

when "his own received him not," and an anticipation of His coming to judgment, when every eye shall see Him, and they also which pierced Him. His entry into Jerusalem on Palm Sunday was an act of condescension—an act of mercy. It was a last offer of His Gospel from the King of Zion—a last opportunity presented to them of learning Who and what He was, what were His claims, and what He had to teach. But if this was a day of grace, it was also a day of triumph; it was a day on which He received the homage of His people Israel—the hosannahs of the multitude, while He entered His capital city, and as the Prophet, the Priest, and the King of the human race, marched in joyous procession to His Temple, where His praises had been sung for ages, and where sacrifices and offerings had been made to His most glorious Name. The Scripture selected for the Gospel is therefore the most appropriate one in the whole of the Sacred Record for the commencement of the season of Advent.

THE CROYDON CONGRESS AND ITS REVILERS.

THE "great and good Dr. McNeile" (as he said he was some time ago, in an anonymous letter afterwards proved to have been written by himself;—and he ought to know—) has been severely exercised at the harmony and good feeling shown at the recent Church Congress at Croydon. It might appear strange that a great and good man, pledged to the cause of Him who came to promote "peace on earth" should be displeased to learn that there was an absence of strife and contention among those who belong to the same branch of the Catholic Church of Christ, who profess belief in the same standards of doctrine, and who use precisely the same liturgical services, with perhaps an occasional variation in the tone, the music, the accent, or possibly the twang. But Dean Close seems to have followed in the wake, perhaps just to keep the ex-Dean of Ripon company. The ex-Dean is intolerant of the toleration that was shown at the Congress towards those who wish to observe the law of the Church as it is unmistakably laid down in the book of Common Prayer. He thinks the toleration shown to the Church party might have been manifested to those who do not belong to the Church at all; and he thus shows an entire want of agreement with the principles of the Church of which he claims to be a member. And further, when he asks, "Are gentlemen to be accounted members of the Church of England who disobey the law, who declare that they are in conscience bound to disobey the law, and who in their practice from week to week openly violate the law?" can we avoid entertaining rather strong feelings of disgust at the hypocrisy of a "great and good" man pretending abhorrence at breaking the law of the Church, when he himself has broken it every week of his ministerial life? Perhaps it may be said that he does not allude to the law of the Church as given by herself, but to the law of the land as laid down by the judges of a civil court. But even so, among other

questions we would ask, Does he teach the doctrine of the Eucharist as laid down in the Bennett judgment? For according to the letter of Dr. McNeile, that forms part of the law, quite as much as anything else. And again, when the ex-Dean was ordained, he declared his "unfeigned assent and consent" to all that is contained in the book of Common Prayer. But this same distinguished gentleman, in company with other law breakers, some years ago, actually proposed for general use a bracketed prayer book, which omitted some important points of Church doctrine! And moreover, whereas the Prayer Book directs every priest to invite some persons and urge others to confession, this same loyal member of the Church, on the 8th of December, 1850, preached a sermon in Liverpool, in which he declared that he "would have capital punishment inflicted on any clergyman who heard a confession, that transportation would not satisfy him, as nothing but death would suffice." Here we have the blessings of the merciful Inquisition back again with a vengeance! Surely the unmitigated hypocrisy and inconsistency of a "great and good man could no further go!"

Nor are these the only persons disappointed at the success of the late Congress and at the unanimous resolve of its members to sink all mere party and unimportant differences as members of the same body. The "Liberation Society" is particularly wrathful and dissatisfied with the result. That body appears to have prepared a huge pamphlet, and to have taken especial pains for its distribution beforehand—the object of it being to excite as much variance and to create as much mischief as possible. Some men seem born for mischief, and for nothing else. They can not be present at any meeting, deliberation, or discussion, but must throw the apple of discord into it. In this case, however, providentially, the speculation did not answer. Even Canon Ryle said he would unite with Canon Carter, with Canon Farrar, or with any other Canon to preserve churches and churchyards for the use of churchmen, and to prevent the spoliation, desecration, and sacrilege contemplated by the movement in connection with the burial of the dead. Upon the whole, then, we are happy to find that Church Congresses and Conferences are an important element in Church progress, that they have done and are doing an immense amount of good, that they serve to bring churchmen together in such a way that they may understand each others' motives, principles and tendencies better than by any other means, and that the peace, and also the prosperity of the Church are thereby greatly increased.

In connection with the late Congress and as an illustration of the harmony and other gratifying features of it, we may mention that the Archbishop of Canterbury has offered the Vicarage of Bognor to the Curate of Croydon, the Rev. W. Wilks, "the courteous and indefatigable honorary Secretary of the Church Congress," but that he has declined it, not being willing to leave his Grace's Diocese.

THE EFFICACY OF PRAYER.

A PAPER READ AT THE DEANERY MEETING, SUSSEX, N.B., BY THE REV. B. SHAW.

IT might seem, at first sight, that the consideration of "The Efficacy of Prayer" would be a very superfluous subject to engage the time and thoughts of a body of Priests, gathered together for mutual improvement and counsel. I trust, however, that this daily duty which we all perform, may yield, upon investigation, interest sufficient to inspire us with greater zeal and confidence in its beneficial results, to determine us to have greater faith in its blessed efficacy.

There can be no doubt as to the obligation we all lie under to practise this important duty. Independently of Revelation, there seems to have been implanted in the human breast the desire of worshipping and adoring something superior to itself. The most ignorant and depraved of the human race have always had worship of one kind or another in reference to a Superior Being.

Revelation, however, teaches us that God has from the beginning required this duty at the hands of His creatures. From the Patriarchal to the Apocalyptic period this subject is brought before us:

I. By express command.

II. By the results of fervent prayer, as exemplified by the direct answers given to it.

There are three different modes or conditions of human life, wherein we are required to exercise this duty. Let us note them briefly:

FIRST—*Private Prayer*. This distinguishes man from the mere animal or inanimate part of God's creation. It is a tacit acknowledgment of our dependence upon God, and also partakes of the nature of a daily sacrifice and offering to the God who made, redeems, sanctifies, and preserves us every day of our lives.

It is a duty oftentimes neglected by those who are enrolled members of the *One Body*, of which Christ Jesus is the Head. It ought never to be slighted because we have partaken previously of Domestic or Public Worship; for it is a duty dependent upon no other, either for its obligatory character, or its beneficial results. It is the drawing near of the individual soul, for the grace and sustenance of Divine love and strength, to keep it alive and vigorous. It is really the foundation of all other worship; and in proportion as we rightly use the privilege of *Private Devotion*, in the same ratio do we take an interest in, or neglect, the other modes and opportunity of worship. In private prayer, whilst we always pray for others as well as ourselves, yet it is more for the benefit of the individual and separate soul that it has been ordered than for the purpose of general supplication. It is the most difficult of the three forms or modes of prayer—for in Domestic devotion, and more especially in the Public Service of the Sanctuary, worldly, sinful, and wicked souls, may outwardly perform all the duties of prayer, nay, may as Christ says, make use of these public forms as masks to hide the inmost corruption, or perform them for the purpose of making a fair show in order to gain