

twenty or twenty-five years ago, some things which have been done in Ontario within the last ten years. Why, the thing would have been regarded as morally impossible, as being quite outside the limits of reasonable consideration.

Those Protestant clergymen who are virtually preaching submission to Rome, may depend upon it that they are not carrying their people with them. They have forfeited their consistency by advocating that which all their lives before, until a short time back, they would have most indignantly repudiated. But the people will not so easily be drawn from the old moorings. Giving the Church of Rome a share in the secular government of Ontario, is going too far for the majority of Protestant people, we should imagine. Some day the blind guides who are now leading people astray, to the extent of their influence, will get a tremendous awakening out of their delusion.

The fundamental error of these blind guides of ours lies here—they fail to comprehend the extent to which the Church of Rome is using provincial powers for her own aggrandisement. It may be said: "Oh! was not Sir John in good accord with that church before Confederation, and did not a heavy share of his support come from Roman Catholic votes? True, indeed, but in those days who ever heard of Roman Catholic interference with Protestant education in Ontario, or with the secular affairs of this province in any shape. How is it that such encroachments as those of the Church of Rome in Ontario, within the last few years, were never heard of in the former time—never until Confederation and the provincial rights craze gave Archbishop Lynch his opportunity? We see this, that things are being done in Ontario now which could not possibly have been done then. And we may see, further, that the Archbishop, or somebody acting for him, adroitly threw out the bait of Roman Catholic support of provincial rights in matters purely secular or territorial, in order to catch Mowat's support of the church in its encroachments in those fields wherein it especially desires to encroach. Small matter to Archbishop Lynch where Ontario's western boundary is fixed, whether at Algoma Mills or within a stone's throw of Winnipeg—if only the boundaries of his control over legislation and administration in the province be extended. Mr. Mowat, simple soul!—swallowed the bait—fell into the trap—and now his defenders are at their wits' end trying to show that he did what was for the best all the time. But one thing he and his Protestant clerical defenders may be sure of. The reaction provoked by that gigantic blunder of his is only beginning. It will not cool of and subside, but will grow stronger and hotter every year that passes. The fierce light which now beats upon the situation will be growing fiercer all the time. Most emphatically the element of time is against Mr. Mowat and his defenders. Revolutions do not go backward, and we are now only at the beginning of one which it is beyond their power to stay.—*The Toronto World.*

—There is no luck, but there is such a thing as hard work and knowing how to make it answer for what others call "luck."

PROTESTANT CLERGYMEN PREACHING SUBMISSION TO ROME.

IN the battle which has arisen between those who object to any exceptional legislation in favour of Rome and the friends of the Papacy, the remarkable feature of the case is that we find a number of Protestant clergymen supporting the Roman Catholic side of the controversy.

The clergy of the Anglican Church appear to be almost wholly on the Protestant side; men of High Church views and men of Low Church views are for once in agreement. It is, strange to tell, within the ministry of the Methodist and the Presbyterian Churches that the most conspicuous Protestant champions of the Pope's power in Canada are to be found.

The adherents of the Churches just named have for a long time been on the Reform side of politics, by a large majority. Presbyterians whose affinities were with the "Auld Kirk" have been mostly Conservatives; but in the whole body the far larger number have been Reformers. Among the Methodists, too, taking clergy and people together, to be a Reformer has been the rule, and to be a Conservative the exception. And no wonder, either, seeing that in time not so very far back old country Governors and Canadian Tories joined hands to deny to Methodist clergymen the legal right of solemnising marriage, except under conditions implying inferiority and reproach. That Presbyterians outside of the Established Kirk, also Methodists of all shades of opinion as to church rule and order, should be on the side of "Responsible Government and the Voluntary Principle," was natural enough. And just as natural was it that the same men should be opposed to the pretensions of the Church of Rome, whether as a spiritual or as a political power.

Already we have progressed somewhat; we have found good reason why both Methodists and Presbyterians should lean heavily to the Reform side; and patriotic reason, too, of which neither they nor their descendants need ever be ashamed. But observe that over all the historical period indicated, these Reformers in politics—Presbyterians and Methodists together—were wholly opposed to the power of the Church of Rome in Canada. They believed that this power had increased too much already, and ought to be diminished. All the more strange, therefore—is it not?—to find Presbyterian and Methodist clergymen to-day trying to make the worse appear the better reason, and to lead Protestant people into the ditch of submission to Rome.

We have to face the extraordinary fact that a number of Protestant clergymen, more or less, are to-day conspicuous in advocating the pretensions of the Church of Rome, and in advising the surrender of Protestant rights. How account for this? It will not do to charge against these men that they are consciously doing so, or to question the sincerity of their Protestantism. After a good many different explanations proposed and rejected, we have to fall back on one which is

both simple and sufficient—*excess of political zeal*. Old and deeply rooted political associations have blinded the eyes of some Protestant clergymen, and have drawn them away from the right path. They appear now to regard as trifles things which the Church of Rome has always held to be of the utmost importance, and which used to be of great importance in their own estimation too. The intensity of their gaze upon old political issues hinders them from seeing the great issue of the day in Canada. Their habit of living too much in the political past, and dreaming of it, is what has sealed their eyes to the realities of the present.—*The Toronto World.*

HOME RE UNION.

LORD Nelson sends to *Church Bells* the following extracts, showing from many quarters a movement towards greater Catholicity.

An American Baptist's view is given in the *Weekly Churchman*.—The line that separates Methodists from Episcopalians is a simple air line, a difference in the atmosphere; the line which separates Episcopalians from many other Christians is a line of Prayer-books; but the line of fellowship which divides Baptists from all other denominations is a canal. Is it not time to put a few convenient bridges over it?

The *Methodist Times*, in a leading article says:—"If we are to evangelise the heathen abroad, we must close up our ranks at home. A fearful responsibility will rest upon all who do anything to perpetuate the existing divisions of the Churches. Nothing is easier than to exaggerate the importance of doctrinal and ecclesiastical differences, especially those which divide and weaken Churches which are agreed in the main. The world will never be saved if we try to ram every jot and tittle of our peculiar views down everybody's throat. In things essential there must be unity, but things essential are by no means so numerous as those who have been trained in narrow coteries imagine. In the larger problem of evangelising the world, as well as in the smaller one of evangelising London, we must substitute elastic bands for red tape. The next generation will witness re-unions and federations on a scale of which the world has had no experience since the unity of Christendom was shattered by the folly and obstinacy of the Church of Rome."

The *Christian World* directs attention to an article by Dr. G. R. Crook, in the *North American Review*, "Why am I a Methodist?" The Doctor asks, "What are the features of Methodism which have endeared it to its followers?" In reply, he puts in the forefront the fact that it draws a great distinction between opinion and religion. Some of Wesley's expressions on this point are (Dr. Crook says) memorable. "I offer," the great field preacher remarked, "no opinion on the term of union with any man. I think and let think. What I want is holiness of heart and life. They who have this are my brother, and sister, and mother." And again: "I desire to have a league offensive and defen-