

sends forth "emissaries, a polite name for spies, to spy out our liberty and to sow discord among united congregations." Such strong words of condemnation parallel those of Archbishop Magee, when he dubbed the English "Church Association," so-called, by the title of "Persecution Company Limited." Such titles are very "telling."

"POOR ABEL!" is the title of a characteristic magazine article from the fearless and caustic pen of "Ouida." It pleases her to level her lance *point blank* at one of the most remarkable blots on the surface of modern life—the morbid fancy for petting criminals, as if they were heroes. The bully, the murderer, the adulterer, the robber—all of these excite the morbid public appetite for such nauseous matter. Abel—the victim—is guilty of that greatest of modern crimes—he is a *failure*! He must return to obscurity.

"LIE DOWN, ULSTER," cries Ouida, "let yourself be brained without a kick or cry. 'The minority lies slain,' in all lands, by the clumsy club of his brawny brother, the majority." Ouida's familiarity with Italian life—seeing Rome "at home"—makes her a very trustworthy witness as to what Ulster may expect if Rome in Ireland gets the upper hand.

THE "RED SHIRTS" of Garibaldian admirers are reported to have greeted the eyes of Mr. Haweis, on his recent pilgrimage to Rome. They had not forgotten his old time patronage of their cause, and turned out in large numbers to do him honour. These continental "pilgrimages" promise to be very interesting, to judge from incidents already recorded.

"THE PRAYER BOOK, THE WHOLE PRAYER BOOK," &c.—It is a very practical commentary on the formation of sensational societies with weak motives and shaky principles, that the announcement of the formation of a certain ultra-Protestant Society has been immediately followed by the formation of the "Canadian Church Union." The former, under cover of loyalty to the Prayer Book, denounced some of its clearest principles; the latter society nails its colours to the mast—it will allow *none* of the Prayer Book to be overlooked or neglected. Full obedience is required.

#### "SYNODS" AND "CONFERENCES."

A remarkable article in a recent *Newberry*, directs attention to a curious phenomenon on the horizon of English Church experience, which has its converse or reverse on this continent. While the Canadian Church is beginning to show signs of getting tired of their "Synods" and feel after "Conferences" as a safety valve, the Church in England has tired of Congresses and Conferences and seeks a representation of the laity as we have them in Synod! The English laity complain that they have no canonical or legal position. All they are allowed to do from the Ruri-decanal "gathering" up to the "House of Laymen," is to talk! "A Diocesan Conference exists solely and entirely by virtue of the Bishop's will and pleasure. The very name 'Conference' is used in every diocese but that of Salisbury, in order particularly to *ear-mark* that body as having no canonical authority *because* it contained laymen." The author follows up this point with a strong plea—largely grounded on John Keble's very strong language in favour of laymen in Church legislation—for a *bona fide* "Church parliament," with some definite resultant to their "parler." True, there was quite an enthusiasm—

surprising when the quiet ways of Englishmen generally are considered—for a long time over these informal gatherings called Congresses and Conferences. This author attributes that enthusiasm—now markedly dying out—to the spirit of party contention, kept alive by the repeated attacks of the so-called "Church Association." The "Church Congress" was the recognized arena for rivalry and parade of forces, as well as crossing swords in argument; and the same spirit was imparted to diocesan "Conferences."

NOW, ALL THIS IS CHANGED.

"With the expected cessation of party warfare, indifference has already begun to show itself, and the *unreality* of lay representation will make itself felt more and more." He next goes into the question of the House of Commons and Lords, showing how this secular parliament has lost its character as a "House of Laymen." "The crown is to all intents and purposes a committee of parliament, and the parliament now is not a Christian body. It is not even a Deist body. The result is that the faithful laity of the Church are absolutely excluded—to use Mr. Keble's words, 'irreligiously and oppressively debarred'—from any voice in Church matters." Then a distinction is drawn between the judicial and legislative functions of Synodical gatherings. The "fiercest democrat" among the laity is credited with an abiding respect for the judicial position of the clergy, *qua* "clergy." As the interpreters of the Church's statute law, the "spirituality" sits supreme as the Church's final Court of Appeal. "But Synods and Convocations consider plenty of questions upon which laymen might vote—the revision of the lectionary, clergy discipline, cathedral chapters, &c." So the writer goes on to urge a course which must "immensely strengthen the bulwarks of the Church, now that the enemies of the Christian faith are arriving on all sides and gathering together in a *political party*, because the scene in Pilate's Court when the people cried 'crucify Him,' flatly contradicts the chief clause of their Creed, '*Vox populi, vox Dei*.'" These are stirring words and remind us of some such epoch in our own history 40 years ago.

WHAT IS ALL THIS TO CANADA?

We are prepared, at this stage of our subject, for the jealous cry of *local interest*, and we are prepared to show that those who shut their eyes to the moving events of the Church panorama in Britain, are blind to their own best interests. The fact is, as we have just hinted, the laity were called into the Councils of the Colonial Church in general, and of Canada in particular, *because* the clergy felt the need 40 years ago of interesting every faithful layman in the battle of the clergy reserves and church schools, &c. It was the era of colonial disestablishment practically, and it was felt that the battle could not be fought by the clergy alone, unless their arms were powerfully sustained by practical and personal lay help. It was then that such men as John Hillyard Cameron and John Gamble, Sir John Robinson, and many others, fought the Church's battles on the floor of parliament, and won for her all the remnants of respect and influence which still remain to her. They had a noble clerical leader, it is true, John Strachan; but he would be and was the first to confess that he needed the strong help of the lay arm. Did the clergy invite their laymen at that time to "Conferences" for mere talk? Far from it; these names we have mentioned have left their mark everywhere on the framework which has been built up for the sustentation of the Church in Canada. They felt they had real work to do, they did it; the

Church applauded the men, and honours their memories—their usefulness and the utility of their position were fully recognized and felt.

WHY GO BACK TO "CONFERENCES?"

Is it not *going back*, practical retrograde? Surely there is enough real work left for the laity to do yet to justify their retention as assessors to the clergy, in something more than confessional gossip and talk—the puerile exercise of a green debating club, where everybody has a chance to talk for the sake of talking! If there is any distinct value in a Synod as we have it—constituted with a co-ordinate lay element—it is that they meet to *do something*; their talk (long or short) is supposed to be positively aimed at practical results. It is not mere "vapouring," no blowing off of useless "gas." Whence then, arises that impatience of Synods which is beginning to manifest itself among us—the very reverse of the present English tendency? We are inclined to think that so much of the "debating society" spirit has crept into our Canadian Synods, that the work done is felt not to be really *well* done, not worth doing as it is done. Everlasting tinkering—of which we have frequent complaints—comes of hasty legislation, crowding into a few hours the work of days. Evening meetings, receptions, &c., crowd useful and important discussions out of place and time, and the stereotyped week of four or five days is gone before the real business is reached. Then, it has to come up next year, and next, and next, to be patched and re-patched. Better spend a month in Synod (as other denominations do), and do the work well once for all. Meantime, away with "Conferences," as long as there is real work to do—let our "talk" be practical, exhaustive, complete, business-like, a real Church Parliament, making its statute laws for the constituent parishes.

#### THE STORY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

THE EARLY MISSIONARIES TO BRITAIN.

In a sketch such as this, it is impossible to chronicle the names of all the great missionaries to Britain; but the work of certain of the most notable is mentioned; and the reader will observe that our country owes its conversion to Christianity, not altogether to Rome, as is so often alleged, but in great measure to missionaries who came from Ireland, Scotland, and other parts.\*

ST. COLUMBA.

One of the most celebrated missionaries to Britain was St. Columba, an Irishman, who was brought up in the Monastery of Clonard in Ireland. On the evening of Whitsunday, A.D. 564, Columba landed in the Island of Iona, one of the most romantic of the Scottish Islands, where he founded a monastery which became one of the most renowned in Europe. For generations both Irish and Scottish kings came hither to be crowned by Columba and his successors, and the "Tombs of the Kings" witness to the fact that the bones of many such were laid here to rest. The actual stone on which the kings were crowned may be seen to-day in the Abbey of Westminster, resting as it should beneath the Coronation chair at the back of the altar.

THE COMING OF AUGUSTINE.†

We now arrive at an important epoch in our story. Gregory the Great, afterwards Bishop of Rome (he whom the English Christians afterwards

\* "It was not by the action of Rome that the whole of England was converted. . . . A very large portion of England was converted not by the action of the Roman missionaries, but from the North."—Mr. W. E. Gladstone, speech in House of Commons, May 24, 1870.

† The late Bishop of Lincoln states that the mission of Augustine "was comparatively sterile in England, whether we regard extent of space, or duration of time. Truth requires us to declare that Augustine ought not to be called the Apostle of England, . . . but the title ought to be given to St. Columba, and his followers."—*Lectures on Irish Church*.