

suggestions of various sanity and practicability were made with a view to improving the Church, nobody seemed to hint at the fallacy of the proposition, but accepted it as axiomatic. This yielding by Christian people to any accusation made without proof is what I wish to protest against, and would like the traducers of the Church to be more accurately informed. Either the sources of their information are unreliable, or they accept as a fact, without investigation, what popularly is indicted. Again the fallacy has the undoubted effect of discouraging many from the Christian way who fear their experience would prove unsatisfactory, or their faith inoperative. I wish, therefore, to challenge the statement that the Church is waning, that Christianity is less or that the outlook is gloomy; and to further express my conviction, drawn from sound premises, that the social, moral and spiritual elevation of the human race rests with the Church and her allied forces.

I look upon the Church as the representative of God and I further believe that through this institution God will work his plans for the salvation of mankind, for the uprooting of evil forces, and for the bringing in of the Kingdom of Christ.

Before undertaking the responsibility of so serious a subject I secured the opinion of a wide scope of critics as a foundation on which to build my superstructure. Choosing my men from various quarters I asked the unvarying question: "What's wrong with the Church?" and I was not long left without a cloud of witnesses against her. The first indictment was serious. My informant gave his evidence to the effect that the Church was too much absorbed in the affairs of men's souls. Meanwhile, he asserted, their bodies were neglected, hence the Church was a failure in this practical age. My next interview was with a good soul returning from a class meeting. He had had a heavenly time and the question brought him down to earthly things. "I will tell you what's wrong with the Church. She has ceased to be concerned with the souls of men and gives time, energy and thought entirely to material things. Institutional Churches have sprung up, clubs for literature and music, and even entertainments with chicken and bun feeds are held more often than enquiry meetings. The Church acts as though man had no soul."

Thus edified I went to one who held an office to investigate cases of distress. It was his opinion that the Church created paupers by indiscriminate giving; that she was an easy mark, and any person with a hard luck tale could get around the Church. She was the prey of all, but could bring none to self-reliance or even to repentance. In other words, she was too easily sympathetic.

The next time the question was asked it was to a representative of many organizations as his emblematic buttons testified. His answer revealed to me that the Church does not fulfil her whole duty. She leaves it to Societies outside her communion to give to the poor, the sick and the needy. If she took care of these there would be an end of many of her problems, and people would believe in her, but until that time others must take her place and share her honors.

"The Church is too ancient," said another. "Times have changed. The Church has perpetuated the first century and projected it into the twentieth. What hope is there for an institution so backward, so behind the times?"