

can Churchmen, by force of the good principle of honesty characteristic of English Churchmen as such. They do not need, like many other nationalities, a sentence of formal ecclesiastical excommunication: feeling unfit for reception of Communion, they proceed to excommunicate themselves! Is this so? Is it negligence rather than 'honesty'? Mixed motives, probably!

MATINS VERSUS COMMUNION was the staple subject of a most remarkable debate at the recent Church Union Conference. The Vicar of All Saints, Margaret St., opposed certain resolutions on the subject of Sunday celebrations with an amendment reversing, or nearly so, the relative positions at present of Matins and choral celebrations, with the express object of excluding from being present at the latter certain self-excommunicated persons—obstinate non-communicants.

SUNDAY OFFERINGS VERSUS ENDOWMENTS.—Bingham says: "If any one is desirous to know what part of the Church revenues was anciently most serviceable and beneficial to the Church, he may be informed from St. Chrysostom and St. Austin, who give the greatest commendations to the oblations and offerings of the people, and seem to say that the Church was never better provided than when her maintenance was raised chiefly from them." Endowments, afterwards, spoiled this touch through the offertory.

THE BI-CENTENARY FIASCO.—A few years ago—1862—English Nonconformists made a desperate effort to celebrate the close of the two hundred years from the time their forefathers were expelled from the Church of England churches and parsonages. The demonstration attracted attention to Church history, and the public were not slow to ascertain (1) that "served them right" was a just comment on the act of 1662, and (2) that the Puritans themselves had been the most intolerant of all. They must be "sorry they spoke"!

HOME RULE

For a province, or other distinct division of an empire or kingdom, to have a large measure of "local option" in matters of strictly local interest and moment, seems—in a general way—a very natural, reasonable, and proper arrangement. There are "State rights" of a proper kind enough which do not tend to disintegrate the State-union. No reasonable man would for a moment question the wisdom of such an arrangement. At the same time, even at such an initial stage of examination into the question, it is apparent that there must be a territorial or *space-limit* to the application of such a species of machinery. It would not do to make "sovereign states" of ordinary counties, townships or boroughs! The range of subjects in which small sections of a country should be allowed liberty of internal control grows small in proportion to the smallness of the area in question. It becomes a grave consideration whether it is worth while—"the play worth the candle"—to keep up a provincial government for places the size of Prince Edward Island, or even Ontario. The point is open to debate, as a matter of expediency and expense.

DISINTEGRATION OF THE EMPIRE

is no chimera—sub-division may go so far as to become a vexatious, because worse than useless, burden to the local tax payers. The process of "dismemberment" is not pleasant to contemplate—union, cohesion, federation, more or less intimate, is a much wiser course. There is a sense

in which "*Be divided*" means "be conquered": it is true that "union is strength," where there is a reasonable amount of similarity and community of ideas and interests. It has yet to be shown that Ireland is so essentially different in its nature and conditions of life as to render legislative division from England, Wales and Scotland necessary or advisable. There is, in fact, only one different element—and that is *Romanism*. Whether it is wise to give that element greater sway than it has at present is a question which it ought to be very easy to answer from British history. Even in England the presence of that element is felt to be a disturbing factor in public life, and nothing but the immense predominance of Protestantism there would have justified the step which was called "emancipation," of so dangerous a factor. The world and Christendom cannot afford to let the British Empire be weakened.

FITNESS TO GOVERN THEMSELVES

is another element in the question which should not be lost sight of in coming to a wise decision. With no disrespect, but because "facts are stubborn things," we suggest that the Irish people have proved themselves unfitted to govern themselves. Internal self-government there has always meant *internecine warfare*. It is for the practical benefit of such people that they should be kept "well in hand" by some stronger arm. Then—but only then—they are capable of doing great things, of compassing brilliant achievements. If there were, then, no other reason—if *Romanism could be trusted!*—there is this glaring fact of history against releasing Ireland from the strings of union in which she is bound with the other portions of the British Isles. Their "wedge" of voting power in the London House of Commons is worth more to them—if they only knew it!—than ten times any advantage they would acquire by being at liberty to scatter each other's wigs on College Green! To reproduce the spectacle of "Quebec" on the other side of the Atlantic would not be an edifying process for Europe. Let us keep our "awful example" to ourselves.

EDWARD BLAKE'S "CREED."

The telegraphic despatch from Dublin recently told us several items of belief in the Home Rule Creed expressed in our Irish-Canadian's best English in that first speech he made in Ireland. Among the "articles" then expressed was this: "He believed in his soul that the Catholics (*sic*) of Ireland would deal with the minority fairly, either in regard to religion or education. . . . He believed that under Home Rule the Protestants would be the spoiled children (!) of Ireland." It would be in order for Mr. Blake now to give us some idea of what—if there be anything—which he would not "believe": since he seems able to believe this monstrous piece of nonsense. It concerns us Canadians that such an utterance should come from a man who, in the same breath, prates of "his experience of Home Rule in Canada," as if that could lead him to any such conclusion. Of what use, we may ask, is the sort of education this talented and eminent lawyer has got here in history, if he remains so densely ignorant of one of those "self evident truths" which lie at the very base of any intelligent study of Romanism here or elsewhere.

WHEN WAS ROME TOLERANT?

is a question whose answer would puzzle even the subtle brains of this clever barrister to answer, with a single instance, if one notice the opportunities for intolerance within reach of that unscrupulous quasi-religious organization. When Rome

dares not interfere with the concerns and liberties of Protestants—she is tolerant, never otherwise. When her daring is repressed by the presence of possibly overwhelming numbers arrayed against her, Rome can be very gentle, lenient, winning, tolerant—gaining her ends, meantime, by every means of chicanery and cunning that the supreme casuistry of their Jesuit learning can devise. *This is the lesson that we are learning in Canada*—this is the experience Edward Blake ought to have carried with him to enlighten his auditors at Londonderry and elsewhere. What use can a man's experience be to him who has passed his life in Canada, and yet believes "in his soul" that the Roman Catholics of Ireland would deal with the minority fairly? Far more reasonably does Dr. Wild argue, that to behave so is to be—"a bad Catholic," as they term it.

IRELAND WOULD BE A LITTLE QUEBEC!

—and, if that be true, what more need be said? What is depopulating the Province of Quebec, what is filling towns in the neighbouring republic with—even—*French* Canadians, but the intolerable tyranny and repression under which French Canada labours at the hands of the dominant hierarchy and its tools? Are the Protestants of Lower Canada found to be the "spoiled children" of Quebec Romanism? Surely even Mr. Blake's summer "outing" at Murray Bay must have brought him into contact with something of the truth, even if his reading and study of the ecclesiastical and political history of Canada have been deficient. His life has been spent, however, in Ontario, where the Romish spirit of domination is kept in some sort of order by an overwhelming Protestant majority. Here their priests are complaisant, and gain their ends by specious pleas and mild insinuations about their voting "machine," rather than by stern tyranny. Hence his mistake—blind Blake trying to lead blind Ireland!

THE OFFICE AND WORK OF THE HOLY GHOST.

Our Lord said, "It is written in the Prophets, And they shall be all taught of God." (St. John vi. 45.) It is the Third Person of the Holy Trinity, God the Holy Ghost, Who now teaches all Christians, and makes them holy. We have seen that He came upon the Blessed Virgin, so that she conceived of the Holy Ghost, that her Child was God, Jesus Christ our Lord. When His work on earth was nearly over He told His disciples a great deal about the Holy Spirit, the night before His death, especially in the sixteenth chapter of St. John. He said: "If I depart, I will send Him unto you." (St. John xvi. 7.) And again: "When He, the Spirit of truth is come, He will guide you into all truth." (St. John xvi. 13.) We pray every day in Church to our Lord Jesus Christ to "grant us in this world the knowledge of His truth." That is one of the greatest things we can have in this world, as is also the power when we know these things, to do them; and both are the gift of the Holy Ghost.

There are three ways by which the Holy Ghost teaches us: The Church, the Bible, and our own consciences.

1. The Church. We know from our Lord's own words, that whatever has been believed in the Church all over the world, at all times, and by all faithful Christians, is the teaching not of men, but of the Holy Ghost. For Jesus said: "He shall guide you into all truth." And again: "He shall take Mine, and shall show it unto you." (St. John xvi. 15.) The Church does not mean only the clergy, any more than the Queen's army means only the officers. It means the Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, and all other baptized Christians to whom they minister the Word and Sacraments. And what is believed and taught by all of these everywhere (as the Creeds) is not man's teaching, but the Holy Ghost's. When the Apostles laid their hands on St. Barna-