

flock shearing their chief shepherd of all authority, is the embodiment of an attempt at all this absurdity.

We cannot be at unity among ourselves so long as a spirit of anarchy and insubordination, under whatever guise, finds a place in our once peaceful midst.

It is a principle of English justice—much more of Christian charity—that every man must be accounted innocent until he is proved guilty. So long therefore as no charge of evil in doctrine, morality or practice has been or can be proved against our Bishop, surely Christian charity demands for his character our heartfelt respect, and for his episcopal authority our unfeigned and fearless submission. And if when they had much cause for dissatisfaction with their heathen tyrants, St. Paul declared that the early christians who should resist the rulers set over them by the providence of God should receive to themselves damnation, surely it cannot be a perfectly safe course to resist and hold up to suspicion the authority of a Christian Bishop—our overseer by Divine permission. It cannot, at all events be a course likely to promote “the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.”

Again—Unity supposes counsel. It is when men take sweet counsel together that they can walk in the honour of God as friends. Suppose a Bishop to be more than suspected of heresy—as in the case of Colenso. Is he, even in such a case to be condemned unheard—hunted down without a trial? And if he is to be tried,—by whom? Surely by his peers. Common justice prescribes a jury of experts. Men learned in the law may wink at his faults,—a council partly appointed by an Assembly of all religions may prove to such a man's errors as indulgent as those who appoint them. But Bishops and Clergymen learned in the gospel, meeting in their deliberative capacity, in Convocation and Synod, compose the assembly appointed in Holy Scripture for the trial of high offences against the truth, therefore such assemblies are absolutely necessary—for God works by means. And there is no peace or unity without truth.

Again, suppose congregations choose to run to extremes in the matter of ritualism. Is any one simple enough to suppose that mere clamour or the threat of persecution will put them down? How shall the law interfere with them in the United States where even the Mormons are free, or in England where the Irvingites have long indulged in an extreme ritual with perfect impunity? Surely common sense shows that the only check upon such extremes is the voice of the Church in her Synods or deliberative assemblies. For the preservation of unity in externals therefore, Synods are an absolute necessity.

To promote and preserve unity among ourselves, and prevent the growth of excrescences on the body ecclesiastical, a mere negative system of protesting will not do in these days of free inquiry. The unity of the spirit is not promoted by a carping jealousy between our different congregations. If we do not like our neighbours' mode of conducting the services let us show that we can fill our churches by faithfully obeying all the rubrics as we understand them. The great love of young and old for good ecclesiastical music—spirit-stirring chants and hymns—is well known to all observers. By all means let us draw men within the sound of the Gospel by thus worshipping God in the beauty of holiness. The New York Episcopalian—an Evangelical paper—in a late editorial against Ritualism, says—“we confess there is need of reformation and improvement in all our worshipping assemblies.” As to the responses in some churches, the editor says the gentlemen are mute, whilst the ladies are only heard “in zephyr-like whispers.” He greatly longs for the “awe-inspiring and impressive volume of sound” which might arise from the worshipping throngs in some New York churches, and therefore