

"Let us speak not in a spirit of defiance, but in a spirit of love, let us eschew all needless expressions which may give offence; above all let us remember that the grand object which we have in view is the discovery of the wisest methods of work, the strengthening of peace, the firmer cohesion of the members of the Body. By this course our very differences will serve to bring out more clearly the unity of our faith, and our diversities of thought will be at once a safeguard and protest against any narrowing of the limits which define the membership of our branch of the Catholic Church."
BISHOP MACLAGAN.

THE BIBLE AND MARMION.

THE contest raging in the Press for some weeks, has not only revealed some startling antagonisms, but exposed even more strange agreements. The two chiefs who have been using, the one his pulpit and the other his editorials in a most amusing duel, like the leading combatants in the good old days when battles were not fought by battalions, but by brave individual warriors, have been the central figures in a very "mixed" fight. To see a Romanist editor slashing at a Romanist Archbishop was fun indeed, but to see a Presbyterian minister rushing in to give the layman a smack with his Bible in defence of the Archbishop was equal to the broadest farce in hilarity. But the crowning point of the scene was the dash made at the Papal editor for defending the morality of *MARMION* by another editor, who only a few weeks ago rushed impetuously upon a certain Churchman to punish him for objecting on moral grounds to TOM PAINE's blasphemous and VOLTAIRE's indecent works! The struggle from the first appeared to us hollow and insincere, like pugilists sparring for gate money, however much mischief may have been inflicted upon the party combatants whose political game was the only interest about which they cared a fig. That grave harm has been done on one side is well known, harm little short of a calamity; but as it has arisen solely from the same want of principle, or more strictly speaking, from making party interests the sole principle recognized as authoritative, we can only regard this adversity with the virtuous satisfaction felt when wrong doers get the due reward of their evil deeds. The interests of the Church of England have suffered not a little from the same policy, dictated from the same source, which has now brought upon the Press of one party the condemnation of the Romish hierarchy. The pen is said to be mightier than the sword; but in controlling votes the crozier is the best weapon, when wielded by Rome. The organ Dr. LYNCH struck at has for some time past treated the Church of England as if it had no position, nor power, nor duty, nor history, nor literature, nor indeed existence outside a busy circle of political zealots, whose efforts to split the Church in twain, or into fragments if necessary to ensure their personal aims, suited the game of those who were all the time working might and main to secure the suffrages of the Romanist body—what is called "the Catholic vote." Protests have been scorned simply because it was well known that there was no such thing in the market as the Church of England vote. These astute plotters knew full well that there is no cry so helpful and sweet to Romanism as the one which belittles the Catholic claims of the English Church. Hence the persistent hostility of the Press, which is working for the Romanist vote, to those who decline to put the Church, which for over twelve centuries has been the historic foe of Rome, on a level with the sects of yesterday. That needs to be thoroughly understood by our friends before they get a key to the discussion on the Bible and *MARMION* controversy. We speak out thus boldly because there are only too

many amongst us who, dreading the opposition of the Press, allow their Churchmanship to be cowed and paralyzed by fear of the utterances of party leaders who show that they despise the Church by seeking to use it as a dumb beast in the party shafts. Let party papers support party Churchmen, the compact is dishonourable to both. In this case it has put into the same bed the Romish hierarchy and the champions of ultra-Protestantism!

Let us look at the issues from a Church standpoint. Clearly then it was the duty of the Romish Bishop to take exception to *MARMION* if he felt the work to be injurious to his flock; that is axiomatically plain. In *MARMION* are the words "Bloody Rome," that first word is enough to justify Dr. LYNCH. Suppose we were in the States, and some anti-British bigot used a text book in which occurred the words "Bloody English," would not any decent Englishman object to his child having such a vile epithet sunk into his memory? If that phrase were in a book prescribed by the State for use in a National High School, would not Englishmen be justified in fighting against the wrong of being insulted in a State text book? We repeat that that one word "bloody" applied to his Church, is a complete defence of the Romanist objection to *MARMION*. The question as to the nuns' life is superfluous for his case. If therefore we must have a system of education supported by public taxes bearing upon all classes alike, it is almost too manifest to justify the trouble of expression, that the text books imposed by the State for use by the scholars, shall not so offend the religious susceptibilities of any class as to hinder them freely enjoying the educational advantages for which they are taxed. So also with the Bible, it may be a hard saying, but it is God's truth, that the Bible is not the property of the State like one of SCOTT'S poems, to be snipped and carved, and mutilated, and covered here and discovered or uncovered there, in order to pick out such rich jewels of moral teaching as even "Jews might kiss and Infidels adore." The Bible is not a collection of elegant extracts on morality, the Bible knows nothing about your sectarian quarrels, the Bible was not written to create or defend a party, but rather to crush the very spirit of party. The Bible is a sacred deposit of revealed truth which the Author and Giver confided to His Church as trustee for the human race. A State made up of men, some of whom love the Word, some scorn it, some ignore it, is not the body responsible to God for Divine teaching.

Canada has taken the ground that the State shall educate the people, the Church has supinely recognized the claim, and the sects have been forced by their divisions into a more excusable surrender. Fatal concession! It is too late to remedy this terrible evil by selecting for School reading a few moral maxims out of the Bible, agreeable alike to Romanist, Methodise, Agnostic and every variety of tax-payer. The State has neither a conscience nor a soul, its institutions are equally destitute of moral organs. To discuss whether our State schools are Protestant or otherwise, is as relevant as to discuss whether they are vegetable or mineral? They are in their State capacity without God, as the State itself is in all lands where the national life has been officially declared free from Church. What then is to be done? Churchmen must revolutionize themselves and turn away from the shifting sands occupied by the State school supporters, to stand upon the rock of Christian consistency. The principle of the Church, the

principle of the Bible, the only principle harmonious with common sense is this—that education, to do its work effectually, must be based upon the Gospel of JESUS CHRIST in its spiritual completeness.

Seeking to train the young in morality by compelling them to read a few ethical maxims from Scripture as a task at school, is a modern phase of paganism, it has already gone far in raising up a generation of unbelievers, over whom the Cross has no influence, and on whose lips the sacred Name is only the emphasis of cursing. It should make Churchmen blush to know that even PASTOR said, "I hesitate not to assert, as a Christian, that religion is the first rational object of education." The divisions of the Christian world here have had this most glorious result, that they have eliminated religion from education as completely as has been recently done by atheistic France, and have made the Word of God and the Church of God footballs for the sport of political parties.

The Church of England holds a commission direct from the Great Teacher, the work He began on earth the Church has to perpetuate; the Church therefore must be the Great Teacher, and then young souls will not be fed on the husks of philosophical moral maxims, but on the sincere milk of the Word, and the Cross of CHRIST, not the State, will be raised up as the supreme authority and inspiration and source of educational work.

PRINCIPAL GRANT ON THE CHURCH.

THE Principal of Queen's College is so amiable that we are drawn towards him as our Saviour was to the young man of many possessions. Like him Dr. GRANT lacks one thing, or rather two, a little knowledge of, and a little charity towards the Church and clergy. The Presbyterian creed does not justify the antagonism shown us by this cheery divine. Presbyterian polity might, but Dr. GRANT bases a recent attack on our Church, not on its polity, but upon the doctrines of its formularies. He wrote a letter to make public his sympathy with the theology of Wycliffe College, which Dr. GRANT evidently thinks is a new dogmatic system not yet formulated, and, of course, not found in the standards of the Church of England, in which he is quite correct.

This new theology he proceeds to set forth in a number of novel propositions evidently meant to supersede the thirty-nine articles and prayer book teaching. We have only space for one or two. One new article for the Wycliffe system is this, "Reason and conscience is (are?) the interpreters of the Bible." So the Holy Spirit is entirely ignored as the abiding guide of either individual souls or the Church. Evangelical Churchmen will fling that to the moles and bats. Dr. G's main new article is this, "Sacerdotalism and sacramentarianism are to be utterly rejected."

Why should Dr. GRANT allow his equanimity to be fluttered by such slang words as "Sacerdotalism" and "Sacramentarianism?" He knows that these words are a mere party scare-crow, or hollow turnip with a candle inside. If Dr. GRANT thinks we Churchmen are terrified by such verbal bogeys, he has a contemptuous opinion of our brains and personal independence. Old crows soon find out and settle on a made up figure to show the young rooks that it is harmless. We tell Principals SHERATON, CASTLE and GRANT, that these big words only frighten a few old women of their own sex, for Churchwomen, and Churchmen too, have their perceptive faculties too clear to be deluded by such