You know, I presume, what the Cross means? In Holy Baptism, when the child is signed with the sign of the Cross, you know why it is done? It is done in token that hereafter the child, so signed, shall not be ashamed to confess the faith of Christ crucified, and manfully to fight under His Banner, against sin, the world, and the Devil, and to continue Christ's faithful soldier and servant unto his life's end.

What more fitting symbol could there be, then, when the ministers of Christ crucified, go to celebrate the memorial of His Death, than the sign of His Sacred Passion, carried before them? Orange and Masonic Regalia are freely allowed to be worn and carried in our churches—on what reasonable ground, then, can the Cross be objected to?

But now let me descend from general objections, to those which are particular; and still let me speak to you in the simplest, most homely, style; for I am anxious above all things (if, indeed, it is possible) not to be misjudged, or misunderstood.

I. First, *it is objected to the Cross that it is " Popish,"* because it is to be seen in Roman Catholic Churches. My Friends, is everything bad which is used in the Latin Church? If so, how about our Liturgy, Creed, Lord's Prayer? Why! there must, of necessity, be in our churches, a great many things which are (as people say, though I dislike to use the term) " Popish," and "look Popish." See the Lord's Table yonder. Why, it looks like an Altar. It has Cross and lights. Exactly so. We wish it so to look ; and intend it so to look ; because, as well as the " *Holy Table* "—it is the " *Altar*." St. Paul, you know, says " we *have* an altar." Whatever is good, whatever is beautiful, whatever has a holy meaning, that, whether it be Popish or Methodistical, that, so long as it is not contrary to the law of the church, that, so long as it helps to good thoughts and holy aspirations, that, I