

a chapel was much needed, still could not a building have been provided amply sufficient for Divine service for the students, at a cost of \$10,000 to \$15,000, all included? It was thought that the munificent HENDERSON family gift was intended for this, and not to be a mere moiety for a magnificent edifice, suitable for a wealthy college, but somewhat too costly for a very poor, very needy institution like Trinity. For the \$20,000 spent in excess of what would have well sufficed, a Science Hall could have been equipped, the very existence of which would have raised the status of the University of Trinity College, and brought out help and sympathy and students attracted by and being of immense service to its reputation.

To reduce the cost of the chapel is, we should suppose, not now practicable; but that such views as are stated above are held by many earnest and experienced friends of Trinity is known to us. The Corporation may rest assured that they have been placed in possession of the opinions of one of their most zealous, most enlightened friends, whose judgment has great weight in the larger spheres of public life. His advice to the authorities, we need hardly say, is the counsel of every person of experience in such operations, and it may be thus expressed—"If you seriously have determined upon spending only \$23,000 over the new chapel, it will be absolutely necessary to take the greatest possible care with all the business affairs connected with the building, and to give all concerned distinctly to understand that no expenditure will be sanctioned in excess of the amount first appropriated. For the new chapel to absorb \$40,000 is highly probable without very decided measures are taken to control the outlay. Such an expenditure would involve either debt or the use of funds subscribed for other uses, and would therefore prove a source of trouble to the College and to its friends.

SACRAMENTAL WINE.

THE question of the permissibility of using unfermented grape-juice in the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist has already attained to no small measure of importance in the Mother Church. The subject seems to have suddenly sprung upon the religious public, but in point of fact it has been silently, slowly, but surely growing towards its evil maturity. It was not to be expected that the zealous advocacy of Teetotalism, often amounting to the extreme of fanaticism, marked for years as it has been by the most unmeasured statements of the evil effects of wine on the physical and moral nature of man, should not at last issue in some serious mischief. How thoroughly aroused to the impending danger the more thoughtful portion of the Church has been at home is witnessed by the petition on the subject to the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury, signed as it is by the foremost men of the Church, parochial clergy, dignitaries, divinity professors, and learned and pious laymen. The Lower House has presented a similar petition to their lordships, almost unanimously, sixty-eight out of seventy-two. The gravity of the situation may be judged from the language of the very sober *Guardian*, in noticing the Dean of York's recommendation of "mutual consideration and toleration," as the means of preventing a schism. The *Guardian* observes, "That is precisely the spirit which in this case is most calculated to breed a schism. If any of the clergy are allowed to teach that the 'outward part or sign of the Lord's Supper' is not 'bread and wine which the Lord hath

commanded to be received,' but bread and some substance not wine which such extremists as Dr. Norman Kerr have prescribed, they will bring a controversy upon the Church of England by the side of which all that this century has yet given birth to will be as nothing. This is no matter for mutual toleration: it is a matter for positive and unmistakable prohibition." In view of this threatening mischief our clergy and thoughtful laity should assuredly give this question timely and ample study. Lately one of our correspondents inquired after some available sources of information on the subject; and as none of his fellow correspondents has seen fit to notice his inquiry, we now beg to say that a full and satisfactory discussion of the whole matter may be found in the *Presbyterian Review* New York, for January, 1882; in the *Church Quarterly Review* (London) for January, 1888; and, in some respects, a more complete discussion still, in a series of letters addressed to the *Daily Mail*, last year, by the Rev. J. CARRY of Port Perry. We cannot but think that this is a subject which claims the most serious attention of our Canadian Bishops, and which demands the early decision of our Provincial synod.—J. C.

MR. GLADSTONE ON THE LOSS OF RELIGIOUS CONVICTIONS.

THOSE who conduct this paper have already expressed their opinions as to what should be done with the Affirmation Bill. And to what has been said we desire now to add but one thing, namely, that a solemn affirmation is an oath in disguise. If there is no God, there is no solemnity in affirmations or anything else. An Atheist making a solemn affirmation is like a Christian pronouncing, with the epitaph in Westminster Abbey, that life is a joke. But let that pass. There are passages in Mr. Gladstone's speech which will be acceptable to all Churchmen, whatever may be their opinion of the Bill. We doubt whether there is a living statesman of the first rank any where in Europe who has had the courage within the last few years to declare, as Mr. Gladstone declared in the House of Commons on Thursday week, that he believed the loss of religious convictions to be "the most inexpressible calamity which can fall upon a man or a nation." This is saying out plainly, for all the world to hear, that a Parliament of Bradlaugh would be a Parliament of ruin. It is true that this is only the verdict of history. But other injuries besides Irish ones are sometimes intimidated. Our Matthew Arnolds have prattled of sweetness and light as if morals were a matter of sugar and candles; our Herbert Spencers have discoursed of sociology as if it were a branch of geology; not only sermons in stones, but sermons, preachers, and hearers all stones together; and, most shameful of all, those amongst us who profess and call themselves Christians have been so eaten up with caste and mutual jealousy that our children cannot be taught their duty to God or man, and our legislators dare not legislate in the name of Christ. We, with Mr. Gladstone, are "not willing that Christianity should be dispensed with." Kissing the New Testament implies to us, as it does to him, "an acceptance of the Divine Revelation contained in the New Testament." And when we speak of God, we mean the God who has revealed Himself in that revelation. There is no other. "Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father." But we must go farther. Matthew Arnolds might prattle, Herbert Spencers might discourse, and coarser infidels might adapt these gentlemen's refined nothings to the

tastes of coarser minds, and yet there might be small danger to the commonwealth if the Christians obeyed Christ. Yet merely to point out that sects are unchristian, and that the New Testament ideal is that of ONE CHURCH FOR ONE PLACE, doing in every place the work of Christ's kingdom and order among men, is to expose oneself to a charge of bigotry and ignorance from the Christian world—world, alas! too truly. What Mr. Gladstone says of Christianity is true of Christianity in all its divine particulars and the Church, the local Church, the One Church for One Place, built everywhere upon Apostolic foundation, is one of those particulars. Yet is not every Separatist meeting-house proclaiming every day and every hour to the daily and hourly passers by, in regard to that visible unity which alone can convert the world, "That is one of the superfluities; that is one of the excrescences; that has nothing to do with the vital substance: all you have to do is to pronounce the name of Christ?" We Churchmen have to bring back the Christians of this nation to the full and universal acknowledgment of the One Church, as being more certainly Christ's institution than even the One Bible which is so widely circulated and so narrowly understood. But then let us look within. What Dr. Beyschlag has lately said in Germany of the Church of Rome we may fairly adapt to the case of English Dissent, both Romish and Protestant,—"Has it never occurred to us that the Divine Government of the world has permitted the growth of Dissent over against our historical churches, not as a terrifying monster of anti-Christianity, but a guardian of principles and methods which we have lost or never had, and which are indispensable for that future form of the Christian Church which all people of the earth shall be both enabled and called upon to accept?"—J. F. in *Church Bells*.

THE PRIEST AND THE INFIDEL SPEAKER.

IN these days of blatant infidelity, when loud-mouthed men of no faith and less reverence or respect for the feelings of others, are endeavouring, right or wrong, to force on their fellow-men the tyranny of unbelief under the guise of what is misnamed free thought, it is often asked what line the clergy of the Church should adopt when the challenge to a public discussion on the matters in dispute is thrown down before them. Are they to take up the gauntlet and defend the right, or let it lie and submit to be taunted as cowards, or as men unfit to engage in controversy for the truth, as those fearing the light? The answer to this question has been well given by one of the secular papers of Pittsburgh, Pa., in commenting on the fact that such a challenge was recently declined by the Rector of a church in that city. In so doing the editor of the *Times* says:

The reverend gentleman displayed good sense. Coming into oratorical contact with any member of the Liberal League would not have been productive of any good whatever. He would not have succeeded in convincing his opponent, nor would his opponent have succeeded in convincing him. The debate would have had its ludicrous side, and the few, or many, gathered, would have been amused and not profited, because they would have been present to laugh—an effort which is involuntary—not to think—an effort requiring much mental strain, and an effort the majority of them are not capable of making. Besides, a minister of the Gospel has no call to defend his religion against the attack of the Infidel. When he does so in a public debate he descends to a level lower than that on which he is accustomed to walk. He gives to the discussion all the dignity it possesses, and, in addition, gives to his opponent a public prominence he could not otherwise attain. The pastor preaches to his congregation, and in