

LAND.

ye.—At a recent meet-
Rev. Canon O'Meara,
College, read an excel-
"rayer." A clergyman
For style and matter,
better paper read at
non will publish it in
The literary society
lent to the CANADIAN
an in the country may
llege and perhaps ar-
ly so as to "take in"
A. Tansey is appealing
sion. Mr. Tansey is an
eld, and deserves en-

Winnipeg.—The Vener-
alled a meeting of the
meet in Brandon, Dec.
be given later, but we
The Rev. Mr. Adam
r of the young men of
last Tuesday evening,
enjoyed by all.

—The Rev. G. Rodgers
Oct. 29th; the church
he service, which was
Rev. Herbert Drans-
one good to hear near-
"Onward, Christian
gers was the preacher,
work he told us how,
e sum of twenty-three
missions to white people
gently needed in the
s the staff of clergy has
nen, and over one hun-
n formed in three years,
n who give to the mis-
ust see that their gifts
to do a grand work,
een done, Mr. Rodgers
a hundred miles away
he archbishop has no
a year needed for his
some man filled with
himself, and to the
ir means. The Hon.
Rupert's Land is the
anipeg, Man.

rchdeaconry of Winni-
16th, 1898: Tuesday,
8 a.m.; Breakfast, 9
clerum by the Vener-
m., meeting of clergy,
ter, Rev. G. Rodgers,
Williams and Rev. C.
n, reader, Rev. T. C.
R. Johnson. Mission-
ng, 8 p.m. Speakers,
Rev. N. Hewit, B.A.,
ay, Dec. 6th, meeting
John's College; read-
speakers, Rev. G. C.
A. Immigration; how
migrant, 2 p.m.; read-
speakers, Rev. F. V.
Young People's Associa-
B.A.; speakers, Rev.
oulding. Church Lit-
circulated among our
entreath, B.D.; speak-
Rev. C. A. Sadler. The
y will kindly write to
ector of Brandon.

Dence.

Illusions will appear over

le for the opinions of our

ight, or a Christian senti-
ions from facts, useful to
n, we would solicit their
e letters in this depart-

nd the Grave.

f your readers kindly
ch's grounds for the
at there can be no re-
r in other words that
ver damned after the
ut hope of reprieve.
W.

Evensong, or Sunday Evening Leaflets.

SIR,—The chapter of St. Andrew's Brotherhood in Napanee have with commendable enterprise and zeal undertaken (if they are supported) to issue a Canadian edition of the Sunday evening Leaflet, on the same lines as the Young Churchman Co. of Milwaukee issue an American edition, and did a Canadian, but had to withdraw owing to lack of support. Now I have no axe to grind in this matter, but I feel bound to try and do a little, if possible, in assisting what I believe to be just what is wanted; in fact I would go further and say to every clergyman in Canada, don't throw the sample and prospectus you have received from Napanee into the waste paper basket until you have given it your most serious consideration, and also consulted your wardens, because it is simply essential to the welfare of the Church in this country. Men are seeking for truth, they want to know amidst the multitude of religious bodies opening their doors on Sunday evenings in our towns and cities, which is "The Church." Now we have it, we know it, only ignorance and superstition keep thousands of others from knowing it. This great mass of humanity in our cities who are nothing (professionally) in religion, go to church (?) somewhere on Sunday evenings. Now I will leave what I want to show those clergy who have never used it and don't know its value to Mr. E. C. Bailey, of Chicago, who spoke on this subject at the St. A. B. Convention in Detroit; you will find it, those of you who take the Cross (and every one should take it), on page 20 of the Convention number. I cannot quote it all, it is too long, but it is all worth reading. He says: "I am a vestryman of Grace Church; I was a Presbyterian; I used to go to the Episcopal Church occasionally, specially at confirmation, just to see. The reason we do not reach the multitude as the denominational bodies do is that we do not make the people acquainted with our 'liturgy.' I went for weeks and weeks without becoming in touch with the service. It was only when I had begun to read the Prayer Book, to get accustomed to the prayers, to realize their significance—that I learned how to find the places in the Prayer Book."

That is a very hard thing for a man when he is grown; he gets all mixed up when he tries to follow; it spoils the service. "When I knew the service of the Church I learned to love it." We can get the multitude, but when you get them what can you do with them? They are indifferent, sometimes they won't stand, they never kneel, and if all the members of Grace Church were helping people to find their places they could not do so. Now what are you going to do about it? The only thing it seems to me, that is practical—it is attended with some expense; it is money well spent—is to have "leaflets" published giving the services in a consecutive form so that strangers can use them.

I think his words need no comment; only get hold of a Cross and read all his speech. He is just the man to speak, and just the man for us to listen to, for he has known, what our people do not know (and do not realize in others) the hollowness of our service when you cannot follow it in the Prayer Book. With regard to expense, the cost is half a cent; is there a man who comes to church that does not give at least one cent, and will he not give it more willingly and more regularly if he has been enabled to realize what it is to worship God in reality, as he can by following the service of the Church of the Living God?

With regard to clergymen in country parishes and missions, they are if anything even more valuable still to them, and in this I speak from personal experience, as I took the Milwaukee leaflet until its discontinuance. And I can assure you it was wonderfully appreciated; men came regularly to our services, and read the responses with delight, and when I told them they were discontinued they felt they had lost a real friend. The expense is nothing, you will be repaid one hundred per cent. For services when benefit societies attend get an extra supply, and you have no idea how they appreciate them; tell them to take them home with them. I have written too much for space I am afraid, but my anxiety lest this enterprise should fall through for lack of a trial, is my excuse. Give it a trial for three months any way. If you do not like the cross on it, it can be printed without.

F. DEALTRY WOODCOCK,
Priest-in-charge, Parish of Camden.

"The Drink Question."

SIR,—In common with many others, I have been, and now am, deeply pained at your deliverances upon different phases of the drink question.

I will frankly and fully concede that drinking, *per se*, is not a sin, and that there are hundreds of thousands of most estimable people who are moderate drinkers. I also am in most thorough agreement with you when you speak of the sins of covetousness and impurity. It is almost impossible, however, to

separate the latter sin from that of intemperance. They are entwined. God's Word says: "Whoredom and wine take away the heart" (Hosea iv. 2). Intemperance is the great feeder of impurity.

The whole drink question has many phases, and is a mighty problem. A very general consensus of opinion from judges, physicians, heads of asylums and prisons, as well as from clergymen, proclaims this. Why, then, seek to minimize it, as you do? Why go out of your way to show the *virtue* of moderate drinking? For certainly this is what your contentions amount to.

Conceded that there are differences of opinion as to the need of alcohol in some form, yet surely such words as these should be most seriously and solemnly pondered. *The Lancet*, a journal that no one can accuse of espousing the temperance cause, says, "a great amount of drinking that passes as moderate is mortal." Sir Andrew Clark, whom I had occasion to consult when broken down in health some years ago, told me that my restoration would be certain if I remained a total abstainer. He has repeatedly publicly declared that entire abstinence from alcohol, in all its forms, as a beverage, is the safest and healthiest course. Sir Henry Thompson says, "Don't take your daily wine under any pretence of its doing you good. Take it frankly as a luxury, which must be paid for, by some persons lightly, by some at a high price, but always to be paid for, mostly some loss of health, or of mental power, or of calmness of temper, or of judgment, is the price." Sir W. Gull, in his memorable evidence before the Committee of the House of Lords, said: "A very large number of people in society are dying day by day, poisoned by alcoholic drinks, without knowing it. I should say, from my experience it is the most destructive agent we are aware of in this country. I am now speaking of what is considered moderate drinking." Dr. Murchison says: "The brittle artery, the softened heart, the gouty kidney and other evidences of premature decay, are often the results—which might be entirely prevented—of the daily dose of alcohol, in the shape of beer or wine."

May you not then, sir, have used an "argumentum ad ignorantiam?" I am sure, if this be so, it is of the head, and not of your heart. I am sure you mean well, though from this standpoint you are entirely wrong.

Again, with reference to restrictions upon the drink traffic, you quote from several clergymen and eminent laymen. Do you not know that the views and publicly expressed opinions of such Churchmen as Bishops Bond and Baldwin, of Dean Carmichael and Archdean Lindsay, are the very antipodes of them? The first named said, on the floor of his Synod, "I declare myself an out and out abolitionist!" The second said, "I can wish my country no better happiness than that the whole liquor traffic should be swept away, from the Atlantic to the Pacific." The last named said, at the same Synod, "I am a prohibitionist, because it is taught by God's commandment, 'Thou shalt not.' I believe in stopping this terrible evil. Human society is made up of prohibitions."

Dean Carmichael, in an impassioned speech on the same occasion, said: "I have been over thirty years in the ministry. During all my labours and plans and thoughts I have been pursued by this sin of the cursed drink; through all the years I have had to deal with the cursed drink, and to-day the cursed drink stares me in the face (applause). I have never appeared upon a prohibition platform, I have never made a prohibition speech, but if a voting paper were placed in my hands to-day, and I were asked to vote 'yes' or 'no' upon this question"—here the dean paused, raised his arm, and then spoke amid a most impressive silence—"for the sake of the Church, for the sake of souls, for the sake of the happiness of the home, I would vote yes, and thank God for it. (Loud and long-continued applause). A new race of men must teach me that God is not a prohibitionist." (Loud applause). But, sir, you supply the antidote to your contentions in your number of Nov. 9th, for in the excellent article upon "Cranks" which follows your leaderettes upon the drink question, you say, "Restrictive measures would, indeed, have a far reaching effect. We suffer to-day from *excess of liberty*." The italics are yours: I am in complete agreement with the sentiment, but, to be logical, why not carry it out on this subject? Personally, I am not pledged to prohibition, but we see the best of men differing on the question. Why, then, suspect or malign each other? Why not trust one another, and work on to the end we all have in view, a "godly, righteous and sober life."

Above all, sir, my soul is stirred within me when I read the quoted words which you commend, that "the children of total abstainers are exposed to a peculiar danger of their own, that of becoming drunkards because they have not been taught and trained to use alcoholic liquors in moderation, and fall easy victims to the vice of intoxication, being unarmed." With all the power of my being I repudiate such an assertion. It runs counter to my whole experience on both sides of the Atlantic, to

all that has been written by such men as Dr. Norman Kerr in his standard work "Heredity," and to the writings of such men as Drs. Richardson, Carpenter and a host of others. In conclusion, sir, it is because I realize that alcohol misused defaces the image of God in man, and debases him to a lower level than that of the brute, that I venture now to write to you upon this subject. I am in such hearty agreement with your articles in general, and your paper as a whole, as to be the more pained at your attitude upon this question.

W. J. TAYLOR.

Dio. Sec. "C. E. T. S.," Huron.

Polychurchism.

SIR,—A layman of Montreal has shown wonderful ingenuity in erecting men of straw for the amusement to be derived from kicking them over. Every one of Canon Hammond's headings or summaries of sections he has carefully disconnected from its context, has endowed with a meaning of his own invention, and has then refuted—not Canon Hammond, but himself.

First. Canon Hammond never asserted that the absence of the words "of God" or "of Jesus Christ" in the official title of a local church deprives that body of its churchly character, but that to be a church at all it must be "God's institution, not man's." It is their origin that he speaks of, not their title.

Second. Canon Hammond never denied the existence of several congregations or churches in one city. What he denied was the existence of "separatist bodies, splits from the parent stock." Unless "Layman" can prove that the churches in private houses were of this character he has not contradicted Canon Hammond in the smallest particular.

Third. Many words are employed here to prove—what? That the Canon is perfectly right in his assertion that baptism was the "one way of making church members—and there was no other." The section contains, however, some characteristic errors which I will point out below.

Fourth. Canon Hammond never said that the Church was visible as a whole to any one person at any one time. He is not such a fool. He claimed that visibility was and is an essential quality of the Church. "Layman" retorts that his definition of visible is not "scientifically accurate." Let us test then "Layman's" "scientifically accurate" definition. The world is not visible, for no one person can see it all at once. A ship is not visible unless it happens to be in sight of land. Its crew suffers under the same inconvenience. Even "Layman" is an invisible being. He is not visible to the bodily eye of myself or the majority of your readers. The fact that he possesses a solid body, palpable to the touch, and impervious to light, does not make him a visible being, unless he is present. Happy thought! we are all of us invisible beings and have no need of Hallowe'en fernseed if we wish to conceal ourselves. I speak as a fool, but I had always thought with Worcester that visible meant "that which may be seen," and Canon Hammond evidently labors under the same delusion. How kind of "Layman" to set us all right.

Fifth. Canon Hammond used the word "corrupt" in one sense, "Layman" in another. His strictures are therefore quite beside the mark, and he is placed in the comical position of gravely rebuking Canon Hammond for asserting that the Church of England is corrupt in doctrine when the worthy Canon never said any such thing.

So much for the ridiculous side of "Layman's" letter. Let me now show that he is utterly unreliable in his assertions. And for this purpose I must take seriatim some of his remarks.

I. "A member of the Church of England does not stand on logical ground in assailing Polychurchism." Why not, when the Church herself assails it? And she has said distinctly that she can recognize no body as a part of the Church which does not accept the four Lambeth propositions. She maintains also the singular form in the Creeds, "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church," not "the Churches," and in many other ways *e.g.*, in many Canons of 1604, makes it clear that she regards herself as the only true Church in England. Here is an example: "Whosoever shall hereafter separate themselves from the Communion of Saints, as it is approved by the Apostles' rules in the Church of England, and combine themselves together in a new brotherhood, let them be excommunicated *ipso facto*, and not restored but by the Archbishop after their repentance, and public revocation of such their wicked errors." "Whosoever shall hereafter affirm that such ministers as refuse to subscribe to the form and manner of God's worship in the Church of England prescribed in the communion book, and their adherents, may truly take unto them the name of another Church not established by law. . . . That this their pretended Church, etc. etc., let them be excommunicated, etc." (Canons 9 and 10 of 1604 still of legal force.)