

actually been used, or have long been disused by our Reformed Church, and which, in some instances, are not only contrary to the custom, but to the law of the Church. The practices referred to are objectionable, not only as innovations, but also on account of their doctrinal tendencies. We need not point out to your Lordship the evils which are likely to result from their continuance, and we earnestly pray your Lordship, in conjunction with your Episcopal brethren, to take such steps as may be calculated to discountenance and, so far as they are illegal, to suppress them.

"We have the honor to be,

"Your Lordship's

"Most faithful and obed't. serv'ts."

The reply of the Bishop of London was as follows :—

"Mr. Archdeacon and my Reverend Brethren of the Archdeaconry of Middlesex,—It has been a great satisfaction to me, on the important subject which you bring forward in your Address, to have had the advantage during the past week of free and full communication, not only with His Grace the Metropolitan of this Province, but with all the four Archbishops of the United Church of England and Ireland, and with a very large number of our Episcopal brethren. In such a body, representing a national Church in which naturally and rightly great latitude of religious opinion is allowed, we expect to find a variety of sentiments similar to that which exists in the Church which the Bishops represent; but I am bound to say that, however various our sentiments, I have been greatly encouraged by finding that we all deplore the excesses of which you complain, and are anxious to prevent the evil consequences which they threaten. The phrase 'excessive ritualism,' however, requires to be explained, for, as commonly employed, it bears two meanings. 1st. Sometimes the phrase is used for the introduction into parish churches of a form of worship always sanctioned and maintained

in our cathedrals and in many of our college chapels. Looking to the time when an unadorned and almost monotonous worship prevailed, and when, in many country districts at least, the service was not only monotonous, but slovenly, many of the clergy have thought it their bounden duty to do what they could to introduce a great change. No doubt the spirit with which these efforts originated has done very much of late years to invest our houses of God with a more seemly dignity, and to give a liveliness to our outward worship, which has been found very attractive, especially to the young. Such changes, in my judgment, are only to be deprecated if they be introduced without proper regard to the feelings and wishes of the parishioners, and without due reference, if need be, to the controlling authority of the Ordinary. I quite sympathize with those who, feeling deeply the responsibility of using all lawful means to make our Church services attractive, not only to advanced Christians, but to those whom it is their office to win from stolid carelessness, have endeavoured to improve their Church music and arrange their services in some other form than was sanctioned by the stereotyped system of our fathers. Only I would have them remember that it never was the intention of our Church, as the preface to the Prayer-book and various rubrics indicate, that each parish priest should be an autocrat, independent alike of the people whose common worship it is his privilege to lead, and of the Bishop to whom he solemnly promises canonical obedience. Indeed, the idea of common prayer is lost if every individual clergyman is at liberty to alter the form of worship according to his private tastes, regardless of what is acceptable to the great body of worshippers. Now, my own experience leads me to believe that a great number of the disputes respecting ritualism which have agitated our parishes, have sprang from the inconsiderate introduction of practices, not unlawful, nor even contrary to the cus-