

such suggestion being unaware of the dissatisfaction. Even now, however, let us know what are the complaints—what the grounds of the dissatisfaction. I have no means of consulting my fellow-labourers in the College, hence I write simply under personal responsibility.

HENRY WILKES.

Montreal, July 31st, 1880.

### MORAL SUASION VERSUS LEGAL ENACTMENT.

To the Editor of the CANADIAN INDEPENDENT.

DEAR SIR,—I very much regretted to see by reports in both "Globe" and "Mail" that our Hamilton bishop had preached a sermon on "Moral Suasion and Legal Enactment." The discourse had reference to the Scott Act agitation, and the rev. gentleman is reported to be clearly in favour of moral suasion being used to effect the desired reform rather than repressive legal measures. I regarded it as a most unwise thing for him to do just at this present juncture when the Scott Act is being tested in that city. For a minister of the Gospel to advocate such views at such times may tell very seriously on the minds of his hearers, either causing them to vote against the Act or not to vote at all. The opinion obtains to-day among the best Christian workers, that any *Temperance* reform must be carried on by the organized churches. Temperance societies may do much, but nothing solid or permanent will be done until the churches unitedly take hold of the movement. I cannot think that Mr. Griffith is so foolish as to try and erect any barrier to the passing of this Act, which the reports seem to indicate. I should be sorry to think that he would try and influence his church against this Act. His sermon, if one may depend upon reports (which we cannot always do), would wonderfully please the "Licensed Victuallers' Association," and no doubt they would pay him handsomely to go through the country and preach it from any pulpit. Mr. Griffith must certainly know that any measure which will *prohibit* the sale of intoxicating drinks, will lessen the *crime* of drunkenness, and will therefore be a blessing. To oppose such an enactment would be suicidal. I may not be wholly in favour of the Scott Act, yet as it is the best thing our Government has seen fit to give us, and believing, as I most certainly do, that its design is to *suppress* the liquor traffic, I should most heartily support it—"Half a loaf is better than no bread." Any movement which is an *advance* towards the suppression of drink and the drink traffic, I feel bound as a Christian to support. If we cannot have total *prohibition* let us have the next best thing, which is a step towards it.

In regard to "moral suasion," I am clearly aware that public sentiment against the use of strong drink must precede all successful legislation. We cannot legislate beyond public sentiment. But would not the passing of the Scott Act in the city of Hamilton be an *expression* of the public sentiment there. If it failed to be passed it would clearly shew that public sentiment was not in favour of suppressing the liquor traffic. I would rather have public sentiment *without* law than law *without* public sentiment. A law on the statute-book that has been dishonoured and trampled upon is not for the benefit of the commonwealth. Yet how are we to know what the voice of the people is if not by testing some such measure as the Scott Act. When a large deputation of temperance men from various parts of the Dominion waited upon the Government a year or so ago, and urged upon them the advisability of passing a *Prohibitory* Liquor Law, the answer they received was, "You have the *Dunkin* Act, go and try that." Why did they so reply? Was it not that they wanted an expression of public sentiment. I take it that numerous signed petitions addressed to our representatives praying for a *Prohibitory* Liquor Law will be in vain, unless we secure the passing of such measures as the Scott Act, and if this could be accomplished throughout the country it would be *prima facie* evidence that public sentiment was in favour of a far more stringent measure, viz., *Prohibition*, for every man who votes for the former, would vote for the latter.

But we cannot expect to accomplish this if ministers wage warfare against it.

John B. Gough says that when he sat down in a hotel in Portland, in the State of Maine, he took up the bill of fare, and on it were thirty-two different kinds of wines, brandy, and ales to be furnished by the hotel, but at the bottom were these words: "We would do it if we could. Look over," and on turning over there was the "Law." He saw the same in Bangor, and says it is almost impossible to get a glass of liquor in the State of Maine. Fully tied up—why? Because the temperance public sentiment is healthy, and not only so, they have a *Prohibitory* Liquor Law. So long as there is whiskey to be had men will get drunk, and you might use moral suasion till doomsday and you would not get men to give up drinking. The passion becomes a disease, and how many a poor victim of strong drink has been heard to say, after all your moral suasion has been expended upon him, "I would give it up, but cannot," and like a "dog he returns to his vomit, or the sow to the mire." Take the drink away from him, and he will have to give it up, and here is a fact—When the *Dunkin* Act was being tested in our county (York) the *worst drunkards* voted for it. They saw it would be a good thing to have the drink taken from them.

Moral suasion has been tried for years—has had a fair trial—and what is the result?—just this: More drinking and drunkenness than ever.

Now let us try "Legal Enactment," it cannot certainly do harm—and my opinion is, it is just what is needed. Let us do our utmost to have the Scott Act passed in every county throughout the Dominion, then we can go to our representatives and say, "here is an expression of public sentiment, now give us a *Prohibitory* Liquor Law," and we will not listen to their twaddle about "revenue" and "the country not being prepared for it," etc., any longer, and if they will not grant us our request, we will say to them as *Cromwell* and his *Ironsides* did, to the *English* Parliament, "Get out of this and give room for *honest* men."

In conclusion I must say I think Mr. Griffith has changed his views wonderfully within the last few years, for when he was pastor at Cobourg I heard him speak at a large gathering of *Temperance* people in a grove near the town, and in his address he advocated most strongly the very principles which he is now reported as condemning. However, men may and do change their minds—it is *nothing unusual*. We hope soon to hear that Hamilton has passed the Scott Act with an overwhelming *majority*, and we would say to our brethren there, "Quit yourselves like men, and be strong. The eyes of thousands are turned towards you." Excuse this long letter. E. D. SILCOX.

Stouffville, August 9th, 1880.

### Official Notices.

COLONIAL MISSIONARY SOCIETY.—It affords me no little pleasure to announce that the former Secretary of this Society, Rev. Alexander Hannay, will visit us in Canada the coming autumn. Officially, I am informed by the present Secretary, Rev. W. S. H. Fielden, as follows: "At the meeting of our committee held on the 5th July, it having been reported that the Rev. Alex. Hannay, Secretary of the Congregational Union of England and Wales, has been appointed to represent the Union at the next Triennial Convention of American Congregationalists, and also that he was willing to visit Canada to see, inquire and report on his return, to our committee, he was most cordially and unanimously requested and empowered to act as our trusted and beloved representative to your churches." Mr. Hannay with Mrs. Hannay will leave Liverpool per the s. s. "Abyssinia" on the 15th inst. He purposes to spend a little while in New York, etc., and then to proceed northward to us. I am warned by him against making many arrangements for him involving labour on his part, as he comes for rest, which they who have knowledge of his work must be aware he greatly needs. But he will do all he can for us. I would suggest to our brethren in central Ontario to confer together and with those east

and west of them, as to what can best be done to utilize to the utmost this visit. Mr. Hannay should see and hear all that it is possible for him to do in the limited time at his disposal. I shall be glad of suggestions from any quarter to lay before him on his arrival. The committee hope that "in the conferences which will be held, there will be a frank and brotherly outspokenness which will result in increased cordiality of co-operation in the whole sphere of our common service." Let prayer be offered continually that so it may be. HENRY WILKES.

Montreal, Aug. 2nd, 1880.

### News of the Churches.

REV. A. F. MCGREGOR, B.A., late of Listowel, has received a call from the churches in Frome and Shedden, but we understand that he has declined it.

REV. D. MCGREGOR, of Guelph, is spending his vacation near Orillia. In his absence Rev. Mr. Powis, of Toronto, will preach in Guelph on the 18th inst., and Rev. A. F. McGregor the rest of the time.

I DROP you a card with the following: The churches at Edgar, Rugby and Vespra have given me (their pastor) a few weeks' vacation, sending me a letter expressive of their high appreciation of my services among them. The work goes on with much harmony and good feeling.—J. I. HINDLEY.

Edgar, Aug. 5th, 1880.

ST. CATHARINES.—On Sunday, August 1st., services were held in the Tabernacle in connection with the ordination of Friend Wetherald and his induction to the pastorate. Among various ministers invited two were present—the Rev. Chas. Duff, M.A., Speedside, and Rev. J. R. Black, B.A., the late pastor. In the morning Mr. Duff preached from 2 Cor. v. 20, Mr. Black presiding at the communion service which followed. In the evening, notwithstanding the intense heat, the building was filled with people. Mr. Black gave a statement of Congregational principles, Mr. Duff the questions to the pastor. To these Mr. Wetherald's replies were clear and full, and delivered in an impressive manner. The charge to pastor and address to the people were deferred till the next evening, for which a social was announced. On this occasion too there was a good gathering of people, and ministers representing the various denominations in the city. Altogether the church starts again under favourable auspices. The people are heartily united in the pastor, and are determined to give with their old liberality, and work earnestly as of yore. In their pastor they have a man of deep piety, great earnestness, and mental ability of no mean order. And though the exodus of people from the city is still going on, and the church has in consequence lost many families, yet others seem to have come in to take their places.

NEWMARKET.—The members of the Congregational church here held a lawn party on the grounds of Mr. A. Millard, which was certainly the most pleasant demonstration of the kind this season. The illuminations were especially beautiful, and produced a striking effect as the visitors approached the grounds. Over the gateway was an illuminated inscription: "Glad to see you," while on the inside of the arch was another which said "Come again." The grounds were hung with Chinese lanterns of every description, and were decorated with bunting, flags, etc., arranged in such a manner as to produce a very pleasing effect. Games of various kinds were provided, and two bands gave plenty of good music. Mr. and Mrs. Millard threw open their house for the accommodation of visitors, and by their friendly welcome made every one feel at home. A very nice lunch was provided, consisting of cake and coffee, which was partaken of by every one with an evident relish. The entrance fee was voluntary, each one receiving a ticket as they passed in. The party was unanimously voted as the most successful "hit" of the season, and if "Come again" means that they are going to have another shortly, we venture to predict that the response will be a liberal one. Proceeds about \$30.—North York Reformer.