

teetotalism or the tyranny of prohibition is the only thing discussed within. I generally find, too, a mass of statistics which have no earthly reference, whatever, to the points at issue. Medical men like theologians are ranged on opposite sides of this question; but it is one in which we do not need their guidance, as a rule a man can best find out for himself what is wholesome for him; personally I find beer, cider, wine, &c., of immense value to health at those times when I can obtain them of fair quality; I therefore use them at such times and leave others to judge for themselves: not "despising" the total abstainer; but never allowing him the slightest influence over me till he brings forward an argument. No one has ever presented one to the writer yet, or he would be an enthusiastic prohibitionist today. Then I turn to our rule to life—the New Testament, and there I find, upon this very point, guidance the most distinct and plain which it is possible in human language to frame. The apostle tells me let no man judge you in drink. But lest such a phrase should be ambiguous, should not call me to defend my Christian liberties; should leave me to allow others to tinker at my conscience. I find the holy apostle giving instruction to one of the highest dignitaries in the Church who had certain teetotal superstitions or proclivities. Instead of extolling the new fangled virtue, he tells him plainly that wine is good on account of his infirmities and also as a general digestive (Kai). Now we have of two conclusions to accept of necessity one; either St. Paul called Timothy from a holy praiseworthy practice of self-denial to a lower plane of life; or else the stand of the moderate drinker is the wisest, the highest, the holiest, that one can by possibility attain. The majorities of theologians of course read their Bibles under the assumption that their judgment is superior to the teaching of inspiration. And the cause of all this is not far to seek in the history of the question. Even the saintly Wesley was herein a heretic: holy as he was he would have presumed to change the constitution of Christ's Church by excluding from her "orders" all who were not teetotalers. The natural consequence followed in due time; his ministers would lead their flocks to this higher life; and then, carrying their system to perfection, force the tyranny of prohibition on the whole community. Thank God the Church of England as a Church has not yet overstepped the boundaries of her jurisdiction, or of her Lord's canons and commands. We have to-day the spirit of antichrist clothed in saintly garb seeking to destroy the authority of Scripture; to make the voice of the people the highest tribunal, and the shifting fancies and fashions of the multitude the sole test of truth. That is the position. How to meet it is another matter.

The advocates of prohibition seem never to think of condescending to argument (I mean the professing Christians among them); they seem to have none; they seem carefully to close their ears to any argument upon the other side; their strength consists in organization, rant, and the frequent cowardice, both in practice and teaching, of the advocates of temperance. I am speaking only of those who in some sense profess to uphold the Bible. An infidel may, perhaps, be logical who takes the prohibition stand; but when we hear statesmen (!) who profess to look at a Bible sometimes talk of "educating" society from the platform of the apostle to that of Father Matthew and call that educating up, then we know at once how much faith we, as Christians, can place in them as leaders of opinion.

That teetotalism is the only wise stand for the inebriate, nay, the only wise stand for every man as to that thing, be it what it may, wherein his special weakness lies, is acknowledged by all. It is the dictate of common sense as well as the doctrine of Christ; but, where any institution is working mischief in our midst, there are always two distinct lines of remedy. (1) Crush it out. (2) Reform it. Where the thing is innocent in itself, the only healthy course—the only course that leaves full scope to the development of conscience, is for society to leave liberty of action to its members until they violate some moral law. The drunkard "endangers the lives of Her Majesty's subjects," a recognizable offence in some branches of conduct; he helps to undermine the morals of society—an offence also in some cases recognized, and with the drunkard society has a right to deal. With the sober man society has indeed the power yet, not the right, to interfere. Unfortunately, jurists of the present day sometimes forget this fundamental distinction so necessary to bear in mind. Meet argument with argument and we have no fear of the result. But the stand of the arguer should be declared beforehand, and that of the infidel and the Christian be kept distinct. This is only the thin edge of the wedge. We know something of the tyranny of puritanism in former times. Will any man attempt to measure its bounds in the future, with our ever-increasing means of organization and intercommunication?

Algoma, March 3, '87.

J. S. C.

THE STATE OF THE CHURCH IN OTTAWA.

SIR,—In your issue of the 24th inst., there appears under the heading, "The Effect of the Mission," an anonymous and injurious attack upon the churches and clergy of this city, but especially upon one of the clergy specified as "our own priest." It is very easy to make unfounded attacks which from their very vagueness cannot be answered. It is not difficult nor yet is it very courageous to strike blows at professional reputations under appearance of zeal for the Church. As a rule such anonymous writers deserve nothing but contempt, but there are reasons for fearing that this spiteful letter may do harm, and hence, I also have somewhat to say as to "The Effect of the Mission." No miracles have been worked. None have had permanent blessing save those who have patiently sought to maintain and deepen the impressions which the mission left. But the clergy are agreed in devout thankfulness for the fullness of the blessing vouchsafed to the Church as a body, and in this feeling they are encouraged both by the expressions and the actions of the laity. Lent has proved the change in the point of view of the whole Church. This is shown in many ways of which I shall mention two. Daily prayer is said in every Church (twice a day in two) and is in each case well attended. Amusements have been more restrained than ever before, and in his allusions to "a very large hall," and to "the affair to be repeated," your anonymous correspondent, especially displays in what spirit he writes. Five young ladies (two not being Churchwomen) gave what was fairly called on the invitations "a small dance," and some bachelors gave a return, both with the insufficient excuse that one of the ladies was leaving Ottawa. So far from the clergy being silent, the matter was distinctly referred to in more than one pulpit, with the result that many withdrew from the second entertainment, and that good has arisen out of unintended wrong, in the assurance that in future more care will be exercised. As the assailant of "our own priest" does not venture to give either his own name or that of the maligned parson, I can only say that I for one do not believe his assertion as against any priest in Ottawa. Lastly, as regards Christ Church I can only quote with approval a saying of one of its oldest and most devout members: "It seems like a different Church." There at least, and I am quite sure also everywhere else the change is radical and so we say, Thank God for the Mission. Yours truly, W. J. MUCKLESTON.

Ottawa, March 30, 1887. curate of Christ Church.

GOOD FRIDAY AND THE LONDON SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIANITY AMONGST THE JEWS.

SIR,—Permit me through your Journal to remind the clergy of this diocese of the wishes expressed by the Lord Bishop (in harmony I believe with the other Bishops of this ecclesiastical province) that the collection on Good Friday, should, if approved of, be given to the above Society.

Such a collection is surely appropriate, and may we not hope this year the response may be universal, and that our church in Canada may arise to a deeper sense of our duty and privilege to send the Gospel to the lost sheep of the House of Israel, and hasten the time of the Lord's coming, remembering the word, "When the Lord shall build up Zion, He shall appear in His glory" (Ps. cii. 16). Then, "A nation shall be born in a day." Then, "All Israel shall be saved." Then, "The word of the Lord shall again go forth from Jerusalem, and the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea."

FRANK W. DOBBS,

March, 1887. Sec. Kingston Auxiliary.

P. S.—Subscriptions and donations from all friends of Israel gladly received and forwarded as may be directed.

SKETCH OF LESSON.

EASTER DAY. APRIL 10TH, 1887.

The Commemorative Feast.

Passage to be read.—Exodus xii. 8-13.

Last Sunday we read of "a night to be remembered." Three memorials were appointed by God for this purpose—(1) The beginning of the year (at least for ecclesiastical purposes), was changed from the middle of September to the middle of March (xii. 2); (2) The first born of Israel were to be given to God, the tribe of Levi being subsequently selected to represent them (xiii. 2, 15; Numb. iii. 11-13). (3) A Feast was to be kept. It is to the last of these that our attention is now directed.

I. How the Feast was kept.—Upon the tenth day of the month, (i.e., four days before it was to be slain), the people were to select with great care a lamb or a kid, "a male of the first year, without a blemish"—one for each family, or company of at least two persons

(Josephus). Then, upon the fourteenth day, the whole assembly or congregation (represented) by their houses or families, were to kill it, "in the evening," or "between the two evenings" (See Margin) i.e., probably between three o'clock and sunset. The blood was now to be sprinkled by means of a brush of hyssop (a climbing plant) upon the two side-posts and the upper door-posts of the houses, in order that the Destroying Angel, seeing it, might pass them by unharmed. The flesh of the lamb was to be roasted and eaten the same night, any that might remain over until the morning being consumed with fire. Unleavened bread and bitter herbs were to be eaten with it, while the people were to be dressed as ready for their journey (xii. 11). Such was the "Lord's Passover," which must be eaten year by year as a memorial of the events of that awful night when the first-born of Egypt were slain, the rebellion of Pharaoh crushed, and the children of Israel delivered.

II. What the Feast meant.—Could they ever forget that feast? But in time to come their children might ask them "What mean ye by this feast?"

Of what three things was it to remind them?

(1) That God had spared them (v. 27). The lamb slain because they deserved death. The blood sprinkled that they might be passed over, and sheltered from wrath.

(2) That God had brought them out of Egypt. (xiii. 3). That fearful stroke which had fallen upon the Egyptians had set them free.

(3) That they were consecrated to God's service. This was to be always before them,—a sign with thee upon thine hand "directing thy going;" "a memorial between thine eyes," known and seen of others; "that the Lord's law may be in thy mouth," thy conversation shewing that thou art God's people. (xiii. 8, 9).

But while a memorial of past blessings, its dreadful warning pointed to the future. They needed deliverance from bondage worse than that of Egypt, by a victim more precious than the Paschal lamb. "Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us. (1 Cor. v. 7, 8). Yes, for Jew and Gentile,—for all men—Christ is the true Paschal Lamb which taketh away the sins of the world." And as the "Lord's Passover" was observed year by year as a memorial, so the "Lord's Supper," instituted by our Lord Himself the night before He was offered in sacrifice, is celebrated continually as His memorial, "showing forth the Lord's death till He come." (1 Cor. xi. 26). Let all who "keep the feast" "reckon themselves to be dead indeed unto sin," but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord." (Rom. vi. 9). How forcibly does the subject come before us at this Easter season!

III. Who might keep the Feast.—Naturally this memorial could only be observed by those who had been delivered. Therefore no stranger could eat of it. (xii. 43-45). Yet these might be qualified to partake of the feast by formally uniting themselves to the family of Israel. (xii. 44-48). So Christians can only partake of the Lord's Supper: they who would must become "members of Christ" in Baptism, while the Church rules that they should also "be confirmed, or ready and desirous to be confirmed." Yet all who are thus united to Christ, should also carefully observe the promises and vows which they have made and "examine themselves before they presume to eat of that bread and drink of that cup."

Family Reading.

THE EMPTY NEST.*

On a bed near Arbor Water,
Where the grass grew fresh and green,
A nest had fallen from the trees,
Where the little birds had been.

So like the home-nest, empty,
My bird had taken flight
Beyond the clouds of darkness
Into "His marvellous light."

And there we will meet our birdies
When our weary work is done,
When the enemy is conquered
And all the battles won.

When the evening light is mellowed
With our numbered days,
And the tinted cloud shall brighten
With His eternal rays.

Away, above the hill-tops,
Where the saints so weary trod,
In the Spring time of our gladness,
Lit by the smile of God.

* On a little grave in Greenwood, an empty nest was found by the mourning mother, emblematical of her nest at home.