

n all parts of the
ing for unity—
than heretofore.
Conference has
is in its resolu-
with this feeling.
troubled waters

ter anxious dis-
ves with laying
which approach
These articles
tures of the Old
all things neces-
sary and ultimate
as Creed, as the
ed, as the suffi-
"3. The two
lf—Baptism and
with unfailing
and of the ele-
Historic Episco-
f its administra-
ons and peoples
Church." Thus
h the Bishops of
aken. It is out-
section with the
the former Pan-
are "united un-
of the one Cath-
the one faith
e Creeds, main-
affirmed by the
urch is Christ's
nd the word."
s of Acts ii. 42.
on the day of
e Apostles, the
thus being put
baptized in the
the Holy Ghost,
ined steadfast-
and fellowship,
ayers." These
e Church is a
r Lord, the In-
dom prophesied
the last days
kingdom which
a stone out out
until it became
e earth. This
represent Him
the regenera-
a who would be
stored up trea-
sures and
He appointed
stewards of His
committing to
after them and
for the execu-
with them and
rd. Thus the
vinted officers
an initial rite,
sustaining rite,
or the Holy
the Church of
of the truth,
ries of Faith"
ceremonies."
reasons of her
ths of Christ-
stated for the
ministry which
To it he must
public authori-
m to call and
d." We hold
e orders. In
in the Prayer
n is made by
men diligently
authors, that
n these orders
s, Priests and
re had in such
it presume to
e first called,
sh qualities as
public prayer,
ed and admit-
a matter of
g the nature
from the same
s our know-
r Testament
ities as have
of the New
fold Ministry
ed from the

first; there is uniform testimony as to its prevailing everywhere from primitive times. In other words, the very authority upon which we depend for the New Testament, tells us that we have the same ministry as prevailed everywhere in the primitive Church. By way of illustrating and justifying the position taken by the Pan-Anglican Council, let me emphasise this point. That Catholic Church of which we claim to be an integral part, "has lasted on as a Divine Institution, a supernatural society, from the beginning with its outward form and organization, and its internal spiritual life and gifts. In all ages it has borne and has been known by these marks; that it has preserved a three-fold ministry, of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, deriving authority through Episcopal Ordination (the "Historic Episcopate.") in an unbroken line from the Apostles: that it witnesses to the Faith "once delivered," in the creeds which have come down from the earliest times: and that it ministers the Sacraments of the Gospel, Baptism, and the Holy Eucharist, according to our Lord's command and institution, as the great channels of His grace." Let us try and grasp this idea. It is a grand one. Surveying the Christian world of to-day, the "millions behind the mountains," as well as the few millions nearer home, we are moved by the force of the testimony which we find is borne to the soundness of our case. Let us not judge of the whole world by our youthful though vigorous Canada. Of those "who profess and call themselves Christians," there are in the world, say, 365 millions. Of these four fifths at least agree with us in these points,—the three-fold ministry, the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, the necessity of Baptism and the Holy Communion, and I would add, the use of a Liturgy—leaving about a fifth of the whole of Christendom, Protestants of the various denominations, who do not hold all of the essential points laid down by the Anglican Bishops. Under these circumstances we naturally think, and think rightly, that such a proposition for Union as that embodied in the proceedings of the Conference, or an equivalent one, is the only one likely to succeed. It is felt by many outside of our communion, both in Europe and America, by Roman Catholics and Protestants alike, that the Church of England is the only possible intermediary between Protestant and Catholic Christians; that being marked by soundness in the faith and by the regularity and validity of her orders, she alone can supply common ground on which a divided Christendom may be brought together. It will thus be seen that as Churchmen we take our stand on the ground of Holy Scripture and history. Such was the contention all through the Reformation period, as is abundantly manifest from the formularies of our Church. We are not of yesterday. Our age is not one hundred years, nor two hundred, or even three hundred years. A recent occurrence in England has helped to point out the venerable standing and the historical continuity of England's Church. A lease of some Church property which had run for 999 years recently fell in. The Roman Catholics in the old country claimed the property as theirs, on the assumption that a thousand years ago they were the Ecclesiastical body then in power. Their claim, however, was rejected by the English Court; the case was decided in favour of the Church of England as being the rightful owner, and the party interested at the time that the lease was executed. There were first the British and Saxon Churches, these gradually merging in the seventh century, into the "English Church," and this again expanding into the great Anglo-Catholic Communion. Thus we have a grand historical position. In fact our lineage is traced back as regards faith and polity to the first days of Christianity. Our principles, our motto as a Church is "Primitive truth, and apostolic order." In the interests of the truth we are obliged to maintain this position, whether it be found to conflict with Rome on the one hand, or with the great Protestant bodies on the other. I think it was Cardinal Manning, in a recent controversy, when pressed with the testimony of the early Church,—who boldly declared that the Church had "conquered history." The appeal to antiquity was too much for him. He would wipe out the past. This we cannot do; nor have we any desire to do so. No one, whether Pope, or Potentate, or church, can change, much less abolish history as regards either doctrine or ecclesiastical polity. The appeal to antiquity, which is so plainly characteristic of the Anglo-Catholic Churches, is a two edged sword, cutting on the right hand and on the left. In it we find a crucial test. "If (says a writer whom I have briefly quoted already,) Religion were a matter of human discovery, like the arts and sciences—medicine, music, sculpture,—then we should naturally, as in those branches of knowledge, correct the opinions of earlier days by those of later times. But religion, and the Christian religion in particular, the Church believes to be a matter, not of human speculation and discovery, but of Divine revelation. While men were left to find out what was of comparatively small importance, that which belonged only to this lower world, Almighty God has made known to us that which is of the utmost

concern for all to know, the truths of religion concerning Himself, His being, nature and character, and concerning ourselves, our origin and destiny, the true standard of our life, our relations to our Maker, and the means whereby we may approach Him. This revealed, speaking most plainly by His Son; and consequently in matters of religion the Church appeals in essential points to the belief and practice of the ages nearest to the Lord and His immediate disciples, as witnessing to the purity of the Faith once delivered. She traces her tradition as nearly as possible to its source. "Let that abide in you which ye have heard from the beginning, this is her rule and motto." Yes, on these points we have strong convictions, conscientious convictions, desiring earnestly to contend for the faith once delivered to the saints, and in the language of St. Paul to "keep the ordinances, or traditions, as they have been delivered to us." It is not our fault if we find ourselves forced to take this position; it is a sound one: the facts are with us. The deposit, the faith of our fathers, is a sacred trust, it is not ours to change the truth, to mutilate or destroy it, but rather to reverence it, to guard jealously and hand it down to our children. If any do not respect our convictions, as we respect theirs, at least they may permit us to hold them. They should not judge us harshly, or lightly say that, in sticking to and upholding our principles, we are narrow and uncharitable. We feel that we are dealing with truth; and truth is God's, not the invention of man; we have no right to barter or throw it away. Surely the Oneness of God's people is a thing to be desired and loved. We may well pray for it, often and earnestly, as Christ prayed that we all might be one even as He and the Father are one. In millions of Christian souls there is a longing for this oneness; and the Conference did not hesitate to express their feeling that the divisions of Christendom—their own among the rest—were a scandal to the Christian name, and they could not quietly acquiesce in their continued existence. So long ago as 1867, at the first Pan-Anglican Synod, the Bishops made the following important pronouncement:—"We desire to express the deep sorrow with which we view the divided condition of the flock of Christ throughout the world, ardently longing for the fulfilment of the prayer of our Lord: That all may be one, as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us, that the world may believe that thou hast sent Me. And we do solemnly record our conviction that unity will be most effectually promoted, by maintaining the faith in its purity and integrity, as taught in the Holy Scriptures, held by the primitive Church, summed up in the Creeds, and affirmed by the undisputed General Councils, and by drawing each of us closer to our common Lord; by giving ourselves to much prayer and intercession, by the cultivation of a spirit of charity and a love of the Lord's appearing." Let us each individually resolve to adopt this course. Let us love our Church, which holds such a position in Christendom; seek to learn more of her true principles and her history; enquire as to what she is doing, and would do in the world,—and "lend a hand." "Walk about Zion, and go round about her; and tell the towers thereof. Mark well her bulwarks, set up her houses; that ye may tell them that come after." "O pray for the peace of Jerusalem, they shall prosper that love thee." Let us add our prayers in private and in public to those which are daily ascending to the throne of grace in this behalf; and when we come to the Lord's house, let us then throw even more heart and fervency into that familiar prayer:—"We pray for the good estate of the Catholic Church, that it may be so guided and governed by Thy good spirit, that all who profess and call themselves Christians, may be led into the way of truth, and hold the Faith in unity of spirit, in the bond of peace, and in righteousness of life."

UNSECTARIANISM.

"Unsectarianism" is a nice sounding word with two meanings. In the dictionary sense it means "Not characterized by any of the peculiarities or narrow prejudices of a sect." In the technical or School Board election sense it means that Codling's the friend, not Short. In this sense just now its praises are being sung with ten-fold vigour. The choir is large and composite, being composed mainly of Jews, Turks, infidels, and heretics, sectaries great and sectaries small, but united in one solid phalanx against the "sectarianism" of the Church. It is true that the voices are somewhat out of tune occasionally, and that there is a preponderance of wind in the orchestra, the few strings being manipulated by a select band of wire-pullers behind the scenes; but they make plenty of noise, and that is, after all, the most important feature in their programme. Their object is to cater for the vulgar, and the vulgar like plenty of brass.

"Down with superstition" is the burden of the

song, but mingled with the pipings of the sects there is a good deal of the bray of the Hall of Science, which makes it sound a little unreal. However, the sentiment is good, although the performers may not all be genuine in the meaning they attach to it. They are all, however, agreed as to the virtues of "unsectarianism." The only question, therefore, that remains is, "What is a non-sectarian?" For it is a comprehensive word, and will include a variety of people. But if rightly understood, it breathes of freedom, and liberty, and breadth, how much more comprehensive is its caricature? For Mr. Bradlaugh is non-sectarian, and so is Mr. Guinness Rogers, and so are our French neighbours, who have carefully erased even the name of God from all the books of instruction lest it should offend the delicate susceptibilities of infidels. As to their pulling down the crucifixes, that only proves the more how thorough is the *entente cordiale* between Protestantism and infidelity, for are not their Christian allies in England trying to do the same thing? Pulling down, indeed, appears to be the distinguishing characteristic of the two systems, for, to recur again to France, another distinguished non-sectarian, M. Ernest Renan, is just now busily engaged in demolishing King David, at the same time that our English Down-gradists are explaining away all those portions of the Bible that do not quite meet their views. Their French friend, however, is more thorough. He does not say that certain narrators are "parabolic," but goes to the root of the matter. He tells us plainly that David was not at all parabolic, but that he was "a hypocrite, a selfish egotist, and that he dabbled to some extent in poetry, but that nevertheless he did not write the Psalms;" and more to the same purpose. Bad as this is, however, it is only carrying the argument that the Bible should be interpreted "liberally" to its logical conclusion, and our non-sectarian friends cannot complain if another non-sectarian goes a little further than themselves in doing so, and interprets the word liberal in too liberal a manner.

But notwithstanding all this, "non-sectarian" is still a name to conjure with, for, the Bard of Avon to the contrary, there is a good deal in a name. It is true that in the course of time, some words lose their original meaning or have new meanings tacked on to them. Of this there are several distinguished examples at the present time—*e.g.*, in secular matters "moral" means nothing else besides morality, in fact, something utterly opposed to it when used by a betting man; and "sportsman," in the same modern vernacular, means a man who cares nothing for sport; while in religious matters, the word "sectary" has become amplified since Shakespeare's time into "Free Churchman," which means a minister who is held in bondage by his deacons, and a pastor who is led by his flock. Of course these examples might be multiplied *ad lib.*, both in secular and sacred matters, in and out of the Church, for unfortunately we are not quite free in this respect ourselves. To take one example only, a Broad Churchman means one who is broad up to a certain point only, and then his very reputation for breadth enables him to be the narrowest of the narrow without fear of reproach, for he is on the popular side. One has only to shout with the largest mob to be sure of an appreciative audience. It is of no importance that these high-sounding words are a cover for something that in naked truth is not high-sounding, and are intended to throw dust in the eyes of the public; the unthinking are flattered, and, above all, their votes are secured. So that, as before stated, "non-sectarian" is still a name to conjure with. For this reason, at this time, the creedless unite with the godless to sing the praises of unsectarian education. No matter that all the large educational establishments of the past were founded by Churchmen; no matter that Churchmen in the present still freely spend their thousands in educating children in the fear of the Lord, which an old fashioned Book says is the beginning of wisdom; the Church has neglected her duty, she has been the foe of education, and has tried to keep the people in darkness. And above all, says the sectary, her schools are "sectarian." The children who are being taught their duty towards God and their duty towards their neighbour, are in danger if they learn it from the Church Catechism, while they are perfectly safe if they are taught neither in "unsectarian" schools. The little ones who are taught by the clergyman, in the words of the Prayer Book, to lead a godly, righteous, and sober life, are in danger of priestcraft, besides which it is unnecessary, as it is well-known that they can learn all that from their parents (who are all sober, and godly, and righteous), or the testotal lecturer, or anybody, or nobody, so long as they do not learn it from the Prayer Book; or if not, they can wait till that vague time, "when they get older," and "choose for themselves," what religion, if any, they will patronise. As for the two sacraments being generally necessary for salvation, that is all superstition, invented and patented by the priests, for the purpose of keeping the children in the trammels of superstition; and here again the "when they are older" argument crops up,