

and much more so than those in the Old Version is the publication of a folio edition for use in churches at the price of three pounds. It is apparent that printers would not engage in an enterprise of this kind unless there was a demand for such a book. It is already used in Canterbury Cathedral and other churches, and it is possible that many persons now alive will see it in common or even universal use. Another evidence of the need felt for a more accurate rendering of our sacred books is found in the action taken by the Episcopal Church in the United States. The General Convention of 1895 appointed a commission of Bishops and Presbyters to consider what, if any, marginal readings for the English version might be authorized for use. The committee has now published its report, recommending: 1. That the Text of the version of 1611 should be left unaltered. 2. That the alternate readings here printed should be placed in the margin, to be used at the discretion of the minister. We have examined these references and find them excellent as far as they go; and perhaps they go far enough for the present. The promoter of this scheme is the Bishop of Vermont, so well-known among ourselves as Father Hall, the eloquent mission preacher, and the wise and devout leader in devotional exercises and retreats. We congratulate His Lordship heartily on the success of his enterprise.

#### IRREGULAR SERVICES.

A very striking article in the October number of the Church Quarterly Review—entitled "The present crisis in the Church of England"—demands attention on various grounds, but particularly in reference to the subject of the Public Service of the Church. The writer is apparently a High Churchman, for he holds that the irregularities in the performance of Divine service are greater among Low Churchmen and Broad Churchmen; but he does acquit High Churchmen entirely of such offences. A great deal of this state of things, the writer says, is attributable to the "Act of Uniformity Amendment Act" of 1872—a remark which would seem very astonishing to many who are very proud of their handiwork in passing that law. Many of our readers are aware that, up to that time, all deviations from the prescribed psalms, lessons, etc., whether for Sundays or holidays or ferial days were illegal. It can hardly be contended that such a state of things was desirable, or could be continued without great inconvenience. In case of special services the Law had to be broken or else inappropriate psalms and lessons had to be used. As a matter of fact, the Law was broken often, sometimes with the consent of the Bishop, sometimes without it. One could of course fall back upon the maxim that the Law cared nothing for trifles; but it was, to say the least, awkward for a Law administrator, who might bring the Law to bear upon one of his clergy, to be told that he was himself a Law-breaker. We are therefore unable to agree with the opinion, partly advocated by the writer in the Church Quarter-

ly, that the Act of 1872 was a mistake, and that the powers of the bishops ought to have been abridged to a greater extent by that Act. We are, indeed, disposed to agree with the Archbishop of Canterbury's interpretation of the Act, that it was intended to give very great liberty to the bishops in the drawing up and sanctioning of special services. We do not see, indeed, how this can be prevented. Since no action can be taken against a clergyman for irregularity in the conduct of Divine service without the consent of the Bishop, it is clear that nothing sanctioned by the Bishop can be regarded as an irregularity. Nor is this an evil. It is, in the highest degree, unlikely that a form of service felt to be needed by an incumbent, and sanctioned by his Diocesan, should be in any respect objectionable. But, for the same reason, we think there should be no introduction of new services at the mere will of the incumbent. In one respect we are grateful to the writer in the Review. He condemns very strongly the omission of the Communion office from the Sunday services. Indeed, he goes so far as to say that the Communion Service, or at least the Ante-Communion, containing the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel, should be used at the principal service of the Sunday, the forenoon service, and such a course is evidently most desirable, where it can be had. But it would be rather hard upon a clergyman having three or four services in the Sunday, and one of them being an early celebration of the Holy Communion, to require him to read the Ante-Communion again at a later service. But, if so much may be granted, what shall we say of those parish priests who seem to think they are fulfilling their obligations to the Church, when they entirely omit that part of the service which gives its character to the Sunday or the Holy Day? On a former occasion we drew attention to this abuse, and we fear that it still prevails. We cannot profess to agree with the article in all points, but we strongly recommend it to the notice of our readers.

#### THE COFFEE HOUSE QUESTION.

By a Layman.

A movement having been again started to establish coffee houses in Toronto, it may be useful to narrate one of the first efforts made in this direction. In 1858, when resident for the winter in Brighton, England, I was one of the lay visitors of the parish of St. John, where the poorest classes lived, largely made up of those whose precarious incomes are derived from watering-place visitors. The drink evil was terribly prevalent, and little wonder, for the wretched people were glad to spend their time in the well-warmed and lighted taverns, amid company, and where games and music could be enjoyed. Talking over our visiting experiences one night with Dr. Beard, Mr. Hole, and the Rev. Mr. Stapleton, curate of St. John's, at the house of the latter, we decided to secure a large room, fit it up with comfortable chairs, clean tables, and furnish coffee and light refreshments at a nominal price. We found a nice, central room, had it well lighted, heated,

and made as attractive as we knew how. A working tinsmith, named Pilfold, volunteered to serve as caretaker and waiter, while his good wife made coffee, tea, and did what was in her power to further our scheme. Newspapers and magazines were plentifully supplied, as were draught and checker boards. Smoking was allowed, and every night we had music, provided by some of the numerous wandering minstrels, who played in Brighton streets and taverns. The clergy and lay visitors avoided being seen in the room lest those it was provided for should distrust our intentions, as we knew how very independent they were, in spite of their poverty, and especially how they resented any attempt to curb their social liberties. In that room a man could have as good a cup of coffee as in the best hotel, a roll and butter, a meat pie, hot, and spend a few hours pleasantly, if so disposed, for the price of a glass of gin or beer. "Three o' gin," proved, however, a more popular drink than coffee. Every night in that parish hundreds of poor laundry women, porters, labourers of all varieties, itinerant musicians, beggars, fakers and boatmen, spent a large part of their day's earnings in drink. What success had our experiment? None, whatever! Those whom we desired to serve, "all, with one consent," declined to enter the Coffee Room, so that, after being several months open in winter, when a warm shelter would, we fancied, bring a crowd of visitors, we gave up the effort. Some years later, in 1864, I took part in a similar movement in South Staffordshire, where a Coffee Room was opened in several towns. One of these was closed, as we found that men got drunk on the premises, as free beer was provided by adjacent publicans, who passed it in surreptitiously through back windows, and some of their agents entered with bottles of spirits, with which they "treated" the crowd. We, however, learnt this fact before these disgraceful tactics commenced, that, card-playing must be allowed, and other games provided for as well as music to attract customers to places of this class. When we gave permission for cards, there was a great howl raised in certain pulpits against the Coffee House. To meet this, I invited the late Lord Lyttelton, a man of eminent piety and benevolence, to address a public meeting on the subject. He defended the playing of cards with much vigour and logic, and the London Times even published his remarks verbatim. But, when affairs were very promising, when our large premises, capable of entertaining over a hundred customers, were well filled and crowded at times, the distribution by publicans of free beer and spirits, amongst the visitors, ruined the enterprise, as we found it impossible to prevent this mischief. I may add that, as part of our scheme, we gave a free concert every week, at which the attendance was always over five hundred of the labouring-classes, chiefly colliers. It was this which angered the tavern-keepers, as, on our concert night, their places were almost deserted. This, in my humble judgment, is the key to the drink problem. Men,