

petition is not injurious in itself, it only becomes so when it is unrestricted, when it takes no counsel of the dictates of brotherly love.

The Committee do not doubt that Government can do much to protect the class known as proletarians from the evil effects of unchecked competition. The English poor-law has long ago provided the bare necessities of life for those who cannot otherwise obtain them; the institution of State Savings Banks has provided for the poor man a safe investment and moderate return for his savings. Acts of Parliament have required the builders and owners of houses to have regard for the health and comfort of their tenants, while the factory legislation of this country has effectually protected those labourers who cannot protect themselves. The Committee believe, further, that the State may justly and safely extend this protective action in several directions. It may legalise the formation of Boards of Arbitration, to avert the disastrous effects of strikes. It may assist the information and maintenance of technical schools. It may see that powers, already existing, under Sanitary Acts, are more effectually exercised. It may facilitate the acquisition by Municipalities of town lands. The State may even encourage a wider distribution of property by the abolition of entail, where it exists; and it may be questioned whether the system of taxation might not be varied in a sense more favourable to the claims of labourers than that which now exists.

But, after all, the best help is self-help. More even than increase of income, and security of deposit, thrift and self-restraint are the necessary elements of material prosperity. And in encouraging and strengthening such habits and feeling the Church's help is invaluable. By requiring some knowledge of economic science from their candidates for orders; by forming and fostering institutions for the provision of practical education and rational recreation; by establishing penny banks and workmen's guilds; above all, by inducing capitalists to admit their workmen to profit-sharing, and by teaching artisans how to make co-operative production successful, she may do much to diminish discontent, and to increase the feeling of brotherly interest between class and class. The Clergy may enter into friendly relations with Socialists, attending when possible their club meetings, and trying to understand their aims and methods. At the same time it will contribute no little to draw together the various classes of society if the Clergy endeavour, in sermons and lectures, to set forth the true principles of Society, showing how property is a trust to be administered for the good of humanity, and how much of what is good and true in Socialism is to be found in the precepts of Christ. The call to aid the weak, through works of what is ordinarily known as charity, has been, at all times, faithfully pressed by the Church of Christ, and has been met by a noble response, which has been the chief strength of works of beneficence in modern Society. But the matter is one not merely of Charity, but of

Social and Christian Duty. It is in this light that the Church has to proclaim it in these critical times, with some special boldness and earnestness. At the same time the word of warning should not be wanting. Mutual suspicion and the imputation of selfish and unworthy motives keep apart those who have, in fact, a common aim. Intestine strife and doctrines of spoliation destroy confidence, arrest trade, and will but increase misery.

The Committee believe that, in the present condition of thought and knowledge, they cannot wisely or profitably go further than they have done above in the way of detailed suggestion. There is the less temptation to over-haste in forcing of social experiments, inasmuch as the history of the past shows convincingly that the principles of the Gospel contain germs from which Social renovations are surely, if slowly, developed by the continuous action of Christian thought and feeling upon every form of evil and suffering. If all will only labour under the impulse of Christian love, for the highest benefit of each, we shall advance by the shortest possible path to that better and happier future for which our Master taught us to hope and pray.

THE TEACHING OF CHURCH PRINCIPLES.

DOES the Church of England sufficiently instruct her members in her distinctive principles? And if not, why not? And whose fault is it that she does not? To an Englishman the latter question is of first importance, for he always wants to know who ought to be hanged or cashiered if anything goes wrong. In her capacity as a teaching institution the clergy and their subordinate and deputed teachers must be taken to represent the Church. To bring the above questions, then, to a practical test by another question, let your readers ask themselves how many times in their lives have they, as regular Church-goers, ever heard sermons directly and systematically explanatory of the distinctive principles of the Church of England? Sermons, that is, which would enable Churchmen to understand for themselves, and to explain to others, why their Church holds to Episcopacy as against Presbyterianism; how she defends Infant Baptism as against Anabaptists; how she justifies the observance of the first day of the week as the Christian Sabbath against the Seventh-day Sabbatarians; why she insists on the organic unity and corporate organization of the Churches as against the unsectional divisions and independent republics of Congregationalists; why she refuses to recognise the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome; how she clears herself of the two apparent inconsistencies, (a) of separation from the Church of Rome while condemning the separation of Dissenters from herself, and (b) of quoting the authority of the Bible as against the Romanists' claims for the authority of the Church, and the authority of the Church as against the Dissenters' private interpretation of the Bible; on what grounds she distinguishes between the

honouring of saints and the invocation of saints, and many kindred questions involving at their root the very *raison d'être* of the Church as an authorized teacher and representative of Christianity.

Implied and included in this main question, is another. In how many Sunday Schools do the Church Catechism and the Prayer-book and Church Principles form a part of the regular instruction given by the teachers and superintendents? A wide experience of the system or no system of instruction in Sunday Schools warrants one in affirming that such schools are the exception and not the rule.

Some may say, that even if the alleged defect in the Church's teaching were proved really to exist, it were better so, or of little importance, if only the doctrinal and moral obligations of Christianity be faithfully presented to our people. But this is begging the whole question. A true Churchman refuses to acknowledge that he is bound to accept the doctrinal and moral teaching of the Apostles, as being a faithful and inspired revelation of Christ's mind and will on those subjects, but that he is at liberty to reject or ignore the mind and will of Christ about the constitution, and rules, and organization of the Church when revealed by the equally inspired actions and arrangements of the same Apostles, whom He left to build up and fitly frame the structural organization of His Church. Why, if we were not convinced that the constitution, and rules, and ordinances of our Church, were not as much part of the revealed will and mind of Christ as the doctrines and moral precepts of Christianity are, and, therefore, equally a part of the deposit of faith to be held wholly and loyally, and not to be parted with as if ours to give or keep—if they were not so, what justification can the Church have for her separate existence at all? what can excuse the sin of refusing to merge herself in a great common nothingarian Church, including Independents, Baptists, Methodists, Salvationists, Plymouth Brethren, and all others who declare themselves to be Christians? If the Apostles did not know and fulfil Christ's will respecting the constitution, ordinances, and rules of the Church as a religious organisation, community, and government, then they are not to be trusted as teachers of Christian doctrine and morals. But if we accept their authority as Christ's lieutenants and vice-gerents in the establishment of the Church, then we are violating Christ's law if we infringe or set aside those Church principles, just as really as if we refused their teaching on some point of doctrine or words.

If Churchmen, then, be practically taught by defects in their Church teaching, that Church principles are of little or no importance, then it is easy to understand that they will, as they do, rightly forsake the Church for various insufficient reasons, and drift into various forms of Dissent. Are we satisfied that this should be so? If not, how is it to be amended? The remedy is plain enough. Let all the clergy make it an invariable rule to preach one sermon a month at least on some distinctive