

reference to Christ and His teaching, are being treated to a reform at the instance of Sir Bryan O'Loughlen, who has given notice of motion, in the Victorian Assembly at Melbourne, to have all such passages restored to their place in the literature of the rising generation. Their absence proved demoralizing! Canada, take warning.

QUEBEC CHURCH LIBERALITY.—The admirable result of twenty-five years' good management in this diocese is well illustrated by the facts that incapacitated clergymen have a pension of \$400 to \$600 per annum: while the widows of clergymen receive a pension of \$400 per annum, with a yearly allowance of \$50 extra for each child. The success of the Quebec system is attracting the notice of the dioceses in the United States.

"UNION COMMUNION" AT GRINDELWALD.—The idea of a "Common Communion" having been set aside, there comes into view the probability of some of the dissenters presenting themselves for communion at a celebration at the Church of England Chaplaincy Altar. Earl Nelson and others seem to think that this act should be "winked" at. Priests will find that "winking" rather difficult, as the rule is *express and emphatic*, "None shall be admitted . . . until," &c.

WHO ARE THE "WORKING CLASSES?"—One of the points made by the Bishop of Rochester on the Sunday question consisted in rescuing this phrase from common misuse, as if it were not applicable in the fullest sense to the laymen and hard-working classes of shop-keepers, shop clerks, business women, and professional men of small means. These people, he argues, would appreciate museums, &c., as ordinary manual laborers cannot be expected to do.

"THE ENGLISH SUNDAY" is happily a characteristic feature of English life, as contrasted with the "continental Sunday"—which no one desires to see introduced. The question, of course, is how far the puritan strictness of the former may be relaxed without introducing the profanation and secularization involved in the latter. Dean Stanley thought Sunday to be a day for bringing the hard workers into unaccustomed contact with the higher beauties of nature and art—from which they are debarred.

QUEBEC EPISCOPAL ELECTION.—Certain writers in the newspapers have been making free with the names of such men as the Bishop of Niagara and Canon DuMoulin in the most impertinent and unjustifiable manner—assuming either that they would, or would not, accept the election, whereas these writers know nothing about it. The canvass of such a point in the public press is in the worst taste and most embarrassing to those whose names are thus freely bandied about. Such speculations are not only premature—for the gentlemen so named are too modest to entertain the question before their election takes place—but they are mean and impertinent to a degree.

CALLING AND HIRING MINISTERS.

The scandalous subversion of Christian principle involved in this practice is one which, happily, the Church of England knows very little anywhere in its broad communion or in cognate sections of the Christian Church. The idea of sheep selecting and engaging their shepherd, of pupils forming a contract with a new master to teach them *what they please* and know already, is so absurdly contrary to the fundamental principle of the Church

Apostolic, as described in the Scriptures—so destructive of sound doctrine and of the entire analogy of the Faith, that there has been comparative immunity from that plague of popularism wherever Christianity has been propagated in regular historical succession of teaching and discipline. The natural and inevitable tendency of any such system to create a time-serving subordination of priest to people, and to stereotype a narrow-minded ignorance as a substitute for broad and comprehensive exposition of the whole truth of the Catholic Faith, has been so abhorrent to the temper of the Church of our fathers, that little has been suffered in the way of damage from this source.

"CORRUPTIO OPTIMI PESSIMA,"

however, is a sound maxim of experience in most things, and it is markedly true of any section of the Church which is foolish enough to subject the maintenance of Gospel Truth to any such crazy machinery as obtains among the ordinary run of people-made sects. The course down hill is rapid, and the depth of degradation excessive, in all such cases of corruption. The picture of a diocese given over to popular election of the ministers of its various parishes is something fearful to contemplate. The worst of it is that the ministry itself has to sink with the mass of corruption. Every man who is "worth his salt" in a religious point of view, feels that his time would be wasted in such an atmosphere, and would sooner become a hermit than remain as partner amid such surroundings. But too many will remain behind—"to do as the people wish"—deluding themselves and their supporters into the fancy that they are maintaining the Gospel message. Some narrow view of doctrine or sentiment is travelled over and over again, with adventitious adornments—"served up to taste"—and the people "love to have it so." They are to be pleased—that is all—edification is out of the question.

SEEKING A CALL.

We have heard of a parish in a certain diocese in which four or five clergymen met at one and the same time, and found they were there on the same errand—fishing for the popular vote! All but one of them retired from the field in disgust at themselves and the circumstances, when the persevering but remaining brother sank into the mire and became part of it. There are already too many such cases. Another sign of the times is seen more frequently—the plan of holding a parish vacant for six months or so to be served by a succession of "preachers" *on trial*, until the local magnates, the lay popes, are satisfied to try one of the number of aspirants. And yet the bishops are armed with abundant power to right this terrible evil, if they only had the moral courage to face the first odium of resisting the popular will and hindering this headlong rush to spiritual destruction. Better that half the churches—yea, nine-tenths—should be shut up for years under an Episcopal interdict, than that the precious message of the Gospel should be narrowed to suit the caprice of local popular taste and fancy.

SEPARATE SCHOOLS—AND CHURCHES.

The recent statement made—in connection with a visit of a Methodist deputation to Ottawa, seeking support for their missionary enterprises in the North-west—by the Government authorities, on the subject of subsidies to religious works, seems likely to agitate public opinion into a shape which may be productive of something solid and tangible in the way of religious support. It has been a curious feature in the platform of those who have

been most energetic and enthusiastic in their denunciations of the Separate School system, that it has never seemed to strike their illogical brains that they are using arguments against the toleration of "separate Churches" just as much as against separate schools. If, by any process, however tedious and roundabout, that bit of sound logical consistency can be made to reach their brains, there will be some hope for a *consensus* of opinion on separate schools for different denominations. The "roundabout way" of convincing them seems to come from that land of experiments—the North-west Territories. When Methodist agents ask for Government support on behalf of their missions, what may we not hope for?

WHY NOT?

If it is right to extend any degree of help to Roman or Anglican missions, certainly there seems good reason for considering the claims of Methodist and Presbyterian, as well as other religious enterprises. The *Mail* report says "Mr. Abbott stated that the Government recognized, of course, the principle . . . and that the establishment of a new system was in contemplation by which all denominations will receive equitable treatment on a *per capita* basis." Again we say, why not? The underlying idea, of course, is—whatever superficial editorials may say—that all such religious enterprises have a common recognizable element of value from the official, governmental point of view; their tendency is to produce order and virtue of substantial and solid use to the edification of the commonwealth. There is no logic or reason in objecting to help them because they do not think alike on all subjects—because they have their individual peculiarities—the useful element of peace and order is there all the same. Horses, as a class, are useful for drawing loads, though they do differ so much in breed, size, weight, colour and other peculiarities.

THE PRINCIPLE OF TOLERATION

is the basis of the *concordat*, by means of which different denominations are permitted to co-exist in the modern community. That they are, as a rule, not simply harmless, but useful, is only to advance one step further in intelligence. Of course, a line must always be drawn *somewhere*, even in the most tolerant communities—it will not do to tolerate "Prince Michaels" and other subverters of public and private morality. That idea, of course, also assumes that the state recognizes some sort of moral code—a set of principles which are beneficial for the common weal. If any sect infringes on these principles, it forfeits its right to state toleration—that is, toleration by the other "sects," or sections of the community. If, in addition to the state's code of morality or ethics, a denomination teaches some positive doctrines which tend to solidify and edify the community on recognized beneficial lines—that denomination earns thereby not only toleration, but support. The state which refuses to recognize its duty of supporting, or subsidizing, beneficial elements in the national life—whether in the technical "religious" arena or otherwise—acts foolishly in a suicidal way.

SUPPORT FOLLOWS TOLERATION

in logical sequence, according to circumstances, and in degrees co-ordinate with the beneficial influence. If the government can perceive no appreciable difference in the value (to itself and the country) of the various tolerated sects, it is quite consistent and wise in adopting a *per capita* basis in regard to their support. The more "heads" any sect has to illustrate, practice and spread its beneficial influence (its peculiarities being suppos-