

others. The Kingston Chapters have kindly undertaken to provide hospitality for all delegates and authenticated visitors. Address Mr. Frank King, secretary hospitality committee, Kingston.

I enclose you two blank forms; will you kindly fill them up or get the rector or director to do so, and return one to me at above address, keeping the duplicate for your Chapter, being careful to fill in name and number. These are wanted at least by the 10th of January next, and I would ask you to fill in the answers as fully and carefully as possible, as it is upon these that the council base their yearly report to the convention. Even if there is hardly anything to report, please fill in as well as you can, as we want to hear from every Chapter. You will receive a circular and programme of the convention shortly from Kingston. Yours faithfully,

SPENCER WAUGH, General Secretary.  
Toronto, Dec. 23rd, 1892.

#### REVIEWS.

THE CHURCH'S MEANS OF GRACE: Church Club Lectures for 1892. Price \$1.00. New York: Young, 1892.

The Church Club does well in continuing these valuable series of lectures on the position and character of the Church. In the present volume, the "Sacramental Ordinances" are dealt with—namely, the two "Sacraments of the Gospel," Baptism and the Lord's Supper, and the other five ordinances "commonly called Sacraments" before the Reformation, Confirmation, Holy Orders, Penance, Holy Matrimony, and Unction. The lectures were delivered in New York by Professor Clark of Trinity College, Dr. G. M. Fiske of Providence, R. I., Dr. W. L. Robbins, Dean of Albany; Bishop Garrett of Texas; and Bishop Grafton of Fond du Lac. Generally speaking these lectures represent the Anglican position, and are worthy of extensive circulation.

HOW TO READ THE PROPHETS: Part III. Jeremiah, by Rev. Buchanan Blake, B.D. Price 4/. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark; New York: Scribner, 1892.

This is an excellent continuation of Mr. Blake's previous publications on Isaiah and the minor prophets. There is on every page evidence of scholarship, and of careful and accurate work on the sacred document; none of the prophets are quite easy reading, and Jeremiah is not one of the easiest. We are continually in need of historical and other guidance; and we have it here quite sufficiently provided. With Professor Cheyne's useful book on the "Men of the Bible," the revised version, and this book of Mr. Blake's any one may know all that can be known of this prophet and his times.

#### THE LORD BISHOP OF MANCHESTER ON DISESTABLISHMENT AND DISENDOWMENT.

I believe that at this hour there is nothing in the world so indestructible as the Church of Christ. Empires may rise and fall, republics may prosper and fall into ruins, philosophies, sciences, social organizations may succeed each other in endless variety, but the Church of Christ will exist through them all and survive them all, giving them whatever of true strength they possess while they are passing across the stage of time; and using them all in turn to prepare her own ultimate triumph. You may rob the Church of Christ and strip her as bare as she was when she came into the world; but weaken her or subdue her you cannot, so long as the spirit of her heavenly Master dwells in her heart and inspires her life. And because I believe the Church of England to be a true branch of the Church of Christ, I believe that this is true of her also. Whoever else may despair of the future of the Church of England, it is not for one to do so who presided over her affairs for nine prosperous years, in a colony where she had nothing to depend upon but her own inherent powers. But while I say all this and believe it, it does not follow that I shall approve of the disestablishment of the National Church. I say, and I believe, that in a free country a man of character, energy, and ability is sure to make his way. But it does not follow that I shall agree that he will make his way all the better if you rob him of his capital and turn him into the street to shift for himself. On the contrary, such treatment would make his career all the more difficult, as robbing him of his resources

and destroying his faith in a community which could treat him so unjustly. It may be true that very often good comes out of evil, but that is no reason why we should do the evil. The Church of England might live and flourish in spite, but certainly not because of disendowment. She would suffer by the process, and so would the nation which had made her the victim of such an act of injustice. I call disendowment an act of injustice, because I can see no justification for it. The Church gained her lands honestly, not from the State, but from the pious gifts of her own children. She received them upon a certain trust, that by means of them she should teach to Englishmen the pure Gospel of Jesus Christ. I believe that she has been faithful to that trust. According to her light, all through the ages she has tried to build up in this realm of England the kingdom of God. When, at the time of the Reformation, her light was greatly increased, she gave to her children the benefit of that light, and ever since, with the failure and imperfection, no doubt, which is incident to all human effort, she has, on the whole, faithfully and diligently striven to declare to the people the whole counsel of God. Nobody accuses her to-day of spiritual deadness, or slackness in work, nor even of want of success. The great majority of the people of England and Wales belong by profession to her communion, and in spite of all her faults look upon her as their spiritual mother and best friend. She has covered the land with churches for the adults and with schools for the children of the poor. No one, again, in these days of reduced tithes and glebes accuses her of being too wealthy. If her revenues are not justly distributed, that may be a reason for reform—it is none for wholesale spoliation. An unbeliever is no doubt consistent in desiring her ruin, for he believes that what she is teaching is pernicious error; but that is hardly a reason which can be alleged by any one calling himself a Christian. On what ground, then, of reason or equity, is her disendowment urged by those who have announced that this proposition is a burning political question? Mr. Gladstone has told us that he considers he can justify his proposed action on the principle of religious equality. Let us endeavour, then, to understand, if we can, what is the meaning of these vague and high-sounding words. There are certain persons amongst us who advocate social equality, and they desire to produce this equality by robbing all those who possess private property, and making the income of the poorest, the idlest, and the most helpless the measure of what any one shall be allowed to possess. Is this the way in which, by means of disendowment, it is desired to establish the principle of religious equality? Does it mean, for instance, that if the Wesleyan Methodists are found to possess corporate property which they have derived from the liberality of the past, they shall be made to surrender it to the State, or to share it with the newest and poorest sects of Dissenters? If not, then with what show of equity can you demand in the name of religious equality that the Church of England shall be stripped of property which, in like manner, she has received from the liberality of the past? "Oh, no," some may say, "that is not my meaning at all. I would rob the Church of England, because her property gives her an unfair advantage in the sectarian competition for proselytes." But who has instituted that competition? Is it the Church of England, which is doing all it can now, as in former ages, to supply the religious needs of the population, or those Nonconformists who have seceded from her communion and are doing what they can to win her members? How would it sound if manufacturers with a small capital were to raise a cry for the impoverishment of greater capitalists in order to give them a better chance in trade competition? Who started the competition? Did not the smaller capitalists; and may they not justly, then, be asked to bear the inconvenient results of the difficulty which they have themselves created? Again, are there none who have a right to a voice in the settlement of this question besides the competing sects? There are two classes of our population for whom the voluntary system has shown itself unable to provide—the small agricultural populations scattered over our country districts, and the large and poor town populations which occupy the central districts of our great cities. With respect to these latter, Bishop Lightfoot declared:

"In the largest town of my Diocese, the borough of Sunderland, during the six years of my Episcopate no less than five Dissenting chapels were purchased by the Church. It was the necessity of the position which forced them to the sale."

The people who could afford to support voluntary churches had gone into the suburbs, and the voluntary churches were obliged to follow them, and to leave the poorest and most helpless—that is, the most spiritually needy—without any religious instruction or ordinances. How would it be with us in Manchester if the Church were robbed of her endowments? If we take away the endowments received by the poorest parishes in Manchester from the estates of the Dean and Chapter, we find that

there will be left twenty benefices with under £50 a year, twenty-one with under £100 a year, nine with under £150 a year, and fifteen with under £200 a year—that is, in these poor parishes there are sixty-five benefices which would have under £200 a year. How could any man live and maintain the necessary organizations in those populous parishes on such incomes? The result must be that, like the Dissenters, we should have to abandon the parishes where the people were poorest and most miserable. And now, I ask you, when these poor people had lost the help and godly ministrations of their Christian pastors, how much consolation would they find in the knowledge that the Church of England was as impotent to do them good as any of the other denominations; that if there was helplessness, there was at least an equality of helplessness? "Oh, but," perhaps it may be urged by some, "that is not exactly what I mean when I object to religious inequality. What I mean is this—that it is not equitable that the members of one religious denomination should contribute to the maintenance of the ministers of another." Well, but now, again, let us try to understand a little more exactly the real ground of such an objection. Do you mean that you think it unjust that you should be compelled to give something which you have the right to withhold, or only that you should be compelled to pay to a Christian Church a debt which you lawfully owe to it? If you mean the former, you are objecting to a thing that is non-existent. No man in England is compelled to give to any religious denomination anything which is lawfully his own. The abolition of church rates took away the last possible ground for such an objection. But if you mean the latter, I would ask you to reflect on the true nature and necessary consequences of such a doctrine. A religious denomination in Victoria owns a large block of buildings in Melbourne, one portion of which is rented by a celebrated man who does not belong to that denomination. He pays a large rent and knows that it is applied to the propagation of tenets of which he disapproves. Is he then at liberty to refuse to pay his rent? Assuredly not, you will say. But why not? Because he chose to enter into a contract to pay that rent. So it is with respect to tithes, for instance, in the Church of England. The man who buys land subject to tithe buys it for a less sum than he would have to pay if there had been no tithe. The tithe is not his. He has not bought it. As Mr. Hammond very fairly puts it, if he objects to tithe he may refuse to purchase the land, or he may arrange to redeem the tithe. "But it is not open to him to buy that land subject to tithe, paying so much less for it for that reason, and then decline to pay," either for alleged conscientious reasons or any other. The principle of religious equality has nothing to do with the payment of honest debts. If, however, this principle be evoked to justify the plunder of the Church of England, it must be evoked also for the plunder of every endowed religious body. There must be equality of spoliation. I believe that the allegation of a transference of religious endowments at the Reformation from one Church to another is utterly opposed to historical truth. A man does not cease to be the same man because he changes his opinions on some subject, and neither did the Church of England cease to be the same Church because it changed its mind as to certain comparatively modern superstitions and ecclesiastical usurpations. But even if it were otherwise, no one will deny that property given by private persons to the Church of England since the Reformation belongs to her to-day. We learn from Mr. Hore's history of the Church of England such facts as these—than during the first fifty years of the present Queen's reign

"No fewer than 2,000 churches were built in England and 8,000 works of restoration effected, entailing altogether an expenditure of £80,000,000; and that the income derived from property given to the Church since the Reformation amounts to about £2,500,000—a sum larger than is derived from its pre-Reformation endowments."

This money has been given as directly to the Protestant Church of England as any of the endowments of the Nonconformists have been given to them. What reason, then, can be assigned why the Church of England should be robbed and the Dissenters spared? It is not, however, on such grounds or by such considerations that this great question will be finally decided. At present there are 14,000 beneficed clergymen in England, compelled to live among their poor parishioners, and constrained by every consideration of duty, and even of care for their personal reputes, to give them instruction and assistance, friendship in their health, counsel in their difficulties, aid in their poverty, sympathy in their sickness, and comfort in their afflictions. These men, provided with a home and a very moderate income, frequently carry into the poorer districts of England, the small villages, and central town districts, no inconsiderable income of their own. It is proposed at one fell stroke to deprive these men of their homes and incomes, and even of the churches in which they minister. But if they are in consequence withdrawn, and their