

1888.
ERNAL
AL USE.
ding at the
bus, Dysen-
ing infor-
of very
value. Every
should
this book,
hose who
for it will
after thank
ucky stars,
money shall
be prepaid to
ston, Mass.

Religious Intelligencer.

THAT GOD IN ALL THINGS MAY BE GLORIFIED THROUGH JESUS CHRIST.—Peter

VOL. XXXV.—No. 16.

FREDERICTON, N. B., APRIL 18, 1888.

WHOLE No. 1782

NOTES AND COMMENTS

WHAT IT IS NOT.—Speaking of the so called Christian Science, Pro. Swing says: It is not Christian, it is not Science.

WON HIS WAY.—A quite prominent lawyer in Chicago, Louis Washington, is a negro. He was a poor slave boy with no education at the close of the war, and whose rise in life had been due entirely to his remarkable perseverance in the face of obstacles. Without help he worked his way through Wheaton College, in Illinois, and after a course of law at the Union Law College in Chicago, was admitted to the bar in 1879. Besides his knowledge of Blackstone, he is well versed in Roman law, and is a good Greek and Latin scholar.

MAY MARRY.—The *Christian Inquirer* tells of a decision of much interest recently given by the highest court in France. A man who was once a priest, but had renounced the priestly character, married. After the death of his wife her property was claimed for the children. Her other relatives, however, claimed the property on the ground that a priest cannot marry, that the mother's so-called marriage was illegal, and her children were illegitimate. The case was carried up to the highest courts, the legitimacy of the children was affirmed, and thus the doctrine is established that the marriage of priests is according to law. The decision will have an influence in the formation of national opinion.

OPPOSED TO REPORTERS.—In this country when a minister finds a reporter taking notes of his sermon he usually feels highly complimented, and is not averse to appearing in print provided the reporter gets within ninety-nine miles of what he has said in his sermon. But in a Welsh church recently a curious scene occurred. The vicar stopped in the middle of his sermon, and ordered the clerk to eject a man in the congregation who was taking notes. The clerk failed to fulfil his duty. The minister attempted the task himself, but failed, and thereupon brought the service suddenly to a close.

"ARMY OF THE LORD."—There is a singular body at Brighton, England which calls itself "the Army of the Lord." The leading spirits of the body made last year by Divine Command, they assert a visit to Egypt and Palestine. They have come back with a series of what they allege to be "revelations." These are published, and are for the most part a curious mosaic of Scriptural language intermixed with original denunciations and ejaculations of an incoherent nature. In Egypt "King Solomon," the "Leader of the Army of the Lord," took possession of the Great Pyramid, and he subsequently appropriated the Holy Land and marked out a site for the restored temple. Here his name was changed to Moses. The "revelations" which came to the rest of the party bear a striking resemblance to those which came to "Moses" all redounding chiefly to "Moses" honour and glory, while proclaiming woe to "professing Christendom."

A CARDINAL'S TESTIMONY.—Cardinal Manning says: For thirty-five years I have been priest and bishop in London, and now I approach my eightieth year. I have learned some lessons, and the first is this: The chief bar to the working of the holy spirit of God in the souls of men and women is intoxicating drink. I know no antagonist to that good Spirit more direct, more subtle, more stealthy, more ubiquitous, than intoxicating drink. Though I have known men and women destroyed for all manner of reasons, yet I know of no cause that affects man, woman, child and home with such universality of steady power as intoxicating drink.

The Prohibition Question.

Nearly all the objections urged against the Prohibition of the liquor traffic are similar to those which have been urged, in all times, against reforms that disturb the existing order of things. The objection, that it is a sumptuary law interfering with popular liberty, has been very frequently urged. Not long ago, the *Andover Review* contained an article by a Mr. Petegill, entitled "The Mistake of Prohibition," which made a strong present-

ation of the objections against Prohibition. In this article, it was maintained that Prohibition was a violation of some of the essential conditions of efficient government. One of these principles, which it was assumed was violated, was that law was the expression of the will of the people. The amendments in the law, it was maintained, showed that Prohibition was not the will of the people.

We cannot see the force of this objection. The legislatures which pass the law represent the people. No one asks that a minority should be able to impose its will upon the majority. But good and necessary laws may need amendment; and scarcely any one would maintain, that no law should be enacted until every person in the country approved of it. Laws are not enacted in that way. He also maintains that repressive legislation must be the sum of all the wills of the people. This amounts to saying, that a minority who desires a systematic provision for the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors should have the power to override the will and judgment of a majority, who believe the traffic to be injurious. In harmony with this extraordinary conclusion, the writer appears to justify the violation of the law by those who do not approve of it. This laxity would play havoc with many laws besides those against liquor selling. We freely admit, that all laws which touch social habits require a strong support by the people; but we cannot admit that the law has no moral right, where that support is not universal. The decision of the majority may not be infallibly right; but there is no other authority to decide the questions which arise in free countries.

This writer thinks the prohibitionists overlook the distinction between law and morals. "Law is not intended to make men good; but to prevent their becoming bad." There are not many who will dispute the general correctness of this. No prohibitionists hold that nothing but prohibitory laws is necessary to make all the people moral and good. The man who combats this notion is knocking down something which he has set up for that purpose. We cannot make men good by law; but law may lessen crime and wrong doing.

A reply appears in the same number of the *Review* by Prof. Tucker. He admits the need of a strong public sentiment to enforce prohibitory laws; but holds that a difference of opinion as to the methods of arresting the evils of intemperance is a different thing from a difference about intemperance itself. Prof. Tucker maintains the question with which we have to deal is not simply the best way of suppressing drunkenness; but, "what shall be done with the power that is making drunkards as an organized industry?" This systematic, organized business combination is intensely interested in extending and strengthening the liquor traffic; a result that cannot be achieved without increasing vice, poverty and crime. Yet an immense capital and a large number of people are engaged in the business of pushing this traffic with great activity. "Its market is the depraved appetite of the community. That must be developed, stimulated and in every way increased."

The people who are engaged in this business may have no desire to injure their fellow-men. They only want to make money by the sale of intoxicating liquors. But an increase in the sale of intoxicating liquors means an increase in the quantity drunk; and an increase in the quantity drunk means an increase of drunkenness and its accompanying evils. Hence, it is truly said: "If the liquor interest is to maintain itself, according to the natural demands of an industry or a trade, it must make itself a corrupting and demoralizing force in society at large." It must do more than this. It must combine its forces, regardless of all other interests, to secure such municipal and legislative measures as shall strengthen and aid the objects it is seeking to accomplish. No form of legalized traffic can deliver from the tyranny of such a combination. As Prof. Tucker forcibly shows, the saloon is becoming intolerable, not merely as a public temptation, but still more as a public menace to society.

In the face of dangers so formidable, it is childish trifling to talk about Prohibition interfering with the sacred rights of men to get

drunk. It is against the privilege of making drunkards that Prohibition is specially aimed. If places for the sale and drinking of intoxicating liquors are hurtful and demoralizing, it is preposterous to argue that they should be legalized for the convenience of those thirsty tipplers who are "men of strength to mingle strong drink." To hear some people talk, one might think that to prevent liquor being sold was on a level with preventing bread to be sold. Nearly every one will admit that if all the people of a country were to become total abstainers, no special calamity would result. It would not injure industry, morality, or religion. But if this be true, ceasing to give special facilities for obtaining strong drink cannot be a very serious privation. If the views expressed in the foregoing remarks as to the relation of the liquor business to the moral and social interests of the community are sound, as we firmly believe they are, then all true patriots of every Church and party should do all in their power to enlighten and mould public opinion, and promote the success of every measure which is adapted to hasten the suppression of a traffic which works so much evil to our country. —*Chris. Guardian.*

The Hindu Home.

The typical Hindu family house is built in the form of a quadrangle, with an open courtyard in the center. Opposite to the entrance-gate is a platform built to receive the images that are made for the periodic religious festivals that are held in honor of the various deities. On the ground floor the rooms to right and left of the courtyard are used largely as store-rooms, offices, etc.; whilst over these are the public reception-rooms, well lighted and generally well furnished, some of them having chairs, etc., for the convenience of European visitors. Here also is a room in which the family idol is kept, before which the priest performs service generally twice a day. All these apartments are used by the male members of the family only. Excepting at feasts, the meals are not taken here, unless there may happen to be a number of visitors other than members of the family who are not admitted into the more private portion of the house. From the back of the courtyard, a passage conducts into a second and smaller yard, which is also surrounded by rooms in which the lady members of the family live. Here the meals are eaten, and here the sleeping apartments of the family are to be found. The guests sleep in the rooms adjoining the outer courtyard. These inner rooms are generally much smaller than those in the more public part of the house; and the windows are also smaller and placed high in the walls, for Manu distinctly declared that it was not right for a "woman to look out of the windows." During the day the gentlemen generally occupy the more public rooms, as they may be transacting business, or amusing themselves in various ways, whilst the women are engaged in household duties, or in their own forms of recreation. As it is considered indecorous for a man to speak to his wife during the day, their only time for conversation is when they retire to their own apartment for the night. And as it is not considered right for a married woman to look at or address her husband's elder brothers, it will be clearly realized that anything like the social home-life of an English house is impossible under such conditions. It is more like hotel life than that of a home. As during the day the men usually associate with the men, and the women with the women, and even during the meals the husband sits down to his food with his wife attending on him as a "servant, and not eating with him as an equal, there is, there can be, nothing at all answering to the pleasant sociability of an English dinner-table. When further it is remembered that in some of these immense houses over three hundred people live together, it will be still more clearly seen how vast is the difference between the Hindu and the English home. Few things in England seem to please the Hindus who come over here more than the sociability of an English home.

The Hindu family system may be described as a sort of Joint Stock Company, in which the head of the family is managing director, with

almost unlimited powers; or as a little kingdom, in which he is an almost absolute sovereign. The sons, grandsons, nephews, who form the family, regard all their earnings as belonging to the common treasury; and their expenditure is under the direct control of the karta, or head. Thus it happens that when several members of the family are absent from home, engaged in various ways, the balance of their salaries or profits must be remitted to the karta. This has its advantages and its disadvantages. There is a home in which a man can leave his wife with confidence when he is hundreds of miles away, engaged in business, or filling some government appointment. This, to the Hindu, who would not regard it as a safe procedure to have his family with him in an ordinary house, is a source of immense comfort. Once a year, if his business is distant from his home, he takes leave, that he may have a few days with his family. There is also the certainty of support in case of sickness or permanent incapacity for work. But it has its drawbacks too. An idle, worthless son has no necessity laid upon him to work; he can obtain all the necessities of life without it; and many a family has one or more members who are mere parasites, doing nothing whatever to increase the income of the family; and, according to our ideas of life, it is destructive of the most sacred institution, the home. Often, however, the idle son is not altogether without his place in society. If he will not or can not go out to earn money as the other members of the family do, it is something if he remain at home to look after the domestic and other affairs, and to afford protection to the ladies who live there. Where all are workers, if the head of the family is growing old, the sons take it in turn to remain at home, perhaps for a year at a time; or the one who has the worst prospects of advancement will resign his appointment at a distance, and devote all his time to the care of the family. —*From Wilkins's Modern Hinduism.*

Australia.

Australia is a new nation; but away back in the ages was an older one. The evidence of the mounds of clam shells on the coast proves beyond question that man has lived in Australia for thousands of years, while the strange tribal laws of the aborigines indicate that their elaborate and burdensome social system must have grown up out of customs of fathomless antiquity. The West, with all its learning, knows not whence they came; and it regards the Tasmanians with small concern, yet in their day they must have been a powerful people with their strictly bound societies, wars, alliances, and even diplomats or statesmen. But now they are fast dying out; no form of protection helps them in the least; education only weakens their brains; some cause, which some believe to be the heart-break, but which may be a change of diet, arrests their profligence, and in a generation or two they will be a memory, clearly recalled only by a few antiquarians and ethnologists—one more added to the thousand evidences that, whatever may be the ultimate purpose of Providence, one of its methods is extinction. We are not given to mourning over the application of effete civilizations like that of the Hittites, or the Aztecs on our continent, yet there is something melancholy in the thought that a race of human beings should have owned that glorious continent for ages, should have been powerless before its capabilities, and should pass away unregarded in forgetfulness, hardly more regarded than some perishing race of birds. But it is part of the world's great Illiad in which the unthinking man finds only chance, but the discerning man, Providence. —*Christian at Work.*

Men Out Of Their Element.

Even so did Pitt hold up his hands in consternation, after a talk with Wolfe the hero of Quebec. Even so did a secretary of State declare that Nelson was the greatest fool he ever talked with. You must take a man upon his proper ground, you must measure his strength where his strength lies. The Duke of Wellington was not an impulsive soul, who could get up from the dinner table, draw his sword and swagger about the room bragging that he was to surpass all the soldiers

of antiquity, as Wolfe did in Pitt's presence. We wonder not that the minister held up his hands on Wolfe's departure, with words to the effect "Must we trust our army to that idiot?" Yet the great duke, long after Waterloo, paid a great sum to get back a letter written by him on the evening of the battle, which letter he instantly burned, saying when he wrote it he was the greatest ass in Europe. I fancy that had we seen the letter, we should in so far have agreed with the great but by no means exemplary duke.

There is the streak of the fool in the wisest of men. It was very apparent in Solomon. There is the streak of incapacity in the most capable man. And it grows most conspicuous when he strays beyond his proper measure. What more graceful than a swan in the water? What more awkward than a swan waddling on shore. —*Longman's Magazine.*

A Princess On Nursing.

The third daughter of the Queen, Princess Christian, has honourably distinguished herself by her deep interest in the nursing of the sick. In *The Woman's World* for April there is a very practical article from her pen on 'Nursing as a Profession for Women.' Nursing, she contends is a science, an art, a gift; it is essentially a woman's province; its method must be learned, and its principles understood. There must be that quick perception and independent judgment, for which there is no other word than intuitive perception. In place of the Sairey Gamp and Betsey Prig type of nurse, who was a reality forty years ago, women of culture and refinement, of high education and social position are coming eagerly forward to learn, to teach, and to carry on the noblest work of women—that of soothing the suffering and tending the sick. The Princess says a few words about the newly-formed British Nurses' Association, which is to be endowed with a large share of the Queen's Jubilee Tribute to the Queen. There are about fifteen thousand women engaged as nurses in this country, but they are completely disunited. It is proposed to bind them together in the Association, and to institute practical examinations in the theory and practice of nursing, those obtaining certificates to be placed upon a register of nurses. As the pay of nurses is very small, and they have but little opportunity of putting anything by, a pension fund is to be established; and it is also hoped that a holiday house may be obtained for those nurses who have no house of their own. Such an Association, for the benefit of women who, "when pain and anguish wring the brow," are true "ministering angels," deserves not only every one's best wishes, but their hearty support.

The Mighty Fall.

In the Washington almshouse are some men, once in honor and high offices. There is a man at one time Attorney-General of Virginia. In his office a number of now distinguished lawyers were students, and they owe much to his advice. His father had been Attorney-General of the United States, and left his son wealthy. But he drank, and sacrificed distinction, fortune, and everything to his love of intoxicating liquor.

Another pauper is an ex-Judge of the Supreme Court of California, and had been esteemed one of the most eloquent men of his time. He came to Washington to get an office, was disappointed, took to drink, and drank himself out of pocket, mind, and friends, and into the poorhouse.

In his company was a once wealthy newspaper editor and proprietor, of New York, a man of great political influence. This man has been for three years in the poorhouse. Sometimes his friends take him out, but he drinks so much that he lies about the street, and is returned by the police.

In the almshouse is an old, white-haired man, who was at one time one of the leading men of the Michigan bar. He is the man who backed Zachariah Chandler, and made him, politically speaking, what he was. And this man of great legal ability and political influence sufficient to make and unmake men, and of much wealth, is now a pauper. Why? Because he drank alcoholic liquor. How foolish is any one, high or low, who will take this

poison and hope to escape its effects! The brightest, the mightiest, fall by drink. Stop drinking now when you can, if you will, for later, you will, but cannot stop. —*The Beacon.*

RUM AND INSURANCE.—The *Medical and Surgical Reporter* notes the fact that the great insurance companies of Great Britain have, by their official action, "pronounced the teetotalers long-lived than those who make even a moderate use of spirituous liquors," and says: "One of the largest and oldest of these companies, which has kept separate registers for twenty years, declares that among the strictly abstaining class the real mortality has fallen short by 30 per cent. of the ordinary expectancy, while fully 99 per cent. of moderate drinkers have attained this expectancy." It also invites public attention to the fact that there are now insurance companies and societies for mutual aid in England designed exclusively for total abstinence men, "and that the taking of even an occasional glass of any intoxicant vitiates their policy." Life insurance teaches the lesson of total abstinence, not upon moral or sentimental grounds, but strictly economic. It is teaching thus a timely and valuable lesson even to many doctors. —*Nat. Advocate.*

GERMANY.—The *New York Tribune* having spoken of Germany as the most splendid sovereignty in the world, the *Christian Standard* corrects the statement, saying,—This, though a common opinion, is untrue in almost every sense. If sovereignty be measured by extent of domain, and natural resources, Germany is many times inferior to Russia, England, or the United States; if by the number of subjects, while she has 46,000,000, England has 300,000,000, Russia 103,000,000 and the United States 65,000,000; if by the volume of commerce she is far behind England. In the matter of steam vessels, railroads and telegraphs the United States and Great Britain are vastly her superiors, and she is excelled by France. Even in the matter of military resources, which are men, horses, money and food, a cool, unbiased calculation shows Germany to be far inferior to the United States, Great Britain, or Russia.

Among Exchanges.

GOT HUFFY AND LEFT.

The brother thought the church would fairly fall to pieces should he leave. He got huffy and left, and is astonished to find that things move along just as usual. —*Mich. Advocate.*

DOG VS. BOOKS.

You have no right to feed a dog so long as you have not the money to provide your family with good papers and books. —*American Agriculturist.*

REFORM OR QUIT.

The preacher who is irritable and fussy, complaining instead of condoling, finding fault with his people instead of trying to get sinners converted, boasting of what he has done instead of doing something, would better get up a little reformation in his own life, or quit and go home. —*Colorado Methodist.*

THE SAME MAN.

The man who is so opposed to late hours in a revival meeting will stay up all night to get election returns, and yell like a Comanche Indian at a political meeting. "That's a horse of another color." "O consistency, thou art!" a whole show-case of jewelry! —*Indiana Christian.*

AN ARTIST'S MISTAKE.

"That farm scene you seem to be sneering at, Sir," said the indignant artist, "is valued at \$500. It is generally considered a fine painting. Allow me to ask you if you are familiar with works of art?" "Not very familiar," replied the agriculturist, who was looking through the studio with his wife, "but I know something about the works of nature, young man; and when you make a cow that gets up from the ground by putting out her fore feet first you are doing something that nature never did." —*Chicago Tribune.*

JUST SO.

One of the greatest causes of trouble in this world is the habit people have of talking faster than they think. —*Journal.*