

the Government, signed chiefly by the floating scum, mingled with some respectable people who are very sorry now for what they have done, praying for license. A counter petition was immediately circulated and it was signed by the large majority of the *bona fide* inhabitants of Brandon, and at once forwarded to Winnipeg; in addition the adjoining municipalities feeling that this was the insertion of the thin end of the wedge for the introduction of license over the whole added territory, forwarded large and numerous signed petitions in opposition to license, yet in spite of these an Order in Council (in itself illegal by the terms of the proclamation which requires legislative action for any change) was passed declaring the License Act in force.

This action on the part of the Government has made the licensed victuallers jubilant, and to further secure their position, they determined to terrorize the magistrates by entering actions for damages against them for illegal prosecutions. Last month they sold Ogilvie's effects under the hammer for a judgment of \$1,500, for proceeding against them under the Scott Act in Marquette, although the case was *sub judice* still in a higher court. They have also instituted a suit against the Hon. A. Sifton of Brandon, a noble worker in the temperance cause, for \$2,000.

Now, Mr. Editor, what can we do? Our magistrates are paralyzed, our Government not only unsympathetic but hostile. Do you wonder that men who have been tempted to come here to be free from temptation are becoming desperate and more than whisper that if such a reign of misrule continues they will be forced to take the matter into their own hands? Or do you wonder that, on the other hand, weaker natures have again succumbed and are slain in scores by this fell curse? As I write word comes that one of these unfortunates, a former trader in Guelph, who ten years ago could freely draw his cheque for \$100,000 has ended his days in a drunken debauch on his way home to join his friends. Our intense cold is as fatal to over-indulgence as the intense heat of the tropics. I noticed one of the members of the Imperial Parliament, in speaking of the Irish emigration scheme, spoke favourably of the North-West and particularly so on account of the prohibitory law in force there. He little knows what a farce it is in the present Province, and if the future provinces follow our course what a sham it will be there. But let us hope for better things. Let us hope that the men who will guide the destinies of the new provinces will be men fresh from an active progressive world, and not those who have been indulging in a Rip Van Winkle sleep by the shores of the Red River for the last century and who have proven by their actions that they are unworthy to lay the foundations of a great country. They are doing a work now which it will take many years to undo, and it is difficult to stand by unmoved and watch such a fair sheet blurred and disfigured by incapacity or inattention. Were it not that we have confident trust that He who rules all things will eventually cause truth and right to triumph, we would retire from the contest in despair even in this much advertised temperance land.

C. T.

April 23rd, 1883.

### THE SABBATH SCHOOL.

MR. EDITOR,—What ought to be the object or aim of the Sabbath school?

Is it to hold a permanent place in the Church?

Has it a tendency as it now exists and is being worked, to usurp the place of religious instruction in the family—to push it aside?

In what particulars does the form or matter of the instruction which ought to be given by parents to their children at home differ from that in the Sabbath school, or are they substantially the same?

Take a community in which the children are religiously trained at home, and take another in which there is no domestic instruction, but the place of it is supplied by a Sabbath school; in which of these communities would you be inclined to look for the happiest results; that is to say the highest degree of piety in the coming generation?

The instances in which there is home training are exceedingly rare. The reason is, that parents are careless or negligent, or that they are incompetent, or that their religion is not a life or reality, but a mere form; or all of these reasons taken together.

The family, with all the duties that pertain to it, is God's ordinance, as old as the birth of humankind. Nothing can properly take its place. The Sabbath school, on the other hand, is a mere expedient, a modern conception.

There is not a word explicitly on the two tables of the Sinaitic law about the duties which men owe to

one another in the wide sphere of their social and civil relations; why? because these duties are all radically and comprehensively in the fifth commandment, as the several parts of a tree are potentially in the germ it springs from. The family is the base or fountain of national life.

The tendency of the work now being done in Sabbath schools is to make intelligent and pious fathers and mothers; we would therefore naturally look as time rolls on for the revival, to a large extent indeed, of a holy training in the family—glorious achievement! The Sabbath school might then be said to have accomplished its function.

But I know districts where those who are now the heads of flourishing families were blessed in their youth with all the advantages which a Sabbath school could bestow, still there is no parental instruction. The Bible is not a study, nor "Home" what it ought to be—a school of religion.

I do not look on the Sabbath school as a finality, but only as a means to an end—scaffolding of its kind—and that end the re-construction of the families of the Church on the model of the patriarchal household "*Thou shalt teach them diligently to thy children,*" etc. Deut. vi. 6, 7.

It seems to me that the Sabbath school as it now stands, and the religious training of households, cannot be made to work independently side by side. One must give place to the other, as yet there is no actual collision, no rivalry—well would it be if there were—for the reason that parents are in a mind to yield up their rights and obligations in the matter to almost any one who offers to take the burden off their hands. But what of parental responsibility?

What is the true place of the Sabbath school in the economy of the Church? Is it rightly adjusted?

QUILIBET.

### DR. DIX AND WOMAN'S WORK.

MR. EDITOR,—I noticed in your editorial columns what seems to me a rather indiscriminate commendation of Dr. Dix's lectures on that much vexed and much abused question of Woman's Place and Mission in the world. I have not seen the lectures themselves, but a pretty full abstract of them; and have seen only one criticism of them—not written by a lady. That criticism appeared in the "Christian Union," and I think it was thoroughly to the point. It heartily commended Dr. Dix's strong protest against the existing tendency to laxity of morals in divorce, while it rightly condemned his attempt to affix this stigma to *Protestant Christianity*, and the individual liberty wherewith the Reformation made us free. I am surprised that you should pass by this unwarranted charge without notice. It also rightly placed the basis of Christian divorce laws in the law given by Christ Himself, which no Church—Protestant or Catholic—should contravene.

Further, as regarded the more general question of woman's place and mission in the world, the criticism I refer to fully endorsed the high estimate given of woman's work in the world. But be it observed that if she is to be fitted for any such lofty mission as to infuse poetry into life, to meet materialism with idealism, and infidelity with intelligent faith, then she must be fitted for it by the training of the intellect as well as of the heart. And the intellect of a girl can be thoroughly trained only in one way—just as that of her brother is trained—by the most thorough discipline and most complete education which can be given her. To say that they are different in character and mission is no argument against this. Your cluster of rhubarb and your cluster of graceful June lilies are different in both respects, yet they require very much the same treatment to develop their full vigour and their respective characters; and the rhubarb does not become a lily, or *vice versa*, though they grow up under precisely the same conditions. Moreover, there are almost, if not quite, as great differences of mental characteristics between women individually, as men and women as a class. One girl has a strong poetical or artistic temperament, another has an equally strong mathematical bent. Take, for example, Mrs. Browning and Mrs. Somerville. Would any amount of training or repression have assimilated their intellects, or if it could, would it have been expedient? Was not each intended to have a "mission" of her own. If we try to efface such differences, to fit any theories of our own, are we not trying to defeat the purpose of Him who gave the differing powers? Women have an equal right with men to the education which shall best give mental training, clearness, accuracy, and vigour, which will ever be

the best groundwork, whatever may be the superstructure. Whether this is to be attained by *co-education*, or not, is a question to be settled by circumstances and possibilities, not by arbitrary *a priori* theories. In England, where facilities are provided for young women obtaining a thorough university education separately from young men, there is no need for urging anything else. In Canada, where we cannot yet afford these facilities, and where girls and boys so generally go through the preliminary school course together, I see no reason why they should not study together in university class-rooms also. Indeed, I think there is less objection to this than to their attending the High schools together, since, when they enter the university, they are more under supervision, and are also supposed to be old enough and to have sense enough to behave as gentlemen and ladies usually do in each others society in ordinary life. Indeed the pre-occupation of severe study, of which all earnest students must feel the influence, is far more unfavourable to anything like laxity of conduct than the ordinary circumstances of society, in which youths and maidens so constantly meet. To be logical and consistent, if we cannot trust our young women in the university classroom, we should follow the example of the Turk and the Hindoo, and seclude them altogether.

"Emancipation" is a formidable word, and many silly and ill judged things have been said about it which have brought it into disgrace. But if it only means that woman should be free to cultivate her powers to the utmost and use them for the good of man and the glory of God in all ways which are not in themselves wrong, then surely no reasonable man or woman should object. And if the morality of woman is to be the higher, as Dr. Dix seems to assume, why should not that morality be utilized in relation to the common weal as well as to the home? If a woman is to be so intelligent as well as morally elevated, if she is to be capable of elevating man's life in other respects, why should she be placed in the humiliating position of being taxed for the property which gives her a stake in the welfare of the State, while she is denied the right of franchise given to even the most illiterate men? I can see no reason, human or Divine, why this should be the case; and, probably, a hundred years hence, it will be considered wonderful that the injustice should have been permitted so long. It is no reply to say that some women would not care to avail themselves of the privilege if they had it; some men do not care to vote, but that would be no justification for taking away their right to do so. And I believe that at least there are very few women who would *sell* their votes! If they are very susceptible of being influenced in other ways, so are the great majority of voters, always.

If the lady writers to whom you refer do not say much in defence of home and in praise of its excellencies, that may be simply because "it goes without saying." To women, speaking generally, the life of the home and of the affections is by far the dearest. It is the life of her *heart*. When that is fully satisfied she cares comparatively little for her "rights" in other respects. But to very many women this full satisfaction is denied. To many it is the sorest trial and deprivation, that, in the Providence of God, they are not permitted to enjoy the blessing of a guarded and cherished home-life. To such women, obliged to battle single-handed with the world, is it of any use to enlarge upon the beauty of the home sphere, or the "cultivation of its virtues?" And often women with happy homes, but no pressing home duties, are called with the same calling that leads men also to leave home, country, friends, to do their Father's work elsewhere. We, who read in our Bibles of Miriam and Deborah, as well as of Rachel and Ruth, should never forget that women may often be called of God to do even a higher work than that of making our home happy. Look at Fidelia Fiske's work in Persia, at Miss Lowe's work in India, at the many noble women who are working abroad in all the mission fields and setting a bright example to men in their ready devotion and untiring zeal! Our own Church has endorsed the missionary work of women, and in its intention of sending out fully-equipped female medical missionaries has also endorsed the education of women for a profession from which a sentimentally limited view, like that of Dr. Dix, has long done its best to debar them. "Nothing succeeds like success," and by this test women have shown that though home is their primary sphere it is not their only one; and that it is as well to give them such an education as shall fit them either for being the intelligent and judicious rulers of the home kingdom, or for any other work that God in His providence shall call them to do.

FIDELIS.