

the process is a very slow one. We can only hope that every Churchman at least who has a regard for truth, for honor, for the interests of education, and the reputation of the Church of England, will do his duty by a stern condemnation of the charlatanism that is so fashionable, and so great a scandal to this age.

FIRST CLASS DISHONOR.

THE advertisement of a new proprietary school, announces that certain members of the teaching staff took "First class honours," that is, achieved the highest academical distinction, the truth being that these persons who are alluded to as so distinguished, *never were students at all in any institution entitled to confer such a distinction as "First class honours,"* as they merely attended the classes of a divinity school.

It is much to be deplored that such language is used in this connection. Some of our non-conformist neighbors are in the habit of giving their ministers academical titles with a total disregard of the usages of the learned world. They dub their preachers "Doctors of Divinity," as freely as Americans style men, "Colonel." But the Church of England has never so degraded titles of learning, had she done so her ministers would not have reached their present fame as the most learned body of clergy in Christendom. When a man allows himself to be dubbed D. D., who cannot pronounce the letters of the Greek Alphabet, as some Doctors of Divinity known to us cannot, he demonstrates his ignorance of what constitutes the difference between a charlatan and true men of learning.

To confer the distinction of "First class honours" upon one who has not passed through the training and labours demanded by a University before such a rank is conferred, is to set the Mint stamp on base metal, it is an affront and injury to all real Honour men, and is in violent opposition to the established honorable usage of the Church of England in keeping titles of learning from degradation.

"First class honours" is a well recognised, high academical rank, it means a *University* distinction, it has no meaning whatever, it is a mere bombastic phrase when applied to one whose education as a scholar began and ended outside a University. We know whereof we speak when we affirm that the average English public school boy of from 14 to 16 years of age, is a far better scholar and theologian than those who are advertised as having won, "First class honours." How can our sons be so educated as to become cultured christian gentlemen, by teachers who assume academical distinctions, that in their cases are an imposition?

NOT UNIFORMITY BUT FREEDOM.

DEAN PEROWNE'S proposal to solve the Ornaments Rubric difficulty meets with considerable support from Churchmen of all schools. Two things are obvious, first, those who read that rubric to make the so-called "vestments" compulsory, will not submit to

any curtailment of the liberty given them by that rubric; second, those who take the opposite view, who regard "vestments" as Popish rags, will not submit to any interpretation of that rubric which would render wearing of the vestments compulsory. Dean Perowne suggests that, "Convocation declare plainly that the Ornaments Rubric should be taken in its natural and obvious sense, without the insertion of a negative, as defining the *maximum* of allowable ritual. But then the rubric so taken must be permissive, not compulsory; and as regards vestments, let it be clearly understood that, while those in use in the second year of Edward VI. are legalised, it shall be sufficient if at all times of his ministration a clergyman wear surplice, hood, and stole or scarf." This would give all the freedom required, and take away the power of legally worrying those to whom the higher ritual is attractive, neither party could reproach the other with failure to comply with the rubric.

We are satisfied that some compromise of this kind is the true way to solve the present difficulty.

It is significant that the Churchman Magazine, by far the most ably conducted organ of the Evangelical body, indeed one of the oldest of our Church periodicals, takes the same ground as the Dean of Peterboro. What other position can be taken? It is hopeless to expect that force of law will compel those who take the Ornaments Rubric in one sense, to, on the one hand, abandon, or on the other adopt usages which their reading of that rubric approves, or does not require an observance of. It is a dead lock if uniformity is demanded, but freedom to use or not to use the vestments, while it must produce a certain amount of confusion and friction, will allow the work of the Church to go on, and with charity on both sides, need not produce any serious trouble.

THE SOCIAL WORK OF THE CHURCH.

A THIRD thing we have to do is to teach people to meet the temptation of the material world rightly. There is a growth of habits going on which threatens the social life, and threatens to undo all we are trying to do when we teach people to use the material world rightly. Therefore I rejoice that you have taken gambling and betting for one of your subjects, and that it is put into such hands. There rises before us then the vision of all that the Church has gained of late years, not for her own sake, but for the people's sake, by her great moral societies; and still the history of the world goes on spreading before us fresh needs. I believe there is nothing which has so tended to put the Church in its present position as regards the great working class as her zeal for their temperance. I believe they are equally waiting for the Church to work among them for their purity, and I am thankful that a society has been started that shall work for that. Next, there come before us the horrors of the liquor traffic with native races. There are horrors which have not yet been

fully put before the public. There are horrors with regard to slavery, and it is for the Church to find out what the House of Laymen discussed—what is the duty of the Church with regard to slavery, and to recognise that the Church has a duty. Then, again, the Church had to recognise that all our English society is based upon the purity of the family—that the lines of the family—what constitutes the family—that is to say, that particular familiar circle within which persons may not marry—is clearly laid down by Scripture and society, and that line the laity and the Church ought to maintain, and to affirm the conviction that if the family circle is once broken in upon, the widening circle of society will be very much injured. And then, among social works, there is nothing we have to attend to more than the people's evenings. Masses of young men and young women, of girls and boys, go home from work at all hours during the evening, and have no place to be in except the streets. Little by little—but ah! how slowly, compared with what has to be done—we are opening places of healthful, useful, and social resort. We ought to go on pressing forward. We do feel that people want amusement in the evening, and we do feel that amusement, like all other gifts of God, can be sanctified, and none others have the power of dealing with the people's evenings as the Church has. Those who have visited such places as the People's Palace will agree with me that we have not merely to provide places in which they can spend a rational and pleasant evening, but we have to create in many the very taste for a rational and pleasant evening. There are thousands of people who by this time have lounged into the People's Palace—young men with their hands in their pockets—and lounged out again, because they prefer street-corners, with their dreary and wicked associations, to places where there is light and comfort and entertainment and instruction—gymnastic exercises, healthful occupation of all kinds provided for them. And, surely, we do stand in a difficult position, surely we stand in a critical position as regards future history if we find that those things which we know to be best, happiest, and pleasantest are not pleasant to by far the majority of those to whom they are offered. But if this be so we must also be on our guard against any violent infringement of their liberties. Nothing is to be done by driving people into the pleasantest and happiest places. We have to take care of the poor people working in shops. They do deserve our utmost compassion, sympathy, and effort; and then, on the other hand, if you will go about the streets and see working men and their wives, and their children, happily walking up and down and gazing into the shop-windows, looking to see the articles exposed, and liking the brightness thrown across the pavement, you will, I am sure, feel with me that it would be far more injurious—it would deserve a name which it does not deserve now,—the name of a pandemonium, I believe—if you were suddenly to close all these shops. There are thousands of people whose only exercise is