

where a great artist painted her with her beautiful boy in her arms, like a Sir Joshua Reynolds portrait. And Lance had plenty to do even for his superabundant energies, with estates in the two countries to manage on which nothing had been done for years, and where things were sadly in need of setting to rights. He was a revolutionary landlord and respected his tenants' rights, and ordered the relations between them and him that when the troubled times came he was perfectly at peace; those measures cost him much popularity with his fellow-landlords, at least in Ireland, for the time, but events proved his wisdom. And he went into Parliament, and altogether led a very busy and honourable life; yet, would it be believed? he always claimed as the happiest days of his life those toiling under a South African sun. And Tom and Mrs. Donovan had the Home Farm on the Irish estate, from which Tom commanded things generally in his son-in-law's absence. Even to be near Sheila would not induce them to live in England, but Tom found his way over once for a short time. I have been told that a very great lady was on that occasion heard to express warm admiration for Lady Armstrong's father, for his distinction of bearing and feature, his silvery locks, but above all for "his beautiful manners."

THE END.

### THE ANGLICAN SYNOD AND PROTESTANT UNION.

The Provincial Synod of the Church of England in Canada, lately meeting at Montreal, discussed, resolved and appointed a special committee to search for some basis, on which the various Protestant denominations of this broad Dominion might be able to unite and form but one Church. This is indeed a laborious duty, for within their own ranks there are many divisions and but little union. A semblance even of unity would be welcomed by the synod.

The members of this committee represent the various opinions to be found within the Anglican communion. As every committee must meet to begin their work, we will suppose such a meeting, and in imagination be spectators of the proceedings, which I picture to myself as assuming something of this form.

The chairman calls the meeting to order. He says: The object of this committee meeting, and which we must keep in view in all our deliberations, is the union of the Protestant churches of this country. The Church of Rome, claiming for herself divine authority in spiritual things, cuts off as broken branches, those who will not believe her, and has thus preserved for herself a remarkable unity. We, who acknowledge no spiritual headship on earth, no authority but Christ, who glory in an open Bible and the right of private judgement, must at times feel ashamed of the many sects into which Protestantism has been divided. It is for us to discover some means of doing away with this shame, of bringing together the various parts and form them into one homogeneous whole, a consummation devoutly to be wished. A united Protestantism would be the glory of our Saxon race, and Romanism would soon become effete.

Rev. Dr. A. then addresses the meeting.

Mr. Chairman,—We are told that in the beginning Christians were all of one mind and one heart. It would be, indeed, a glorious ending to this nineteenth century, if through our humble endeavours, unity should be restored to Christendom. We must make a beginning by finding a basis of union with the different denominations, we unhappily see around us. No doubt this union once formed will spread, until the English-speaking people of both hemispheres be united in one faith. This basis, in my opinion, is to be found in the practices and teachings of our grand old Church of England, the Anglican branch of the Church Catholic. The Bible which she translated, notwithstanding the Revision, is still the Bible of the sects. The Bible, therefore, should be the first plank in the platform, which is to form the basis of our union. There are also those ancient symbols of faith, the Apostles and Athanasian Creeds. These short formulas define the teaching of the earliest days of Christianity, and should form our second plank. For about eight centuries

the Church is admitted on all hands to have been free from the corruptions of Rome, and to have taught the pure, unadulterated doctrine of Jesus Christ. The first four councils are the expression of the belief of the whole Church in those days, and must form another plank in that platform if the united church is to teach the pure doctrine of Christ. Without Apostolic Succession, we can claim no commission to teach or orders to make us ministers of God. In this we find a fourth plank and I should say a sufficient basis of union. I have no wish that our noble Church should seek union on any less stable basis. Moreover, I consider such a basis should be satisfactory to the denominations. The only objection I find that they can have to the Church of England to-day is the Thirty-nine Articles. Hence I have not insisted on their forming any part of the ground-work of our union. In fact, I would rather that Cranmer, Parker and their associates had never written them, or that the Government had never sanctioned them. This obstacle removed I have great hopes of our union being consummated, on the basis which I have laid down.

Rev. Mr. B., after a short pause, rose to address the members.

Mr. Chairman,—I have to thank the learned Doctor, who has taken his seat, for the clear and concise terms in which he has stated his opinion; but I must say, the platform is too narrow. What we want is a basis broad enough to hold men of every belief and opinion. Why impose on men of intelligence those relics of barbarism, the obsolete creeds of antiquity, and the anathemas of Athanasius? Why should the early councils be accepted, or their decrees be received, when our councils of to-day, even the Pan-Anglican, dare not define any doctrine? We have the Bible and the right to interpret it as we please, and will not accept other teaching. All creeds and councils must go the way of the Thirty-nine Articles, and be abandoned, if we desire union. This is the only basis on which we can become united.

Rev. Mr. C. then took the floor.

Mr. Chairman,—I am more than pleased with the short and pithy speech of the rev. gentleman who has preceded me. Whilst, I fear, he went, perhaps, a little too far in some things, he forgot to mention what, in my opinion, is one of the greatest stumbling-blocks to union with the Evangelical churches. I mean Apostolic succession. I do not believe in orders, yet I think myself as good a churchman as any in the hall. I find no difficulty in filling a Methodist or Presbyterian pulpit. Nor have I any objection to have any of them, provided he is eloquent, preach in my church. Among their clergy are many godly men, whom it is an honour to associate with. We must look upon their rights to the ministry as equal to ours, if we shall have union. Apostolic succession sounds well. But whence comes this succession? From Rome. Are we Protestants to take our commission or ministry from Rome. For me, I want nothing from Rome, neither orders nor dogmas.

The fourth speaker was Rev. Dr. D.

Mr. Chairman,—I can claim to belong to no party. I think we must approach the discussion of this subject most cautiously. In this enlightened age, we cannot be too careful in laying down any basis of union. What we accept to-day, we may deny to-morrow. Our belief has changed again and again. Science and history have done much to destroy the vaunted theories of the past, and falsify the opinions and belief of our fathers. Our orders have their foundation in the civil law, and do not come down the ages from the Apostles. Our church is, at least in England, a purely State church. Her highest tribunal is likewise the highest tribunal in civil affairs. In the past almost every opinion has found favour with some English churchman. The same may be predicted of the future. Even one of our Bishops denied the inspiration and authenticity of parts of the Bible, and it is no strange thing to hear her dignitaries deny the eternity of punishment. We must therefore not place any belief in our basis that may be controverted. We ourselves are without authority to define anything. The future will give us no greater authority. Therefore I would say:—Let us be consistent. Let us make the basis of our union be nil, neither creed nor faith.

The chairman concluded the debate in the following words: