

The Presbyterian Review.

Vol. X.—No. 43.

TORONTO, MAY 3, 1894.

\$1.50 per Annum

The Presbyterian Review.

Issued EVERY THURSDAY, from the office of the Publishers, Rooms No. 20, 21, 22, 25 Aberdeen Block, South-East corner Adelaide and Victoria Streets.

TERMS, \$1.50 per annum.

All communications for either Business or Editorial Departments should be addressed PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, Drawer 2464, Toronto, Ont.

EDITORIAL STAFF.

EDITOR.—Alexander Fraser, M.A.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS.—Rev. Prof. Andrew B. Baird, B.D., Winnipeg; Rev. G. Colborne Heino, B.A., Montreal; Rev. Alexander MacGillivray, Toronto; Rev. Donald MacKenzie, B.A., Orangeville.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENTS.—Rev. James Robertson, F.D., Winnipeg; Rev. D. D. MacLeod, Barrie; Miss Machar, Kingston; Mrs. Anna Ross, Brucefield, Ont.; Mr. George. H. Archibald, Montreal.

ADVERTISING RATES.—Under 3 months, 15 cents per line per insertion; 3 months, \$1.00 per line; 6 months, \$1.75 per line; 1 year, \$3.00. No advertisement charged at less than five lines. None others than unobjectionable advertisements taken.

Toronto, May 3, 1894.

Presbyterian Federation.

IN last week's issue we gave the outlines of an address given at a dinner tendered the Executive of the Pan-Presbyterian Alliance in Philadelphia, by the Rev. Dr. Cochrane. Several of the matters referred to, are certainly worthy of serious consideration, although it may be some time before such a Presbyterian Federation as the Doctor advocated, can become an accomplished fact. The Presbyterian Churches in the United States, North and South, with their six or seven thousand ministers and congregations, are a strong body, compared with which the Canadian Church may appear somewhat insignificant, and yet the smaller church in some respects, because perhaps it is more widely, is certainly better worked and more systematically supervised, from Cape Breton on the East to Vancouver on the West. But whatever may be the differences that may exist between them on minor matters of church polity, the fact that there is a constant interchange of ministers, and that their great mission work lies contiguous, and has much in common with our own, makes it imperative that their should be occasionally mutual conferences and co-operation along certain lines.

As Dr. Cochrane remarks these churches, and we may include the smaller Presbyterian and Reformed Churches, in the United States, have much in common. They have the same standards and confession of faith; they demand the same standard of theological training, they have the same form of church government, and in a general way, follow the same rules in the reception of ministers from other denominations. And yet there are

manifest differences, which if synchronised would tend to make Presbyterianism on the American continent much more effective, and remove friction that occasionally is felt, from the varying forms of action, followed by these respective churches. The United States Churches, so far as known to us, have no scheme for the distribution of Probationers in vacancies, such as exists in the Canadian Church. This may appear to some rather a blessing than a defect, inasmuch as the scheme now in use is rendered to a great extent useless, by the indifference or opposition both of Presbyteries and Probationers. But neither have they any scheme for appointing students to mission fields in summer, as is done by our Home Mission Committees East and West. Again in the reception of ministers applying from other churches, there is no reference on the other side, to the supreme courts of the Church. Presbyteries receive them at once, whereas in the Canadian Church, they are first approved of by a Presbyter and then appear before the General Assembly for reception. Perhaps our method in certain cases is too rigid, but on the whole it is preferable. This divergence of practice, for reasons that need not now be discussed not unfrequently leads to friction, for it will not be disputed, that an Assembly Committee, removed from all local influences and prejudices, is better able to judge of the scholastic attainments, and the reasons given for the change in denomination than any one Presbytery. Then again—and more important still—the Mission work of the Canadian Church in the North West and British Columbia, is so contiguous to that of the United States Churches, that at times the student or missionary, is called to give temporary service in both countries. Indeed the Canadian Church in several well-known instances, has become the source of supply for leading pulpits in Dakota and adjacent territory. Some of the most promising students of Manitoba College and ministers in Manitoba, have gravitated across the line, and are lost to the Canadian Church. It may be difficult to prevent this, by any species of "protection" but certainly it is a one sided reciprocity, that makes the Canadian Church educate ministers for the United States. We may admire the good judgement of American Christians in calling them, but it becomes rather costly and trying, when we are crying out for labourers in our own vast mission fields.

These are but instances, where divergence in polity leads to difficulties, and involves both churches in needless expense. And above all, as Dr. Cochrane remarks, leaving all question of reciprocity in trade and tariffs, and such matters to politicians, what is there to prevent these churches, meeting on common ground, for the evangelizing of this great continent? A federated Presbyterian Church, through their representatives, discussing matters of vital importance to all, could do much to