

of Rome which, after the Reformation, having adopted the novel creed of Pope Pius IV., introduced its bishops, some from Spain and some from Italy, and placed them in sees already occupied by Irish prelates."

THE LATE REV. J. LAIRD CLOUGHER, M. A.—It is with no ordinary regret we have to record the death of the Rev. J. Laird Clougher, M.A., second son of Mr. J. Clougher, High street, Cardogan, and up to recently the beloved and esteemed curate of Holy Trinity Church, Swansea, who peacefully passed away early on Monday last to the great grief of his family and relatives, and the sincere regret of a numerous circle of friends and acquaintances, at the early age of 28 years. His amiable disposition endeared him to all who had the pleasure of knowing him, and his affability and sound good sense won him the esteem of all with whom he came in contact;—in private life, kind, considerate, and affectionate, and in his duties as a minister of the Gospel he was conscientious, painstaking, and sincere. The deceased completed his university course at Saint John's College, Oxford, in 1881, taking his degree in honours, and was ordained deacon by the Bishop of St. David's in September of the following year, being then licensed to the curacy of Holy Trinity, Swansea. It should also be stated that on his retirement from the curacy of Holy Trinity Church, he was presented with a handsome Bible and a purse of £44, by the parishioners as a memento of their great esteem and appreciation of his ministry, and this testimonial was originally intended as a wedding gift.—*Cardogan Advertiser.*

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.

INFORMATION GIVEN.

SIR,—As I have been requested to reply to "Inquirer," in your paper of the 21st, ult., in answer to the question "Should the earthly remains of such unbaptized person be taken into the church for any service?" No. "Should the clergyman officiate in surplice or not at all?" Not at all. With regard to marriage, the rubric says, "The persons to be married shall come into the Church with their friends and their neighbours." But, notwithstanding this rubric, I believe more marriages are solemnized in private houses than in Church. P. Tocque.

CHURCH EMIGRATION SOCIETY.

SIR,—This society is endeavouring to do a good work for Canada and England, and I believe it is working on safe lines. Its plan is to write to the country clergy, and ascertain from them how many labourers they can find places for. If a clergyman reports that he can find places for ten, the society would, I am sure, be safe in sending five. The same plan could be followed with female servants. I believe that during the course of the summer I could find places for one hundred female servants, if sent out, say twenty at a time. I think also that I could find places for twenty farm labourers, if sent out in April. Of course a few dollars would have to be spent in advertising. Hundreds of prosperous farmers give up farming every year because their wives cannot stand the work, and no help can be had, female servants are so scarce. A neighbour of mine is paying \$14 per month to a servant girl. The average wage here is from \$5 to \$7 per month.

I am surprised to learn from your editorials that girls can be had in Toronto to serve in stores for four shillings per week. Many girls like to be before the public, and like the privilege of roaming round at nights. The shop-keepers know this and pay accordingly.

Yours,

COUNTRY CLERGYMAN.

ARCHBISHOP LYNCH.

SIR,—Your article in last week's CHURCHMAN is none too early in appearance. There can be no doubt whatsoever that the aim of the Church of Rome at this instant is to cripple England, and so weaken Protestant liberty. We see it in Canada; it is seen in England, in Ireland, in Scotland, in America, and in Germany. What is it done for? It is to relieve and to emancipate the Irish Roman Catholic? Any man (Roman Catholic included) of common sense, knows to the contrary. At this moment there is going on the struggle between order and anarchy, and the prime movers on the side of the latter are the priest-

hood of Rome. What shall it all end in? In the erecting of the statue of liberty—one law for all—over the world. Everybody knows we are not for coercion; everybody knows that Christ was not for coercion; but everybody also knows that there is such a thing as "rendering unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's," save and except Rome. She is ever the foe to nationalities. The same law in "Land," in "Church," in "School," applies at this very moment to Roman and Protestant alike in Ireland, but its not liberty its priestly despotism Rome want in Canada and in Ireland, and we must never forget this. Let Canadians arise now and forever declare that every man has a right to the same laws (and to none other) irrespective of creeds. Wycliffe gave us the Bible, Ridley and Latimer died to give us freedom, and the "light" once lit will never go out. Let Canadians read English history, and with Victor Hugo admire the struggles of England with Popery, slavery, and infidelity, and reading be astonished. I am, sir, An IRISHMAN with many Roman Catholic relations in Ireland.

HIGH CHURCH AND LOW CHURCH.

SIR,—In your issue of 31st March you have a letter (a somewhat painful one) on the above subject, from a correspondent. His complaint reminds me of the two persons who differs as to the pronunciation of the word "neither." One would have it that it should be called, "neether," the other that it should be "nither," and at last they decided to refer the matter to the first man they meet; he said it was "nayther." Thus it stands as regards "High Church" and "Low Church." There is no denying the fact that the world is sick unto death of partyism, and the only true return is to leave the days and times of "Anne," "Macaulay," and the "latter day Saints" to look after themselves, and take the stand of the one Church "book"—the Bible, and to see what our name really is. We have no "High Church" there; we have no "Low Church" there; we have no "Broad Church" there, but we have these words: "Woe unto me if I preach not the Gospel." ("Va (i.e. vae) mihi si non evangelizavero.") I have never found any difficulty in the matter. I do not think "High Church" dates from the first century. I do not think that "Low Church" comes from the sixteenth; but I do believe "Evangelical" Churchmen were from the beginning, and upon this belief I act. "Evangelicals" have not been as near perfection as they might be, but I think wherever we go, from Georgia to the Arctic, and from Central Africa to the "gates of Central Asia," and from New Zealand to Quidisfarne, they have not been in the rear rank all the time. Let us forget our dividing lines, and go forward having this for our motto: "Una ecclesia in terris omnibus." I am, sir, C. A. F.

DIVINITY DEGREES.

SIR,—In your issue of the 21st, you publish a letter from a correspondent furnishing a report of an interview between certain representatives of the Church of England, and the Premier of Ontario, on the question of Divinity Degrees. I write with reference to the position of the whole question as far as the Colleges and Provincial synod are concerned. The controversy arose through the Montreal Diocesan College applying to the Quebec Legislature for liberty, after due examination, to confer degrees of divinity on those graduates of the college who were also graduates of some recognised University. This application, though strongly opposed, nevertheless passed the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Quebec, but was beaten in the Senate by a small majority. The Bishop of Quebec followed up the question by bringing it before Provincial Synod, in the shape of a proposed "canon of degrees in divinity," but action met with a notarial protest from the Montreal Diocesan Colleges, served on both houses, which protest stated, that the Provincial Synod had no jurisdiction, that it was seeking to override the acts and rights of the Synod of Montreal, which recommended that the application to the Legislature should be renewed, and that the diocesan College would not consider itself bound by any action which might be taken by the Provincial Synod in the matter. The proposed canon then came before the house of bishops, and the debate resulted in a message to the lower house, which stated, "that the consideration of the proposed canon on divinity degrees be postponed to the next triennial synod, because the bishop of Montreal had undertaken to say that he will not consent to the taking of any steps towards the renewal of the application to the Legislature before the next triennial meeting of Provincial Synod." This message also stated that the house of bishops had appointed a committee to confer with a committee of the lower house, and report for definite action at the next Provincial synod. The matter then came up before the lower house; the resolution passed by the house of bishops was concurred in, a committee was ap-

pointed to confer with the bishops, and there the matter ended.

Now, Mr. Editor, I would ask the outcome of all these facts? 1. The Bishop of Montreal is personally pledged as Bishop of Montreal, not to renew the application on behalf of Montreal Diocesan College before the next triennial meeting of the Provincial Synod. 2. Certain members of both houses of Provincial Synod are pledged to meet together in amicable conference to talk over the whole question, and if possible, initiate some policy that will be agreeable to all parties interested in it. But the great question as to the right of Provincial Synod to interfere in the matter, remains just where it was when the protest was served on both houses, the protest was never withdrawn. The Montreal College as an incorporated body is wholly unpledged, for it repudiates the right of Provincial Synod to interfere with its work. I as a member of its board consider myself wholly unpledged in connection with the question of the jurisdiction of Provincial Synod, and I fancy that in the same way the other colleges have a right to consider themselves unpledged. I for one, am sincerely anxious to see the question amicably settled, and wish every success to the joint committee, but I hold that I take my seat as a member of that committee wholly unpledged, that I am at liberty if I think it wise to do so, to open up the question of rights of the College and of the Synod of Montreal, to assert them to the full in the interests of the college and diocese, or to advocate their surrender in the interests of peace. The only person really pledged in the matter to any definite line of conduct is the Bishop of Montreal, and he is pledged no further than his legal powers as bishop of the diocese and president of the college will permit of his being pledged.

JAS. CARMICHAEL.

The letter and editorial comments to which Dean Carmichael alludes did not place him or his friends on their defence. Those upon whom the condemnation fell, which the letter in the Mail conveyed, and which the action of the bishops demonstrated to be just and called for in the interests of the Church, were a very small company indeed, it seems probable that one hat would cover them! Dean Carmichael has had an experience of the tyrannous, overbearing temper prevailing in that quarter, and he knows, we believe, that those to whom we referred, do continually, as a policy, with the utmost deliberation, treat Episcopal authority with sovereign contempt, and never lose an opportunity of displaying an utter disdain for Church authority, in any and in every form. We know what the feeling and conviction of the bishops are throughout the Dominion, with one exception only, and it is not favorable to the action of a Provincial Synod, being set at naught as of none effect at the instance of me or two irreconcilables, as was done in a sly, underhand manner by the attempt to use the University Federation Bill as a Trojan horse directly contrary to the wishes of the bishops, and the arrangements of the Provincial Synod. We assure Dean Carmichael, that we feel for him too much respect to imagine him amenable to criticism as a breaker of "solemn pledges," express or implied, or a sympathiser with any man proposing to be a member of the Church of England, uses his talent, influence, and money, to disturb the peace and order of the Church, or who, by open and by subtle acts of rebellion, seeks to bring every form of Church authority into contempt, as is being done systematically in the diocese of Toronto by those who have raised the Divinity Degrees controversy.—Ed. D. C.

SKETCH OF LESSON.

4TH. SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

MAY 2ND, 1887.

The Law Broken.

Passage to be read.—Exodus xxxii. 1-8, 26-28.

Last Sunday we saw that God had given Israel a law, that Israel had accepted it, and had promised to keep it (Ex xxiv. 3). But how could they do so? In their own strength? How must we keep the promises and vows we have made?—"By God's help so I will." So with Israel. They should ever have looked to God for help;—should have kept their eyes fixed on Him, and He would have enabled them to keep His law. This they did not do, so the law was broken. Let us see what our lesson says about this. I. The Failure of Faith. After the solemn promise given by Israel, God called Moses up into the Mount. He had many more directions and commandments to