

# CORNER STONE OF THE SPORTING-MAN'S CHURCH

## A Peculiar Pastorate



In Toronto on November 27th, the athletic corner-stone of the Sporting-Man's Church was laid by Mr. J. G. Merrick, President of the Amateur Athletic Association. The Pastor, Rev. J. D. Morrow stands with bared head facing the ceremony.

NOT long ago a Philadelphia parson sanctified Sunday baseball by opening a game with prayer. Now a Canadian athletic parson, the Rev. J. D. Morrow, has started a sporting-man's church. The corner-stones of this church were laid in Toronto last week. Rev. Mr. Morrow is a Presbyterian who believes first and foremost in the Biblical passage, "Let us run the race that is set before us." He is a sprinter of renown. At Toronto University years ago he was the crack runner. Till a few years ago he was in Hespeler, Ont. When he went to Toronto he became deeply interested in sporting men; and it was only a little while till he had formulated his plan to build perhaps the most unique church in America. In this church the doctrines of John Knox will be subject to some revision in practice. Mr. Morrow's congregation will be sporting men and young men interested in athletics. It is not expected that Easter hats will prevent any of the congregation from seeing the preacher. The general corner-stone was laid by Lieut.-Governor Gibson; the athletic corner-stone by Mr. J. G. Merrick, President of the Amateur Athletic Association. At the close of the interesting ceremony the Police Athletic Association presented the pastor with a hundred-dollar cheque.

Now the question is raised—whether there will be modern conveniences in Mr. Morrow's church, such as billiards in the basement, card-tables and a gymnasium, soft drinks on the side, and such other odds and ends as serve to make the old religion palatable in a new way.

## OPINIONS OF OTHER PEOPLE

*Sundry Topics Intelligently Discussed by Various Readers.*

### Western Canada and the Navy

Editor CANADIAN COURIER:

Dear Sir,—I have your issue of November 13th to hand, and must take issue with you with regard to some of the points in your editorial on the naval question. To start with, in the comparison you draw of the Boer War, you say immense moral benefit was drawn from the spectacle of seeing us colonials coming to the assistance of the Mother Country; from this you would infer that the same amount of benefit would accrue to the Empire from the possession of colonial navies. Now it seems to me that the comparisons are absolutely dissimilar. In the first instance we were fighting a guerilla warfare, and though we were often defeated, this could not be said to have put the Empire into any great degree of peril. But, Mr. Editor, contemplate the effect of one single disaster to the British fleet in home waters at the hands of the Germans or any other rival power. It would be a catastrophe such as could in all probability never be repaired; all the moral effect from having small colonial navies would be lost immediately in the sudden realisation of the world at large that the very centre of the Empire was at the mercy of the invaders. A navy such as we contemplate here in Canada, consisting of second-class cruisers, is folly; naval strength today is counted in Dreadnoughts. We have only to look at the fate of the Russian fleet to see what a disaster we would be inviting by dividing our naval forces.

You also assert that the talk about the supremacy of the Empire being settled in the North Sea is "arrant nonsense." Well, sir, no doubt you are well informed as to a matter like this, but I believe the public at large would be more inclined to believe the assertions of eminent naval experts, such as Sir John Fisher, Sir C. Wilson (perhaps the greatest naval strategist of the day), Mr. Fred T. Jane, and Captain Mahan, the great historian and naval expert of the United States navy, who one and all assert that the Empire's supremacy will be decided in the North Sea.

Furthermore, you deduce from the fact that our troops were better scouts than the native-born British in the Boer War, that our naval recruits would be in many ways more efficient than the regular English "Jack Tars." Well, I must admit that I am amazed at such an assertion from you, Mr. Editor. I think it is self-evident that the running and fighting of modern Dreadnoughts requires men who are specialists, and not raw recruits who put in (perhaps) ten days a year on a warship. Our inherent qualities would be of no avail against highly specialised science, fighting behind steel walls.

Again you assert that the fishermen of the

coasts would be better off for naval training and experience. That is a point which needs no debating but surely their physique would be developed to an equal extent if they were drafted to a naval reserve in connection with the Imperial fleet.

You also assert that funds, as administered in the Imperial Naval Department, i.e., the Admiralty, would possibly not be as well spent as if they were spent here in Canada. This line of argument, however, has this great defect, that the British Admiralty are never accused of malappropriation of public funds (even by their worst enemies) whilst on the other hand, the same thing unfortunately cannot be said of our Militia Department and our Ministry of Marine.

Furthermore, you assert that the party who are opposed to a Canadian navy, chiefly consist of and are led by dissatisfied Conservatives (at whom you more than hint) who apparently, according to your arguments, are not worthy to be leaders of any party and who have their own axes to grind. I think in this matter you are out of sympathy with and do not realise the feeling and sentiment of the West, as this is a matter not of party, but of National and Imperial significance. As you no doubt are open to hear both points of view in this matter, I would be much obliged if you would publish this letter. I believe that only by a full, fair and open discussion can the many points which are at present in variance over our proposed naval policy be set at rest. If we start by making this into a party question it will be a bad day for Canada and the Empire.

Yours sincerely,

F. C. S. DAVISON,

Member of the Executive Committee,  
Winnipeg Branch, Navy League.

### Religion and Harsh Speech

To the Editor of the CANADIAN COURIER:

Dear Sir,—You are right in condemning harsh language being used by Protestants and Roman Catholics towards each other, and especially in connection with missionary work. A most successful missionary of the olden time used to say, "You can catch more flies with one drop of honey than with a whole gallon of vinegar."

But if, for example, a Roman Catholic, taking advantage of the fact that, besides the *Orange Sentinel* of Toronto, there is another *Sentinel* published in Montreal, by Roman Catholics, were to induce Orangemen to subscribe to the latter, by showing them samples of their own organ, could you blame these Orangemen very much if they

made use of language much stronger than "that was not nice"? Or do you think that their just anger would be lessened by the explanation that they should welcome "the clearer light and fuller knowledge" contained in the *Montreal Sentinel*? Even the Prince of Peace called the "false prophets in sheep's clothing ravening wolves."

To prevent, therefore, harsh language, bitter feelings, and suspicion, Protestant and Roman Catholic missionaries, as well as others, must learn to treat each other with justice and fairness. There must be no deception, trickery, calumny, or bribery to draw adherents from one side to the other. "Mud-throwing" or "you are another" arguments are a disgrace even to politicians, and of course, much more of a disgrace to Christian workers. What would we think of an infidel who would argue that since one of the twelve men chosen by our Divine Master betrayed his Lord the whole twelve were traitors? But to argue that because some members of a denomination or church are bad they are all bad, or that the denomination or church is false, is practically the same thing.

Yours faithfully,

PEACE.

### Apples in Manitoba

Editor CANADIAN COURIER:

Dear Sir,—In your issue of October 23rd, you produced a cut of an apple scene and below it you made an assertion that such scenes are not to be found in Manitoba, Saskatchewan or Alberta. Evidently you are not aware of the fact that Southern Manitoba at least can produce a similar scene in a few instances.

Do you know that apples from this part have been on exhibition in the London, England, Emigration Offices for a number of years? Such is the fact.

I am enclosing two clippings, one from the *Winnipeg Telegram* and one from the *Free Press*. They speak for themselves.

The cut in the *Telegram* is the reproduction of a case of apples exhibited in the town of Morden, and consists of varieties grown by different parties in and around Morden.

I mention this as there seems to be a great misapprehension existing in Ontario and the East, and especially Toronto, regarding the climate of Manitoba and the West.

Yours truly,

T. BALLAGH.

Morden, Man., Oct. 30th, 1909.