

they were not so, and still less in regard to Separate Schools.

ACCORDING TO THEIR UNION WAS THEIR STRENGTH.

True that in 1851, the "Convention" or "Visitation" at Toronto made an unanimous assertion of the permanent duty of connecting religion with education, and it petitioned Parliament that "the assessments ordinarily paid by Churchmen for the support of Common Schools be applied to such as are in connection with the Church, where such appropriation is practical and desired"—a very reasonable request, one would think. In 1853, at the Visitation, they were still face to face with the disability of synodical canons, those of New Zealand having been expressly disallowed at headquarters as invalid. Still they bravely declared themselves a synod: repeated their demand for Separate Schools, and appointed a committee to draft a constitution for the diocese. They were "clearing the decks" for action. In 1854 they "floated" their provincial constitution. At the same session, the intrepid Bishop (Strachan) denounced the "pernicious system of education which prevails in this province," spoke of the Church's continual remonstrance against the "iniquitous law," and denounced the obstruction to their rights. In 1856, they had realized "confiscation" of the Reserves: but still

STOOD UP FOR THEIR RIGHTS.

Another year saw the achievement of synodical power, an Act having been passed "conferring power to frame constitutions, make regulations, etc., for the management of the affairs of the Church." The draft constitution was finally "revised" and left over for adoption in 1858. This was accordingly done. Thus two of the three difficulties were overcome, and the Church's attitude on education was still maintained, only now Churchmen in various localities "had taxed themselves for the erection of buildings and machinery" and started Separate Schools, looking to Parliament for some commendation and reward for their extra devotion to this cause. In vain! In 1859 we find them (still led on by Hon. J. H. Cameron) petitioning the Court of Queen's Bench and Common Pleas. Failing, they resolve to appeal to one of the Supreme Courts, and to the Legislature. In vain, again. In 1862, we find the first break in the record of united front.

THE FIRST NOTE OF DISCORD.

A considerable minority of synod (nine clergy and twelve parishes) supported Mr. Hodgins' amendment to the resolution in favour of Separate Schools—equal rights with Roman Catholics! The proposed amendment asserted, "As members of the United Church of England and Ireland in this diocese, we do not desire to see any interference with the Common School system, as established by law, or to demand exclusive privileges not at present shared in equally by other protestant denominations in Upper Canada." All such motions were rejected: and the fight went on—but the "rift had appeared within the lute." We look in vain any longer for the "united front," and we expect discomfiture of the disunited hosts of Churchmen. Dissension did its work: disloyalty to spiritual interests corrupted the Church's power. Thenceforth we read about "a Church School," Sunday Schools, and "Ragged Schools": but the agitation died out, and the strenuous protest delivered by the Canadian Bishops in their declaration of 1851 came to naught. It may be that some half measure might have succeeded where the point blank remonstrance failed. Who can tell?

SUCH A MEASURE IS SUGGESTED IN "CHURCH BELLS" for English use, emanating from the committee of Lichfield Churchmen. It is that the rate of expenses prevailing in a certain school district for ordinary "running expenses" should be annually ascertained and reported: and a government grant on this basis should be accorded to each separate school in that area. Their actual rate varies from 5s. 2½d. in Hull to £2 0s. 9½d. in London. This distinct arrangement gets rid of the difficulty arising from any discrepancy, and assures the public against any possible favouritism towards any class of religious schools, as compared with one another or with the Common Schools. It has the merit of offering a "fair field and no favour." It supports one or more religious schools struggling for existence in a certain locality. The Government says to the supporters of these, "We will give you as much as (and no more than) the common school costs: if you can live with that, well—if not, die."

IT PRESENTS NO PRACTICAL DIFFICULTY,

and its refusal would put the Government in a very unpleasant corner, to say the least. We fancy that its refusal would be so unjust and glaringly unfair as to excite indignation in the breast of the most obtuse Saxon: and once convince Englishmen that a government is acting unfairly, and that government is doomed. Such a wave of indignation will be raised as will sweep such managers out of the way. The only possible "hitch" would arise from some gross neglect or mismanagement, whereby such an admirable instrument should not be wisely displayed when it comes to be used. John Bull may be counted on to act squarely on an issue that he understands: but like his prototype, he is rather prone to be misled by "red rags," and to run full tilt against what—in his sober senses, guided aright, and acting with cool deliberation—he would strongly approve and support. Above all, Churchmen must keep together: that is the lesson here.

REVIEWS.

CHRISTIANITY AND EVOLUTION. By Rev. Prof. Iverach, D.D., Aberdeen. Sm. 8vo., pp. 232. New York: Thomas Whitaker; Toronto: Rowsell & Hutchison.

A truer estimate of the facts of Evolution and of the inferences to be justly drawn from these facts, is now being attained than was possible twenty years ago. There used to be, on the one side, the wildest assertions regarding ancestry, natural selection, the survival of the fittest, and the natural advance of the human race through the ape to an unknown perfection: on the other side, there was as wild a panic and fruitless contention because the foundations of science and biblical teaching appeared to be overthrown, and each must haste to the rescue. The series of the Theological Educator has given a sober and helpful view of many points in Christian teaching, and the latest of its productions takes up the question of Evolution. Dr. Iverach writes with great calmness, clearness and incision. He is at home in his theme, and we feel safe under his guidance. There is much truth under the idea of Evolution, but it is not a creator or intelligent force, or necessary condition. That God willed to create by such a law we can all accept, and find infinite delight in tracing God's hand through all His works; but a law of working cannot be a personal agent or take the place of God. Again, there is a higher world than matter or mere animal perception. In Psychology, Ethics and Religion there is evidently a designing mind in the process of Evolution, and our only consistent account of it all is found in the wisdom and power of God. Dr. Iverach gives a very convenient summary and statement of how the questions are viewed up to the present date, and his sentences are laden with thoughts.

MAGAZINES.—*The Music Review*: C. F. Summy, Chicago. In the June number are two particularly good articles; one is about the great Bohemian opera composer, Smetana, who wrote faithfully to his art, but slowly out of local fame; the other is "Anecdotes of Von Bulow," the eccentric conductor and pianist. The music this time is "Hark, Hark, my Soul," a solo and quartet. *The Etude*: F. Presser, Philadelphia. From the many short and bright articles we select as most pleasant to read "Life of Wagner," by himself, and a letter from the prominent music teacher, J. C. Fillmore. Besides the wealth of other reading matter, there is full-sized sheet music by E. Doru, Tschaiakowsky, S. P. Snow and F. L. Eyer.

LAY HELP.

The jubilee of the Church of England Scripture Readers' Association last week, at which the Bishop of St. Alban's presided, was an interesting event. It is something to remember that for fifty years organized and paid lay help has existed in the Church of England. It is true that Low Church parishes have obtained most of the benefit, but this Society has improved of late years, and the presidency of the Bishop of St. Alban's may not unfairly be regarded as a guarantee that it is feeling the upward movement of the Church at large.

To the theory of paid lay help we cannot object. We know there are not a few who hold that the funds of the Church ought to be expended on the clergy only. But organists and lay clerks, vergers and sextons, get their stipends, and we do not see why, where circumstances require it, other lay agents should not be ranked as labourers worthy of their hire. As a rule, however, from long experience we have found that unpaid lay agency is the best. Still, the lay helper who expects no salary is necessarily not so well able to render organized and continuous service to the incumbent as the man who is paid, and voluntary lay agency means that the lay helpers must be chosen mainly from the upper and middle classes. On the other hand, there are many places where a working man is most useful in dealing with his fellows. This has been found markedly to be the case in the Church Army, where most of the officers are paid working men. The Church Army is the great rival of its elder brother, the C.E.S.R.A., but the rivalry has so far been, and, we trust, ever will be, of a friendly character.

The solid success of these societies reminds us of a missing link in our system. Why does not the Catholic party in the Church of England form a lay helpers' association of its own for working men willing and able to give up their lives to the Church? It is futile to plead that this is an uncatholic suggestion. It is not so. The great orders of St. Francis of Assisi and of St. Benedict were really lay helpers' associations, for most of their friars and monks were laymen. It is quite a mistake to think that the Church of England in the Middle Ages did not avail herself of lay help. She used it very extensively, and a great deal of the evangelization of the peasants of old England was done by lay friars. The main difference between the lay organizations of the Middle Ages and those of modern times was simply that the lay friars in mediæval times were bound by the threefold vows and were under far stricter discipline than their modern successors. We cannot therefore quite sympathize with those priests who refuse all lay help, on the ground that it is uncatholic. The need of our age seems to us to be an organization of devout and earnest laymen under strict discipline (not of necessity the direction of secular and married priests), and thoroughly devoted to the Church, who shall be willing to devote themselves to the work of the Church on Catholic lines, and under the authority of the parochial clergy. To some extent the Church Army and the Scripture Readers' Association profess to meet the want, but their men are usually, to use the colloquialism, "hardly High enough Churchmen" for our needs. On the other hand, when High Churchmen give themselves up to parochial work it is usually with the *arrière pensee* of expecting holy orders. Now, we do not want a peasant priesthood. We have known, indeed, of artisans who have worked their way up, and been taken by the hand by friends, and become in the end fairly efficient priests. But the experiment is risky. It would hardly do to tell any man who was fit to read the lessons in church, or to undertake a cottage lecture in the slums or in a remote hamlet, that he might expect holy orders. Yet we fear this is a very common case. What we want is an order of men who give themselves up to the Church's service for a bare living (as the Church Army officers and Scripture Readers do), but only look for promotion in their own order.

The error so far has been that such Orders have been started on mediæval lines. Dressing a man in a robe and cowl will not make him a monk or friar, not even if he lives in a conventual house. The

working which any for feudalism are by 1 been in and swe England consid living a not rec our lay while ti been fa when v of work willing may be

I hav going, o zines o cussing magazi worker especia the air really c serious some p Utopian dreams liable t a sort Utopia mitted public' August Thoma Bellam to the myself for one But God? at whi May I what I suffice (1) / ization founde wante round tioning every God fo inspire they a also h all the tempo night; I cann orphan hear someo the gi but fr to Go earne help n ties w degen (2) every per" comm or gra well, one ce The poor p too e celebr vout (3) the F music a wee able ought primi still. must Early coura Latir (4) Matt conv Chur very