

with the same difficulty. Not only is there a St. Andrew's Brotherhood among the Lutherans, I believe, but there is also a Brotherhood of Andrew and Philip. I have not heard, however, that their name has stood in the way of their forming chapters, although their order was not the earliest formed.

Another objection raised is that the King's Daughters are preferred because they unite to other Christians. This is, perhaps, a personal preference, rather than an objection. The Daughters of the King do not in any way contend against or oppose any other bodies of Christians. We simply take up a specific work in our Church, and in our respective parishes.

Doubtless many a rector might find it to his advantage to have in his parish a band of consecrated women, who pray daily for "the prosperity of the parish to which their chapter owes allegiance" and who are pledged "to offer at all times such aid to the rector as he may deem necessary for the furtherance of the work of Christ."

So much for the reasons given by the clergy for not establishing chapters in their parishes. Now we turn to those raised by women, who are asked to join the order and who decline. First: There is no use in, or reason for, such an order. Are we not bound by our Confirmation vows to do all these things that the order requires? Is there anything in your pledges that is not the duty of every professing Christian? This objection has its weight.

Perhaps one might answer this question by asking another. How many women communicants, members of our churches, bound by their confirmation vows to do all they can for the spread of Christ's kingdom, do offer up daily prayer for the spread of Christ's kingdom among women, and for the prosperity of the parish to which they owe allegiance? How many have it on their minds and consciences to be on the lookout day by day, as they go about their daily duties, for opportunities to lead their sisters to Christ, or to encourage those who have already confessed Him before men to a higher and more consecrated Christian life? How many have the best and highest interests of their parish at heart, are loyal and true to their rector and are ready to "render him at all times such aid as he may deem necessary for the furtherance of the work of Christ"?

Another objection is to the vow of service. It is too specific. It is impossible to carry it out.

If we take the letter of the pledge, this is a valid objection. Not all of us can be missionaries, nor do missionary work. If this were needed many of our most useful members would be lost to us. But note that the pledge reads, "make an earnest effort." It does not require of us the impossible. It means no more than this, that we shall be on the watch for opportunities to advance directly or indirectly Christ's kingdom among women. Many of our lives are so bound and hampered by circumstances, that direct work of this kind is not given us to do. I know of two members of the order, loving, earnest Christian girls, confined to their homes by illness, seeing no women outside of their own families and small circle of friends. Are their prayers of no account? Have their patient, holy lives, their sweet resignation to God's will concerning them, no influence on those about them? Do not I beg of you, let this pledge stand in the way of your joining our order. God sends opportunities in a way which we know not of, and there is no one who cannot keep the spirit of the pledge.

Others object to the wearing of the cross. Two objections are made in this case. First, that it is making a parade of our religion: that it is contrary to the spirit of humility commanded by Him who bade us not to let the left hand know what the right hand doeth. These forget that He also gave another command-

ment: "Let your light so shine before men, that they, seeing your good works, may glorify your Father which is in heaven." But those of us who wear our tiny cross do not feel that we are flaunting our religion, and these who make this objection do not apply it in other cases. We are not the only ones who wear a badge as an outward sign of the principles by which we strive to guide our actions. . . . My sisters in the order will agree with me, that the wearing of the cross does not make us Pharisaical. It rather tends to make us very humble, for it is a reminder always of how far we fall short in all that the cross stands for to us. Bringing before us the perfect life of Him we serve, it brings out the imperfection of our service to Him.

But there are still others who do not object to wearing the cross at times, on Sundays, perhaps, or at chapter meetings, who do object to wearing it habitually. They say there are times and occasions when its use is inappropriate. . . . If to wear the cross habitually, means to wear it at all times and in all places, I have no answer for this objection. My own reverence for sacred things is so strong that, I too, like to keep them apart in quiet places and for seasons when mind and heart are attuned to their contemplation. But to wear the cross habitually means simply that we shall have the habit of wearing it. It is used as a safeguard against carelessness on our part. As it stands the term may have two meanings and I hope, when the next convention meets, this pledge may come up for consideration and its meaning may be made more plain.

We are told that but for these objections we could enlarge our borders and bring in many new members. This would be very desirable, but not so desirable that we should give up for this end our distinctive principles. We would be glad to see a chapter of the Daughters of the King formed in every parish of the diocese, but it is better to have a few chapters established upon the right basis, than many members who would come in carelessly and without a realising sense of all that the pledges mean. We pray earnestly for the spread of our order; we work hard for it, but more earnestly we pray that its members may be devoted, consecrated women, faithful to their vows and devoted to the service of Him, for whom we work, who died for us, who lives for us, and intercedes, our Saviour Jesus Christ.—*The Churchman, N.Y.*

#### INDEPENDENT WITNESSES.

The thanks of churchmen are due to "The Independent," a newspaper published in New York, for a genuine service it has recently rendered the cause of Catholic truth. Not long ago the editors of that paper addressed communications to the Bishops of the Church, requesting the views of each on the subject of further concession from the Episcopal Church with a view to Christian union. By way of a text it furnished each Bishop with the proof-sheets of an article written by Dr. H. K. Carroll, in which, after complimenting the Episcopal Church as having set forth in the Chicago-Lambeth Declaration "the first definite proposition for the removal of schism from Evangelical Christianity in the United States," he deplores the fact that so little has resulted from the proposed platform. "Representatives of the Church which makes the overtures and which has shown almost infinite courage and patience in explaining them, cannot avoid now and then expressions of regret that so little progress has been made."

Coming to the cause of the trouble he says: "It is generally admitted that no practical difficulty arises in connection with the acceptance

of the first three of the four Lambeth articles. It is the fourth, concerning the 'Historic Episcopate,' which is the subject of the most serious discussion." The grease necessary for the wheels of the quadrilateral cart he thinks is to be found in what he calls "ministerial reciprocity," or the simple expedient of allowing the ministers of the various Protestant bodies, such as the Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists and so on, to officiate in our churches! This, he says, "would give the cause the Episcopal church has so much at heart a splendid impulse." If the Episcopal church will strike out just two Canons from its Digest he thinks the difficulty will be overcome. "Let the Protestant Episcopal church repeal these Canons, and remove this frowning barrier, and the other denominations will at once be convinced that it is terribly in earnest."

In its issue of March 8th "The Independent" prints this letter of Dr. Carroll's, together with replies from twenty-seven of our Bishops.

It was indeed a good text to present to the holders of the Episcopal Office in the Episcopal church. We do not know what sort of replies "The Independent" expected to get. Strange things have been said and done, however, by men holding the Episcopal Office since the Lambeth declaration was put forth, and perhaps "The Independent" was simply putting out a little quadrilateral of its own in the shape of a net, with the curiosity of seeking what kind of fish would come into it. If so, it seems to have chosen a day when the wind was right, and perhaps it was providentially over-ruled to choose the season of Lent, for it made a haul which must have been as surprising to it as it is gratifying to every believer in the Divine Order of the Church. We are inclined, on looking over the names of the Bishops who accepted this invitation, to change our figure of the net to that of the hook and line. The net, like the Lambeth Quadrilateral, is intended to catch in shoals, but the Episcopal fish were fortunately not in convention when "The Independent" let down its bait. They came to the hook separately, each without consultation with his neighbor and there does not appear to be a bad one in the whole twenty-seven. There is something quite interesting about this. The Bishops whose letters appear in "The Independent" represent no particular school in the Church. They may be said very fairly to represent the Church at large. So fairly, in fact, that had they been gathered in convention for the purpose of issuing a Pastoral letter on the subject of Christian Union one would be left in considerable doubt as to what kind of a Pastoral letter it would be. It might be something clear, out spoken, unmistakably Catholic, PERHAPS; but it might have been like a good many other Pastoral letters: not much stronger than the weakest name appended to it. Under the most favorable circumstances it could not possibly have been as strong as the concurrent testimony of these twenty-seven independent witnesses. The good thing about these letters is that they were written without opportunity for consultation. Each Bishop spoke for himself and not for some weak brother. Had the twenty-seven Fathers all tried to put their mouths to the trumpet at once there is no telling what note they might have struck, but in the event each has taken his time, has had all the room he wanted to inflate his lungs, and the result is that we get something like a Catholic tone. The trumpet blast rings out clear and strong, not once or twice but over and over again. There is no uncertain sound in this case, and that fact in itself will do more for genuine Christian union than forty Lambeth Quadrilaterals. It is gratifying that "The Independent" finds space to print all these letters in full in the same issue, and we reflect with satisfaction that strong words for Catholic order will be read widely where they will do the most good.