

chorals will be made to Westminster Abbey. As most people are aware, the office of a vicar choral is an *inalienable freehold*, and this action on the part of the Abbey authorities is said to be dictated by the difficulty of securing adequate discipline under such conditions. [The italics are mine.] Like causes produce like effects. In this country when a bishop appoints a clergyman to a parochial charge he confers on him an *inalienable freehold* the same as in England. If the English clergy had been amenable to discipline, the Archbishop of Canterbury would not have had to appeal to Parliament for power to deal with contumacious clergymen." The paragraph I have quoted fully bears out the contentions of two writers in the *Empire* the fore part of June, one a clergyman and the other a layman, pointing out some of the effects of life appointments. One of them stated that if the clergy had to render an account of their stewardship to their Bishop every five years, there are some whose conduct would be different. The bane of our Church is life appointment, with its attendant train of injurious influences, which parochial councils could in no wise counteract. The remedy rather lies in an opposite direction, that is, of clothing the Bishop with power to exercise an efficient episcopal supervision, which is now merely nominal.

A DELEGATE.

### Unfermented Wine.

SIR,—My grievance in relation to the ruling of the Lambeth Conference anent Sacramental Wine simply amounts to this: Why not let well alone? It is rather late in the day, as the millennium draws nigh, to begin meddling with Rubrics that have satisfied the Church thus far. The Rubric of common sense must also be respected. If poor communicants may be allowed "to drink of the pure blood of the grape" as Pharaoh's butler "took the grapes and pressed them into Pharaoh's cup and gave the cup into Pharaoh's hand," I fail to see the sacrilege or the disgrace of any weak brother preferring, say, an un-intoxicating wine. L. S. T. does not object to fermented wine personally—nor does he condemn others who, like the successors of Nadab and Abihu, were thus restricted: "Do not drink wine nor strong drink, thou nor thy son with thee, when ye go into the tabernacle of the congregation." Had the Corinthian Christians not used intoxicating wine at the Lord's Supper they certainly would not have been drunken. L. S. T. is quite as anxious as Rev. Mr. Goldberg to reverence sacred things, and altho' satisfied to use fermented wine for the Holy Communion, he is not prepared to condemn others who consider that they are perfectly justified in drinking of this "fruit of the vine"—even before it has become old wine, and consequently before it has become intoxicating. As it is, your correspondent observes communicants sometimes scarcely sip the cup.

Cap L'aigle, 6th July, 1892.

L. S. T.

### Cacouna Clergy House.

SIR,—As one of the first little company of clergy who have enjoyed the benefits of the Cacouna Clergy House of Rest, and the very first to bid farewell to its hospitable walls, permit me briefly to tell my brother clergy throughout Canada what they may expect to find here. The late Dr. Campbell used to say that the air of Cacouna was the best in the world. Of this healthful and delightful air the House of Rest has fullest advantage. The house is large and roomy, delightfully situated, overlooking the river, contiguous to the beautiful little church with its daily service, and within two minutes walk of the beach. There are, I think, some sixteen bed rooms in the house, dining room, sitting room, a very comfortable reading room in a small separate house, with the beginning of a library. The matron and her household are kindness and competence personified. The attendance and meals are all that could be wished. The only draw-back is that one has a provision equal that of a good private hotel, made by the love and generosity of one's brother Churchmen and Churchwomen, and is deluded into the idea that one is paying for it all by being charged at the rate of half-a-dollar a day.

The House of Rest is already an assured success, and the spirit in which it is being carried on by its managers (I will not shame their modesty by mentioning their names) is,—well, if I should say all I feel, I should write extravagantly.

HENRY ROE,

Archdeacon of Quebec.

Clergy House of Rest, Cacouna, P.Q., July 11, '92.

### Burial Reform Association.

SIR,—From a recent editorial in your paper I would infer that myself and the "Burial Reform Association" entertain extreme views in connection with the undertaking business. Instead of entering into a newspaper controversy with the above society, I have been instructed to tender an invitation to

them to meet us at our annual convention in Richmond Hall, Richmond Street, Toronto, on Monday evening, September the 14th, and present their aims and objections to the present system of interment. Any delegated officer will be allowed forty-five minutes on behalf of B. R. A., and an equal amount of time guaranteed to the Undertakers' Association to reply thereto. One week from date of the appearance of this notice in your paper will be afforded the secretary of the B. R. A. to accept or reject this invitation. Trusting you will insert this for the benefit of all concerned.

W. H. HOYLE,

Sec. U. A., Ontario.

Cannington, July 17, 1892.

### Notes and Queries.

SIR,—If the Christian marriage bond be dissoluble by divorce, allowing either party to marry another during the life time of both, what about marrying a divorced wife's sister? Would this be considered wholly legal, or would Lev. xviii. 18 be considered sufficient protest?

SIGMA.

Rocky Mountains, June 24th, 1892.

Ans.—On this hypothesis, where the divorce is a *vinculis*, that is, made absolute, we cannot conceive that any restriction remains as regards affinity, or that, on this supposition, any court would recognize such distant collaterals of the original union. But the courts would also be careful to guard the rights of all in so far as they depended upon the condition of affairs prior to the divorce, and even after the divorce if there were any danger of the innocent being called upon to suffer through the guilty. But all this supposition is outside the Church's sphere, and on points like this the statute law is sometimes made to clash with canon or Church law: colonial law has also been carried farther in this direction than British law has. The Lambeth Conference of 1888 decided that "under no circumstances ought the guilty party, in the case of a divorce for fornication or adultery, to be regarded, during the life time of the innocent party, as a fit recipient of the blessing of the Church on marriage." We can easily imagine how complications would arise, but scarcely the one in question.

SIR,—Will you kindly give your definition of the word "Protestant," and say whether the term properly belongs to the Church of England? Can a person belonging to the Church of England, and professing the creed of the Prayer Book, be a Protestant? A definite answer, one to the point, will oblige.

ZINI.

Ans.—If we give you a dictionary definition, as "one who adhered to Luther in 1529, when he made a solemn declaration of dissent from a decree of Charles V. and the Diet of Spires," you will possibly say that is not "a definite answer, one to the point." This is the proper and historical meaning of the word: any other definition is from vulgar use, as, "a name applied to all Christian denominations that differ from the Church of Rome—restricted to those sprung from the Reformation." As members of the Church of England we are nowhere called by the Church in any of her offices or canons, Protestants. We protest against all errors, be they Roman or reformed. If we say that we are Protestants we class ourselves with all sects on the one foundation of anti-Romanism, and our creed is simply a denial of what we think that others believe. We affirm, then, definitely and to the point, that the term does not belong to the Church of England: that a person belonging to the Church of England and professing the creed in the Prayer Book cannot, in any proper sense of the word, be a Protestant, but in an improper, popular sense, he, or a Plymouth Brother, or a Bible Christian, or Unitarian, is a Protestant. Practically the term Protestant is equivalent to Anti-Romanist, as if this embraced all the clauses of the Christian creed: any positive definition is impossible.

Characteristics of Hood's Sarsaparilla: The largest sale, the most merit, the greatest cures. Try it, and realize its benefits.

### Sunday School Lesson.

6th Sunday after Trinity. July 24th, 1892.

EIGHTH COMMANDMENT.

These last three commandments treat of the religion of the body. The hands are a part of the body, a very important part. Hands are one of the great differences which distinguish men from beasts,

Sixth Commandment told us something about the hands, the Eighth tells us something more. The Sixth protects life; the Eighth protects property.

#### I. WHAT WE ARE NOT TO DO.

(i.) *Thou shalt not steal.* When we stretch forth the hand to take what is not our own the Eighth Commandment says "stop."

If you were to go into the county jail and ask the prisoners there for stealing how they came to steal, you would probably find that some of them had been well instructed but had refused to obey, had paid no attention, did not take God's law into their hearts, did not say their prayers; or perhaps they read bad books which made light of God's law and put it into their minds to steal. Let us be careful never to read books which say "yea" when God's Book says "no."

(ii.) *Picking and Stealing.* *Picking* means *pilfering*, stealing little things. Must not take even little things which do not belong to us. Must not steal anything nice because it is small. The spark soon grows into a flame, the flame becomes a great fire, and some great building is burnt to the ground. A little spark is a dangerous thing. [Illustr.: Every large fire has a small beginning.] If you are in doubt about taking a thing, "Stop."

We must not steal little things from our parents. (Prov. xxviii. 24.) It is sin to rob an orchard, to steal good things from a cupboard, to take a new thing away and put an old in its place, to put bad money upon the plate in Church, or to withhold our offerings from God; all these things are wrong, they are *picking or stealing*. Many of them may seem small, but little things make little sins, and little sins are great things in the sight of God.

#### II. WHAT WE ARE TO DO.

To be true and just in all my dealings.

(i.) We must get an honest living. (Eph. iv. 28.)

(ii.) We must do our work honestly. To take our wages and neglect our work, or do it badly, is not to be true and just in all our dealings.

(iii.) We must pay honestly for what we have. It is not honest to give bad money, or short money when not likely to be found out. It is stealing to smuggle goods into the country without paying duty. It is stealing to run into debt when we have little chance of paying.

(iv.) We must give to all their dues (Rom. xiii. 7, 8).

(v.) If we sell we must give good weight and good measure (Lev. xix. 35, 36); what we sell must be what it proposes to be, anything else is *cheating*.

(vi.) We must not take advantage of another.

(vii.) Offer to God a fixed proportion of our money. No dishonest person shall inherit the Kingdom of God (1 Cor. vi. 10).

7th Sunday after Trinity.

July 31st, 1892.

#### CHRISTIAN DUTY—THE NINTH COMMANDMENT.

This Commandment teaches the religion of the tongue. Few things in the world are more mighty, either for good or evil, than the power of speech. The first work of God is represented as having been wrought by speech, "God said, let there be light." The Eternal Son is called the "Word of God." The Holy Ghost *speaks* by the Apostles and Evangelists. And men have power over one another by speech, to soothe, to make angry; to explain, to confuse; to encourage, to dishearten; to hinder, to lead, etc. On the contrast between good and bad uses of speech see S. James iii. 10-12. The whole chapter is closely connected with the subject of the lesson; and the comparison made between the tongue and a "little fire" (v. 5), very aptly shews what great evils may grow out of a few unkind words.

We will briefly consider the three things forbidden by this Commandment. The first is directly spoken of in the commandment, while the other two belong to the fuller statement found in our Duty to our Neighbour. It forbids,

#### I. FALSE WITNESS.

Swearing falsely in a court of justice. Taking an oath is a very solemn thing. The witness promises to tell "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help me God"—Then he kisses the Bible. Many of those who are now children will some day be called to act as witnesses. They must remember that their oath to be perfectly truthful is made in the sacred Name of God—and that He will severely punish those who break their oath. The law also will punish any found guilty of this crime, which is called *perjury*. See what the law of Moses says about false swearing (Deut. xix. 16-21). Many have suffered from false witnesses (1 Kings xxi. 13, 14; St. Matt. xxvi. 59-61).

#### II. EVIL SPEAKING OR SLANDERING.

The law of our country may not count this as a crime, but false things said of others in private life often do them more harm than false witness in the courts. Even as a matter of worldly honour, it is a mean and cowardly thing to say things about people behind their backs which they have no chance of