

but the supervision of the Bishop of London can never be otherwise than merely nominal. The importance of the whole matter is obvious. It would be well worth trying the experiment begun in Madras in some of our poor missionary dioceses in the North-West. A slight and friendly intercourse, perhaps an occasional exchange of missionaries, would create a special knowledge and greater interest, and that would be much. More is not needed at first. But a beginning would be gladly hailed, and would prevent the recurrence of some very harsh and erroneous comments on our North-West, which we noticed in the Gazette some months ago. The want of Irish interest in Canada did not always exist. In the later days of the Establishment, the interest and intercourse was very real; without mentioning those who survive, we recall, among our recent losses, Bishop Sullivan, Archbishop Lewis and Archdeacon Bedford-Jones.

Naming the Baby

Is nothing to the thought expended on the name of the Church in the United States. The letters continue in an unabated swarm, and the contents are, we regret to say, monotonous. It is not the fault of the sponsors, their misfortune it is that they are more than a century too late. It is difficult to change a child's name; it is still more difficult, and we might humbly suggest, impolitic to change the name of the Church. We suggested that it was already known by one, and however undesirable, it was the one by which it would continue to be called by the people. Drop the Protestant as unnecessary, and call it the Episcopal Church of the United States. Whether we like it or not, we are Episcopalians, the wide world over.

Devotion.

It is often asserted that devotion is a lost art. That there is ground for such an assertion no honest observer of the trend of much of the modern popular religion will care to deny. The idea of objective worship has never dawned upon the minds of some of the most prominent workers in the Church, and in the religious bodies by which she is to-day surrounded and sometimes supplanted. It is when the knowledge of a personal God, holy and just, is borne in upon the mind, and the soul realizes its own helplessness and accepts the offer of a Redeemer, mighty to save, that devotion is awakened. The whole being is henceforth prostrated before the throne of God and of the Lamb. The life becomes one act of devotion and active service. God is all and in all. Devotion is a grace once found, is not easily lost.

CRITICISMS ON FOREIGN MISSIONS.

The Bishop of Tinnevely, preaching in St. Paul's Church, Toronto, on Sunday morning, the 15th inst., referred to our article on the above subject in our issue of 12th inst., in which we quoted some of the objections made to missions in an English paper. It is objected that vast sums are spent with inadequate returns. The whole sum spent

yearly on missions would only meet the expenses of the present war for less than a week. Nor can we measure spiritual work by dollars. It is life, not dollars, was given for the world. The money is given to support those who tell the good news. The Bishop said that if he had only his pay as a missionary Bishop, he could not afford to get home from India, much less to visit Canada. Many workers are honorary. Reckless charges are made against missionaries. The Bishop was told that when a sick European on one occasion was brought into the station, no one went to see him. On enquiry it was found a missionary had gone as soon as he heard of the sick man, who forbade the missionary to speak about religion to him. People are ready to swallow what careless travellers tell them, and how little some care for missions was illustrated by the case of a lady who called on a missionary and took up his time in asking various questions to help her in her travelling, but when he mentioned his work said she did not want to see any work but only heathen temples. It is often remarked that Christianity has turned the people from their old religion. Secular education does this equally, but Christianity has something to offer instead, whereas secular education has at the best a cold morality; and nominal Christians, some of whom lead inconsistent lives, are hindrances. Not a few Hindoos have become Christians through seeing the godly lives of their teachers. And as to the confidence placed in the missionaries, only a few months ago, after long quarrelling over some matter by Mahomedans and Hindus, it was agreed by the contending parties to go to the Christian missionary and ask him to arbitrate. His decision completely satisfied both parties. The Bishop also quoted the words of Lord Cranborne, Under Secretary of State for foreign affairs: "The extension of the Empire could only be defended on the ground that we believe that by the genius of our people and the blessing of our religion, we are able to confer benefits upon the people we subdue, which no other nation could do. . . . He did not care what they might do in the countries they conquered, what secular colleges they might found; unless they carried along with those institutions the definite teaching of Christianity, they had done nothing at all." Missionaries and converts have faults like other people, and need the prayers and help of Christian men and women. Bishop Morley left Toronto on Monday, the 16th inst., to take part in the great missionary meeting at Montreal on Tuesday, the 17th, and sails for England on the 25th inst.

RESERVATION.

(Communicated).

[Continued.]

The rubric directing it was not inserted in the English Book, but it was inserted in the Latin Book. In the English Book, a rubric was inserted which directed the curate, "if any of the bread and wine remain, to have it to his own use." But in the Latin Book, which is still legal in college chapels,

and university churches, Reservation was provided for. In 1562, the Thirty-Nine Articles were drawn up, and in the Twenty-Eighth Article a clause was inserted which has been commonly understood to unreservedly condemn Reservation. The clause is as follows: "The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped." At first sight this does seem to imply a mild reproof of the practice, but there are reasons which point to an opposite conclusion. The Latin Prayer-Book is, so far as the universities, at least, are concerned, as authoritative as the Articles, and it distinctly countenances Reservation. Is it credible that the reformers would have given or continued their authorization of a book which prescribed that which in the Articles they reprov'd? I do not think so. Either, then, the reformers were inconsistent in a measure beyond the common inconsistency of man, or the clause referred to is a statement of historical fact, rather than a rubrical direction. As an historical statement, it is unimpeachable, for Reservation is no more an outcome of the institution of Christ than the practice of kneeling to receive the elements. But just as kneeling may be defended on the grounds of reverence and Catholic custom, so may Reservation be justified on the grounds of fitness, antiquity, and universal consent. Besides, there are other reasons which point to the same conclusion. Ten thousand Marian clergy were in England when Elizabeth ascended the throne, and only a fraction of that number refused to conform. We have the testimony of Walsingham to the effect that Queen Elizabeth did not worry her clergy about ritual matters, provided they accepted the Prayer-Book and her supremacy. It cannot be doubtful that many, nay most of those conforming clergy carried out the services of the Book of 1559, with all the pomp and circumstance of the service in the days of Mary. There was nothing to prevent them in doing so, and few rubrics to guide them in doing otherwise. If the omission of the rubric directing Reservation and the clause of the 28th Article, already referred to, be taken as proof that the practice was prohibited, why is it that no hint of any trouble in enforcing the law comes to us. The whole ritual trouble of Elizabeth's reign arose out of the disobedience of the Puritans, and there is not a hint of coercion with a view to reducing the Catholic party to obedience. The only rational conclusion is that every rite, which was not expressly condemned, was tacitly permitted. In 1662, the final revision of the Prayer-Book took place, and the rubric, directing the consumption of the consecrated elements, took its present form. In 1559, the rubric simply provided that "if any of the Bread and Wine remain, the curate shall have it to his own use." The reader will observe that there is no distinction here between the consecrated and unconsecrated species. In 1662, the revisers added to the existing rubric the following words: "But if any remain of that which was consecrated, it shall not be carried out of the church, but the