

sole return of an occupancy of four hours a week. And this will be managed and brought about and borne by gentlemen who would consider the same course in their private affairs as a *prima facie* qualification for the lunatic asylum.

Ask any member of a vestry which will build a church to cost a quarter of a million, on a lot that is worth a hundred thousand more, for occupancy one hundred and four hours in a year, what he would think of one who would invest three hundred thousand in a residence which he proposed to occupy nine days in the three hundred and sixty-five; and he would tell you the man must be a madman or a fabulous millionaire. And yet this same vestryman, a member of a Church, which, as we have said, is always in the highway begging, which never has enough, which pleads and implores for more,—this vestryman, we say, will coolly become one of a half dozen to do, in Church financiering and investing, just this amazing performance. Over all the country the Church has enormous and unproductive investments of this sort,—hundreds of thousands of dollars locked up in stone and mortar, to be used four hours a week, and to be utterly useless all the rest.

We are not blaming people for investing largely in church building. We have no fault to find with costly and grand churches. Buildings of that sort are always a legitimate method of investment for Church funds.

What we want to call attention to, is the fact that we do not use them. We build them and lock them up. We keep them, as in some neighborhoods, we have heard, they used to keep a "best room"—the largest, airiest, most attractive, and best furnished room in the house—shut up and closely curtained, into which nobody enters, except on occasion of a wedding or a funeral, or when "the minister" comes to tea. Our churches are our best rooms. We have no rooms in our houses now, shut up like hermetically-sealed cans, and too good for family use; but we erect costly churches as "best rooms" for the community, and let nobody peep in except on state occasions,—and, unfortunately, these state occasions are very rare and far apart.

We have done nothing extraordinary yet in church building in America, and it is very evident, from what we have here discoursed upon, that we are not likely to do much at present. There is a self-imposed limit on absurdity, and that limit is reached when people build a church, costing three hundred thousand dollars, for use four hours in a week. They really will not go on and build one costing five hundred thousand for that purpose. We think the other is the limit that can be depended on. Of course, to build one costing a million or two,—a cathedral,—for that extent of use, is too glaring an absurdity for even building committees, in this great country, to perpetrate in cool blood.

Matters are bad enough as they are, and we never hear of the proposed erection of "an elegant and costly church" without a sigh,—so much more capital buried.

For, as we see, we have not learned what to do with our elegant and costly churches. We will not be guilty of so poor a jest as to suppose that any sane man can dream that "an elegant and costly church" is really to stand like an empty jail, on the street, all the year round, except those four poor hours on a Sunday. A religion that wants a church only four hours on Sunday, is a very absurd and recklessly extravagant religion, if it wants an elegant and costly one. That sort of religion never built elegant or costly churches in the past. It never put two stones together in a cathedral. It is a religion that built wooden meeting-houses in America, and "little Bethels" of red brick, for "protracted meetings" and tea-drinkings in England. When it takes to building churches, unless that act is a prophecy of better things to come, it is only *dilettante* af-

fection. Perhaps there is something of the first extant among us, but thus far there has been a fearful deal of the latter in our attempts at Church architecture.

We are every day making religion more and costly, more and more a luxury, and not a necessity of life. It will soon be as far away from ordinary people, for common use, as turtle-soup and ortolans from their dinners. When it costs religion an investment of from one to five hundred thousand dollars capital to house itself for two hundred and eight hours in a year, it does not need much skill in figures to see that to provide it house room—not for nine days, but for the whole three hundred and sixty-five—will require an amount of outlay which is entirely hopeless of attainment.

We need scarcely make the evident suggestion that our elegant and costly churches might be used to much better purpose. It would not hurt them to air them, occasionally, on other days than Sundays. Also to make the most use of our invested capital, it requires no wonderful wisdom to discern that there are twelve hours in a day on Sunday, as on all other days—twelve, and not four—and, having digested that fact, it might occur to us that a much larger number of people—indeed, two or three quite different congregations, one or two free—might occupy the same house without interfering. Moreover, a neat building which will accommodate our Sunday-school for two hours a week might, quite as easily, accommodate our parish school six hours a day, and be free, then, for a night school besides.

We are doing a good deal in the way of those permanent investments of the Lord's money in stone, or brick and mortar; but thus far, as we have hinted, we have not done much to make these investments yield adequate returns. It would seem that the time has come to study up this matter a little and discover what churches are built for, and for what purpose money is put into their walls and roofs. It strikes us, at times, that some of our parishes, which have become possessed of elegant and costly churches, are very much in the position of the man who drew the elephant in the lottery. They have one advantage over him, however. The parish can "close the church for the season," and be rid of the elephant during the hot weather.—From "Copy," by the Right Rev. Hugh Miller Thompson.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

An able letter over the *nom de plume* of "Churchman" appeared in the *Toronto Globe* of the 31st July in regard to the coming Provincial Synod, suggesting various matters requiring early consideration by that Assembly. Amongst these is that already referred to by us in previous numbers of the *GUARDIAN*, viz., the relative powers of the Provincial Assembly and of the Diocesan Synods. This we regard as the most pressing of all subjects, in view of the cry of "diocesan autonomy" raised whenever any particular local interest is, or is thought to be, interfered with in behalf of the Church as a whole. If the system of Provincial and Diocesan Synods mean anything, the former must possess powers not only greater than the latter, and of more general character, but also of control over the several dioceses forming this Ecclesiastical Province in so far as any local matter or interest affects the Church at large. And there are many such matters; and whenever they have been mooted in the Provincial Synod the bugbear of diocesan rights and diocesan autonomy has immediately been raised. The interests of the Church in this Ecclesiastical Province imperatively de-

mand an early and careful consideration of this question and a definite expression of the powers claimed and to be enforced by the General Assembly of the Church.

ANOTHER matter referred to by "Churchman" was the *name*; and he seemed to favor a change. This we cannot regard as desirable, nor do we believe the matter one of sufficient importance to occupy any portion of the time coming Synod. The writer is not quite accurate, we think, in stating the position of the Church in Canada relatively to the Mother Church, and is most unfortunate in his statements as to the Church of Rome being the "established" Church of the Province of Quebec. That we deny, and fail to find any such recognition of it in the Cession and the Agreement following, or in the Acts of the Imperial Parliament. And such statements only serve to strengthen the already too prevalent feeling of aggression on the part of the Roman Catholic element of the Province of Quebec.

In some dioceses it has become a common practice to employ the students of our various Theological Colleges in carrying on the work of the Church in vacant or extensive parishes or missions. This is specially the case during the summer months. Whilst we are not prepared to dissent entirely from the practice, we yet consider it to be *one fraught with great danger*, and to be adopted only under necessity and with the strictest precautions taken to limit the authority and define the duties and position of these so employed. We regret to say that in many instances complaints have reached us in regard to the position assumed and the style of teaching given by some of these young men, who seem to forget that though in training for the ministry they are nevertheless but *laymen*, and are not entitled to preach and teach and act as those who have been admitted to Holy Orders. One of the latest peculiarities of such teaching that has been reported to us is that of one such young *theologue*, who in explaining the Apostles' Creed, in every allusion to the "Catholic Church," endeavored to impress the people with the idea that the "Church of England" alone was meant; and that the word "Catholic" was equivalent to or meant "Romanist." We have also heard another assuming to baptize where necessity did not exist, and even in the parish of a resident Priest. We fear, too, that in many instances no limitation is placed upon them in regard to using the sermons of others only, and such too as have been "approved." We would earnestly urge the necessity of greater caution in the employment of such an agency, and also that wherever possible not only the consent of the Incumbent should be had (*that is essential*), but also that personal supervising and direction should be provided for. To place a student in *sole* control of a parish or mission is in our judgment a grave injury and wrong to the Church, and well calculated to develop the pernicious tendency existing in some parishes to claim the services of this or that particular individual before ordination.

People seldom improve when they have no better model than themselves to copy.