

of peace and blessedness." The loss of the National line steamship Erin, with all her crew of 75 souls on board, the chaplain considers had also a very solemnizing effect on their minds. He adds that the Bibles are much sought after and are read by the men with avidity and for hours at a time. The reading-rooms are a great boon to them, as there they can meet their friends, write and receive letters, and have their quasi-clubs without being tempted to drink and gamble. Among these sailors there is ample room and verge enough for temperance work, and the Church Temperance Society has come among them, and come to stay too, and though only an infinitesimal amount of what might be done, were it not for the scarcity of funds, has been accomplished, the missionaries can thankfully say that their "labors have not been in vain in the Lord." If the Churchmen in New York would only send Easter offerings for the support of such missions, what a vast deal more good would be thereby achieved than, for instance, by giving a magnificently massive chased gold inlaid and jewelled alms-dish—an ostentatious in memoriam gift lavished upon the Church of the Heavenly Rest, this city. Surely the money expended on such a useless luxury were better spent on missions to the seamen visiting the port and harbor of New York, or the many wretched inhabitants of our countless slums and alleys.

BROAD CHURCHISM IN EXCELSIS.

The so-called Broad Church wing is becoming more and more aggressively in evidence. It is "against everything on general principles" that Churchmen hold as most precious. It is mad at present against the Athanasian Creed, and most unreasonably mad at that, seeing that it nowhere appears in our formularies. An obscure organ of the party, *The Church of To-day*, effusively thanks God that the American "fathers refused to adopt the Creed and make it a part of the Faith of the Church"—an action which, it avers, has saved us untold volumes of controversy, and has prepared a refuge for all tender souls who would not believe in unconditional damnation and preterition." It proceeds:—"O the agony of believing in a creed which consigns to eternal punishment any one who can't say that Three Persons are One Person, and which predetermines the number of the saved, and without regard to opportunity in life, the individual and millions of them who shall be condemned for evermore." The foolish body has evidently never even read over the Athanasian Creed, or he wouldn't make such blunders as to its contents or read into it what the Church never said would be read into it. But on much the same grounds he would condemn as cruel the Apostle of love, S. John himself, who certainly used much stronger language as to those who disbelieved in the eternal divinity of the son than the creed does. Poor S. Paul, with his Anathema Mazanatha, would stand every chance of being branded as a fearful bigot in these days, were the editor of *The Church of To-day* to be his judge.

SPURIOUS UNITY

and those who aspire after it will do equal harm temporarily to the Church with those Broad Church utterances. Thus we read that in this city a "notable event" took place on Good Friday. All Saints' church was, of course, the scene of this "notable event." Its rector, R. Heber Newton, D.D., is a staunch advocate of this spurious Church union, and reduces his theory to practice as far as possible. On this occasion he invited six ministers of different denominations—a Congregationalist, a Presbyterian, a Baptist, a Methodist, a Universalist, and a Professor in the Union Theological Seminary, all representative men, to speak from his pulpit on "The Seven Last Words of Christ." Each spoke ably and earnestly on "The Last Words." "No one," says the *Church Union*, "could detect in their utterances any denominational bias, thus proving how closely united are all sincere Christians in the essentials of the Gospel. Why, then, maintain divisions on non-essentials?"

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.

Tithes.

SIR,—Not having seen Dr. Carry's ten letters to the *Mail* on the subject of Tithes, I am in no position to judge how completely they may disprove the divine obligation of them, but I can hardly accept the inference that they are unanswerable because they have not been answered. Now, as I have neither the ability nor the attainments to enter into an argument with so talented and learned a doctor on a subject on which I am "manifestly ignorant," though I have devoted some time to its consideration; I will merely

suppose that Dr. Carry has proved unanswerably his four points, namely, (1) "That Abraham did not pay tithes," for all that, in the instance recorded, he seems to have considered Melchizedek was the proper party to receive them. (2) "That Jacob's vow is against the 'obligation' of tithes," notwithstanding that some persons do neglect their obligations. (3) "That the Lexical tithes was quite different from 'R's' notion of tithes," though 'R.' has not stated what his 'notion' is. And (4) "That Malachi's words have no place, certainly no realization under the Christian covenant," whatever that may mean. There is, therefore, no divine obligation to pay tithes; but does that settle the question of tithes and proportionate giving? It is well known to most people who take much interest in missionary work, that the Church is deplorably cramped for want of funds, that all kinds of expedients—many of them very questionable ones—have been tried to remedy this, and all have failed in filling the coffers of the Church as they ought to be filled; we advocates and adopters of tithe paying are convinced and can prove from our own experience that the general practice of it by the Church would amply provide funds for (1) paying our missionaries decent stipends in place of the miserable pittance many of them can scarcely exist upon. (2) For opening new missions in all the waste places of the Dominion, home and domestic. (3) For assisting in all foreign mission work to Jews and Gentiles. And (4) for relieving God's poor and other charitable objects. Is there any wrong motive in this? Is there anything inherently bad in returning to God a fixed portion of what he has given us, even if there be no divine warrant for doing it? On the other hand, what is the object of those who speak and write against it? Will the display of their learning and abilities advance the spread of the Gospel or relieve God's poor? When they have incontestably proved that the payment of tithes is not binding on Christians, there will still remain a Scriptural sanction for it, and if God promised such great blessings to the Jews for the faithful performance of it, surely we may reasonably expect a share of those blessings if we honestly carry out the same system, if not in obedience to his command, yet to enable the Church to obey that last command of our Lord's, to preach the Gospel to "every creature." I would willingly follow Dr. Carry's example and affix my name to the above instead of my initial, but unlike his, it would add no weight to my plea, and I write not for argument, but to urge my fellow churchmen to do as we do.

Diocesanism.

SIR,—In these days when the Church in Canada is but beginning to wake up to the need of a united Church of Canada, and in these days when some strong words have been said against Diocesanism and congregationalism in our Church, as being against that spirit of unity which has been ever held as a dominant and expressive feature of the Church's catholicity, is it not, to say the least, singular to find it said (as we find it published) that the Bishop of Ontario has given out, as Bishop, that hereafter during his episcopate no stranger (cleric) need apply for a post or charge in his diocese, because he will have no more come to him or under him who come from other folds or dioceses? What does it all mean? Is it that hereafter Ontario diocese is to be a close diocese; that no Lennoxville man or Trinity man who has been so unfortunate as to be ordained elsewhere than in his diocese is to entertain for a moment any hope of entering Ontario diocese, however orthodox or clever a scholar he may be? Does it mean that, hereafter, Ontario must altogether replenish her clerical ranks from within herself? Surely Ontario is not going, at this time of day, to go in for such diocesan isolation as that! No, I expect the Bishop not having gone that far will, at once, publish a correct report of what he did say. NON-EXPECTANT.

St. Matthew's Church, Toronto.

SIR,—Words fail me when I see how wonderful has been the growth of St. Matthew's parish, across the Don, since I resigned its oversight in 1882. It was then weak and struggling, fighting against difficulties that seemed well nigh insuperable, and staggering under a load of debt that threatened every moment to crush out its feeble life.

Yet it was in better trim than when the Bishop of Toronto licensed me to the curacy. It had then hardly the "name to live," and still it did live, nor did I ever despair of its being one day a strong parish. I knew, however, that it would require the undivided care of a man who could afford either to live on nothing or to find his means of livelihood somewhere else than from the scanty resources of the parishioners.

Till such a man turned up, I was willing to wait on and do my little best to keep the spiritual life alive. Many were the prayers offered for the right man to come forward, and never did I offer the Holy Sacrifice on the modest altar in the church that I

did not couple with it the petition that God would send some faithful laborer to work in this most unpromisingly promising portion of His harvest-field—one which I saw must one day be an important outpost of the Church in Toronto. This I always impressed upon the Bishop of Toronto, whose fatherly and loving interest in the parish and its work and whose loving support of myself, as its priest, at times when I was disposed altogether to give up hope, I can never remember, but with the deepest gratitude. The Bishop, with that instinctive perception of his as to what was right, always believed my report and counselled me to hold on till the God sent successor should arrive. The successor in due time appeared, in the person of the present zealous and indefatigable priest who, as a deacon, took over the parish, and, as priest and rector, has been known to bring it to an excellent work.

All these years I have kept track of St. Matthew's, and never has a Sunday or a holy day passed without my offering to God in the Holy Sacrifice of the altar a remembrance for its rector, its assistant, and its people.

To them I wish good luck in the name of the Lord, and now that they are in their new church, may they go on conquering and to conquer the strongholds of sin and Satan, the fortresses of heresy and schism, and that some day all "across the Don" may be one fold under one shepherd.

I would ask of them, whether priests or people, whether they know me or not, never to forget me at and before the holy altar, so that there at all events, there may be a loving meeting and a loving union with and in the Lamb that was slain.

ED. RANSFORD.

Elizabeth, N.J., Low Sunday, 1890.

The Union of Our Church.

SIR,—I had expected that the public had heard the last from me on this subject, as I should regret it very much were I to be taken, in any manner, as an authority on so grave and complex a question. However, as Mr. Imlach wishes to hear from me again, will you please allow me to say that I believe (1) There is much, very much, in a name. (2) There is a wonderful power in representation.

(1) If the Church in Canada seriously desires union there cannot be any great difficulty in the matter. We must beware, however, lest, by a "name," we undo a work of amalgamation and consolidation which we would set on foot. For one, I do not see anything to hinder us in applying the term "National" to our Church Council, unless we create the difficulty for ourselves. Readers of history can plainly see for themselves that we are not going against the Mother Church or the Mother Nation—we simply want a federated Church in Canada. To produce a federated church throughout the world you require, as a beginning, a "National" Church of England, a "National" Church of Ireland, a "National" Church of Scotland, a "National" Church of France, a "National" Church of the United States of America, a "National" Church of Mexico, &c., &c. Have we all of these Churches? No. Are we to cease trying to produce them? No. It is the end of the life of the Church to produce Churches as much as it is the end of the life of preaching to save souls. The man who does not recognize the former had better give up the latter. The churches to be produced must be the same, and yet not the same. They must be the same in genus though not in variety. The consolidating power of Pagan Rome lay in the fact that she never attempted to upset "National" beliefs although she gave little heed to individual beliefs. She opposed Christianity because it claimed an universal allegiance, but she forgot what too many Churchmen forget, that Christianity does not denationalize men, it intensifies the national character. If we want a proof of this we find it in the history of the "National" Church of England as against the history of the "General" Church. Let us, in Canada, as well as Ireland, use the term "General" Synod if we will, but let us never forget what we hereby mean. England to-day owes (1) her laws, (2) her education, (3) her government, to a "National" parliament given her by the National Church. Had she acted towards the other Churches (e.g., Ireland and Scotland) as a National Church helping National Churches, you would not have Rome in the one country and Presbyterianism in the other in 1890. Alas! for England and for Scotland and for Ireland she has too long learned from Rome the denationalizing lesson to help Ireland under Archbishop Browne, A.D. 1585, Scotland in this and the 17th centuries as she should have helped them, I mean nationally. It is sometimes a good rule in political and ecclesiastical economies to try to change the faith (never by any other means than moral suasion), of peoples, but never never to try to denationalize them. I am now writing of nations as a whole.

(2) Representation. If you in Canada want a just and equitable system of Church representation study the words of Bishop Kingdon. I can only say that a personal observance of the Churches of England