

or the outposts of
ramental system.
is done. May God,
arch many men as

MINISTRY.

subject we referred
ing men were kept
ry, and dwell more
ient remuneration
find it difficult to
It is quite intelli-
nothing to a young
to whom all difficul-
n the same young
s good and earnest
myself, with half the
rty and anxiety, he
himself whether his
e trial better than
n.

the second reason
e ministry, namely,
he office is held.
eds to be carefully
mistakes. What
f the ministry not
greatly fear that, in
is merely that the
position assigned
e, and if this reason
certainly be cause
h such aspirations

rich men very sel-
work in any com-
is different in Eng-
d on many grounds,
al character, others
ok of. But it is of
in Canada, or for
examine the style of
unless perhaps that
first of causes and
ertain something of
es. That the sons
or holy orders may
ant to be rich, like
pect of being so in
hink, however, that
the way of spiritual
n this country, far
hildren of rich men
id self-indulgently,
s hardly the stuff
labourers can be

is the fact, if it be
ility are shrinking
We say that this
er, if it be so. We
le preaching of the
the greatest intel-
ual influences; and
al of nonsense and
s subject. To hear
suppose that the
f intellectual imbe-
ave done the great
age had been men
education. Could
masius, of Augus-
Calvin, of Cranmer,
to mention many

others? We must not worship intellect, but we must use it, make it the servant of God; and, if we do not, God will be badly served.

Now, it is said that many of our most gifted young men are refusing to think of the ministry; and even that some of those who enter the university, intending to go forward to holy orders, afterwards change their mind and relinquish their purpose. There may, however, be many explanations of such a course. A young man may find that he has mistaken his own mind, or the kind of work which he has to do; or he may come to associate with men, his contemporaries, who destroy the spirit which formerly animated him. But perhaps we shall find that, in many cases, his line is determined by remarking the small estimation in which the sacred office is held.

We are quite aware that many will deny this. They will point to Mr. So and So and Dr. So and So, and Canon This or That, as evidences of the respect in which the clergy, and especially the Anglican clergy, are held, how some of them are sought after, and the like. But this is really nothing to the purpose. In the first place, this is social consideration—a matter of comparatively little importance—and not regard for the office; and in the second place, it is merely personal.

Do Christian people—do members of the Church of England—commonly regard their clergy as ministers of Christ for their advancement and edification, for the extension and confirmation of the Church of God? Or do they look upon them as men who ought to make themselves agreeable, who should have nice services, and preach short sermons, and give their people as little trouble as possible? And then we wonder that we do not get a heroic ministry!

Now, we quite admit that we need such a ministry—voices crying in the wilderness—a John the Baptist here, a Peter the Hermit there, a Savonarola elsewhere—Wesleys and Whitefields to break in upon our slumbers; and we should pray for such; and God may be preparing to give us such. But what right have we to complain that our clergy are not like this, when we really do not want men of such a kind? It may be said that the low estimate in which Churchmen generally hold the ministerial office should not deter men from seeking it. As an abstract statement, this is, of course, quite true; but few men can rise very much above the general notions of those who are around them. At any rate, it is not for the laity to complain that men do not crowd to occupy an office which they plainly shew that they lightly esteem. The other reason for the falling off in the candidates for the ministry we hope to consider in another paper.

THE STRIKES.

Never was there a time when people generally, and working men in particular, had more need to recall the counsel of Dr. Johnson: "Clear your mind of cant." Cant is high-flown, unreal speech, consisting of phrases and sentences which are originated by one man and copied by another, which are generally false or exaggerated as used by their original author, and which become more so as they are propagated, learned, imitated. Or these phrases and sentences may be such as had real meaning and force in their first use; but, having passed into other mouths, have become no longer the expressions of convictions, but merely the echo of other men's thoughts.

Among the cants of the present day there is hardly anything more dangerous than the frequent

and unexplained use of the words "Christian Socialism;" and this because, in the first place, Christianity was not socialistic, in the modern sense of that word, and modern socialism is not Christian. There never was a time when community of goods was required by the law of the Christian Church. There never was a time when communism prevailed throughout the Church. We know that it existed for a short time in one particular church; but we are told distinctly that it was optional and not compulsory, and many persons believe that it led to the subsequent poverty of the "Saints at Jerusalem." This is a matter, however, which we need not discuss.

There is, however, one very conspicuous difference between the socialism of the New Testament and that of modern levellers; and it has been pointed out accurately and epigrammatically by a German writer whose name we cannot at present recall. The socialism of the New Testament, he remarks, says: "All mine is thine;" whilst the unbelieving socialism of the present times says: "All thine is mine." This is the exact point of difference. The spirit of the Gospel is loving, giving, communicating, self-sacrificing. The spirit of modern socialism is selfish, envious, covetous, rapacious.

Now, if by socialism the first, the Christian spirit is meant, then indeed we may well pray with all our hearts that it may spread; for this is our great need. That men should love as brothers, knowing that we all belong to the one great family of Him who is God and Father of us all, is the one supreme need of modern society; and it is the need of employers as much as of employed. If masters had been more just and more kind, servants would have been more loyal and submissive. But injustice will not be cured by injustice; nor will selfishness be remedied by hatred.

There can be little doubt that the strikes which are now going on—one may say—throughout the whole world, in the United States, England, Australia, not to speak of other nations, are greatly promoted by the diffusion of the spirit of socialism. And this is shown in the tyrannical spirit which has become developed in them. Simple minded people who know only the surface aspects of these questions would say that socialism is one of the latest outcomes of the spirit of liberty; and that strikes are a way of securing liberty (among other blessings) to the working man. Let such persons get to know the interior of these movements, and they will soon be undeceived.

Socialism is the destruction of personal liberty: let that be set down as an undoubted fact which hardly needs to be argued. It is a return from the State to the Family; from the rational rule of law to the continual interference, guidance, and correction of the parent. It may be that some of us would prefer such a state of things; but at least they must admit that it is a reversal of the wheels of civilization: it is a return to a species of feudalism. No doubt, Democracy is going very much the same way, is doing its best or its worst to abridge personal liberty; but it would find its perfect work in this direction in socialism.

Then, with regard to strikes, if they had only remained as the organizations for preserving the working man from the oppression of capital, most reasonable men would have regarded them as lawful and even necessary. When, however, they are used to domineer over other working men, and to deprive them of their liberty, and perhaps of their lives, because they take a line of action different from the majority, the case assumes a new complexion.

Are any men prepared to maintain the thesis that labourers who refuse to join a certain "voluntary" organization, whether a Union, Knights of Labour, or anything else, may probably be set upon, maltreated, maimed, or even killed? If this is maintained, then we must reconsider the bases of society. If it is denied, then these socialistic strikes must be condemned. There can be no two words on these points.

But worse than this—it appears fit and proper for some of these knightly men to vent their wrath not merely on the company which dismissed them, or upon the workmen who took their places, but upon unoffending men, women, and children, travelling peaceably in the fulfilment of duty or in the pursuit of recreation. It is by what we should call a mere accident that a great train from New York to Chicago was not wrecked a few days ago through the murderous malice of some of these knights—a calamity which might have led to the slaughter and the maiming of many human beings. This is war, and it is the war of wild beasts upon civilization.

The strike on the New York Central Railway does not seem to be successful, and if one or two more dastardly attempts like that to which we have referred should be made, it will probably collapse. In England the prospects of success are not much greater; and they would be very low but for the statement of Mr. John Burns that there is there a capitalist union with eight millions (sterling) at its banker's. Mr. Burns at the same time declared that any association which tried to organize protection for blacklegs (a euphemism for non-union men) would "have its hair lifted," whatever that may mean. These are certainly very peculiar utterances to come from people who seem to be patronized by "Christian Socialists," like his eminence Cardinal Manning.

It would appear that the strikes in Australia are more "successful," as it is said that the whole sea-board trade is stopped. We will, however, venture one remark of a prophetic character. It is not well, we are warned, to prophesy before the event. But we will hazard a little. Let those places be noted in which strikes, for the time, seem to have succeeded the most, and we venture to say that, before long, in some of those places the condition of the labourer will be the worst.

SOME LITURGICAL STUDIES.

BY REV. DR. GAMMACK, EAST TORONTO.

No. 13.

2. Remembering the reverence and humility to be observed in presenting and placing the alms and other devotions of the people upon the Holy Table, we seem to be plunged at once into a new and frigid atmosphere by the next rubric: "And when there is a Communion, the Priest shall then place upon the table so much Bread and Wine as he shall think sufficient." The change of tone was possibly assumed in order to minimize the sacrificial aspect of the service. It is at least noticeable that the rubric of the Scotch Book of 1637, from which that of 1662 was taken, presents quite a different picture to our mind: "And the Presbyter shall then offer up and place the Bread and Wine prepared for the Sacrament upon the Lord's Table, that it may be ready for that service." Cosin wished to have the whole rubric transferred in 1662, but the "offer up" was cut out, so that the "Oblations" in the subsequent prayer can hardly be meant to include the sacred elements that are intended for consecration and placed so quietly upon the Table; the Oblations are rather