

her that the Church of Rome as a Church opposes all secret societies; and lastly that one of the Fenian principles, namely, that Priests have nothing to do with the people's politics, is highly distasteful to the principles of the priesthood and quite contrary to its practice in past times. On the other hand, it is certain, that the Roman priesthood have often been hostile to the British Government—that Fenianism is simply the fruit of their perpetual influence and agitation—that Priests have marched in the mock funerals in some cases, and lastly, that masses were said in all the Roman Catholic Churches in Dublin for the souls of the men executed in Manchester. If they are sorry for past agitation and its effects, still they cannot claim equal merit with those who have always been loyal. Why express sympathy for these murderers more than others, as the Marchioness of Londonderry and the Dublin Roman Catholic Churches have done, if it were not because of sympathy for the cause in which they suffered? We hope that our governments at home and abroad will cease favoring that Church by giving them more money than other religious bodies. They may receive as much favor, but certainly upon no principle should they receive more. If there be a grand difference between them and other bodies, it is a difference that entitles them to less and not to more. Upon what principle do they in this Province receive £750 a year for education and the Church of Scotland not one farthing? We require to be earnest and watchful, and *now more than ever*, under a Dominion where nearly one half of the population are Roman Catholics. Let us be well assured that not one stone will be left unturned to secure the peculiar ends of Roman Catholic ambition.

One of the absurdities of the Anglican convention was an address to the Greek Church, which retains all the peculiar corruptions of Popery. A correspondence of this kind took place more than a century ago. The nonjuring bishops in Scotland attempted a union between themselves and the Eastern Church in 1723, but were at last grandly told by the Eastern Bishop that they must submit to Eastern doctrine without qualification ere such union could take place, so that this is an old story and a very silly one. Meanwhile the Ritualists persevere with their ceremonies and threaten the disruption of the English Church, if they are not tolerated—a catastrophe which it will be very difficult now to avert. Such are the evils which have sprung from sacerdotalism. Under the New Testament every man is his own priest and the clergy "servants for Christ's sake." The cry for "short sermons" has an undoubted connection with ritualism on the one hand and infidelity on the other—it is the joint offspring of irreligion and superstition. Is religious instruction not necessary—is not the preaching of the gospel a Divine appointment? And when is it to be done? Religion is now driven out of the schools into the cold. What is a creature that can merely read, write

and cypher? Is a thing of that description a man? You might construct a speaking, printing and calculating machine by steam, and drive it by steam faster than any Yankee could guess or spit tobacco, but would that be an educated human being. We require men that fear God, hate evil and love their neighbor, and what but religious instruction will give such—combined with prayer for God's help, for a Christian must be *created*, not made. The necessity of religious instruction being admitted, how long is that part of, it commonly called the "sermon" to be? Archdeacon Denison says "ten minutes" and similar journals say the same or less. But Dennison being at the very head of the ritualist party, wants ceremony and not teaching, and infidels oppose the gospel. How would the press like to be thus tied down? Some say ten minutes—some twenty and some a half hour. Others say "condense." But if you "condense" you will not be listened to or understood, and if you *dilate*, as every teacher of the people must do, how are you to do that in ten minutes? So that the clergy have a hard time of it among many counsellors, who have so kindly taken their interests in hand. There cannot be one time for all men, all topics and all occasions. Any man with half an ounce of sense must see that. It would be as reasonable to say that all dinners must bestow the same quantity of food, or all journeys must be the same length. Topics must be taken up and thoroughly discussed in the pulpit, whatever time it takes, if that mode of instruction is to remain useful to the public. The "word" must be made a "goad" to pierce and a "nail" to stick. The first process requires explanation and the second hammering, and the nail must be struck again and again—driven home and then rivetted, if necessary, and all this requires time. Sermon literature has nothing to fear by a comparison with that of the periodical press. It has contributed much more valuable and durable material to the classics of our nation. Let us beware then how we ignorantly join in a cry, which has for its object either crushing the truth or obscuring it. A rapid homily of ten minutes length, in which nothing is discussed, in which truth is neither explained nor applied, or where, if it is explained it is not applied, or if it is applied it is without having been explained, and prefaced with incense and outflared with red and white garments, and songs and candles may just suit many people; but it will have no more effect than a gun having powder without ball or ball without powder, or perhaps the snap and momentary mist of the cap on a gun that has neither.

Public attention has of late been much directed to national education. The state of matters is very bad in England, where about a third of the people married make a mark on the register instead of signing their names. Mr. Lowe advocated in Edinburgh a thorough reform and a purely national system, severed from all sectarian control. This is perfectly