

EDITORIAL NOTES.

THE Lord Bishop of Nova Scotia paid a well-deserved tribute to the late Right Reverend Dr. Sillitoe, Bishop of New Westminster, in his address to the Synod held in Halifax, N.S., lately. When referring to the decease of the Bishop of New Westminster, we expressed our opinion that his influence in the House of Bishops at the time of the meeting for the formation of a General Synod in September of last year, operated to prevent what at one time seemed inevitable, viz: a deadlock between the Clerical and Lay members of such meeting and the Bishops. His Lordship of Nova Scotia confirms the opinion which we then expressed, based upon information received by us in Toronto at the time. The Bishop says in his address, speaking of Bishop Sillitoe: "Well do I recall his strenuous endeavour to avoid not only the impending deadlock, but the threatened failure to consummate the consolidation of the Church, when the Bishops and elected Delegates met in the city of Toronto in September last; for it was largely owing to his pleading with his fellow-Bishops, and his advocacy of a conciliatory attitude towards those whom some of us looked upon as taking a position unwarranted by the facts, that harmony was restored, and peace came to cement and perfect our union." We feel sure that everyone who took part in that historic meeting will be glad to find this now open tribute paid to the late Lord Bishop of New Westminster, whose strong personality and wise judgment as well as winning manner, impressed itself upon all who were present and won so great a benefit for the Church in Canada.

THE Bishop of Nova Scotia bore further testimony to his brother Prelate, deceased, which should be, it appears to us, more widely known than it is likely to be simply through the publication of the address in pamphlet form, and we therefore have pleasure in quoting it here. The Bishop described Bishop Sillitoe as: "A man of solid learning and many gifts; he never spared himself in any way if he might do or say something which would further the work committed to his trust, the establishing and extending of the Church in the newly created diocese, including all the southern half of the mainland of British Columbia, and containing an area of 186,000 square miles, a territory about eight times the size of this diocese. Is it any wonder that fourteen years and a half of such work, in such a field, should have quite sufficed to cut short, before its time, a life full of great blessing, and to arrest a career which contained the elements of greatness? Another warm heart has ceased to beat; another encouraging presence has been withdrawn; another cheering voice has been hushed; another workman's task is ended; another leader of God's host has fallen. 'They shall enter into peace; they shall rest in their beds, each one walking in his uprightness.'"

It will be pleasing to Churchmen in Canada to know that the Declaration adopted at the General Synod in Toronto, after careful deliberation and under the wise and scholarly direction of the Bishops there assembled, has attracted the attention and received the commendation of some in the great Sister Church in the neighbouring Republic. We notice that in the *Church Eclectic* for September the Rev. J. Ankell calls the attention of the Constitutional Commission and members (likely to be) of the next General Convention of the P.E. Church in the United States to this Declaration as

being "in every way superior to the doubtful propositions made in the last General Convention." Those who were present at the General Synod will remember with what care and with what learning almost every clause of the Declaration referred to was scanned, and how, after being formulated, it was considered and reconsidered, and finally only adopted after the Bishops in their own House had further carefully and fully considered it.

OUR readers will find in our *Algoma Diocesan News* an authoritative statement in regard to the much talked of resignation of the Bishop of that diocese, and we are glad at last to have something authoritative. From the interest taken in the Diocese of Algoma, on account of its missionary character it was natural that any change or proposed change in the Episcopal government thereof should give rise to all sorts of rumors. It was affirmed early in the season that the resignation of his Lordship was actually in the hands of His Grace, the Archbishop of the Province, and that a special meeting of the Provincial Synod was to be called for the purpose of electing a successor. It will be a source of gratification to know that this rumor is untrue, and that the very large expense involved in a special meeting of the Synod will not be incurred. It is clear from the announcement now made that it is His Lordship's intention to retain control of his diocese and fulfil his functions as *Episcopus* until the next ordinary meeting of Synod, which will take place in September, 1895. We are sure that all our readers will join with us in the hope that his sojourn abroad during the winter may so restore his health as perhaps to render resignation unnecessary, and enable him to continue work in the field which God's Providence has assigned to him. Episcopal resignations are, we think, to be regretted, and they have been, in our judgment, too frequent in the last few years. We do not wish to be understood, however, as in any way questioning the necessity or the wisdom of the step contemplated by his Lordship of Algoma. We feel sure that he would not resort to this extreme measure otherwise than under absolute necessity.

THERE are some in the Church of England who seem to think that our branch of the Catholic Church has not sufficiently defined her faith and that there is no ultimate authority or test as to doctrine. We would refer any such to an article in the *Church Eclectic* for September, entitled "Doctrine of the Church," by the Rev. Alban Richey; in which he says that it is time this statement were challenged, and proceeds to show what the Church has expressly laid down as doctrine for those to whom she entrusts the Commission to teach and preach. Of course he deals chiefly with that branch of the Church Catholic known as "The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States," but it is so intimately connected with the Church in England that his argument is equally applicable to the whole Anglican body. In the course of the article he says: "As a true branch of the Catholic Church, the Church to which we belong is, as was said of her, the heir of all the ages and inherits the faith once delivered and witnessed to by Apostles, Martyrs, Fathers, Doctors, and declared and set forth by the General Councils and received *ubique semper et ab omnibus*. The discovery of the Church's doctrine is then but a matter of historical research possible for everyone who is not wilfully ignorant, and who has not given up the study of historical theology, in order to busy himself with foolish

and unlearned questions, which engender strife." And referring to his own branch of the Church, he asserts that "She has a doctrine plain enough that he who runs may read. It is to be found in the Prayer Book, the Articles, Constitution, and Canons of the Church. More than this she holds to the doctrine of the Church of England as declared in her standards."

THE CROSS IN OUR CHURCHES.

What does the Primitive Church say about the Cross? We may observe here that until the religion of Christ received toleration and protection from Constantine, we cannot expect to find many evidences of the public use of Christian symbols and emblems which would have only provoked the heathen to measures of repression and persecution. In a general way the testimony of the early Church on this matter is as follows:—

The use of the sign of the cross is very ancient and expressly signifies the Passion of Christ as a strength against unholy thoughts and sinful acts. Tertullian says that the Christians before they would undertake any work; at going out and coming in; at sitting down and rising up; at board, bath or bed; at the bringing in of lights; in a word, in all occupations, made the sign of the cross upon their foreheads. St. Chrysostom recommended its use before and after meals; and St. Jerome extended its use to every act, and especially when going out. Prudentius in his hymns, refers to the custom, and Ruffinus mentions that every house in Alexandria had its doorposts, pillars, etc., painted with the sacred sign. St. Jerome says that it formed the military standard, and St. Augustine exclaims: "Kings wear the cross on their brow, of more price than all the jewels of their diadem." With the cross the priest signed the sacrament at consecration. Soldiers signed themselves when the trumpet sounded for battle. Ships carried the cross; the tomb of the martyr bore it; it glittered over the altar. Valentinian III, and Eudoxia set it on their crowns. Justinian required that no church should be built without having a cross affixed to it. The Emperor Valens, on the contrary, who became an Arian, required that every sign of our Saviour Christ, whether engraven or depicted or painted, should be effaced. And here we wish to refer to a very important feature of this subject. There is no doubt that some of our people, perhaps even a large number, have a certain fear and almost horror of the cross. This appears and is strange and sad; how can it be accounted for? It is partly owing to a controversial feeling, that because the Roman Church so frequently uses the sign and symbol of the cross, we ought to avoid its use altogether. That this feeling or prejudice is dying out to some extent is evident in this way; new churches are now seldom or ever erected without external crosses, and memorial crosses in graveyards appear to be almost becoming the rule. The chief object now seems to be to keep the cross out of the east end of the church. Why so? We find it hard to understand this ourselves; but it seems that the cross must be kept away from proximity to the Holy Table. On that table indeed we "show forth the Lord's death till He come;" but the cross as a symbol of His death and passion must be kept away from it. The symbol of the death must be removed from the place of the memorial of the death. It is very strange—is it not incongruous?

Some people, too, who ought to know better, talk loosely and wildly about "idolatry." We kneel to receive the Holy Communion; and if there be a cross before us in the sanctuary, is