

of being overlooked. What shall we say of working dressmakers? How many hours and under what conditions are many of them now labouring? What shall we say of young women who are serving in shops? Are their hours reasonable? In some cases, we are informed, they are intolerably long. Here is a matter that could be quite easily dealt with; and we think that philanthropists would be much better engaged in grappling with acknowledged evils which are capable of being remedied, than in discussing abstract principles which have little chance of being applied in practice.

DR. WILD'S RETURN.—We desire to unite with our Contemporaries in offering our warm congratulations to the Rev. Dr. Wild on his improved health and his return to his attached people. Dr. Wild has many opinions which we do not share, and he has methods of his own; but, unlike many who are separated from us, he never has an ungenerous or unkindly word for the mother Church of England, and he is a loyal and courageous subject of the British Empire. Moreover, by his close devotion to duty, he gives an example which many of us would do well to imitate. It is seldom indeed that a Sunday comes round without his being in his pulpit. Even his summer holidays are nearly all taken from Monday to Saturday. Such devotion is a rebuke to many of us. We have here some part of the explanation of one man's success and another man's failure.

CLERICAL FELLOWSHIP.—It is often complained that our clergy have too little time for study: we are therefore happy to learn that a fellowship has been founded in the General Theological Seminary at New York, for which Canadians as well as Americans may become candidates. The Fellow is obliged to be in Holy Orders; have a degree from some college or Theological Institution; remain, of course, unmarried; live in the Seminary buildings; preside in the Refectory in the absence of the Dean, or one of the Professors; assist in the Chapel services, when required; and give one hour a day to coaching dilatory students. The income is \$1,000 a year. It will afford any clergyman fond of study an excellent opportunity of pursuing it.

THE FAILURE OF RITUAL PROSECUTIONS.

We have no thought of making a promiscuous assault upon the Church Association, or denying its right to existence. But we could hardly point to any organization which has been so badly advised, or which has practically proved so great a failure. Instituted for the purpose of checking ritualism, it is almost certain that it has provoked and fostered the very usages which it was set up to oppose. Whether it has stopped them anywhere, in more than four or five cases, we cannot tell; but we doubt it; and it is quite certain that it has forced many to declare against it who would gladly have remained neutral.

As an example of its special unwisdom, we might point to its attack on the eastward position. Long before ritualism was heard of, it was quite common for men of all schools in the Church of England to say at least the Prayer of Consecration, standing before the table and facing east. Such action seemed the most natural way of complying with the rubric, and it is certainly the most convenient position for the natural performance of the manual acts. At any rate, it was the position taken at that time by many evangelicals.

It is quite likely that extreme men on the other side made the eastward position a matter of great

importance, speaking of it as a necessary expression of the Eucharistic sacrifice, together with other nonsense. But the Church Association ought not to have lost its reason because of trifles like these; and it lost its reason when it assaulted the eastward position, a usage observed by multitudes of moderate men, Anglicans, and others, who were no more ritualists than the members of the Church Association themselves.

The immediate effect of this great blunder was to alienate from the society nearly all the members of the great Anglican party which is and always has been the bulk and the strength of the English clergy. Many of them became members of the English Church Union, and many more sympathized with its work even when they were not enrolled as members. Common prudence might have averted such a calamity. But, when the mistake had once been made, the result was inevitable. From that time to this the work of the association has been worse than resultless. As far as we can judge, it has promoted the cause which it sought to defeat.

This failure is the more wonderful on account of the very large amount of success which has attended its attempts to obtain the condemnation of clergymen for using the practices objected to. Most of the innovations have been declared unlawful. Very few of those attacked have escaped without censure. And yet, for all this, the movement goes on, and where it is checked, this is very seldom the work of the Church Association.

The explanation is not far to seek. Men forget that the passing of Acts of Parliament and the obtaining of the judgments of courts are in reality worth no more than the paper that they are printed upon, unless they represent the voice of reason and the common judgment of the people. As Pascal long ago told us: Opinion is Queen of the world, and if a body of fanatics or of extreme partisans—in religion, in politics, in social economy—get together, they may possibly manage to get laws passed representing their own resolutions; but they will not get them obeyed. And it was the same with the work of the Church Association. They had not the sympathy of the Church, and nobody paid much attention to their demands.

Besides, they were not contented themselves to obey the law which they were putting in force. The Bishop of Peterborough, with his usual acuteness, reminded the clergy that the rubrics enforced by the Privy Council judgments were no more and no less binding than those other rubrics about the meaning of which there never had been any doubt. The Low Churchman condemned the ritualist for mixing water with wine, but he had no credence table without which it was impossible to comply with the requirements of the rubric, and he frequently omitted the Prayer for the Church Militant, when he used the ante-communion service and had no celebration. Again, the Low Churchman fell foul of his adversary for singing a hymn after the Prayer of Consecration. It was intolerable, he said, that such illegal acts should be allowed; but he had no scruple in having a hymn sung between the creed and the Prayer for the Church Militant, which is just as illegal as the one in the other place.

And thus it has come to pass that extreme counsels on one side have very largely prevailed, just because there was no moderation or common sense on the other. We are not without hope that the time is coming when we shall better understand what is essential and what is comparatively unimportant; when we shall be careful not

to hurt the Church by needless innovations for which many members are not prepared; and, on the other hand, that we shall not be scared because some persons like more ritual than we like.

THE CHURCH ASSOCIATION AND ITS FUTURE.

In another article we have drawn attention to the general failure of the Church Association, and have endeavoured to point out its true explanation. But we fear, from some reports now before us, in the *English Guardian* for May 7, that its members are not yet learning the wisdom and moderation which alone can bring them any hope of true success. The twenty-fifth annual meeting has just been held in London; and it is said that the interest of the gathering was in no way inferior to that of its predecessors. "For one thing," says the *Guardian*, "it exhibited Mr. Christopher in the unexpected character of a humourist. There is a grave irony about the statement that the Association is doing 'a work of love' which reminds us of Swift."

But there are worse things than this. Good Mr. Christopher might easily convince himself that the repression of extreme ritual was the work of love, nay, more, we are sure that, unless he had so believed, he would have taken no part in its work. But apparently Mr. Christopher's spirit was not universal at the meeting; and, as we read the report of what happened, we are at once surprised at the nature of the proceedings, and illuminated as to the failure of the Church Association to carry with it the sympathies of the educated classes of England. In the first place, a Mr. Wainwright spoke with a certain indignation of the Bishop of London having given the address at the three hours' service at S. Paul's on the afternoon of Good Friday.

Now, we have no quarrel whatever with people who do not find a long service of that kind edifying. We are quite prepared to hear that many devout persons should find it quite the reverse. Natural constitution of mind and education and habit make the very greatest differences in men's preferences and powers of appropriating any particular spiritual nourishment. But how any one should object to other persons making use of such means of grace passes our understanding. A service which is made up of extracts from the Bible and the Prayer Book and of hymns is distinctly legal, if sanctioned by the Bishop, and such sanction may certainly be presumed when the Bishop himself conducts the service.

But the bad taste of the speaker does not seem to have ended here. He actually introduced into his speech the statement that Mrs. Benson the wife of the Archbishop, was present at this service. When we first read that this statement was greeted with cries of "Shame," we naturally assumed that the audience were denouncing the bad taste and insolence which dragged the name of a lady on to the platform. Whether these people thought, as the *Guardian* seems to suggest, that the Bishop of London ought to have been rebuked by the wife of his Archbishop, or that the presence of the Primate's wife would in some way prevent her husband from doing full justice and judgment on his offending suffragan, does not seem quite clear. By the way, the Archbishop himself was there! Worse and worse! Can it be wondered that men of cultivated minds, and of masculine common sense alike should turn away with disgust from this mixture of vulgarity and buffonery? It is impossible that the *Record* and the *Rock* should approve. We find, as a fact,