

the relation, not of rivals or competitors, still less of antagonists, but of cordial allies. The Free Churches of England can have no ground of opposition to each other, and they who would sow seeds of division among them are enemies of all. We have common adversaries, and we have a large number of common principles, and if we have sectarian principles as well, which Christian charity does not require, and which loyalty to truth would forbid us to conceal, that is no reason why we should indulge a sectarian spirit, and labour for the extension of a party rather than for the glory of our common Lord and our common faith."

We must reserve for next month Mr. Rogers' manly and noble utterances about preaching and the ministry for the times. We give his closing sentences: "Our time for labour is very short, our powers very limited, our service at best but very small, ourselves but as drops in the ocean of being. As we talk of our purposes, and plans, and hopes, we are overwhelmed by the sense of our insufficiency, and hear our words echoed back in notes of derisive laughter from the mighty hosts of evil we have to meet. And their scorn, be it ever so bitter and mocking, would be deserved if we thought of ourselves as anything but poor links in that chain of instrumentality by which God is accomplishing His grand design. Our one confidence is that His purpose will be fulfilled. The world will be redeemed, and our Lord will be its Redeemer; and in that day, when the Hallelujahs of the heaven and earth shall proclaim the victory of the Lamb, it will be given to us to rejoice that even our labour has not been in vain in the Lord."

ROME AND HER EXPOUNDERS.

BY THE EDITOR.

Archbishop Lynch, of this city, has apparently been very much disturbed of late by what somebody has been saying about the Holy Mother Church, and has been treating the citizens of Toronto to an authoritative exposition of her teachings, in a Lecture, in St. Michael's, which has been reported in the city press. We say "authoritative," but really we are perplexed to know whether it is so or not; for if "infallible" Popes can contradict and anathematize one another as they have done, how are we to trust the words of a sinful and fallible man like Dr. Lynch?

We presume, however, that the Archbishop will be accepted as an authority by all the faithful in Canada, and as there are in his lecture "things new and old," which are not often expounded to heretics and schismatics, and some things which if true, we would like to know more about, we lay these before our readers with a view to a more critical examination of them.

We are glad to learn from his Grace that the "anathema" of the Church of Rome, which in the days of the Holy Inquisition and of Queen Mary of England meant fire and faggot, and rack and thumb screw, now means "cut off, separated—not accused, but deprived of the privileges of the Church." Will his lordship kindly tell us how long it is since this change in its meaning took place, and whether it might not revert to its former sense, if the Church only had the secular arm to back her again? We should like, further, to have him give us a lecture shortly on the terms of the "major excommunication," pronounced not long ago on the enemies of the Church, and published in this Magazine. Very mild, isn't it? But then, Dr. Lynch says it does not mean anything—so let it pass.

The Reverend Lecturer sneered at the great Protestant right of "liberty of conscience," and caricatured it as "the liberty to believe as much, or as little as you like, provided you don't believe as much as the Catholics." Well, we don't admire the definition, for we take it to mean the very opposite, viz.: the duty of believing all that God has declared in His Word, after patiently and prayerfully striving to arrive at its true meaning. But if we are not to interpret the Holy Scriptures for ourselves, who is to do it for us? The priest? And who is he but