

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- Coloured covers/  
Couverture de couleur
- Covers damaged/  
Couverture endommagée
- Covers restored and/or laminated/  
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- Cover title missing/  
Le titre de couverture manque
- Coloured maps/  
Cartes géographiques en couleur
- Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/  
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- Coloured plates and/or illustrations/  
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- Bound with other material/  
Relié avec d'autres documents
- Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin/  
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure
- Blank leaves added during restoration may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming/  
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.
- Additional comments:/  
Commentaires supplémentaires:

- Coloured pages/  
Pages de couleur
  - Pages damaged/  
Pages endommagées
  - Pages restored and/or laminated/  
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
  - Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/  
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
  - Pages detached/  
Pages détachées
  - Showthrough/  
Transparence
  - Quality of print varies/  
Qualité inégale de l'impression
  - Continuous pagination/  
Pagination continue
  - Includes index(es)/  
Comprend un (des) index
- Title on header taken from: /  
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:
- Title page of issue/  
Page de titre de la livraison
  - Caption of issue/  
Titre de départ de la livraison
  - Masthead/  
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below/  
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	12X	14X	16X	18X	20X	22X	24X	26X	28X	30X	32X
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

VOLUME XXIII.

NUMBER VIII.

THE  
MONTHLY RECORD,  
—OF THE—  
CHURCH OF SCOTLAND,  
—IN—  
NOVA SCOTIA, NEW BRUNSWICK,  
—AND—  
ADJOINING PROVINCES.

---

AUGUST,



1877.

PICTOU, N. S.:

PRINTED AT "THE COLONIAL STANDARD" OFFICE.

1877.

**NOTES OF THE MONTH.**

On the 12th of July a serious riot took place, between the Orangemen and Roman Catholics in Montreal, resulting in the death of one of the Orangemen.

Not wishing to disturb the peace of the city, the Orangemen, at the request of leading citizens, waived their right to a "procession," on the promise of the authorities that they would be protected in attending religious exercises, without their regalia. Faith was not kept with the Orangemen; a serious disturbance and reign of terror for a time was the result. Resolutions of Censure on the Mayor have been passed by mostly all the Orange Lodges in Ontario—pity that conduct so partial and culpable could not be punished more severely than by censure. 'Tis high time that distinctions between the rights of different creeds should cease, and the rights of all equally recognized. It is high time that partiality or cowardice in high places came to an end, otherwise a discontented, distrustful and disloyal spirit will manifest itself among a very important class of subjects, now the most peaceable and law abiding.

**ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.**

**HOME MISSION**

COLLECTED AT ROGERS HILL BY

Miss H. M. McKenzie, Scotsburn,	\$ 3.35
" A. Murray, B. Meadows,	1.25
" Elizabeth Murray,	4.10
" M. Fraser, Hardwood Hill, }	6.01
" J. McDonald, " }	
" D. Gordon, Dalhousie, }	3.60
" M. McKay, " }	
" A. Murray, Scotsburn, }	2.39
" J. Campbell, " }	
" C. McKay, }	5.75
" B. McKenzie, }	
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$26.45</b>

**CAPE JOHN.**

" C. McKenzie,	\$ 2.92
" M. Gran',	2.65
" F. McInnon,	1.45
" I. B. Fraser,	1.90
" I. McDonald,	1.05
" B. McKenzie,	
" N. Bailie,	2.67
" E. Gray,	
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$12.64</b>

**FOREIGN MISSION.**

Received from Saltsprings cong.	\$12.35
" " Mr. Galbraith,	
West Branch East River.	\$12.04
Stellarton.	\$5.61
St. Paul's, E. River,	\$10.50
<b>JAMES HISLOP,</b>	
Treasurer.	

**SUPPLEMENTING FUND.**

Neil McDonald, Lake Ainslie,	
per Rev. W. McMillan,	\$2.00

**ST. JOHN RELIEF FUND.**

St. Paul's, E. River,	\$8.65
-----------------------	--------

**PRESBYTERY HOME MISSION.**

Rec'd from Vale Colliery	
and Sutherland's River,	\$34.62
" " Falls Earltown,	\$28.00
<b>JAMES HISLOP,</b>	
Treasurer.	

**MISSIONS OF THE KIRK.**

Collected by Miss Jeannie McKenzie at 3 Brooks Carriboo, \$3.40. Handed in to Mr. Hislop, Treasurer, 9th July.

# THE MONTHLY RECORD,

OF THE

## Church of Scotland

IN

NOVA SCOTIA, NEW BRUNSWICK AND ADJOINING PROVINCES.

VOLUME XXIII.

AUGUST, 1877.

NUMBER VIII

*"If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning."—Psalms 137, 4-5.*

### THE PAN-PRESBYTERIAN COUNCIL.

EDINBURGH, July 5th, 1877.

The opening of the Pan-Presbyterian Council, which had been anticipated with so much interest by the Presbyterian churches throughout the world, took place in this city on the 3d inst. by religious services and a public meeting.

#### THE OPENING SERMON

was preached in the High School by Professor Flint to a large audience, his text being John xvii., 20, 21. After noticing the circumstances in which the words of the text were first spoken, Professor Flint went on to say that the unity prayed for had often been grievously misrepresented, and the consequences had been most lamentable. The aim of all philosophy was to reach a true intellectual unity; yet that had been the chief source of its errors. All false systems of speculations, like Materialism, Idealism, Positivism, and Pantheism, were simply systems based on false or narrow and exclusive unities. There were also caricatures of unity in political life; but nowhere had erroneous views as to the nature of unity been so mischievous as in the province of religion; for in its name men had been asked to sacrifice the most sacred rights of reason and conscience. Going on to speak of what Christian unity was, the preacher

pointed out that it had its origin in heaven, and was the natural and necessary expression of the common relationship of believing men to the one God, one Saviour, and one Holy Spirit. It was in itself separated by a broad and clear boundary from the unity opposed to it and glorified by Positivists, and Humanitarians, and Socialists—the mere unity of the human brotherhood. But the signs of the times seemed clearly to indicate that, in some form or another, what had been called the "religion of humanity," which was belief in the brotherhood of man, separated from belief in the fatherhood of God, would be one of the chief enemies which Christianity must contend with. The unity of the Church was not a thing merely to be hoped for in the future; it was a thing which already existed. Christians were certainly far indeed from being one as Christ desired they might be; but to the extent that they were Christians at all they were already one. Any unity, therefore, which they were entitled to look for in the future must be merely a development of that which already bound together Christian men of all denominations. Some seemed to think that the great duty of Christians in this matter was to ignore, or conceal, or get rid anyhow of their differences. They appeared to find it difficult to understand how there could be unity co-existing

with and underlying differences, and wholly distinct from uniformity, which could only be gained by the surrender or suppression of these differences. That was a very superficial view, and represented Christian unity, not as a living and spiritual thing, but as a mere dead, outward form of doctrine or polity. It was also a very dangerous view, for it tended to the establishment of ecclesiastical despotism. Christian unity did not require them to undervalue any particular truth, or surrender any denominational principle, or even an individual conviction, if well founded. It merely required that their minds and hearts should be open also to what was common, catholic, and universal, and that they should not allow their denominational differences and individual peculiarities to prevent them from praising and admiring the operations of the spirit of grace through the most dissimilar channels. There might be Christian oneness where there were also differences which no man could rationally account of slight moment. The differences between Protestants and Roman Catholics were of the most serious kind, religiously, morally, and socially; yet obviously the feelings to which St. Bernard gave expression in the hymn, "Jesus, thou joy of loving hearts," and those which Charles Wesley poured forth in the hymn, "Jesus, lover of my soul," had their touch in the same holy Spirit, and their object in the same divine Saviour. There was a great distance, and there were many differences, between the Roman Catholic Church and the Free Church of Scotland; but Fenelon and M'Cheyne were one in their spiritual experience; they were ecclesiastically far apart, but would anyone dare to say that they were not one in the Lord Jesus? As a matter of fact, it was not the differences of principle or of opinion between the various denominations which marred their Christian unity, but the evil and angry passions which gathered

round these differences. It was not when one body of men held honestly and firmly the Voluntary principle, and another body the Establishment principle, that Christian unity was broken; but when those who held the one principle insinuated that those who held the other were, in virtue of doing so, ungodly men; when, instead of freely acknowledging what was good in each other, each exaggerated what was good in itself, and depreciated what was good in the other, or even rejoiced in its neighbor's humiliation; and when those who represented them contended by speech or writing in a manner from which a courteous and honest man of the world would recoil, then certainly Christian unity was broken visibly and terribly, for then the Christian spirit itself was altogether absent or grievously feeble. While unity in the Christian faith had naturally led to a doctrinal unity, they must not confound the two things. A man might err very widely in creed and yet have a sincere believing soul. Wherever there was mental activity or intellectual or spiritual life, research was ever advancing; and the first results of advancing research, either into the meaning of God's Book of Nature, or of God's Book of Revelation, were always discordant and unsatisfactory. There were conflicting opinions entertained on many questions regarding heat, light, and electricity; there were rival schools in geology and natural history; there was hardly a subject in mental, moral, or political science about which there was not the greatest possible diversity of opinion. In all these cases, however, the continuance of free research would bring order out of chaos, and harmony out of confusion. But would the perfect order and harmony of nature, he asked, be discovered until science had fully comprehended nature, and there was no room left for further research? It was not otherwise with regard to revelation. They could only have absolute harmony

of opinion as to the Bible when there were no more new truths to be derived from it, or new questions raised concerning it; when its interpretation was perfected, and research regarding it completed. That would not be, he believed, before the day of doom. Certainly it would not be in their day. Never was Biblical research more actively pushed forward in all directions than at present; never, therefore, were the Churches more bound, while conscientiously guarding old and assured truths, to beware of dogmatism as to new views, or of unnecessarily trammelling advancing research. The free action of spiritual life in the form of investigation and criticism, when displayed in fields hitherto little trodden, and on questions hitherto little studied, might apparently produce, or really produce, for the time, only contradictory and destructive theories. Yet, in God's good time it would assuredly bring about unity and peace, and minister to faith and virtue, as it had done in fields already traversed, and in regard to questions not settled. Christian unity also tended to uniformity of worship; but it did not follow that the one was at all dependent on the other, because in his opinion there was not one divinely given form of worship for all men in all circumstances. The same had to be said about oneness of ecclesiastical government or polity, and in this connection he indicated the opinion that unions of Churches must be grown into, and not striven for, and that a Universal Church was as grandiose and diseased a dream as was a universal empire.

#### A PUBLIC RECEPTION

took place in the Industrial Museum in the evening, when about 5,000 persons were present. Addresses of welcome were delivered by the Lord Provost, Lord Balfour of Burleigh, and the Rev. Dr. Blaikie. The address of Lord Balfour was one of great beauty and power. He thought the number of delegates and associates who were present, and who,

he understood, represented more than 20,000 congregations of Presbyterians scattered all over the world, formed a striking proof of the life and vigor which existed in Presbyterianism at the present day, and he believed he was not wrong in thinking that is also bore ample testimony to a bond of sympathy which existed between the Scotch and the other Churches represented, and which he considered to have been engendered entirely through their united adherence to the forms of Presbyterian Government. It had been objected to such a Council, and to the alliance they proposed to form, that no practical good could arise from it, because no permanent union was likely to ensue. But to that he replied that they did not seek an absolute union. If by union was meant a merging of the individuality of their respective Churches into one Pan-Presbyterian union he thought that they should at once say that such was nothing more than the mere dream of an enthusiast. They should probably all admit that the spirit of separation, which had been engendered by years of separate existence—it might be in different countries under different forms of civil government—could not be annihilated by a stroke of the pen; but what they hoped they could do by means of the Council was to encourage a greater spirit of unity, to establish a more loyal co-operation among the different branches of the great Presbyterian family, and to form a means of communication, and to hold conferences upon subjects in which they, as Presbyterians, were all interested, perhaps he might not say invidiously, to the exclusion of other members of the Christian Church. Another thing they desired was, that those barriers of mistrust and misunderstanding which were apt to rise among them should be broken down. Such being their common aim and end, he asked them to join with him in wishing that the Council, which had been commenced in order, might be continued in harmony and ended in

peace, alike to the glory of God and the honor of the Presbyterian Church throughout the world. In a very graceful and impressive manner his lordship then pronounced a welcome to the assembled delegates.

These addresses were responded to very appropriately by several delegates. Dr. Adams, of New York, said that if anything could mitigate the sense of sadness to which those were subject who wandered far from home, it was such kind words as they had just listened to. Already they felt they were not strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens in that Church which knew no kindreds or nationalities. Professor Monod remarked that of all the Protestant Churches, the Established Reformed Presbyterian Church in France, he should not say had been the most faithful or the most pious, but had suffered the most for the Word of God and the Gospel of Christ. Principal Snodgrass, of Canada, expressed a hope that the Council might be the means of helping Presbyterians to realize more fully the importance of Christian oneness. Dr. McCosh, of Princeton, N. J., said that there were no fewer than fifty separate Presbyterian Churches in existence, and that, till the present movement originated, most of them had no bond of union among them. They were now, however, united for the purpose of promoting the spread of the Gospel. Amongst other speakers were Dr. De Pressense, of Paris, and Professor Balogh, of Hungary, both of whom referred to the condition of Reformed Churches on the Continent, and were happy to see the great Church of the Reformation—the great Presbyterian Church—united in such a beautiful and marvellous way, forming a great confederacy, and showing to the world that without which religion should perish—liberty and unity.

The Council assembled for business on Wednesday morning in the Free Assembly Hall, under the presidency of

Dr. Stuart Robinson, of Louisville, Ky. After some preliminary matters had been arranged, Dr. Schaff, of New York, read a paper on

#### HARMONY OF REFORMED CONFESSIONS.

Having referred to the Conference summoned by Archbishop Cranmer in 1552 for the purpose of forming a union of all Reformed Churches, Dr. Schaff divided the Reformed Confessions into three classes—the ante-Calvinistic, the Calvinistic, and the post-Calvinistic. After detailing the principal Calvinistic confessions, including the Westminster Standards, he said these documents constituted a most remarkable body of literature. They were not originally intended to be formulas; they were rather apologies—a vindication of the Protestant Evangelical faith against Romish misrepresentation and slander. They resembled in that respect the Apology of the early Christian centuries, only that, instead of being directed against Paganism and Judaism, they were directed against Romanism; and they represented a far more mature stage of Christian knowledge and experience. It was only by their intrinsic merits that they became an authority inferior only to the Word of God, of which they professed to be a fair summary. Although these confessions were very numerous, yet they expressed and taught substantially one and the same system of doctrine. There was no such harmony between the Reformed confessions of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as there was between the symbolic books of the Lutheran Church, or the Tridentine and Vatican standards of the Church of Rome. All these Reformed confessions unanimously taught that the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament were the only infallible rule of Christian faith and practice, in opposition to the Roman principle of holding ecclesiastical traditions as a joint rule of faith and practice. For more than two hundred years these confessions

maintained their supremacy in the councils of the Church, in the professor's chair, and in the pulpit. Then followed, in the middle of last century, a theological revolution such as had never swept over the Christian Church. It affected not only the Reformed, but still more the Lutheran and Roman Churches; while in France it ended in the Reign of Terror and the French Revolution, which abolished Christianity itself. Since then the symbolic books had lost their former authority in almost every country except England, Scotland, and the United States. In the present century came theological revival, which was still going on all over the Christian world. That revival or regeneration was a return to the faith of the Reformation, a deeper plunge into the truths of the Bible. The faith was the same, but the theology differed. Every age must produce its own theology. Modern theology was a catholic endeavor to do justice to all elements of truth scattered abroad in other branches of the Christian Church, which had resulted in such practical movements as the Evangelical Alliance, the Presbyterian Confederation, and the union of the old and new schools of theology in America. It had now become an article of faith that conscience was a sacred domain over which God alone had sway, and that while the civil magistrate was bound to maintain and protect the subject, he had no right to interfere with a man's religious convictions. The last point he had intended touching upon was, what was this Council to do with this great question of the consensus of the Reformed confessions? It had declared such consensus necessary to membership. Was that consensus to be left indefinite, or to be formulated by a series of articles, by historical statement, or by an Ecumenical Reformed Confession?

The Rev. Mr. Cousin, Edinburgh, on behalf of Professor Kraft, Bonn, submitted a paper, the general scope of which

was to realise in a series of articles—thirty-one in number—the idea of Cranmer of a consensus of the Reformed confessions. The paper had been to some considerable extent, Mr. Cousin said, anticipated by Professor Schaff, so that it was unnecessary to repeat it.

Professor Mitchell, St. Andrews, submitted a printed statement, in which he endeavored to show the harmony of the Westminster Confession with the confessions of the earlier Reformed Churches, and particularly, in so far as it was not founded on the Irish Articles, its harmony with French and Belgian confession, relating to the Holy Scriptures, which could not be traced in the Irish Articles, might, he thought, be pretty clearly traced in the two confessions he had named.

An interesting conversation ensued. Principal Brown, Aberdeen, remarked that the harmony of the Reformed confessions could not be too distinctly expressed or too prominently brought forward in order to silence—it would not do that, but to put to shame the calumny of the Church of Rome, which said that the Reformed Churches were divided into as many distinct and conflicting religions as there were sects of them. The more intelligent Romanists knew perfectly well that this was false, but it suited them all the same to say it and repeat it, because it had a certain pithy and plausible sound, but nothing more; and Presbyterians were there to testify, and they did testify, that it was false, that in all that was substantial and vital in Christianity the Reformed Churches were practically one.

Professor Candlish, Glasgow, said they could not but be impressed, not only with the actual harmony of the various confessions of the different branches of the Protestant Church, but also with the consciousness on the part of the Churches of the age of the Reformation, and long afterwards, as to the agreement of their confessions. There



were some circumstances, especially in the history of the Church of Scotland in those days, which he thought very interestingly brought this out; and in a very elaborate manner the Professor illustrated the point.

Dr. Marshall Lang, Glasgow, thought there were deeper issues involved than merely touching the surface in their confessions; there was the whole question as to the authority and place of the Bible, and behind that the whole question of the supernatural; and he did not think they could deal with this matter at all effectively unless they dealt with it in a spirit of deep responsibility, intense earnestness, and thorough understanding of the whole question relating to the theology of the Roman Churches. Further, they must remember that, as there was a harmony of the Reformed confessions in the sixteenth century, so there was also to be considered the harmony of the Reformed Churches in the nineteenth century; and there was a mighty responsibility resting upon any Church or body of Christians which, by its own denominational action, would break upon this harmony, or so act as not to keep the unity of Christendom as the higher thought ever in remembrance.

A motion was made by Mr. Taylor Innes, advocate, Edinburgh, to remit the whole subject to a committee to obtain information.

Principal Tulloch, St. Andrews, seconded the motion. They could never, he thought, remit to any committee to draw out a new creed, or even formulate a consensus of all creeds without their being fully informed about those creeds. Now it appeared to him that this information, which was what they were to obtain if the motion was adopted, was exactly what they needed. Nothing could be more interesting than that they should know what were the actual creeds of all the Churches composing the Council.

After a few playful remarks from Dr.

Begg and Dr. Ormiston, the motion was adopted.

Dr. Gould presided at the afternoon meeting, at which a paper was read by Professor Cairns, Edinburgh, on

#### GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF PRESBYTERIANISM, AND ITS RELATION TO THE WANTS OF THE DAY.

After alluding to the primary points on which all Churches were agreed, such as the need for a creed and the rules of discipline, the Rev. Professor proceeded to indicate the views which separated Presbyterians from Episcopalians. First, he said, they differed in principle from Episcopalians in holding that there was a variety among the governors of the Christian Church. No Episcopalian needed to be convinced that a teacher in the Church was also a ruler—what he required to be convinced of was that others who were not teachers might also be rulers. No doubt, they were now seeing great approximations made to Presbyterian principles in this direction by Episcopalians; but still, it was distinctive and characteristic of Presbyterianism, that it alone contended on principle that there should be this variety. So important was this doctrine to him, that if it were taken away, he should, he confessed, have but little heart to plead for the equality of Presbyter and Bishop. While circumstances had hindered the Continental Churches from fully developing this principle, the Churches in Britain, America, and the colonies had fully recognized it; and thus their brethren from the Continent, who were members of the Council, might see the success which had attended the working of this part of their system, and might go home strengthened and encouraged to give more prominence in future to the principle than they had been able to do in the past. The other point on which they were separated from Episcopalians had reference to equality of power in the government of the Church

—Presbyterians, of course, holding that there should be no Bishop higher than a Presbyter. In connection with this topic the Rev. Dr. brought forward arguments in support of the Presbyterian position, and in refutation of the arguments on the other side. Speaking afterwards of the manner in which they differed from Congregationalists, he said their arguments against the principles of that Church were more inferential than in the other case. They asked the Congregationalists to show any case in Scripture where a controversy was begun and ended within the limits of a single congregation, and to show where there was evidence that in the great cities of Ephesus, Antioch, and Jerusalem, there was a possibility of a single congregation accommodating or supplying the wants of the whole community. In conclusion he pointed out the advantages secured by synodical government; urged that the Arminian controversy might either have been avoided or rendered less injurious had this part of their system been then more fully carried out; and, quoting Dr. Chalmers' opinion as to the Presbyterian basis being one to which on the one hand, Episcopalians might lower themselves, and to which on the other, Congregationalists might elevate themselves, submitted that Presbyterianism might in this light be said to be a kind of

#### Midway station given

For happy spirits to alight between the earth and heaven.

Dr. A. A. Hodge, Princeton, in speaking of "Presbyterianism in relation to the wants and tendencies of the day," said that in modern times a triangular contest has been inaugurated between the Presbyterian principle of human equality subject to Divine sovereignty and liberty under the supremacy of the written Word at the apex, and the ancient foe of absolutism and the modern foe of license at the opposite angles.

Dr. Stuart Robinson, Louisville, next read a paper on the "Churchliness of Calvinism." Remarking on the distinctive theological opinions of Zwingli, Luther, and Calvin, he showed that Calvin advanced on Luther and Zwingli just as the later astronomical theories advanced on those of Ptolemy and Copernicus. The earlier Fathers made the centre of their theological system the Son of God, but Calvin showed that the whole system moved round another force—"the eternal purpose of God."

Dr. Irenaeus Prime, New York, read a paper on the "Influence of Presbyterianism in the United States." The Presbyterian Church in the States, he said, had shown as great capacity for division and sub-division as it had elsewhere. Presbyterians were the same set of men, and they were setting the same way—that was, their own way—always ready to give up when convinced, but never convinced, if they could help it—willing at any time to part with their best friend rather than yield a point in dispute. Indeed, they had a tradition in America that one of their Presbyterian Fathers in Scotland, when moderator, prayed thus:—"Grant, oh Lord, that we may be right, for Thou knowest we are very decided." They had in all in the States 9,028 Presbyterian ministers, 12,000 congregations with 1,005,200 members, raising in one year money contributions for various purposes to the amount of £3,000,000, equal to £3 for each communicant. The history of the Church had been marked by steady, solid growth.

Dr. Inglis, Brooklyn, in making some remarks on the papers, commented on certain of the tendencies of the times, and said it was evident they must, as Presbyterians, give no countenance to the philosophy which sought to limit the idea of God to its conclusions.

After a few other short speeches by Dr. Blaikie, Dr. Wilson, Limerick, and Mr. R. G. Balfour, the papers were remitted to a committee.

In the evening a

PUBLIC MEETING

was held, at which Lord Moncrieff presided. His remarks, he thought, though not profound, would represent the thoughts of the laity regarding what might be called the secular effect of Presbyterian Church government. They were met in the spirit of brotherhood and mutual sympathy and respect. Presbyterian communities, like all other communities, had their own distinctive sections, their own pronounced opinions, their own subjects of difference. Differences were laid aside, and they were met for the purpose of union and co-operation respecting even the differences which, though they existed, could not separate those who were one in object and heart. This conference was well-timed in the present juncture of religious opinion and belief. There were those who looked with some despondency, apprehension, and foreboding upon the state of opinion throughout the world. It was no doubt an age of bold inquiry—an age when many forgotten dogmas were revived, and many received truths were decried or derided. He had no apprehension of the tendency of the present age. So far as one could read into the future, he thought these signs were not in the last discouraging. While he wished to extend that freedom of opinion to others which he demanded for himself, he could not help remarking that there were some who seemed to try, belonging as they did to the Presbyterian Church, how far they could stray from the Presbyterian faith without wishing to be deserters from it. He thought those people should remember that the freedom of conscience, the liberty of opinion, the toleration, which enabled them to express their own mind, was the fruit, wholly and solely, of the Reformation. The heresies which were dug up in one age, refuted in the next, and discovered again in the third, simply indicated the tendency of the human mind. He did not

think there was anything in present speculations to lead men to despond in the slightest degree for the future opinions of the world. That spirit which not only could maintain itself, but which leavened the whole mind of Europe when the powers of earth were against it, was quite able to hold its own; nothing but its own supineness was against it. He had rather have an age of inquiry and disputation like the present than an age of lethargy and indifference. Earnestness was really the foundation of all success, and they might depend upon it that out of the contact of earnest minds the spark of truth was to be elicited. Men must be met with their own weapons, and if the challengers of anciently received opinions were to be met with success, they must be met on their own ground; learning must be brought against learning, knowledge against knowledge, earnestness against earnestness. If those were stirred up who had the power, he thought there would be no necessity in the end to regret the collision of opinion. Presbyterian Church government was cosmopolitan; it was not provincial—not a Church numbering only amongst its adherents those who spoke one language or descended from the same race. Presbyterian polity was a complete and symmetrical system. The Presbyterian Church was not a college of ecclesiastics, but was composed of the whole body of the faithful, and it was impossible to exaggerate the importance of the lay element. The only remark he should make with reference to spiritual independence was that it appeared to him impossible to have spiritual independence in a Church connected with the State, unless the lay element was introduced. Spiritual independence could only properly exist, in its full force, in a Church where the governing body was not purely ecclesiastical, but where the people were truly and fairly represented. There was ecclesiastical parity in the Presbyterian Church; for there

was no recognition in it of such a thing as a priest, in the sacerdotal sense. Presbyterian polity was the cradle of toleration; it had always been the bulwark of liberty; and he did not know a better test for the efficiency and purity of a church than this. A church that was the enemy of toleration, that was the handmaid and companion of political oppression, he did not think could be any possibility be an Apostolic Church. Under Presbyterianism a man depended on no one, and that feeling had given a manly spirit of independence to the Presbyterian population in this and all other countries where it had been allowed free scope.

Dr. Hoge, Richmond, delivered an address on the "Simplicity and Scriptural Character of Presbyterianism, its expansiveness and adaptation, and its friendly aspect to other Evangelical Churches."

The Rev. Mr. Henderson, Ballarat, said Presbyterianism was adapted to the wants of a new country like Australia and New Zealand, and it had done good work there.

Dr. Ormiston, Reformed Dutch Church, New York, confirmed what had been said as to the expansibility and adaptation of the Presbyterian system. It was with sorrow he had heard it said in good old Scotland that the Shorter Catechism, which was prepared expressly for those of weaker understanding, was not fit for a child. He told them it was; he knew it, because he had tried it, having been reared on oat-cakes and the Catechism on the banks of the Clyde. That form of sound words was like the good pease-bannock he remembered in his early days, which could be kicked from one end of the house to the other without being spoiled: they might trample on it as they pleased; and when his friends were able to do what he could once do—begin either at the middle, the beginning, or the end of the Catechism—they should find that the book was one which gave light to the understanding

and joy to the heart, and which, if it was used there, was a power in the pulpit.

Dr. Fraser, London, said that while concurring in the views that had been previously expressed, he wished to be allowed to state that he had been a little surprised and chagrined at the compliments paid to the Council by those outside, and who said that, after all, it was not supposed that Presbyterianism was synonymous with Christianity. How, he asked, had it entered into men's minds that Presbyterians entertained such a notion as that? It had never been in their thoughts to arrogate to themselves a position of exclusive dignity and favor, to the disparagement of those of their fellow Christians who were organized under ministrations different from their own. So long as they did not give countenance to the superficial, and often mischievous, notion that it was of no consequence to what section of the Christian Church a man belonged so long as he himself was a genuine Christian, he did not think they could not cure and heal, in frets and divisions and discords of Christian society by as much co-operation as was possible, not merely with fellow Presbyterians, but with fellow Christians, in the enterprises of Christian righteousness and love which were open to them in an informal and extra-ecclesiastical Christian union.

Dr. Macgregor, Edinburgh, after stating that he believed it quite possible to make a great deal too much of their Presbyterian principles, said that, nevertheless, all this talk about their principles was needed, which position he illustrated by a variety of examples.

The meeting closed with thanks to the chairman.

EDINBURGH, July 11th, 1877.

At the re-assembling of the Council on Monday morning, after some preliminary matters had been disposed of, a paper was read by Dr. Patton, of Chicago, on

"THE UNBELIEF OF THE PRESENT DAY."

In undertaking to explain why men did not believe they must be careful lest, in referring to

the Church, the want of consistency among Christians, they overlooked the generic cause of unbelief in the subjective state of the sinner, in a depraved nature, which, in the first place, made him desirous of hearing the gospel; in the second place, put him in a false argumentative attitude in respect to the gospel; and in the third place, prevented his hearty acceptance of the gospel, though intelligently convinced of its truth. Faith in the Bible and faith in Christ were so closely allied that sometimes there was confusion of thought in regard to their relations. Saving faith was confidence in Christ, and not belief in the authority of Scripture. The two things were distinct. For a man might believe the Scriptures and not trust Christ, and a man might trust Christ who never saw the Scriptures. They must keep these things separate for two reasons—(1) lest they rashly misjudged that a man thus lost his hope in Christ because he had never held, or had ceased to hold, the required view in regard to all, or a part of the Scriptures; (2) lest in their anxiety to serve the truth they put themselves in a false argumentative position. For he held that if a man's Bible should be reduced to the three synoptic gospels, it would still be his duty to believe in a risen Saviour, and to trust Him for salvation. Where unbelief was not due to lack of evidence, increasing the evidence would not help a man. After referring to sundry other points of this nature the speaker insisted that a revival of the study of dogmatic theology, and of a doctrinal ministry was needed. They must carry on an inductive study of the Scriptures in order that they might ascertain what was the mind of the Spirit on the points of inquiry. Dogmatic theology was an inductive science, but, like other inductive sciences, it was deductive, too.

Dr. McCosh, of Princetown, N. J., next read a paper on

#### DISCOVERIES IN SCIENCE AND SPECULATIONS IN PHILOSOPHY.

No wise man, he said, would set himself against laws established by deduction. Religious men often injured their cause by denying truths of science which had been established beyond question. Christians might leave scientific men to settle questions of alleged science, for those seemed to him to be questions in which Christians, as Christians, had no interest. Supposing a law established according to the canons of induction, it would be madness in Christians to resist this. He who had an intelligent faith in Scripture was sure that no science could contradict him. Very likely, on inquiry, he would find that the scientific discovery was not opposed to any statement in the Word of God, but to some popular or traditional belief. Pious men were staggered at first with the Copernican theory, but they were not so now; and it was shown that the account

given by Moses 3,000 years ago was in wonderful accordance with geology as to the succession of day and epochs of the world's formation. In our own day the keenest discussion arose round the question of development, and religious men were only injuring the cause of Christianity when they denied the development hypothesis to educated young men. Those who had to deal with young men know that, were clergymen to say that there was no such thing as development, they would be laughed at. Scripture was full of development. But development, while it explained much, could not explain anything, and the religious men might let the investigation and discussion go on, feeling confident that, when scientists gave to the hypothesis all that it could claim, there would be left an indefinite region in the possession of religion, not unknown, but known as clearly as that the sun shone on the earth; and they might see in it the design and moral government of God, who was all and above all. Physical science in its most advanced forms seemed to him more in accordance with Scripture in the present day than it was during last century and the beginning of this century. Sir William Thomson and Mr. Herbert told them that the world was one day to be burned up with fire, a truth which a Galilean fisherman knew 1,800 years ago. It was of some moment in this age to have scientific men admitting that there was evil in the world, for our savans had actually reached the same conclusion on that point as the Preacher in Ecclesiastes. The German philosophy of Hegel had now no influence, the most powerful philosophy being materialistic psychology. This had great power in England, and some influence in Scotland; in America it is known in schools of science, but it is counteracted in the colleges by the religious character of those institutions.

#### "THE PERSONALITIES OF GOD"

was the subject of a paper by Dr. Watts, of Belfast, in which he said the question arose, Was the one ultimate cause of all a person or a thing? When they said God was a person, they meant that He was a self-conscious, a self-determining power. Not only was their own good Calvinistic theory unchangeable through all history and movements of the Church, but in fact natural theology was unchangeable. There was nothing in an existing form of life to account for its origin, and there lay between life and all forms of the inorganic world a gulf which science had never bridged, and which he believed it never could bridge. That which exhibited marks of design must have been an intelligent author, and as that was true of the universe, the universe must have had an intellectual author.

Addresses were then delivered by several prominent members of the Council, on the sub-

jects thus introduced. Dr. Ed. de Pressense pointed out the prevailing characteristics of infidelity. Dr. Hoedemaker, Amsterdam, that in Holland the National Reformed Church was just recovering from the long sickness of Rationalism. They had had infidelity in the Church and among the people, which had rested upon them as an incubus; but now they could look back upon what it had been and could fortify their brethren in other lands and say:—"Don't be too much afraid of it, God will make it into a blessing after all." Sir H. Moncrieff thought the papers which had been read proved that there were abundant resources within the Presbyterian Churches for meeting modern infidelity on its own ground. Dr. Wangemann, Berlin, after referring to the sceptical tone of newspapers, magazines, and scientific associations in his native country, said that, in view of this state of matters, it was to be deplored that the Christian Church had almost entirely abandoned scientific research in the physical world. Something, he urged, must be done in this direction. There was much greater need for Christian investigators of the book of nature than for theologians. Professor Flint, Edinburgh, set forth what he thought should be the attitude of the Church towards unbelief. Professor Cairns, Edinburgh, said the grand source of unbelief was moral and spiritual. Man could not remove it; argument could not remove it; even example could not remove it; they must go back to prayer.

#### THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

was the subject of the first paper at the afternoon session, introduced by M. Theodore Monod, Paris. Spiritual life, he said, was not a question, but *the* question of Christendom. The whole of Christendom would be of less use without spiritual life than the huge skeleton of the whale hanging from the ceiling of the Industrial Museum. Spiritual life was a necessary result to a correct intellectual conception; but holiness did not follow orthodoxy as a matter of course. It was one thing to hold the truth; another thing to be held and governed by the truth.

Dr. Andrew Thomson, Edinburgh, read a paper entitled

#### "THE SABBATH A HELP."

While he was afraid the Sabbath was not so well observed now as it was many years ago, still, looking along the lines of Christendom, it is pleasing to notice at various points measures and movements whose intention was to preserve the day of rest, and recover it where it had been nearly or wholly lost. The advantages of the Sabbath rest were then ably pointed out.

#### "INTEMPERANCE IN THE UNITED STATES"

was the subject of a letter next read by Dr. Lane, Allegheny, in which he said that on

the other side of the Atlantic intemperance was not correlated as it should be with other social evils. It was estimated that there were 160,000 shops for the sale of intoxicating liquor in the United States, \$500,000,000 spent in drug annually, 500,000 habitual drunkards, and at least 50,000 annually going down to a drunkard's grave and a drunkard's doom. The evil was a terrible one, and the Church in the United States had come to realize its importance, for three-fourths of the Presbyterian ministers there had become total-abstainers. The Church, he submitted, must utter her protest against the drinking usages of society.

---

## The Monthly Record.

---

AUGUST, 1877.

---

### HOME MISSION.

At the risk of wearying our readers we return to this subject. Our aim is to convince Kirk Sessions of the necessity of collecting for this scheme by schedule —by lady collectors calling at every house in order to give every family an opportunity of contributing something. It may be said "we do not like to be always asking for money for the schemes;—people get tired of it." We answer; It is not just that some congregations should regularly contribute while others do nothing. The most loyal will soon grow weary of it and give over contributing. It is not true moreover that people in general complain of being asked for money. There may be a few who will grumble; but the great majority give willingly and cheerfully.

It may be the duty of others to refuse, but let themselves be the judges of that. A man may be in debt, or from some other cause may find it impossible to contribute. Be it so: we have no right to accuse him of stinginess. But by all means let the sessions give every family a chance to give or withhold as Providence has dealt with them. One explanation of the marvellous financial success of the Free Church immediately

after the disruption is to be found in this that once a month lady collectors called on every Free Church family in all Scotland for a contribution. It was one of the most perfect organizations in the world. No civil government ever invented anything like it. Indeed no civil government could work such a scheme for the collectors laboured voluntarily, and without reward. Every adherent was thus led to interest himself in the work of the church. The true idea of Church organization was thus realized.

It is quite true collectors will seldom come forward to offer their services; but let the minister pay them the compliment of asking them and no one will refuse. It is only with an effort that the most liberal will contribute. Even those who are under a strong sense of their responsibility will not give without an opportunity. The church must give them a chance. If the elders will not assist in this work let the minister do it himself. Year after year our Presbytery orders it to be done, and a few only obey. Is it to be so always? It is not the fault of our people. It is the fault of Kirk Sessions; at their door lies the whole blame. The church does not ask for large sums. A quarter dollar a family would secure \$500 a year in this Presbytery. Let our readers examine our columns and see for themselves what congregations do their duty. In our next article we purpose publishing a list of those who do not contribute, beginning with some of our wealthiest congregations.

Perhaps there should be a committee of two appointed by Presbytery to see that each congregation does its duty, with instructions to visit delinquent ones, and bring the matter before them.

---

#### MINUTES OF PICTOU PRESBYTERY.

##### ST. ANDREW'S CHURCH,

Pictou, 27th June, 1877.

The Presbytery of Pictou met this day, according to appointment, and was

constituted with prayer by the Rev. Geo. Coull, Moderator, with whom were present Rev. Messrs. Herdman, McMillan, Stewart, Fraser, Dunn, Galbraith McKay, MacKichan and McCunn, Ministers, and Messrs. Fraser, (C. John,) McBean and Munro Elders.

The representatives of Vale Colliery and Sutherland's River Congregation having intimated that they had made an arrangement with Mr. A. W. McLeod for his services as Catechist at the rate of \$600 per annum, the Presbytery agreed to sanction the arrangement. Appointments made at last meeting for Vale and Sutherland's River were cancelled.

It was moved, seconded and agreed to that Mr. J. C. Herdman, a licentiate of the Church of Scotland, (Presbytery of Edinburgh) being present, be invited to sit and deliberate. Mr. Herdman being requested by the Moderator, made a short statement as to the terms on which he had been sent out to this field by the Colonial Committee, from which it appeared that the Committee while paying passage money and providing outfit, give no commission to any particular Presbytery.

The Presbytery proceeded to the consideration of the "Rules for the Sustentation Fund" drawn up by the Committee, and published in the June RECORD; when, after some conversation and several suggestions made, it was agreed to leave the Rules open for discussion and emendation until the next quarterly meeting. In the meantime congregations are requested to choose their representative in accordance with Rule 6. It was further agreed that the first meeting of the managers be held on Wednesday, 5th Sept.

It was agreed to ask the Colonial Committee if they would be willing to pay for the services of a Catechist for C. Breton, or should a Gaelic Catechist not be available to contribute to the expense of supplying the pulpits of one or

our Gaelic-speaking ministers say for six or eight sabbaths during summer, to enable such minister to labour among the vacant congregations in the island of C. Breton.

Closed with the Benediction.

ROBT. MCCUNN,  
Pres. Clerk.

We extract the following from the Report of The Church of Scotland's Col. Com. and which will show many of our readers, what they wish to be assured of, viz., that the Church of Scotland still regards with undiminished attachment, and will continue to aid with her wonted liberality, those who continue to call themselves by her name in this and other of her colonies.

#### FUNDS.

The Committee's income from all sources during the year ending 31st December 1876, was £6581, 16s. 4d., upwards of £1800 being derived from legacies. The expenditure for the same period, though no new field was entered on, was £8182, 7s. 9d.—the excess of expenditure over income being £1600, 11s. 5d. In these circumstances, the Committee have reason to be thankful for balances at their bankers and in the hands of their Treasurer, amounting to £2458, 13s. 10d, which enable them to await with hope the return of the opportunity for a renewal of the liberal support which the congregations of the Church of Scotland have ever afforded to the Colonial Missions of the General Assembly.

For that liberal support the Committee renew their cordial thanks; and they appeal, in justification of their hopes for its continuance, to the wide field and the great work they have on hand, as indicated by the Report they now lay before the General Assembly, with the documents in illustration of it contained by the Appendix.

The claims of CANADA alone are ample proof that in the great Colonies of the Empire the work of the Church in caring for the spiritual welfare of emigrants from Scotland is by no means at an end. It may be that by recent ecclesiastical changes in Canada the relation of the Church of Scotland to *one part* of the field is modified. To this extent it is so modified, that in aiding the recently united Church in Canada (as in other colonies where similar churches exist), the General Assembly stands side by side with all the Presbyterian churches at home, to co-operate with them in supporting a work which, *for a time at least*, must be aided. And *that* is co-operation in which the General Assembly of the National Church will certainly desire to be creditably forward. Unless all co-operation everywhere in Christian work is to cease till everybody sees eye to eye about everything, there seems to the Colonial Committee no reason why it should cease in Canada. Strict neutrality as to the question which has divided our brethren there does not seem to the Committee to necessarily involve any impossibility in the way of co-operation in the work,—*as to which they are as one*—of promoting the religious interests of Canadian immigrants who are our Presbyterian fellow-country-men. Ever since 1871, when the General Assembly first declared itself as to threatened ecclesiastical divisions in Canada, *non-intervention in the differences* which divide the colony has always been associated in the Assembly's resolutions on the subject with a declared propose to *co-operate in the spiritual work* of our brethren there. The Assembly has persistently declined the right to dictate to colonial churches as to what in regard to incorporating unions ought to be their course; and now that their several courses are determined, the Assembly will not visit either side, or both sides, with what would practically be a penalty for having acted on the dictates of their



consciences, by withdrawing from co-operation with them, *so long as it is necessary*, in the great work which the Lord has called them to in the mission-fields of their adopted home. The time no doubt is probably approaching when the co-operation, at present called for, shall be no longer needed. Meanwhile, the claims on the aid of all the home churches, pressed by appeals from New Zealand and Australia, as well as from Canada, do undoubtedly demand the earnest sympathy and liberal support of the Church of Scotland, and the Committee will not allow themselves to believe that for any reason she shall fail in her support and sympathy.

But the Report, with its appendix, now laid before the General Assembly, represents the effort of the Church of Scotland to fulfil her duty to our expatriated countrymen, far beyond the limits merely of the great colonies of the British Empire. The history of the Committee's work from the beginning fully illustrates the design of their appointment to have been to follow, on behalf of the Church, her spiritual children with anxiety as to their eternal welfare, wherever they may become resident, in any place *anywhere abroad*. Through the operations of the Colonial Committee the Church thus seeks, as to Scottish emigrants on every distant shore at the very time when the need is greatest, on their first settling down in their new home, to aid in providing for them the ministrations of the Gospel, according to the Scriptural standards of faith, and the simple forms of worship of the Church of their Fatherland; and what effort could better become the character of a living Church whose Christian activities crave full expression in every field of missionary enterprise? The Home and Foreign fields have each of their urgent claims to be equally respected in the right discharge of our missionary duty. No living Church healthfully exercising its Christian activities, will ever neglect the

one for the sake of the other. But claims just as urgent are presented by the field, distinct from both our Home and Foreign Missions—as it were, between them, and partaking of the character of both—where lies the work of the Church among our home-bred Presbyterian emigrants to the colonies and residents in foreign countries. And assuredly, wherever with reverence the Master's voice is heard asserting the relations of all just claims on the support and sympathy of a living Church, His judgment as to what we owe to *Home and Foreign Missions*, and to our *Missions to Scottish emigrants abroad*, will reach us in the solemn words of the familiar sentence, "*These ought ye to have done.*" AND NOT TO LEAVE THE OTHER UNDONE."

*In name and by appointment* }  
*of the Committee.* }

ROBERT H. MUIR, *Convener.*

THE MANSE, DALMENY, EDIN- }  
BURGH, 21st May, 1877. }

---

#### THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

The Holy Spirit is the beginner and finisher of the work of grace in the hearts of the redeemed. He enlightens, sanctifies, and comforts, and is given by the Father to those who ask him. And as the corn of wheat is by degrees softened and dissolved in the ground, and gradually, without our perceiving it, assumes a life of its own, puts forth a germ, and silently continues to grow, until the blade makes its appearance above ground; so, according to holy Scripture, is the process in the renewed heart. It loses by degrees its own peculiar form, its old inclinations and views; it is sensible of something within, living and powerful, which frees the spirit more and more, and raises it above this world, until the day dawn, the morning star arise, and the mystery, 'Christ in us,' be made manifest in it."