

they feel any distressing doubt or perplexity as to receiving the Holy Communion; they do not delight in drawing near to God by other modes of approach, trusting that they may find in them, at least in part, the spiritual benefit which they dread to seek, or have not learned to look for, at the Table of the Lord. These men are not communicants because they purpose to put far from them the responsibilities of the Christian life; they do not intend at the present to do anything else than follow their own way, and seek their own pleasure. Can we doubt that persons of this class, had they failed to receive Holy Baptism in their infancy, would stand aloof from this Sacrament also, even as they now do from the other, instinctively shrinking from any act, whereby they might appear to recognize their obligation to lead a life, wholly at variance with that which they are actually leading? The only possible difference would be this, that Baptism is not, like the Supper of the Lord, a rite continually recurring, so that the sense of incongruity between the Christian profession and the unchristian life, however startling at the moment, would at least, not be perpetually re-awakened; or, perchance, the world in the Church may still, in some sort, believe of Baptism, what it does not believe of the Lord's Supper, that it is "generally necessary to salvation," because it is far easier to think this of a thing of the past, well-nigh forgotten, than of a thing ever challenging our obedience, rebuking our worldliness, and causing us disquietude in the present. Can it then be justly represented as an act of narrow bigotry—is it not rather an office of true Christian charity—to point out to such persons the position which they are really occupying? If they deliberately divest themselves of the obligations and responsibilities of the Christian character, can it be right to soothe them into deadly indifference by recognizing them as men who are really abiding in the communion of the Christian Church? Are there others, who have not as yet formed a settled purpose such as has been described—whose error is rather negative than positive: who are failing to think aright, rather than persisting in thinking amiss; who follow the example of others rather than a resolve of their own, and hold it to be neither unsafe nor unseemly to "go with the multitude" when they pour forth from the House of God before the celebration of the Lord's Supper? Then surely in their case the charitable voice which warns them that they are not abiding in the unity of the Church is no less due, and may be spoken with far better hope of being listened to. We are told that it is the part of the clergy to utter this voice. So, beyond all question, it is. We are told that they should preach and exhort on these subjects. So, undoubtedly, they should. But there are others who preach, by a necessity laid upon them, as well as the clergy in their pastoral capacity. The Synods of the Church, by their constitutions and laws, proclaim (or preach) in a most emphatic manner, to all her members, what they should hold and believe on all subjects, to which those laws and constitutions in any way relate. Our Synod is, therefore, incurring a most grave responsibility, if it solemnly accords to any man a position in the visible Church of Christ, to which he is not, by the law of Christ, entitled; it is teaching men to account very lightly of obligations the most sacred, and is lulling to sleep those wholesome apprehensions, which it is its duty to awaken and to deepen by an unequivocal declaration of the truth.

Above all, be it remembered, that it can never be the office of Christian Councils or Synods to lay down limits of Church membership of their own

devising; the conditions, under which men enter into and abide in the fold of Christ, are conditions which it rests not with them either to relax or to make more stringent: their sole province, in this regard, is studiously to protect from violation the laws, which have been laid down from the beginning by the highest and most sacred authority; which have been recognized by the Church of England from very early times, and again enforced, on the Reformation of our Church, in the rubric at the end of the Communion Office, which provides that "every parishioner shall communicate at least three times every year, of which Easter shall be one."

GEORGE WHITAKER.

#### THE BEGINNING OF THE END.

THE letter which we publish in another column, furnishes somewhat instructive reading. In Ottawa the Reformed Episcopal Church made a bold splurge, and received its chief recruits from the congregation which has the reputation of being "Low Church," but which was still too "High" for certain of its members. An erratic and deposed American clergyman, named Gallagher, gathered these persons round him, with some others, malcontent in their various sectarian denominations. He boldly asserted that the Prayer Book was false to the Protestant principles of the Church of England,—that the Church had betrayed her trust in many nations, especially in pretending that there were three Orders of the Ministry, whereas there were in reality but two—a Presbytery and a Diaconate—and that an Episcopate was no order at all, and not believed in by any enlightened Churchman. The new Church, of which Mr. Gallagher was the accredited fugleman, was to abolish this order as such, and its Bishops were to be simply superiors of the Presbytery, like the Superintendents of the Methodists. However, it soon became apparent that the main body of the seceding party were not of Mr. Gallagher's mind, and we had a parade of men standing about in shovel hats, aprons, and breeches, and addressed superfluously in public and private as "My Lord!"

One gentleman, already a Presbyter in England, and who may be presumed to have had some lingering belief in the virtue of consecration by somebody, came across the Atlantic and had the hands of those "Bishops" laid on his head. He seems, however, to have had a distrust in the "Bishop" who was his consecrator, and, it is said, bullied the Recording Secretary to substitute in his parchment the name of another "Bishop" who was present, but who had once been a "lawful minister," i. e., a lawfully ordained minister of the P. E. Church. The gentleman evidently had some doubt as to the virtue of his "Apostolical succession" when coming through "Bishop" Fallows. All this unquestionably startled those of their followers who were honest in their ignorance and their unbelief in Bishops, and they were still more disturbed when they found this English ex-priest, who travelled to Chicago to receive a true Episcopal and Apostolical succession, assuming the grandiloquent title of "Primate of England!" People all round were laughing at this crowning piece of tomfoolery. Indeed the *Primate*, with his fine appellation of "Most Reverend," has done more than anything else to turn the whole thing into ridicule, and show the absurd inconsistency of the new *Reformation*. By degrees the most sensible men have had their eyes opened to the imposition on their credulity and have already left the "Reformers," many expressing their great sorrow at their attempt to play at schism. The letter of Mr. Quail will speak for itself, and, perhaps, will be a warning to some who feel inclined to listen to charlatans who would dupe them into "reforming" the Church of England. It is also one of many symptoms, as regards this latest of sects, that the collapse is not far distant. In fact, such a letter may well announce the beginning of the end.

#### PLAIN REASONS AGAINST JOINING THE CHURCH OF ROME.

ROMAN IMAGE-WORSHIP.

XIV. Never, let us take the worship of images and pictures. Here it must first be said (a) that the Roman Church in terms denies that any such act as can be strictly called *worship* is done to pictures and images, even by the most ignorant, since no one believes that these representations can see, hear, or help themselves; (b) that there is no question as to the lawfulness of making some such images and representations, if not intended to receive homage, as even the Jews had the brazen serpent, and the figures of the cherubim in the Holy of Holies, where however, only one man ever saw them, and that only once a year; and the early Christians set up pictures of our Lord in the catacombs, still to be seen there. But, on the other hand, there is a very suspicious fact which meets us at the outset of the inquiry as to the actual Roman practice, as distinguished from any fine-spun theories in books, namely, that no Roman catechism teaches that there is either danger or sin in any making or using images for religious honour, short of actual paganism. The point is not, as Roman controversialists are apt to put it, whether their way of dividing the Decalogue, which makes the First and Second Commandment (as the English Prayer-book and Catechism have them) one precept, and then restores the number ten by making the Tenth Commandment into two (a plan which seems only to repeat the Seventh Commandment, and to make St. Matt. v. 28 superfluous), be a better or a worse than the Anglican; nor whether the whole text of the commandment against image-worship be not found un mutilated in Roman Catholic Bibles; but whether in practice one Roman Catholic in a million ever knows that image-worship can be abused or sinful without virtual apostasy from Christianity. The Shorter Lutheran Catechism cuts down the First and Second Commandments just in the same way as some Roman ones do; but, then, on the one hand, Lutherans have free access to the Bible in their own language, and, on the other, nothing of the nature of image-worship has ever been practised amongst them.

Intelligent and shrewd heathens, when arguing in favour of idols, say exactly what Roman Catholic controversialists do in defence of their practice, namely, that they do not believe in any sentient power, as residing in the mere stone, wood, or metal, of which their idols are made, but regard them as representing visibly certain attributes of Deity, to bring them home to the minds of worshippers; and that homage addressed to these idols on that ground is acceptable to the unseen spiritual Powers, who will listen to and answer prayers so made indirectly to themselves; and, in fact, Athenagoras, a Christian apologist, who lived in the second century (A. D. 177), tells us that such was the defence set up by the Roman pagans of that time on behalf of Roman idolatry, and adds that they appealed to the miracles and curses wrought by such images as proofs of their truth ("Apol." xviii. xxvii.).

#### Diocesan Intelligence.

##### MONTREAL.

[FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.]

The Provincial Synod met yesterday. A report of the proceedings will be furnished the DOMINION CHURCHMAN by our special correspondent.

##### ONTARIO.

[FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.]

A very interesting and successful meeting of the Bay of Quinte Clerical Union was held at Bath, on Tuesday and Wednesday, the 10th and 11th of August. The Rev. A. F. Echlin, who is in charge of the parish during the absence of the Rector, the Rev. F. H. Tane, did everything to render the meeting all that could be wished, and his efforts were appreciated and rewarded. A celebration of the Holy Communion was held at 7.30 a.m., on Tuesday, Rev. J. W. Burke, celebrant; followed by Morning Prayer at 10 a.m. A meeting at the Rectory followed, the Rev. A. F. Echlin presiding, at which the Rev. Mr. Roberts read an excellent paper on the subject, "How best to increase the number of our communicants," after which the subject was discussed by the clergy present. Much stress was laid on the advantage of an early presentation of the subject of Holy Communion to children with a view to make them acquainted with its importance and desirous of its benefits. At the afternoon session, the Rev. Dr. Clarke, of Christ Church, Belleville, read instructive paper on "Church