

"4. But the Episcopal Church, though in poverty and destitution, still continued to exist, and kept up with the most faithful and conscientious care the Episcopal succession in the Apostolic ministry, thus providing for the continuance of the due administration, in the Church, of Christ's Word and Sacrament.

"5. From 1746 to 1792 members of the Episcopal Church (having always warmly supported the cause of James, commonly called 'the Pretender,' and Prince Charles Edward against the usurping monarchs and persisting in the refusal to recognize, as king, any one not of the House of Stuart) were placed under the most severe penal statutes. It was made illegal for them to possess any churches or chapels; those which had remained in the country districts were ruthlessly burnt; those in towns were ordered to be pulled down at the expense, if not with the hands, of the Episcopalians themselves: all public service was forbidden; more than four persons, besides the family, were not permitted to meet for divine worship in any house, the penalty incurred by the officiating priest for disregard of this prohibition being, for first offence, six months' imprisonment; for second offence, transportation for life.

"6. During all this time the Church of England raised not a single voice of remonstrance against this cruel persecution; and thus, though herself in spiritual communion with the Episcopal Church of Scotland, tacitly approved of it all.

"7. Notwithstanding the malice of the enemies of our Church, and the indifference of those who should have been her friends, the bishops in Scotland, in 1784, consecrated Dr. Seabury as the first bishop of the American Church; the consecration took place secretly, in the upper room of a house at Aberdeen; and through that act, done by the venerable prelates of our Church in their hour of bitterest adversity, the Episcopal Church of Scotland became the Mother Church of the Episcopal Church of America, now the largest (sic) portion of the Anglican branch of the Church Catholic.

"8. In 1792 the Penal Statutes were relaxed; but through the bitterness of the persecution, the clergy had been reduced to forty and the bishops to four; where a century before, there had been two archbishops, twelve bishops, 1,000 clergy. There are now seven bishops and about 230 clergy.

"9. Thus the Episcopal Church of Scotland has continued to exist till this day; now (thanks be to God!) in freedom from persecution, but yet crippled on all sides by her poverty; sorely wanting men to labor in her fold; and (without which men cannot be maintained) money. She humbly asks and gratefully receives the offerings of the faithful to assist her in witnessing for the 'one faith which was once delivered to the saints'; it is her work, under the divine blessing, to win back the people of this country from the various conflicting forms of Presbyterian and Calvinistic error, to the 'faith of their fathers.' The Episcopal Church is, therefore what it claims to be, 'The Old Church of Scotland.'"

Correspondence.

All Letters containing personal allusions will appear over the signature of the writer.

We do not hold ourselves responsible for the opinions of our correspondents.

THE NORTH WEST.

SIR,—The Ascension tide appeal of the Board of Missions is a fearful indictment of our missionary apathy, and *laissez faire*, at a moment most critical in the history of the Church, and of Canada. The time has come, but will be soon gone forever, when we may retrieve the past, regain the lost opportunity that was ours when Ontario was first settled. If the Church had only been able to give her ministrations to her children, as at that time they came seeking new homes in this province, the majority of population would have been of our communion to-day, and our Churchmanship, in its worship, morals, and mission spirit would never have been the frightened, weak, Laodicean thing of a cowered cause. Canada's virgin soil would never have been confiscated from pious uses; and the virgin hearts of her children would have been taught in her schools the knowledge revealed from heaven, as well as that discovered upon earth. The Church of England in Canada would not have felt herself to be by the Babylonian waters of a widely prevailing trend of public sentiment and prejudice alien to her, tempting her children too often, alas! to hang their harps upon the willows of trepidation and despondency. But the free, strong, winsome life of holiness inherent in her divine faith and organization, would have laid its hand of blessing

upon us, informing all our institutions and laws with its divine "sweetness and light," and dwelling in the new skies with those who had been estranged from her fold in the darkness of an evil hour; who can tell in view of the unions that have taken place in Canadian soil, but that the ancient life of Christian unity in the apostle's doctrine and fellowship might have been given through her, in Canada, even as the *coram Canadensis* is found in Canadian rocks elsewhere, deemed azoic. That opportunity, so pregnant with glorious possibilities, was lost, but is given back to us again to day.

Again a great West of Canada is being settled, and the plurality of the population pouring into that land is of the Church of England. If we will do our duty to our fellow Churchmen there, for the next few years, we shall have made the North West a Church of England land for all time—shall have given it the blessing lost to Ontario, but capable of being won back through the North West, as "the dew of Hermon upon Mount Zion."

The influence of the North West must be dominant in the near future, and shape the destinies of all Canada, recasting them in its own mould. The religious communions around us see this, hence the characteristic political struggle of the Romanists, and the praise worthy missionary efforts of others. But as to ourselves, the story of Jacob and Esau is reversed. The Church of England, Jacob, who has the promise, and is asked, this time, to come and receive the blessing for himself, and the land of promise, is selling it for the meagre pottage of withheld missionary offerings and work, while his brother Esau, catching something of Jacob's voice of faith, is winning all of the broken blessing he has power to receive. Would that God would make our Board of Missions a Beza leel, given "wisdom to make all manner of workmanship of the sanctuary," in to which His voice of the present opportunity bids us build our Canada.

And make us all "wise hearted" to give and to work, till "the cloud of His presence cover" us, and "His glory fill" the land. Our Eastern Canada, the chancel and chair where the voice of God shall be sounded forth, as the voice of many waters of our own Niagara, into the great nave of the western plains where the congregation is now assembling in its thousands. British Columbia, the Galilee Poarch, richly light looking out with open doors of the church, at least, towards India, and China, and the islands of the sea.

Yours, &c.,
E. F. D.

CORRECTION.

SIR,—Allow me to correct a statement which appeared in your issue of last week, (June 10th), from a Streetsville correspondent, respecting the financial condition of Trinity Church in that place. For the last two years of my incumbency, the churchwarden's books showed "for the first time for several years a balance on the right side," in the same way as I have been informed, they did this year, viz.; "when all the pew rents are paid in, up to date." Moreover, we had not a two hundred dollar bequest to draw on. I may further say that there has been no debt on the church in question for the last three years. Your subscriber in Streetsville will understand my reason for writing this letter.

J. A. HANNA.

QU'APPELLE.

The following letter has been addressed to all the Bishops of the Dominion:

RIGHT REV. BROTHER,—The knowledge that I am one of the junior Bishops in the Dominion, makes me reluctant to address you on a subject that I am sure must have already received your careful attention. But, I have always found that it is better to speak out on any subject upon which one is led to feel deeply, even at the risk of being thought presumptuous in so doing; and I believe the subject upon which I am venturing to address this letter to you, and the other Bishops of the Church of Canada, to be of very great, if not vital, importance to the welfare of our Church.

Perhaps, too, the fact that I have so lately come from the Mother Church of England, and that this Diocese is more entirely dependent for support on that Church than probably any other Diocese in the Dominion, and is likely to be in the same condition for some time, may help to free the proposal that I desire to urge from the suspicion that I know some entertain concerning it, that it is desired thereby further to sever our connection with the Church of England.

I desire to ask you and the other Bishops of the Dominion, and through you, our brethren of the Clergy and of the Laity, whether the time has not come for an earnest effort to be made to obtain a change of name for our Church?

Allow me to explain why I venture to urge that the sooner some change is made, the better.

1. All legal ties that once bound us to the Church of England are undoubtedly already dissolved. The Acts of Provincial and Diocesan Synods, and our separate Canons, abundantly testify that the only tie that now connects us with the Mother Church is a voluntary compact. This tie, binding us, as it does, in a very real unity of a common discipline, and a common worship, voluntarily accepted, is, I believe, a far stronger tie, and likely to be more enduring, than any that the secular arm could impose by external authority. But, nevertheless, we must not flinch from the responsibility which this freedom from legal restraint brings with it. The Church in England may have certain advantages from her union with the State. I, at least, believe that while the advantages derived from this union are really greater to the State than to the Church, the Church should maintain them as long as she can for the benefit of her people. But, on the other hand, there are undoubtedly disadvantages under which the Church in that country labours, on account of that connection, and as the price she pays for the advantages that she reaps. She is very considerably hampered in adapting herself, and her Services to the varying needs of her people. The Church in this country, freed as she is from those restrictions, if she is ever really to be the Church of the country, should adopt a bold policy, and shew the world how there can be a true independence of action, united with an essential unity of faith, and worship, and order. And, as the first recognition of the fact—a fact that, as I have already said, is accomplished, whether we like it or not,—that she is really an independent body, having all the responsibilities of a separate corporate existence, she should adopt a name expressive of this fact, and, moreover, clearly asserting her claim to be the representative of the ancient Catholic Church in this country.

2. Every year that this action is delayed, its accomplishment will be made more difficult, or at least, more expensive. There will be more Acts of Parliament to be amended. Every year new Acts are passed incorporating various Church bodies by the name of the "Church of England."

3. The continued use of the title "The Church of England" now, is, to say the least, altogether unmeaning in this country. As long as we were bound by English Acts of Parliament, and subject to the same Courts of Law in matters of Doctrine and Discipline, the name asserted the fact that the Church in the Colonies was merely the Church of England going forth into other countries for Missionary purposes, but having no independent existence in those countries. Now, however, that the Church, in colonies that have independent Legislatures, has also to assume independent action, and to govern itself, to continue the name is to continue what has ceased to have any real meaning.

4. But the name is not only unmeaning, it is also, I venture to say, positively unjust to many of those who come to live amongst us, and, above all, injurious to the best interests of our Church.

There are amongst us, many people who never did belong, strictly speaking, to the Church of England. They belonged in their old homes, to the Church of Scotland, or of Ireland, or of America, and as such when coming to any other country, they would naturally belong to the Catholic Church of that country. There is no reason why, when they come to Canada, they should call themselves members of the Church of England, any more than they cease to be Scotch or Irish. They may become Canadians, but not English.

Why, again should our converts from Heathenism amongst the Indians, be asked to belong to anything but the Canadian Church?

There are also many living amongst us with whom the name of the Church of England very needlessly excites no small amount of prejudice. In some cases their forefathers separated from the Church of England for political rather than religious reasons. The Church of England, is associated in the minds of many Dissenters, with political events which are very much misunderstood and misrepresented, and with which the State had really far more to do than the Church. Why should we continue to involve ourselves by our name in mere political questions which have long since ceased to have any real connection with us? We do not shrink from anything that may be involved in the closest connection with the Church of England as a spiritual body, but no loyalty to it binds us to fetter ourselves with the prejudices that have been created by its political connections.

5. Are we not also in danger, by maintaining this title, of gradually drifting into one of the worst errors of the Church of Rome, the claim of one merely local Church to a lordship over other Churches? Much of Western Europe may have been indebted to the Church of Rome for its evangelisation or the revival of religion, and for this we owe that Church a debt of gratitude. But that Church departed from the principles of the Catholic Church when it took advantage

of the benefit of other nations as they grew in the Church, ob The Church has, I am sure, rather asserted to which it to the detri

6. But th seems to m possible, is, name, we s ous externa connection bership of

If we can tive of the country, I c laws of the be governed can make to assert it we owe the be said tha a change as siders it de one of those it would be Dominion t especially, an importa our desire far—larger Province.

7. If it would say name of th all antiquit in no way Rome, who Catholic C York (Dr. with regar American Church," c be less like tians. Th well worth to us as to selves by t to assert th and there be offende Church w sized by o actor with emphasize there can Our very Church, w iam, and feel. themselves only Amer never be i we are."

I may a and fresh returns (o or Presby

I know preted as t presumptu ving more fore, call f that our o truth, and the legitin Catholic claim inv right that as evident from the l through o the better for deliver ing on ou

There raised, an certain c country a name is c Some few cannot bu the identi establish a change identity o subjection of its Bish