

leaven handed down from apostolic days, and offered at the dawn of day in the Holy Sacrifice. On fast days the celebration is delayed till the hours of fasting are over, 2 p.m.

TEMPERANCE IN CHARLOTTETOWN.—In the progress of the Prohibition Commission it was elicited from E. J. Hodgson, Master of the Rolls, that "extreme temperance people and the lowest kind of rum sellers had united to vote for the Scott Act!" It was time for the temperance people to say *non tali auxilio*, and return to even free rum selling. That ensures open competition in good liquor—not the reverse.

A LINK OF UNITY (says Dr. Maistre) is the Church of England. By her constitution, she is in communion with the Churches of the Orient, and with the sounder Churches of the Latins. By her firm hold upon the word of the Saviour, she excites no prejudice among Lutherans and Reformed. She is admirably prepared to be a link of unity." So quotes and argues Bishop Coxe, in support of Pere Hyacinthe's Reform Movement in France.

THE POPULAR EVANGELISM OF THE DAY is responsible, according to Dr. Potts' opinion—expressed at the recent English Methodist Conference—for religion made easy. Whatever defects the Methodist system of religion ("religion conducted in a business way," Dr. Ryerson once defined it) may have, we have to thank that movement, certainly, for great emphasis laid upon the correspondence of outward living with professed convictions.

"A HEALTHY BODY which is capable of itself putting a check on the development of morbid micro-organisms is the best means of combatting them—sanitary measures which prevent the very appearance of morbid germs are the surest means against the possibilities and risk of infection." Krapotkin goes on to show that the healthy body possesses natural guards ("Alexins, sozins or phylaxins") which attack and destroy disease germs as soon as they appear.

TEMPERANCE REFORM.—The *Guardian*, in a strong editorial, recommends the Bishop of Chester's proposal to the Church of England Temperance Society, as the only society which professes not to consider total abstinence the only panacea for the ills of intemperance. The proposal is like the Gottenberg system (where it reduced drunkenness 50 per cent.) of Norway and Sweden (Government management), and somewhat like Dr. Rainsford's idea.

"ORTHODOXY is almost as much a matter of authority in Science, as it is in the Church. We believe in all sorts of laws of nature which we cannot ourselves understand—because men whom we admire and trust vouch for them. If Messrs. Helmholtz, Huxley, Pasteur and Edison, were simultaneously to announce themselves converts to"—anything! how the public would follow their lead! So argues Professor James in the *Forum* as to "Psychical Research."

FUNNY "SCIENCE."—Prince Krapotkin writing on "Recent Science" in *Nineteenth Century*, after referring to the contradictions of scientific discoveries, (?) says: "Such ephemeral discoveries (!) are simply indications of an unhappy general tendency among modern scientists—that of hastening to announce discoveries and attach one's name to something new before the supposed discovery has been submitted to the test of searching experiment. The same tendency prevails in all sciences."

#### TEMPERANCE—FASTING AND ABSTINENCE.

A few weeks ago, in our editorial notes on current topics, we drew attention to some unusually strong and energetic expressions used by our English contemporary *Church Bells* on the subject of "True Temperance, Total Abstinence, etc." A respected medical correspondent—either inadvertently or illogically—attributed the quoted sentiments to ourselves: whereas, all that could be inferred from our notice of them was that we thought them worthy of some consideration. And so we do—more than even D. Jackson has given them. He has inferred that we (rather *Church Bells*) "would seem to enjoin (!) the habitual use of intoxicants by all persons, drawing disparaging inferences regarding those who, from choice, necessity, or prudence, abstain entirely from such beverages." The paragraphs we quoted, on the contrary, expressly refer to exceptions to the rule of moderate use, and only "disparage" those who have rendered themselves peculiarly obnoxious by assuming a proud superiority over men who are habitually temperate users, while they themselves only abstain because they have not the moral power to use at all without abusing. Nothing is said about those who abstain (like Rechabites) from choice or prudence, for the sake of others, or out of regard to duties which demand unlimited attention and energy. These are motives which every one should respect.

#### THE CHOSEN ILLUSTRATION

in *Church Bells*, that of horsemanship, carries the whole argument very neatly. No one insists on everybody riding on horseback; there are people who dare not attempt it (for constitutional reasons), others who prudently abstain from the exercise, others who do not care for it. But imagine the folly of a man who is afraid (and rightly so) to venture on horseback, and yet ridicules and looks down upon, or condemns, those who can ride safely and well, enjoy it, and benefit by it! That is the foolish attitude which *Church Bells* seeks to discourage and expose on the part of too many advocates of Total Abstinence. Is it too much to say that men who can ride safely and well, and who can walk upon occasion, or even generally, are even of a more valuable type than others? They have a faculty (natural or acquired) which the others have not!—and a most useful one, as well as conducive to enjoyment and health. The same may be said of swimming, sailing, and many other things. Those who should not indulge in these things are exceptions to the rule of manhood.

#### THE ARGUMENTS PER CONTRA.

Having said this much to justify our attitude—that the position taken by *Church Bells* is "worthy of consideration"—we must go further, and say that it improves upon acquaintance, when compared with the arguments of opponents. Underlying these latter is the fundamental fallacy, more or less apparent, that the desire to use alcoholic drinks is not a natural but an acquired taste. Alcohol is only one of many stimulants—products if you please—of nature, or art. The man who holds that human nature does not desire stimulation in some form, must be blind intellectually. The taste is notoriously world-wide! Anything that quickens the pulse, enlivens the imagination, excites the nerves and muscles to greater activity, is grateful to men of energy and action. One man finds his taste satisfied by alcoholic drinks, another prefers something else; but we hold that those who do not appreciate "wine that maketh glad the heart of man" are few and far between—are exceptions. This is a matter for observation.

#### ANOTHER FALLACY.

based upon the former, is, that because a certain quantity does harm, any less quantity will do only proportionately less harm! One is surprised to see this argument—in the heat of controversy—used even by physicians, who know so well that quantity is of the essence of "use." The whole practice of "prescription" is based upon this idea. "Take so much—it does you good: take more, it does you harm!" What is the meaning, else, of an "overdose"?

#### "FOOD OR MEDICINE?"

We take leave to say, is a point beside the real question. The distinction is, for practical purposes, artificial and arbitrary. "Every creature" of God—whether so directly or only indirectly—is good, has its use. It is a practice of wisdom to find out what that use is. It is a matter of expediency "how, when, where, and how much" to use. To say that we shall be guided by our physicians in such matters—of "food," as well as "medicine"—is simply a dictate of prudence. That is what they are for—to "prevent" even more than "to cure"! They must finally decide for each individual which is the wise course—to taste, touch, handle, indulge, abstain, use in measure or not use at all: to "fast" wholly, or only to "abstain" partially. "One man's food is another man's poison" was never more true of anything.

#### "I DO NOT FEEL AN INTEREST IN THE PAROCHIAL SCHOOL."

Says a Churchman, who accordingly sends his children to another day school. A Churchman, and yet not interested in a Church school, to the establishment and maintenance of which his minister has devoted so much anxiety! How is this? Perhaps the other school is the cheapest, and certainly, if education for your children at the least cost be the object, the Public School is best, or if you design merely to prepare your child for successful business, that is the place. There are, however, some singular people who have different views, and who do sustain their own Church schools. The Romanist system is well known; but besides this, the German Reformed Church, at one of their General Synods, recommended such a school in every one of their congregations. The Methodists also have academies and colleges under their especial charge; so that this singularity is by no means confined to Episcopalians. Yes; there are some parents who act on the belief that their children have souls to be saved, as well as bodies to be cared for; who feel that God holds them responsible for "training their young in the way they should go;" who think, with Judge Erskine, of England, in his charge to the jury, that "it is found by experience that mere education, unaccompanied with instilling sound religious principles, did not tend to lessen crime." Such parents, regarding any training that does not contemplate eternity, as essentially defective, send their children to a Church school where a judgment day may be taught without offence; where the Bible and the Catechism are learned without disturbance; where prayer is made to Him "without whom nothing is strong, nothing is holy;" and where the minister of Christ can enter without intrusion. "To seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness," is not only a duty for yourself, but for your children also. Such a course will be found, even in a temporal point of view, the best; for, things which at the beginning are cheap, are not always the cheapest in the end. And this is particularly true of a Christless education.

A Church school may cost more than another, though such is by no means always the case. Supposing however, that it be so in this instance, what are a few dollars compared with the manners which your child is forming for life; the intimacies which mould its character, and above all, the principles of conduct which determine individual,