

extra profits among the employees. A large number of other concerns are worked on the employees co-operation plan. The Church clergy are very active in advocating these reforms in business.

ARCHBISHOP PLUNKETT OF DUBLIN seems to have put his foot in it rather badly, according to *The Guardian* and other English Church papers, by ordaining a deacon for the Reformed Church of Portugal, using the Portuguese Ordinal with variations. It is not clear that the Irish variations cured the faultiness of the Portuguese form. There is some fear of a Portuguese version of the Mexican fiasco called "The Church of Jesus."

CHILDREN'S EUCHARIST.—It is said that the children at St. Peter's, London Docks, prefer their 9 o'clock mass to any other service. The average attendance is about 300. The service, which lasts 50 minutes, is choral, organ but no choir, with numerous hymns. It is succeeded by a careful instruction in Church doctrines. There is also afternoon Sunday school, largely attended, but not so popular as the early service.

"A VERY COPPERY PLACE" is the term applied to Folkestone by one of its fishermen in conversation with Rev. E. Husband. And yet the Vicar seemed rather disappointed to find that when he asked for a *silver collection* from his fashionable congregation lately, the offerings consisted chiefly of penny pieces neatly folded in fine white note-paper. He regretted that he had "not yet learned how to live on the best white paper neatly folded."

HOW IT WORKS.—The advocates of profit sharing and co-operative interest claim that the resulting benefits are as follows: 1. The system is recognized at once as a practical application of the Golden Rule of the Gospel. 2. The process begets an atmosphere of mutual kindness between employers and employees. 3. This, together with self interest, produces better work, more of it, and larger profits to the advantage of all concerned. 4. Prosperity and happiness increased.

THE ANCIENT HITTITES are coming more and more into prominence on account of the archaeological discoveries. At Bulgar Maden in the Taurus, a remarkable (nearly 400 incised symbols) inscription has been found on a high, almost inaccessible rock, near the very ancient silver mines of that locality. It is supposed to be Hittite, and of great value. Explorers are on the lookout for a dual inscription, which would serve to interpret the Hittite symbols.

DEATH OF MR. ROBINSON OF THE NIGER.—The sad death of the devoted C.M.S. Secretary for the Niger mission has aroused much sympathy. He was one of a whole family of talented and devoted priests, sons of the late Rev. Geo. Robinson of St. Augustine's, Liverpool. Other brothers are Rev. J. A. Robinson of Cambridge University, Rev. C. H. Robinson of Truro Theological College, and Rev. A. W. Robinson, of All Hollow's, Barking. He had been working great reforms in African mission work.

MIDDLE-CLASS DISSENT IN THE COLONIES.—It is notorious that dissent flourishes chiefly among the tradespeople and shop keepers of Great Britain. To this state of things the Bishop of Nassau, in an able letter in the *Guardian* of 22nd July, attributes the prevalence and power of dissent in the colonies for this neglected class is the very one which emigrates largely and forms the wealthy ruling

element in colonial life. The Colonial Church is weighed down by English poverty, without the backing of English wealth.

FALLING FOUL OF RAINSFORD.—The eloquent rector of St. George's, New York, has got himself into new trouble by a sermon in which he does scant justice to his adopted mother—the Protestant Episcopal Church. This is the way the *New York Churchman*, endorsed by the *Living Church*, looks at it: "If every word he says were true, as nine-tenths of them are sheer perversions of the truth, the publication of them in such language and in such a spirit would be little to the credit of a clergyman whom the American Church has received and treated with boundless hospitality."

CHEAP LIBERALITY.

Since the propriety of the Massachusetts election to the Episcopate was questioned and challenged so strenuously in many quarters, and the chances of the election being confirmed were very uncertain for a while, the ebullitions of indignation on the part of so-called liberal men have become very amusing to those who take the trouble to look beyond their nose at principles and results. A very high-class American monthly has taken a very high tone in this babel of remonstrances—protesting in lofty terms against free thought of broad intellects being trammelled and confined by the circumscribed formularies of creeds and confessions. The drift of the article to which we refer—in which evidently the editor wades into water of unaccustomed depth for him—is to teach the superficial reader of his periodical that there ought to be absolutely no limits which infringe upon the free handling of forms and principles by such men as Phillips Brooks, MacCreary, and others who have lately been criticized as to orthodoxy by the several "law and order" organizations of the Christian bodies to which they belong.

BRING THE MATTER HOME

to such superficial writers, and what should we find? They are, in fact, airing their supposed liberality at the expense—not of themselves, but of other people. If we put the saddle on their own back they will wince quick enough. How long would a board of bank directors tolerate a manager, or official of any kind, who professed principles at variance with the principles upon which the institution was founded: who, for instance, did not respect the sacredness of the securities entrusted to this charge? Such a man would be considered unsafe. They would very soon put a check on his liberty of thought and action within the bank! He would be firmly—and not perhaps very gently—invited to take a position outside that institution. So of a subordinate officer on a ship: such persons are not allowed to exercise their free thought on the rules of navigation and naval subordination. As soon as they begin to express their original ideas in an obtrusive manner, they are very quickly court-martialed and dismissed, at least. Even a magazine or review has its rules and regulations which those persons must observe who wish to take part in its publication. Mr. Editor has very stringent lines of liberty for his "subs."

OTHER MEN'S LIBERTIES

are, in point of fact, ignored and contemned by such free and easy interference from outside the Churches. Have not Churches and religious societies a right to see that their fundamental principles are respected by those who wish to

retain their membership? Why should an official of an Episcopal Church be at liberty to impugn Episcopacy? Why should a Baptist minister be allowed to ridicule immersion and advocate infant affusion—while still a member of that body? Why should a Presbyterian elder have immunity, if he chooses, to declare the whole system of Calvinistic theology untenable? Yet these are the things which Churches and sects are blamed for regulating—their own regulations! Of course, the underlying sentiment of all such rubbish as we read on this line of liberty for thought is anarchy—nothing less. That is the virus which is working in the blood and poisoning the current of thought throughout this continent. Anarchy means, really, the right to interfere with the liberties of others, while preserving one's own intact and sacred—that is the reservation in the mind of all such anarchic writers and authors as we have been hearing so much from of late.

THE GOOD OLD CHURCH.

The other day we took as a companion the mid-summer number of that most beautiful of American monthlies, *The Century*, along with us for a bit of our annual holiday, "Sailing on the Summer Seas." In a very pretty and otherwise wholesome article entitled "The Clown and the Missionary," we met with a statement as follows, albeit only a variation of what one sees too often in newspapers and magazines. Says the author, "One effect of Puritanism or Protestantism has been to unfit it for many ministrations which the *old Church* still better or worse performs. This was *apropos* of a remark just made that "one does not find religion taking much interest in circus clowns and other sawdust performers." I am not accustomed to see religion flourish among any such class, except semi-occasionally in the case of Roman Catholics." The author notes, as an exception to this rule, how, in her story, a gentle, shabby little missionary from China gets hold of the clown who was his fellow passenger: the upshot being that the said clown joins the mission-staff as a helper—and goes out to China with the missionary on the supposition that though *not repudiating circus life* at all, still "they'll let me be a Christian there."

THIS IS ALL VERY PATHETIC;

but why should a circus clown not be able to profess and be received as a Christian in America or England as well as in a China mission? Above all, why should the so-called "Old Church" of Rome have a monopoly of such classes and characters? The answer arises naturally from the idea suggested by this author herself: *Puritanism*, so far as it has affected Protestantism, tends to raise artificial barriers here, there and everywhere, against sympathy with the humors and fancies and pleasures of natural humanity. The Puritan tendency is to stamp as sinful a multitude of indifferent things by a kind of conventional code of holiness, from the utter and senseless artificiality of which the common sense of human nature revolts. The Roman Communion, whatever be its faults, and they are many and grievous, has retained enough of primitive Catholicity among its traditions to generally refuse to recognize these artificial and conventional barriers: and so all these classes of life, ostracized by Puritanism, drift inevitably to the Roman Communion, or any other which, in this respect, holds like liberal principles towards the joys and pleasures of human life.