

The Presbyterian Review.

NOTICES.

(a) Terms:—In advance, \$1.00; after 1 month, \$1.25; after 3 months, \$1.50; after 6 months, \$1.75; after 1 year, \$2.00. The number of the Review is printed on the top of the paper, and is to be paid for by the subscriber. The Review is published for the purpose of a society. The Review is published for the purpose of a society. The Review is published for the purpose of a society.

Subscribers failing to receive the "Review" promptly, will confer a favour by immediately notifying the Manager.

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 16TH, 1886.

OUR ATTITUDE TO THE CHURCH OF ROME.

THERE are two views of the Church of Rome prevailing in this country, each of them springing from a want of real intelligence with regard to its history and its doctrines. The first of these is the falsely-styled "liberal" view, which is now being constantly put before us in the *Globe*. That paper, for instance, exulted over a paragraph in Professor Campbell's speech at the General Assembly last June, in which he spoke of the Church of Rome as a branch of the Church of Christ and tried to impress upon its readers, that the paragraph in question really embodied the views of the Presbyterian Church. Other journals go even further than the *Globe*, and make it evident that their liberalism is founded upon indifference to religion and a contempt for all Churches. This liberalism blinds the eyes even of men of great ability. They say they have seen greater bigotry among Protestants than Catholics, that they know many of the priests, and that they are jolly fellows, and that all this cry about papal aggression is arrant nonsense. Therefore, all such men are patted on the back by the Archbishop and his priests, and are probably among his most useful tools.

The *Globe* just now professes the utmost scorn at the idea that there is any influence of a political kind wielded from the Palace; and we do not think it impossible that some of the writers on its staff could be found who actually believe such to be the fact, so thoroughly hoodwinked have we found many of our friends on this subject. It never seems to dawn upon them that the Church of Rome will never thank them for calling her a branch of the Church of Christ. She is the Church and this she declares continually in the daily papers which report the sermons delivered in St. Michael's Cathedral. If she was prepared to admit that the Protestant Churches are on a level with her, also being branches of the Church of Christ, all this debate which so annoys "the liberals" would cease. But unless we admit her claim stated so clearly the other day by the papal ablegate from Rome, and consent to unchurch ourselves, there cannot possibly be peace between us. The Archbishop is delighted with Protestants who are willing to admit the claims of his Church, but we are confident his smile will fade out whenever these friends tell him that his Church is only a denomination after all.

But let us ask: How is it that there exists a Catholic vote, and how is it that the Roman Catholics require the Governments to provide them as Catholics with a certain amount of representation in the cabinets, and in every government office. Why is it not demanded that Presbyterians and Methodists and Episcopalians should be treated with like consideration? Why does not the *Globe* look after the interests of these branches of the Church of Christ? The answer is plain enough for even a child to give. The Church of Rome is not a branch of the Church of Christ; it would rebel against being treated as only on a level with the denominations. It claims to be the Church, and so not simply to be independent of the State but to be over the State and bound to control the State as far as it may have the power to do so. The Archbishop in his letter to *Grip* says, he interferes very little in politics, but he is evidently growing old and his memory is rotas good as it once was. He has forgotten about the manifesto of Hon. Frank Smith and others before the last Provincial election and about the existence of two papers in this city, the *Irish Canadian* and *The Tribune*, which ostensibly on different sides in politics are thoroughly at one whenever the Church is to be defended. Witness their articles on the Massie case.

The Protestant Churches have ever refused to claim favours from the State on religious grounds and no attempt would succeed in bringing the Protestant electorate under ecclesiastical control. Then why should the *Globe* desire such exceptional favours to be granted to one denomination, while the others are left to carry out their plans without such recognition? It might be a righteous retribution upon the cowardly politicians if the Protestant voters some day combined and refused their support to any Government that truckled to the Church of Rome, simply demanding that government appointments should be made on the ground of fitness and without any regard to the religious denomination of the person appointed. Why must there be a certain proportion of Catholics in our cabinets and why is the number limited? Is it not because they demand separate representation and even the most "liberal" among us are convinced that it would be dangerous to the State were that number exceeded.

But the other view prevailing in some quarters with regard to the Church of Rome is to our mind as obnoxious to the true Christian and as

dangerous to the State as that above referred to. It shows itself in a bitter party spirit which meaning only hatred to Romanism, is a disgrace to religion and a cause of humiliation to all Christian people. Even intelligent and reasonable men among us are influenced by this bitter spirit which is popularly designated the "No Popery" cry, and become the leaders of the more ignorant partisans. These men often make no pretension to religion, are not found engaged in religious work and are by no means considered pillars of the Church but they are "Protestant to the backbone" and they seem to consider that no other qualification for heaven is necessary than a thorough hatred of the papists.

Now hatred begets hatred, and here, therefore, we have the solution of the Belfast riots, and the thousands of other faction fights in the name of religion. It makes little matter who began the riots or who were the most violent and the most lawless. It is enough to know that the spirit of hatred had possession of the partisans on both sides, and that they were ready to murder one another in the sacred name of religion.

But what should be our attitude to the Church of Rome? We should make ourselves acquainted with its doctrines, and with the fruits of these doctrines as seen in its history. We should distinguish between the system and its adherents, so that while we are clear in our denunciation of the Church's errors, we may be tender and sympathetic towards those who hold and teach them. We have no quarrel for example with Archbishop Lynch. He is a faithful servant of his Church, and has doubtless done her good service, but we will not cease to call attention to the erroneous views he propounds in the sermons he preaches, and the letters he occasionally sends to the papers, and to denounce the errors he seeks to thrust down our throats. We should refuse to allow the Church of Rome to interfere even a little in politics, but should look for a statesman who would break with the hierarchy, and demand that henceforth there should be no Catholic vote, but fair play all round to every branch of the Church of Christ. If such a statesman could be found, he would soon have a large and enthusiastic following. We ought to keep ourselves free from entanglements which would separate us from our Roman Catholic friends and neighbours. When Christ gave us the new commandment to love one another as he loved us, He gave us the weapon which alone can give us the victory over every form of error; and it is only in as far as we are able to keep this commandment that we can expect to attract our Roman Catholic neighbours into fellowship with us in the Church of Christ.

CHURCH BUILDING AND ADORN-ING.

THE following paragraphs from a recent article on the subject of American church architecture in the *New York Independent* are worthy of the careful consideration of all congregations engaged in, or contemplating church building or renovating:

"Among the most common faults of design is the unreasoning use of various features; pinnacles, buttresses, flying arches and spires, being introduced into the design without any necessity, either constructive or æsthetic. Another is the idea that costly material is in itself beautiful, irrespective of the form into which it is moulded. Windows are often made narrow and few, as though the 'dim religious light' were necessary for our protestant worship, to the great detriment of eyesight and the great increase of gas bills. Stained glass is hideous unless really fine, and the finest glass in the world is made in this country, and yet thousands of church windows are filled with imported trash from Munich and Paris, or with cheap, painted glass which five years' storms bedrage into disgraceful shabbiness. Far better the plain 'cathedral-tint' glass than these cheap, flashy windows that suggest the religious chromos in Catholic book stores. But there is yet a ranker abomination, called 'substitute for stained glass,' much in demand for larger beer saloons and skating-rinks, which is sometimes thought by impecunious churches to 'beautify' (save the mark!) their windows.

"However well-planned our churches are—and many of them are admirably arranged and excellently planned—their interiors suffer by the same defects as the external design. Repose, dignity, and simplicity are rare qualities. Gaudiness and over-decoration are frequent, every inch of wall space being tormented with stenciled ornamentation, often in loud and inharmonious colours. The different parts of the decoration oftentimes neutralize each other, and give no rest or satisfaction to the eye. Sometimes, on the other hand, these interiors are painfully bare and white, cold and dazzling to the eye. To steer between these two evils—to secure richness without ostentation, or simplicity without bareness—is not easy, nor is it often done. Fortunately, ambitious flights into the domain of figure-painting are rarely attempted; for the failure is apt to be deplorable and ludicrous.

"Far less excusable, however, than merely artistic faults, is the prevalence of sham in the construction of our churches. One would imagine that here, at least, honesty and sobriety should prevail. And yet there is no class of buildings, except theatres, where imitations and shams are so general. Sanded wooden pinnacles on stone spires and buttresses; sanded wooden cornices and balustrades; cheap pine pews and wainscoting painted and grained to simulate costly woods; brick columns plastered to resemble stone, and lath and plaster vaulting, pretending to be of masonry—these are all so common as to be almost matters of course. They are used to produce a false impression of richness and beauty, just as a courtesan wears paste jewelry, and there is little

difference between the two motives. Does it never occur to our churches that it is morally wrong thus to pretend to a wealth and resources that do not exist? And yet, did they but know it, the eye gains far more satisfaction from a simple, well-proportioned, honestly built interior, where all is solid and genuine, than from a richly decorated interior, where all is fraud of stucco and paint. Their search after beauty is in the wrong direction, since it ignores the principle that the highest beauty in architecture is based on good construction. A great reform is here necessary; the builder's tricks and the decorator's illusions must be suppressed. Solidity, durability, permanence, resistance to the ravages of fire and time, must be recognized as essentials in church building, and far more important than much gilding and 'frescoping.'

AN INSTANCE OF PARTYISM.

MR ALEXR DUFF, formerly an elder in Central Presbyterian Church, Toronto, now an elder in Parkdale, has filled an honourable position in the Custom House in this city for the long term of thirty-five years. During this long period he has been off duty for only five weeks, and he is acknowledged on all hands to have been a faithful and able civil servant. Mr. Duff has been superannuated. And we naturally ask, Why? Has he become unfit to discharge his duties? Have any complaints reached the authorities as to his competence for his work? Did he ask to be relieved from the cares of business? On the contrary, Mr. Duff is acknowledged to be such an expert in his Department that it will be hard to find as able a man to take his place. He is still as able for his work as any man in the Custom House. Instead of having asked to be shelved he feels, we are given to understand, that a grievous wrong has been done him in compelling his retirement when he has at least ten or more good years of work in him.

What is his crime that his family should be suddenly reduced in circumstances and himself forced into idleness? The only fault, which can be laid to his charge is that he is a Reformer, and has been faithful to his colours all these years. He has therefore no influence with the powers that be, and must stand aside to make room for some one who has. An election is coming on, and every vacancy which can be made is needed as a bribe, and therefore Mr. Duff must retire, that his place may be kept dangling as an attractive bait before the hungry office-seekers.

But are there none others in the Custom House who might be superannuated with great advantage to the public service, and whose claims for that token of the Government's favour far surpass Mr. Duff's?—Hush! It is dangerous even to whisper such a thing, for we shall be taken very sharply to task. There are some who could be safely dispensed with, but they are Roman Catholics, and the Minister of Customs is far too wise a man to suggest their retirement on the eve of an election. A Presbyterian Reformer is of no consequence, but a Roman Catholic can always count on having his Church at his back, and so it is dangerous to meddle with him.

The method of making appointments in the Civil Service, and the principles on which Ministers act in filling them, also show the demoralizing influence of partyism. Two vacancies occurred recently in Toronto. An Orangeman was appointed to one and a Catholic to the other. They may be good and capable men, but they were appointed simply because it is necessary to hold the balance evenly between those contending factions. When shall we be done with this wretched partyism which is the source of such miserable trickery and flagrant wrong-doing? Who is to fill Mr. Duff's post? Of course we do not know, but we may be sure it will be an appointment intended to strengthen the Government. But in the meantime the public purse must be robbed by the superannuating of an officer capable of long years of service and a worthy and faithful servant be lost to his country, simply to meet the exigencies of a political party. It is no part of our duty to seek to right party wrongs on one side or the other, but it is our purpose to throw light upon all such deeds of darkness as this, especially when the sufferers are men whom we have long known to be worthy of the respect of all loyal Presbyterians.

The Methodist Conference has continued in session during the past week, and its proceedings have grown in interest. Decisions upon some matters to which we referred last week have been arrived at after due deliberation. The proposal to commit the Conference to an expression of opinion that the Methodist people as a body should take a more active interest in political affairs was laid on the table by a vote of 103 to 88. After a long and very able debate, extending over several sessions, the question of College Confederation was settled by the passing, by a vote 138 to 113, of the following amendment proposed by Dr. Dewar.

"Whereas the scheme of college federation, which has been for some time before the people of this Province, provides by means of this proposed university professoriate large and important educational advantages for the students of Victoria and other confederating colleges under the supervision of the senate of the university, in which the church colleges shall be duly represented, while it leaves Victoria as complete control of its own religious life and collegiate work as it possesses at present; And whereas, in response to the representations of our Board of Regents, the Government of Ontario has agreed to carry out the scheme, even though none but Victoria come in, and has agreed to give a site for our college in the Queen's Park at a nominal rent, and has also given assurances in regard to the efficiency and stability of the University professoriate, and the equitable recognition of our claims in future Government appointments to the University Senate; *Resolved*, therefore, that this Conference hereby expresses its approval of Victoria University

united with our Provincial University, on the line indicated in the plan of federation prepared by the representatives of the different colleges, and further, that this Conference authorize and instruct the Board of Regents to complete on behalf of Victoria any necessary details of the task of union, and to take proper steps to give effect to such federation at as early a period as due regard to existing interests and to the necessary financial and other arrangements shall render it practicable.

A motion to give hymens of all the annual Conferences representation in equal numbers to ministers on all Church courts and stationing committees, was sent to the Annual Conference Committee. A deputation representing the Dominion Alliance, consisting of his Worship Mayor Howland, Rev. John Smith, Ald. McMillan, Mr. G. M. Rose, and Mr. F. S. Spence, appeared before the conference and received a hearty welcome. The Conference unanimously passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That this Conference has listened with unbounded satisfaction to the statements of Mayor Howland and the deputation accompanying him, as representing the Dominion Alliance for the total suppression of the liquor traffic, and beg to assure him and his colleagues of the continued and united support and co-operation of the Methodist Church in the future as in the past, for the entire extinction of the liquor traffic, employing our influence as ministers and members of the Church in our families, our churches, and through our public and political institutions until the great end we all seek shall have been satisfactorily accomplished.

A deputation from the Presbytery of Toronto consisting of Rev. Dr. Reid, Rev. H. M. Parsons, Rev. P. Nicol and Ald. Carlyle, conveying fraternal greetings, was received with a standing vote. The following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"That we have listened with very great satisfaction to the words of our brethren from the Toronto Presbytery of the great Presbyterian Church; and to assure them that we heartily reciprocate their kind and appreciative words; and that we rejoice most sincerely in the wonderful success which has attended their labours; and we earnestly pray that, as in the past, and yet more abundantly, the blessing of the Great Head of the Church may enable them and us to labour untiringly in all the great moral reforms of the age; and in the maintaining in truth and doctrine, as well as in practice, the essential truths of our common Christianity."

On Tuesday evening a great Missionary meeting was held, at which the Rev. John Macdonald, the well known missionary of the North West, with some of the Christianized Indians, delivered exceedingly interesting addresses. Interest was lent to the proceedings by the presence of Sir John A. Macdonald, who delivered a brief speech.

THE persevering efforts of the Executive Committee of the Sabbath School Association of Brant have, we notice, been crowned with success. That county has now attained the enviable rank of a banner county, having recently completed the work of local organization, and will, we understand claim the distinction at the next Provincial Sabbath school convention to be held at Hamilton on the 26th, 27th and 28th of October next. The following are the local associations in the order of seniority, with the names of presidents, namely:—Town of Paris, 1871, David Brown; City of Brantford, 1876, John Mann; Burford Tp., 1878, Rev. C. S. Pedley, New Durham; N. Brantford, Onondago and Tuscarora, 1885, Rev. P. German, Echo Place; South Brantford and Oakland, Ald. W. Whitaker, Brantford; South Dumfries, 1885, G. Fleming, Glen Morris; also Union of Primary Sabbath School Teachers, 1885, W. N. Hossie. There are, it may be mentioned, ninety-eight schools in the county, eighty-three of which have been personally visited by the county president within the past two years, and now the local officers are engaging in the work of visitation. There are also 108 officers and 1 teachers, 8,436 scholars, with an average attendance of 6,200, and during 1885 more than 700 are reported as having been added to church membership from the ranks of the schools. The very creditable position which the county of Brant takes in Sabbath school work is largely due to the labours of the indefatigable secretary Mr. W. N. Hossie, Wind Asylum, Brantford.

THE following is an analysis of the vote at the Methodist Conference on the College Confederation question: The total vote cast was 251, 138 for and 113 against. The majorities by conferences are: For confederation—Toronto, 10; London, 1; Niagara, 2; Guelph, 21; Montreal, 2; Newfoundland, 1. Against—Bay of Quinte, 2; Nova Scotia, 7; New Brunswick, 3; Manitoba, 1. The total ministerial vote was 66 for and 67 against. The total lay vote was 72 for and 46 against. The five Conferences which constitute the constituency of Victoria College give a ministerial majority of 7 and a lay majority of 27 for confederation. The vote by colleges was—ministers, 66 for and 67 against, laymen, 72 for and 46 against. The ministerial majorities are: For confederation—Toronto, 4; Niagara, 2; Guelph, 8; Newfound-land, 1. Against—Bay of Quinte, 6; Montreal, 1; Nova Scotia, 1; New Brunswick and P.E.I., 2. Ties—London and Manitoba. Lay majorities: For—Toronto, 6; London, 1; Guelph, 13; Bay of Quinte, 4; Montreal, 3. Against—New Brunswick, 1. Ties—Niagara, Nova Scotia, and Manitoba.

REFERRING to the recent grievous assault upon Father Chiniquy in Prince Edward Island, the Halifax Presbyterian *Witness* says: "Archbishop Lynch and Mr. Anglin are ever ready through the press to preach and teach liberality, fairness, freedom of conscience and virtues of that delightful character. Yet the disciples of these gentlemen are never slow to apply sticks and stones to the man who dares to leave them. This is the most telling proof of their love of freedom and fairplay! In this Dominion there should be, there must be liberty of speech, freedom of conscience, freedom of worship. All are agreed to this except our