

fiscation of their property. To say that this bill has outraged the social, civil and religious sensibilities of more than half the population of the Dominion but feebly expresses its effect on Canadian public opinion. Into the technicalities of the case I shall not enter. Suffice it to say that other and bolder demands will follow upon this assuredly as the night the day, to be succeeded by others bolder still, unless earnest and vigorous protest convince the powers that there is a limit to the public patience, and that Canadian Protestantism will not submit to Roman arrogance and Papal dictation.

THE SYNOD of the Diocese of Toronto has uttered its protest against the Jesuits Estates Act; and the Bishop of the Diocese also referred to it in his charge, condemning such legislation.

#### CONTEMPORARY CHURCH OPINION.

##### *The Living Church says:—*

The fact is, the great mass of defections from the Church is not from the ranks of the so-called "Romanizers." It is from the extreme Protestant party and from the Broad Church school of thought; witness the schism calling itself "Reformed Episcopal;" witness Dr. Noakes; witness the recent secession of a priest in Missouri. It is not from those who believe too much, but from those who believe almost nothing, that the Church has most to fear. This is not to say, that we endorse the theological vagaries of Smith and Jones. But so long as they hold and teach the Catholic Faith and are loyal to the Apostolic order of the Church, we shall not denounce them from their pious opinions.

#### NOT RECOGNIZED.

A story worth thinking about has been going the rounds of the newspapers. A minister, it is said, preached an eloquent sermon on "The Recognition of Friends in Heaven." A man who heard it thanked him for it, and suggested that he next preach a sermon on the recognition of friends on earth; "for," said he, "I have attended your church for five years, and have never yet had recognition from any one." The story has force, and we can well understand why it should find place in the humorous column of the newspapers. But it is a very absurd story after all. It represents a man as having been an habitual attendant upon a certain church for five years, and in all that time having no acquaintance in it, nor ever receiving any recognition from any one connected with it. Had he done his duty, he would first of all have reported himself to the pastor. He could then at once have had acquaintance with, and glad recognition from, at least one fellow worshipper. Besides, if a sensible and Christian man, he would have engaged actively in some sort of Christian work there; would have done what he could and all that he could to bring others to the Lord's House, and enlist them in His service. In that way alone he would have surrounded himself with brethren from whom he could have had all the recognition that any sensible man could desire.

Suppose we ask: Of what use is a church, anyway? You have, perhaps, one or two dozen churches in your city. What purpose do they serve? A very useful and important purpose, we think. But it is possible for a man to misapprehend that purpose altogether; possible to consider the matter purely from a worldly standpoint; to consider these organizations as clubs, and these churches as club houses. He may say that no moral obligation rests upon him to belong to one of these more

than to another; or, for that matter, to any of them. Yet he may think there are good reasons for so doing. Should it cost him anything to do so (say \$20 or \$30 a year), he may yet think it a wise investment. It is a business matter. He wants to spend his money where it will bring the best return. So he looks about, and considers where he can find the most "privileges" for the least money. It is as much a secular matter as buying a piano or renting a house. If a man "chooses his church," in any such spirit, he will certainly complain if he does not get "recognition." That is what he paid for, and what he looks for—recognition either in a business way, or socially. He will of course complain if his investment brings no return. Recognition! If he does not get it at the "P.E." church, he will try the "M.E." or the "R.E." or some other "E." Recognition! Could any man in this country live twenty-four hours without recognition? But let us think of another sort of person altogether; of a man who believes the Christian Faith, and is trying to live a Christian life. What a totally different matter it will all be to such a man. He believes, and knows what he believes. If a Churchman, it is on principle and on conviction. His parish church is the House of God. It is his duty and privilege to worship Him in His holy temple; to seek unto Him in all His appointed ways, and to do all that he can to bring other men to the knowledge and worship of the Lord. Will not such men have all the recognition they want, and more too? They are sufficiently rare to be noticeable enough. Where is the rector that doesn't recognize such men as far as he can see them? Some day we hope to know what sort of recognition they will meet in heaven; and yet we have no great concern about it. They are so easily recognized here, that we have no doubt they will find ample recognition there.—*Living Church.*

#### CORRESPONDENCE.

[The name of Correspondent must in all cases be enclosed with letter, but will not be published unless desired. The Editor will not hold himself responsible, however, for any opinions expressed by Correspondents.]

##### A SUMMER RESORT FOR CLERGY.

*To the Editor of the Church Guardian:*

SIR,—I have been looking for some replies to Dr. Roe's letter in answer to E. C. P.'s, but so far have seen none. Will you allow me to make a few remarks upon it, for I am unable to see that Dr. Roe's reply touches E. C. P.'s suggestion. Dr. Roe does not think the proposal needed, and, therefore, it is not. I cannot help thinking that E. C. P. expresses the views of many more than Dr. Roe has any idea of, and that there are plenty who would be glad of such a change as E. C. P. suggests could they see their way to it, in spite of Dr. Roe's opinion to the contrary. Doubtless it is very presumptuous of the country clergy to think that they need any kind of rest or change, especially as they have all the beauties of nature to feast their eyes upon all the year round, and not a few of them the beauties of the forest and fields of stumps. The clergy of Lennoxville with only from three to four months holiday every year to get rest and change need it, of course, to break the terrible monotony of Collegiate life and scholastic occupation.

Dr. Roe speaks first of Cacouna, and says that it affords a summer chaplaincy every year to two clergymen, and adds that for seven or eight years it has been filled mainly out of the city. Let me state the facts. In 1888 the duty was taken by the Rev. A. J. Balfour, of Richmond, and the Rev. T. Richardson, of Quebec. In 1887, by the Rev. G. H. Parker, of Compton, and the Rev. George Thorneloe, of the city of Sherbrooke. In 1886, by the Rev. Principal Adams. In 1885, by a Mr. Owen from Upper Canada. In 1884 and 1883, by the late Princi-

pal Lobley. Previous to this by the clergy of St. Matthew's, Quebec. Most of these clergy were certainly outside the city of Quebec, but whether they all consider themselves country clergy is another thing. Dr. Roe says also that the number of the clergy of the Diocese of Quebec is not very large. There are about sixty-four, setting aside the Gulf clergy (8), those of the city and Bishop's College, 12, who are so happy as to be able to provide for themselves, and those who have private means, who, if I mistake not, could be counted on the fingers of one hand, minus the thumb, and those of Magog and Georgeville and other similar places. He comes to the conclusion that there are not more than eight who would desire to spend a month at the seaside. This is pure assumption, and as by his own showing he has only asked four, I may say the minority, of the clergy, he has no right to assume anything of the kind.

Next comes the Island of Orleans, which has, he says, provision for two clergymen each for a month. I do not know who takes the duty this year, but for the two previous years it has been taken by a clergyman from the Diocese of Montreal, and up to that time, I think, by the late Rector of Quebec.

Of Cap a l'Aigle, Murray Bay and Tadoussac, I know but little, but think the more or less irregular services in these places are usually taken by city clergy.

Then comes Riviere du Loup, which Dr. Roe says does not come under this head, being one of our regular Missions with a resident clergyman. If report be true, this is to be made an exception of this year, a clergyman from the Diocese of Ontario, Dr. Roe's son-in-law, taking the duty for July and August.

I am of opinion sir, that there is need of some such thing as E. C. P. suggests, and which the clergy would rejoice to see supplied; whether they will see it supplied is another thing. It is change we need, change of scene, change of circumstances, to break the monotony of our work, and to take us out of the barren ground we are wont to fall into; and then some of us who are fond of fishing might be able to go like Dr. Roe himself.

Yours, A COUNTRY CLERGYMAN.

MARKET GUIDE OFFICE,  
Chatham, Ont., June 13th 1889.

Sir,—In the issue June 5th of your valuable journal, (I use the adjective in no conventional or unreal sense), I see an article from the Bishop of Alabama, in which to illustrate his argument he supposes the case of an inhabitant of the tropics, who calls the narrator of the fact of water freezing into solid ice, an impostor. I was cognisant personally of a singularly similar incident, in actual life, when I was living in Greytown, Central America. I was talking with a chief of a visiting tribe of Indians (Woolwas I think) once during the turtle fishing. He was very intelligent and inquisitive and could speak English very well, though slowly. I was telling him about England and mentioned ice. He gave a sort of non-committal grunt, which might either mean dissent or assent. It struck me that he might have seen or heard of ice being brought in the English and American steamers to Greytown. Then I told him about snow. He asked many piercing and sarcastic questions, in fact cross-examined me like a "nisi prius" lawyer, with a view to confuse. When he found that I stuck manfully to my story, that snow was water, that it came down from the sky as a white powder or in flakes, that it fell to a depth of several feet, that in Canada, vehicles and heavy loads were drawn upon it, he absolutely screamed with laughter and ran off to give the other Indians the benefit of what he thought my Munchausen story. Before he left as a Parthian dart, he threw this at me, "white man big big, O very big liar." I hope the Bishop of Alabama may see this; and I remain,

Yours truly,  
W. B. HAMILTON.