

to-day, the Secer of Concord would be compelled to change the subject of that sentence to Canada. Religion and the Church, greatest among the influences that mould a people's character, must lead the van of the forces as they march towards the goal. The day of debate over differences is past. The things that count are our agreements in Christ and the work to which Christ calls us. Paul may have planted and Apollos may have watered, but we were not baptized into the name of Paul or Apollos, but of Christ. Unity of action is the sine qua non of effectiveness. The subordination of mere personal opinion involved makes for a stronger grip upon essential truths and a larger sympathy with brethren who differ. Already magnificent fruit has been brought forth by concerted action in the field of missions. Evangelical and Anglican forget to be partizans, and remember only that they are instruments of one Master in the work of the world's redemption. It is matter for infinite regret that the flame of love which is sweeping over the Church with such beneficent power, should have failed to melt the iron barriers dividing these two colleges from each other. Their union would have compacted power, reduced expense, increased facilities, broadened intelligence, and projected an impulse for good throughout the life of the Canadian Church.

THE GREAT MISSIONARY CONFERENCE.

This great gathering of representative missionary workers from all parts of the world has now passed into history, and it will stand there as one of the most important and remarkable assemblages in the record of our common Christianity. To us it is a matter for devout thankfulness that the Church of England saw its way to officially assist in the proceedings, and especially that the venerable and representative "Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts" finally decided to send representatives. The Society at first, when approached on the subject, declined to officially recognize the Conference, but as time went on wiser counsels prevailed and at a subsequent meeting it was resolved to accept the invitation. The action of the Society has been unfavourably criticized in certain quarters, as compromising the Church of England, and the matter has been taken up by a well-known and influential Church paper with its accustomed force and ability. But ably as the other side has been presented, it does not in the least tend to modify our opinion as to the rightfulness, the expediency, and in a sense the necessity of our Church co-operating in the work of the Conference. And the overwhelming preponderance of Church opinion on both sides of the Atlantic is, we are convinced, with us in the matter. The Church, in refusing to take part in the Conference, would not only have done wrongly, and been guilty of a tactical error, but would have done herself serious and possibly irreparable injury. As the English Guardian points out, the invitation to the Conference constituted what may probably turn out to be an epoch-making opportunity to our Church. For the first time in ecclesiastical history, if we are not mistaken, one of the "historic churches" has officially made common cause with the various Protestant denominations. Churchmen, the Guardian says, were received with great cordiality and evident respect. And what was very significant, no attempt was made in any quarters to belittle or disparage what may be called the irreducible minimum of orthodox doctrine. The whole tone and temper of the assembly was strikingly, unexpectedly and refreshingly conservative. There was no disposition, as had perhaps not unreasonably been feared by some of our own people, to play fast and loose with the fundamentals. The utterances of our own representative men, Archbishop Davidson, Bishops Gore and Brent, and others, were very well re-

ceived on the whole. Some of them dwelt with great plainness and force on our present divisions, which were apparently listened to with much respect, and, in some cases, evident sympathy. It was plain from the whole atmosphere of the Conference that the old theory, in almost unchallenged occupation a generation ago, of the impossibility and undesirability of the organic re-union of Christianity has received its death blow. In the new era upon which we are manifestly entering, of steadily widening movements for corporate re-union, our Church is certain to occupy a very, probably, an exceptionally, prominent place. For she has everything to give and nothing to lose. Under these circumstances, as the Guardian puts it, she was wise in showing her sympathy and admiration for the work of these, it may be hoped, temporarily alienated communions, for whose alienation she herself is in many cases not wholly blameless. There is most undoubtedly among all the Protestant bodies a very widespread and genuine liking and respect for the Anglican Church, often resolutely disguised. But hitherto this kindly, respectful feeling has been neutralized by the attitude of the Church. Nobody relishes being ignored. The average man does not resent your differing from him, but he does feel aggrieved at being not taken seriously. The same thing applies to churches. The Anglican Church has hitherto, in the old land at all events, refused to officially acknowledge the work of other religious bodies, and to take it seriously. Now that she has, as on this historic occasion, frankly and unreservedly done so, it is something, as we have said, to be devoutly thankful for. The best results may be anticipated from the action of the Mother Church in the person of the Archbishop and others. The cause of re-union has received a great forward impulse, and it is, after all, upon the success of this movement that the whole future of missions depends. Only a united Church will conquer the world for Christ.

SPECULATION VS. GAMBLING.

The inclusion of certain forms of speculation under the general head of "gambling" has always appeared to us unjust and illogical. Of course there is speculation and speculation. There is a speculation which is the "life of trade," and without which business could not be carried on for twenty-four hours. In a sense, and in a very real one, every man who makes a venture of any kind is a speculator. In the still wider sense our life is a speculation, for in secular, as in spiritual things, we "walk by faith and not by sight." The element of so-called chance, i.e., uncertainty, enters into every transaction of life, that however remotely and indirectly has to do with the future. Now this is especially true of commerce. The business man, could such a being be conceived of, who would consistently abstain from all speculation of any kind,

may be faintly compared to the mariner who would never go out of sight of land, or the explorer who would never stir a foot without a guide. Whatever else he might be, he would cease to be a business man. As such he finds he must "take chances," i.e., he must, to use the old Elizabethan phrase, sometimes "put things to the touch, to win or lose it all." He cannot help himself. It is forced upon him. He must stake his success upon contingencies and possibilities which are absolutely beyond his knowledge and control. In doing this, then, is he in any sense a "gambler?" Assuredly not. Take even the extreme cases of speculation, i.e., speculation which is based upon fictitious or assumed ownership, the buying or selling of stocks "on margin." This sort of thing is often most unjustly termed "gambling." Strictly speaking, it is nothing of the kind, and to apply such a term to it is a striking example of that "confused thinking," which is every day so disastrously confounding great moral issues. For in what consists the essential wrongness of gambling? It is profiting by the misfortune of another, and it is more than that even. It is to gain the dead loss of another. It is to get something for nothing at the expense of somebody else. Everybody loses but yourself. Now, take the worst kind of speculation, viz., on margins. By the rise in a community which you nominally own, e.g., wheat, or cotton, or pork, you make a certain sum of money. What difference in the abstract is there between your case and that of the regular grain merchant, who buys from the farmer and sells again to the consumer? Both parties in the transaction, the seller and the buyer, make their profit. Nobody loses, or necessarily loses. In the case of a fall in margins you undoubtedly lose, but not everything, or nearly everything, as the unsuccessful gambler does. In the case of purchasing mining shares at a low price, in the hope of a rise later on, the contrast is still more glaring. Great strikes of ore cause mining stocks to jump up. You get "something for nothing," it is true, but everybody else gains. To apply the term "gambling" to this is therefore manifestly absurd. Now here we stop. Speculation of this latter kind, we do not for a moment, be it borne in mind, attempt to defend. The element of "chance" enters far too strongly into it not to render it a most dangerous pursuit, and then, of course, as is well known, the professional speculator is subject to the temptation of creating and maintaining fictitious values. Many men we know have been demoralized by their passion for speculation, but even under its most objectionable form it is not gambling in the true meaning of the term. Gambling, on the other hand, is morally absolutely indefensible. It is robbery by mutual consent, as duelling is murder by mutual consent. Of all forms of gain-seeking, short of actual theft, it is the most hardening and degrading. A systematic or professional gambler must resolutely repress and, if possible, extirpate all his finer feelings. He learns to watch for and rejoice in another's misfortune. He is forced into the position of a vulgar, grasping, ruthless, calculating self-seeker. There is no room in gambling for the exercise of anything but the most sordid qualities. Its effect on character is ruinous. Gambling, of course, has a strong affinity with speculation in its most objectionable forms. To gamble, no doubt, is to speculate, but it is something infinitely worse. Every gambler is a speculator, but every speculator is by no means a gambler, i.e., if words are to be used in their true sense. We feel assured that there are thousands and tens of thousands of speculators, even of the most adventurous kind, who would scorn to take a dollar won by any game of chance. Gambling is essentially anti-social. It is the deadly enemy to real friendship, and poisons all the social relationships. May the day be far distant when it involves Canadian society.

FLOWERS IN BRASS ALTAR VASES

are reasonable altar decorations. Our Ecclesiastical Department is showing an attractive assortment of Vases at the following prices.

\$1.80, \$2.00, \$3.00, \$3.60, \$5.00 and upwards according to size.

Send for Illustrations.

Henry Birks & Sons, Ltd.
MONTREAL