

CLOSE UP THE RANKS, confederate and consolidate, is the slogan of the Church in England at present, *apropos* of the new phase of the attack on Church schools. The new proposal comes from the Methodists, and is tantamount to an invasion—namely, to give their teachers the privilege of instructing their children in Church schools. They are not content with the "conscience clause" allowing them to withdraw their children during the "religious hour": they want to enter and occupy Church ground! Impudence could no further go.

THE DEATH OF CHARLES BRADLAUGH removes a remarkable figure from the Imperial Parliament. By iron will and dogged obstinacy he had managed to secure a hearing in the House by taking a Christian oath. Strange to say, after taking the oath, all the bitterness of the man seemed to die out. His attitude as infidel or sceptic or secularist seemed to become lost in that of a reformer of an ordinary type. It was a curious coincidence that as he breathed his last breath, the parliamentary oath died too.

IRREVERENCE TOWARDS CHURCHES is very widespread. While Bishop Blyth is blaming the C.M.S. for winking at it in Palestine, and Dr. Dale of Birmingham is inveighing against it in England, a preacher in Michigan stops his service for 15 minutes to reprove *flirting, gum-chewing, note-writing, &c.*, and ends by turning his hearers out and locking the doors! We have known a Canadian Missionary warn his hearers (?) that he had left a horse whip in the vestry, and would use it if flirting and tobacco-spitting did not stop.

THE INCH AND THE ELL.—The English *Guardian*, in its blind following of Mr. Gladstone, argues laboriously for the reasonableness of relieving the Roman Catholics of the last remnants of their legal disqualification for the highest offices in the Empire. One wonders what further experience and knowledge of papal ways we need to convince us that they cannot be trusted fully for loyalty to any Government or State other than at Rome. Surely, the lesson of their final subserviency to papal dictates, is "writ large" in history, and by Mr. Gladstone's own hand too.

SCRIPTURE TEXTS ON POLITICAL PLATFORMS.—It seems almost incredible that a certain sanctimonious layman should have quoted the text, "Put off the old man, &c.," as a point against a political opponent who appears to be affectionately called "The Old Man" by his followers. If so, the fact proves how shallow the veneer of religion he professes must be, when such sacrilege is possible with him. No wonder somebody on the other side is moved to retort by a reference to "The Old Serpent." So quickly does evil beget evil: so surely does Nemesis come to him who sets a bad example to friends and enemies. "Perverting Scripture" is a fit occupation only for the evil one.

#### CHARITY.

We have received a communication informing us that a congregational chapel having been destroyed by fire in Kingston, the homeless worshippers were offered the use of an unconsecrated church building (not a church) for their meetings, until they could provide a suitable place for themselves. This communication takes what we may call a feeble-forcible view of the matter and denounces the loan in strong terms. We have concluded not to publish this letter, believing that the authorities concerned in that act are revealers of

the true charity of the Church. There is nothing in the Articles, Formularies or Canons of the Church forbidding directly or indirectly such an act of friendliness and sympathy towards Christians who believe in the Holy Trinity and the two greater Sacraments, whatever we may consider their misbeliefs in regard to the latter and other matters; and the petition which we offer up to be delivered from all "false doctrines, heresy and schism," is sufficiently lived up to by our abstention from attendance at their services. We draw the line of censure at the laws and principles laid down for us by the Church, whose abounding charity to individuals we cannot and would not circumscribe. While to our actions she has set her limits, beyond these there is freedom to benefit them and deserve their esteem and gratitude in all charitable ways, and we think we need not fear that godly dissenters will abuse the trust and confidence reposed in them—will be abused while we freely give them shelter under our roof in their distress. We therefore think our correspondent's alarm in this case is unfounded. The true object-lesson is one of charity, shown in a way which in no degree compromises the principles of the Church.

#### ENDOWMENTS—GOOD OR BAD?

Persons opposed to endowments on principle as being injurious in their action, invariably give, when pressed for particulars, as a reason for their opposition, this fact—a congregation able to pay its own expenses is relieved by endowments from the necessity of doing some part of its duty in that respect, and is tempted to fall short of its contributions proportionately. This indictment is true, and proves clearly enough that rich congregations should not be endowed, or, if endowed, their endowment should be modified so as to materially lessen, if not altogether remove, the evil effects. No doubt there are exceptional cases, as in the case of the mother church of a locality, which, being situated in the oldest part of the settlement—which naturally becomes deserted by the wealthier classes in course of time—gradually loses its congregational support, and becomes the refuge at last of only the very poorest classes.

On the other hand, noting the exceptions, the experience of ages in 10,000 cases has proved that where a congregation is *not* able to pay its own expenses, an endowment, judiciously measured and administered, gives a great impetus to Church work and liberality, encouraging the people to strive towards a standard of contribution, which, without adequate subsidy, they would despair of even being able to reach. Endowment, then, becomes a direct and powerful encouragement to exertion in Church support. Such is the experience of the mother country, where a double rule obtains in dealing with endowments; (i) to give no endowment where the congregation can pay its own way, and (ii) to measure endowments in other cases according to the need of help. A third rule is observed as a safeguard against *too rapid church extension*; no endowment is given unless the district concerned contains at least 4,000 souls. These three rules work with perfect satisfaction for the good of the Church. Our remarks so far have regard to parishes in rich and poor localities. Have they any application in the case of public institutions? The practical question in this case is, can endowments increase to such an extent as to not leave room for the exercise of a "live trust" on behalf of the people of each generation. Such cases may arise; they

at least can be imagined as possible. The possession of endowments not needed, or misused on account of excess, has been made the excuse for confiscation in the case of many monasteries and similar institutions, both in ancient and modern times. It is indeed the alleged cause for the process of disendowment in the case of churches. The facts being fully ascertained, it becomes the duty of a paternal and beneficent government to use "the doctrine of Cypres," by transferring endowments thus wasted or misused, in whole or in part, to kindred uses in the case of somewhat similar institutions. The consciousness of such an event, however, need not act as a deterrent, so as to prevent people from leaving their funds for the endowment of churches, orphanages, hospitals, &c. Posterity may be trusted to look after its own interests, and to carry out the spirit of a benevolent will whenever the mere letter of the will is found to fail. No founder of a hospital wishes to see his funds wasted some years after he has passed away, and the practice of government in the doctrine of "Cypres" is his safeguard, that they will not be wasted in the future any more than in the present. They who raise unreasonably the cry of "spoliation" when a government confiscates for benevolent purposes, are themselves furnishing the strongest argument against endowment, if it were not for the fact that their unreasonableness presently appears in time to discredit their cry. The public soon discovers if self interest dictates the cry, and it fails of its object.

#### BREADTH

In subjects connected with religion it would seem that men are more prone to invent catchwords and shibboleths than in any other. Such words are analogous to some political cries which are very taking, but are often of doubtful or dangerous import. Their real meaning is concealed beneath a certain glamour which the words themselves possess, and which serves to attract, and to a certain degree inspire many minds with a certain indefinite idea of the greatness of one "cause" or another which the words are used to represent; and when we say "indefinite idea" we speak advisedly, for were it not for such indefiniteness of conception, the words would lose more than half their importance. They are intended for the uninformed, the thoughtless and inconsiderate, and are projected into publicity for their acceptance by the genius of interested partizanship. But they are, for the most part, as shining tinsel and sounding brass, and as hollow as a drum. Look, for instance, at this oft reiterated word "breadth." The natural conception which it connotes in its inventor, as a catchword, betrays a consciousness of its inanity. For why did he not invent some word expressive of solid contents? He might have employed his genius in evolving some abstract word which would give the idea of a cube, a rhombohedron, a pyramid or a parallelopipedon, or a sphere, but he did not. His idea was of something indefinitely extensive, very flat, with nothing below and nothing above it. Therefore he chose the word "breadth"—in which two dimensions only, length and breadth, are involved, and the third, *depth*, is excluded. It is true that the above named solid forms might be conceived by the malicious to be *hollow*, but not very likely, by the general public, who, seeing the elaborate pretensions to strength (mental) and power of manipulation, might the more easily be duped. Yea, even the very elect might have been the more readily deceived had this inventor stop-