

being worked, though it simply means, as much theological poison shall be administered as the poisoners can agree upon. In these circumstances Freethinkers should rally to a man round the secular flag.' 'Our duty is,' says the same journal, 'to fight with all our strength against religion in public schools. The students in Non-conformist colleges are equally (with those of the Church) trained in sectarianism.'

That is the cry from the enemy's camp. And will you still say that unity amongst Christians is not desirable, is not essential? Will you still linger behind in the battle that is being fought for religious education rather than bear arms along with us? Nay, then, let me remind you of a certain woman of long ago, who said, Kill the child and divide it rather than let the other woman have it. And, remember, she was rightly judged not to be the true mother.

We Christians must no longer move the ridicule of the world by our foolish and needless dissensions. What perhaps was the natural outcome of the confusion and distress of the sixteenth century has no place in the nineteenth. The old Church of our fathers is awake and active, sympathetic and comprehensive. She is not now, at least, cold and dead and intolerant. She is ready once more to gather back into her fold children who have gone out from her. She is the only possible rallying point for English Christians. For they were once beneath her wing. United, and acting together in love, what work should we not do? And again, as men beheld the spectacle they would exclaim, as in the early days of triumph, 'See how these Christians love one another!'

J. H. M.

The Church and the People.

LORD MACAULAY ON THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH.

IN a speech made in the year 1845 that great statesman and historian, Lord Macaulay—after saying it was *not* on behalf of the noble and wealthy that he advocated an Established Church—continued: 'The person about whom I am uneasy is the *working man*, the man who would find it difficult to pay even 5s. or 10s. a year out of his small earnings for the ministrations of religion. What is to become of him under the voluntary system? Is he to go without religious instruction altogether? That we should all think a great evil to himself and a great evil to society. Is he to pay for it out of his slender means? That would be a heavy task. Is he to be dependent on the liberality of others? That is a somewhat precarious and somewhat humiliating dependence. I prefer, I own, that system under which there is, in the rudest and most secluded districts, a house of God, where public worship is performed

after a manner acceptable to the great majority of the community, and where the poorest may partake of the ordinances of religion, not as an aim, but as a right.'

It might be added that not in the poorest and most secluded districts is the need of an Established Church the greatest. If anyone desires a conclusive test, let him wander through that vast district of East London—in itself a mighty city—which is inhabited by the poorer classes. What is Dissent doing there? Absolutely nothing! Where are the chapels? You will not find them! All that is done is done by the Church. The reason is plain: the poverty of the inhabitants is too great for voluntary efforts. Dissent, which is dependent on voluntary effort, would starve in such a locality. It is on behalf of the poor man that we plead for the maintenance of a Church, which—though just as *voluntary* in any sense of the word as any chapel in the land—is for the present supported by the