its present relation to the Kirk does not prevent the Kirk from making some other disposition of it—which is what the objectors wish—why should an exactly similar relation to the United Church prevent the United Church from making a similar disposition of it, at some future time?

But, what objection can be urged to its present relation to the Kirk? It does not, as far as I can learn, appear to be an inconveniently close relation. The relation is not such as to require the administrative management of the College by the Supreme Court. The principal thing which the Synod seems to have to do with its management is to elect annually three persons to the Board of Management to supply the place of an equal number retiring. The Board manages the affairs of the College, and, I am told, elects its professors. There can be no objection to this. The Board will feel it to be its interest to secure thoroughly efficient men to keep up the literary character of the College, and thus to make it attractive to students; and professors will seek to distinguish themselves in their office which is their proper sphere. This is probably safer than to have professors elected by Presbyteries, which may be greatly influenced by personal feelings; and safer too than to have professors tempted to seek to sustain themselves in their chairs by a kind of floating popularity over the whole Church. I must humbly confess that I can see nothing specially objectionable in the relation, if we are to have the College at all.

But this last is the great difficulty with many. They are opposed to having such a College at all. They plainly wish to have it so separated from the Church, that the Church can allow it to go down without dishonour to herself. Unless it be separated to this extent from the Church, the object desired by a few will not be gained.

Now, as the College is an institution vitally connected with the sister church—an institution which has done much good, and may do much more, it clearly devolves on those who are opposed to its conception to produce strong reasons in support of their views. Such reasons have not yet been produced. Some say that its reception would be an act of hostility to the non-sectarian system of higher education for which the country is famed. But there is surely room for Queen's College in central Canada, especially as the Government has hitherto confined its lavish expenditure on higher education to the city of

Toronto. Besides our non-sectarian Colleges might be benefitted by a little honorable competition. Sustained by the resources of the Province they could not suffer from it, and should not betray any fears on this score. If Denominational Colleges diffuse more widely the blessings of a liberal education, without asking grants of public money, they are not to be despised. It is a remarkable circumstance that the very persons who are so much opposed to the competition referred to with the Provincial Colleges, are constantly insisting on the inefficiency of Queen's College. Why should Queen's College be at the same time both contemptible and formidable? And why is the Presbyterian Church alone to be accused of disloyalty to our Provincial Colleges, if it presumes to have a college of its own; when other denominations, as the Baptists, have such colleges without exposing themselves to any such charge? Can it be possible that the Canada Presbyterian Church has become connected with a political party, and thus must be subject to political control? If this be so, the sooner the connexion is dissolved the better.

On the other hand, two very strong reasons may be stated why we should willingly receive the College into the United Church. One is that it may be the means of doing much good to the Church. It will furnish a valuable bond of interest and union among our widely scattered Presbyterians. A flourishing college too must, if wisely conducted, exert a good influence on the country at large. It may attract many of our promising young men who would not otherwise think of aspiring to a liberal education. Besides, as we have no influence in the choice of professors in our Provincial College, and as skepticism greatly prevails at the present day, and as non-denominational colleges are still on their trial, it is quite possible that professors, under whom we would not wish our young men to be trained, may be appointed to chairs in our Provincial Colleges. The possession of a college of our own, and one in which we had entire confidence, might in such a case be immensely valuable. There is no reason why we should needlessly deprive ourselves of this advantage when it is providentially placed within our reach; although, if such a College did not exist, I would not advocate the erection of one to meet such an emergency before it actually arose.

The other reason is, that if we do not receive the College, union will be impracticable. Considering the attachment of our Kirk friends to it, and the large amount of money which they have recently raised for its endowment, we may be sure that they will not give it up. And, indeed, if they were to give it up for any reasons which have yet been offered, they would by doing so forfeit our respect to such an extent as to make the Union seem far less desirable to many of us, and far less comfortable and honourable to themselves.

I am well aware that financial difficulties are apprehended in connection with the reception of the College. It is known that this College sustained a heavy pecuniary loss by the suspension of the Commercial Bank, and by the discontinuance of the Legislative grant. To meet this deficiency an Endowment scheme was formed in January, 1869. At the meeting of the Kirk Synod, last June, it was reported that \$72,777 had thus been realized. So that the College at the Union, no matter how soon it takes place, will be found to be self-sustaining. If, therefore, the Presbyterians of Canada are satisfied with it as it now stands, no burden need be imposed for its support. If it should seem desirable to increase the staff of Professors, and give Professors higher salaries, by which greater efficiency may be secured, of course a larger endowment will be required. But this will be easily obtained; for we are told that it is intended immediately to raise the \$72,777 up to \$100,000; and further, that an additional \$100,000—and more if need be—will be derived from the disposal of the Temporalities Fund. The Endowment will thus be amply sufficient to make the College thoroughly efficient, and to make it an honour and a blessing to the Presbyterians of Canada.

As I dare not further encroach on your space, you will perhaps kindly permit me, in a subsequent paper, to say a few words in reference to the Theological Colleges.

Yours, &c.,

ALGUIS.

## NOBLE COUNSEL.

Amid the muttered threats of revenge against Prussia which are heard every where in France, it is encouraging to hear the noble counsels of men like Edgar Quinet. This distinguished historian has unfolded his plan of revenge in a letter to one of his colleagues in the Assembly; and it is a revenge which all the best men of Germany, all the best scholars, all the men of thought, and not less heartily Prince Bismarck himself, would, we fancy, be glad to see France accomplish. M. Quinet says that France lost more than territory when she yielded up Alsace and German Lorraine. She lost also a spirit—that of the German race; she lost an element of sobriety, of seriousness, of deep feeling, and religious intensity, which was of priceless value to a people who, in their lightness of mind and passion for the forms of art, are the Greeks of the modern world. When Alsace and Lorraine were taken away, France could say, "A virtue has gone out of me." M. Quinet adds that France cannot afford to sustain such a loss. She must win back her Germans. But how? Not by war. She must find a place of meeting for her own aims and the minds of Germany in her own provinces which lie nearest to Strasbourg and Metz.

"Convert Nancy," he says, "into another Metz—another Strasbourg; only arm it with scholarship instead of with forts." He wishes the State to found a great university on the borders of the new German territory; not a set of mere rhetoricians' chairs like the Sorbonne, but such a set of learning as Heidelberg or Berlin, in which the first scientific men of Europe shall teach—men devoted to study—and through which the profoundest research and spirit of Germany shall reach France. "You can make of Nancy another Metz," he says, "by drawing the new generations of Alsace to a new centre of scientific instruction which we shall found on our new frontier. You have lost territory, but will save the traditional genius of the populations which have been taught by us; there will come a day in which the treasured genius and guarded traditions will give us back the lost provinces." M. Quinet has a better right than most Frenchmen to make such a proposition, for he himself was educated at the universities of Germany. He has drunk deep at the well of German learning; and his own poetic, sentimental spirit, his eye for the symbolism of nature, his dislike to the cold, precise, positivist spirit which runs continually through all the thought of France, are more German than French.

Quinet remembers no doubt, that when, after the battle of Jena—the Sedan of Prussia—Stein began the great task of regenerating his country, one of his first acts was to place Fichte at the head of the University of Berlin, and to draw to Berlin such teachers as Wolff, Schleiermacher, and Niebuhr, in order that the higher education of Prussia might be the profoundest in the world. How he succeeded is written in history. Speaking of the work which was achieved by Stein, M. Renan has said that "the force which conquered at Sadova was German science, German virtue, Protestantism, philosophy, Luther, Kant, Fichte, and Hegel." And the demand of M. Quinet for the foundation of a great University on the borders of the conquered provinces only expresses in a modified form, the profound wish of the greatest scholars for a revolution in the higher education of France.

## WHY WE REJECT THE APOCRYPHA.

1. Because it was never written in Hebrew.
2. Because it was never quoted by our Lord.
3. Because it was rejected from the Canons of the Jews.
4. Because it was rejected from the canon of Scripture by Origen, A. D. 200; St. Epiphanius, A. D. 368; and St. Jerome, A. D. 392.

Besides these reasons for rejecting the Apocrypha in general, we especially reject the book of Maccabees as uncanonical and uninspired:

1. Because Pope Gregory I. A. D. 590, did so; and, by the late Vatican decree, that must be an infallible judgement.
2. Because the author distinctly disavows inspiration, saying, "If I have done well in writing this history, it is what I desired; but if not so perfectly, it must be pardoned me."—2 Mac. xv. 38.

## RIGHT USE OF LAYMEN.

There is probably no denomination in this country that has a nobler body of laymen than our own. But it is doubtful whether in any other it has been used to a less extent. We have been content to leave nearly the whole Christian work of a parish in the hands of the pastor, or at least to hold him responsible for it, and this too in many cases, where by his ordinary duties alone, he is sorely overtasked. If the Church lacks efficiency, it is charged to his neglect. If it fails to reach the masses around, the reproach falls upon him. And this too when those who should be his most active coadjutors sit at ease with folded arms, and perhaps even fail to respond to those calls of charity which above all others they might be expected to meet.

Hence it becomes a grave question how to use the moral power of the lay element in our churches. Human enterprise would not allow rich ore-beds and coal mines to remain long neglected, when there was a chance, by exploring their treasures, to pile up colossal fortunes. But coal mines and ore-beds have no value compared with that which belongs to the undeveloped resources of the lay elements of our churches, and great fortunes are but dust compared with those grand moral results which may flow from the labor of earnest Christian workers, in revolutionizing society.

The weakness of our churches lies in this, that the real power of the laymen is suffered to remain dormant. It is reduced practically to the minimum of receiving and not giving, of hearing expositions of duty without doing it. There are many spheres in which they might be useful, into which they never think of entering. All their work is done by proxy—the preaching, the teaching, the praying, and often too, to their shame, the giving.

This surely ought not so to be. We must find some spheres of action for all this wasted talent and misdirected energy. But to make suggestions will prove of little avail, so long as the conditions of Christian activity are so exceedingly diverse. General rules will not meet the case. It belongs to pastors and sessions, rather than Presbyteries and General Assemblies, to provide the means for bringing out the power of each congregation into active service. In some cases this has been done very effectively. District visiting and neighborhood prayer-meetings have been resorted to with the best results. Without assuming the place of the pastor, laymen have been led to employ their private influence in a very effective way.

This subject, we are glad to see, is inviting attention in various quarters. *The Advance*, reformer, to the theory of the early presbytery of the local church, pleads for a return to what it considers New Testament usage. Discarding of course the representative Presbytery, made up of pastors and elders from different churches, it would have each church provided with "elders" selected for their capacity to teach as well as to rule. It says truly:

"The churches abound in Christian lawyers, physicians, teachers, and other men of good education, who, with a little reading and with weekly practice, might become useful preachers of the Gospel. Our idea is, that a church should select five, eight, or ten such members, and have them publicly set apart, in an orderly and solemn way, as its local preachers, to co-operate with its principle pastor, in maintaining the discipline of the church, in conducting the prayer meetings, the church Sunday school, and the mission schools, and in holding evangelistic services in the open air, in private houses, or wherever the people could be induced to gather for worship."

The Presbyterian Church has already the advantage which *The Advance* proposes to secure for the Congregational, so far as the "Presbytery" or session of the local church is concerned. What is wanted is that it be rightly composed, and that its members take hold of this problem of using the lay element, and while they direct others, point the way by their own example. Too great a burden is thrown on pastors. Willingly or unwillingly they are forced to assume it. But it is better for all concerned, for the laity as well as its officers, that a burden that is a discipline in itself, should be fitly distributed, and all will reap the benefit. A faithful pastor and a working church—when they combine their power—cannot but have a great moral effect upon any community.—N. Y. Evangelist.