

without them, because we can thus build up on more solid foundations. Many reflections suggest themselves on a survey of the field thus presented for our observation, especially two things—the need of the central organizations of our fore- and devoted work on the part of the clergy in particular, and also of those who are their helpers and fellow-workers. Of our work we do not venture to speak here, for that can be known only to the workers and to God. But of our Church organization we know something, and it is far from complete or satisfactory. What must be done?

THE RIGHT TO THE EARTH.

"The equal right of all men to the use of the earth." How plausible, how seductive is the thesis! It sounds like a first principle, an elementary truth. Is not one man as good as another? Above all, is not the earth, which was made by God, and not called into existence by any act or work of man, equally the possession of all? Well, but what does this mean? Does it mean that the whole world belongs to the whole human race, and should be cultivated for the benefit of the whole human race? If we say, Yes, we shall then have to ask how this may best be done, for we have not in that way come to the end of our difficulties. Does it mean that those who discover and cultivate land hitherto unoccupied may have it in possession as their own? As a general principle this will not be denied. Does it mean that any one or any body of men may dispossess those already in possession? This would be anarchy. The question, then, is not quite so simple as it looks. Even if we admit the general principle, we are hardly a step nearer to the application of it. We have before us a discourse by the Very Rev. the Dean of Cleveland, Ohio, written in a very excellent tone and spirit, in which he professes to explain and defend "the equal right of all men to the use of the earth;" by which he says, he does not mean the equal right of every man to equal ownership; and he lays down these axioms:—"That which the individual produces belongs to the individual. That which the community produces belongs to the community. That which God gives belongs to all His children." With these propositions we are not disposed to quarrel, although we may not think as the writer does on the application of them. "The hand of labour alone can write the title of private property on any natural object." Granted. And labour does not create the land. Granted also. But labour may impart to the land all the value that it possesses, and, in such a case, all that value on the writer's own premises belongs to labour. The writer imagines certain cases of unjust possession, and doubtless there have been many cases of unjust possession and transference of land in the history of the world, and many instances of the undoing of such wrongs. But neither the wrong nor the righting of the wrong can be elevated into a principle of universal application. If we go back to the undoubted truth, that the earth belongs to mankind and

should be cultivated for the benefit of men, then we have simply to consider how this may be best accomplished. The universal or almost universal practice of mankind has been to concede a special proprietorship in land to those who had reclaimed it—not indeed an absolute proprietorship, for the owner or tenant-in-chief has always been held bound to perform certain duties to the community as the condition of his holding his estate. These duties or conditions have varied at different times. The rights which were conceded to the owner were sometimes greater, sometimes less. The duties required of him have also varied. But certain principles have been recognized—that the land was held of the nation, that the owner had certain equitable rights in the land, and also that he had duties to the country. In recent times we have seen how a government has intervened to diminish immensely the rights of landlords in the recent legislation on the subject in Ireland. To many persons the action of the British legislation in that case seemed oppressive and inequitable. But the evils of the existing system were grievous and some great changes had to be made. All were suffering, landlord and tenant alike; and something had to be done. Undoubtedly the thing which was done pressed heavily upon the owners of the land; but the measures taken were believed to be justified by the necessity of the case. Now, it seems to us, that this is the right way of approaching such a subject. Those vague statements about "the equal rights of all men" are not only indefinite and unintelligible, but they are generally mischievous. They raise hopes that can never be realized. They suggest changes which, in many cases, would be hurtful to the community. At present they chiefly end in what is becoming a kind of fanaticism—the single tax doctrine—the doctrine that all taxes should be laid upon the land. It is curious that this doctrine should have come up at a time when land almost everywhere is depreciated—when, in England, large areas are falling out of cultivation, when, on this continent, the young men are deserting the freehold farms on which their forefathers have lived. This state of things will not be altered for the better by Single Tax.

LAWLESSNESS IN THE CHURCH.

An article in the Times (London, England) with the above heading, demands the serious consideration of all Churchmen. We subjoin the greater and more important part of it.

The reasonable expectation of loyal Churchmen has just received support from a somewhat unexpected quarter. At a conference between "the two wings of the advanced school in the Church of England"—i.e., we suppose, between moderate and extreme High Churchmen—held last week under the presidency of Prebendary Berdmore Compton, certain resolutions were carried unanimously, which, if they represent the real mind of the "advanced school," and will be accepted by its free lances, ought to satisfy moderate Churchmen and strengthen the hands of the Bishops. These resolutions affirmed "the full authority of "the Bishop" to prohibit any service not contained

in the Book of Common Prayer, or any omissions from or additions to the services contained in that book; and directed that a copy of the resolutions with a list of those present should be forwarded to the two Archbishops and the Bishop of London. More valuable, perhaps, than resolutions which may be disregarded in practice was the strong disclaimer of lawlessness by so eminent and so respected a representative of advanced Churchmanship as the Venerable Canon Carter, the convener of the conference. Speaking as one who had been associated with Pusey and Keble and others in the struggle for principles now generally recognized, on which the High Churchmen of an earlier day were united and acted together, he deprecated the fact that men now acted as they liked and on their own responsibility in any forward movement, and re-nounced his hearers of a truth too apt to be forgotten by those whom the Bishop of Hereford designates as "heady and high-minded clergy"—that authority is a distinctive principle of the Catholic Church. Such resolutions and such expressions of opinion must, of course, be taken for what they are worth. They will, perhaps, be disregarded by those clergy who snap their fingers at all authority. They will not satisfy Churchmen who like Lord Grimthorpe, seem to believe in the inherent incapacity of all Bishops for administration, and whose great bugbear, in all schemes for Church reform, is the fear of giving too much power to the episcopate. They do not deprecate "forward movement" in itself but only undisciplined forward movement by irregular free lances. Nor do they offer better security than at present against the possible case of a Bishop in sympathy with ritual irregularities. They tell him that he has full authority to repress them, but they do not say that he must exercise it. Their value is possibly negative rather than positive, but it is, we think, appreciable. It is something that some of the most trusted leaders of the most influential section of the clergy—a section popularly credited with no great respect for law and authority when opposed to their views—should publicly declare that authority is necessary, and should dissociate themselves from the irregular action of men whose freaks, however unimportant or ridiculous, loom large in the public eye, and weaken the hold of the Church upon the people. It is something to know that the leaders of the High Church party find, as Dr. Pusey found in his time, that it is necessary for the common good of the Church to dissociate themselves from, if they cannot suppress, the misguided zeal of their followers.

For behind these little questions—out of which, however, as of old, great movements sometimes arise—there lies something more serious. It is of comparatively slight importance whether Mr. Kensit can or cannot find a service to his mind in any parish of which he constitutes himself a troublesome parishioner; whether "Father" So-and-So may sprinkle an indignant Protestant layman with what he is pleased to term holy water; or whether a parish priest nominally in communion with the Church of England, and owing allegiance to her formularies, may offend his Anglican congregation by announcing a celebration of "High Mass" in their church. These matters are of importance to those immediately affected by them. But of far greater importance to the English people as a whole is the credit of the Church and its continuance as an establishment. That credit, as all will admit, stands higher than it did. Increased life and activity, and a higher standard of clerical duty, have brought increased respect, while diminishing revenues have lessened hopes of spoil. The Church is far more than it was the Church