

We learn that the Rev. George Granville Bradley, Master of University College, Oxford, and sometime Honourary Chaplain to the Queen, and Examining Chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury, has been appointed to the Deanery of Westminster. He was a pupil of Dr. Arnold's.

On the 1st August the Archbishop of Canterbury and family entertained nine hundred of the poor of Lambeth. The guests first met in St. Mary's parish church for an address by the Rev. R. T. Davidson, his Grace's domestic chaplain. Tea was provided in the library, which was filled three times.

#### TWELFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

A GLORIOUS dispensation was that of the Law. It had many elements of greatness in its essential character, and of magnificence in its external manifestation. Contrasted with the polytheistic systems of surrounding nations, there was infinitely more grandeur about it; and in opposition to the deistic principles which pervaded some other nations, it typified the only sacrifice for sin, it indicated the lamb for the burnt offering, and it gave an immensely higher tone of morality than Western Asia had ever known before. But, glorious as was the manifestation, it was afterwards found to have, compared with the exhibition of Christianity, no glory at all by reason of the glory which excelleth. Because it was through type and figure only that its excellency was displayed; but when the true Light came, the Presence of the Most Holy One was secured to all His faithful followers through all time, in the Sacraments, and other means of grace, of His own institution and appointment, and especially in the Sacrament of His own most Blessed Body and Blood.

It is evident that it was the Presence of Christ which was the grand circumstance that verified the prophecy of Haggai—that the glory of the latter house should be greater than the glory of the former. And it is the Presence of Christ with His Church, collectively and individually, which constitutes the peculiarly transcendent glory of the Christian system, and which casts into the shade the glories of the Mosaic dispensation. The Christian religion had its origin in boundless mercy directed by perfect wisdom and unerring rectitude. It was the subject of the counsels of the Infinite and Eternal before the heavens were stretched out or the foundations of the earth were laid. As far as we can learn it formed the centre of the Divine designs, and the ultimate point to which every other purpose of God was directed. As it was designed to be the spiritual reign of God over the mind, and at the same time to be a kingdom in which the sovereign and subjects shall be of the same nature, it was necessary in order to its establishment that God should become incarnate—necessary, not only for the redemption of His Church, but also for the purpose of His people being governed as it was intended they should be governed. Ere the government could be placed upon His shoulder, Messiah must be a "Child born, and a Son given." And forasmuch as in this kingdom the tabernacle of God was to be with men, and he was to dwell amongst them, and such a condescension of mercy would have been utterly unbecoming the Blessed and only Potentate, without reparation to the Divine honour tarnished by rebellion, it was requisite that a sacrifice for sin should be made,

worthy of the occasion, which could nowhere be obtained, but by the offering of the body of Christ once for all. Thus the foundation of this "ministration of righteousness" was laid in the Incarnation and Atonement of the Son of God; and the solidity and extent of its foundations, immense and vast as they are, do but manifest a due proportion to the majesty and duration of the structure.

#### Dr. WILSON'S GODLESS EDUCATIONAL SCHEME.

AFTER the address written by Dr. Wilson, President of the University of Toronto, and read for him by Mr. Buchan, before the recent Teachers' Convention in Toronto, we no longer wonder at the demand for Separate schools. Most inaptly, as it seems to us, the writer entitled the paper "Religious Instruction in the Public Schools." A perusal of the address shows that it was so headed on the *lucus a non lucendo* principle. Dr. Wilson objects to religion. Dr. Wilson pooh-poohs the notion that the non-secular instruction afforded to young Canada should have anything in it that shall bind the students down to any creed or to any form of faith. "It is no part of the duty of a Public School teacher—and so by implication, of the Public School system—to set forth denominational catechisms or creeds, or in any form to inculcate dogmatic theology." But to teach either directly or indirectly that there is a God, as Dr. Wilson insists that teachers should do—but quietly, and in such a manner as not to give any offence to the weaker brethren; that there is a religion founded by Christ the Son of God; to hint at the obligation of believing in a heaven or a hell, involves inculcating dogmatic theology. These doctrines, therefore, must not, if Dr. Wilson's ideas are to be followed out, be taught in any school or college. But without inculcating such doctrines all education must be godless; and this godless "system, as applied to the Provincial College over which I (Dr. Wilson) preside, has my fullest approval, and is, indeed, the only one that may be called truly national."

Such words in the mouth of the head of the Provincial, we might say of the Canadian University serve as the keynote to the teaching afforded therein. And though Dr. Wilson objects to the term "godless," as applied to it and to the whole system of Canadian education, yet we fancy he would be sore bested to call it by any other name. Christian it is not, as to be Christian it must distinctively put forward the Incarnation of the Son of God, which would offend both Jew and Unitarian. But if not Christian, it is not according to God. Deistical, pure and simple, it must not be, else the Atheist and Agnostic would be repelled. But if not even Deistical, it can only be without God, *i.e.*, godless.

Dr. Wilson has had a glorious opportunity of refuting this accusation of godlessness in its teaching so righteously brought against the Canadian Public School system. This golden opportunity he has not only lost, but has actually misused—for political purposes. As President of the University he had it in his power to speak with authority in favour of pronounced religious education. Instead of that the presidential trumpet gave forth a most uncertain sound, or rather sounded not an alarm against the godlessness of the day—the great enemy to be combated, but a note of truce, even of notice to the foe that henceforth there should be no attack upon his lines. Better no religious instruction at all than any de-

vised dogmatic teaching in our schools! Better a system of mere humanitarianism, of a moral training, not even so developed as that of Plato, than a system that shall speak to the student of a revealed religion, of the being of a God, of an Incarnate Saviour, of a quickening, enlightening Holy Ghost, or of a Trinity in Unity! Instead of these fundamental principles of belief, the teacher is to garnish the every-day work of the schools with what, as Dr. Wilson lays them down, are only a few trite aphorisms, a beatitude or two, an occasional unexplained parable or isolated text; not one of which, when divorced from Christian teaching, conveys more than the ancient philosophers conveyed by their teaching, or speaks to the youthful mind of anything higher than that morality which is common to the satirist of old, and the Unitarian or Agnostic of the present. For a Divine and supernatural religion, the religion which teaches the little children to come to Him, Who is the way, the truth, and the life, Dr. Wilson would substitute a man-made natural theology, whose end can never be to make the pupils wise unto salvation. Yet the President of Toronto University is not without a religion of his own. Unless he has greatly changed, he is a man of the most pronounced opinions, and not ashamed to put them forward, occasionally with a somewhat unpleasantly dogmatic fierceness. So far however, does he go in his latitudinarianism that he seems to object to the Bible being taught in State-aided educational institutions at all—he even indulges in a covert sneer against his good Presbyterian forefathers, whose method was to give plenty of Bible and Shorter Catechism in their schools. Nay! the President of Toronto University would dispense even with the recital of the Lord's Prayer and the Benediction, lest haply it should give offence. Even heathenism could descend no further than this.

"Morality," Dr. Wilson would, of course, have taught in the Public Schools, but such teaching "should be altogether distinct" (he urges) "from questions of Sacramental grace, of Baptism, or the Eucharist. Questions of grave importance on which the Churches of Christendom are at issue, can find no proper place in the national school system of a free people." In these words the cloven foot peeps out. Dr. Wilson himself has no faith in Sacramental grace; he denies Baptismal Regeneration; he repudiates the Biblical teaching on the subject of the presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist. He would therefore, have all teaching either to square entirely with the views of the party he represents, or else be utterly godless—for call his system by whatever name he pleases, godlessness is its only style.

Such in brief is the educational creed of Dr. Wilson. As the utterances of Dr. Wilson as a private individual they would carry no weight. Unfortunately, however, he is not a private individual. He, as occupying an important public position, becomes a public man; and it is that position which speaks, not himself. We can only regret that such a position should be filled by one who is even professedly a Churchman; we regret that the Church should be credited even remotely with utterances, such as, we are sure, no true Presbyterian, as he was not many years ago, would have allowed to proceed out of his mouth.—Not any other sectarian, save a Unitarian or Agnostic, or a member of that body to which the Coryphæus of godless education in this country, Dr. Egerton Ryerson, belongs, would have allowed himself in such a pronouncement. In the name of the Church we protest against and disown both the speech and the speaker, and congratulate ourselves