arrangements for doctor and nurse. Remembering the very limited space of the cabins, and that the barges are frequently far away from medical aid, it can be understood that the maternity-room is a great boon.

The Canal-Boat Mission Hall and Day School is doing excellent work, but it is believed that with larger accommodation its usefulness could be vastly increased. Therefore the missionary and his friends are making an earnest effort to build at Brentford a small institute which shall contain, in addition to a large schoolroom and better maternity accommodation, a wash-house and a reading-room. Evening classes for young bargemen and women will be held, and coffee, tea, and other refreshments sold. The Grand Junction Canal Company has offered an excellent site, close to the locks and near to the spot where on Sunday evenings, during the summer, Mr. Bamber holds an open-air service. The cost of building and furnishing the institute is estimated at £800, and £260 has already been received. The institute will do much to better the condition of the canal-boat people, and therefore it is to be hoped that the required £540 will soon be forthcoming.

HENRY CHARLES MOORE.

---

**The Month.**

The announcement that the Bishop of London had fixed a subject for the second Round Table Conference, had chosen its members, and arranged the time of meeting, was received with respectful but not very acute interest. This time the Conference is to consider "Confession and Absolution," topics which, it will be agreed, are very much in the minds of English Churchmen just now. The members of the Conference, who will see the Old Year out and the New Year in at Fulham, are here, for purposes of comparison, set side by side with the list of Bishop Creighton's gathering:

1901-1902.
The Dean of Christ Church.
Professor Swete.
Professor Moerby.
Professor Mason.
The Rev. Dr. Wace.
The Rev. Dr. Gee.
The Rev. T. W. Drury.
Canon Aitkin.
Canon Body.
Canon the Hon. E. Lyttelton.
Canon Childe.
The Rev. R. M. Benson.
The Rev. V. S. S. Coles.
Lord Halifax.
Chancellor P. V. Smith.

1900.
Dr. Barlow (now Dean of Peterborough).
The Rev. Prebendary Bevan.
The Rev. Dr. Bigg.
The Rev. N. Dimock.
Canon Gore.
Professor Moule (now Bishop of Durham).
Canon Newbolt.
The Rev. Dr. Robertson.
Canon Armitage Robinson.
Professor Sanday.
The Rev. Prebendary Wace.
The Earl of Stamford.
Lord Halifax.
Chancellor P. V. Smith.
Mr. W. J. Birkbeck.

16—2
It will be seen that the names indicate a fair balance of power between the two chief opposing schools of thought, although it seems odd that the Broad Churchmen should practically be excluded from gatherings of this character. Have they no right to their view of what the Church may mean as to Confession and Absolution? There is no one on the Evangelical side at all corresponding to the extreme position marked by Mr. Stuckey Coles, Father Benson, and Lord Halifax, and this is the most obvious deficiency in the constitution of the gathering. No doubt it was advisable to get, as far as possible, a new body of men, lest it should be said that a kind of permanent committee was sitting to settle the differences of the English Church, but the loss of the unequalled erudition of the Rev. N. Dimock must be felt. It will be seen that Dr. Wace is the only clerical member common to the two Conferences. It will be remembered that he acted as Chairman in 1900, and edited the report of the Conference.

The difficulty most people feel in regard to such gatherings as these is to discover their value. With all respect to the London Diocesan Conference, it is a little difficult to see quite what the last Round Table Conference did, or what the new Conference may be expected to do. So far as any influence on the breach between the extreme Anglicans and the rest of the Church is concerned, the first Conference would appear to have been absolutely futile. Of course, it is just possible that the main body of Church-people were in some way affected; but it may fairly be alleged that there are no signs of this, or, indeed, that the main body of such persons as much as knew the Conference existed. The other gathering had, indeed, one value for the student; it showed the strength of the position held by sober Churchmen, and the utter impossibility of reconciling that position with the views of the Lord Halifax party. But, really, there was nothing very novel about this. Perhaps the new Conference may have some more definite value.

The appointment of Bishop Welldon to the stall at Westminster held by Canon Gore has been welcomed on all sides. It implies a distinct accession of strength to the clerical forces of the diocese—an accession which will help to keep in check the tendency to extreme and fantastic Anglicanism. It should also imply a distinct gain to the cause of Foreign Missions on their home side. Bishop Welldon is hardly the man whom the critic will accuse of ecclesiasticism, or sentimentality, or bigotry, or any of the crimes occasionally alleged as the peculiar characteristics of persons who think the last command of our Lord ought still to be deemed binding upon us. Dr. Welldon must be counted with the Bishops of Calcutta who had but short reigns—Heber, James, and Turner. The see has not yet been founded a century, but it has had nine Bishops already.

One interesting side of the appointment is its relation to the attitude taken up by Canon Henson towards the question of Home Reunion—an attitude in which he seems to some extent to have Canon Armitage Robinson with him. If Dr. Welldon agreed that it was time to acknowledge the Non-Episcopal Churches of Great Britain as real and true Churches, possessing valid orders and valid Sacraments, then the Westminster revolt against a typical doctrine of the extreme Anglicans would take a new form. At present it has very much the air of a protest against the extreme application of the doctrine of a Visible Church which has helped so many people on to Rome, and the resultant doctrine
"No Bishop, No Church," which has raised so deep a feeling against us in Protestant Nonconformity.

As had been generally anticipated, the Islington Clerical Meeting has been placed in the hands of a committee. It has been decided that a body of twelve clergymen, six resident in London and six in the country, shall in the future have the general control and management of the meeting. Dean Barlow, who is still Vicar of Islington, will be president in 1902, and the Rev. C. J. Procter will act as hon. secretary. The first committee consists of the Bishop of Durham, the Bishop of Liverpool, the Dean of Peterborough, Chancellor Allan Smith, Archdeacon Hughes Games, the Rev. Prebendary H. E. Fox, the Rev. Prebendary Wase, the Rev. Prebendary Webb-Peploe, the Rev. Walter Abbott, the Rev. A. E. Barnes-Lawrence, the Rev. Hubert Brooke, and the Rev. C. J. Procter. The 1902 meeting will be held on Tuesday, January 14, at Mildmay Conference Hall. The General Subject will be: "The Duty of the Church of England to the Nation"—(a) in removing hostility and apathy—the Rev. Dr. Nickson and the Rev. J. E. Watts-Ditchfield; (b) in effecting conversions—the Rev. W. H. Stone and the Rev. A. B. G. Lillingston; (c) in perfecting the Saints—Prebendary Webb-Peploe and the Rev. Canon Roxby; (d) in winning the young—the Rev. E. A. Stuart, the Rev. J. S. Tucker, and the Rev. H. H. Gibbon. There is ample opportunity here for some extremely interesting and useful papers; but the first programme issued by the committee is not unusually attractive. There is no marked and immediate connection between the subject and the special anxieties of the time; but this may very well be supplied by the speakers.

The editorial notes of the C.M.S. Intelligencer, discussing the financial position of the Society, and the need of new income, dwell upon a fact which needs wider attention than it has hitherto received from clergy and their people:

"The great thing to be done is to reach the laity of the Church. Not the millionaires—except, indeed, such as may be whole-hearted Christians—but the numerous wealthy or well-to-do men, particularly in the great towns of the Midlands and the North, who are communicants, and many of whom are now 'guinea' subscribers. It is hardly fair to expect the clergy to appeal to them individually. The clergy, overburdened with parochial anxieties, want the larger gifts of such men for local objects, which, being near, loom large. There are not many vicars who, if a churchwarden came and said, 'I have got £500 to give away just now: what shall I give it to?' would reply: 'The evangelization of the world is the first and greatest duty of the Church: give it to that'; and although there are some who would say it, it would be unfair and unreasonable to blame the great majority who would not. But these others would be sincerely glad if such large gifts were given to missions in response to an appeal from somebody else. What we have to do is to find the somebody else; and our belief is that we must use laymen to reach laymen. But the clergy can, and should, do this: set forth (1) in frequent sermons the greatness of the missionary enterprise as the fulfilment of Christ's commission; (2) the obligation upon every Christian to take an individual share in the work; (3) the Christian duty of systematic giving, to any object, on a very different scale from that which is common."