

and blood. He dwells, indeed, on the destruction of the city, and predicts His own coming to judgment, and although in St. Luke's account the two events are distinguished by a separating particle, in this of St. Matthew He speaks of the two events together, as embodying that idea of judgment which is common to them both; and, perhaps, in the expression, "the tribulation of those days," He includes the calamities of the Jewish people, connected with their dispersion down to the period of their ultimate return to their own land. When Christ spoke in these solemn terms of Himself as coming in the clouds of Heaven, He was appropriating, as belonging to His own person, that vision of the prophet Daniel, in which "One like unto the Son of Man came with the clouds of Heaven, and came to the Ancient of Days, and they brought Him near before Him; and there was given Him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom that all nations, and languages should serve Him." But Daniel says nothing of a judgment; and our Lord, therefore, is not merely applying the prophet's words to Himself; He is doing so with reference to a particular occasion which He announces. It is this, which, of itself, would have made it impossible to resolve the allusions to the clouds and the majesty and the glory into a mere metaphor, descriptive of the spiritual side of a great calamity, if our Lord had not, in the next chapter, so expounded what here He states more concisely, as to make this procedure impossible. That picture of the King on His Throne, with all the nations before Him, with the host of ministering angels around Him, with the impassable chasm between the saved and the lost, with the two-fold sentence, is either, in its broad outlines, a most substantial prediction, or it is a worthless figment. There is no room for doubting what the Divine Speaker meant by it, and He will be taken at His word, or otherwise, just as men do, or do not, believe that He is what He claimed to be.

#### RICH AND POOR IN GOD'S HOUSE.

ARE FREE SEATS ENOUGH?

FEW people are aware of the amount of trouble taken by clergymen and parish visitors to induce the poverty stricken to appear at public worship. They naturally shrink from a contrast which makes "odious comparison" inevitable with their well-to-do fellow-citizens, everywhere. You do not meet them—except in the case of beggars, who have lost all self-respect, or are driven to desperation—rubbing shoulders with silk and broadcloth on our fashionable thoroughfares, or gay street parades; nor do you find them in public meetings or assemblies, even where the admission is free. "Misery loves company," and this class of people loves to congregate where there will be no one so well-dressed and well-fed as to remind them of their poverty. This is the stereotyped feeling of the poor, and all the clergymen and visitors in the world—disregarding this essential element of their feelings—cannot make very perceptible headway in bringing these people to church, where they are sure to meet those who, (albeit unconsciously), remind them of their misery.

The question is, Do we go the right way about it? Do we really make allowance for the natural feeling? Or do we foolishly set it at defiance, and try to "make water run up-hill?" Again and again do we see churches erected with a missionary intention among the poor, and, at first, filled fairly with the class for whom they were chiefly or primarily intended, gradually lose their missionary

character and become depleted of their most desired material. The cause being that the Church has been invaded by people dressed with ostentatious regard to fashion and display. Visitors to St. Alban's, Holborn, used to notice that, at the ordinary 11 o'clock service, it was filled by a fashionable congregation, drawn from the West End of London; but the more observant and careful kind of investigators soon discovered that the poor appeared in considerable numbers at the earlier services, which happened to be too early for the West-Enders living four or five miles away. In process of time, the West End people have erected similar churches for themselves nearer home, and left St. Alban's, gradually, more to itself. The poor began to "crop up" at the mid-day services; but the process of weaning them back from a service from which they had been, as it were, frightened from by uncongenial company, is necessarily slow. So in hundreds, indeed thousands, of other churches, of very different types from St. Alban's. The advantage of St. Peter's, London Docks, was that it was situated in a part of the slums into which even the most rash and courageous "fashionable" would scarcely dare to penetrate, or, at least, care to repeat the experiment; and so the poor had their "Father Lowder" and their gorgeous services all to themselves, and could easily realize that they were "in a little Heaven here below," and in the very gate of the Heaven of angels.

The remedy easily suggests itself, viz., let the people who can afford to dress splendidly, keep their splendid dress for more fitting places—the ball room, the concert, the fashionable promenade, the opera; and never flaunt their prosperity in the faces of the poor! It requires self-denying effort, some judicious and careful management, to arrange a rich wardrobe so as to include that which will not suggest wealth too ostentatiously. The same thing is still more true of ladies. But is not the object worth the effort? Is not the achievement of getting our poorer brethren by our side in God's house worth the exertion of making the arrangements? It is true that the poorer classes themselves often show want of consideration amongst themselves; the families of the better kinds of mechanics dressing so flashily as to drive the laborers to despair. If, however, those who are supposed to know better, gifted with higher education, taste and refinement of social life, set an example of modest and unassuming dress, in church at least, the middle classes of our people will as quickly follow them in the good habit as they do now in the habit, and the poorest of all will be able to take their places comfortably in all our churches—once more, instead of being driven to out-of-the-way "Mission Rooms," and hole-and-corner services in some of their cottages. Not a few well-meaning, but shallow-trained, youths devote themselves to the fraternizing of poor people in "cottage meetings," instead of getting them to church, whence they have been driven by the over-dressing of these very youths and their friends.

The pew system is already moribund in Canada, but to little purpose, if the still more offensive dress system be not sent after it. In a pewed church there is commonly provided a separate quarter for the poor, where they may sit together without being brought into close contact with their well-dressed brethren; but in a free church, the close local contact brings out the painful contrast more clearly—a poor man cannot sit anywhere but that he is liable to find his next neighbor

dressed like a lord. It is a pity their minds are not strong enough to stand the trial of this odious comparison; but they are human, and, (by reason of their misery), peculiarly sensitive about such matters. We must take them as we find them, make allowance for their infirmities as well as their misfortunes, and then we shall experience the pleasure of carrying out the Golden Rule. "That the strong should bear the infirmities of the weak" is one of the chief precepts of the Gospel; and one of the least practiced. Let us give up lamenting over the callousness of the poor, in regard to the duty of public worship, and the practice of abusing them for it; and set ourselves to remove from ourselves the very obstacles that stand in their way. We need not go to church in rags; but we can dress so plainly that neatness and cleanliness will become more conspicuous in us than costliness and splendor. Then the poor can and will imitate us.

#### A STRONG PULL—ALL TOGETHER.

A CHURCH newspaper, such as ours, is a *Live Trust*; it depends on the good will of its subscribers, as evinced, not only by the prompt payment of their individual subscriptions, but in their efforts to promote the spread of the paper, and the enlargement of its subscription list. A rich corporation—half-a-dozen millionaires will do—can pay a handsome salary for an editor, print a paper, circulate it gratis, or at a nominal subscription, without difficulty; but, if the paper be a private enterprise for the good of the Church—the editor and proprietor require, meanwhile, to live in order to do their work—those who are interested in the paper must put their shoulder to the wheel and HELP.

We have to thank not a few of the clergy and laity, including the ladies, of Canada, from Sandwich to Halifax, for noble-hearted help during the past year; but these have only made, by the light of their good works, the darkness of the inactivity of others visible. Those who have helped—some of them under great difficulties—by getting people to subscribe for our paper, have demonstrated how much might be done if all, or nearly all, were to do likewise. The result would, indeed be exceedingly satisfactory.

Meanwhile, "every little helps," every man, woman, and child among our subscribers, [for we have, for instance, a round dozen subscribers among the Sunday School children of one of the poorest parishes in the Diocese of Toronto, can do something to lighten the load of our labors and difficulties. The DOMINION CHURCHMAN is now an assured success, probably without parallel in the history of the Canadian Church; but the "trust must be kept alive," the success should be increased. We have confidence in our good friends through the length and breadth of Canada, that, amongst the fruits of the bountiful harvest and returning prosperity of our country, will be found, not only arrears of hard times, in past years, paid up, but a goodly number of NEW SUBSCRIBERS among the "comfortable farmers," and other thankful inhabitants of Canada. Let the DOMINION CHURCHMAN, [as is the case with the papers of Methodists, Baptists, etc.], be at the fire-side of every Churchman *this winter*; and we promise to give them articles that they will enjoy reading, and which will add to their comfort.

We do not represent a clique of busybodies, afflicted with a surplus of money, and anxious to inflict and impress the fancies and caprices of heads as empty as their pockets are full, upon the Church; but we desire to REFLECT in our columns the best thoughts and feelings of the authorized