

good churchman." It is about time that this old fallacy was exploded. It will be our object to show that there is no contrast between the two, and that an earnest and honest man may be both. Lukewarmness and unfaithfulness towards our church is not the best guarantee for earnest attachment to the truth of the gospel.

Judging by experience we may safely assert that the principal cause of defection from our ranks has been a vagueness of perception as to boundaries. Dr. Newman in his *Apologia* shows that when reading and reflection had convinced him of the fallacy and danger of his early denial of a visible church, he found no rest for the sole of his foot until he had planted it within the battlements of self-asserting Rome. And why? Because there were none to point out boundaries to his satisfaction as in nervous haste he passed across from one extreme to the other. In the days of his doubts the sworn guardians on the ramparts of our church either held his own original error, or on the other hand seemed to him so timid, shifty and uncertain in their assertion of truth that his affrighted soul could not safely trust herself to their teaching. Some held to no visible church as a Keeper of Holy Writ, an authority in controversy,—asserted no regular threefold order and apostolic succession in the ministry—saw no definite meaning in the Master's promise of endless protection to His Church—could show no clear, and well-defined, boundary between their existing position and ultimate latitudinarianism, rationalism and infidelity. Others there were—the objects of suspicion and persecution—shot at from both sides of the wall—because of an uncertainty in their teaching, an inability to show a clear boundary between the Anglican Church and Rome, exhibiting a reserve and timidity so like his own peculiar weakness, that the fugitive from one enemy rushed for safety into the ranks of another. Thus Dr. Newman, and others like him yearned for the strong hand of authority to save them from themselves, and at length found it in the iron grasp of Ultramontaniam.

A clerical pervert to Rome in our own diocese, as we all know cast in our teeth the awkward accusation, that finding in our Church numbers laying no claim to catholicism,—finding a large proportion of us doubting the ministry and the very existence of a visible church—he in his doubt and perplexity, rather than deny Christ's promise, went over to a church asserting its sole claim to these scriptural marks of truth.

Others again feeling the same need of clearly defined boundaries on the side towards sectarianism, and failing to find them under the long-popular system of instruction in our church, see no fixedness but in Rome on the one hand, or the narrow exclusiveness of some one of the many sects on the other. To their perception all in the Anglican Church is loose and undefined,—no doctrine—no discipline. In the recent scene at the Ballast Wharf in the harbour of St. John, N.B., the principal figure—the late curate of the Rev. Canon Gray,—was one whose ideas of the marks and bounds of our branch of the Catholic Church, of her sacraments and the ministry he was about to cast aside must have been hazy indeed.

The ministry and sacraments of its church cannot be separated. Vagueness of view, or doubt in either, leads to the eventual loss of both, as Colenso and myriads before him have proved. Distorted views of both—not according to the proportion of faith—led to the great Reformation, and Western Christendom has since been oscillating between two extremes—Romanism and Rationalism. "It hath been the wisdom of the Church of England to keep the mean between the two extremes," in this as in other matters.

This middle course shall be the channel of our little magazine. The infidelity of France and the hydra-headed scepticism of America, ought to warn us off the