

delegate or come himself to Canada to place before us his side of the case, and so they desire to forestall such a possibility. Therefore, we, as Christian brothers, do wish from our hearts to simply caution you in season on this point, and say, as you must desire fair play, pause a little before you decide in this matter, lest we all fall into a similar position as did Bishop Gregg and his followers at the hands of the same American Bishops.

"No serious inconvenience can possibly arise by being most careful, and in that light we simply suggest that you should delay the time for electing a Bishop until you have more positive knowledge of our true position and requirements, and know something of the person that may be presented to us for such an important and lasting position, and that he be in every respect well qualified in all the essentials that should adorn a worthy Christian Bishop. For it certainly is of the first importance for the welfare of our Church, that we make a judicious selection at the start; consequently we think that it is not too much to say that we can continue for six or twelve months longer without a Bishop, rather than jeopardise our true interests by a too hasty election, as by such delay personal intercourse may prove of the greatest importance in securing the proper person, and also the peace and prosperity of our Church as a whole, which was so happily organized by the late Reverend Bishop Cummins. Remember that union is strength—also that most of our pastors have been sent here from the United States, while the congregations are British subjects. Therefore, there will be a natural divergence of interests between pastors and congregations under existing circumstances. While we contemplate the position, we feel it our duty and privilege to place these facts before our fellow-laymen in order to secure united action on their part, because, after all, they are most concerned, and should be most careful.

"It would be a sad spectacle to see our Church divided up in Canada; some claiming the jurisdiction of Great Britain, others that of the United States and, possibly, others that of Canada—pure and simple. As British subjects we most naturally prefer that authority whence all that governs us emanates; and as we are credibly informed that Bishop Gregg intends to establish a R. E. C. in every city in this Dominion, we hail the announcement with great pleasure, and earnestly hope that you will seriously consider all these facts.

It is a sad spectacle to see a church "divided up" anywhere; but when division is based upon such trivial ground as that of "jurisdiction," and when it is accompanied with the use of such strong language and damaging charges against the personal character of some of its leaders, it becomes a source of pain and shame. Since Athanasius roused the worst passions of those within the church, and the fierce scorn of those without, by his theological invectives, members of the Christian community have manifested an unvarying aptitude for promoting internal differences; and the Reformed Episcopalians of these latter days promise to be no whit behind their forefathers. It can hardly be that disputations are needful to church life; nor can it be to the spiritual advantage of any body of believers to make pompous pretensions to be the purest and most ancient of churches. Such pretensions call for no arguments in rebuttal, only for a word of gentle remonstrance. The gentlemen who issued the circular would have done well in consulting a writer of English, and still better in cultivating a spirit of modesty.

I have expressed no opinion on the question in dispute between the Bishops and the congregation of St. Bartholomew's, simply because it has somehow been made a little obscure to outsiders; but as to religious controversy, I will set an example worthy of all imitation, by saying nothing about it, further than to refer the curious in such matters to the tomb of Sir Henry Wotton, in the chapel at Eton, whereon is the following inscription:—"Hic jacet hujus sententiæ primus auctor: *Disputandi pruritus Ecclesiæ scabies.*" Here lies the first author of this sentence: "*The itch of disputation is the scab of the Church.*"

Laticus.

"CONVENTIONALITY vs. INDIVIDUALITY."

It is a very fascinating and instructive amusement, no doubt, to search into,—nay, revel in the follies which women commit through their slavery to Fashion. But are men much in advance of them? Certainly dress is to man, not so much of a passion. But there are other phases of masculine life in which conventionalism almost completely kills individuality.

Just as women have so little confidence in their own individuality that they prefer to trust to "Fashion" in the matter of dress, so men, doubtful of the Truth which is in them, if wrought out into life, would find shape in anything either useful or beautiful, take refuge in conventionalities. Hence result what are called business "cliques," social "clubs," and political "parties." In these what is individual and natural to the leader becomes merely fashion in most of the followers. Men clothe themselves with a form of thought which is not their own, but an imitation of some real thinker who could hardly repress his individuality from finding expression, even if he longed to do so.

Such fashions, peculiar to the "lords of creation," exercise a very powerful lordship over them. Look at business cliques, for instance. To enter any of these a man must look business-like. In England he must be careful that in externals he is respectable, but not foppish. He must look grave, as if wholly occupied with weighty transactions. His place of business must have the regulation musty, grave, oppressed, and oppressive look; and he and his employees must be conventional and precise in their hours of attendance. He must lunch or dine at conventional hours—must look calm and dignified externally, though internally hurried and worried to the verge of distraction. He must, in fact, sink the individual and become one of a class.

This form varies according to nationality. Take the neighbouring nation, for instance. No doubt the original American merchant took a humorous view of trade, liked his business, enjoyed it, and felt like a schoolboy at play, and so now his follower *has to be* funny on 'Change, whether he feels like it or no. He must be always animated, festive, and in a hurry. Even his conventional drinks at the bar he must bolt hurriedly, drop his sarcastic joke like a leaden bullet, and then be off like a shot, as though a man with a big cheque were waiting for him round the corner.

Canada is not without its business conventionalities either. Here the business man must rejoice in much and long continued hard work. He must positively gloat over it, in itself considered, without regard to any usefulness there may be in, or through, or by it. He must partake of the Englishman's gravity during the hours of labour, and of the Yankee's grim jocularity during recess. He must talk large of his power of work and his triumphs over competitors, or his clique will think he is ashamed of himself and is not succeeding; and then said clique will "go back on him," dropping hints of warning to each other which will affect his credit. He must never "cave in," but run it to the very last, and then be a nine-days wonder, when the smash comes, to all but his Bank Manager—sometimes even to him. But if he has done all this, and done it well, his estate may go, but *he* will be accounted a smart fellow, hard working and full of "energy"; and his clique will take him to their arms once more—that is, if he have money, influence, or backing enough to make it "worth their while."

Professional life is only another phase of the same underlying principles; for some professions at least are but meaner forms of trade. Business "chique" (which is a nicer way to spell it than "cheek") can be seen in its fulness in our Law courts. There it carries all before it, because it is the fashion, revered by all. As "professional confidence" it takes its place beside the Doctor in his consulting room, and sits complacently alongside of him on his "buggy." While as "modest assurance" it is neither rare nor unfashionable even in the pulpit.

And then in Political life where shall we look for anything but "Fashion"? We are *all* conservatives. Progress must not only be individual. It must only be progress along certain well defined lines. These have been probably really individually thought out and adopted by the leader, because through these he finds he can best express *his* individuality; but to the "party" these become only a "fashion" which they follow.

In men as in women this devotion to Fashion is the outcome of lack of individuality. Somebody has said somewhere in the past ages that "Union is Strength"; and men have taken it as their creed. To him who said it, it was the expression of a truth given to him to perceive; that union of *will*, or motive *is* strength. For union in mere externals, without the union of the internal will or motive, is a most potent source of weakness. Tie a dozen men firmly together with a rope, and then tell them to leap over a wall to reach something valued by all on the other side, and you will see union of externals hindering union of motive from free exercise. The tie becomes a bond. Grand freedom with the same union of motive, and, while some may crawl over, some leap at one bound, and some will have to help each other, *all* will reach the other side.

Fashion in dress, manners, trade or politics hold men together by external ties only. These hinder advancement. Union of motive—a unity of longing to be useful each to each, and all to all, causes immense diversity in externals; yet such a union is the only one that gives strength. Where it does exist it cannot but work itself out through individuals according to their individuality. External bonds are soon broken. A. cares not a jot to know or study how B. conducts his business. He entertains no doubt that B., like himself, is trying to do the best he can for the community with the powers and means at his disposal and it does not make him look ashamed at B. that he finds him in a shabby hat or coat, or with a cigar in his mouth at mid-day instead of at 7.30 P.M., as by business law established. He charitably supposes B. finds the weed most nourishing at that hour of the day and works better for it.

Oh! that men would but have the courage of their individuality, and having first permitted Life from above to make them pure in motive within, choose just the best and most appropriate means they can find by which to let that purity of motive find natural exit into life. Then, as a nation we would have *character*, distinctive and natural, and plenty of variety of it, instead of feeble and wearisome "copies from the master." We would no longer have fashion in Politics—parrots copying a meaningless party cry adapted neatly to their imitative powers—but real live men, each a "party" in himself, driving onwards the rulers of our nation. Government by the people is a reality among us, and on the people rests the responsibility. If they are fooled and led astray, it is their own fault. If they *will* not become individuals, they must cease to be men, and sink to the level of fashion-worshippers, and mere members of a "party."

Now, men, what do you think of it? If women lack individuality, it is because you do. Is there one among you who in dress, trade, profession, social life or politics, will dare to become as free from the fetters of fashion as in this 19th century, here and now, to set public opinion at defiance and live the life that is in you as fearlessly and grandly as would the woman who would dare to become individualized as to the outward apparel?

If you are possessed of some slight will towards Goodness, and some faint glimmerings of Truth, why don't you clothe your outward and visible life with these and let them shine in the light of day? Never mind "use and wont." Don't be conservative as to method, but by every and *any* method let the Light that has been given you so shine before men that seeing your *good works* they may glorify God who enables you to do them. Become a real live unit in the universe—not a mere copy and imitation of a man.