

voice rose loud and clear, reminding us, in some degree at least, of what it was in the orator's best days, as he proceeded to deal with Archbishop Tait and Sir W. Harcourt's plea that the residuary legatee of disestablishment would be the Church of Rome. But has not the fort that was intended to defend us turned its guns against us? "Oh," says Sir William, "you may change the garrison; but don't blow up the fort." The fact is, however, that the garrison and the fort are inseparable. It is only through the hierarchical and prelatical church that there are converts going over to Rome. Parliament and the people are helpless in the matter; and it is the State bonds in which the Church is bound that cause the mischief and the helplessness. No one, I may here note, cheered these remarks more enthusiastically than Professor Fawcett.

Mr. Bright closed by saying that he did not recommend constituencies to exact pledges for disestablishment. "It is," he said, "one of the gravest questions which the people have ever had to consider. It is a far more important question than the question of free trade, and far more important and far more difficult than the question of extension of the franchise or redistribution of seats. It is a question that goes deep down in the hearts of hundreds and thousands and millions of men, and women in this country, and you cannot by a wrench settle it. What you have to do is to discuss it with fairness—fairness to the Church, and fairness to its ministers. I am not asking you to plunge into a violent agitation for the overthrow of the Establishment of the Church of England. I think it would be a great calamity indeed that a great change like that should come by violent hatred and discussion, and should be accomplished in a tempest which is almost like the turmoil of a great revolution. I ask you only to consider it, and I appeal not to you who may be Nonconformists, or to you who do not care about the Church; but I appeal to those who do care about it, who do care about Protestantism and religion. It is not for me to lead you in any crusade against the Church. I have offered to you to-night my homely contribution to the discussion of the greatest question of our time. If I am able to form any just judgment upon it, I should say that it will be a great day for freedom in this country, and for Protestantism and for Christianity, which shall witness the full enfranchisement of the Church within this realm of England."

---

### THE WEEKLY OFFERING.

"UPON THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK LET EVERY ONE OF YOU LAY BY HIM IN STORE AS GOD HATH PROSPERED HIM."

This requires that charitable appropriations be *systematic*. It requires some plan, deliberately and prayerfully adopted, assessing on the income a determinate proportion for charitable purposes. It forbids giving merely from impulse, as under the excitement of an eloquent charity sermon, or the accidental sight of distress. It forbids giving merely at random what happens to be convenient. It transfers the control of charity from the capriciousness of sensibility and the parsimony of convenience, to the decisions of reason and conscience. It regulates impulse by principle. It brings the whole subject into the closet, to be determined by prayer and deliberation, according to the rules of the Bible, in the fear of God, and the spirit of consecration to him. In carrying into effect the plan thus deliberately adopted, charitable appropriations will enter into our calculations as much as the necessary expenditures on the person, the family, and the business; they will be managed with as systematic exactness as any matter of business; they may with advantage be as regularly booked. A line written on a memorandum of his charities, kept by a systematic giver and found after his death, suggests an important reason for keeping such a record: "I keep this memorandum lest I should think I give more than I do."

They who obey the scriptural rule of benevolence, *do not wait to be solicited.*