

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 NON-CONFORMISTS ON CHURCH REFORM.

IN the *Contemporary* for August there is an article by Henry Richard, M. P., on "The Non-conformists and Church Reform." Mr. Richard handles pretty roughly the Bishop of Peterborough for his eloquent speech on the Bishop of Carlisle's "Cathedral Statutes Bill." Granting that the article was written, as Mr. Richard explains in a note, before the terrible illness of the former prelate, still we cannot but think that delicacy ought to have induced the writer either to suppress it as a whole, or alter its most pungent passages.

Mr. Richard professes himself a friend of the Established Church. His friendship for her induces him to write this article, in the course of which he leaves nothing unsaid that he thinks calculated to injure her. "Save me from my friends," may well be the cry of the Establishment, when thus favored by Non-conformist patronage. There is something too transparent in this attempt to veil hatred to the Church, under the guise of anxiety for her welfare.

Mr. Richard's great Episcopal authority to whom he refers, with somewhat of triumph, is the Bishop of Liverpool. Whatever may be the merits of Dr. Ryle, and no doubt he has many, no one can put down friendship to the Church of which he is an overseer, as one. We have little doubt he has much in common with Mr. Richard, as his curious conduct recently in Scotland shows. If the latter gentleman thinks that he has in the Bishop a witness of the Church's weaknesses from within the Church herself, we wish him all joy of his witness, remarking by the way, that very little weight will be given by Church people to his testimony.

That the Church of England has need of Reform, that she is not altogether as she ought to be, no one can for a moment deny. That the Right Reverend Prelate, whose oratory, we trust, the Nation may hear again, wearied of the vexatious delay in Parliament in Church matters, may have spoken strongly and perhaps a little hastily, may also be admitted. But that because she needs reform, because there are difficulties in legislating for her, that therefore she must be disestablished, is a conclusion which Mr. Richard will find denied *in toto* by almost every member of the Establishment, and a large number who have separated from it. It is only the political dissenters that seek the Church's downfall. A large proportion of the various sects acknowledge her power, influence, and activity for good, and would resist any attack upon her tomorrow.

Mr. Richard makes much of a religious census compiled by the editors of various newspapers, which tells in favor of the Free Churches. As to pointing out the true state of affairs, his figures are valueless. They are unofficial calculations, made perchance, of whose accuracy we have no guarantee. It is amusing to see Methodists, Independents, and Baptists, classifying themselves under the head of "The Churches," with Jews, Greeks, Roman Catholics, Spiritualists, Irvingites, and Atheists.

Nothing but envious enmity toward the Establishment would induce the former bodies to mix themselves up with such a motley company. Again, the returns only refer to the two services generally held in all dissenting churches. Mr. Richard forgets, or is perhaps, unaware, that in most Anglican churches there are other services than these. We have no doubt that a number of persons attend early celebration of the Communion, who may not be present noon or evening service. Such persons would, of course, be omitted from this slipshod list. Again, no note is taken of the crowds of young people who gather in to the afternoon children's services, or of the congregations which fill the many mission buildings attached to most of the churches.

Mr. Richard charges the Establishment with acting unfairly when it asks for a census of religious professions. "What advantage," he says, "would it be to the Church of England \* \* \* to have added to her ranks tens of thousands of persons who never avail themselves of her services?" Mr. Richard either forgets or wilfully dissembles, that the thesis which he wishes to uphold is that the Establishment is politically weaker than Dissent; that if the question of disestablishment and disendowment were before the English people tomorrow, it would be at once carried. The reason why he is so afraid of a census of professions, as he calls it, is because it would show us the fallacy of such a position. It is absurd to suppose that of the tens of thousands of professing Churchmen, not one would vote for the Church. Nay, Mr. Richard knows too well that they would stand not by her to a man, and that he and his friends would stand in a weak minority. A census of attendance at places of worship, while it may be a proof of the value attached by those who profess a religion to its forms, is no test at all of the comparative political power of religious bodies.

Let the Church reform herself; she has the power to do it. She has marvellously shown how she can do it, within the last quarter of a century. It is just this reformation from within which Non-conformists fear, for it would not only, if thorough, dissipate the objections which they urge against the Establishment, but leave them no just reason for being separate from her.

#### MISLEADING ECCLESIASTICAL WORDS AND PHRASES EXPLAINED.

##### EVANGELICAL.

WHEN a designation or watchword outlives the special circumstances which gave rise to it, and which may have rendered it necessary, its use undoubtedly becomes misleading, if not meaningless. It may even become mischievous. The history of the word, 'Evangelical' would afford abundant illustrations of this truth.

At first used as descriptive of an earnest and zealous party in the Church, who were pre eminent for their devoted labours in preaching the Gospel of Christ at a time when worldliness, formality, and almost deadness, widely characterised her ministry and ministrations, it is now to a great extent, inappropriate and out of place as descriptive of any body of clergy in the Church who have either a monopoly or a superior measure of either Christian grace or truth.

If a man take to himself the designation of Evangelical as descriptive of himself as a Churchman, does he not thereby assume that if his fellow-

Churchmen do not think as he thinks, and feel as he feels on religious subjects, they are not Evangelical? Now if a professing Churchman be not Evangelical, he is not only not a true Churchman, but he has but little, if any, claim to the designation of Christian at all; for the very essence of the foundation on which the Church rests, and that which pervades all her worship, services and offices, is the Evangel or Gospel. And as for Christianity itself, what is it but the Evangel or Gospel, and doctrines, blessings, and obligations which spring out of it?

But, then, it is the Gospel of the New Testament as set forth in it, and not the Gospel or Evangel as understood by the prejudiced and narrow spirit of a party or a sect. Were I asked the question, Are you an Evangelical? I should be inclined to answer, What do you mean by *Evangelical*? Do you mean to ask me whether I preach the Evangel as I find it set forth in the Gospels, and as it is embodied in the Book of Common Prayer? then I answer I hope that I am. But if you mean to ask me whether I belong to the party in the Church who monopolise for themselves the designation Evangelical by what I regard as an assumption of their possession of superior light, grace, and truth, and as intended to indicate that their loyalty to Christ and his Gospel is greater than that of their brother-Churchmen, then I say I am not, and certainly have no wish to be designated—in that sense—by that name. The designation of Evangelical in the Church of England, as truly descriptive of a school or party within her fold, is out of date. There are few people possessed of accurate knowledge on the subject who would venture to say that the good, earnest, and devout men who still range themselves under the banner inscribed with the word 'Evangelical' have a monopoly of the Gospel, or are more earnest in preaching its simple facts and truths, than those who perhaps might be designated 'High Churchmen,' or even 'Ritualists,' or, still further, those who refuse to designate themselves, and object to be characterised or known by any other name than that of members or clergy of the Church of England.—*Church Bells.*

#### THE RECTORY CASE.

AN open letter from the city rectors (plaintiffs) to the Rev. Canon Dumoulin, Rector of St. James' Church, Toronto.

REV. AND DEAR SIR,—As we are now informed that the negotiations that have been going on for some time for an amicable settlement of the suit, Langtry v. Dumoulin, have finally failed, and as efforts are being secretly made to throw the blame of this failure upon us, we beg to set before you and the public at large a brief statement of the case as it presents itself to us.

You are, no doubt, aware that by patents from the Crown, of different dates, all the lands in dispute were granted for the endowment of the Church of England in Toronto; that by an act of the Parliament of Canada (29 and 30 Victoria, chap. 16) "Full power and authority is given to the Synod to sell and absolutely dispose of any lands granted by the Crown... As a glebe of, or appurtenant to, or appropriated for any rectory of the said Church, by whatever name the same may be called, or in whomsoever the title thereto may be vested," and that by an Act of the Legislature of Ontario (39 Vic., chap. 109) it is enacted, among other things, that the rector of St. James', in the city of Toronto, shall receive the sum of \$6,000 a year, neither more or less, and all or any excess