

castaway who comes to the gallows and the highly respectable rogue who comes to reward and honour. Once more we may say, "There, but for the Grace of God—but for a good home, happy surroundings, and the influence of affection—goes Richard Baxter."

—It was just after going to press with our last number that we were favoured with a copy of a religious newspaper containing a solemn editorial on the Toronto University dinner, at which, because there was wine, it was charitably assumed by the writer that there must have been intemperance. The writer deprecated the title of "Maw worm," which he seemed to think some persons might be so misguided as to apply to his moral zeal. Social crusades, such as the temperance movement, have done much good, and are most hopeful signs of moral life in a community; but they are apt to produce a one-sided morality. A man, who has been all his life committing breaches of charity and poisoning the social atmosphere around him, may fancy himself, and be fancied by others, to be a saint because he can scent debauch where there is nothing but good-fellowship. It is strange that these censors, who assume that it is impossible to touch wine without running into excess, should forget that in England, where it is the regular habit of the gentry to take a glass or two of wine every day at dinner, you may pass your life in good society without ever seeing a man the worse for liquor. Perhaps we should be better without wine: that is a question between us and our medical advisers. If you say that the use of wine, however moderate, must be morally criminal, because the beverage, if taken in excess, would intoxicate, you will have, if you are a Christian, to expurgate your Bible, striking out, among other passages, the narrative of the Marriage Feast at Cana, and to abolish the Lord's Supper. The theory that the wine of Scripture was the unfermented juice of the grape, is the most desperate of exegetical subterfuges. When people are guilty of excess and make themselves