

fare well with them? What banished Church teaching from King's College, and made it a thing of the past? Sectarian influence. Yes, someone answers; but all that is ancient history. Well, then, what is the hindrance to the Church of England in Canada having parochial schools of her own to-day, where, with a fair share of school funds, it is possible? Just the same answer, sectarianism. The Church in Canada has been despoiled of lands and college, and is not allowed to have schools of her own upon the same terms as others have. And, strange to say, the millennium is not yet with us. Prisons and penitentiaries and asylums have multiplied very rapidly, and they are, we read, not empty. A strange remedy was a little while ago suggested by a grave, learned, and experienced physician of Ontario for the woes of the province, with its large percentage of idiots, insane, and criminals. Ontario after its complete separation of Church and State, religion and politics, is not, it would seem, by any means a foreshadowing of Paradise, the blessed home or resting place of the saints of God.

WORKMAN.

REV. H. SYMONDS AND HIS CRITICS.

Sir,—Whilst not fully according with the views expressed by Mr. Symonds in his letter, in which he seems to say that the Church has passed through different stages of Church government, one cannot but admire the true spirit of brotherly love that characterized his now famous Synod sermon. Had it not been for his unfortunate quotation from Bishop Lightfoot, and his deductions therefrom, the sermon itself might have passed unchallenged, as indeed it has, for not one scholar in the Canadian Church has publicly criticized it. Anonymous remarks count for nothing, and even Phillips Brooks or Lightfoot, must have a claim to a patient hearing prior to any claim "Hoosier" thinks he has. The principle characteristic of the letters of your correspondents as against Mr. Symonds, is their calm assumption of all knowledge. Everybody knows, of course, the statement in the preface to the ordinal; but I fail to see in it any claim that the three orders of the ministry were ordained and deliberately appointed by our Blessed Lord. All I can read in the only authentic accounts we have of His actions, is of His ordination of the Apostles and His commission to them. His appointing of the "other seventy" may have been a foreshadowing of a wider extension of the ministry, but we are not told so. So far as we can gather, the Apostles had a free hand, subject to the guidance of the Holy Ghost, who was to "lead them into all truth." This very promise cuts at the root of the theory that these details were arranged during the great forty days. The development was rapid, I grant, but still it was development, and that is the claim that Mr. Symonds has put forth in section III of his sermon, and one cannot but be surprised that men who profess to understand these matters should take exception to such statements, because Revelation has told us so little. If Bishop Phillips Brooks has failed to read all there is there, we must be very careful not to read more than there is there, and go beyond what is written either in the New Testament or in the Book of Common Prayer, especially in the face of the undoubted fact that God has blessed the labours of Non-conformists in a signal and wonderful way. It is dangerous, considering whom we have to deal with, to make quotations, but there is one writer who has made special study of these very subjects, so much so that he has become almost an oracle amongst us. I cull from him the following: Of elders, he says: "That they were a separate estate, as it were, in the Church, is certain; but respecting their authority and ministry we are told nothing whatsoever." Then with respect to the seven called deacons, what we are told is almost contradictory. They were ordained to execute one work of a quasi-secular character, but we afterwards find them going about as evangelists." (Church Doctrine Bible Truth, 7th edition, p. 300). This whole chapter, in view of our controversy, is very instructive reasoning. If your correspondents could only get held of the true loving Christian spirit underlying all its utterances, we should not have the ungentlemanly, not

to say un-Christian abuse that Mr. Waterman has hurled at the head of one of the first scholars of the Canadian Church. We are thankful that our creeds were not written by such men as "Hoosier," and it is refreshing to turn back in the pages of The Canadian Churchman this last week and read the united utterances of the Anglican Bishops, in paragraph 28 of the Lambeth resolutions. But in this I am afraid we are apt to argue from different premises. Certain of us think only of the past, and look for cut and dried regulations to be found in Holy Writ. Dissenters look only to the present, and present needs. It is the old story of the gold and silver shield. Each can only see one side. The large-hearted Synod sermon bids us look at both sides, and though perhaps subsequent letters appear to overstep the mark, yet I think there is no fear that well informed Churchmen in looking round to the other side, will shut their eyes to the former one. It is time we ceased calling our brethren nick-names, which some of us do not understand. (What are "Plyms," anyway?) They have not forgotten, if we have, Graham of Claverhouse, and the star-chamber, and the boots and thumb-screws. Wesleyans have not forgotten the mobs which attacked the early revival services, "too often encouraged by some profligate clergyman." (Perry Ch. Hist.) We are told the Church needs friends to stand by her in this hour of danger. We need friends who are not afraid to tell us of our failings, and these matters to which I have referred have been spoken of by some of the best men of the Church to-day. Can we expect that those outside will draw near to us unless we draw near to them? Of what are we afraid? Cannot the truth live and flourish? Must all our Anglican institutions be maintained in order to preserve the integrity of the Nicene Creed? We need for the evangelization of the world greater freedom than is given us by that insuperable bar to progress, the "act of uniformity," and I am convinced from the tone and spirit of your correspondents' letters that it is Anglicanism, not Catholicism, that has opposed Mr. Symonds' sermon. The traditions and narrowness of Anglicanism are wedded to Protestant episcopacy. It is the spirit of the "Act of Uniformity," and of the "Test Act," that is not dead yet, and until it is dead there can be no progress made in this Canada of ours. Clearly, it is our duty, our bounden duty, to seek by the help of God, and in the power of the Holy Ghost, to undo the great schism that has rent and divided English Christians, and that cannot be done by saying: "Stand afar off, for I am holier than thou." Let men be brave and strong in the righteousness of their cause, and not be afraid to discuss these matters with our separated brethren. There are many in our ranks to-day who were brought up afar from us, and one and all will reiterate the experience of the present writer, that had not the clergy gone after them and sought them out, they would have been dissenters yet. Your correspondents' letters bear the stamp of the remark so often heard: "They are not Church people, why should I call on them?" It is but another form of the question so ably answered by our Lord in last Sunday's Gospel: "Who is my neighbour?" When men need the ministrations of clergy let it be not said, "By chance there came a certain priest that way, and when he saw him he passed by on the other side." Let it not be said of you and me, brother, and it will be said if we do not recognize our common Christianity, and as far as may be, join together in every good work. The best of dissenters will respect our principles if we are willing to call him brother Christian, though we cannot call him brother minister. And for those that are not the best, can they not be converted also? May we not go to the lost sheep of the house of Israel? Let me close with one more quotation from Mr. Sadler: "I desire to recognize, and to thank God for the abundant spiritual life which seems to exist, external to the Apostolic stream, but this can, and must be done without interpolating some impossible Presbyterian system, which, if once founded with any view to its permanence, never would so utterly have disappeared from Christendom. If I am asked 'on what principle I can recognize this life, I answer: On the principle contained in the very words of Christ, 'Forbid him not, for he that is not against us is for us.' (Luke ix. 50). If this

was said of one who followed not the twelve, with Jesus personally amongst them, we must surely say it with far more emphasis with respect to those who follow not the successors of the twelve. No one of the Apostolic band upheld the unity of the mystical body as St. Paul did, and he also could say, and let us say it with him, 'Notwithstanding, every way, Christ is preached, and I therein do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice.'

EDGAR W. PICKFORD.

Family Reading.

"THE GATE OF HIS ENEMIES."

"Thy seed shall possess the gate of His enemies."
—Gen. xxii. 17.

O world of pride,
Throw open wide
Your golden gates of splendour!
And let the Holy Christ come in
The cities of this world to win—
O kings, your homage render!

O world of woe,
Wide open throw
Your iron gates of terror!
And let the Consolation in
To triumph over death and sin,
And free from bonds of error.

O labour's sons,
Ye toiling ones,
Throw wide your brazen portal!
And let Him in—the Son of Man—
Your toil to own, your work to scan,
And bless with joys immortal!

O gates of doom,
Make room, make room
For Christ, the King of Glory!
He shall the world's wide gates possess,
He shall come in to judge—to bless—
And end earth's bitter story.

—Clara Thwaites, in the Church Gleaner.

ASKING ADVICE.

Some persons have a mania for asking advice, not that they intend to follow it, but because they like to talk matters over, and then do what they please. Maria Louise Pool says of such a woman:

"She was in a mood to consult. She particularly liked to get peoples' ideas, and then do exactly as she pleased. She had a way of asking a person's opinion as if the opinion would have weight with her—and sometimes it did have weight, for a few hours."

This habit, once formed, is not easily broken, and it is one into which women especially are prone to fall. To ask advice is a mistake unless one is really in a quandary as to what she should do, and needs the unprejudiced opinion of an outsider. Even then it is an error to consult freely with other people about one's private affairs. There is a homely adage which states that "every tub must stand on its own bottom," and the sooner that each of us learns to judge and act for himself, the better it will be for all concerned. Every one has enough responsibilities of his own without settling matters for other people. Wives accustom themselves to going to their already burdened husbands with every little hitch in the household machinery. One wife confesses: "For the first two years after I was married I told John everything. Every time one of the maids slighted her work, lost her temper, or broke a dish, I informed John of the fact, and asked him what I ought to do. At first he advised me, and I have no doubt that I got myself into many an unnecessary domestic broil by following his impetuous counsel. How should he know how to manage Bridgets and Gret-