

But seriously, not only have these non-natural teachings inspired a vastly increased and increasing desire for primitive and pure doctrine in this diocese, but in New Brunswick even the secular prints frequently give the utterances of Episcopal correspondents whose feelings have been outraged by the uncharitableness and unfairness of the Church Witness' attacks on their own communion. One writer, a few months ago, after enumerating some flagrant instances of this, breaks out with the indignant exclamation that if it be High Church to disagree with such injustice, he would glory in being called High Church, Puseyite, Tractarian, or whatever else might convey the idea of the very antithesis of the Church Witness' teaching. Another churchman writing from the country to the St. John Church Magazine, last May, gives the report that certain of the St. John clergy despise one of the Church's Creeds, and that several mutilate the Baptismal, Marriage and Burial Services, and that the editor of the Church Witness, "to deceive people, say that devotional expressions must not be taken to have an absolute sense, and that the Catechism requires a charitable construction."

We said in a late number of the Church Chronicle that the uncharitable attacks upon things pure and primitive, as well as modern and ritualistic, which we find in every number of the different echoes of the London Record, published on this side of the Atlantic, would advertise the Ritualists and give them an easy triumph by enabling them to clear their private characters (admitted on all hands to be lameless and self-denying) and to mix up their modern innovations with primitive doctrines and practices, so that one must stand or fall with the other. "A layman" in St. John sees this also, for in the June number of the Church Magazine he complains that any nominally Church paper should supply the enemies of the Church, with material for evil accusations. He thinks it unfair that for the sake of having a fling at practices which do not exist in New Brunswick, unassailable things, such as *Choral Services*, *Surpliced Choirs*, *Services on Saints Days* and *Free Seats in Churches* (and he might have added *Daily Prayer*), should be spoken against. Said we not truly that all this advertising would have a contrary effect from the one intended. Such uncharitableness on the part of a professedly religious paper will first disgust men, and set them to reading for themselves, and no sooner is this done than the old raw-head and bloody bones which for so many years has had so much influence in the hands of the Church Witness editors will become a laughing-stock instead of a terror. We have seen the day when the stigma of High Church would blast the usefulness of a man in many places. Timid men lived on sufferance and dared not assert the doctrines of the Church. That day—thank God—is gone forever!

But it is not Ritualists alone who will profit by the zealous labours of Miss Lloyd's imitators in New Brunswick and elsewhere. The infidel and the free-thinker will reap a large harvest from the seed they are sowing. Side by side with the attack upon our humble serial, the Church Witness gives in large type an extract from the London Record against the Archbishop of Canterbury and the forth-coming General Anglican Council. Because the good Archbishop, in his invitation to the Anglican prelates, says he "humbly trusts that it is not without the guidance of the Holy Ghost" he has decided on calling together this Council, the Record straightway sees "an enormous difference between this and the first Council of the Apostles, wherein St. James could confidently say—"it seems good to the Holy Ghost and to us." Could such a Council be called in the present day, the Record says it would have a right to trust to the overruling wisdom of the Great Head of the Church to guide and bless the issue. To the Record's mind, the assumption that