

the Lord, like Saul and Barnabas, or as many a wealthy, learned, devout Christian has done in the past, and as is now often witnessed among our sisters of charity, or like those Roman Catholic missionaries to whom the Bishop of Algoma (Dr. Sullivan) alluded in his sermon at the opening of the Provincial Synod in 1886. We may well learn a lesson from the Roman Church here—in spite of her errors in doctrine and practice she has preserved far better than ourselves an appreciation of the highest forms of self-sacrifice, and she would, I believe, if it were not for those errors, carry all before her on account of her faithfulness to Christ in this respect. This is but to say, in other words, that if the Church of England with her deposit of uncontaminated truth would but humbly and heartily pray and labor for this most Christ-like characteristic in her midst, she would be simply irresistible everywhere. As a step in this direction let us set the seal of our approval as publicly as we can on any attempt or proposal to revive Missionary Brotherhoods in our Church. By God's blessing the immediate result would be a great gain in spiritual fervour and energetic action, an increased supply of men best fitted for the work, and sufficient means, at least, to give them support. Let us long and pray for such revival. Let us be more self-sacrificing ourselves, more liberal in our gifts, more energetic in our work, wherever it may be, so as to prove the earnestness of our desire for it. Let us now, to begin with, I do not say consent to tolerate men who will thus give themselves up to Brotherhood life in the mission field, but beg for their aid, and hold out a hearty welcome to all who may dare by God's grace to make trial of the same, and let us hail gladly the day when the Church will declare herself ready to encourage by all means in her power the formation of Missionary Brotherhoods for the pioneer work of the Church in Canada.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

WHAT A PRESBYTERIAN SAYS.

I AM not an Englishman, nor an Episcopalian, yet no loyal son of the Church of England could look up to it with more tender reverence than I. I honor it for all that it has been in the past, for all that it is at this hour. And not only is it one of the oldest churches in the world, but one of the purest, which could not be struck from existence without a shock to all Christendom. Its faith is the faith of the Reformation, the faith of the early ages of Christianity. It has held the primitive belief with beautiful simplicity, divested of all "philosophy," and held it, not only with singular purity, but with steadfastness from generation to generation.

What a power is in a creed and a service which thus links us with the past? As we listen to the Te Deum or the Litany, we are carried back, not only to the Middle Ages, but to the days of persecution, when "the noble army of martyrs"

was not a name; when the Church worshipped in crypts and catacombs. Perhaps we of other communions do not consider enough the influence of a Church which has a long history, and whose very service seems to unite the living and the dead—the worship on earth with the worship in heaven. For my part I am very sensitive to these influences, and never do I hear a choir "chanting the liturgies of remote generations" that it does not bring me nearer to the first worshippers and to Him whom they worshipped.

With these internal elements of power, and with its ages and history, and the influence of custom and tradition, the Church of England has held the nation for hundreds of years to an outward respect for Christianity, even if not always to living faith. While Germany has fallen away to rationalism and indifference, and France to mocking and scornful infidelity, in England, Christianity is a national institution, as fast anchored as the island itself. The Church of England is the strongest bulwark against the infidelity of the Continent. It is associated in the national mind with all that is sacred and venerable in the past. In its creed and its worship it presents the Christian religion in a way to command the respect of the educated; it is rooted in the universities, and is thus associated with science and learning. As it is the National Church, it has the support of all the rank of the kingdom, and arrays on its side the strongest social influences. Thus it sets even fashion on the side of religion. This may not be the most dignified influence to control the faith of a country, but it is one that has great power, and it is certainly better to have it on the side of religion than against it. We must take the world as it is, and men as they are. They are led by example, and especially by the examples of the great—of those whose rank makes them foremost in the public eye and gives them a natural influence over their countrymen.

Such is the position of the Church of England, whose history is as a part of that realm, and which stands to-day buttressed by rank and learning and social position and a thousand associations which have clustered around it in the course of centuries to make it sacred and venerable and dear to the nation's heart. If all this were levelled with the ground, in vain would all the efforts of Dissenters, however earnest and eloquent—if they could muster a hundred Spurgeons—avail to restore the national respect for religion.

Looking at all these possibilities, I am by no means so certain, as some appear to be, that the overthrow of the Establishment would be a gain to the cause of Christianity in Europe.—*H. M. Field, D.D.*

THE LUTHERAN tells of Mr. Charles Groves, a wealthy Liverpool merchant, who, believing that the very best means of fighting the hydra-headed social evils was the preaching of the Gospel, for fifty years spent only one-tenth of his income on himself and devoted the other nine-tenths to building and sustaining churches for the poor.