

years Parliament has, upon two occasions, voted subsidies to the English Church: one grant of £1,000,000 for the building of churches in poor districts; one grant of £1,000,000 for the augmentation of poor livings. With the exception of these two grants, which are but a small fragment of Church property, Parliament has never made any grant of any kind towards either the building of Established churches or the endowment of the established ministry.

What, then, is meant by the English Church being established and endowed? The annual income of the English Church is about £7,000,000. Of this income it may be stated, without fear of inaccuracy, that *the hundredth part has never at any time been supplied by public funds*. The endowments of the English Church are the results of *private and personal* beneficence. You know how our own Bishopric of Liverpool was founded. It was founded and endowed by the subscriptions and donations of pious Churchmen. Parliament voted no portion of the endowment. Nor do I know of any single bishopric which is endowed with a single shilling of Parliamentary grant. My own Church at Mossley Hill was built and endowed from monies left in a gentleman's will. Hundreds of churches have been built and endowed in a similar manner. During the past twenty-five years more than £40,000,000 has been voluntarily subscribed by pious Churchmen for the building of churches and the support of the clergy; but not one shilling of the £40,000,000 has been supplied either from rates or taxes. Thousands of other English churches occupy precisely the same position as mine. They are the product of the personal piety of religious families. The money spent on them is private money. With the exception of the £2,000,000 I have mentioned, the English Church has never received for parochial purposes any Parliamentary grants. This £2,000,000 is a sum so insignificant in relation to the entire bulk of Church property that it is broadly true to affirm that the property of the Established Church is the result of private munificence and that the Established Church possesses no endowment from Parliamentary or public funds.

What, then, is the meaning, we ask again, of the Church being Established? My answer is that the whole privilege of Establishment is the privilege of *duty*, not the possession of property. The property of the Established Church is private property; but the duties of the Established Church are public duties. Establishment means the identification of Christianity with the public, the civic, the social life of the nation. By the Establishment the Protestant succession is secured to the throne, the Christian faith is publicly recognised in Parliament, the whole realm is penetrated with the influence of resident ministers of the Gospel. Christianity gains in largeness and comprehension by the fact of Establishment. It gains also in stateliness and soberness and spirituality. There is no instance in the world of a Church so definite in its creeds, yet so broad in its comprehension, as the Established Church. If the Anglican Church was disestablished it would inevitably break up into sections, and the largeness of Christianity throughout the world—for the great Nonconformist communities of Christendom gain a reflex benefit from the comprehensiveness of the Establishment—would suffer from the narrowing disruption. But by far the most distinctive result of the Establishment of the Church is the splendid *character of religious rights which it confers upon the people*. By the Establishment the whole realm is mapped out into parishes. Over every one of those parishes some clergyman presides. Upon the ministrations of that clergyman the people have a clear and legal right. Every parishioner, whatever his rank, his politics, his opinions, his income, can claim the services of the parish parochial minister for the baptism of his children, for marriage, for burial, for the visitation of the

sick. If the Church were disestablished these rights of the people would immediately disappear. The parochial system would necessarily be abolished. The clergy would cease to possess the privilege of visiting from house to house within their parish; and the people would cease to possess the right of claiming their visit. The congregational theory would take the place of the parochial system. I do not blame Nonconformist ministers—far from it; the fault is not theirs: but, as a matter of fact, they visit only the members of their own congregation for spiritual purposes. No one outside their congregation has any claim upon their services. If you ask a Nonconformist minister to baptize your child, the request must take the form of a favour, unless you belong to the minister's congregation. In the case of the Established minister the request is not preferred as a favour, but as a right. I challenge contradiction when I affirm that the ministers of no voluntary religious communion either do or can visit from house to house in the same way as the ministers of the Established Church. This house-to-house visitation, and these rights of the people to claim as their own, without dependence or favour, the ministrations of their parochial clergy, I hold to be the chief value of the Establishment. If I am asked, "Is Establishment worth preserving?" I answer, "For the sake of political power, no; because the English Church would be, politically, ten times more powerful disestablished than established." "For the sake of financial advantage? No. Because the hundredth part of her possessions have not come from Parliamentary sources, and even were the Church despoiled of her private possessions, her children would soon endow her again with even larger stores." "For the sake of social prestige? No. Because the Episcopal Church has an equal prestige in countries where it is not Established." "For the sake of the identification of Christianity with national life, and for the greater comprehensiveness of the gospel? Yes. But most of all I desire the continuance of Establishment because Establishment confers invaluable religious rights upon the people, and definite religious duties upon the clergy, which by any process of disestablishment must inevitably be abolished."

Disestablishment is essentially and pre-eminently a people's question. If the people do not value their rights or care to retain them, they are sure in the end, from a variety of motives, to barter their heritage and fling their rights away.

But it is the business of the clergy and of all true Church people to make both the rights and privileges of the Establishment a reality among the people. The people of this nation will never injure or destroy any institution which they perceive is a blessing to them. Let the English Church make herself an evident and mighty benefit among the English people and the English people will raise no hand against the English Church. The English people is, at heart, a righteous and religious people. The best and noblest Englishmen are always ready to thankfully acknowledge that there is no nation more great, that hath God more nigh to them, than the Lord our God is in all things that we call upon Him for. The English Church has nothing to fear so long as it continues to be the Church of the people. But if the English Church sinks down into the Church of an exclusive social class, or an exclusive political party; if she magnifies ritualism into religion, and narrows the Kingdom of God into anything less than righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost, then, not only are her days as an Establishment numbered, but her claim to be a true and faithful branch of the Church of Jesus Christ will be also gone.—*The Family Churchman*.

SEND for "The Jesuits Estates" Act of the Province of Quebec and read it. Price 5 cents.

### L'HOMME S'AMUSE.

"To amuse and be amused," is the chief end of man "in Society," according to Thackeray. Judging by the course of their daily lives, it is the chief end of a large and increasing number of English people, who find the balancing bitternesses of life in the consequences attendant upon their irregularities. What a poor, hopeless, senseless life it is! Even with all its picturesque embellishments of art and fancy, and tinsel glitter, it is a sorrow failure. There is a sound defence for the Cinderella dance, or the occasional ball, in season; the opera, the theatre, the concert room, and the countless private entertainments within reach of the wealthy classes have all clearly-defined places in our social cosmogony. But an interminable succession of these, such as may be witnessed in London next month, or any month during the "season," is good for neither manhood nor womanhood. When amusement is the principal business of life, it becomes a dull, trivial round indeed. Cynics, of course, might point out that the boredom and ennui which inevitably result from such a course of life themselves take up a text and preach certain homilies to the victim. A few admirable virtues and many commendable graces are, no doubt, inculcated in its votaries by society, as if, in the language of Keats, to "dress misery in fit magnificence." The patience, courtesy, desire to please—or even the mere affectation of these qualities—demanded by society have a profound effect in promoting gentleness of character. Nor do we doubt some "men of pleasure," and many women of society, are industrious in good works, and full of compassion for the toilers and the poor. It may even be conceded that idlers among this class are rarer than in some previous generations. But side by side with the increasing self-indulgence of the age there has grown up a new conception of industry, a novel commercial morality, and a dangerous kind of activity. Covetousness is the ruling spirit of our times. The desire to make money by every possible means—honestly when that is the surest policy, dishonestly when that is tolerably safe—is becoming a passion even among the wealthy. Lately we have heard a great deal about fashionable gambling resorts; every day we hear and read about gigantic financial bubbles, and it is a sad fact that this speculating spirit is extending its ramifications among all classes of Englishmen. The effect upon our national character is nothing short of disastrous. For this covetousness is all directed towards one end the tinsel glitter of a mere increase of "pleasure," more diamonds for the rich, and occasional champagne for the poor. Unlike the old commercial spirit, its aim is not even professedly the advancement of civilization, or the increase of national resources. It is a poor, heartless kind of lucre-thirst, combining the greed of the miser with the folly of the spendthrift. Do the clergy adequately realize the mischief which this evil is working among their flocks? Do they reflect that, almost without exception, each of them has before him, Sunday after Sunday, no inconsiderable number of the victims to this modern greed of money and thirst for pleasure? Do they, knowing these things, rise to the highest function of their ministry by openly condemning them as opposed to the pure teaching of the Gospel, and all the dictates of true humanity? If not, why not? Excessive luxury is gnawing like a vulture at the vitals of the nation. Intemperance, in all its forms, is rife among every section of the community. Impurity of thought and speech, and, we fear, impurity in deed also, is extending its contagious influence with most fearful rapidity in country as well