

be had. As a consequence, it is a simple fact that, whereas in certain small towns the places open for the sale of liquor before the Scott Act came into operation numbered from 15 to 20, after that they numbered from 30 to 40. Not only so, but the sale of liquor was carried on (inevitably) by a less respectable class of men. Another consequence was a deterioration in the quality of the liquor sold; another the fostering of a habit of secret drinking, productive of all kinds of evils; another the inaugurating of a system of espionage, conducted by the agents of the prohibitionists—some of them very unscrupulous; and finally a system of lying, contention, perjury, which produced the very worst effects in many districts. We forgot to mention the secret and illicit manufacture of liquor, generally of the most abominable quality; but even now we doubt whether we have enumerated all the evils of the system. These are not imaginary or speculative evils—they are facts to which many will bear witness who promoted the introduction of the Scott Act, and who were most unwilling to confess that it was a failure. It was, however, a failure; it did not promote temperance, it worried the respectable members of the community whom it was in no way necessary to restrain, it did not restrain those who seemed to need restraint. It did no good; it did much harm. It may be said, however, that we are taking only one set of examples. Why not go to the States in which prohibition is exercised? Very well, it is testified by witnesses of undoubted veracity that the same consequences of prohibition are found there. Moreover, although the retail sale of liquor is prohibited in those states, it may be introduced from other states and sold in larger quantities (in parcels). What might be the consequence of total prohibition throughout the Dominion one can only imagine. We would therefore implore our readers to think well—twice—three times before they bring such a measure into force. There is not a great deal of intemperance in Canada. We believe there is less and less every year; and the spread of education and moral and religious influences will do far more and far better in this and in all other needs than compulsion or restraint. We cannot force people to be good, although we may influence them. A peculiar responsibility is laid upon members of the Church of England. Some other communities will go almost solid one way or the other. Members of our own communion are not pledged in this manner. It is to be hoped, therefore, that they will be guided by sound reason and reflection, and by a consideration of the consequences which will result from their action.

BISHOPS AND PEOPLE.

It must surely be reckoned among the blessings accorded to the Canadian Church that there has been, of late years, at least, hardly any friction between the bishops and the people. Of course that might result from a state of things in which no work was being done, and therefore no collision could

occur. But we do not believe that this is the case among ourselves. We believe it has resulted from two things, from the bishops allowing to the clergy and laity a large amount of influence in the government of the Church, and from the clergy and laity regarding the office and person of the Bishop with reverence and affection. Apparently there are other parts of the world where the case is different. An article in "The Star," an ably conducted journal, published in Johannesburg, has an article headed "The Bishop and his People," which enables us to see how things may be so managed as to bring about something like a rebellion. This is the way the article begins: "His Lordship, the Bishop of Pretoria, although he has the most charming personality, has been splashing in hot water ever since he took the souls of the Transvaal Episcopalians in charge. He is, in his way, as autocratic and as obstinate as another eminent Pretorian who shall be nameless." There can be no doubt who this is, and it is a pity that Bishop Bonsfield should, during his ten years of office, have found no better example of deportment than President Kruger. The article goes on: "As a natural consequence he has been involved in divers quarrels with his churches and his clergy, which have been followed with cynical interest by people of other creeds and denominations, and with indecent jubilation by the many who have no creed at all." Then comes an account of an episode far from edifying arising out of a dispute between the Bishop and his people, who complain that he has not only overruled the law of the matter and the wishes of the laity, but also the decision of the South African bishops. The long article ends in the following manner: Taking everything into consideration, and fully recognizing as we do Mr. Bonsfield's many admirable qualities, we feel bound to express our opinion that the Church would, on the whole, benefit by his Lordship's retirement." It is quite possible that a full statement of the controversy which, however, is here impossible, might cast some different light upon this affair. It can matter little to people in South Africa what we, in this remote Canada, may think of the matter; and we are not reproducing these incidents for the sake of offering counsels; but rather that we may draw instruction for our own guidance. Here we have an example of the way in which the Church is hurt and hindered, other denominations are replenished from our ranks, and Christianity itself is brought into contempt. It may not be altogether the fault of the Bishop—it can hardly be other than partially his fault. But whose soever fault it may be, it is grievous, and such things should not occur, and they need not occur. There ought to be ways, and there are ways of managing ecclesiastical affairs without effusion of boiling water and unchristian disputes, and it is a serious condemnation of those concerned, that better ways are not found. We have said that things of this kind are of rare occurrence in our dioceses. We are not so sure that they do not frequently occur in our parishes. Here, too, the fault may not be all on one side—but we

know where the chief responsibility lies. A young man, going forth from college to the work of the ministry, said to his tutor: "You have taught me sir, if I don't get on well with my parishioners, to suspect that the fault may be my own." "My dear friend," was the reply, "if you go into your parish in that spirit, you are very unlikely to quarrel with your people." Glancing again over the article in "The Star," we come upon a passage which is like a ray of light in darkness. Speaking of one of the episodes in the dispute, the writer says, "A heated discussion followed, but before anything really serious had occurred, Canon Fisher, the best loved man at the Capital, and himself a sufferer once upon a time from the Bishop's autocracy, interposed successfully with the oil cruse." We do not think that Canon Fisher, who is rector of the Cathedral at Pretoria, and so virtual Dean, is a Canadian; but we believe he is a graduate of a Canadian University, and we are consequently proud of him. We sometimes have difficulty in filling satisfactorily our Canadian sees, and we rather object to going to England. It might be as well to keep an eye on Dr. Fisher. He is said to be not only a man of peace—with his oil cruse—but also a scholar, a student, and a man of practical administrative ability—all of which qualities we greatly need.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF THEISM.*

Some time ago we drew attention to Professor Fraser's first series of Gifford Lectures on the Philosophy of Theism, delivered before the University of Edinburgh, in which the Lecturer had, for many years, been a very distinguished Professor. We cannot altogether regret that a considerable interval has been allowed to elapse between our first notice and our second, since the revival of the subject may possibly interest a new set of readers. The commendation which not we only, but all the principal literary and philosophical reviews bestowed upon the first series, cannot be withheld from the second. To say that the work throughout is marked by the most careful and the closest thinking, that it displays, on the one hand, the firmest grasp of theistic principles, and, on the other, the largest liberality in dealing with opinions opposed to those of the Lecturer, is merely what one should have expected from a writer of the most extensive learning, of the deepest insight into the problems of knowledge and being, and of the most liberal philosophical spirit. That which first impresses the reader who takes the book in hand is the remarkable beauty of its style, and this is the more to be noted as it is not purchased at the expense of any looseness of thought. The chain is wrought throughout in closest texture, yet the art of the writer has made it a garland of flowers. We do not mean to say that it is always easy reading. Students unfamiliar with the questions here discussed will often have to look back to the

* Philosophy of Theism: Gifford Lectures, 1895-96. Second Series. By Professor A. Campbell Fraser, LL.D., D.C.L. Price, 7s. 6d. London: Blackwood, 1896.