

his large number only one hundred and fifty thousand are settled in Canada; all the rest have gone over our fine railways to the United States; and I have no doubt that a very large proportion of these fully believed they were going to settle in Western Canada under the British flag—such is the lamentable ignorance which prevails among that class of emigrants!

All my lectures were intended to disabuse their minds of any such ideas; and to inform them that Britain lost the "American Colony" when they rebelled against British rule and asserted their independence in 1776, and that they are still independent of British laws and of British institutions. I also explained to them that Canada alone was British, and would ever be a part of the British Empire; and by the use of maps showed them plainly the position of the United States, so as to prevent any confusion in their minds about what was British and what was foreign.

These points having been explained, I pointed out to them that no British subject (who would of course be a "foreigner" in the United States) could hold a deed of freehold land in the States without first forswearing his allegiance to his native land and Queen Victoria. I met several persons on their return home on account of the money crisis in the States, who said they were obliged to take this oath or lose their property.

Also "foreigners" settling in Britain or Canada must all become British subjects and take an oath of allegiance to our Queen before they can enjoy the full privileges of British subjects.

In conclusion I strongly recommend that the Governments of Canada will without further delay select the most influential men to meet the British Parliament, and to unite the two governments in this great cause of Emigration to this the western part of the British Empire, say to the number of four millions of men which will release her of her surplus population; and will add greatly to our strength and loyalty and prosperity, as we are only four millions of inhabitants in one of the largest and most prosperous countries in the world, capable of settling fifty millions inhabitants of prosperous and happy farmers, machinists, and mercantile business men, and make us what we must be, the right arm of the British Empire.

(Signed,) MAJOR C. DONALDSON,  
Director and Commissioner of Emigration Aid  
Society of the District of Niagara and St.  
Catharines, in connection with Hamilton  
and the Government of Ontario.

The following are the resolutions  
Moved by Alexander Muir, and se-  
conded by P. Larkin.

That the report just read of Mr. C. Donaldson's mission on Emigration as our commissioner to Europe, including cash expenses, be received and adopted, and printed, and an assessment levied of a third call of twenty-five per cent. upon the capital stock of the Society to pay the same.—Carried.

G. A. CLARK, President.  
Moved by Alexander Muir, and se-  
conded by P. Larkin.

That a vote of thanks to Mr. Donaldson for his energetic and persevering labours in so short a time in Europe in sending out so many fine, healthy farm labouring families, and arranging for a large tide of Emigration of farm labourers, tenant farmers, domestic servants and capitalists to come out to Canada next Spring.—Carried unanimously.

G. A. CLARK, President.

—The *Times* special despatch from Madrid says it was Marshal Serrano's wish that Senor Castelar should be a member of the new Ministry, but the latter refused to again accept office. On the defeat of Senor Castelar, and previous to the interference of General Pavia, the Cortes elected Senor Pataria President of the Cabinet. The *News* special says the Republican force besieging Cartagena accept the new Government, and the National Militia in Madrid is being quietly disbanded. The *News* despatch also says a rumour is in circulation in Madrid that the late retreat of General Morione was a concerted manœuvre in support of General Pavia's *coup d'état*.

—An important movement, by way of answer to the trades unions, has just been set on foot. A society called the "National Federation of Associated Employers of Labour" has been formed, with a council consisting of five-and-forty of the most eminent firms in the country, including Crossley, of Halifax; Laird, of Birkenhead; Salt, of Saltaire; Menclaus, of Downais; Akroyd, of Halifax; Maudslay, of London; Trollope, of Westminster; and Brocklehurst, of Macclesfield. The president is Mr. John Robinson, of the firm of Sharp, Stewart, and Co., of Manchester; and the treasurer, Mr. Stephen A. Marshall, of Leeds. It is stated that the Federation already includes the employers of a million persons.

—Cable dispatches dated Jan. 1 and 2 report that Sir Garnet Wooley, with 500 sailors, had advanced seventy miles into the interior, and the Ashantees were flying before him; that they were driven across the river Prat, re-entering their own territory in great disorder. They left a large number of their dead and wounded on the bank of the river, and 800 of the natives were drowned.

—Postage on the CHURCH HERALD throughout the Dominion, is five cents per quarter, payable invariably in advance at the office of delivery.

—Thos. A. Richardson is no longer connected with the Church Printing and Publishing Company, either as advertising agent or in any other capacity.

—The important address of his Lordship the Bishop of Toronto on the subject of the Church Association of the Diocese of Toronto, is now ready, in pamphlet form, in any quantity that may be desired, at this office. They can be afforded,—post-free for 5 cents each; 35 cents per dozen; or \$2.50 per hundred.

—Subscribers are respectfully requested to communicate with our office, by letter or postal card, (which costs only one cent,) when they wish to let us hear from them. The custom of returning the paper, or getting the postmaster to send a "slip," proves most unsatisfactory, and is not relied upon by our Company as a correct medium for conveying information.

## The Church Herald.

TORONTO, THURSDAY, JAN. 15, 1874.

### TEMPERANCE VERSUS TOTAL ABSTINENCE.

In another column will be found a letter from a correspondent on this subject. We give it insertion, not because of any thing new or original in the arguments used, nor because of any peculiar merit in the position taken by the writer, but because it very fairly expresses the grounds upon which a considerable number of worthy christian people are conscientiously opposed to the temperance reform movement.

Before proceeding further we desire to disabuse the mind of our correspondent of an erroneous impression produced by a phrase in a former article in this paper. We used the expression "half-hearted friends of temperance" as being half-hearted in the cause of temperance associations; and understood in that sense our friend, we think, cannot take exception to it, as it would hardly apply to him, he being not half-hearted in favour of that movement, but whole hearted against it. If we have unconsciously let slip an expression offensive to a number of christian people whom we deeply respect we are sorry for it, and would take the earliest opportunity of making amends. We are not amongst those who think that any cause can be best advanced by the use of hard language or violent advocacy. We hope we have lived long enough and been observant enough to learn the lesson that men may differ and still hold each other in the same high estimation as if they were of the same opinion. And we feel that this question is one which in particular demands the exercise of the truest principles of Christian love and courtesy. In the heat of controversy and moved by a zeal which is not always tempered by discretion, some of the advocates of the temperance cause may not always have kept these principles sufficiently in view. We do not desire to take their sins upon our shoulders, nor to be held responsible for what they say and do. But on the other hand, if the principles of temperance reform are in themselves meritorious, and not inconsistent with Bible teaching, we think they ought not to be prejudiced by improper or injudicious advocacy. We are much opposed to side issues. The short comings of "Teetotalers" or any impropriety in their language or conduct cannot affect the great question really in issue. The world is familiar with the tactics of a certain ingenious lawyer whose private instructions to counsel were, "No defence—abuse the plaintiff's attorney." The incident involves a principle of action only too common in life, but we hope we shall not see its application in the treatment of this matter. It is not our purpose at the present time to enter upon any elaborate discussion of the points relied upon by those whose views are indicated by our correspondent. We believe their conclusions drawn from certain passages of holy scripture, are erroneous. The grounds principally relied on are that there is nothing in the recorded words of our Saviour on the subject of total abstinence; that He drank wine; and that the first miracle

was the turning water into wine; and that wine is referred to in certain passages as a good thing. To say that our Saviour did not recommend total abstinence, or form societies on that principle, is certainly no greater negative argument than could be adduced against many other useful reforms that the varying conditions of society have required and called forth. It is equally true that our blessed Lord did not in His infinite wisdom see fit to ordain or recommend the thirty-nine articles nor any of the formal creeds of christian faith; nor did He draw up or establish any specific set of rules or formularies for the Government of His church. Yet we all believe in the soundness and propriety of these articles, creeds and formularies, and that they are sanctioned by divine authority. As we do not find our Saviour laying down specific regulations for the temporal government of His own church, still less do we find Him prescribing a complete code of laws for the moral, social and physical well-being of communities. In these matters men were left to form their own ordinances. In doing so it was and is their duty to be duly influenced by the spirit of divine teaching, and to legislate accordingly. For example take the matter of slavery. We do not find it denounced in scripture, yet was it wrong, on Christian grounds, for men to combine to secure its abolition? We believe modern slavery to be a great evil and one that ought to be suppressed. Moral suasion was tried in vain, and then human laws were enacted in aid of the moral duty. We think the movement which brought about these laws was just and proper. We endorse the men whose labours in the cause aroused public opinion to a correct estimate of the slavery scandal. Do any of our friends in Canada think that the anti-slavery agitation was wicked, because our Saviour and His apostles did not become members of any abolition society? We can well remember the time when the slaveholders of the South used arguments very similar to those used by the opponents of temperance societies. The difference in the two cases we think was rather, in favour of the slaveholders; because in scripture times the slavery system was a more prominent evil than drunkenness, when compared with the same evils as existing in modern times. At all events, the principles of abolition were once denounced in the Southern States on the ground amongst others that slavery accorded with scripture and was not condemned by holy writ; that abolitionists presumed to set up a code of moral reform higher than Revelation, and were thus guilty of infidelity and blasphemy; and in so doing it was hinted that their conduct was instigated by Satan. A pamphlet recently issued in Philadelphia entitled "short off-hand sermons," written in opposition to the temperance movement, takes similar ground. In this production certain passages in the English version of the Bible are quoted and pressed as favouring the drinking of wine; but the many passages of scripture that tell against the use of intoxicating drinks are entirely suppressed by the writer. This is scarcely a fair way of discussing the Bible aspect of the question.

As to the argument drawn from our Saviour's example in the use of wine, and those passages where it is spoken of as a blessing, it has often been pointed out that there are different kinds of wine intended in scripture. In the original language there are several words each having a different shade of meaning, all of which are translated into English as *wine*. In those passages where wine is approved of, it will be found, we believe, that the article referred to, (as it often is in connection with bread) means either the grapes themselves or unfermented juice of the grape, neither of which is intoxicating, and both of which are good and nourishing as food. We have reason to think this was the only kind of wine approved by our Saviour. In other contexts, wine is mentioned as an evil; as a "mockery," and people were warned against it. This we presume was some kind of fermented wine more or less intoxicating; and we do not believe this kind of wine is anywhere recommended in the Bible. In addition to this consideration there can be no doubt that many of the liquors of modern invention are far more destructive than any in use amongst the ancients. It was not until

long after the christian era that the process was discovered of extracting alcohol out of vegetable substances and distilling it into liquor. The extent to which this process has been carried and the many newly invented strong drinks that have been produced in consequence of the discovery, are truly appalling, and the general use of them has caused an amount of human suffering, the extent of which defies calculation.

The fact is, experience has proved that in the varying condition of human society, more or less artificial, new restraints and regulations are from time to time found necessary to meet new inventions and new abuses. These restraints are what distinguish men in a state of civilization, from men in a state of barbarism; such regulations are human laws, and have been from time to time enacted by communities that required them. It was not, we believe, any part of the scheme or plan of our Lord to interfere with these regulations. He did not, for example, in words teach that polygamy would be wrong in any country, or any condition of society that then existed or that might exist after His time on earth; nor did He say that poor laws ought to be provided; or that education should be furnished or regulated by the State; or that it was wrong to sell or use unwholesome food; nor did He prohibit the habitual use of noxious poison in any form such as arsenic or prussic acid; yet all those and many other kindred subjects have since been regulated by human laws according to the requirements and good government of men. If public morality and good government require some restriction to be placed by the state upon the making and selling of alcoholic poison in any shape, we are at a loss to conceive what sound scripture argument can be adduced against such regulations. If we are satisfied that the habitual use of strong liquor is injurious and dangerous to our brother, we do not see how we are committing sin by abstaining ourselves and trying to persuade him to abstain from its use. If we are justified so far, do either of us sin by a mutual promise to abstain for the future? We could wish our correspondent would visit some of our largest cities; walk down certain of their streets as the hour of midnight approaches; observe the saloons and drinking haunts being emptied of their inmates; see those young men with bleared eyes and bloated cheeks as they reel and stagger under the influence of the liquor that has made them drunk; let him listen to the foul blasphemy that desecrates their lips and contaminates the very air they breathe; and then let him say, if he can, that he condemns the efforts of the societies that are trying to save those young men from the ruin that stares them in the face.

### CHURCH UNION IN CANADA.

Under the above caption our largest Toronto contemporary publishes a characteristic article, in which the design of the writer is quite clear, namely to do what could be done by hostile and sarcastic criticism to widen the supposed breach in the ranks of the Church, and to inflame the minds of Churchmen against each other. Our chief object in taking notice of this one in particular (when so many productions of a similar character emanate from the same source) is to correct the erroneous impressions which are liable to be produced from the statements made in the article in question. In the first place, the two associations in England are referred to, namely, the "Church Union" and the "Church Association," and it is alleged the former contains all the extreme Ritualists, and that the Society furnished the funds to defend those who in England were prosecuted for breach of Canon law; that all those who signed the petition to Convocation for revival of the confessional were members of the "Church Union." The "Church Association" is described as being formed on the opposite side; and that its members contributed "thousands and thousands of pounds" to "prosecute Bennett and other pronounced heretics." In fact that the two Societies are entirely antagonistic to each other, and the one formed to oppose the other, each being made up of a membership derived respectively from the two extreme parties. The writer in question then proceeds to inform his

readers that "in Toronto, it now seems, we have got our own 'Church Union' and 'Church Association.'" After alluding to the fact that the President of the "Church Union" had endeavoured to induce the members of the "Association" to join the Union, the ingenious author of the article then proceeds thus: "One has to fancy Dr. Pusey or other high representative 'Unionists' at home—say Mr. Machonochie or Bennett—writing to the Dean of Ripon or Mr. Newdegate, with the exhortative peace and harmony 'Pro' and 'Con' more to the same effect; the course being to do the Canadian Church all the harm in the power of the pen in question. The broad statement is made that "the members of the Church of England in Canada are beginning to marshal themselves under the same rival banners as their fellow Churchmen in England." This is a gross misrepresentation of the facts. So far as the "Church Union" of Toronto is concerned, that society is not and never was a party organization. If the person who wrote the article we refer to had been in the least concerned as to the facts he could easily have ascertained that the membership of the Toronto Union has no reference to parties. All schools of opinion in the Church are represented in the Union, or rather, the Union knows no party, its membership being drawn from all sections. It is formed upon the comprehensive basis of the whole Church. In fact we believe that some of the members of every congregation of the fourteen Church congregations in Toronto and Yorkville, are members of the Church Union. To represent the Church Union as a party organization, and still further to insinuate that its members are extreme Ritualists, is simply to caricature the facts. Nor on the other hand do we believe that the "Church Association" was formed or intended as a rival association. The purposes for which the latter association was formed appear from their address and their constitution, in which it is nowhere stated that they object to the work or influence of the Church Union, or that it is a Ritualistic Association.

Such being the facts, it was a most natural and reasonable thing for the Bishop who is president of the Church Union to use his good offices in bringing about a Union between the two Associations. We are glad to say there is still a fair prospect that the effort may be attended with success in spite of the uncalled-for interference of outside enemies of the church. That a complete union may be established; that the members of the Church Association may agree to work in harmony with the Church Union, is a result greatly desired by the friends of our Communion.

We have already published in these columns the constitution and bye-laws of the Church Union, and reports of their work from time to time, so that we presume our readers are familiar with the objects of the Union. To those who are not aware, we would say briefly, the Church Union is formed for missionary and other Church work, including the equipment and maintenance of city missionaries and Lay-readers; tract and book distribution, reading-rooms and library; a girls, home and boarding house; relief of indigent families; a night school for boys and young men; lectures &c. On the other hand, no party subjects are ever heard in the Union. All the money it has raised, which has been considerable, has been spent in promoting the objects above indicated. Yet the veracious writer of fiction in the article referred to would have its readers infer that that the objects of the Church Union of Toronto are the same as those of the English Society which is alleged by him to have spent its money in defending breakers of the law, who were being prosecuted by the other English Association.

### THE CHURCH IN THE WEST INDIA ISLANDS.

A correspondent in the last number of the London *Guardian* gives an account of a recent conference held at Georgetown, in British Guiana, by the Bishops of the West India Islands. Like all other Colonial questions the question of Colonial Churches and their future relationship to the Mother Church,