

financial support come to the individual. The diocese can only give what it gets from its members for mission work, and the province can only administer that, and nothing more. All movements, therefore, depend upon the degree in which the Church mind apprehends them for their permanent success, and this movement will pre-eminently require to be apprehended aright to get the necessary support from those who alone can give it. Whether movement is possible at all at present, or if possible, what shape and form it shall take, cannot be known until after business discussion by both branches of the Provincial Synod, and as the main difficulty is that of ways and means, the rank and file of the Church membership require to act so as to make any change that it is deemed Church interests require, a reality. In our next we propose to discuss the duty of the Church members in this province to the Church at this juncture.

THE OTTAWA ANGLICAN CHURCHMAN'S UNION.

In reading over the correspondence published in last week's issue between the Rev. Mr. Snowdon and the Archbishop of Ontario, we can see nothing on the Archbishop's side but the words of a courteous gentleman, apart from the responsibility of his high office, to the letters of a forward, and not over-polite young man, we are ashamed to say, priest of the Church. We cannot imagine any man possessed of Christian modesty writing such letters at all. Is there no discipline for such insubordination and disloyalty? If there is not, so much the worse for young clergymen who make such mistakes, fatal to their own spiritual advancement, fatal to their own peace of mind and fatal to their own influence for good in the Church. But there is something more than this. A Bishop is under vows. And we laymen expect our Bishops to keep them—otherwise, and we may as well tell them this at once, we cease to respect them. They at their consecration solemnly engage themselves "with all faithful diligence to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's Word; and both privately and openly to call upon and encourage others to the same." Also they engage solemnly "to maintain and set forward as much as shall lie in you, quietness, love and peace among all men; and such as be unquiet, disobedient and criminous within your diocese, correct and punish, according to such authority as you have by God's Word, and as you shall be permitted by the ordinance of this realm." Bishops bear the weight and responsibility of authority, and the moment they shirk this responsibility, they do untold injury. We laymen understand this. There must be the acknowledged head or nothing can come but confusion. They who have the best interests of the Church at heart, implore our Bishops to rise to a sense of the dignity and value of their authority and its just exercise. The whole well-being of the Church depends upon it. If, then, the Archbishop of Ontario, who showed more than a kindly interest in this young Mr. Gibson, even going so far as to provide him with free tuition, in accordance with his own convictions as to his duty to his diocese, suggested a course at Trinity College, Toronto, or Lennoxville College, it was his duty to do so. The Archbishop's sin, in the eyes of Mr. Snowdon, was that he would not allow himself to be forced into a course other than that his own convictions and wisdom suggested. Now, we ask what regard could we Churchmen have for a Bishop who did permit himself to be governed in such important matters by such dictation? To

suppose for a moment that the Archbishop acted otherwise than his duty and conscience suggested, or that he was moved by a personal feeling and prejudice, would be an impertinence. Now we come to the pith of the whole matter. We begin by putting the matter plainly. We fear very much that Mr. Snowdon is the tool of mischief-making men and of a mischief-making organization existing in the City of Toronto. Our brother Churchmen in Ottawa may just as well open their eyes to this fact. And we ask them in all sobriety and good feeling: Are they going to subserve the interests of the Church and of true religion by permitting outside influences to govern them in the fulfilment of their obligations to their own diocese? In an article recently published in the interest of these foreign interferers, we are told that "the present agitation has grown out of a refusal of the Archbishop of Ontario to accept as a candidate for the sacred ministry, a student who proposes to enter Wycliffe College." The Archbishop did nothing of the kind. What he did do was to make an offer of kind assistance and suggest the training he would require. If people finding themselves unable to coerce the Archbishop for their own party purposes, now twist the thing into a refusal to acknowledge them and their college, they make very evident and patent the fact that they have been making themselves busybodies in other men's matters, and that after their inexcusable interference they writhe under the infliction of a deserved rebuff. We in this article have again the boast that "Wycliffe College is maintained in order to furnish the candidates for the ministry distinctive evangelical training in theology, in accordance with the Reformed and Protestant principles of the Church of England." We who know the institution believe that it is maintained for the very opposite purposes. It does not teach evangelical truth, and it does not maintain the Reformed and Protestant principles of the Church of England. It exists for the purpose of creating and perpetuating disunion and uncharitableness among Churchmen. It denies the distinctive doctrines of the Church. The plain meaning of the Prayer Book is disregarded, the history of the Church is ignored, and its whole influence is to destroy, not to build up. We advise our brother Churchmen in Ottawa to look into the matter. Again we read: "We are feeling the blighting effect of the mediæval reaction which has torn and weakened the Mother Church." We in this day, who know the immense growth and activity of the Mother Church and its missions, with the vast number (over 80) of colonial dioceses, are asked to believe such nonsense as this. Then we are told, "The growing sacerdotalism must be withstood by agitation and organization." This word "sacerdotalism" is one of the big scare words used by these gentlemen to influence the unthinking. Should any one feel the slightest tremor of fear, let him consult a dictionary and any decent little book on popular theology. We have no fear of such language and invite all our brother Churchmen to take the pains to find out really what such words do mean, and not permit themselves to be frightened by a bogey. To begin with, let them count the number of times the word priest is used in the Prayer Book. But while this is amusing, and not at all alarming, we do wonder at the temerity of these gentlemen in their hysterical call for "agitation and organization." Is there not something absolutely wicked in this? Is this the religion of peace and good-will? Was ever any good gained for righteousness and truth by "strife and debate"? Let Churchmen ask

against whom is this agitation and organization to be directed. No man can honestly lay a charge of disloyalty against the Bishops and clergy of the Church. We believe that as a body of men they are true to the teachings of the Church, and that they are sincerely teaching their convictions, having bravely to bear oftentimes great discouragement in so doing. The truth is, the time has come for intelligent laymen more plainly to give their sympathy and help to men who are endeavouring faithfully to administer the Church in accordance with the Church's Prayer Book and formularies. Let Churchmen study the history of Christianity, and especially of their own Church, and in the light of such knowledge find out what the Church's teachings really are. We have no sympathy with "agitation and organization"; what we want is the intelligent concord and organization of Christian men, with minds enlightened with the necessary knowledge, with hearts moved with the love of Christ and filled with a strong resolution to labour for the temporal and eternal welfare of men. Meantime, these apostles of "agitation and organization" have accomplished very little, and will accomplish less. There is a deep seated piety in the breasts of vast numbers, High and Low, if they choose to call themselves by these names, which instinctively shrinks from the impertinent officiousness, deceit and fraud by which some men seek to destroy the peace and harmony that should exist amongst those who are brethren.

REVIEWS.

ETHICAL ADDRESSES. First series. Philadelphia; Weston, 1895.

We have here a collection of essays proceeding from some of those modern ethical societies which have been founded for the scientific study of conduct without religion. It is possible that in quarters which do not welcome theology, these studies may be better than nothing; but experience seems to prove that morality cannot stand firm of itself.

MAGAZINES.—The *Expository Times* (March), in its notes of Recent Exposition, points out that the question of the date of the Gospels is not yet settled; and that we may still find good reason for pushing the time of their composition still further back. Instead of considering St. Paul's earliest epistles as the first written books of the New Testament, there seems some reason to believe that the Apostle was familiar with the Gospels. Some useful remarks on the recently discovered "Gospel of Peter" are made, Mr. Davies continuing his excellent memoir of Dillmann. Dr. Orr writes ably and usefully on the growing and dangerous School of Ritschl. The serial papers, great text commentary, etc., are good; and the reviews are executed with care and judgment.

CHILD NATURE AND HOW TO TRAIN IT FOR GOD.

(A PAPER FOR MOTHERS.)

Take this child and nurse it for me, and I will give thee thy wages.—Exodus ii. 9.

Of all the varied feelings which the human heart has experienced, is there, can there be a holier one than the tenderness with which a young mother regards her first born babe? The first sound of its helpless cry, the first sight of its innocent face, the first touch of its baby fingers, seem to awaken a new sense in which self has no part, which makes to a mother no danger too great to be faced, no labour too heavy to be undertaken, if only the safety or good of her child may be secured. What to her are nights of sleeplessness or days of weariness if her darling be suffering? She gives up her wonted pleasures to watch over his cradle, her times of leisure to fashion his clothing with her busy fingers. Nor does she feel anything she can do for him a task, but rather her highest joy. As the dawning intelligence of his infant mind, the light of that breath of life which God Himself breathed into him, begins to show itself in his sweet smile, his outstretched hands, his first attempt at utterance—how her wonder and delight increase! We all know