

THE CHURCHMAN

December, 1912.

The Month.

The
Bishoprics
Bill.

WE referred in our September issue to the Bishoprics Bill, and deprecated any policy of total opposition to it. The Bill was "ordered to be printed June 25, 1912," and has, in theory, since that date been accessible to the general public. It is only, however, an interested few who take the trouble to purchase copies of a Parliamentary Bill. A wider circle will now be able to study its provisions, as the full text of the Bill is given in the columns of the *Record* for November 8. We commend it to our readers as a subject for careful study. If it can be shown that the foundation of new Bishoprics is the true way of increasing the effective power for good of the Church, then Evangelicals will be the last to oppose such a praiseworthy scheme. But where there is full agreement on a general principle, there may be differences of opinion as to the best method of carrying it into practice. And it is here that Evangelicals will do well to walk warily, and to ponder the ultimate possibilities to which the Bill in its present form may commit them. For example, the Bill provides that "His Majesty may, from time to time, by Order in Council made on the recommendation of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, provide for the formation of new Bishoprics." We have no wish to question the ability or impartiality of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, but, in the present condition of the Church of England, might it not, in each case, be expedient to devise some pre-

liminary inquiry or process of a more public character, at which all those interested might be enabled to express their views ?

It is true that Clause 7 of the Bill enacts what **The Proposed Safeguard.** has every appearance of being exactly such a safeguard as we desire. It lays down that, "Before any Order is made under this section the draft thereof shall be laid before each House of Parliament for a period of not less than thirty days during the Session of Parliament, and if either House, before the expiration of that period, presents an address to His Majesty against the draft, or any part thereof, no further proceedings shall be taken thereon, but without prejudice to the making of any new draft Order." This looks like full protection, but in practice proves to be delusive. We are assured by some who have had prolonged and intimate experience of Parliamentary procedure that a clause of this kind is absolutely futile as a safeguard. As a matter of fact, the Bill has already been "blocked" by five notices of motion, three standing in the names of Liverpool Unionist Members, and two in the names of Radicals. For our own part, we have no wish to hinder a project that contributes to the welfare and efficiency of the Church of England, regarded as a body that is not only Apostolic and Catholic, but Reformed and Protestant. We have merely emphasized the foregoing points in order that our readers, if they support the Bill, may know what they are doing, and why they are doing it.

An Excellent Precedent. We have long cherished the strong conviction that much preliminary ground must be traversed before we can gaze upon any near prospect of ecclesiastical reunion. We spoke of one such preliminary stage last month in supporting Mr. Wilson's "Practical Policy for Evangelicals," and pleading for more constant and friendly interchange of views between Anglican and Nonconformist clergy. Another preliminary stage is the co-operation of Anglican and Nonconformist scholars in the production of such

great works as Hastings' " Dictionary of the Bible," and in the academic life of both the older and the newer Universities. Men who work together in the cause of Christian scholarship must surely come to feel a great desire that they may not be divided in worship of the Master for Whom they work. Feeling this so strongly, we are delighted to quote the following paragraph from a recent issue of the *Methodist Recorder*, which describes an event of happy augury for the future of the University concerned, and, indeed, for the larger welfare of Christendom :

" Sheffield University has set a notable precedent. Last year the Senate inaugurated a Commencement Service, to be held on the first Sunday of October, alternately in Anglican and Nonconformist churches. The Archbishop of York led off last year, and last Sunday the service was conducted by Dr. J. H. Moulton at Glossop Road Baptist Chapel. An interesting and unique feature of the service was that the Bishop of Sheffield (Dr. Quirk) walked in the academic procession from the University to the chapel and attended the service. We wonder whether this is not the first time on record in England that an Anglican Bishop has listened to a Methodist preacher in a Baptist chapel, but we are quite certain that the genial Bishop will not have suffered any evil from the experience."

Evangelical
Schools and
Colleges.

Attention is called, and very rightly called, from time to time, in the Evangelical press, to the urgent need of supporting the educational institutions founded by the representatives of that school of thought. One of the most recent and most impressive pronouncements is that of the Dean of Canterbury in the *Record* for November 1. All educationalists are awake to the immense importance of environment. It is not only what a student learns that matters, but the mental and the spiritual atmosphere in which he learns it. We have already good boarding-schools both for boys and girls. We may reckon that in three non-graduate Colleges, two post-graduate Colleges, and one constituent College of a University—St. John's Hall, at Durham—Evangelical traditions are upheld, and Evangelical principles are taught. It is now for the great body of Church-people, to whom these principles are dear, to contribute generously to the support of these institutions. It is hardly too much to say that in all directions—

especially that of providing bursaries and exhibitions for deserving and able students—the work is limited and hindered. If Evangelicals, who have such a magnificent record for support given to practical evangelistic work, could similarly realize the need for supporting educational work, it can hardly be doubted that the cause they have at heart would progress by leaps and bounds.

The Eurasian Problem. We are glad to observe that the subject of the education of Eurasian children, to which we have occasionally called the attention of our readers, is not being permitted to disappear from the horizon of the Christian public. That excellent magazine, *The East and the West*, devoted a recent article to it, and in the *Educational Supplement* to the *Times* for the month of November Mrs. Forbes writes an interesting and informing article on the same topic. The problem, as she points out, is not one of the school only, but of the home. "It is solemnly true," she says, "that many an even well-to-do Eurasian home is the worst place for any child to be reared, and culture is entirely lacking." It is for this reason that the Bishop of Madras pleads "for industrial homes and schools in the hills, where the children can be lifted 'clean out of their vicious circle and degrading environment, and given a fair start and a better opportunity.'" One thing is certain. The Roman Church has perceived the immense possibilities of the work in this field. If her efforts should be crowned with success—and she is said in the past ten years to have added some twelve thousand Eurasians to her communion—she will have won a great base for her future work in India. Will the consecrated statesmanship of Protestant Christendom allow so great an opportunity to pass unused?

George Tyrrell. The Life of George Tyrrell¹ has just been published. It is partly autobiography, and partly biography, the latter being written for us by Miss M. D. Petrie.

¹ In two volumes. London: Messrs. Arnold. 21s. net.

It is a book of very real interest for two reasons. It is the story of a thoughtful man, and the search for truth of a thoughtful man, even if it be somewhat unsuccessful, is always interesting to seekers for truth. But the book is something more than the story of a man: it is the revelation of an ecclesiastical system. The reader who expects sensationalism will be disappointed, but he who wants to understand the spirit of modern Romanism will find ample material here. We want to be quite fair to Rome, and it is probably true to say that George Tyrrell was of such a type of mind as to make it unlikely that he should be quite happy in any of the Churches of organized Christendom. Tyrrell was an idealist, and in his ideal Church of the future he wanted to find a comprehensiveness which probably no Church will ever be able to give. There is modernism and modernism, some of it innocuous, even useful; some of it so entirely rationalistic that we pray it may never have a place within the Christian Church. But granted that Tyrrell was a difficult person to deal with, and we readily grant it, we cannot help but feel that the story of his relations with Rome is only another manifestation of the cast-iron narrowness and exclusiveness of that Church which dares to arrogate to herself, just as narrowly and exclusively, the sole right to the title of Catholic.

George Tyrrell was born a member of the Church of England, or rather of the Church of Ireland; he forsook the Church of his baptism for Rome. Now and again men are tempted to do what he did, for Rome has her specious attractions, and the Church of England's position has its difficulties. We hope that those who are beginning to find Rome attractive will read the sad story of Tyrrell's life, and we fancy the attraction will vanish. It is true that though Rome excommunicated him and refused him burial, he believed to the end that Rome might still be the Church of the future; but in all his dealings with the Church Tyrrell found much of system and but very little of that sympathy which does not quench the

smoking flax, very little of the pity of Him Who calls the weary and heavy-laden, and comforts when He calls.

We are profoundly thankful that to the Criminal *White Slavery*. Law Amendment Bill, now before the House of Commons, there has been restored the clause which the Grand Committee omitted, and that the power to arrest has again been granted to any police officer who comes in contact with this nefarious trade. Once again the Christian public opinion of the country has triumphed over the timidity of the legal precisionist. And, further, we would express our frank satisfaction with the fact that, as the Bill now stands, a man convicted of this crime may be thrashed for it, though not upon his first conviction. We confess that we have not the slightest sympathy with the so-called humanitarianism which would protect the skin of the foulest blackguards the civilized world knows. Carefully administered, corporal punishment is no bad thing, as the discipline of our great public schools still clearly shows. But even supposing in ordinary cases we are averse to its use, either because we think it degrades, or because it seems too large a concession to physical force in matters moral, surely we need feel no squeamishness in the question before us. We were glad to see that men of such different experience and point of view as Colonel Lockwood and Mr. Crooks could express their willingness to inflict the punishment themselves, and that such kindly and sympathetic men as the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Chester could cordially approve of the procedure. To those of our readers who differ from us on the grounds that we have suggested, we venture to commend the leading article in the *Times* of November 2, from which we quote the following paragraph :

“As to further degrading a brute who lives by bullying women into prostitution, and appropriating the earnings of their wretched occupation, the thing is simply impossible. No human being can sink lower than that, and none that has sunk so low can be securely appealed to except through his skin. By a happy provision of nature the skin appears actually to become more sensitive as the moral sense becomes atrophied. The police know that, and declare that if flogging were the punishment on a second conviction there would not be any more second convictions.”

At last we have in our hands the Report of the The Divorce Commission. Royal Commission upon Divorce, and as was, perhaps, to be expected, it is a double one, a Minority Report being signed by the Archbishop of York and two others. It is too soon to form any judgment on the details of the Reports. About one thing we shall all be agreed—that man and woman should be put upon an equal footing in the eye of the law. On another point, too, agreement will be practically general—that if there is to be divorce at all, it must be as open to the poor as to the rich. Again, we shall all be thankful if the recommendation of the Commission regarding the publication of reports of divorce cases is carried into effect. On these points the two Reports agree, but in general principle and point of view they are poles apart. The majority seem to regard marriage much in the light of an ordinary contract, not indeed terminable at will, but to be regarded as broken on grounds which, in relation to marriage, we cannot regard as “very grave,” to quote the Report’s own description. Putting aside the religious aspect of marriage altogether, cruelty and desertion are such relative terms that to make them grounds for divorce will tend seriously to weaken the moral fabric of Society. But we cannot put aside the religious aspect, and although we are somewhat suspicious of the oft-quoted but rarely-explained law of the Church, we are quite clear that there is a Law of Christ in this matter, and that in the light of that Law these new proposals must be carefully scrutinized, and many of them stoutly opposed.

