

melancholy report of the shipwrecks on Sable Island—one of the most dangerous points apparently in the approach to these shores; the danger has been attested by hundreds of wrecks. What would be thought of the ship's captain, who with this report in his hand, persisted in sailing close to the fatal shore, nay, when he saw the wreckage of noble vessels floating around him, still kept on his course, merely saying that he did not think there was danger for him? Were we on board such a vessel, should we not almost be inclined to join in any revolt that would take the command out of his hands and transfer it to some one who would turn the vessel's head from the danger, and carry us into a safe course? Yet, with the "wreck chart" before us, surrounded by wrecks of noble lives, we madly dare the shoals and rocks on which others have perished, thinking that we are safe! Let us beware.

We are often exhorted from the pulpit—and rightly so—to do everything as unto God, that eating and drinking, buying and selling, labouring in the house or in the store, we should do all as servants of our Divine Master. But may there not be a higher truth than even this? May we not in the midst of our worldly occupations, when filled with the concerns of this life, be actually doing God's work in the world? Unconsciously this is sometimes done. Joseph going down to look after his brethren; the daughter of Pharaoh taking her daily walk and bath by the river's side; David's visit to the camp of the Israelites when Goliath threw out his mocking challenge. Upon each of these, momentous results hang; they were the roots of history, and we to-day are in a different position because of them. But consciously, how shall we do this? By putting before us divine ends; we cannot mistake them, they are the blessing and salvation of the world; so by shaping our lives, our concerns, our business, our daily work as will make for this blessed result, we are doing God's work. Hard, is it? Yes, it is; but all the more worthy therefore of attempt.

A few weeks ago an overture came before the Presbytery of Toronto, urging that total abstinence from intoxicating liquors as a beverage should be made a condition of church fellowship. In that presbytery are men of life-long total abstinence principles, yet all felt that the terms of fellowship are in the

New Testament, and total abstinence was not included—a position, we venture to think, virtually unassailable. The Montreal *Witness*, which has, even at a great sacrifice of worldly gain, ever stood firm on the temperance platform, rather unadvisedly assailed this action of the Toronto Presbytery, and appeared to draw the conclusion that the Presbyterian Church had arrayed itself on the side of the liquor traffic. Our esteemed contemporary, the *Canada Presbyterian*, true to the national emblem, "*Nemo me impune lacessit*," takes the *Witness* sharply to task, and ungenerously finds an opportunity to have a slap at "the church of which it has long been considered the organ," viz., the Congregational. It is true that the Dougalls, father and sons, have been connected with the Congregational Churches, a fact which neither party has reason to be ashamed of; but the *Witness* has ever been undenominational, and without venturing upon the "so are you" argument, we must quietly but firmly enter our protest against the occasion our contemporary has found whereby to recklessly attack a friendly denomination. We shall not slap back. (Matt. v. 39.)

MR. WM. O'BRIEN, editor of the *United Irishman*, an ultra Home Rule paper, came to Canada avowedly to cover our Governor-General with shame, because of his alleged hard dealing with some Irish tenants. Lord Lansdowne's position here keeps him from saying anything in his own defence. "The king can do no wrong," and he is the Queen's representative. All parties, for once, join rightly in denouncing the attempt to stir up strife, and to prejudice the representative of Royalty in the eyes of the public with stories that, to put it very mildly, have two sides. We believe in free speech, but there is a difference between freedom and license. It may be questioned whether we ought to give a madman freedom with dynamite in his hands. For ourselves we confess that we should have justified the authorities in forbidding the agitator's mission. Canada did not want O'Brien. But it was resolved to allow him the right of free speech. Then, every loyal citizen was bound to see that the right was respected, and the mobs which hooted and pelted the uncalled-for visitor both here and at Kingston were a disgrace to our Dominion. We can live, and work needed reforms under our laws, if we will; then let us maintain law in its in-