

much in the same way as they would do if they were heathens; and not unfrequently quarrels arise between them to the great disgust of the Christian Church, when they unconsciously say or do anything affecting each other's caste." This is sad to read, and we hope that some notice will be taken of it; indeed it cannot be overlooked. But there are some remarks in the six folio pages of print which are interesting, as coming from Palamcottah, and all valuable to us at home.

First, it is very striking that they ask for celibate priests to be sent to them as Missionaries. They ask that "the chief Mission Stations be provided with true Catholic-minded Missionaries, who would do everything for the glory of God, and who are charitable and self-denying bachelors. We make this request with regard to Missionaries, because some Missionaries with the above characteristics have already come to India and opened our eyes by their marvellous examples in their own congregations." Again, "European priests are generally regarded high or low according to their piety and moral gratifications and according to their charitable actions and teaching. Those that are bachelors, and in their actions appear to be ascetics, are regarded and revered more than others."

Next, much mischief is traced to the neglect of Church teaching and the Prayer Book. "It is natural that a Christian cannot have any reverence for a priest in whom he finds no qualities to show that he is a representative of Christ; and the chief reason for all their evil in the Holy Church is, we think and assuredly say, *the neglect of proper Church teaching and the strict teaching of the Church's Prayer Book.*"

Next, they complain of the manner in which the subscriptions of the converts are collected. These are collected at some stated time of the year like a tax instead of a voluntary offering in Church at the offertory. The people "have not deviated from the policy of receiving, and have not learned to give and to think that it is better to give than to receive; they, therefore, take no trouble to approach the Sanctuary with their gift. They are neither taught about the importance attached to it in the Prayer Book, nor the custom of the Anglican Church in that respect. . . . The Missionaries of some districts have begun to train their people in the proper method of giving money by the offertory, and we not only pray God to bless their exertions and to open the eyes of other Missionaries and Christians to adopt the same method, but we beg the Society also to co-operate with us by making the necessary amendments where needed for the proper collection of money from us for the Church."

These extracts are so interesting, as coming from the native converts in Tinnevely, that we make no excuse for quoting them, especially as they make suggestions which are worthy of consideration amongst ourselves. The last is a strong argument in favour of the envelope system in the offertory.

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

A BAPTIST contemporary very wisely says:—"It is of no use for Church of England people to affirm that their Church does not teach Baptismal Regeneration." We quite agree with this statement, and are glad to be able to add that there are now very few who call themselves Church people who affirm their disbelief in what is

so plainly taught by their Church. If our neighbour will read the office for Infant Baptism in the Prayer Book he will find the doctrine stated so plainly that none can mistake it without wilfully shutting their eyes to the words there used.

We have taken occasion more than once to urge upon our people the importance of making known to others what the Church does feally hold and teach; and we feel sure that if this were made a more common practice Church people would themselves be the gainers by being forced to read up on subjects too frequently ignored.

ESPRIT DE CORPS.

We have no expression in English that exactly corresponds with this, and perhaps very little of the quality which it stands for. The nearest we can come to it in translation is "class feeling." It is not exactly enthusiasm for a *cause*, but rather the animating spirit of the corporate body, irrespective of the principles which the body represents.

It may be a very superficial motive and a very narrow one, but it has its use, and if well directed may be turned to a very good account. The success of nearly all enterprise, that requires concerted action, depends upon this *esprit de corps*. The town depends upon this for its progress and improvement, the army for its efficiency, and even the nation itself for confidence at home and respect abroad.

In the professions, also, it has a legitimate influence, but not half the scope and power that it ought to have. Community of interest here ought to unite men more closely, and awaken an enthusiasm of class that would be productive of good to all.

But professional men too often assume to be above this motive, and so they often fall below it. Beyond a few conventional courtesies they seldom recognize the tie of class, or concern themselves about those who are doing the same work and who stand or fall with them. They do their work in lonely isolation, without the stimulus of sympathy, and the strength that mutual support should give. Each one fights his battles alone and meets his enemies single-handed, or worse yet, becomes a victim to the jealous opposition of those who ought to stand and defend him. We have had occasion to observe this especially among physicians and clergymen. We have seen and do see nearly every day, the lamentable lack of professional spirit among them. Personal promotion seems to be everything, professional pride nearly nothing.

A physician listens to absurd accusations against a good man of his own "school," and caters to a temporary popularity by quietly acquiescing in the wrong. The whole profession is so far damaged as the influence of that case extends, and he himself is injured with the rest. "Whether one member suffer, all the rest suffer with it."

Clergymen, too, suffer from each other in this lack of professional spirit; not only negatively, from want of co-operation, but positively allowing their opinion and practice to be brought into disparaging contrast with the opinion and practice of brother clergymen. It is not seldom that the visit of one clergyman in the parish of another is a positive damage to both from the unfavourable comparisons that grow out of it.

But there are other and larger classes that should learn a lesson. All Churchmen, aside from community of religious sentiment, have a corporate relation. They constitute a class, with common interests and enterprises that concern the general good.

In theory the Church is a family, where all the members are related and dependent. It is a great brotherhood where ties are stronger and more enduring than those which grow out of worldly interests. From the nature of the case, and by express sanction of its Divine Head, the rule is, "Bear ye one another's burdens."

But in *practice* this seems, by common consent, to be ignored. There is, perhaps, less class feeling among Churchmen than among any other people associated for a common purpose. There is almost an utter lack of enthusiasm about the enterprises upon which the success of the body depends.

We need not instance the want of enterprise in building hospitals and schools, in sustaining Church book stores, and Church papers, in every branch of Church business that languishes among us. Nearly all that is done, is done by individual effort and in spite of the apathy that chills the enthusiasm of those who are willing and competent to push forward the general work.

Next to the grace of God we need a healthy *esprit de corps* among us.—*Living Church.*

AN UNTRUSTWORTHY LIST.

THE *American Churchman* says:—"What is known in England as Mr. Fowler's Return of Churches and Chapels has been pretty widely quoted, as showing the enormous increase of nonconformist places of worship over those of the Church of England. The return was got up in the interest of the 'Liberationists.' It turns out to be absolutely worthless.

"The method of getting it up appears to have been, to give, on the one side, all nonconformist places certified for worship, including barns, rooms, etc.; and, on the other side, to give only those Churches of the Church of England which were registered for marriages. By this process of "cooking" the desired result was reached. A few instances will show the utter fallacy and deceptiveness of the result, better than any general statements.

"In London alone, *sixty* consecrated Churches, as not registered for marriages, are omitted by Mr. Fowler, to say nothing of mission chapels belonging to the Church of England.

"In Brighton, Mr. Fowler only gives *eight* Churches of the Church of England, whereas, in truth, there are *twenty-three*, and they—no mission chapels being reckoned—accommodate 25,000 people, while all the nonconformist places, including mission chapels, rooms, etc., accommodate 18,500.

"In Tideswell, a parish in the diocese of Lichfield, which includes *six* hamlets, only the Parish Church is registered for marriages, and, accordingly, only *one* place of Church of England worship would appear in the returns. Whereas, had the rule by which nonconformist places of worship are reckoned been followed, *ten* places of worship would be reported.

"These glaring fallacies, and they cover all England, are so barefaced that the nonconformist newspaper gives up the returns as hopelessly untrustworthy, while the Methodist Recorder says,