

British American Presbyterian

Vol. 4—No. 14.]

TORONTO, CANADA, FRIDAY, MAY 14, 1875.

[Whole No. 170

Contributors and Correspondents.

St. Thomas "Home Journal," et al. vs. St. Andrew's Church, London.

Editor BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN.

Sir,—As you found space in your issue of 9th inst., for that foul slander on St. Andrew's Church, sent you by some correspondent, as clipped from the St. Thomas Home Journal, and thereby being the medium of circulating it from one end of our Dominion to the other, perhaps you will also find space for a few remarks on this unfortunate matter. And, in the first place, as regards the Home Journal, it don't look well to call names, so we must only say that the writer deliberately penned what is not true.

Whoever inspired the article, it is quite in accordance with that wonderful amendment moved by Mr. Outhbertson, of St. Thomas, at the meeting of Presbytery, and said to be duly seconded. It is not often we find in the Record, (as in this instance) a motion and an amendment given in full, especially when only the mover and seconder voted for the amendment. It is rather amusing to see such an exhibition of canting hypocrisy as in that amendment, trying to make the Presbytery express their deep felt distress, etc., etc., by bringing the congregation into undue prominence before the Church and the world. Perhaps, Mr. Editor, you would hardly credit the fact, that said amendment was moved during the afternoon-sederunt, but did not get a second then, and during the recess for tea, (so seemingly anxious was the mover of it, "not to give undue prominence," but require St. Andrew's congregation, for the very high esteem in which (he well knows) he is held by them, that said amendment was actually in the hands of the printer for publication, an hour or two before a second could be found for it. It was amusing to see the opening of the evening sederunt, when things came almost to a stand still, as the Rev. George could not read his amendment, because the reporter had not brought it back. However, St. Andrew's Church has got the benefit of it, as far as the mover could do, in sending it in full to be published in the Record, and as a matter of course, signed "Geo. Outhbertson, Clerk."

And now, Mr. Editor, without asking the Church or the world to accept our emphatic repudiation of the foul slander emanating from St. Thomas, we simply ask for a little space to state the simple facts of the case, and leave those outside to judge for themselves, and in doing so, we will endeavor to be brief.

Some years ago, the teachers of the St. Andrew's Sabbath School, were desirous of getting a melodeon, or musical instrument into the school, and it was the wish of others of the congregation that it might also be used at social meetings of the congregation; but the pastor, the Rev. Mr. Scott, was strongly opposed to it, and therefore, the matter was allowed to lay in abeyance for some considerable time, until after the action of our Supreme Church Court had been taken, leaving it optional with congregations whether they might have instrumental music in their churches or not. (Here let it be distinctly understood, that the request was only for its use in the Sunday-school, and social meetings, and on no pretence, whatever, to be thought of in the church during Mr. Scott's time.) And as the matter had been frequently discussed in the session and out of it, Mr. Scott went as far as to say, "that in the event of a colleague being appointed, who had no objection to the use of the instrument, that to meet the wishes of all parties, he could take charge of the Sunday-school; and, perhaps the conclusion arrived at by many was not far astray, when, thinking that if a colleague was at liberty to countenance, and be present with the children, and hear the sound of an innocent instrument mingling with their voices in their feeble efforts to sing, that there could not be much sin in it." So at a congregational meeting, a resolution was passed requesting the session to take a vote of the congregation, whether it was their wish that a musical instrument might be used in the Sunday school and social meetings, or not. Out of deference to the wishes of the pastor, by the session, one year was allowed to pass, and no vote taken as requested by the congregation, who felt rather indignant, being thus treated with sneering contempt. Mr. Scott's reasoning was, that he had foreseen this crisis coming for years back, and therefore wished to put it off as long as possible, (which has not turned out to be a wise policy).

Without any fear of contradiction we unhesitatingly say that Mr. Scott has not left because the instrument was wanted for the Sunday School and Sunday meetings, but owing to the way and the policy adopted to defeat it. To explain what is here meant: There were two ways of taking the vote on Instrumental Music, and on showing these, we leave it in the hands of the public to say on whose shoulders rest the responsibility of this most unfortunate matter. If in the first place, Mr. Scott, (without any fear of the result) had frankly said to the congregation, "you all know my opinion on this matter, and therefore I request all to use your freedom in voting this vote; do not let my opinion influence you in the least." And suppose a majority had voted in favour of having the instrument. Then he might as frankly have told them, that with his present convictions he could not remain if they wished the use of the instrument. Then Sir, you would have seen a proper vote of St. Andrew's congregation, whether they would part with Mr. Scott or the instrument, and instead of a large majority for him, we do not believe that a single person in the congregation would have raised their voice against him, but he would have stood higher than any in the estimation of the

congregation. But unfortunately a different policy was adopted, one something like trying to make water run up hill. "No treat parties as if they had no right to an opinion of their own, if they know these to differ from their pastor's, and if they persisted in them, must be publicly called his enemies and treated as such, (but not in accordance with the injunction to love them, etc.) (what more could be expected from the great city itself), and then the private agencies, "If you are in favour of the instrument then you want Mr. Scott to leave," and so on, and then the very day cards were distributed for parties to record their votes on. A sermon was preached on the subject, (which unfortunately, we fear, had the opposite effect of what was intended) so that in reality the vote that was taken was no expression of opinion by the congregation on the matter at issue, and thus left matters more unsatisfactory than ever. Then came a threat of leaving, by encouraging a call from North Bruce. Then a deputation from the Presbytery, who did not want to hear anything from those who differed in opinion from the pastor, and therefore may be said to have made no effort to heal the breach. The night of their visit a resolution was carried in the congregation to give Mr. Scott \$1,000 per annum retiring allowance and the use of the house, and let the congregation get another minister who would have full power, as Mr. Scott needed rest. During all this time Mr. Scott turned the cold shoulder to all those who did not throw aside their own opinions and coincide with his, and when accused of it, said "they deserved it," so that you see we presented a sad and lamentable spectacle to outsiders—a pastor not having fellowship with a part of his congregation, because they differed in opinion from him on some points. After that liberal motion was carried, those who did not vote for it said, "go on and fulfil your promise, we throw no obstacle in the way," the reply was, "we are masters of the situation, if you want another minister get one; we don't want another." Now admitting that his friends meant this for kindness, it was cruel kindness; for there was no provision for rest for him. And thus we consider that following their ill-advised and suicidal policy, and Mr. Scott retaining that coldness towards those who differed from him, notwithstanding the many years of intimacy, and unmistakable tokens of real friendship, (we did think he might have made a step towards them, but no), and a separation has been the unfortunate result. As his services were highly appreciated, the prevailing feeling has been one of grief under the unfortunate circumstances, for which we are all more or less to blame.

A. B. London, April 28, 1875.

Licensing of Students.

Editor BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN.

Sir,—When the Synod of Toronto was sitting last week, a reference was brought up from the Presbytery of Toronto, which is not unlikely to appear in your newspaper. I allude to the case of a student of theology who has finished his curriculum at Knox College, who has also engaged with the Assembly's Home Mission Committee to go out, for two years at least, to British Columbia, in the event of his being licensed, and to whom the Presbytery, advised by the Committee above-named, proposed to give license without obtaining leave from the Assembly. The matter, however, when referred to the Synod, divided that house; and when put to the vote, it was decided not to sanction the course proposed. Now I don't wish to raise the question whether the decision adopted by the Synod was a right or a wrong one. But I do raise the question, and I have put it to more than one of our ministers, whether the law of our Church is a good one which requires leave from the Supreme Court before students can be taken on trial for license. Prior to the Union of 1801 there was no such law in the Church with which I was then connected, and I am pretty sure there is no such law in the United Presbyterian Church to the present hour; when students have finished their theological curriculum, and can furnish testimonials to that effect, they are taken on trial for license by any Presbytery. And why should it not be so in the C. P. Church? It is proper enough, it is very wise, when students come from other Churches, to submit their cases to the General Assembly; just as we do, and do wisely, when licentiates or ministers apply to be received from other Churches. But our own students who are certified by our own professors, and can easily be certified by our own ministers—is the law referred to necessary in their cases? If it is so, I should like to be informed of the ground of it. By all means, let us see to the soundness and purity both of our students and probationers. But a highly respectable young man, known to be right in all respects, who is urgently needed for mission service (home or foreign), surely ought to be rendered available without any needless loss of time. And the law which is needless in that one case is equally needless in all such cases, namely in the case of all our certified students. Let our Presbyteries have leave, without asking for it, to take them on public trial for license.

May 10, 1875. Yours truly, C. P.

The Presbyterians of Lynedoch intend building a very nice brick church during the present summer. It is to be finished and ready for occupation by the 1st of November. The many friends of the Rev. R. Ewing, of Georgetown, who has been spending the winter in Florida, will be pleased to learn that he has benefited considerably by his visit to the South. He will return shortly to Canada.

Home Mission Grants to Churches Having Organs.

LETTER FROM THE CONVENER.

Editor BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN.

Sir—A letter in your last issue asks me, as Convener of the Home Mission Committee, to explain upon what conditions grants are obtained, and why a certain congregation that has placed an organ in their church, has received a supplement of \$150.

I know nothing of the congregation in question, nor is it within the jurisdiction of the Home Mission Committee, before making a grant of money, to ask whether the church has or has not an organ. Should the General Assembly instruct the committee, to give support to weak congregations, in accordance with the opinion of your correspondent, the thing will assuredly be done. I have no doubt but others may have the same feeling, "that the very fact of a congregation being able to purchase an organ, (may it not have been given them?) is a sufficient cause for the committee withholding or withdrawing supplement." But the opinion of any member does not make law by which the Home Mission Committee are guided in their acts.

I presumed that the way in which grants are made was very generally known. A church or mission station needing aid, makes application to the Presbytery of the bounds; the case is investigated by the Presbytery, and reported to the Home Mission Committee, as a case, in the judgment of Presbytery, desiring aid. Full statistics must accompany every application, containing information as to the number of families and adherents, the attendance, and the amount they can themselves raise for the support of ordinances. The case thus presented to the committee, is generally supported by the Convener of the Presbytery's Home Mission Committee at the half-yearly meeting in Toronto, and the grant given, or withheld, as the majority of the committee may decide.

If your correspondent has any grievance, it is with the Presbytery within whose bounds the church referred to is located, and not the Home Mission Committee. It is not for the committee to lord it over Presbyteries, but to co-operate with them in the great Home Mission work of our church. It is presumed that in every application made for aid to a mission station, or a weak congregation, the Presbytery has come to the conclusion that the aid is absolutely necessary to the existence of the organization and the maintenance of the minister.

In the communication referred to, the remark is made, "that it is no wonder there should be a deficiency in the funds, seeing that such grants are made." If your correspondent will take the trouble to go over the grants made during the present year, or any year, in detail, he will find a very small amount of the \$20,000 given to churches having organs. The cause of our deficiency does not lie in a reckless expenditure of money, but in the fact, that very many of our congregations give far below their ability for this great cause.

I do not claim infallibility for the Home Mission Committee; like other men, they may make occasional mistakes. But of this, I am assured, that no committee is more deserving of the thanks and confidence of the church, for their devotedness to duty, and their unwearied efforts to overtake the spiritual destitution that abounds in so many parts of our land.

I am glad to know that the congregation with which your correspondent is identified, so heartily responded to our appeal last year for funds. I trust it may do so again. It would, however, add very much to the weight of such communications, if the names of the writers were attached. To attempt to answer all the anonymous letters that have appeared in your columns during the past year, advisory or otherwise, in addition to the regular correspondence of the committee, would be a hopeless task.

I am, Sir, Yours, faithfully,

WILLIAM COCHRANE,
Convener, Home Mission Committee,
Brantford, May 7th, 1875.

Were the Egyptians Immersed in the Red Sea?

Editor BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN.

Sir,—In the Presbyterian of April 23rd, you, in effect, say that it was the Egyptians who were immersed in the Red Sea. This is a remark which is commonly made in reply to the interpretation which our Baptist brethren put on the passage in which Paul speaks of ancient Israel having been baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea. If any can at all be said to have been immersed on the occasion referred to, it was the Egyptians. I do not think, however, that they can properly be said to have been immersed in the sense in which the Baptists use that word, that is, dipped. The water was put on them, they were not put into it. This is plain from the following passages: "Stretch out thine hand upon the Egyptians," etc., "And the waters returned and covered the chariots," etc., (Exodus xiv. 26, 28.) "The Lord brought again the waters of the sea upon them," (xv. 19.) "The Lord brought the sea upon them (the Egyptians), and covered them," (Joshua xiv. 7.) It is true that in Exodus

xv. the Lord is said to have thrown, and to have cast the horse and his rider into the sea. This, however, is poetical language, which can be interpreted in harmony with the plain language of the historian. In the same chapter, it is said that "they sank into the bottom as a stone," and "sank as lead in the mighty waters." They were not rooted to the ground when the waters came on them. Men and horses, therefore, as is usual in cases of drowning, came for a time to the surface, during which they strove to reach the shore, but at length,

Subdued by toil, they drank
The stifling wave, and then they sank.

It is also said that we have an instance of immersion in the destruction of the old world by the flood. What has been said about the destruction of Pharaoh and his host in the Red Sea applies equally well here. The flood came on it. "I, even I, do bring a flood of waters upon the earth," (Genesis vi. 17.) "The flood came and took them all away," (Matthew xxiv. 38.)

Yours respectfully, T. F.

SYNOD OF LONDON.

The Synod of London, in connection with the Canada Presbyterian Church, met in the Rev. Dr. Proudfoot's Church, London, on Tuesday evening. The Moderator, Rev. A. A. Drummond, of Shakespear, preached an excellent sermon of which we shall endeavor to publish a pretty full synopsis next week, after which the Synod was duly constituted, the Moderator in the chair, and Rev. J. Fotheringham, clerk. The roll of members was called, and about 100 answered to their names.

The Moderator then addressed his brethren, in the course of which he remarked that the time had now come for him to retire from the position in which they had elected him one year ago. Before doing so, however, he desired to express his heartfelt thanks for the courtesies and kindnesses which had been extended to him during that term. It now was their duty to proceed to the appointment of his successor.

Rev. Mr. McQuang, of Clinton, moved, seconded by the Rev. Mr. McLean, of Blyth, that the Rev. Thomas Goldsmith, of Scarforth, be appointed Moderator. Rev. Mr. Macpherson, of Stratford, nominated the Rev. J. Duncanson, of Forest, seconded by the Rev. John Thompson, of Sarnia. Rev. Mr. Goldsmith in a graceful manner, asked the withdrawal of his name, as he had no aspirations for the position, and would be pleased to see his friend, Mr. Duncanson chosen Moderator. Mr. Duncanson was declared elected.

The retiring Moderator then introduced him to the Synod, after which the newly-elected presiding officer returned thanks for the unsolicited honour conferred upon him, and for the kindness and confidence his brethren had manifested in electing him to fill such a responsible position. He felt that the duties would be rendered pleasant by the courtesy and self-control which would be accorded him by his brethren.

The Clerk then read the following recommendations. That the following members of the Synod be appointed to examine Presbytery Records:—For London—Rev. R. H. Waidon, W. King and Elder H. Hartono. For Chatham—Revs. A. McLean, J. Renno, and Elder R. Fleming. For Stratford—Rev. J. Thompson, F. McQuang, and Elder James Elliot. For Huron—Revs. John Gray, Geo. Cathcartson, and Elder Tho. Gordon.

That the following members be a committee on Elders Commissions, viz.—Revs. Geo. M. Milligan, Dr. Proudfoot, John Ross, G. G. McKelvie, and Elders W. Grieco and R. A. Donaldson, the first named of each to be convener.

The Presbyteries have leave to meet on the call of their respective Moderators during the intervals of the meetings of Synod.

Rev. Mr. Outhbertson moved the adoption of the recommendations.

The motion carried without dissent. Rev. Mr. Rennie, that a hearty vote of thanks be tendered the retiring Moderator for his dignified and courteous bearing, and also for the excellent sermon preached by him this evening. Carried unanimously. The Roll was read the committee on Bills and Ordinances—London—Rev. George Sutherland and Hon. A. Vidal. Chatham—Rev. John Grey and David Taylor. Stratford—Rev. P. Musgrave and Andrew Riddell. Huron—Rev. John B. Scott and James Elliott.

On Wednesday the report from the Committee on Elders' Commissions was read and adopted.

The treasurer's report was read and adopted, and a hearty vote of thanks was tendered to the Hon. Mr. Vidal for his valuable services as Treasurer.

The report from the committee appointed by the General Assembly to consider the bonds of Synods in view of the union of churches, was then taken up, and after discussion was agreed to leave the matter in abeyance for the present.

A report relating to the boundaries of Presbyteries was adopted.

A discussion on the relative inadequacy support of the Christian ministry was then introduced by Rev. Dr. Proudfoot, who said that ministers were the only professional men who did not receive an equivalent for their labours. The salary of other professional men is continually advancing, yet the salaries of ministers remain the same. Inadequate support has an injurious effect upon both ministers and people; it lowers his standing in the community, which lessens their respect for him, and thus he loses a great deal of influence; and this, fact, keeps many young men out of the ministry, especially in the higher class. A minister

should have enough to keep him comfortably and raise him above the grovelling cares of life; as a servant of the Lord Jesus Christ, he should have an independent spirit, not tied down by the anxieties of family support, he also should be able to stock well his library; his people can not expect learned discourses unless they furnish him with the means to provide books. His knowledge should increase with the service of the age, and he should at all times be able to combat with opponents. The congregations also suffer in a spiritual sense in withholding from God his tithes and offerings. It closes heaven and deprives them of many needed blessings. The Dr. closed by submitting a memorial on the subject to be forwarded to the General Assembly.

The Rev. J. Thompson, Sarnia, said that no class of men were so poorly supported as ministers. Clerks in second-rate establishments had better salaries. No profession enlists so much talent as the ministry, which is clearly shown in the competitive examinations of our universities and colleges, and yet their poverty in after life prevents them from bringing it out that the public may be profited thereby, whilst others in other professions, not hampered by the lack of means, have an opportunity of greatly benefiting their fellows. The fault lies principally with the ministers and elders, in not bringing the matter duly before the people. Giving is commanded as well as preaching, and forms no small part in the worship of God. In our church it costs more than in any other to get an efficient education. It is anomalous for one man to get \$1,000, whilst another, not head and shoulders below him, gets only \$1,200. There should be a sustentation fund that the salaries of ministers might be equalized to some extent. A salary of \$700 eight years ago was more than \$1,600 now, on account of the increase of cost in living.

The Rev. J. Ross, Brucefield, objected to comparing ministers with men of the world who have only money for their aim.

Dr. Proudfoot explained that it was the salaries he was comparing, not the men.

Mr. Ross said he would not permit the world to put a money value on the Christian ministry, but appeal to the Christian liberality of the people, and if we do our duty, the Master will not let us want.

Rev. Mr. Macpherson, of Stratford, contended that the memorial would not discourage ministers nor tend to lead them to the world, but as many ministers are in poor circumstances, it is our duty to place the matter before the people and stir them up to the necessity of providing adequate support for those who minister to them in spiritual things. He thought the memorial a good thing and much required.

Rev. Mr. Milligan, Detroit, said as we are still in the body we require those things which are needful for it. He did not speak from his own standpoint, but he knew many who had to battle with the cares and troubles of life on account of lack of funds, and if the Church does not do something to raise her ministers above the grovelling cares of life she sadly neglects her duty. She is wealthy now and her ministers should not be in poverty. If a minister cannot supply himself with books, he cannot do his duty as he would like to do, for lack of knowledge and discouragements consequent on it.

Rev. Mr. Goldsmith, Scarforth, held that we should have a sustentation fund separate from the Home Mission, and he held it to be the duty of ministers and elders to lay the claims of the ministry before the people, and lay hold on the delinquent congregations, and try to rouse them to a sense of duty.

Rev. Mr. Sutherland thought that all the congregations and mission stations in the churches should be dealt with and their duties laid before them by annual visitations.

The memorial of Dr. Proudfoot was adopted.

The congregation of Biddulph was transferred from the Presbytery of London to the Presbytery of Stratford, and connected to the congregation of Granton under one charge.

Reports on the state of religion were read by the convener of the committee. They were all very full with the exception of that from the Presbytery of London. The reports were of a very encouraging nature, and show that good has been done during the past year, and that God has largely blessed the labor of his servants.

The committee on Evangelistic work and the state of religion was re-appointed.

The Synod was then closed with the benediction.—London Free Press.

We have before us the Statistical and Financial returns of the congregations of Baltimore and Cold Springs for the past year. These indicate the congregations to be in a most prosperous state. The following is a synopsis.—Number of families 155; number of communicants 318. There were added to the membership of the Church during the year fifty-one persons, forty-seven of whom were received on profession of faith. There are attending the Sabbath School 165, and in the Bible Class ninety. The following are the contributions.—For the salary of the pastor, Rev. W. A. McKay, M.A., \$1,000; total contributions for congregational purposes \$3,479. Total contributions for the schemes of the Church, \$378.71; for new College building, \$280; and for Mr. Carnthers, \$14. This makes the total contributions for the year to be \$4,131.71. Our subscription list shows a very large proportion of the families in these congregations to be subscribers to the British American Presbyterian, and we trust that we may not stop short of our usual number.