

SUBSCRIPTIONS RECEIVED SINCE 1st MARCH.

The following have remitted their subscriptions for the current year. The last list was published in our issue of 23rd Feb:—

Kingston.—T. C. Wilson, E. Rose, H. J. Spriggs, John Poyer, G. J. Tandy, R. Kent, Capt. Taylor, Hon. James Patton, A. M. Patton, R. V. Rogers, Miss Fowler.

Goderich.—Mrs. Sinclair, S. Andrews, G. N. Davis, Jas. Cox, R. H. Kirkpatrick, T. R. Edwards, G. Cattle, Mr. Stotts, Rev. Canon Elwood.

Port Albert.—Thos. Hawkins, W. Graham, W. J. Haden.

Kincardine.—John Walker, D. McKenzie, R. Baird, R. McIntosh, W. McKenzie, F. Walker, J. P. Wright, W. P. Small, M. Lard, R. Walker, Mrs. Kirk.

Southampton.—Thos. Lee, F. Proudfoot, W. W. Cobb.

Invermay.—Dr. Francis, J. Hall, W. Riddell.

Blythe.—Thos. White, R. Knox, L. Nethery.

Belgrave.—D. McCartney, W. Bryans.

Wingham.—D. McCurdy, S. McCurdy.

Walkerton.—Jos. Walker, D. Moore, H. Cowie, E. Kilmer, J. S. W. Mozer, W. A. McLean, Jas. Waterson, Judge Moore, H. P. O'Connor, J. Fleuty, Mrs. Stovel, Jas. Noble, J. G. Cooper, J. A. Wilson, John Craig, John Kidd, John Nixon.

Owen Sound.—W. Knugh, F. LePan, T. L. Lum, R. Nottter, T. G. Chatwin, W. F. Wolfe, Jas. Johnson, Robt. Edgar, H. Stephens, J. Coates, J. Frizzell, J. K. Vick, S. Parke, Jos. Lillie, L. Smith, A. J. Spencer, H. P. Heming, Capt. Smith, J. P. Coulson, Thos. Gordon, Thos. Scott, W. Seldon, Geo. Crane, B. Hopkins, Chas. Hall.

Paisley.—W. R. Farr, Jas. Saunders, William Keyes.

Lucknow.—L. Copeland, Thos. Harris, W. F. Read, M. McDonald.

Walsingham.—Rev. W. Wood, C. Wood, Richd. Evans.

Port Rowan.—Mrs. Stevenson, C. Bennett.

Toronto.—R. Wood, Rev. E. Baldwin.

England.—Rev. J. Wood, Mrs. Papillon.

Esquesing.—John Murray, Samuel Rayner.

Hamilton.—J. Bancroft, Y. M. C. Association.

Seneca.—J. B. Aldridge, Jas. Old, J. B. Holden.

Durham.—T. Davis, H. Farr, G. Whitmore.

Miscellaneous.—G. Caldwell, Auberon; M. McManus, Chesley; J. Davison, Scone; F. Shelton, Kinloss; Jas. Johnson, Kinlough; J. W. Ellis, Cannington; Jas. Phelan, Pleasanthill; E. Jarvis, Ingersoll; J. F. Charles, Garden Island; Rev. A. Appleby, Clarksburgh; Rev. N. Dishrow, Dunnville; Rev. S. Givens, Yorkville; J. Watson, Eglinton; Rev. H. Caulfield, Mitchell; J. Wellman, York River; Miss Gibson, Seaforth; Rev. F. Burt, Minden; D. Howdill, Galt; Rev. M. Kerr, Gaspe; Capt. Pope, Quebec; A. G. Parker, Georgetown; Mrs. Walker, Belleville; Rev. B. Johnson, Macon, Ga.; Capt. Rogers, Lakefield; Mrs. Dickinson, Bedford; John Lindsay, Woodstock; G. O. Lucas, Varney; Rev. Thos. Watson, Monford; Rev. W. B. Railey, Tyroconnell; S. Watson, Glenallan; John McAree, Eramosa; Y. M. C. A. Cobourg.

The Montreal subscriptions are not published.

Church Observer.

"One Faith,—One Lord,—One Baptism."

MONTREAL, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 13.

MR. BEECHER'S SERMON.—In compliance with numerous requests received from various parts of the Dominion, we purpose re-producing in our next number the Rev. T. K. Beecher's sermon on "What a Congregationalist says of the Church," which appeared in our issue of the 9th ult. Those desirous of obtaining copies of that issue will please make immediate application for the same, addressed to this office.

RED RIVER.

The position in which the Dominion of Canada stands at present, with regard to a nominal portion of its territory, is a very strange one—and the events which have led to that position are, in some respects, unprecedented in the history of civilization. Who would have supposed, six months ago, that the scattered settlers of that north-western wilderness would have been able to keep our whole force of statesmanship at bay, and to dictate terms of conciliation with a high and even bloody hand. The Riel coup d'état, insignificant as it appears, from the numbers and characters of its leaders, in point of actual strength from natural circumstances, is, so far, more successful than any of the many insurrections or revolutions that have, of late years,

followed each other with such amazing rapidity. The last fifteen or twenty years may be known in history as the era of revolt. A broken wave of disaffection has now swept over the whole surface of the globe. France, Mexico, India, the United States, China, and Japan, Ireland, Spain, and Cuba, have each, in turn, become the scenes of internal commotion, the succession being not unlike a series of earthquakes.—Who ever dreamed that this epidemic of political convulsion, having almost spent its force in the thickly-peopled regions of the globe, would choose for its final manifestation a vast, sparsely-settled area, without name or boundary? The fact, a very grievous fact for us, proves how little mere statecraft, with all its manoeuvres of diplomacy, can penetrate the arcana of the future, or change, by broad-sealed commissions, the ordered course of the world.—But, from a human point of view, the Red River rebellion has taught our statesmen another lesson, namely, that in the end nothing is gained by trickery and collusion; and that cabinet eliquism is a treason against the public interests, which brings its own punishment. Now that blood has been shed, the blood of an innocent man, and that none can tell of how much loss of life it may be the horrible prelude, those who are, at the head of affairs may begin to see, amid the indignation of four millions of outraged people, that ministerial jokes, and piques, and farces, are not the fitting preambles to the formal occupation of a new territory. It can no longer be concealed that the whole affair, from the beginning of the stipulations to the departure of Mr. ex-Governor McDougall, was wretchedly mismanaged, if not worse.—Who is responsible for all that has taken place? No one, of course. The blame is shifted from shoulder to shoulder, only to be shrugged aside. One of two propositions, however, is true. Either the Government knew, at the date of Mr. McDougall's appointment that he should encounter opposition, and so was, in fact, in league

with the Rielists; or the Government did not know of this intended opposition and so is guilty of most culpable remissness. *Aut aliquis latet error.*

We have no doubt that, notwithstanding the evil auspices under which the Red River Territory has begun its career as a colony of the Dominion, a better feeling will ultimately prevail, and loyal men outnumber the Riels and O'Donohues, but, nevertheless, we hold that not only the murder of Scott, but the whole plot of which it is the tragic episode, should be submitted to the fullest investigation, regardless of persons or places. With nothing less will the sentiment of justice be satisfied.

CHURCH REFORM.

The English nation is so proverbially conservative, that when we hear of any proposed change in any of its institutions, political, ecclesiastical or educational, we may be sure that it is suggested by long and mature thought on the subject. This is at least generally true, and such exceptions as, for instance, the disestablishment of the Irish Church, or the previous extension of the franchise, only prove the rule. In enunciating this proposition, it ought to be recollected that change,—revolution, is one of the most marked characteristics of the age in which we live. There seems to be a sort of epidemic for sweeping away old landmarks, and setting up new ones. We had occasion to speak lately of the proposed revision of the Bible; now our attention has been called to a publication by the Rev. J. C. Ryle, vicar of Stradbroke on the subject of church reform.

Mr. Ryle is well known as an earnest, evangelical Christian, and with some of his

devotional tracts our readers are well acquainted. The papers which he has not published in a volume, were contained in the *Rock*, and we read them with much interest, as they appeared from time to time in that paper. Besides the much in them that concerns the Canadian churchman, they are important as showing the longings, even on the part of those in England who are far from desiring the abolition of the State Church for its freedom in matters of government and discipline as we possess. Some of Mr. Ryle's suggestions will be startling to us, free colonists. He thinks, with many, that the present (English) mode of electing bishops should be changed; but he would also eject bishops (all but five purposely elected) from the House of Lords, and approves of the American plan of a standing council of clergymen and laymen to assist the diocesan in his deliberations. He also advises, in his remarks on the reconstruction of convocation, that bishop, clergy and laity should sit, debate and vote together—the now settled *questio vexata* of the Irish Church. He would have every bishop the dean of his own cathedral, and he would limit the chapter to four chaplains appointed by the bishop.

He considers the baptismal service far too long; he thinks the communion service should be used alone, and that non-liturgical services should occasionally be allowed.

He would add to the ministry the orders of subdeacon and diocesan evangelist, licensed by the bishop to preach wherever in the diocese he might think his services needed or likely to cause spiritual revival. Although he is of opinion that greater care is wanted than at present prevails in giving young men testimonials for orders, he does not advocate their indelibility. He would give the laity much more to do in the management of the church than they now possess, and would make their cooperation necessary in every work of bishop, convocation or parochial clergy, and he would also give them a choice in the appointment of their ministers.

These are some of the leading changes which Mr. Ryle proposes or rather suggests. He argues for them with great earnestness, and his object in making them known is to do his share in educating the mind of the public in their favour, that so eventually Parliament may be called to see their necessity.

With, perhaps, two or three exceptions, Mr. Ryle's ideas on Church Reform are admirable, and some of his hints are of more than insular application.

That some Church reform is needed in England, notably, in the appointment of bishops, the sale of livings, and the Cathedral system, hardly any one will deny; but the question arises whether the call for these changes may not be answered by the last change of all,—separation. This, while a few might desire, very many would shrink in horror from and are therefore are silent. But Mr. Ryle at any rate has spoken out fearlessly.

THE HABITUAL DRUNKARD.

The present age, whatever may be its faults, is undoubtedly characterized by marked progress in enterprises of benevolence. The standard of our duty to our neighbour is much higher than formerly it used to be. Organizations for the relief of suffering, of whatever nature and however caused, are more abundant and more active than ever before in those lands where Christ's Gospel is preached. The helplessness of childhood, the infirmity of old age, the debility of disease, injury from accident,—in fine, every form of distress, has some public or other provision made for its relief. There are homes for the stranger, refuges for the houseless wanderer,

food for the hungry, rest and medicine for the weary and the sick. And even for those whose deplorable condition has resulted from their folly or vice, who have created the ills which they ought, from every principle of sense and morality, to have avoided, means are provided for alleviation or restoration or cure. To this latter class of unfortunates, who, even while they excite in us feelings of aversion, have also their claims on our compassion and help, belong the victims of intemperance. It is not our intention to dwell on the awful consequences of this degrading habit. They are too well known to need description. Probably there will be no one who reads these words who cannot draw on his own experience for instances of the fearful ravages of this monster sin on the happiness of the family circle, of its terribly destructive effects on mind and body and soul. We wish to say a few words about its prevention and cure.

We shall speak first of its cure as it was in this respect that our attention was lately drawn to the subject. We mentioned not long since that an act had been passed for the restraint of habitual drunkards. In the same session was passed another Act virtually restoring to tavern-keepers certain rescinded privileges! Of this latter we may say more by and by; but we see by a Quebec paper that by the former, a habitant of the parish of Beauport has been placed under interdict. This interdict cannot be removed except on proof that the person involved has continued sober for a year, and the law gives power to his curator to confine him in an asylum for inebriates.

Now this is the very point which we desire to touch. With the exception of one institution, of a private character, and whose charges only throw it open to persons of wealth, there is no asylum of this kind in the Province of Quebec. Insane asylums are intended for quite another purpose, and a melancholy affair does not sanction the confinement in them of such persons. Even if such a division were legal, it is well known that our asylum accommodation is insufficient even for those suffering from insanity.

What, then, is the practical value of the act of interdict? Simply this, that it is an evidence that our legislators see and wish to cure the evil of intemperance. In this respect they are in advance of these in England, for a resolution of Mr. Dalrymple, in the House of Commons for similar legislation was set aside as "the dream of a benevolent mind." It is no new thing, however, that reformers should be called dreamers. But the obvious corollary to the late act is the building of a suitable House or Retreat or Asylum. Without this the act is a mere farce of philanthropy, akin to that empty generosity which St. James rebukes.

Whether such an institution would be successful or not would depend, to a great extent, on its management. That of Binghampton in the State of New York has been attended with results that have convinced the most sceptical of the benefits of the system pursued there, and we believe that the private establishment near Quebec has restored many to self-control and happiness and usefulness. It is certain, however, that no disease is more difficult of cure, and none is more ruinous to its victim, none more hurtful to others in the sweep of its terrible influence.

Now, a few words about prevention, which is "better than cure." The inebriate asylum would be, of course, the last resort within the bounds of hope. Before that stage it is supposed there is some prospect of reform, and it is here that Christian benevolence may lend its preventive sym-