

## Correspondence.

All Letters containing personal allusions will appear over the signature of the writer.

We do not hold ourselves responsible for the opinions of our correspondents.

### FAMILY WORSHIP.

SIR,—Family worship has been on the decline in the cities as well as in the country. In only a few houses is family worship observed daily, in others it is observed only on Sundays. But in the great majority of houses no worship is kept. The Bible is hardly ever read. No blessing is asked upon meals, no thanks expressed. The heathen blindly bowed to wood and stone, but in this land of gospel light many parents do not so much as observe the very form of bowing before the Lord. In some homes the difficulty is to get the members together at a suitable hour. In the morning all is hurry and confusion, and in the evening the engagements are so many and the hours of retiring so different, that no convenient time can be found for the service. So on one plea or another the parent excuses himself from the duty, and the family goes without the morning and evening blessing. All Christian people are agreed that it is of the utmost importance that family worship should be conducted regularly in the home. It was the practice of General Gordon during his first sojourn in the Soudan to lay a pocket handkerchief at his tent door half an hour each day. This was respected by all as the signal that he was at his devotions. The best time for evening worship, where there are children, is immediately after tea. There ought if possible to be praise as well as reading, and prayer, and the children should be encouraged to take part in the reading, as it gives them a greater interest, and if they begin to take an interest in the worship in the home, they would also take an interest in it in the Church. Need we be surprised if our children drift away from the services of the Church, when family devotion is neglected in the home. There will be more life in the heart, in the Church, in the home, in all Christian effort, when there is more prayer in the home. It is a matter deeply to be deplored that in many families there is no such thing as family worship. There may be religious members in the family, but that in itself will not constitute family religion, and indeed it is difficult to see how there can be family religion where there is no family worship. No teaching is so powerful as example. It was when the disciples heard Jesus pray that they said, "Lord teach us to pray." When children hear their parents pray, they are beginning to bear upon them the most powerful influence to lead them to pray. The Rev. John Ryland, the predecessor of the celebrated Robert Hall, at Cambridge, being on a journey was overtaken by a violent storm, and compelled to take shelter in the first inn he came to. When the hour of rest approached, his host informed him that his chamber was prepared whenever he chose to retire, "But," said he, "You have not had your family together." "I don't know what you mean," said the landlord. "To read and to pray with them" replied the guest. The landlord confessed that he never thought of doing such a thing. "Then, sir," said Mr. Ryland, "I must beg you to order my horse immediately, I had rather brave the storm than venture to sleep in a house where there is no prayer: Who can tell what may befall us before morning." The landlord called the family together, when Mr. Ryland conducted family worship, which resulted in much good to the family and neighborhood, Rowland Hill when travelling, was once placed in precisely similar circumstances. It is said that "a family without prayer, is like a home without a roof, exposed to all the injury of weather and to every storm that blows." In Greenland when a stranger knocks at the door, he asks, "Is God in this house?" and if they answer "Yes" he enters. The direct influence of family prayer is to bring down the benediction of God upon the children of the house. We live in the days of multiplicity of engagements, and many parents are excusing themselves on the plea that they have not time for family prayer. The father has to rush off to business, he has time, it is true, to read his morning paper, but no time to gather his family around him and by the hand of faith put them under the sheltering wing of God. In the evening he is tired and wearied, and thus family worship is neglected. He suffers his business to consume his time, so as to deprive him of opportunities for prayer, reading the Bible, and real communion with God, his services of mammon eat up his service of God. A Frenchman, it is said, visited his chapel in Paris to say his family devotions, but he found no priest in attendance, and the building undergoing repairs. He walked up to the altar, laid his card on it with a low bow and withdrew, well satisfied with the homage he had paid to the Lord. It is to be feared that too many of the

morning prayers of the family are little more than laying a card upon the altar, a complimentary presentation of respects. But nothing less than such a communion with God as touches the heart and draws forth earnest desires, can be any safeguard to us in the busy scenes of the day. In some families, the father is nominally a Churchman, the mother may be Presbyterian, Methodist or Baptist, but the children are godless, knows no religion. With how many the consideration of supposed want of time has been allowed so to weigh that in their homes there has come to be no family altar. No one who believes that God answers prayer will think of omitting either secret or family devotion for want of time, even when business is unusually urgent. The plea of want of time none should urge it, but those who regard prayer as an empty mockery. There must be real communion with God and not a mere formal prayer.

November 10th.

PHILIP TOCQUE.

### ROBERT ELSMERE.

SIR,—I am aware that very many people are discussing this remarkable book and some are taking the role of critic. I will neither discuss it nor criticize it. I want to refer to one point, and one only. I am afraid Mrs. Ward does not know the "Rev. F. O. Morris to whom the Queen lately donated £100 per year out of the Privy purse. Had she known the "Humanity Series" of school-books she would hardly have made Elsmere's "boys" to pass their spare hours in taking the lives of birds, beasts and reptiles that they might become rustic Natural Philosophers. Boys are cruel and wanton enough already as it is, and "science" has had a good deal to answer for at the hands of unscientific persons. How any one can cry out against "Vivisection" and then go and make every plough-boy in the land go up to his elbows in the blood of the lower animals, so as to have a "parish" museum is more than I can understand. Would to God we had a few more of the "F. O. Morris" stamp and of the "Burdette Coutts" type in this wicked world of ours. Are the "Rugby" teachers going to create a Holy Crusade against the lower animals. I have found "Indian" children to delight in tearing the poor butterfly to pieces, but I really think we ought often to remember that God has a "garden" although it be very badly kept by us.

Yours.

C. A. FRENCH.

### MOVEABLE WOODEN CHURCHES.

SIR,—There are many missions, just starting, or in scattered places, where it is impossible to erect anything but a wooden church, and only too frequently these are built without any regard to dignity of worship, either because of an idea that cheapness and churchliness are incompatible with each other, or from inability to procure good plans.

Struck with the description of some "moveable wooden churches" designed for mission use in England, I wrote to the architect asking if he would be willing to prepare a special Canadian edition of his pamphlet, with working plans and drawings, for a church which should be at once well ventilated, easily heated, churchlike and cheap; also suggesting that the almost universal but very unsightly stovepipe should, if possible, be abolished. I have received in reply a most kind letter, in which Mr. Hopkins says, "when I feel certain that our labor and thought will not be thrown away I shall feel it a privilege to undertake the work." The means he suggests for discovering whether such a pamphlet would be welcomed is as follows: "A sufficient number of subscribers should be obtained to pay for the elaboration and publication of a special and revised edition, which should contain the necessary working drawings and specifications to enable an intelligent workman to carry out my designs. It should also embrace certain modifications which would be requisite to meet the varied requirements and circumstances of each case." The English pamphlet referred to was published for 6d. (12c.), and bearing in mind the greater cost of publishing in this country, and the addition of the drawings, &c., I feel certain such a book could be sold retail for \$1 if not less, but can fix no price until matters are further advanced.

May I ask those who desire to raise the character of all buildings set apart for Church worship, and who would be willing to subscribe to such a book, provided it be published at not exceeding one dollar, to furnish me with their names.

I cannot assume any financial responsibility, such as collecting cash, &c.; nor do I intend to guarantee Mr. Hopkins subscribers, I only ask that promises of subscription may be sent me, and when matters are in trim I shall hand them over to himself or his publishers to make their own arrangements for distributing the copies and receiving payment.

Mr. Hopkins is consulting architect to the Church Extension Society, and Fellow of the Royal Institute

of British Architects; and this, I think, will be sufficient guarantee that his plans will be good and practicable.

His English plans have been warmly received by (amongst others) the Bishops of Ely, Durham, Gloucester and Bristol.

A clergyman of this diocese who has seen the English pamphlet and Mr. Hopkins's letter to me, writes as follows:—"The wide circulation of such a pamphlet, as is proposed by Mr. Hopkins, with full plans and specifications, would help forward the matter, for many, no doubt, are often at a loss to know where to look for the information and guidance they stand so much in need of."

It is, perhaps, better to add that I have no pecuniary interest in the success or failure of this scheme.

Trusting that Mr. Hopkins may receive the necessary support, I am, yours faithfully,

(REV.) ROBT. W. RAYSON.

### FANCY FAIR RELIGION.

SIR,—Through your columns I desire to recommend to my brother Churchmen a book called "Fancy Fair Religion, or the World converting itself," by the Rev. J. Priestly Foster, M.A., Vicar of Oxenhall, Gloucestershire (p.p. 184, Swan, Souvenschien & Co., Paternoster Square, 1888, Willard Tract Depository, Toronto, 85 cents.) The author deals faithfully with his subject. In his preface he says, "Inasmuch, therefore, as I believe the *cultus* of what is here called Fancy Fair Religion to be as degrading to the Religion of the Redeemer as it is contemptible in the heir of immortality, I have not hesitated to write somewhat strongly." At page 26 he says, "A certain object designed to promote God's glory is in need of support. An appeal is made to a community of nominally Christian people to support it for the love of God; the appeal is unsuccessful: an appeal is made to the same community to support it for the love of pleasure; the appeal is successful. Therefore, this community of nominally Christian people are lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God." The author relates the following incident as having occurred at a Bazaar, (I do not profess to give his exact words.) A young man was being served by a fascinating waitress with a cup of tea. He understood the price to be sixpence. She raised the cup to her lips and sipped the contents. He was too polite to do more than stare at what appeared to him rather greedy behaviour! but said nothing, and tendered the sixpence. She remarked that the cup of tea was sixpence before she sipped it, but now it was half a guinea. With an "Oh! ah! hum! thank you! yes!" he paid the ten shillings and six pence and said, "And now will you kindly bring me a clean cup." It is stated that a fancy fair having in the autumn of 1887 been inaugurated on behalf of Foreign Missions in a Cathedral city and the balance of the proceeds over expenses having been intended for the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, the Standing Committee of that venerable body two days before the fair closed passed the following resolution, viz. "The Standing Committee regret to have heard to-day, for the first time, of the Fancy Fair which is being held at —, and trust that in the future their friends will not have recourse to such questionable means of raising money for the Society. While fully recognizing the well-intentioned but mistaken zeal of those who have organized this effort, the Standing Committee feel that they cannot under the circumstances receive for the Propagation of the Gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ any funds thus raised." I wish that the book may be widely read. Yours truly,

CHURCHMAN.

### THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE.

SIR,—Only some apparently of the English Bishops directed or requested their clergy to read the Letter and Resolutions of the Lambeth Conference in their churches. It seems a great pity that all the members of the Conference did not, in some way, secure its reading; for surely Church people everywhere should know what was concluded at such an assembly. Perhaps you will not think it uninteresting to your readers the following collection of Episcopal judgments on the subject: 1. The Bishop of Liverpool alone, as far as I can find, has censured the Conference; and this not for what it has done, but for what it has left undone—(1) "I deeply regret that the Encyclical gives such faint and feeble recognition to the non-Episcopal Churches of the present day. . . . I think that their claims to brotherly notice have been somewhat overlooked, or, at any rate, rather coldly handled in the Encyclical." (2) "The most serious objection which I feel to the Encyclical is the conspicuous absence of any reference in its pages to the unhappy divisions which endanger the Church of England in the present day. I have never heard or seen any satisfactory explanation of this silence."

2. The Bishop of Winchester says with reference