We gladly call attention to the stirring appeal made by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York on behalf of work in Western Canada. The ground of the appeal is given in the following remarkable facts:

"In Western Canada a great nation is advancing to a foremost place in the world. The resources of the land are immense, and rapidly on the way to be developed. The two provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta alone are larger than France, Germany, Holland, Belgium, and the British Isles all put together. England one way, Japan the other, are distant little more than a week's journey. An ever-increasing tide of immigrants is pouring in, thousands after thousands. Last year 180,000 entered Canada, most of them bound for the West. Plainly, the history of the world will largely depend upon what this multitude comes to be in character, in faith, and in life."

The question is whether our Church is "doing its duty by this vast and swiftly growing nation." Other Churches are hard at work, and, as the Archbishops say, "our own Church, bound by its position to care most of all, seems to lag behind." That part of the appeal which refers to the remarkable work of Principal Lloyd will have the special interest and sympathy of our readers:

"The large and important work which is being accomplished in the diocese of Saskatchewan, under the powerful leadership of Principal Lloyd, supported by the Colonial and Continental Church Society, demands especial mention. It is vital that this work should be strengthened both with men and money. It lies in the very centre of the foremost need."
We commend the appeal most earnestly, and beg our readers to send their contributions to the Colonial and Continental Church Society, 9, Serjeant's Inn, Fleet Street, E.C.

As year by year we are told, through the medium of that admirable and indispensable publication, "The Official Year-Book of the Church," that the voluntary contributions of the Church of England make the magnificent total of several millions of pounds (this year over eight millions), we naturally feel surprised and glad that our Church should be able to show its liberality in this splendid way. It is a striking testimony of what is being done by Missions, of the vast and varied opportunities afforded by the Church of England, and yet it is impossible to question the truth of the following remarks of the *Record*:

"We do well to rejoice over the more than eight millions raised in voluntary offerings, and we know that, large as it is, it does not represent the whole total of the gifts of Churchmen, seeing that their contributions to interdenominational societies are excluded. But there is another side to the question. We could do better. Those who give liberally and cheerfully to the Lord's work are usually—though we know there are exceptions—but a small proportion of the general congregation of any church; the others give but little, not because they have not the money to give, but because they choose to spend it upon themselves and their own pleasures."

There is, indeed, another side. The workers and givers in our Church represent, as a rule, a very small proportion of the communicants, to say nothing of the general congregations. If only all who "profess and call themselves Christians" gave according to the New Testament principle, "as the Lord hath prospered him," the result would be stupendous. It would pretty certainly be a repetition of that unique day in the life of Moses when the people had to be restrained from giving because enough had been provided for the work of God. Alas! we are very far from this consummation; there is no sign, perhaps no likelihood, of a repetition. It would mean the possession of a far deeper spiritual life than we now possess.
It came as a great surprise the other day that even a small minority could possibly exist in our Church who were unprepared to offer the forthcoming World Missionary Conference at Edinburgh their cordial sympathy. The occasion will be unique, for such a gathering of missionary workers has never yet been held, and its influence is certain to be deep and far-reaching. And yet a small number of extreme High Churchmen were ready to withhold the expression of sympathy, in spite of the fact that large numbers of Churchmen will be included among the delegates, and will take a leading part in the deliberations of the Conference. It is another illustration of the impossible position taken up by those who hold a view of Apostolical succession which is warranted neither by Scripture, nor by scholarship, nor by the overwhelming testimony of Christian life to-day. Happily, however, Convocation did not listen to this opposition, and with the Bishops in the Upper House unanimous in the expression of good-will, the resolution was passed in the Lower House by a large majority. The words of the Guardian take a line on this matter with which all true Churchmen will gladly associate themselves:

"We can only regret that any note of hesitation or misgiving should have been sounded. Perhaps, in the circumstances, it was well that the show of hands was insisted upon, for this made it plain that the members who were for sending the greeting in the strongest terms were in an overwhelming majority—the proportion was five to one. When it is added that the Bishops of the Upper House concurred with markedly emphatic approbation, we may reasonably hope that those to whom the resolution is sent will accept it as the expression of our very sincere regard for their labours. We gladly acknowledge that their missionary zeal is a constant incentive to us, and we rejoice to believe that we are being brought ever nearer to the time when we shall be of one mind, as well as of one heart, in the endeavours which we make to further the Divine will for the Church and for the world."

It is natural and inevitable, in view of such an attitude, even of a minority, that the Times should remark that—

"It will not be surprising if there remains in the minds of the laity an uncomfortable fear that the large conception of the National Church may
yet shrink into the mere expression for the narrow exclusiveness of a small sect."

During the Debate in Convocation the public was informed that the S.P.G. had not seen its way to be represented officially at the Missionary Conference. This decision is all the more remarkable because of the way in which those who are responsible for the Conference have endeavoured to obtain the support of Anglican High Churchmen. Indeed, it is confidently said in certain quarters that it was only by the omission of South American missionary work among Roman Catholics from the purview of the Conference that it became possible to obtain the support of certain leading High Churchmen. Be this as it may, the fact is clear that in the nine Commissions which constitute the Conference definite High Churchmen occupy a prominent part, and one of the Commissions is presided over by the Bishop of Birmingham. To many it has been somewhat of a surprise to realize that the vast interests of the C.M.S. in the Mission Field should not have been represented in the Chairmanship of one of these Commissions. It might have been thought quite natural that the Bishop of Durham, or some other leading Evangelical prelate, should have been Chairman of one of the Commissions, as representing the C.M.S. What makes the action of the S.P.G. all the more surprising is that it is well known that Bishop Montgomery, the Secretary, has been asked to nominate no less than fifty delegates to the Conference, so that the S.P.G. will be undoubtedly represented, even though its representation cannot be strictly called official. We had hoped that the narrow policy of former days associated with the S.P.G. was at an end, but it is evidently not the case. Meanwhile Churchmen will not fail to understand the meaning of this object-lesson. Evangelical Churchmen, without in the slightest degree compromising their Churchmanship, are always ready to give the right hand of fellowship to those who are labouring with them in the Mission Field. Happily there is an increasing comity of Missions in
various parts of the world, and, like David Livingstone, we ought to be ready to welcome with all possible heartiness all who endeavour to heal the sores of humanity by proclaiming the everlasting Gospel of the grace of God.

The Danger of Specialization.

In one of those illuminating articles contributed to the British Weekly by “Claudius Clear,” which are well known to be from the pen of its brilliant editor, Sir W. Robertson Nicoll, the following suggestive passage occurs:

“The judgment of experts is no doubt very valuable, but it is not infallible, and it is especially apt to err when genius appears in the field. When the course of literature or of thought is to be altered, those who have been walking by the river for long, and complacently following its flow, generally throw up their arms in protest and in anger. The new genius with new ways is likely to find his appreciation among younger and more daring spirits. This fact might be illustrated over and over from the history of literature. Again, experts are apt to postulate a uniformity in style and merit which is not the characteristic of genius. Hence the excessively precarious character of much literary criticism that is based on internal evidence. Now that the superstition about Shakespeare’s uniform excellence has been broken by Jusserand and others, critics will come to perceive that much which has been written on the composite authorship of the plays is futile. Let no one say that this is an idle question. It is a question which goes deep down, and involves much that is very precious.”

The bearing of these ideas on Biblical criticism is only too patent. In these days of increasing specialization in all branches of knowledge there is a constant danger lest we fail to appreciate the due proportion and perspective of things. Literature must be continually balanced by history, philology by archaeology, physics by metaphysics, and it is only in a constant appreciation of the various departments of human thought that we can ever expect to arrive at the truth. The most pressing danger to-day in connection with the Bible is the concentration of particular scholars on their own specialization of thought to the forgetfulness of other branches equally important and equally valid. The deeper a man bores into the ground the less of the sky he is likely to see, and the more a man penetrates into one realm of knowledge the more he is in danger of forgetting other
realms. Let us ever be on our guard against what has been rightly called the tyranny of the expert. Let us insist upon keeping as far as possible a due proportion in regard to our avenues of knowledge.

There are doubtless many among our readers who are not aware of the interest and work of the Victoria Institute, or Philosophical Society of Great Britain. It was established for the purpose of investigating the most important questions of philosophy and science, but more especially those that bear on the great truths revealed in Scripture. To this end it associates together men of science and authors who have been engaged in such investigations, and all others who may be interested in them, in order to strengthen their efforts by association, and by bringing together the results of such labours after full discussion in the printed transactions of the Institution. The Society consists of Members and Associates, and among the names on the list are some of the best-known and highly honoured in the various Churches. The Institute has done much to advance the cause of Biblical scholarship and true learning, and it is a bare duty to call attention to it and commend its valuable work. The Secretary, H. Charleywood Turner, Esq., at the office of the Institute, 1, Adelphi Terrace House, W.C., will be glad to give full information to any who may desire it. The Institute affords a welcome rallying-point for those who wish to prosecute their study in the realms of religion and science.