

unless it be familiarity with the appearance of crime? But, then, crime is not attractive in its appearance, but rather repulsive when not clothed in the fictitious garb of romance. If "familiarity breeds contempt," surely our people should learn to despise crimes that are too common. Crime should be dragged into the light and all its hideous details exposed, in order to deter imitators. Newspapers have to counteract dime-novels.

#### DISREGARD OF THE RIGHTS OF OTHERS

is what we find when we search back beyond the first stage of the criminal exposure; an utter ignoring of a man's right to retain possession of his own property, or a female's right to retain her own virtue and purity intact—if some stronger person wishes to interfere and enjoy the personal rights of those who happen, momentarily, to be placed at a disadvantage, or naturally weaker. All this is, of course, only a development of selfishness. But then the question arises, How did this development come to take place? Why should the element of human selfishness not have lain a dead letter in the machinery of those particular specimens of humanity? After all, we must get down to the question, "Where does this evil course really begin?" There must be some one point where the thing begins, when it does begin. At the one end is murder—what is to be found at the other end? Trace back the action step by step, and where do we come to a standstill? It is like a long chain, perhaps, or a short one—length does not matter—what is the first discoverable link in that chain?

#### "THOU SHALT NOT COVET"

is the last of the Commandments, added as a final and absolutely conclusive word—we may infer—sweeping up remains of requirement, in order to a perfect life, morally speaking. But the thing itself is evidently an initial step—it does not require any argument to enforce that point, it goes without saying. It seems almost as if the Divine Lawgiver would say, "If you wish to stop the very first symptom of evil towards your neighbour, be careful not to allow any tendency to desiring other people's possessions to develop in your mind. It sets up just that very principle of regard for the rights of others which is almost ignored in practice at the present day over a large portion of the earth's surface. A certain neighbour of yours owns something—a wife, a house, a servant, anything, call it as you like, only it is "his." Leave that alone, hold it sacred from any interference; thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's. If this be true, how is it that there appears to be an utter want of connection between the Divine command and the people of this generation? It needs no argument to convince or prove that the 19th century—as we know it in Europe and America—seldom remembers the existence of the 10th Commandment, and when reminded of its words only faintly wonders why such a refinement of theology ever found its way into the popular statute book of religions—so very far-fetched does it seem to ordinary people of the day. The fact, then, is that the world of our day is not "in touch" with God. Where was that touch lost?

#### WE ARE NOT "EDUCATED" TO IT.

There is the whole thing "in a nut-shell"—we have drifted away from the anchorage of religion because a whole generation has been educated (?) up to the point of ignoring the necessity of remembering God and His will. People have got the impression, from the State's line of action in

educational matters, that religion is a kind of luxury or refinement, which we can very well do without, except for certain conventional points which are conveniently referred to it for the solution. The idea of extracting principles of practical life from the Bible seems to strike most people as supremely absurd—"unbusiness-like," to use the favourite fetish of the day and generation. The Bible is not recognized as one of the "text-books" under our national system—our "excellent educational system," don't you know!—so it can't be of much account or practical value; that is about the way the mental process runs in the average Canadian secular mind. Of course, those who are deeply religious look at the matter differently—but who are they? and where?

#### IS IT THE CHURCH'S FAULT?

Hardly! The Church does its best to utilize every moment that the world allows it to snatch. The whole staff of the ecclesiastical force is called out and made to "hustle" all day Sunday—but what can be done in a fraction of one day out of seven to counterbalance the evil influence, the dead-weight, of the other seven days? But then someone says, there is clause 7 of section 81, Public School Act, which gives to the clergy and others the right of imparting religious instruction "to the pupils of their own Church in each school-house at least once a week, after the hour of closing the school in the afternoon." A very pretty and effective provision—for making religion as distasteful as possible to the children generally! The act might just as well say, "the clergy, etc., of each religious denomination are hereby permitted to make Canadian children regard religion as an 'imposition' of the worst kind, by 'keeping them in after school hours,' and adding to their already too irksome, onerous tasks"—the "last straw" of an unmerciful "grind" upon the unfortunate mental "backs" of the little ones' brains. No better or surer plan could be devised to make our children hate religion than to put that clause in force. Fortunately, most parsons have sense enough to see through this cunning device, and avoid the snare. So the "net result" is that children are growing up inclined to "ignore" religion, without any active hostility; but it comes to the same end in the long run—covet, grab, steal, force, assault, murder. That is the natural chain and sequence of "our excellent educational system"—systematic shelving of religion!

#### REVIEWS.

THE ETUDE. T. Presser, Philadelphia.

The October number seems to have more numerous articles than is usual, and its subjects are of a variety to suit both family and student readers. The "Petit Bolero" is delightful music.

THE MUSIC REVIEW. C. F. Summy, Chicago.

A special paper in the October issue is "Wagner's Debt to the Greek Drama"; also "Organists and Hymn Tunes," by W. S. Pratt. The music is a Thanksgiving Anthem by J. A. West.

"Marching," a new song, by H. Trotere, composer of superior songs, has lately been published by the Anglo-Canadian Music Publishing Association, Toronto. It has the swinging, marching movement which always interests an audience, and is arranged in three keys. "Sing about Jack," by Ed. M. Chesham, is a well-written, cheerful, humorous sailor song, and has been copyrighted by this firm. The keys are B flat and C. "The Sweetest Song of All" is by J. Christopher Marks, whose songs are accepted favourites, and this one shows his usual careful work.

#### THE MISTAKES OF MODERN NONCONFORMITY.

Being a Paper read at the Grindelwald Conference, August 1, 1894.

BY REV. CANON HAMMOND.

(Continued from last week.)

4. Another mistake is that you maintain a separation from us when the reasons for which you separated no longer exist, and when it taxes all your ingenuity to assign any adequate reason for not rejoining us. I say, in the first place, that you have not the reasons for separation (assuming that separation is ever lawful) which your fathers had. The Brownists, for example, had an excellent reason for leaving the Church, namely, this, that it was not a true Church, and that its ministry was anti-Christian. You allow, on the other hand, that it is a Church and its ministry lawful, and yet you hold aloof from it—hold aloof when you have thus cut the ground from under your feet! So, at a later date, when the Independents had discovered that it was a Church, "though not so pure a Church as some others," they could still allege reasons for their attitude which you cannot. They objected to the surplice, to kneeling at the Lord's Supper, to architecture, to organs, to stained glass, to fixed forms of prayer, to Confirmation, to frequent Communion, to the observance of Lent, of Christmas Day, of Good Friday, and so forth. But you object to these things no longer; on the contrary, some of you eagerly adopt them; you allow that the Church was right on these points, and reproach your forefathers with groundless prejudices. And other matters, on which you retain their opinions—such, for example, as lessons taken from the Apocrypha, the exclusion of parents from being god-parents to their own children, pluralities, non-residence, the traffic in advowsons—these have either been removed by the Church or remedied by public opinion. Your fathers could allege, again, that the Church was asleep, that the clergy did not preach the Gospel, and so forth; but you cannot and do not say so now. You allow that there has been an unexampled revival of religion amongst us, and "the last charge," says Dr. Dunckley, "that anyone would now think of bringing against the Church is that it does not preach the Gospel." Yet you stand aloof as resolutely as ever; and if any Dissenter should by chance join us, he does it amid a loud chorus of lamentations and sometimes of cruel imputations. And if we ask what there is so very wicked about the Church, all you can mention is that we hold that infants are regenerated in baptism—some of you freely allow that, believing adults are—and that we are guilty of sacerdotalism. But the mention of that word leads me to speak of another mistake.

5. I suppose no accusation is so frequently brought against the Church as that of sacerdotalism. I question if the Congregational or Baptist Union, or the Wesleyan Conference, ever meets without copious philippics on the growth of "priestcraft," or "priestly assumptions" amongst us, and you assign this as a reason for "war to the knife." Well, you do right to resist us if you honestly think we are wrong; but you do us and yourselves an injustice if you fling at us this charge, so damaging in the eyes of an uninstructed public, without first being clear that we are guilty of the things whereof you accuse us. And you are not clear; you cannot define this sacerdotalism; if you can, I ask you to do it now. The definitions you would give, if you stooped to give any, are such as we should eagerly repudiate. Some of them are definitions which would fit your own ministers more than ours. If you say, for example, that sacerdotalism means that the priest claims to come between the soul and God, then we reply at once that the chapel minister comes between the soul and God no less than the Church's priest. His sermons do it even more than our sacraments. If you say that our priests come between the sinner and the Saviour, so as to hide the latter from view, we reply that this cannot be done in the services of the Church; and it may be done, and is done, in the ministrations of the chapel. No, you have never troubled to find out and to state clearly what our heinous sacerdotalism consists in, and you owe it to us to do so before you make the charge. At present all you do is to give the Church dog a bad name, hoping that the public will presently hang it. I appeal to you, therefore, my brothers in Christ, to deal more fairly by us in this particular. In the name of our sacred religion, in the name of Him Whose disciples we desire to be, I implore you to make it clear what it is we are guilty of. There are indelicat men amongst us, no doubt, as there are amongst you, and if they have made arrogant and unscriptural claims, we will do our best to bring them to a better mind. All we ask is that you should not call names; that you should not trade on public prejudice; that you should not injure religion by striking a left-handed blow at some of its ministers.