

declares that the gospel is the only true civilizer, and that if this were all, it is worth while to send Christian missionaries to the field.

If Canon Taylor thinks missions a failure, he ought to have been wrecked, like a certain Scotch seaman, on that island in the South Sea, where, eight years before, a whole ship's crew were thrown ashore, escaping the devouring jaws of an angry sea only to be roasted in cannibal ovens and eaten by remorseless savages; yet here natives in English dress and with English words of welcome now pulled their canoes toward the sinking ship, eager to rescue the perishing and invite them to hospitable Christian homes. Has Canon Taylor heard Mr. Culvert and Mr. Webb tell the story of Fijian missions? How heathenism has been so swept away that the visitor cannot believe that those people, polite as Parisians and honest as Norwegians, were wild cannibal a generation ago! How, out of less than 112,000 Fijians, over 100,000 are attendants on Christian worship! How, where fifty years ago there was not one Christian, there is to-day not one avowed heathen! How there are over 1,200 places of Christian worship and not one cannibal oven or heathen temple! And yet Christian missions are "a great failure"! Is it not rather the Canon himself?

The argument by which the Canon would reduce Christian missions to an absurdity is itself capable of an easy *reductio ad absurdum*. He calculates that at the present rate it would take from 300,000 to 1,000,000 years to convert the world—a result rather remote for any of us now living to hope to see! What a shallow argument against missions! Shall we haul down the flag of the cross before this noisy cannonade? Behold the logical inference as to all other work—reformatory, benevolent, philanthropic. What if it can be demonstrated that, notwithstanding the Herculean labor of temperance reformers, it would take, at the present rate, a million years to make every man a total abstainer or even to clear the world of drunkards, would that prove the temperance work a failure or lessen the value of individuals already rescued and homes already redeemed from this curse? Give the Canon's argument a broad enough application, and all existing philanthropies would cease to-morrow! There are in operation a thousand forms in which unselfishness ministers to want or woe—asylums for the blind and deaf, the incurable, the cripple, the insane; refuges for homeless orphans and midnight missions for lost women; soup-houses and coffee-rooms for the poor, night-schools and lodging-houses for bootblacks and newsboys. Blindness, prostitution, crime are said to be on the increase. All our best efforts cannot overtake human poverty and misery. Shall we then pronounce all beneficent work a failure and abandon all eleemosynary institutions?

This is a "distinguished clergyman of the Church of England." Well, how does he measure values? After the law of a carnal commandment, or after the power of an endless life? Results that affect