

### A SPLIT IN THE EVANGELICAL RANKS.

SEVERAL large meetings were recently held in London, England, to organize an evangelical society for Churchmen to whom the Church Association has become obnoxious. The proceedings were noisy and some strong language was used by the seceders and those who cling to the old association.

We have predicted over and over again for many years that some such split would occur, as those who know Church life in England, apart from the newspapers, know well that there has been for over a quarter of a century, at least, a decided objection felt by the more cultured evangelicals, to the rant and violence of those whose incessant party cries made the unknowing imagine that they fairly represented the English Church evangelicals, just as a knot of agitators in Canada misrepresents so scandalously the evangelical churchmen of the Dominion. The feeling of the more scholarly members of this party found expression in the meetings to which we refer.

It is highly significant that very emphatic protests were raised at these meetings against the title "Protestant,"—these protests being made by several of the staunchest of evangelicals. In reference to this the *Church Times* says:

The newly-launched "Protestant Churchman's Alliance" seems to need a great deal of whitewashing before it can become acceptable to that portion of the Evangelical party to which, according to the *Rock*, it appeals. Our contemporary pleads for a better name to attach to the new organisation. It says:—"Unfortunately, this section (the Liberal Evangelicals) have over and over again shown their aversion to the term Protestant as commonly applied," and it goes on to predict that the term Protestant will keep a good many from joining the new society. Thus it is clear the term which once was held to be all-powerful in appealing to British Philistinism, is felt to be no longer a term to conjure with, and, on the principle that a rose will smell just as sweet under any other name, the experiment of disguising the true character of the new alliance is unblushingly advocated. The proposal is not one which is at all likely to succeed in its object, but it is a remarkable sign of the times that the Protestant party should aim at getting rid of its own distinguishing cognomen."

There are indications of an undercurrent of dissatisfaction amongst the Romanists in England. Popery in the old land has been kept within moderate bounds so as not to irritate English Romanists. But, here and there, some zealous feather-headed priests has shocked his flock by giving them a taste of Popery of the ultra Spanish or Italian type, and grave offence has been caused which has resulted in a movement to establish a branch of the Old Catholic communion.

Any scheme for Church union is woefully incomplete that leaves out of view the lamentable division between the Catholic Church of

England and those of the East. Now any movement towards a return of English Romanists to their Mother Church, the old Catholic Church of their fathers, is hindered by the prejudice created by Churchmen constantly ignoring our Catholic position and vaunting our Protestantism.

That Roman Catholics will be led to join a merely Protestant Church, in any numbers, is the wildest of chimeras. But it is not at all unlikely that there will come a time ere long when they will see, as many now do see, that the Church of Rome in England is a schismatical body, that the Church of England is the old Catholic Church of their forefathers to which their love and allegiance are rightly due. The establishment of a branch of the Old Catholic communion will be no doubt irregular, but it will certainly, we believe, lead to enquiries and discussions which will so far open the eyes of English Romanists that they will be compelled to admit the catholic claims and position of the English Church.

### AN ANOMALY IN DISCIPLINE.

OUR Presbyterian friends will find it hard to reconcile the discipline administered to certain members in Galt, with their total unconcern about a member who seems to us far more to deserve their attention. The Galt members were tried before the General Assembly, found guilty, and severely though probably justly dealt with for claiming that they lived sinless lives, the possibility of which is denied by the Presbyterian faith. The member to whom we allude is a prominent public man, he is also a very prominent Presbyterian, an office bearer, Bible class teacher and so forth. This gentleman affirmed in the House of Assembly that in the schools in Wales, the Welsh language was used and taught. The statement was proved by evidence given before a Royal Commission, by private letters from distinguished Welsh scholars, and by other testimony, to be an absolute falsehood—to be without a scintilla of truth. Yet this lying assertion was repeated by the gentleman we allude to in a public speech at Toronto on the 29th June last. He also made on both occasions statements in regard to our public schools in Ontario which are wholly untrue, and concealed also, deliberately suppressed, facts which are of supreme interest and importance in considering the question dealt with by him.

Now, we ask our Presbyterian neighbors why they should discipline so severely persons whose only offence was claiming to lead innocent lives, when they take no notice whatever of a member who thus transgresses against the laws of morality? Do they think it worse for a Christian to be aiming at perfection, at a life free from sin, than for one to set common morality at defiance? Is innocence less tolerable to the Presbyterian body than lying? Or does this body grade offences according to the social position of their members, and regard a member who is a leading politician as too exalted for discipline?

### THE CHURCH OF IRELAND.

THE *Irish Times*, of Dublin, for a copy of which we are indebted to Bishop McLaren, contains a long account of the proceedings of the College Theological Society, at Trinity College, Rev. J. Gwynn, D.D., presiding, November 12th. The main feature was an elaborate speech by Mr. Richard Eubank, Auditor, on "The Needs of the Irish Church." He rejoiced in the recent appointment of Dr. Salmon as Provost. He then described the Church of the New Testament as a "visible Body, which can have reports made to it of the bad or good conduct of its members; which can be summoned to receive tidings or to offer worship; which can give mission to its members, or be assessed for charitable purposes."

He showed the continuity of the present Church of Ireland from the ancient Irish Church of S. Patrick:

The early Irish Church was independent of external authority; her ecclesiastical customs were peculiar, and differed from all the Western Churches; her bishops were numerous, her missionary enterprises successful, her monastic schools famous. Irish Archbishops acted as metropolitans from the fifth to the twelfth century without the pallium, and Irish Bishops performed their functions without an oath of obedience to the Pope or recognition of his authority. From the twelfth century to the Reformation, and since, the Church of Ireland has been in full communion with her English sister. Both have a common mission to fulfil, and partake in a common responsibility to proclaim clearly and emphatically all the great facts of Christianity.

At the beginning of the century four Archbishops and eighteen Bishops governed the Irish Church. Some years since a great change took place:

Her episcopacy is now thirteen, the number of her clergy and people most seriously reduced, she has been stripped of her property and disestablished. What shall I say of her present political influence? It has been so completely broken that she can only return two members to the Legislature who could in any sense be said to directly represent her interests. Moreover, I feel bound to remind you that the only return made to the Irish Church for her enthusiastic loyalty during a recent Royal visit, was an attempt made to deprive her of her name and to dub her "Protestant Episcopal." Such is the result—the inevitable result of Erastianism and Puritanism. We have reached, I hope, the end of our disasters. Let us begin a new era—an era of reform and progress. If they were as zealous for the Church as they are for "our common Protestantism," and as watchful against the inroads of heresies and schisms as they are against "Ritualism," the Church of Ireland would have no reason to dread the future.

He then made a strong argument against the pew system, and in favor of liberal voluntary offerings, and the duty of the clergy to teach and urge this principle.