

MESSANGER and VISITOR.

\$3.00 per annum; paid within thirty days, \$1.50. S. McCracken, Editor. J. H. Saunders, Business Manager.

Office: 25 Gormley Street, St. John, N. B. All correspondence intended for the paper to be addressed to the Editor.

Payments for the Messenger and Visitor must be by check, draft, or P. O. order. Cash must be sent in registered letter, or otherwise at the risk of sender.

DISCONTINUANCE.—The Messenger and Visitor will be sent to all subscribers until an order to discontinue is received.

A CHANGE IN ADDRESS will be made provided the old and new addresses are given. No change can be made unless the old address is sent.

Messenger and Visitor

WEDNESDAY, DEC. 9, 1891.

LEGALIZED LOTTERIES OF QUEBEC.

Much is written in the United States press about the world wide lottery which has its legal standing in Louisiana. The Postmaster-General employs the authority given him by the general law, governing his department, to embarrass the working of the lottery scheme in the United States; but, through express agencies and otherwise, the literature is distributed and the business goes on.

This lottery law, as is well known, emanated from the rulers of the Roman Catholic church in the province of Quebec. Without their sanction no such law would have been moved or could have been passed. Let the responsibility rest just where it belongs.

A little more plain talking and writing would be of service to our Roman Catholic neighbors. It is well known that the free systems of public schools are everywhere opposed by the Roman hierarchy. Grant that they are conscience bound in this matter, because of their religious convictions; but what shall be said of other matters, still more important to the welfare of the commonwealth than any free educational system?

initial state of organization; about where the other bodies were fifty years ago. Here is room for charity and forbearance. But what shall be said of this lottery business? Is there anything in the creed or history of Romanism, making this a matter of conscience? It is reactionary in the highest degree—a plunge into legalizing corruptions made in the open daylight of this century, in the face of public opinion, both in England, Canada and the United States.

As Quebec is now throwing out her moral pollution all over Canada, protected by her own law, is it not time for the other provinces to rise up and emphatically declare their abhorrence of this legalized gambling, that strikes at the heart of the virtue of the whole country? When the Quebec Legislature voted \$400,000 to reimburse the Jesuits for their forfeited estates, and \$60,000 to Protestants as hush money, much agitation followed in other provinces of the Dominion. An Equal Rights Association was formed in Ontario, and things looked at one time as if there would be a third political party formed because of this action of the Quebec Legislature.

It is time that the Protestants of Canada should speak in tones of thunder to the Roman Catholics of Quebec in regard to this matter of throwing the stigma of the church over this gigantic system of gambling. It would not be in vain. Romanism is self-respecting. Let it be tried.

VICTORY THROUGH SACRIFICE.

The idea and the doctrine of sacrifice are prominent throughout the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. Sacrifice was continually before the Jew in symbol, in the ritual of the Temple service. The life of Christ was a life of sacrifice. In His death the love of God poured itself forth on behalf of sinful men. Sacrifice, too, forms the divine law of human life in this sinful world.

But the Christian law of sacrifice is not the law of death but the law of life. Its pain is the pain of warfare for liberty from the power of sin and for dominion with the sons of God. Its pain is also the pain of sympathy for the sinful and suffering. Christian sacrifice never involves the loss of real manhood or womanhood. It refuses conformity to this world, not that the soul may be deformed and crippled, but to the end that it may be transformed by the renewing of a spiritual mind, that it may prove the beneficent influence of that law which is "the good and acceptable and perfect will of God."

The life and death of Christ afford the supreme illustration of conformity to God's law of self-sacrifice. But in the life He lived and in the death He died there was no surrender of the nobility of His manhood. In every situation in which the experiences of His life and the wrath of His enemies placed Him, He appears as Master and Lord. His disciples followed with amazement as He went up to the culmination of His life work—His final trial and His final triumph at Jerusalem. So do we gaze with reverent wonder on the three years' journey, which extend from the banks of Jordan and the baptism of John to Calvary and its Cross. His pathway is that of a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief, from whom many hid their faces as from one "smitten of God and afflicted," but that pathway is luminous with the smile of God. And that short life has a nobility and a glory, beside which all other lives seem poor and mean. He recognized the Divine law. He saw the Father's will and did it. And because of this recognition and obedience, the Son of man is exalted to the right hand of God. His name is above every name. To Him every knee shall bow and every tongue confess Him Lord. For those who will follow Christ there

is a fellowship of suffering and self-denial. But it is here in this present life a fellowship infinitely richer in joy and peace than any which the world can give; and it is also a fellowship which means victory and dominion with Him in the world which is to be.

THE WAR IN WALES.

The fight for disestablishment goes bravely on in Wales, and cannot fail to elicit a good deal of interest and sympathy on this side of the Atlantic. The first annual meeting of the Nonconformist Union, which was organized some eighteen months ago, has recently been held at Swansea. A Welsh Nonconformist Union was ridiculed by the church press as being among the impossibilities, and some Nonconformists were not without apprehension that the movement would interfere with the action of the respective denominations. But the Swansea meetings have effectually dissipated these fears and have shown that the several denominations, widely as they differ in some points of doctrine and practice, are nevertheless capable of acting in harmony and presenting an unbroken front, in a struggle for liberties which are the common right of all.

A church congress was held not long since at Rhyl, with the purpose, as is charged, of making interest against the movement for disestablishment. Some of the sermons and addresses had a strongly political bias. When the congress was over, the Nonconformists thought it was their turn, and a meeting was called in the Town Hall, at Rhyl, to reply to the statements made at the congress. A Mr. J. Herbert Lewis presided at the meeting. In the course of some opening remarks he said:

There is no intention of attacking the church as a religious institution, but simply to sever its connection with the state. This connection we believe to be injurious to the interests of the church, unjust to the Nonconformists, and poisonous to the social life of the principality. He combated the statement that the Church of England was the church of the many and maintained that it was the church of the aristocracy, the aristocracy of wealth and worldly culture, but by no means the aristocracy of theology. The social position that carries many a young Nonconformist over to the Church of England is due to the glamour of wealth and high society. In conclusion, the chairman said, "they had right and justice on their side, they had twenty-seven members of Parliament on their side, and further, they had Mr. Gladstone on their side. If they gained a victory it would be for the best and truest interests of religion and the state."

The Rev. J. Guinness Rogers, in the course of some remarks, said: "They intended to bring about the severance of a union between church and state, which they held to be irreligious, unjust, impolitic and utterly opposed to the highest interest of religion and humanity. He did not object to bishops, but to the peculiar position in which they were put under the Establishment. He had no objection to apostolic succession; he could do without it. It seemed to him to be one of the most remarkable delusions that ever possessed a human mind. If, however, churchmen were able to cherish it, why should he not be put under the Establishment? If the State sanctioned it, and if, because of that, they attempted to put him and his brethren at political disadvantage, then he would fight against it to the last."

The grand speech of the meeting appears to have been that of Mr. Lloyd George, M. P., who criticised in detail several of the speeches which had been delivered at the church congress. In the course of his remarks Mr. George asked: "Can you picture Peter coming down to attend the church congress in a special train with a man in buttons dancing about him, carrying a jewelled crozier and marching in a brilliant procession to attend the conference? Can you portray him driving up in a brougham to the door of the House of Lords, loling on his scarlet benches, and in his most archiepiscopal twang, drawing out a series of speeches in favor of county-courts and imprisoning his fellow-religionists for refusing to pay tribute to what they have conscientious objections? We may be told that these pretensions, inasmuch as it cannot abrogate the apostolic succession. If it cannot do that, it can prevent the state from recognizing and endorsing at the expense of the nation these high-down notions."

In concluding his speech Mr. George said: "The doom of the establishment is sealed. In the words of the old Gaelic saying, 'His hour is pursuing it.' That hour cast its shadow on the church proceedings at the diocesan council in Liverpool, when the good old bishop warned the clergy that it was nigh. One day, not distant, that hour will overtake the establishment in the great council chambers of the nation; and then this ghastly spectre of priestly tyranny which has so long haunted our hillsides will have been numbered forever among the cruel oppressions of the past."

Mrs. Cephas Bennett, who died in September last in Rangoon, Burma, had spent sixty-one years in missionary labors with only four visits to America. She went to Burma in 1830, and with her husband was closely associated with Dr. Judson in his work in Maulmain. When she arrived in Burma, Maulmain was the only station. She lived to see the number of missionaries grow from 5 to 132, and the Christians from 49 to 29,689.

Is Scriptural for Women to Take a Public Part in the Social Exercises of the Church?

We have to recognize the fact that there are many Christian men and women who do not believe that women have any right to have anything to do with taking conspicuous part in public worship of any kind. And there are many who are as sincere Christians as they are who believe to the contrary, that women have a right to be recognized as constituent members of the church, and as such have a right to the privilege of taking part in the public exercises of the church.

Both of these parties base their views upon separate passages of Scripture. One party bases its views upon 1 Cor. 14: 34, 35, where it says that silence becomes a woman as in the services of the church, in fact, it is a shame for her to speak at all; and upon 1 Tim. 2: 11, 12, where the woman is commended to "learn in silence in all subjection," and where she is not suffered to "teach nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence." The other party fully as confidently refers to 1 Cor. 11: 5, where we learn that woman did take part in the public exercises of the church, i. e., she prayed and prophesied. Prophecy here, as well as in other places in Paul's Epistle, means to teach under the influence of the Holy Spirit. This, therefore, means that woman was in the habit of praying and speaking in public when moved to do so.

Thus the Scripture is made to support both views. But can it be possible that Scripture is so self-contradictory? Can it be possible that the same apostle who is credited with such wonderful lucidity of mind, and such unexcelled argumentative powers, in the same epistle could contradict himself in this glaring manner? One thing, we know, is sure, that Paul never contradicted himself. Therefore the trouble must be in our misunderstanding of him. It is evident, from 1 Cor. 11: 5, that Paul recognizes the privilege of women to take part in the public exercises of the church. He does not command them to desist, but merely gives instructions in regard to their personal appearance. The only limitation he puts upon them is, that they must not appear before the public bareheaded. Thus, they can pray and speak when moved to do so.

It is evident, too, from 1 Cor. 14: 34, 35, and 1 Tim. 2: 11, 12, compared with 1 Cor. 11: 5, that the apostle does not preclude women from taking part of any kind in any of the public exercises of the church; but only a certain class of them: such as those who love to ask contentious questions, "to object, to altercate, to attempt to refute" certain statements that might be made in regard to certain phases of the truth. There might be women in the church that delighted to parade their superior knowledge and intelligence before the public, and by means of this, rush into positions that rightly belonged to the male portion of the church, thus usurping its authority and privilege. The apostle positively commands such women, if they desire to learn anything, or to display their talent, to do so at home, and not before the public. Let the husband be the sole teacher and hearer. It is a shame for a woman, in direct contravention of the common rules of decency and the respect that she owes her husband, to go before the public in such a spirit and to make such a display of herself. But when a woman was moved by the influence of the Holy Spirit to pray or speak, he would have her, by all means, obey the impulse; only she must be careful of her personal appearance. This, I think, is the apostle's teaching. DAVID PRICE.

Pulpit or Desk.

Amongst the modern changes (some prefer to call them improvements) introduced into our public religious service is the platform, furnished with a narrow reading desk or brass lectern, in place of the old pulpit. I cannot account for this innovation on grounds of usefulness or convenience. It may perhaps be the natural outcome of the unprecedented prominence now given to rhetoric as a study in the scholastic preparation of young men for the Christian ministry. However that may be, I am obtuse enough not to perceive the superiority of the reading desk or the lectern over the discarded "pulpit of wood," in which an Ezra, a Luther and a John Calvin did such effective work.

Were our preachers expected to stand on the same level with the feet of their audience then their auditors' direct line of vision would naturally strike the face and bust of the preacher; but, as the height of the ordinary platform stands above the main floor between two and three feet, their line of vision necessarily strikes somewhere between the waist and the knees. This, of course, thrusts the shape and action—however inelegant and awkward these may be—of the speaker's lower limbs into notice unobtrusively and certainly without much respect to the delicacy of refined taste. The prominent pannoch of a hearty Englishman, or the abdominal hollow of a lank Yankee, or the baggy knees or rough boots of some rustic orator, why

should these peculiarities be obtruded right on the plane of my vision?

A speaker standing on the main floor-level of a church of ordinary size, to say nothing of our larger city churches, could not have a fair command of his audience. This I grant at once. Well, if to make his address as effective as possible he must be elevated, then I maintain the lower parts of his body ought not to be exposed, unless, of course, he is dressed in character—dressed for the elucidation of his subject in a certain period and social status; in this case we want to see, with the aid of footlights, etc., the entire man from head to foot—from cap or casque down to buckle or sandals.

The Gospel not being such a dramatic performance but a simple message from God's word to men, ("faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God,") all we want of the messenger is to deliver it honestly and earnestly, without any unnecessary obtrusions of his animal physique on our notice. In the case of a man of handsome form and elegant carriage his strutting on the stage can only attract the admiration of a certain portion of his observers, and if he be ungainly awkward, (slightly bandy-legged or knock-kneed) his pedal performances can only awaken pity or dislike. Trousers were once named "unmentionables." By what change in our aesthetics have they become the ornament of a public platform?

If a man speaks to me in earnestness and brotherly kindness, I expect (he and I standing or sitting on the same level), that his head and face, his breast, shoulders and arms will fill my field of vision, and I certainly do not expect my attention to be distracted by the shape and condition of his pants and shoes. It is only a few days ago that it was my good fortune to hear two very superior sermons; but, oh how they were discounted and marred by the awkward movements of the worthy speaker! Now, his lower limbs suddenly appeared on this side of the small proscenium, then he rested a moment behind the narrow screen only to dart forth on the other side again displaying his coat-skirts and "contaminations." Going home with some intelligent company I found that the good man's strut had attracted and impressed rather more than his excellent address. Sad, is it not?

I might, by reference to Paul's epistles, show that the less of "the flesh"—the animal—which asserts itself in our religious services the more profitable they are likely to be. But this I leave to professional theologians. Refined taste suggests the speedy abandonment of this new fad of platforms and lecterns. If we cannot humble ourselves to return to the dignified, modest, comfortable pulpit of our pious ancestors, then, for pity's sake, let us adopt some decent style of robe—the apostolic garment, or the Roman toga lengthened to the ankles. "The Lord taketh not pleasure in the legs of a man"—Ps. 147: 10.—would make a good text for a modern minister. J. DENOVAN.

Baptist Temperance Committee.

The Baptists last year were among the foremost to petition for prohibition. The recent Convention at Moncton was in accord with the idea of furnishing the best of proof to the Royal Commission that Canada, as far as Baptists are concerned, is ready for prohibitory enactment. It must be conceded by all practical people that such readiness is not "shown" by resolutions of associations and conventions, nor even by petitions.

It is generally understood now-a-days that temperance resolutions are allowed to be passed; the least said is soonest mended. Recently our Presbyterian friends have tried strong temperance resolutions at every assembly, and at first they were opposed vigorously, and very lively discussions resulted, and some plain truths were spoken and much good done. This wave of talk and thought and difference, begun in the assembly, went through all the congregations, and has helped to float prohibition better than ever on Presbyterian waters. Discussions and differences on this question ceased in Baptist assemblies a generation ago, and it has since been difficult to have a breezy tone over any report, no matter how strong, that our temperance committees would submit. So here we have been and are in the front rank, with all the other denominations, we trust, well abreast of us.

The liquor traffic and traders pretty well left the Baptist body many years ago. They found little sympathy, though able and willing to give large donations to college and missions, and to erect fine churches. Baptists said very plainly they would rather do without even the big donations from distilleries, breweries and wholesalers, than have even slight collusion with the liquor traffic.

Now, the country is far enough advanced to look prohibition squarely in the face. What should our Convention do? The temperance committee represents the Convention, or rather the 400 Baptist churches of these Maritime Provinces, with their 42,000 communicants and quarter of million of members and adherents. I suggest that our committee should

gather and furnish the commission with facts—in part as follows:

(a) The number of our churches that now use the pure fruit of the vine at communion service and discard the "wine" of commerce. No government would dare to enact prohibition so long as most or many of the churches and clergymen of Canada use intoxicating wine on their tables.

(b) The number of our churches that discipline their members for making or using intoxicating liquors. It may be only "cider" or "commercial wine" or "stable beer" that the members make or use, but we should let parliament know who of us practice what we have asked them to make into law for everybody.

(c) The proportion of our members who would actively sustain prohibitory legislation.

(d) The proportion of our clergymen and deacons who are total abstainers and active temperance advocates.

This information could be secured by sending a brief letter with the questions (ready to be detached and returned) to each pastor and clerk of the 400 churches. Those churches not forwarding replies on such a live and pressing question of the day, might almost be set down against us, as they would be either lukewarm or quietly indulging; and in this day of fierce battling such churches are not worth much for prohibition.

This letter, you see, is not intended to be exhaustive, but practical, in the hope that others, and especially our committee, will gather facts that can be relied on. J. PARSONS. Halifax, Dec. 3.

P. S.—If the temperance committees and workers of other denominations would furnish similar facts we could shortly know where the professing Christians stand; and the facts concerning the non-Christian part of the population could be gathered. The denomination or individual church that will not help at this time by furnishing such facts as above stated, cannot count for much in the struggle to get and enforce prohibition. J. P.

The Young People's Society Movement.

A QUESTION.

I have read with a degree of interest much that has appeared in our own paper and elsewhere, in regard to the Young People's Society Movement. That the movement is gaining ground I think is evident, and Bureks just now seems to be the watchword. But, after all, are we sure that we have found it, and that the organization of the young people of our churches into a separate society is the best thing that can be done?

Organize, organize, is the battle cry that many of our good brethren are shouting quite lustily just now. But why turn all our attention to the young in our churches? If it is a good thing to have an organization for the young, would it not be well to have an organization for the older members of our churches also? Rather, would it not be better to organize the whole church, the old and young together? Whatever difference there may be as to age, all are one in Christ Jesus, brethren and sisters together.

Each heart beats in sympathy with the other. All are under the same sacred vow and engaged in the same great work. The older ones need the inspiration which comes from the presence of the young in their midst, and I do not think that many of our young people feel that they do not need the experience of the older members in planning work and fulfilling the mission of the great head of the church.

That the entire church membership should be a unit in effort, prayer and giving, in seeking the advancement of the interests of the church, has ever been considered of the very first importance, but it has seemed to me that much of the agitation that is going on at the present time may, in the long run, tend rather to division than to union.

I do not write in any spirit of controversy, but simply to raise the question whether, if we accept the principle of organization, if it would not be better to organize the whole church rather than to organize one class in the church into a separate society?

Possibly some of the contributors to the Messenger and Visitor will be kind enough to point out these reasons for what seems to them to be "the better way." I. K. BILL.

Florida Moss.

Lately I have received several letters from home friends asking if I would send them our lovely southern moss for Christmas decorations. Certainly, and if you have a nook of space to allow me in the paper I will say to one and all who wish the moss for Xmas, that I will send it freely to all who send postage, as there is plenty of it here, easy to get, and I have the time to oblige you. Send postage at the rate of 16c. a lb., or if you wish a large 4lb. roll of moss, send 64c. in stamps and I will mail you that amount. Four pounds is the limit of weight allowed a mail package. Do not plant the moss, which is properly an air plant, but hang or drape it anywhere, keep it moist, and it will continue to grow. Mrs. F. A. WARNER. St. Nicholas, Florida.

Christmas Gifts.

We are in need of Church Edifice donations. Three churches here and others are asking time is coming apace to make gifts.

For several years Sunday-school teachers instead of making presents to one another, money that would be expended to Home occurred to our number of our scholars and scholars that instead of making presents to make an offering to the Edifice Fund. I talk up this matter so do then good cause.

Let others who mas presents from A. C. COLE, Hebron, N. S. S., Forestry.

At the last meeting of the Board the Finance Convention was postponed over nine months for the salaries of the general work upon three thousand outfit of missions. We have received convention less than last year, showing that now very largely quarterly averages about and beside this, forward additional of new buildings. It is that the contribution individuals must and promptly for of the Board, in meet our engaged work with that advance demands.

Tabernacle.

I am sending churches in New Brunswick, to be taken, if possible, but if not, church, early in erection of the church in Halifax. Our people have basement below. We have members were not able find not comfortable Strangers who own, as a rule, of worship, and our own. The repairs are waste of money when our new basement and room is a need. Brethren, I please our appeal into give us a collection, and so put and do better for our own sake, proud to worship, ten years have prove that. We more for "Christians. We will acknowledge such in the future. Some friends needs have already. We believe other.

249 Creighton P. S.—As the hand, where I pastor I send in each case the

A Visit to

Right in the city of Nova Scotia established Baptist spacious; hands depot of Baptist lined with four shelves lie the noblest men walked God's dead. Thought Book Room, the enthusiastic man within the reach best thoughts of denominations. The chief attraction both old and young the right as you are commentaries illustrations to arrows, and see show how the The saintly Ma the front, and new six volume hundred and second the good in his suggestions oftentimes weight bids fair to be in