

the doer of all the work that went on in his parish, but he should be the regulator and ruler of it, and he should have, in a measure, in carrying on that work, the steadiness and inflexibility of a machine. He should be like the church clock that went on quietly and regularly striking the hours and measuring the time in cloud and sunshine alike, in days of joy and in days of sadness, while the funeral procession passed by, or the wedding group, or the worshippers who were summoned to prayer, still keeping on its way with order and precision. All clergymen were not naturally punctual, and some were lazy and procrastinating, bustling and fidgety, absent and self-absorbed. Some were eager and impulsive, ready to make any promises under excitement, but who failed when the impulse had expended itself. All engagements should be conscientiously observed with punctuality. This was within every clergyman's power, though he could not make himself a man of genius. Regularity was but a small thing, easily attainable, but, nevertheless, it was most important to the efficient working of a parish. At the same time no one need be a slave to routine, and allow it hopelessly to master him. The clergyman must not get mastered by routine so as to become a slave to his parochial machinery, and sacrifice everything to an abstract system of organization. Love and patience and sympathy and personal dealing with individuals must interweave themselves with all his parochial machinery.

THE CASE OF M. MARTIN.—It will be well to abstain from harsh or hasty comments on the case of the "ex-priest," as the papers not quite theologically call M. Martin, at present of Montreal. It is quite easy for any one who knows anything of spiritual doubts and fears to understand his misgivings about having forsaken his priestly calling. It is equally easy to understand the voice of nature which called him back to his wife and children. But the action of Roman authorities must also be judged in accordance with their theories and convictions. It does not appear that any attempt was made to molest M. Martin before he wrote to Cardinal Taschereau; and, on the supposition that M. Martin was living in mortal sin, which is, of course, the theory of his Church, the Archbishops could hardly have acted in a different manner from what they did; and, as far as we can judge, they acted with great kindness and consideration. If only some care had been taken of the forsaken family, the poor young wife and her babes, we can hardly imagine that any reasonable man could have censured their action.

THE PASSION PLAY AT OBERAMMERGAU.—In accordance with immemorial usage, the first representation of the Passion Play took place this year on the Monday in Whitsun Week. Great multitudes attended, and many were unable to find admission. As has been common of late years, a large proportion of the visitors have been English and Americans. The increase of the numbers may be accounted for, not only by the increased interest in the representations, but by the greater ease with which the place can be reached, the railway now going much nearer to the village of Oberammergau than it did in former days. It is said that the representation has proved most satisfactory, in other words, that the dreaded secularization of the performance has not taken place. This is a matter of sincere gratitude; since few things could be more distressing than the degradation of a Mystery Play which has been found edifying to multitudes besides those who are members of the Roman Communion.

THE DUKE OF CONNAUGHT.—The reception of His Royal Highness, the Duke of Connaught, seems to have been a very successful and brilliant affair. That the great city of Toronto should strain every nerve to give a loyal reception and a hearty welcome to the Son of our Sovereign was a matter of course; but all circumstances, except the weather, seemed to be favourable. Not least pleasing among the phenomena of the visit, was the enthusiasm of the multitude, which, indeed, may sometimes mean but little, but which, in the present case, undoubtedly declares that the people are loyal to the Crown and the Sovereign.

PRAYER FOR THE QUEEN.

We have received, as we expected, some replies to our complaint that the intercessory collects for the Queen and the Royal Family are omitted, whilst that for the Clergy and People is said. These replies are instructive and generally say the kind of thing which we expected. We are sure, our kind friends will forgive us, if we declare our conviction that such arguments would not satisfy them, if offered in behalf of any principle or practice which they disliked. It is the old case suggested by Aristotle. Only one who was defending a thesis would use such an argument.

We believe it is not quite twenty years since this innovation first appeared in England; and it is not long before the customs, bad or good, which get established in the old country, float across the Atlantic to our own shores. It is quite likely that the practice in question may not affect so disagreeably the feelings of Canadians; but we have reason to know that it excited great indignation among laymen in England. Of course the Queen is a "specified member" of the Church. Our excellent friend would not, we suppose, have a number of Queens, a class. The person of the Queen is so august, whilst we have a Queen, that she represents the unity of the Nation and of the National Church, that she rules in the Name of God.

But the strangest of all the arguments for leaving off intercession for the Queen is that employed by another correspondent, who urges that prayer might be more properly offered for an autocrat than for a constitutional monarch. And because Queen Victoria is of this kind, "there is no reason why we should pray for her so very often *qua* Queen."

In the first place, the "very often" is not the question. It is quite easy to omit all those three collects if any of them are omitted. Queen and Clergy are prayed for in the *Preces*. Queen and Clergy are prayed for in the Communion Service. It is the using of the one collect and the omission of the others that draws attention to the strange variance of the practice with the simple requirement of the Apostle. If a prayer for the whole Church and the whole World is required, there is the prayer for all sorts and conditions of men. But the argument drawn from the constitutional or limited character of the English monarchy is the strangest of all, and to our minds the most hopelessly unintelligible. Our correspondent exclaims, with a kind of rapture, that the Kings of other days "*were Kings*." Apparently it was worth while praying for Nero, or rulers of that kind, or even for Charles the Second, or Dutch William, or Hanoverian George; but for Queen Victoria! Really it seems quite unnecessary to make such a fuss about a person who is so little of a Queen!

Does this mean that the Queen does not need to be prayed for; or that she is "past praying for?" Or does it mean that the laws promulgated

by a constitutional sovereign are less worthy of respect, or are less the laws of God, than those which are published by an autocrat? We can hardly think that this is the meaning. Shall we say that a Sovereign whose throne is "broad-based upon her people's will" is less of a Queen than one who is the mouthpiece of the clique by which he is surrounded, and whose bidding he must do or risk assassination, or of one who has accidentally got an army upon which he can rely to compel obedience to his decrees?

The requirement of reverence for the powers that be does not depend upon the manner of their appointment, or the particular system under which their authority is exercised. The King of Israel was the "Lord's anointed;" but the Roman Emperor, although he might come to the throne by a mutiny of the soldiers and the murder of his predecessor, was nevertheless the "minister of God;" and the descendant of Cerdic the Saxon, of Malcolm Canmore, of William of Normandy, of Henry the Lion, who comes to the royal and imperial throne of England by a lawful succession, has a right to reverence as supreme ruler in State and in Church, second to that of no monarch who reigns over a Christian or a Pagan people.

We have been led to these remarks, lest we should seem tacitly to acquiesce in the theory assumed by our correspondent. And this is a point of more importance than the mere saying or omitting of a collect. If we are to make our obedience to those who are set over us, depend upon the manner of their appointment and the particular nature of the Council by which their authority is exercised, it will be quite easy to explain away the duty altogether, and then we may as well blot out the words: "Obey them that have the rule over you."

THE SYNODS.

We are now approaching a season of the year in which the solemn gatherings of the clergy and laity of the Church take place, for the transaction of business and for the taking of measures which must prove a help or a hindrance to her God-appointed work. We are sure that the members of the various Synods will meet together under a very deep sense of their responsibility and with an earnest desire by word and deed to promote the best interests of the Church, for the raising and sanctifying of mankind and for the glory of God.

There is really no great danger of the members of our Synods generally taking the subject otherwise than seriously. Moreover, it has become habitual with our Synods to be in earnest without being quarrelsome. Party spirit hardly ever dares to raise its head; and, when it attempts to do so, it is promptly and sternly repressed by the combined sentiment of the meeting. This is an unspeakable blessing, and it is the parent of other blessings which have not yet attained to full growth. It becomes every loyal and devoted member of the Church to give thanks to God for such tokens of His favour.

But, whilst these good things are worthy of all recognition, it must not be ignored that there are some evils not remotely associated with them under which we are still suffering. Our earnestness is apt to take forms which are a little vexatious to our neighbours and slightly obstructive of the business of the Synods. We are apt to fancy that it is quite necessary that we should bear our "humble testimony" to this and that, and so many of us are possessed with this conviction that there is great danger of the precious time of the