

The following is
 undas: The Rev.
 ermon last Sunday
 egation. On Mon-
 t meetings of the
 Mrs. Lyons', when
 ent of the Guild.
 ent. Mrs. Gerald
 surer. A meeting
 eted with Sunday
 y evening at Mrs.
 December 30th,
 entertainment. On
 of the congregation
 s to bid farewell to
 Vishart, in a short,
 ect of the meeting-
 ress, which with a
 Mr. Bevan by Mr.
 in a feeling and
 was a beautifully
 undas *Star*, in its
 The congregation
 ll to the Rev. Mr.
 astor, last Sunday.
 have lost, and the
 osperity in his new

meeting of Synod for the reason thus given by him
 at its seventeenth session, will further explain the
 surprise felt at his being represented as opposed to
 the observance of the day: "I wrote from London
 to the Secretary, requesting him to summon the
 Synod for the 3rd of December. On returning home
 I found that that day had been appointed as the Day
 of General Thanksgiving, and it would be unseemly
 if the Church of England clergy should ignore the
 proclamation by meeting in Synod instead of hold-
 ing Divine Service in their churches on Thanksgiving
 Day. I therefore prorogued the Synod for six
 months."

BUXTON B. SMITH,
 Acting Rector S. George's Cathedral,
 Kingston, Nov. 20, 1890.

[Our remarks were based upon the references of
 the Toronto papers to the Bishop of Ontario's ser-
 mon. We felt that the impression which these re-
 ferences were sure to produce ought to be corrected.
 We are glad to find from Mr. Smith's letter that they
 altogether misrepresent his Lordship of Ontario's
 sentiments and teaching, which is wholly in the line
 our article advocated.—ED. C. C.]

Trinity University.

Sir,—Now that Archdeacon Bedford-Jones has
 spoken, it will be in order for smaller men to take up
 the question. Without doubt, every institution in
 Canada must be Canadian, if it aspires to hold the
 affections of Canadians. It has been for years clear
 to me and to others that we cannot work any insti-
 tution in this country in obedience to the traditions
 of another civilization. Let any Englishman who
 has boys grown up, educated in the common schools
 and high schools of the country, consider the promi-
 nent characteristic of these young fellows. Is it not,
 "We are Canadian"? And this is right.

One cannot measure the possibilities of Trinity.
 Let her take her part in moulding the young life of
 Canada. Every Churchman's son should be able, so
 far as College restrictions are concerned, to take his
 degree at Trinity. Again, the hopes of Churchmen
 are built on Trinity, for we do not see at present any
 other institution that can do the true work of the
 Church. Protestant but not sectarian, Catholic but
 not Roman, holding "the Faith," let her go forward
 and fear nothing.

ALFRED OSBORNE, Markham.

"The Drink did It."

Sir,—The editorial note in your issue of 20th
 November, under the title "The terrible effects of
 drink," is a specimen of the misleading paragraphs
 one sees so often in newspapers. With all due re-
 spect, I would suggest that such a way of regarding
 the "Drink question" is out of date. Drunkenness
 is no longer regarded scientifically as a cause of
 crime and insanity, but as a symptom of moral or
 intellectual weakness. It is not true that the "drink
 did it," or that the array of horrors so often paraded
 are really the terrible effects of drink. We must
 seek a deeper cause. There is far more gluttony
 than drunkenness in the world, and when you quote
 95 per cent. of crime or 70 per cent. of insanity as
 traceable to "Drink," you might quote 99 per cent.
 (just as logically) as traceable to gluttony—over
 eating. The scriptures are full of warnings about
 gluttony in connection with all sorts of impiety and
 crime; every one knows how "high living," even
 among total abstainers, proves an incentive to crime,
 as we put it.

If the cause be deeper, then, which is it? When
 a murder is committed, reasonable people do not
 stop at the knife or the pistol, and say steel did it,
 or powder did it, or rave about the terrible effects of
 knives and revolvers. They seek for deeper causes:
 motives, objects, intentions—primary causes. So in
 all these terrible effects, we must not be content to
 find drink as the cause. How is it that a man
 allows himself to take stimulant in excess, when he
 must know that he is loading himself with a danger-
 ous weapon, a very sensitive explosive, which may
 carry wreck and ruin to those who ought to be his
 nearest and dearest? No other cause can be assigned
 but a defective moral sense, a criminal carelessness,
 a want of natural affection. Sometimes we hear
 such a statement: when sober, he is one of the kind-
 est men living, but a fiend when under the influence
 of drink. All fudge; no really kind or good man
 would put himself under the influence of drink,
 knowing how it would lead him to act. The man who
 loads himself up in that way ought to be treated on
 a par with him who carries a lighted match into a
 powder magazine, or carries a dirk-knife or a loaded
 revolver about the streets. He should be put where
 his utter disregard of the safety of his fellows will
 not do harm—a criminal not because of drink, but
 because he takes it!

SMILAX.

Sunday School Lesson.

Second Sunday in Advent. Dec. 7, 1890.

Private prayer and public prayer are quite different
 things; but people often forget this fact and pray
 for themselves alone, when they meet together
 ostensibly to offer prayers and praises *as one family*,
 each for the other, and all for the Church. This
 lesson is on *Public Prayer* and the way of conducting
 it.

I. THE PRESENCE.

When "the trumpeters and singers were as *one*, to
 make *one sound* to be heard in praising and thanking
 the Lord. . . . the glory of God filled the House of
 the Lord." (2 Chron. v. 13, 14.) Thus did God show
 by the visible sign of His presence, His acceptance
 of the worship offered. Our places of public worship
 are hallowed in the same way, although not visibly;
 for our Lord has promised to be in the midst of those
 who are gathered together in His name. (S. Matt.
 xviii. 20.) If we would but realize that He always
 listens to the prayers, and watches the actions of
 the congregation, there would be less irreverence
 and fewer wandering thoughts during the service.
 Who would then dare to mock God by *pretending to
 kneel*? But Christ, our Lord, has not only *told us*
 to meet together in prayer: He has also *set the
 example*. It was His custom to attend the synagogue
 service *regularly* (S. Luke iv. 16); and, whenever
 possible, the Feasts in Jerusalem. The glory of the
 second Temple was greater than the glory of the first,
 because the "Desire of all nations" came to it.
 (Hag. ii. 7, 9.)

II. THE PROMISE.

God has said that the praises of men *honour* Him.
 (Ps. i. 23), and He not only allows us to ask for what
 we want, but *commands* us to do so. What is the
 best and most scriptural way of praying and praising
 God publicly? Is it better to use a Liturgy (or fixed
 form of prayer) than to leave everything to the will
 of the minister? Our Church for many reasons
 claims that it is.

1. Note the warning words, "Be not rash with thy
 mouth," etc. (Eccles. v. 2) How can the congrega-
 tion be sure that the *extemporaneous* prayer of the
 minister will be reverent, and will express all their
 desires, without "vain repetitions."

2. A petition addressed to an earthly monarch by
 his subjects is carefully composed beforehand. Surely,
 petitions addressed to the "King of kings" are at
 least as important.

3. The Jewish Church used a Liturgy, and had
 special prayers for marriages, burials, etc. Eight-
 een Collects, said to have been composed by Ezra,
 are still in the Jewish Prayer Books. The Psalms
 were regularly used. (2 Chron. xxix. 30) God
 Himself told them to use particular forms on cer-
 tain occasions. (Num. vi. 24, 26; Deut. xxi. 7: xxvi.
 5, 11: 12, 15.)

4. Our Lord sanctioned the use of forms, by join-
 ing in the liturgical services of the Temple and
 Synagogues. He also gave the disciples a form of
 prayer, (S. Luke xi. 1) and the words to be used in
 baptizing. (S. Matt. xxviii. 19.)

5. The early Church prayed "with one accord,"
 (Acts i. 14; iv. 24), and used psalms and hymns
 (Col. iii. 16) The custom of saying "Amen," as a
 congregational response, seems to have been usual
 from the very first. (1 Cor. xiv. 16. See also Deut.
 xxvii. 15, 26.)

6. Liturgies were used *universally* for many
 centuries.

7. It has been proved by experience that no body
 of Christians can keep the faith and doctrine un-
 changed for centuries *without a Liturgy*.

8. The use of "forms of prayer" makes it possible
 for the congregation to "agree" in word, as well as
 spirit, and so to claim the great promise attached to
 united worship (S. Matt. xviii. 19).

9. When all join in using the same prayers and
 praises, the "Communion of Saints" becomes an
 apparent fact. All the members of the body unite
 "as one, to make one sound." See the advantage of
 union (Eccles. iv. 9-12)

III. THE PICTURE.

If the worship of the angels is copied on earth,
 our churches are like pictures of Heaven. We join
 "with Angels and Archangels" in praising God, so
 our service, like theirs, must be reverent. They fall
 on their faces to worship (Rev. vii. 11); let us not be
 too proud to *kneel*.

God's House should be used only for His glory
 (S. John ii. 14-17). This buying and selling in the
 outer courts of the Temple, was very wrong; although
 perhaps the Jews thought that as it was for the
 sacrifices God would allow it, so do some people now
 hold concerts, for charitable purposes, in their
 churches.

In another way the Church ought to be a picture
 of Heaven. There "the rich and poor meet to-

gether" (Prov. xxii. 12) on an equality. Thank
 God, the system of "free seats" is spreading. There
 should not be good seats for the rich, and poor seats
 for the poor. All are alike in God's sight, and, in
 church at least, no difference should be made (S.
 James ii. 2-6).

Family Reading.

Second Sunday in Advent.

A SOLDIER OF CHRIST.

What is a soldier?
 A man in uniform who fights. That's the
 easiest sort of answer to the question, but not quite
 a right answer.

For uniform doesn't make a soldier. And
 merely fighting doesn't make one either. You
 might fight for the sake of hurting somebody, but
 that sort of fighting certainly wouldn't make you
 a soldier.

A soldier must fight for a reason, and a good
 reason too. An English soldier fights to defend
 his country, or to take the part of some other country
 which is being oppressed—a small country perhaps,
 that is put upon by a big one.

Ah! yes; those are good reasons for fighting,
 and not only good, but fine and noble ones as
 well.

Now let us see what sort of man a soldier ought
 to be.

Why surely, first of all, he must be *brave*. Of
 course he must be that, not a bit afraid, not a bit
 inclined to run away when he sees the enemy. (I
 dare say, however, it's hard not to feel a *little*
 afraid just at first.)

But depend upon it, he can't fight well if he's
 got real fear in his heart—fear that the enemy is
 too strong for him, and he shall get beaten.

Why it has been said that Englishmen fight so
 well just because they never know when they are
 beaten! If things go against them, they are not a
 bit cowed, but are up again and full of pluck.
 They believe they *can* beat the enemy, and that
 just makes all the difference.

But let a soldier be out of heart and he will
 begin to be afraid directly. And then it's all over
 with him. He thinks he's going to get the worst
 of it, and then in nine cases out of ten he *does* get
 the worst of it. Which is a pity, but quite true
 all the same.

Now what is all this to do with you who are
 reading this book at this minute? Why a great
 deal. For what I want to tell you is, that there's
 fighting going on all round you. And the fight-
 ing is every bit as *real* as that with cannons and
 swords and rifles. Only it goes on for the most
 part out of sight. And it doesn't make a great
 deal of noise either.

But for all that, it is done by soldiers, soldiers
 that have really and truly enlisted, and have a
 grand Name and a grand Banner to fight under.

The name and title are, Soldiers of Christ.
 And the Banner has a Cross, Christ's Cross upon
 it.

And He is the Captain and Head, and every
 soldier, young and old, has Him in sight when he
 goes into battle. Wherever he is, he isn't far
 from his Captain, but quite near.

And what is the enemy? Ah! that's summed
 up in one short word, Sin. Sin wants to be
 master, remember that, and so we must always be
 fighting him. It's a glorious fight too, a great
 deal finer than cutting down live enemies in
 battle!

Well, we think about that sort of fighting
 to-day, and about being a soldier in that great
 Army that is scattered all over the world. Yes, it
 is everywhere. Sometimes there's a brave soldier
 in a little narrow street, and there's another out
 at work in the fields, and another shut up in a
 dull dark office. The place makes no difference.
Wherever the soldier is, he can fight. That is the
 main thing.

Perhaps the best fighting goes on in out-of-the-
 way corners. I am inclined to think it does—
 sometimes at any rate.

We said the soldier's first requisite was to be
brave. So it is. Well, a Christian soldier must
 be distinctly brave to begin with.

What does that mean?