

Let us speak not in a spirit of defiance, but in a spirit of love, let us eschew all needless expressions which may give offence; above all let us remember that the grand object which we have in view is the discovery of the wisest methods of work, the strengthening of peace the firmer cohesion of the members of the Body. By this course our very differences will serve to bring out more clearly the unity of our faith, and our diversities of thought will be at once a safeguard and protest against any narrowing of the limits which define the membership of our branch of the Catholic Church.—
BISHOP MACLAGAN.

A PROBLEM.

LOOKING over our land, from a religious stand-point, and to obtain a view of the religious world, we find the moral and religious field in the hand, and more or less under the control and cultivation of various religious teachers; from him who regards the centre of religious gravitation as pointing to the city of the seven hills, with its infallible Pope and its mariolatry, down to him who believes in neither sacraments or ministers, but only in himself, or a Book. The varieties are found by the score. Amid them we see teachers called "Ministers of the Church of England." We observe that those who gather around them, while they are, as we cannot fail to see, the more staid, wealthy, learned, and respectable, (because wealthy or learned) of the several sections, yet they are outnumbered, judging from attendance at their stated times of religious assemblings, by those who attend Romanistic, Methodistic, Evangelistic, &c., &c., teachers. And we ask, as thoughtful travellers have again and again asked, yet vainly: "Why is it so?" To answer this I have reasoned thus: Why, or with what object do our missionaries go forth among other sects and bodies, and where especially these other bodies seem to enlist the sympathies and draw out the support of the greater number? The Low Churchman will answer, "to preach Christ." The High Churchmen (Gresley, &c., &c., and others) says, "To win souls to Christ." But is not this just what others have as their object, and which they seem to achieve with more rapid success and greater enthusiasm? Are the ministers of the Church of England to be sent into country districts (for to the country parts these remarks more particularly apply) and to be sustained there in greater part, and for half centuries at a time, by funds from elsewhere, and living in distress and debt even then, and all to do what? To do in a seemingly cribbed and confined way, what others are doing better, if more members, ministers, and money are tests, and these are the tests most people apply. Is it possible that in preaching Christ, or in bringing people to Christ, that (and if we are to take the teachings of certain, in certain so-called Evangelical or Low Church Colleges, it is so) we have nothing more to offer than other denominations, than, let us say, a Liturgy, believed by some to be more edifying, and of a human organization somewhat more perfect, and certainly more antiquated and stilted, a more general culture perhaps, and a certain traditional social elevation? If this is all that can be specially urged in her behalf, is it any wonder that the Church of England is not increasing at the rate others, at least in Canada, are doing? And may we not fairly ask, why should missionaries be supported at such cost, where the work is being better done by others? For let us preach Christ to the utmost in the general and emotional way, that a certain school is supposed to do. It will be found that there is a dampening atmosphere in the way we do things, even in the lowest of the Low churches, that repels the convert, or cools his fervor, and sends him where he feels more at home,

that is in some one of the other bodies where no surplice is even seen, or stated form used, or distinction, beyond what order may demand, made between the teacher and the taught. On the other hand one cannot be blind to the fact that there are places (thank the Lord they are decreasing) where the claims of the Church to a hearing have been put on a higher, and at the same time more apostolical grounds, but put forward in a cold, dry, emotionless manner, that while it has produced stiff Churchmanship with a few, it has not warmed the affections or stirred up the spiritual life in the many. Baptism, Apostolic succession, Historic fame have been dwelt upon unto weariness. In such cases the Church has not thrived. Nor again has it done so where Ritual has been attended to for the sake of an æsthetic taste, or to impress and draw merely. These have been the bone work and the clothing, but not the life. But wherever the Church is preached of as being the ordained medium by which Christ vouchsafes His presence to men, the medium by which He carries on His Redemptive and Reconciling work, and that its character and composition, so to speak, is like Himself, sacramental, the visible and the invisible, the material and the spiritual being found united in its organization and ordinances, there will the necessity of unity be perceived by those who are thus taught, the necessity of a regular and apostolic succession, of a devout, elevated, and faculty-comprehending ritual be the natural outcomes. There will be Church life and work, for there will the Christians find exercise for their faith, that in being baptized they have put on Christ, coming to communion is in and by faith touching the hem of his garment, and that living according to Church teaching is a developing of the character of Christ by reason of contact with Christ in His Sacramental Church and Ordinances. And in conclusion, those who, being preachers or priests, have imbibed this new view until their hearts are filled with it, will not be wanting in fervor and life in the pulpit or the parish, and the people will perceive something therein that meets the needs of humanity, devoid of the caricatures of Rome and its superstitions, on the one hand, and above the negations and the egotisms of the sects on the other.

W. R. B.

A CROSS GRAINED OBJECTOR TO THE CROSS.

[COMMUNICATED.]

WE have received a copy of a tract entitled, "The voice of the Church of Ireland," signed "Protestant." This effusion is only worth notice, because the writer represents an idle class whose sole business appears to be to create discord in congregations unfortunate enough to include them.

It appears that some slight alterations have been recently made in the chancel of St Peter's Church, Toronto. The apex of the reredos is adorned with a brass pinnacle in the shape of a Maltese cross surrounded by a circle, and upon the upper surface of the holy table a similar cross is engraved. Because of this innocent adornment "Protestant" is flooding the diocese with tracts! He considers that the use of the cross as an ornament is a breach of the Second Commandment, and either wishes his readers to infer that he cannot himself see a cross, or even be in the presence of a cross he cannot see, without worshipping it, or else that the other members of the congregation are so super-

stitious that they are unable to do so. If the former is the case one can understand this protest, and pity the deplorable condition of the writer of the tract, but if the other is the point he wishes to insinuate, we can only regard it as a deliberate and wanton insult to the intelligence of the rest of the congregation. If the mere making of the likeness of anything in heaven or earth is wrong, then it would be wrong to give a child a picture book or a toy house, or even to have one's photograph taken. The tract is remarkable for its shallow display of learning, which only serves to make the utter density of the writer's understanding more conspicuous.

When for eighteen centuries the cross has been the visible symbol of the religion of Jesus Christ, it seems very like Mrs. Partington attempting to mop up the Atlantic Ocean for an obscure writer to attempt at this late era to prove that the whole Christian world has been wrong, and that the cross, which they have all agreed to make the emblem of the Christian religion, is really nothing but an old heathen emblem, and instead of being the sign of Jesus Christ is really the sign of Tamming. But it appears that Samsi-Vul IV., king of Assyria, wore a pectoral cross B. C. 885, therefore it is inferred that it must be a sin to wear one now! But Samsi-Vul is also shown to have worn clothes, therefore we fear a parity of reason may lead this obtuse individual to consider it sinful to wear clothes now, and we may next expect to hear St. Peter's congregation has been startled by the apparition of a gentleman clad in a pair of spectacles, as a protest against Samsi-Vul IV's practice of wearing clothes.

As another specimen of the acuteness of this writer we may mention that he takes exception to the authenticity of the records of the proceedings of a council of the Church, on the ground that the originals have been lost, and all that remains is "a copy of a copy, and what would such evidence be worth in a court of law?" he triumphantly asks. Well, all that we have of the New Testament is a copy of a copy of a copy several times removed, and yet the New Testament is considered to be very good evidence for all practical religious purposes.

This tract writer objects to the Christian symbol because he is not quite satisfied that the Cross upon which our Lord was crucified had, as a matter of fact, a transverse beam, but is inclined to think it was simply a post and nothing more! Such an objection is about on a par with the objection of another equally profound gentleman who objected to keeping Christmas day or any saint's day, because he could not be sure that the event commemorated actually took place upon the particular day in the year set apart for its commemoration, and because the day appointed for the commemoration had received the sanction of a Pope of Rome! The argument of the tract, if such it can be called, is this, that because the Church of Ireland, which has a perfect right to manage its own affairs, has passed a canon prohibiting the use of crosses on, or about, the communion table, therefore such an ornament should be forbidden by the Church of Canada, which is just as able, and has just as perfect a right, to manage its own affairs as the Church of Ireland. The Synod of the Church of Ireland, knowing the proneness of the Irish people to worship crosses, may have very prudently passed the canon in question as a protection to them from falling into idolatry, but Canadians at present are not in the least likely to fall into any such sin, and what may be good and necessary for Irishmen may be neither the one nor the other for Canadians, and any attempt to pass any such canon would be regarded as a flagrant imputation, both on their religion and their common sense. Considering we are a part of the foremost Christian nation of the world, a nation which has emblazoned upon its national flag no less than three crosses, that in Ontario our Provincial arms are also emblazoned with the cross, which crosses, if they mean anything at all, mean that we are a Christian Province, and that the religion of the crucified One is our glory and our boast, considering all this, we think a person who can live and enjoy his principles as a citizen of such a nation and such a province, and