

mission station left vacant in winter by the withdrawal of the student. Now, we tell all this, not to boast, but to illustrate. Our session is just like many others in the Church. We know members of neighbouring sessions that are alike useful. They are willing to work when called on to do something. Several of these gentlemen have assured us they would be quite willing to give some Sabbath supply to near mission stations, provided they were asked by the stations, and had the sanction of the Presbytery. Other neighbourhoods, we assume, would also furnish their quota of willing workers, and thus, in the bosom of every Presbytery, would be found the very men, that with a little encouragement, would grapple with the felt want and involve us in no serious financial difficulty. We would humbly make the following suggestions.

Let each Presbytery appeal to all the sessions within its bounds for volunteers asking their presence at its September meeting.

Consult every volunteer as to the stations nearest to him, the number of Sabbaths he would be willing to give, and when.

Then adjust the available supply in the way most favourable to all the vacancies, and let each volunteer be furnished with a list of his appointments, and also every station with its list of supply, enjoining the latter to all due care for the convenience and comfort of the gentlemen who thus, for the Lord's sake, undertake to help it.

Lastly, is it not possible that some of the younger, better educated and more gifted of these gentlemen might thus discover their endowments, and so consecrate and more carefully prepare themselves for this as their life work. A PASTOR.

CHURCH SOCIALS, PLAYS AND LOTTERIES.

MR. EDITOR.—A recent issue contains some startling extracts, under the above heading, revealing the modes used for raising money by the Presbyterians of Amherstburg. However painful, it will not be surprising to the careful student of the results to be expected from employing unchristian modes of raising money for church purposes. The lines dividing the Church from the world have become so faint, that it is no wonder that the pious Christians in Amherstburg, have overstepped them. The downward tendency is becoming so rapid that we may soon expect to see it broadly asserted that "the end sanctifies the means."

Should there be a little money wanted for Sabbath-school purposes, or to make up the deficiency in the minister's salary, or any other lawful purpose, instead of members from high Christian principle considering it their duty as well as their privilege to put their hands in their pockets and supplying the deficiency, we find that the needful can only be extracted from them by a series of socials, or tea-meetings, oyster suppers, elections, plays, or thinly disguised lotteries, or other equally disreputable worldly modes. And what is most surprising, the minister is often found amongst them, presiding as the master of ceremonies, making funny speeches, in order to make them bleed more freely. And what enhances the disgrace of those proceedings, they are often held within the courts of God's house, which has been consecrated and set apart for His worship alone. And it is not uncommon to find meetings held in or near to the church, cannot be let pass without an effort being made to recruit the funds of the church by such means. I lately received a handbill setting forth that the induction of the Rev. J. W. Cameron would take place at Richmond Hill on such a day, and so forth. No harm in that, but it was evident that the first part of the bill was merely the preface or introduction to the main object of the bill, which, like the postscript to a woman's letter, was found at the foot of the bill and was as follows:

"Immediately after the induction services the ladies in connection with the church purpose having a grand dinner prepared in the lecture room to which a cordial invitation is extended to the public. Tickets 25c; children 15c." Now this following the solemn, sacred services of the induction with a feed in the lecture room at twenty-five cents a head, this converting the consecrated house of God into a public eating-house in competition with the licensed victuallers, is to say the least of it, disgraceful. True, there were no stringed instruments or dancing on the occasion, but we may expect before long they will be up with their sisters in Amherstburg.

Would these zealous ladies but listen to the thundering tones of the Apostle Paul in his reproof of the Corinthian converts, reverberating through the centuries and across the Atlantic saying "What, have ye not houses to eat and drink in, or despise ye the Church of God?" It is unnecessary to add further examples. In fact the disease has become chronic. The remedy is in the hands of the ministry. They have but to show faithfully the evils likely to result to the cause of Christ and the dishonour done to His name from such modes of raising money, and a speedy reformation would take place, if it did not, if no amendment was made after faithful warning, and teaching the good old paths, then they might write Ichabod on their church doors and leave it. Christian liberality for the support of Gospel ordinances, is the true barometer for indicating the spirituality of a church. EQUITY.

King, Jan. 19th., 1885.

THE DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER.

MR. EDITOR. Having read the findings of some Presbyteries of the Church on the important subject of the marriage of a man with his deceased wife's sister; and being not satisfied with such utterances as were given, I thought of requesting of you the favour of inserting the following observations in your valuable paper.

1. That any decision given in this matter, which might claim to be *satisfactory*, must be in accordance with the Word of God.

2. That the Word of God, according to our beautiful English version, and the original text in Hebrew, unquestionably (in my judgment) *forbids* the marriage of a man with the sister of his deceased wife.

3. In Lev. xviii. 16, it is said, as a matter of divine command, "Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy brother's wife," or thou shalt not know thy brother's wife.

4. All divine commands given in the Word of God in general, which concern man or woman, as to personal or individual duties, are addressed to the man as the head of the woman. If we hold, *as we do hold*, that the moral standing of the woman in the Church and in society, makes her a subject of the moral law, and involves in her case equal responsibilities with the man, the command is addressed to her in certain circumstances, with equal propriety as to the man.

5. Then the command given to the man in the text (Lev. xviii. 16.) *forbidding* him to marry his brother's wife is also given to the woman, and would read thus: To the man, "Thou shalt not marry thy brother's wife." To the woman, "Thou shalt not marry thy sister's husband."

The case might seem to give rise to a *singular* question, does a sister bear the same relation to her sister as a brother bears to his brother? If so, then the Word of God settles this matter.

I may further observe that the judgment of the Christian Church, from Apostolic times, disallowed the marriage of a man with the sister of his deceased wife. The Church should be allowed to be its interpreter of its own standards of moral rectitude and propriety. The Greek and Roman Catholic Churches, and all Protestant Churches (if let alone) were, for over eighteen centuries, of one thought and judgment in this matter. Should not the unanimous sentiment of the Church of God during past ages, in a case like this, be regarded as worthy of the highest respect?

It is not consistent with the moral dignity of the Church of God, to be standing at the gates of civil courts and parliaments asking for information and direction as to the course which she should take in the administration of her own laws, or what interpretation such parties might give her of some texts in the Word of God.

Strathburn, January, 1885.

W. R. S.

IN AN INDIAN CAMP.

MR. EDITOR.—I visited an Indian camp about ten miles from here, on the banks of the Gatineau River. I found the people, especially the women and children, in great destitution. In one hovel there were crowded two or three Indians with their wives and a great many children. In the middle of the floor there was a fire kindled, some of the smoke from which passed through a hole in the roof, and the rest after passing round and round through every corner of the place, escaped as it best could through a broken door or crevices in the walls. Crouched on the floor with an old blanket wrapped about her was a very aged squaw. She must have been nearly one hundred years of age, judging by appearances. Opposite to her was her

grandson, lying on a bundle of straw, and to all appearances dying. He had been sick since early in October. He understood English and could also speak it. I spoke to him concerning the love of God and salvation through faith in Jesus Christ, and prayed with him. He seemed exceedingly grateful. He has a wife and four children, one of whom was huddled beside him under the same blanket to keep himself warm. The others were almost naked. One in particular I noticed had nothing but a bit of rag thrown over his shoulders. Now, Mr. Editor, I know many of your kind readers have been sending cast-off clothing to Indians in the far North-west, might I plead that some be sent for those nearer home. Any parcels sent to W. Shearer, care of Rev. Dr. Moore, Ottawa, will be thankfully acknowledged and forwarded to the needy people. I would also take this opportunity of thanking you for the large bundle of PRESBYTERIANS you sent me for distribution among the shantymen. W. S.

Baskatong, Feb., 1885.

TIMELY AND WELL TAKEN.

MR. EDITOR.—The following letter appeared in the *Dundas County Herald* of last week. It was written by a worthy elder of our Church, and deeming it timely, I forward it for insertion in THE PRESBYTERIAN: With commendable liberality THE CANADA PRESBYTERIAN makes favourable mention of the *Globe's* enterprise in securing and publishing a weekly sermon from the pulpit and pen of the world-renowned preacher. While the *Globe* is receiving plaudits, it enjoys the satisfactory feeling that it has made a good hit, in addition to its primary object—popularity and profit—but such movements require to be looked at with caution, as the following sequel will show: In the sermon referred to, Mr. Spurgeon says: "The gaoler trembling before him (Paul) said, 'Sir, what must I do to be saved?'" But observe that Mr. Spurgeon withholds Paul's direct emphatic answer to the gaoler's momentous question, which is: "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved and thy house." Instead of that Mr. Spurgeon gives his own version as follows: "The answer was given, he was directed to believe and be baptized, and he and his house were saved." Comment is unnecessary, every eye that reads can see. The *Globe* has assured its readers that Mr. Spurgeon's sermons are corrected and revised by *himself* before they are published. A glance at the closing verses of The Book might be a warning.

I submit that "Observer's" point is well taken, and goes to show that not even the best and most liberal of the advocates of "dip and nothing but dip" are free from the use of misrepresentation. G. D. B.

TAX EXEMPTIONS.

An esteemed correspondent, who usually knows what he is talking about, sends the following:

IT is as absurd to suppose as too many do, that ministers and office-bearers in churches are the only persons in favour of tax-exemptions. If a majority of the people wish to abolish exemptions, we venture to affirm that no opposition will come from ministers or the officials who are charged with the management of churches. Many ministers never have their salaries taxed so that they can vote with perfect freedom and take an interest in public affairs without having it thrown up to them that they "don't pay taxes like other citizens." The fact is there is little or no public opinion against exemptions outside of Toronto, and the agitators in the city are, as far as possible, from agreeing among themselves. Even the deputations that waited on the Government could not agree upon what they wanted, nor could they agree in asking that all the property included in the list submitted to the elders of the city, should be taxed. The question is a very much larger and far-reaching one than it at first appears. No county will permit the county town to tax county property. The whole Province is opposed to taxing the Provincial property in Toronto. It is easy to shout "abolish exemptions," but ask almost any Ontario man who resides outside of Toronto: "Do you wish to pay taxes to the city of Toronto on the Lunatic Asylum, Central Prison, Mercer Institute, Parliament Buildings, Normal School, University College, and all the other Provincial property in the city?" and he at once answers, "No, that is not what I mean." Of course not. Mr. Hard asked a deputation that waited on the Government on this matter the other day why they passed over \$18,000,000 of exempt bank stock, the largest item on the list? They were in favour of taxing churches and other property of that kind, but not in favour of taxing bank stock. It would not be hard to tell the reason why.