

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

As we are now approaching the end of the year, it becomes our duty to request our friends who are in arrears to pay up their subscriptions at once. All arrears must be paid up to the end of 1886, at the rate of \$2.00 per annum. If \$1.00 additional is sent, the paper will be paid for up to the end of 1887. At this period a number are past due; we trust they will now be paid promptly, as well as the next year in advance. In remitting, it would be highly desirable if each subscriber would make sufficient effort to send on in addition to his own subscription, one or more from his friends or neighbours; so that we may be able to double our subscription list, and thus be placed in the same position as we hope all our subscribers will be,—in having a "Merry Christmas and a Happy and Prosperous New Year."

CHURCH THOUGHTS BY A LAYMAN.

NO SURRENDER.

A LETTER appears in this issue from the son-in-law of the Premier of Ontario, who with charming chivalry rushes to the defence of his defenceless relative. The position he assumes is that occupied by a baloon—it has no hold whatever upon a solid basis of either fact, logic, or inference. Mr. Biggar is one of the most valued correspondents of this journal; his judgment is usually so sound, his feeling so charitable and churchly, his tone so moderate, and his language so well chosen, that his contributions are ever welcomed. But in this matter naturally our friend is excusable in having allowed honorable domestic feelings to have overmastered his reason. The world would be a nobler and happier one were mere reason more generally thus subordinate to affection. The position assumed by Mr. Biggar may be thus stated, "that whatever measures may be placed on the Statute book the Church has no right to criticise or condemn because those Acts are the work of politicians; and to condemn them is a political act." If that is not our friend's meaning his letter is to us meaningless as the wind. Let us look at this quietly. Every Act of Parliament or Legislature is passed by or with the approval of some one political party. If, then, any Act is condemned by the Church, then the Church censures the political party by whom that Act was passed. But Mr. Biggar contends that the Church must never condemn a political party, because to do so would be to entangle it in politics, then the Church is in a very lamentable state of helplessness. *We have no doubt that the present scandal has arisen because certain politicians thought that do what they would to wrong the Church, the Church press was either so muzzled or so cowardly as to submit without protest.*

We speak of both political parties in this judgment; we speak generally of all political leaders as such, when we declare our conviction that because the Church of England has been so timid in the past, scared lest she should

be charged with being a political machine, our beloved Church has been wronged and robbed; her principles have been trampled upon, her rights have been denied, and the minds of her children have been debauched by false teachings which the Church of Rome and the sects who laugh at Mr. Biggar's position, have compelled politicians to force upon the Public Schools of Canada. The French wit asked to approve of the abolition of death sentences said, "Certainly, but let murderers set the example!" So when our friend demands that the Church of England must never condemn a political leader who has been recreant to his trust as a Protestant, we say most politely but with iron firmness, "Certainly, but let the Roman Church set the example!" If Mr. Biggar's rule were to come into force how Archbishop Lynch would rejoice: he would have an even clearer course than it is now, and whatever legislation his tools in the Government passed we Churchmen forsooth, would have to sit in subjection, thankful we suppose that liberty to live and speak still existed in Ontario.

No! a thousand times No! with thunder tones echoing down long centuries the Church says No! to Mr. Biggar's demand for silence when wrong is done to her own or to the civil and religious rights of Churchmen. The Church not to touch politics or politicians? The history of England would be wiped out were the conflicts of the Church with politics and politicians to be erased from the record. If Mr. Biggar's theory had been sound England would have been as enslaved to the Papacy as Spain or Italy. To bring Canada into that subjection is and for years has been the policy of the Papacy. Since the return of the Jesuits to power this *policy has become openly developed in political action.* The "Protestant Surrender" we condemn and lament is the manifest outcome of Jesuit audacity in trampling upon Protestant civil rights. We had every confidence that with a Presbyterian lawyer as Premier in Ontario, the wily Jesuits would be foiled. But he to secure the political support of Romanists gave to these Papist plotters the manipulation of the School laws of Ontario; the manipulation of the School Books of Ontario, and the manipulation of the School Bible of Ontario! If that was not treason, treachery is fidelity; if that is not a betrayal of a solemn trust, dishonor and honor are one and the same thing. We repeat, "The gate was kept by a Presbyterian who for a bribe handed the key to Archbishop Lynch." In over seventy Public Schools in Ontario, *supported out of public funds by the consent of the government, the Papist Catechism is used instead of the Bible, and every child of Protestant parents must go without education or learn as follows:*

Question. Can one be saved out of the Roman Church?

Answer. No—out of the Church there is no salvation.

Could we have expected a Presbyterian Premier to have sanctioned Protestant money being given to such schools? Does Mr. Big-

gar like his money spent by his relative to support such schools? We are referred to the States as the land where the Church engages not in a struggle with politicians. But if the Church there were plotted against by a political leader; if the civil and religious liberties of American citizens of any Church or class were legislated against, or any Church or class given high and exclusive privileges such as the Premier of Ontario has given the Church of Rome, then would the Church press, with the whole press of the States, lash the offender with a thousand thongs. Let the leader of Mr. Biggar's party treat all Churches and all citizens with equality, and we Church of England men will do him all honor as a ruler. But let him or let his political opponent touch the sacred Ark of our Church's free life or the free life of her sons, and be he Liberal or be he Tory, his hand will be struck down with all the force our strength and our sword can swing for the punishment of any man whose finger-tips even desecrate the Ark of Canadian civil and religious liberty. We commend to our friend the following remarks in the *Week*, a paper which has very decided leanings towards his party:

"Perfect equality there will not be so long as any one Church exercises a special influence in politics. *That the Roman Catholic Church does exercise a special influence in the politics and the political appointments of this Province, while it is at the same time hustling Protestantism, politically and in every other way, out of Quebec is surely an indisputable fact.* We have in this city—Toronto—a journal which is the manifest, and we may almost say the accredited, organ of the alliance."

Pray are we to see our people *hustled* out of Quebec, our Church's influence paralyzed, our missions destroyed, and keep silent because this is done through political action? Are we to watch this most dangerous alliance consummated and established, an alliance which has already given enormous advantages to the Papacy at our expense, an alliance which is championed by the official organ of Mr. Mowat's Government? Are we to let that danger grow and to say not a word lest we hurt Mr. Mowat's feelings? Away with such sentimentalism. Principalities and Powers are to us no more important than Christmas dolls compared to the majesty of the Catholic Church. Premiers, Attorneys General and the political interests of all the tribe of political dignitaries of whatever party, are to us insignificant as the puppets of a Punch and Judy show, compared with the eternal grandeur of the principles of civil and religious liberty upon which alone can be built such a nation of freemen as every Canadian patriot longs to see the ultimate issue of this Dominion.

Woe! to any Premier, big or little, Liberal or Conservative, who seeks to blast the rising grandeur of Canada by such legislation as that by which the Roman Catholic Church has secured unjust privileges in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Biggar questions our interpretation of the School Law, *we decline the discussion, we*