

NOTICES TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We must beg our friends to write the names of persons and places as distinctly as possible. This will save much annoyance. Communications received later than Wednesday morning must stand over till our next issue. We cannot undertake to return rejected manuscripts. Back numbers will be sent only on application. *Subscribers are especially requested to make complaint at once to the office of any irregularity in mailing or delivery of their papers.

VISIT A. J. PELL'S GALLERY OF ART, 345 NOTRE DAME STREET, In rear of Post Office, MONTREAL.

Church Observer.

"THIS PROTESTANT KINGDOM."—Bill of Rights, 1868. MONTREAL, 1st OCTOBER, 1868.

THE CHURCH IN CANADA.

That the Church in Canada is now in an extremely critical and trying state, will, we fancy, be disputed by no one. In the history of nations no moments are so fraught with danger as those in which they declare their independence and commence their own individual existence. The absolute freedom from restraint, together with the intense desire for reform are apt, if not reined in with a firm hand, to precipitate them into a state of anarchy compared with which their former existence was almost peace. Now while we, the members of the Church of England in Canada, do not for one moment mean to assert our absolute independence of the Mother Church, yet we cannot shut our eyes to the fact, that the action of the ecclesiastical authorities in England, and the recent development of ideas in Canada tend, to a greater or less extent, to that end. Our grounds for stating the above rests on the following reasons, which we submit for the careful consideration of our readers: First, the declared invalidity of patents granted by the Crown to Colonial Bishops. The recognized principle of English law as regards bishoprics in the Colonies undoubtedly is, "that the Crown having once parted with its legislative power, cannot, by its subsequent act, supersede the functions of the legislature which it has established." Now this admitted axiom, though always in force has only of late been officially declared. The patents granted to the Bishops of North America, Australia, South Africa and New Zealand, were all originally granted in direct defiance of the principle, though Lord Eldon, who was consulted in the matter of Quebec, seems scarcely to have been satisfied even with his own opinion; for in the case of the bishopric of Calcutta he obtained an Act of the Imperial Parliament to give validity to the Letters Patent. Years, however, rolled past without any legal enquiry being made as to whether the patents held by Colonial Bishops were valid or not; and it was not till the year 1846 that their invalidity was authoritatively established. At the time referred to, an appeal was made to England from the Diocese of Tasmania, complaining of the assumption of power by the Bishop; and, on the matter being laid before the law officers of the Crown, it was decided that Her Majesty had no power "by Letters Patent to create the ecclesiastical jurisdiction complained of," and, in order to rectify the mistake, new letters were made out, in which the only powers conferred on the Bishop were those included in the word "visitation," not jurisdiction.

Now the establishment of this great principle was the inability of the Crown to grant letters patent to Bishops in Colonies having legislative powers, naturally caused thoughtful men to consider other means than those formerly employed to settle the matter of Colonial Church government; and, in proof of the above, we may state that it was this impression which led to the great Canadian Act of 1856, by which the Church of England in Canada not only obtained power to regulate its own affairs, but the various Dioceses of Quebec, Toronto, Montreal, Huron and Ontario became formally recognized by law. This, then, in our humble estimation, constituted the first step towards the independence of the Canadian Church, induced as we have seen, not by any restlessness here, but by the judgment of the law officers at home. Furthermore, not only has the highest legal opinion at home decided the invalidity of a vast number of patents, but it has authoritatively settled the right of the Colonial Church to legislate for itself. We quote the following from the celebrated Long judgment—"The members of the Church of England may adopt, as the members of any other Communion may adopt, rules for enforcing discipline within their body, which will be binding on those who, expressly or by implication, assent to them." Now as we in Canada have not only our Diocesan but Provincial Synods, to which we have given in our adhesion both by our attendance, and, in some instances, by our prom-

ise, it follows that not only are the enactments of the Provincial Synod binding on us as regards discipline, but that from them there could be no appeal to England.

This, then, is our first position: That whatever steps the Church of England in Canada may have taken towards her virtual independence, they have been caused by legal judgments at home, and not from any desire on the part of the Colonial Church to break her connection with the mother country. The next point to which we desire to direct our readers is to the bold declaration of opinion made at the last Provincial Synod, and to that which is of far more consequence—the direct action taken by that august body in the matter of ecclesiastical independence. The greatest and most learned members of Synod expressed their opinion that the Act of Uniformity was not in force in Canada, and that the Church was free to make such canons, laws and regulations, as she might deem fit for her welfare and governance. The absolute elimination of all mention of the Court of Arches, introduced into the resolution of the Bishops, was the boldest and most significant action of the Synod. The Court of Arches is, next to the Imperial Parliament, supreme in ecclesiastical matters; and this action of the Synod, if it means anything, means that the Canadian Church will not be bound by the decision of any court in England however high, considering herself to be supreme within her own realm and province.

A delicate question must now arise as to whom the future Metropolitan is to take the oath of canonical obedience; we suppose to the Archbishop of Canterbury. But even then it is obvious that his power to act as Metropolitan must be derived directly from the Provincial Synod, which has enacted a canon to meet the necessity. In conclusion, we may state that though, according to the late Natal judgment, an Imperial Patent can bestow on a Colonial Bishop the status of a Metropolitan, yet it cannot convey to him an authority the Crown does not possess, or grant him a jurisdiction "it is in the power of the Provincial Synod alone to bestow."

PARSONAGE AND GLEBE.

It is sometimes said by the clergy in country parts, "You town parsons do not know some of the difficulties and trials which, though small, often times trouble us in the country, and you cannot sympathize with us, because you have never felt the annoyance." It is to be feared that there is too much truth in this that we do not enter, as we ought, into the perplexities of those who reside in the rural districts, unless we have had some experience of their life; therefore, although we are not ignorant of the subject on which we are about to write, we would ask the consideration thereof by our more immediately interested brethren; and, in a communication, the result, of their consideration.

Ought not every parish or mission possess a parsonage and glebe? Undoubtedly, it will be replied. And, it will be added, this is the right way of beginning an endowment. In many places land may now be had at almost a nominal price, which, in course of time, will become very valuable; and a comfortable house may be begun upon it, which, being gradually finished, will, without laying upon the people too heavy a burden, be a great benefit to the missionary. So we say, let every one do his part in trying to secure a parsonage and glebe in every parish or mission.

But then arises another question: the land may not cost much, still it must be fenced; ought the missionary to bear this expense when he may be removed in a year or two? It must be partly cleared; should the incumbent bear the cost of this? And if he builds, must the outlay come largely from the scanty resources of the missionary? It may be said, let him beg. All very fine; begging demands time, which he does not feel warranted in taking from his missionary work; begging requires a peculiar hardihood which some of the best missionaries do not possess. And begging is at best a poor occupation; what then is to be done? We think there might be some system under the direction of the Synod, which would render the acquisition of parsonages and glebes an easier and a cheaper process than it now is.

But when you have the parsonage and glebe, that is not all, it must be kept in order; now who is to do this? It is obvious that it might be most unfair to make it incumbent absolutely upon the parson in possession. A fire originating in the woods might make sad havoc in the fences or even in the outbuildings. A storm might do the same. The neglect or mismanagement of a predecessor might throw upon the possessor an onerous expenditure. In these and a variety of other instances; such as serious deterioration through the lapse of time, the burden ought not to fall upon the incumbent for the time being.

Nor is this all; a clergyman may be carelessly or wilfully permitting the property of the Church to fall into decay; or he

may dispute the assertion that it is his duty to have the necessary repairs made. Who is to decide? who is to act in this behalf? At present in this Diocese, something devolves upon the Archdeacon in this behalf, but there is neither rule nor canon to guide him.

Again, a large amount of property belonging to the Church is uninsured, much larger than many suppose; and already serious loss has accrued to the Church through this neglect. Ought there not to be a clear understanding whose duty it is to insure and keep insured the property of the Church? And ought not some officer be directed to see that there is no neglect in this matter?

It will be seen that we have thrown out these thoughts in the form of questions to invite replies. And we will add another question: Would not some one prepare a Canon for the next Synod which may meet this exigency?

ELECTION OF BISHOP AND METROPOLITAN.

The Dean of Montreal has called a special meeting of the Diocese on the 9th of November, to receive the nomination of the House of Bishops and to elect a Bishop and Metropolitan.

The Canon of the Provincial Synod, see page 79 of Journal, provides:—

"1. That the House of Bishops at said special meeting shall nominate at least two persons to be presented to the Diocesan Synod of Montreal, in order that such Diocesan Synod may choose one of such persons to be Bishop of the said Diocese, and the House of Bishops shall continue such nominations until the Diocesan Synod of Montreal shall make choice of one of such persons as Bishop of Montreal."

We have laid down by the Diocesan Synod as follows:— "1. In such election by said Synod of Montreal the Clergy and Laity shall vote separately by ballot; the Clergy by individuals, and Laity by parishes or cures. A majority of votes in each order shall determine the choice, provided that two-thirds of the Clergy entitled to vote are present, and two-thirds of all the parishes or cures entitled to be represented otherwise two-thirds of the votes of each order shall be necessary to determine the choice." "Article 10 further provides:—If a vacancy should occur in the number of representatives, by death, resignation, or any other cause, the minister shall proceed to hold a new election with as little delay as possible, after due notice."

It thus appears that the Bishops will make their first nomination to the Diocese of Montreal, on the 10th of November, and will go on nominating until the Clerical and Lay Delegates, shall agree upon a successor to their late lamented Bishop. We believe that no decision of any kind has yet been arrived at by the House of Bishops, nor will the names of the nominees be known until the meeting of the Diocesan Synod. It ought to be, and doubtless is a time of earnest prayer to every faithful member of the Church, that it may please God to provide a worthy successor to our late Metropolitan.

SARUM USE!

In the discussions on Ritualism at the late meeting of the Provincial Synod, special attention was called to some very strange proceedings at the recent consecration of a Church in the Diocese of Montreal, where, according to the narrative of the "Church Advocate" the "Altar was vested according to Sarum use;" and other proceedings agreed therewith. What "Sarum use" is, it would puzzle many good Churchmen to tell. But one thing, at least, is certain, viz. that Salisbury, or Sarum use, is expressly forbidden in the preface to the Prayer Book. Nevertheless the "Sarum Missal" has come into such favour with a certain class of advanced Anglican revivalists of Medieval rites and doctrines, that "the Church Press Company" has recently issued an English version of the old Romish Missal, and dedicated it to "the Dean and Chapter of Salisbury."

Let us then take a peep into this old Service Book, and see what are the special rites, doctrines, and forms of prayer, which advanced ritualists are anxious to set forth for the admiring imitation of English Protestants. Among the novelties now happily forbidden by the Provincial Synod of our Canadian Branch of the Church, are lights on the Lord's Table, or "Altar-lights;" as their admirers prefer to call them. On turning to the Sarum Missal we find a special service provided for their use; and styled "the Blessing of Candles." It is no inapt illustration of the "profane and old wives' fables," which some professed members of the Reformed Church of England would seek to superadd to the simple, scriptural service of our English Prayer Book.

"Set being sung, let the Blessing of the Candles be solemnly begun by the Bishop or Priest, in a silk cope and the other vestments, on the highest step of the Altar, turning to the East, and saying:— V. The Lord be with you. R. And with thy spirit. Let us pray."

Bless, O Lord Jesus Christ, this creature of wax for us who pray to Thee; and pour Thy heavenly blessing upon it, by virtue of the Holy Cross, that as Thou has permitted it to be used by men to dispel darkness, such may be the measure of power and benediction which it receiveth by the sign of Thy Holy Cross, that whosoever it shall be lighted or set up, the Devil may depart in fear and

trembling, and flee away, with all his, out of those dwellings, nor presume any more to disquiet [Here let him chant] them that serve Thee. Who, with God the Father and the Holy Ghost, livest and reignest God, world without end. Amen.

Let us pray. O Lord, Holy Father, Almighty and everlasting God, Who didst create all things out of nothing, and by the labour of bees at Thy command hast brought this fluid to the perfection of wax; and Who, on this day, didst fulfil the desire of righteous Simeon; we humbly beseech Thee, that by the invocation of thy Holy Name, and at the intercession of Blessed Mary, ever Virgin, whose festival we this day devoutly celebrate, and at the prayers of all Thy saints, Thou wouldst vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these candles, fashioned for the service of men, and for the good of their souls and bodies, whether on land or water; and mercifully hear from Thy holy Heaven, and from the seat of Thy Majesty, the voice of this Thy people, who desire reverently to bear them in their hands, and to praise and exalt Thee; and show mercy to all they cry unto Thee, whom Thou hast redeemed with the precious Blood of Thy beloved Son."

Surely we may ask: Is Protestant England, after having enjoyed for centuries the noble gift of the English Bible, to be invited now to look with favour upon such childish superstitions as these?

Our English prayer book is the work of holy and devout men, in an age of earnest piety and zeal for the pure and Scriptural worship of God in his Church. It is not to be forced into an equality with the inspired Word of God, breathing for us the words of those who "spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." But we have only to compare our English prayer book with any Romish Missal, ancient or modern, to see how noble a work of reformation was wrought for us by the Fathers of the Church of England, who, at the Reformation, purified it from the errors and corruptions of Romanism, and delivered themselves and us from the degrading yoke of Papal bondage. Here, for example, is a specimen of Saint Avon's prayer book as set forth in the Sarum Missal, in a Collect of Saint Scholastica's holy day:—"O God, Who for the setting forth of the way of innocence didst cause the soul of Thy Virgin S, Scholastica, to enter into heaven in the shape of a dove, grant us, we beseech Thee, for her sake, to live innocently, that we may be counted meet to attain to the same joys."

But the crowning error of modern Ritualism is its Eucharistic doctrine; of which posturing, altar lights, vestments, &c., are but the outward and visible signs. We accordingly find in this publication of the Church Press the following among other directions to the priest officiating at the "altar":—"Let him have carefulness in making the Body of Christ. In handling the Body of Christ let there be reverence, great respect of its comprehending Christ's so excellent Body; greater in respect of its comprehending Christ's so excellent Soul; greatest, in respect of its comprehending Christ's so excellent Godhead."

Again, the priest is told:—"Let thanks be given in the highest; for that in so great, so sweet Bread of Angels, he hath received the Creator of creatures for that in so great perpetual Food of all Saints, he hath received the Creator of creatures; for that in so great and effectual Viaticum of Christ's elect, he hath received the Creator of creatures."

These are the teachings that lead clergy and laity of our Reformed Scriptural Church step by step backward, until we have to mourn the loss of hundreds dragged downward into the gulf of Romish error and superstition. These are the dazzling "altar lights" round which so many gaudy-vested moths are now fluttering, and doomed, if God in his infinite grace do not prevent, to be consumed in the flame.

Nevertheless we are not without hope that this publication of the admired "Sarum Missal," in plain English, will prove to be for good. We cannot believe that the plain, honest sense of Protestants, and, above all, Christian England, is to be deceived and betrayed by the substitution of superstitious rites, gaudy dresses and elaborate Church ceremonial for the beautiful, becoming simplicity of the reformed worship as set forth in our prayer book. It has been well said by a recent writer:—

"So long as the service of God is a reasonable offering, it will be hard to persuade the great body of English Protestants that return to the rites and notions embodied in the Sarum Missal is desirable. The nation has progressed so far within the last eight hundred years that it can never go back to medieval opinions either in politics or religion; and an ecclesiastical machinery, minute as the Levitical one will not be sanctioned by men trained to think in the school of St. Paul's writings. With all its imperfections, the English prayer book is a noble work beside every old Latin Missal."

The specimens we have given will show how dangerous are the lengths which some extreme men have already ventured in Canada, where "Sarum use" has already been introduced in our midst. But we rejoice that the clear and unmistakable utterance of the Supreme Court of the Church in Canada no longer leaves any room for doubt on the question of rites, ceremonies or vestments. The simple rules of the prayer book and the familiar white surplice with the plain black scarf and academic hood in its public use, are defined beyond dispute as alone sanctioned or permitted within any Diocese of the Church in Canada. God grant that, while maintaining the outward simplicity of the Church of our fathers, we may be found actuated by the Spirit which animated those who, like Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Hooper, Porter, Askew, and many

more noble confessors of our Reformed Church, counted not their lives dear to them in comparison with the maintenance of pure and undefiled religion, and their fidelity to their baptismal vow as true soldiers and servants of Christ. We have received the heritage of God's Word and a pure Reformed Scriptural Church from our fathers; let us see that we transmit them unimpaired to our children's children.

The General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States will meet in New York on Wednesday, the 7th day of October. It is expected that business of great importance will be transacted, the Church, north and south, being again united. The question of Ritualism in some form or other is certain to be discussed; Missionaries' Bishops are to be chosen and consecrated. So admirably are these meetings conducted, that it would be well if some of our Delegates to the Provincial Synod could be present to gather lessons from the riper experience in legislation of the sister Church; and we are glad to learn that some are purposing to be present.

DEATH OF THE DEAN OF ST. PAULS.—The Rev. Henry Hart Milman, Dean of St. Pauls, died on the 25th September, aged 77.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—"C" received. We cannot insert communications without the name of the writers.

PERIODICALS.—We acknowledge with thanks, from Messrs. Dawson Brothers, the London Quarterly Review for July; and Blackwood's Magazine for September; both containing, as usual, articles of a superior order.

Correspondence.

We are not responsible for any opinions expressed by our correspondents.

[To the Editor of the Church Observer.]

Sir, With your permission, I will lay before your readers a few thoughts on the Provincial Synod's wise labours, after a sitting of more than ten days, has just closed. The great questions discussed, was; no new thing, viz. Ritualism, alas, for our peace and prosperity, was not a novelty; no sudden emergency springing into existence from a "casualty," but a growth with its seed-time and careful culture, and, I might add, its harvest at hand; for who shall tell the consequences of the timid policy then proposed? Our Church has received its answer—her rulers hesitate to do that which will preserve its Evangelical Protestant character. The like treatment of this disease, which has so injured the health of the mother, we are told is to be met with her Canada daughters is to be expected. Has it succeeded with the parent? Can it with the child? Remember the difference between the two. Is there any comparison? A mild and gentle treatment of a dangerous disease when the knife and the cauterizing iron, removing every fibre, would have been still— is little else than quackery. Such a course of dealing with a disease which is feeding on the vitals of our Church would be absurd. Three long years, (so it was proposed) are to test; the nature of a prescription in Canada, which has so signally failed at home in restoring the Mother Church to such a condition of body, that she can be once more going about her house and doing those duties for which her husband chose her to be his wife. Well, Mr. Editor; yes, and it is well; well with the mother and well with the child; for that is well which the "maker and Husband" of His Church does. He may have purposes akin to those which prevailed in reference to "the Seven Churches," to remove the candle-stick of the Protestant Episcopacy from its place, and who would have the hardihood to pronounce this suggestion an impertinence. One Church, at least, suffered for its cowardice, and why not ours? If there be no analogy between Canada's Church and the Church of Thyatira, then I do not know where resemblance can be found. If Ritualism be not the Jezabel of our Church, seductive to idolatry as was the Queen of Israel—stirring up our rulers to do evil as did the wife of Ahab—powerful for mischief and persecuting the truth wherever and whenever opportunity offers, then analogy fails to teach a most important lesson from a great historic fact.

And it is with this soul-ruinous system that some men are willing to make a compromise! They are willing to give up the gown in the pulpit, (concession number one.) The teacher is to give place to the priest; for though we may mean nothing by this change, the action with the others is a symbol, a speaking figure, expressing the sacerdotal character. They tell us so, why not believe them. The service, at present sufficiently long, is to be lengthened out by the prayer for the Church Militant and other prayers, and thus crowd out the preaching; whilst the offertory by the sound of money dropping into the plate is to drive away whatever of heaven has been wrought by the preacher's voice in the hearer's heart. Drape the tent of the teacher's place in a priestly garment, and, creature of circumstances as man is, he forgets that he is the teacher. Envelope him in the flowing surplice and action is out of place; he stands the official lecturer, at most the preacher, no longer. Thus, for the sake of peace, we are asked to concede number two. I ask my brethren, can any course be more fatal to our success as a Church? Will our people consent long to listen to preachers, a reproduction of the seventeenth century? Will men be willing to exchange the cold, formal essayist, though he should be a Tillotson or a Eliot, for the man, inferior though he may be in the learning of the schools, who brings his master's message warm with the sympathies of a heart living and breathing under the power of Divine love; the man who shows his sympathy with his subject, and tells his hearers that he feels by the usual actions of feeling? Again, was it to the ministerial or the teaching character, to which the Evangelical revival, at the latter end of the past and beginning of the present century, stands indebted? Was it not to the pulpit? The desk remained unchanged. The utterances from the pulpit called into life the breathings from the desk. No longer discrepant, they