

London permits its use in his presence, as I had occasion just now to say; and in the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, it is not unknown as an adjunct to the service; only recently, Bishop Odenheimer held a confirmation in his diocese at which a processional Cross was carried. So it would seem that all round the circumference of the globe, there are Bishops and Clergy acting (to use our Bishop's words) in a manner "contrary to the spirit and ritual of our Church." Indeed, brethren, I intend no flippancy; no disrespect. But I do intend, when reckless statements are publicly made, no matter by whom, fearlessly and resolutely to meet them.

IV.—It is objected—*whereas we were a united, prosperous congregation; the Cross will cause loss of people, and will be a source of debate and strife to the Diocese at large.*

Let us see what this objection means.

I cannot think that we shall lose any of our really attached people. Should we do so, then, I can only say that my teaching and my ministry among you, for now over eighteen years, have gone for very little. The confidence between them and their pastor, can never have been such as ought to subsist between Priest and Parishioner, if a matter like this is to separate us.

I can understand people reasoning to themselves in one of two ways:

1. Says A,—“I have been coming to this church for a good while now, but I have never felt quite comfortable, or at home here. Misgivings about compulsory confession, transubstantiation, and the like; candles on the altar; singing at the Sacrament, these have always made me fancy that all is not quite right here. It is true the Bishop comes now and then to preach, and does not seem to object to things, but I should like to feel sure that my clergy were good, sound Protestants. And now this Cross (which the newspapers are full of)