

matters to its own peculiar circumstances, which shall ensure the possession of that elasticity and liberty without which our external unity would be but the "unity of death."

We give the pith of some shrewd remarks of the London Guardian in noticing the objections which have been made in various quarters to the Lambeth Council, as we find they tell equally well against the same objectors to the Final Report.

First, there is a large class of outsiders, who, when they have some special point to make, tell us that they are "well-wishers to the English Church." It may be so, but their actions prevent our taking their word for it. When the sheep in the fable took the advice of their "well-wishers," the wolves, it did not turn out well for the flock. But inside the Church there is a class who would put down all activity and life which does not move in their own direction, on the plea that it is best to be quiet and "let well enough alone." They would advise idleness in others, whilst in their own clique they are constantly working for their favourite ends. Another class are fearful lest these signs of Church life and vigour are at the same time symptoms of a dissolution of the ties between the Church and the Throne. They are not careful to distinguish between the things that be Cæsar's and those that be God's. The Royal Supremacy has no true interests incompatible with the purity and discipline of God's Church. But really the objection is that this revival of self-government in the Church will set aside the supremacy—not of the Queen—but of the laity as expressed through the Legislature, in so far as this lay supremacy would contravene the Church's laws or screen the law-breakers. The Report of the Lambeth Conference shows that the Church is quite willing to admit to her councils the faithful laity, and it would indeed be an ill day for her, if her enemies, by citing the fears of the timid on the subject of endowments, could extinguish the desire for unity and counsel which is at once the sign of vigorous life, and the guarantee, under Providence, of her safety. The question is—shall the Church be in the hands of her children, or in those of her enemies?

### RATIONALISM.

WHAT we pointed out months ago is now beginning to be perceived by some of the zealous advertisers of Ritualism. Rationalism or covert infidelity is quietly leavening society in England. A writer in the London Record, (the paper which last winter so violently attacked our Bishop,) shows that Rationalism in England lays hold of the principal places of education, the public institutions, and above all, of the press. We have wondered how Colenso found so many sympathisers, in high places, and thus by the help of the secular arm managed for so long a time to set the whole Church at defiance, and ravage Christ's heritage. The wonder is explained when we hear that the *Times*, the *London Telegraph*, the *Pall Mall Gazette*, the *Saturday Review*, the *Athenæum*, the *Spectator*, the *Economist*, the *Examiner*, and "many minor weeklies," as well as Fraser's and McMillan's Magazines, and the Quarterly, and some other Reviews are either neutral or on the Colenso side. Dr. McLeod, the favourite of the Queen, is the editor of "*Good Words*," a magazine leaning to Rationalism. "*Ecce Homo*," is a book which in some passages throws great doubt on the miracles recorded in the Gospels, and yet we are informed that a man of great note in England, who—if he live—will probably have the appointment of many English bishops, warmly approves of this book. The son and daughter-in-law of the late Prime Minister of England, it seems, attend infidel lectures, and this on Sundays.