

A very successful mission was concluded on Sunday, the 27th ult., in the parish of St. John's, King's Lynn. It had extended over sixteen days, commencing on the 12th. The missionary, the Rev. E. Walpole Warren, Rector of Compton Martin, Bristol, worked indefatigably, and preached with great zeal and power, taking six services daily, Saturdays excepted. These embraced early celebrations and addresses, twenty-minute services for working men; at one p.m., other gatherings of men only, instructions, and mission services, with after meetings. There were also addresses in the schoolroom, to women only, by lady workers, which were well attended and much appreciated. The congregations were very large, and as far as can be ascertained at present, much good has been done in the town and neighbourhood.

The questions proposed by the Bishop of Peterborough for discussion in the various conferences of his diocese, are, 1. "What reforms are, in the opinion of your conference, desirable in the existing ecclesiastical courts, both of First Instance and of Appeal?" 2. "What can be done in this diocese for the extension and better organization of lay agency in the spiritual work of the Church?" The Bishop states he trusts that the clergy and laity will more and more largely respond to his invitation for their presence and counsel to aid him in the administration of affairs which are theirs even more than they are his. He says the diocesan conferences have been to him in this respect a great gain and a great strength, and he is persuaded that they are a really indispensable part of diocesan organization.

THE FIFTH SUNDAY IN LENT.

THIS is also called "Passion Sunday," because the sufferings of the Saviour are now particularly brought before us for the first time in the Christian year. But the Church has, in connection with the Passion, also brought prominently before us the Oneness of the Saviour with the Everlasting Jehovah—the assumption of independent existence by Him Who said, "Before Abraham was, I AM," just as much as in the announcement, "I AM THAT I AM." A former age had announced Him as the glorious Being Who is the Father of Eternity, from Whose feet and at Whose decree the boundless ages of Infinite duration are poured forth—a conception immensely in advance of the qualities conjoined therewith, representing Him as the Mighty God and the Prince of Peace: He comes declaring Himself identical with the I AM of a former age. Afterwards an Apostle in a passage of surpassing magnificence brings Him before us as "The resplendent outbeaming of the Father's Glory," and "The exact impress of His Hypostasis; and subsequently, another Apostle announces Him as the Alpha and Omega, the First and the Last, the Beginning and the Ending, Which is, which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.

The announcements of the absolute Divinity of the Saviour, hidden behind His passion, but which afterwards burst forth in its own proper splendor, are seen by the attentive reader throughout the Divine Scriptures. The first chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews is so strong and so remarkable an assertion of the Divinity of "The Son," that one could hardly have imagined the possibility of interpreting any portion of it in any other way, were it not that in the Socinian version of the New Testament the passage "Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and

ever," is ridiculously translated "God is thy throne for ever and ever"—thus blasphemously making God to be the Throne of One whom the translators believed to be a creature. And the fact that one of the committee of the New Testament revisers belongs to that "persuasion," is quite enough to excite very strong suspicions with regard to the value of the new revision—even if we had not been favoured, through the medium of the *Record*, with a number of puerile alterations from the authorized version, which seem to distinguish the result of the labours of the accumulated wisdom and learning of the age.

But notwithstanding all the quibbles of the pretentiously learned, CHRIST IS GOD. One text, which cannot be controverted, is quite enough to satisfy all believers in Divine Revelation of the absolute Divinity of the Son:—"In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. All things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made that was made." The Word was made flesh, dwelt among us, and in His human nature suffered death on the cross, as "the just for the unjust that He might bring us to God."

CHURCH PROGRESS.

WE are glad to learn from our correspondence columns that the minds of Canadian Church people are considering the state of the Church in Canada. There can be no doubt that the Church is going either backwards or forwards, and while we think that on the whole she is holding her own, not even the most sanguine can successfully maintain that she is making that advance in Canada, which her historic character and her early advantages entitle her to achieve. We, as our readers well know, are not given to look at the dark side, but take the hopeful view that all will eventually come right. So it will, for the words of the Lord Jesus can never fail; and He has promised that the gates of hell shall never prevail against her. But while this is true, it is equally true that her present welfare is committed into our keeping. We are all interested in discovering the state of the Church in the Dominion; but how are we to arrive at any definite conclusion when there are so little reliable data given from whence our conclusions may be drawn? What we want are not impressions of various writers, clerical or lay, but sure and certain facts. In other words we should have correct statistics from every parish and every mission. We believe that there is no body of religionists who know so little about the concerns of their body as do the Church people. And what is more it is almost impossible for us to learn anything about our state. Now we are in nearly every respect in the same position as the Church in the United States. We know that she has advanced, and we can find, if we choose, exactly where the gains have been made. In order that we might do the same with the Church in Canada, why should not every parish send to the Bishop of the Diocese in which it is situated, a detailed report of the work done and the apparent result of it, for the current year. No clergyman who is working faithfully would be afraid of giving a *resume* of his labours. Take up the reports of one of the United States Dioceses, and the amount of work reported is amazing. Every year the record of each parish tells a tale of advance or declension. We may be sure that the authorities of each parish strive to make its progress as great as possible, and

that every effort would be made to prevent a falling off.

There can be no doubt that this system works successfully. For the Church in Canada to adopt it would be no innovation, for it is already in partial use. We believe that each clergyman assisted by the Mission Fund gives in an annual report to the Mission Board. This is the case in some dioceses, and it ought to be so in all. Now why not extend this to every parish? Let the reports be addressed to the Bishop of the diocese, and published in the Journal of each Synod. There might be then an opportunity for applying a remedy when needed. There is no reason why any Church official should be allowed to destroy a parish. But as matters are now a parish may be practically wiped out of existence, and the general Church public be utterly ignorant of the fact. We have in our mind now three contiguous parishes containing within their bounds four whole townships, and parts of several others, which were in the throes of dissolution, but are now in a happy and prosperous state; but the Church people of the diocese knew little of their fall or of their rise. One of our correspondents alluded to a deserted church; now when that was abandoned, was there any notice taken of the fact? If not, why not? If our Synods would only not fritter away their time on questions of order, but discuss our disorders, would not more be attained? Would the mutual recriminations in which we sometimes indulge take place, if we had correct figures to decide these matters? Unless statistics are carefully prepared, they are worse than useless: they are positively mischievous. And moreover, why cannot our Right Reverend Fathers in God adopt the United States' custom of the chief pastor of the diocese visiting each church annually. There is nothing that would advance episcopacy in this country so much as the personal intercourse of the bishop with his people. The bishop would then assume the responsibility which belongs to his office. The laity would in most instances listen to his fatherly suggestions and to his authoritative decisions. We know of more than one instance in a Canadian diocese where a building called a church has recently been constructed just like a meeting house, with no chancel, no altar, not even a reading-desk, but a platform instead; as though the structure was intended solely for the purpose of speechifying. And in this ugly building the clergyman has been accustomed to officiate without even a surplice. We are perfectly certain there is no bishop in the Dominion who would knowingly suffer so deplorable a state of things to exist in his diocese. The remedy, we take the liberty to suggest, would be an annual Episcopal Visitation of each Church, and not to leave these matters to those who have no business to interfere with them.

But at present there seems a strong tendency in the Episcopal mind in Canada to shift the responsibility belonging to it to other shoulders than its own—either to a synod, or to archdeacons, rural deans, mission boards, committees, or to some other humanly-devised substitutes; so that, while the office and title of Bishop may be respected, its Fatherly character appears to be far too little understood, and indeed almost forgotten.

We are glad to see the subject of the progress of our Church exciting so much interest. We shall be glad to receive brief communications in reference to it from all parts. We are satisfied that if the whole truth were generally known, nothing more would be necessary in order to stop the mouths of gainsayers and grumbling faultfinders, whose chief cause of complaint is that they cannot have everything done in their own way.

THE
portat
is gra
upon
the e
discus
the tu
to exe
of the
progr
by pu
are pe
able t
us be
An
of th
order
imme
card
have
very
a gre
were
an o
ankle
called
to he
exam
enou

A
our C
mini
origi
Grea
to pa
Arch
to t
com
Chu
whic
city
mitt
of A
not
whic
brou
wish
T
the
upon
or r
eigh
ness
tion
hist
assu
of t
find
Arc
Aug
Ver
Et
was
the
Enj
can
bei
craf