

*les assassins commencent.* It is one justly forfeited and worthless life against the sanctity of life altogether and the safety of society. Mercy to the convicted poisoner is the worst of cruelty to innocence. But there are people whose perverse and morbid sympathy passes over natural objects to fix upon the criminal. After all the public instinct of self-preservation and the public indignation against crime will assert themselves, and when the law has been nullified by perpetual interference, and juries have been deterred from convictions which they know will be futile, the next thing is a resort to lynching, that genuine though strange offspring of a spurious and fatuous philanthropy, which is rapidly ousting public justice in the adjoining country, and the name of which is beginning to be muttered even in our own.

DR. TEMPLE, formerly Head Master of Rugby, and now Bishop of Exeter, was one of the authors of the famous "Essays and Reviews." His own essay on the Education of the Human Race contained nothing which had not in substance been said by Coleridge as well as by German philosophers of a religious school, or which need have disturbed the peace of orthodoxy; but having embarked in the same boat with the other essayists, he encountered the same storm. He has, however, always been Liberal, both in theology and in politics. His political rather than his theological Liberalism recommended him for preferment to Mr. Gladstone, whose ecclesiastical predilections have always remained High Church. As a bishop he has won by his energetic performance of duty and by the breadth of his sympathies, which embrace High Church as well as Low, the goodwill of all parties in his diocese; and his reputation for force and integrity of character as well as for mental power and culture, lends special importance to any deliverance of his on the absorbing question of the day. In his Bampton lectures on the relations between Religion and Science he frankly embraces Evolution, as at least highly probable, and contends that instead of subverting our belief in an intelligent and beneficent Creator, it enables us all the more clearly to recognize Him in His work. "The doctrine of Evolution," he says, "shows that with whatever design the world was formed, that design was entertained at the very beginning and impressed on every particle of created matter, and that the appearances of failure are not only to be accounted for by the limitation of our knowledge but also by the fact that we are contemplating the work before it has been completed." The Bishop must, however, see that in accepting the genesis of man by Evolution, he gives up the doctrine of the Fall and the whole structure of dogma respecting Redemption and Regeneration which has its foundation in that belief. If man has been developed by a series of improvements out of an ape, and originally out of a worm, it is not of his Fall but of his Ascent that we must henceforth speak. Nor does Bishop Temple solve the terrible problem presented by all the suffering and waste—waste apparently of souls as well as of seeds—through which the Creator's design is worked out, or show how its ultimate completion will compensate the countless individuals who perish in the process. The Garden of Eden the Bishop plainly calls an "allegory." He insists strongly on our personal identity as a fact which Science cannot decompose and our knowledge of which is not relative but absolute. He also insists on the reality of our Free Will, however circumscribed in its exercise, and however rarely exerted, as a power beyond the domain of Science, breaking into the world of phenomena and having behind it God. "The Will," he says, "though always free, only asserts its freedom by obeying duty in spite of inclination, by disregarding the uniformity of nature in order to maintain the higher uniformity of the Moral Law." The distinction between the Moral Law and the Scientific Law, and the superiority of the Moral Law to the Scientific, are the leading principles of the lectures. The Bishop is liberal in his views with regard to Biblical Inspiration, condemning as Rabbinism "the attempt to maintain a verbal and even literal inspiration of the whole Bible, filling it, not with the breath of a Divine Spirit, but with minute details of doctrine and precept often questionable, and, when separated from the principles of the eternal law, valueless or mischievous." God's Word, he says, instead of leading us to Him, is made by Extreme Inspirationists to stand between and hide His face. The miraculous element he upholds, and declares it to be inseparable from the Gospel. Yet he admits that, "take each miracle by itself, there is but one miracle, namely, our Lord's Resurrection, for which clear and unmistakeable and sufficient evidence is given." If there is not sufficient proof of any one of the miracles severally, how can there be evidence of them in the aggregate of such a character as to form a sure foundation of our faith? The Bishop must be right when he says that the main evidence of the Revelation to us consists, not in miracles, but in its harmony with the voice of the spiritual faculty within us.

A BYSTANDER.

### THE "BYSTANDER" ON THE SCOTT ACT.

THAT the "Bystander" has written with much force and cogency on the attempts now being made to suppress the liquor traffic in various parts of the Dominion of Canada must be readily conceded by all, whether they agree with his conclusions or not. No one who has a rightful claim to be considered a moral philosopher will call in question the principles that have been laid down in these discussions, *e.g.*, that men cannot be made sober by Act of Parliament; that furtive drinking fosters deceit and hypocrisy; that personal freedom is to be maintained intact, even if not wisely used; and that, when Government has legalized and sanctioned a line of business, it is not justified in sweeping it all away without, to a greater or less extent, compensating those engaged in it.

But it is quite evident that the "Bystander" has never looked at this whole question from the standpoint of that large section of the community which, accepting his principles, yet reject his conclusions, being compelled to do so by the stern logic of facts which appear not to have come under the usually keen eye of the "Bystander." It is quite evident that there are phases of Canadian life which he has not only never studied, but in regard to which he has not performed the functions implied in his *nom-de-plume*. He has doubtless read "Ten Nights in a Bar-room," but it is questionable if he ever spent a single evening in one. Probably he never saw the inside of a "sample-room," and does not even know the meaning of the term as applied to one or more apartments in well-appointed country-town and village hotels. A somewhat narrow-minded cleric, sadly ignorant of the world he is professedly trying to convert, was recently indulging in cheap philippics against saloons and bar-rooms at a public temperance meeting, and was astonished on being told that these places were not the worst scenes of temptation in the town where he lived, but that the "sample-rooms" were far more mischievous drinking-haunts. It is only a certain class of people who indulge in bar-drinking, and are seduced into drunkenness by open and public treating. This is a great evil, but it is far transcended by the "sample-room." Here commercial travellers representing all lines of business display their goods, invite the merchants of a place to inspect their wares, and it is well understood that an order for drinks on the salesman's part, perhaps several of them, must precede an order for goods on the part of customers. The custom is universal in "this Canada of ours," and it is unspeakably demoralizing. Not a few commercial travellers have been put on the inclined plane of drunkenness as the result of it, and the extent to which business men all over the land are schooled into love of drink by this means is perfectly appalling. Nine-tenths of our wholesale dealers and commercial travellers will drop a quiet ballot in favour of the Scott Act because they wish to break up a system which they know is terribly injurious both to trade and those engaged in it. Multitudes of voters go for the Scott Act simply because they know treating to be the prime cause of drunkenness in Canada, and they see plainly that the Scott Act will be the death of the pernicious custom.

The "Bystander" seems to be profoundly ignorant of the fact that many of our best citizens, who are by no means extremists on the temperance question, feel that desperate cases demand desperate remedies, and that the drinking habits of our country have reached a pitch which calls for the interference of all true patriots. The Scott Act is a clumsy mode of curing the evil; but it will cure it, and there is no other legal remedy now available. We have a choice between two evils: the existing license system with its everywhere-present and ceaseless lure to drunkenness, and a mode of legislation which with all its faults removes the temptation which many find irresistible when it comes in their way. Our legislators are greatly to blame for forcing such a "Hobson's choice" upon us, and both political parties are alike culpable. When Mr. Mackenzie was in power, and a delegation of temperance reformers waited on him, he somewhat curtly told them to avail themselves of the legislation already in existence, referring to the Dunkin Act—in certain respects more objectionable than the Scott Act. The attitude of Sir John Macdonald on the question is well known—too well.

Correct legislation in regard to the liquor traffic will recognize the responsibility of Government in regard to the moral condition of the people. This is recognized in the prohibition of immoral books and pictures; why is it overlooked in regard to a traffic more prolific of immorality than all the artists' pens and printers' ink that have ever deluged the earth with their prurient productions? What Government *should* do, what it *must* do in the end, is to cut the liquor traffic down to the smallest dimensions consistent with the needs and rights of a free people. Instead of having strong drink sold amid every inducement to excess, and being itself a partner in the business, it should restrict and hedge it in by restraint and supervision.