

those who have the responsibility of making the choice have reason to know that he has the qualifications necessary for his new post. That Mr. Festing has these qualifications in a very high degree comes to us on testimony which it is impossible to question. We are able to confirm these statements. Mr. Festing succeeded one of the best parish priests in London, at Christ Church, Albany St., the Rev. Henry Burrows, now Canon of Rochester; and it is no slight testimony in his favour, that, under his Incumbency, the Parish has retained all its old power and influence.

MR. STANLEY AND LORD SALISBURY.—We give in another column a portion of Mr. Stanley's letter to the *Times* on the subject of the occupation of Africa, and in reply to Lord Salisbury's remarks on Mr. Stanley's warnings. Lord Salisbury had said that Mr. Stanley seemed to be assuming too lightly that Germany had been permitted to have everything her own way, whereas nothing had yet been settled. Mr. Stanley's reply is a little too elaborately ironical. We do not presume to intervene in this controversy; but Mr. Stanley's letter deserves consideration.

DR. DÖELLINGER AND THE OLD CATHOLICS.—Our readers are aware that the ecclesiastical position of Dr. Döellinger at the time of his death has been a subject of controversy. The late Mr. H. N. Oxenham alleged that the great Munich Divine had severed his connexion with the Old Catholics, although no one pretends that he had accepted the Vatican decrees. The testimony of Dr. Friedrich, quoted in the *CANADIAN CHURCHMAN*, has, however, set the matter at rest, as Prebendary Meyrick declares in the following letter to the *Guardian*: SIR—I am glad that it is now acknowledged that Döellinger was an old Catholic *once*, for even that, preposterous as the idea is, has been denied in your columns by Mr. Oxenham formerly and by "C." lately. I am at a loss to see why the passing record of a passing conversation held with Döellinger in 1879 by an English tourist should be evidence, "the only evidence of any value," as to Döellinger's later sympathies and Professor Friedrich's declaration in 1890 that the statement that Döellinger had ever separated himself from the Old Catholics, is "the reverse of the truth," and his further declaration that Döellinger "continued till death an Old Catholic," should *not* be evidence. Is it supposed that Friedrich did not know Döellinger's mind?

TU QUOQUE.—Controversy is never quite easy, and for many persons it is decidedly unsafe. We hear that the "Catholic Truth Society" have been circulating an impudent letter to working men in which all the old fallacies about Protestantism being the religion of Henry VIII., and the like misstatements, are furbished up again and repeated. Tho Rev. Beauchamp Stannus has rejoined with a reply, the only defect in which is that it is a little too long. But he presents his case pithily. For instance, he writes: "You have drawn our attention to Henry the Eighth as described by Chas. Dickens—'a disgrace to human nature.' We do not derive our religion from him, nor from popes who have been his rivals in wickedness." As to "confession to a priest," Mr. Stannus observes: "The case of Judas is the only one recorded. He went and hanged himself. We do not wish to follow such a bad example." Perhaps this is too flippantly put, as the incident is hardly a subject for jesting. About Mariolatry he reminds the Catholic that "in the city of the Pope there are annually twenty feasts of our Lord to thirty-nine of the Virgin."

AN APOLOGY.—The attention of the Editor has been drawn to the letter of a correspondent of this paper which contains an attack on a lady formerly resident in Toronto. The Editor need not say that he had no part in the insertion of that letter; and he now expresses his deep regret that it should have appeared. He is assured, on every side, that there is not the least ground for the imputation contained in that letter. He is informed that the lady thus assailed is the author of countless acts of beneficence in the city of Toronto, performed in the most unostentatious manner. But apart from these considerations, the remarks made were utterly unworthy of a paper conducted on Christian principles. The Editor will do his best to prevent the recurrence of such an outrage; and he can assure the readers of this paper, that he has every reason to hope that his efforts will be so seconded by those who co-operate with him, that no such oversight will take place again.

OUR CIVILIZATION.

Two questions are continually asked respecting our modern civilization. Are men better and happier than they were in former days? This is the most common. The second is this: Can we be satisfied with our actual civilization? The former of these questions is not easily answered. Even if we declare that, in most respects, we are better and happier than our forefathers were, we are forced to confess that there is something to be said on the other side; and, finally, that it is not easy to institute a satisfactory comparison between a state of things which is present with us and one which has passed away.

In dealing with the second question we must be regulated a good deal, or perhaps altogether, by our own point of view, or rather, by our own ideal of human excellence and happiness. Now, there are undoubtedly a certain number of Optimists among us, who are never weary of "slurring the days gone by," and holding forth on the glories of the present. But it is undeniable that these self-congratulatory persons can hardly be said to belong to the best classes among our literary men, our theologians, or our scientific men. It would appear that there is a certain tone of sadness among our higher minds, and it is not quite safe for us to ignore this tendency.

When the theologian places himself as a *laudator acti temporis*, the common inference is that he is simply lamenting over the downfall of his own favourite system. When, however, the man of science raises a Jeremiad, such a criticism is no longer possible; for science has triumphed "all along the line," and if its triumphs are not accompanied by a kind of social millennium, then no such golden age can be hoped for as the result of science. And this is very much the position taken by Professor Huxley in some recent articles in the *Nineteenth Century*.

This eminent man of science feels deeply, as every thoughtful man must feel, that the end of all true human work is the amelioration of society. This is the end of all knowledge, of all effort, of all legislation, of all evangelization. If this end is not attained, then our work is, more or less, in vain. If the Church is not making society better and purer and nobler, then the Church is labouring in vain, and it is high time for her to look to her methods, and to her actions; to ask what her ideal has been, and how far she has done her best to realize it, and has succeeded or failed. And so with every other form and department of human thought and work. "Assuredly," says

Professor Huxley, "if I believed that any of the schemes hitherto proposed for bringing about social amelioration were likely to attain their end, I should think what remains to me of life well spent in furthering it." And these are words which will be taken up by every philanthropist, whether he calls himself a Christian or by any other name.

But Professor Huxley is by no means contented with things as they are. "Even the best of modern civilization," he says, "appears to me to exhibit a condition of mankind which neither embodies any worthy ideal nor even possesses the merit of stability. I do not hesitate to express the opinion, that, if there is no hope of a large improvement of the condition of the greater part of the human family; if it is true that the increase of knowledge, the winning of a greater dominion over Nature which is its consequences, and the wealth which follows upon that dominion, are to make no difference in the extent and the intensity of Want, with its concomitant physical and moral degradation, among the masses of the people, I should hail the advent of some kindly comet, which would sweep the whole affair away, as a desirable consummation."

Now, let us remark, this is the judgment of a learned and thoughtful man, who is doing his best to look at human society as it is, and who wants to do his very best for it. And what does he suggest as a remedy for the state of things which he deplures? He says he would return to the analogy of the Family, and he would find in the government of the Family the best rule for the constitution of human society at large.

Now, let us ask, what this counsel says to us as Christians. As far as we can understand it, it sends us back to the Christian ideal. Mr. Huxley says that we have no worthy ideal. By that he means that we recognize no worthy ideal as our guide. But the ideal which he wishes to set before us is simply that of the Gospel, of Christianity, of the Christian Church. We have one Father, and all we are brethren. Here is the cure for the evils of the age; and how shall we apply it? There will be many questions debated at the meetings of our Synods, and some of them may be of secondary importance; a good many of them will have no claim even to that rank. But what place will be given to this fundamental question? Our civilization is not satisfactory. There is only one way of even endeavouring to put it in the right way. Are we going to ask how this may be done?

THE DIOCESE OF TORONTO.

We hope to give some account of the state of the Church in the various Canadian dioceses, from the facts brought out at the Synods now being held. Beginning with Toronto, we find the account given by the Bishop in his charge to be, at least, fairly satisfactory. He congratulates the diocese on the prevalence of peace within its borders; although he is forced to rebuke some of the congregations; and emphatically a very prominent one, for their want of liberality.

One of the most serious facts mentioned by the Bishop is the small number of baptisms in the diocese. It can hardly be thought that this arises from the small number of births, as seems to be the case with the Presbyterian congregation of Dr. J. Hall, of New York. In the States it seems to be getting unfashionable to have children; but, by God's blessing, we are, so far, preserved from coming to this pass in Canada. But it is sad to think that children should be born of Christian parents who are not recognized as having a right to a place in the Christian covenant. Does it pro-