

proficiency. Indeed, it was currently reported during the year 1893 that one class of Indian school "graduates" petitioned to be admitted as privates into the army, upon the ground that they could not return to the old life on the reservation without much loss, and there were no positions open to them among white people, with whom they wished to reside in future.

Social sorrows fall heavily upon a race in its transition period. We wish to care for the Indian; in our desire to do so we create in him a dependent spirit. He knows we will not allow him to starve, hence he will lazily rely upon our bounty. If we are a little slow in securing to him his weekly rations, he knows well how to hasten matters. A "row in camp," mutterings against the "dishonest agent," the killing unlawfully of a few head of cattle off the reservation, an insolent remark that "some Injuns go on warpath"—these gentle reminders bring the rations, and possibly an order removing the agent "for cause."

No philosopher has yet found a solu-

tion to the Indian problem; but it is within the truth to assert that nowadays it is the white man who is the one imposed upon. Policies of the immediate future, howsoever wisely conceived, may scarcely be expected to wholly correct the evils which are incident to and have grown up about the Indian question.

It is well always to remember that an Indian's testimony may sadly substitute wants for needs. Good and faithful agents have been sacrificed by official decapitation and newspaper condemnation because they recognized the Indian's needs, but refused to entertain voluble statements of his wants. I have heard Indians argue their wants with such vehemence as would do credit to a criminal lawyer skilled in the art of making the lesser appear the greater reason.

Exact justice is to be done the Indian, the officials who directly control him, and the Government which supports him. Any act which discriminates against either of these three parties postpones the day of equitable adjustment.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

A Drawing Preacher or a Holding Church?

It is said that Dr. Henry Van Dyke, of New York, was at one time requested to recommend to a wealthy church a preacher who would *draw*, and that he replied: "What you want is a church that will *hold*. You haven't got it. Twenty congregations have passed through your church in the last twenty years, and they have passed through because you have not had a church that will hold. . . . Success depends not half so much upon the minister as upon you, the church."

There is more than a little truth in the reply, as it has a general application. The preacher's function is not that of drawing or that of holding; it is that of preaching, and that alone.

His mind is not to be taken up with distracting anxiety as to how to get men to come to him. His absorbing thought should be to present the truth so as to get men to come to Christ. The preacher who is an adept at "drawing" congregations is, in ninety-nine cases out of every one hundred, a failure at winning souls. Unconsciously it may be, yet too surely, he yields to the temptation of tickling ears rather than fulfilling his obligation of touching hearts. This, we say, is almost invariably true of one who thinks much about "drawing." But it is equally true that he who, possessing average ability and making a consecrated use of it in the study of the Word, of nature, of providence, and of man, gives himself to the work of winning souls, will be a drawing preacher.

At the same time, it is in the power of a Church to do either of two things with those who are drawn to it: to thaw them in or to freeze them out. We say