

so desecrated, recalled the wandering thoughts of many a soul, unconscious whence came the breath that revived the dying flame of his devotions. Then self-blame, tears of penitence and bitter remorse, of which those kneeling nearest knew nothing, wrung the heart, shocked at its own careless ingratitude, wondering at and adoring the forbearance of the Almighty, while more concentrated thoughts, and, I trust, more fervent prayer, succeeded to the momentary forgetfulness.

In spite of all these helps, however, the amount of real devotion was small; and when I looked at the angel's tablets, I was shocked to see how little was written therein. "Out of three hundred Christians," thought I, "a scabbed after a week of mercies, to praise and bless the Giver of all good, are these few words the sum of what they offer?" "Look to thyself," said the angel, reading my inmost thoughts. "Such as these are, such hast thou long been. Iarest thou, after what has been revealed to thee, at such a part again? Oh, could thy mortal cars bear to listen to the songs of the rejoicing angels before the throne of the Almighty, thou wouldst indeed wonder at the condensing mercy which stoops to accept these few faint wandering notes of prayer and praise. Yet the sinless angels veil their faces before Him in whose presence man stands boldly up with such mockery of worship as thou hast seen this day. Remember the solemn warning, lest hereafter it be counted to thee as an aggravation of guilt."

Suddenly the sweet, solemn voice ceased, the glorious angel disappeared, and so oppressive seemed the silence and loneliness, that I started and awoke. My watch pointed to the hour of eleven. It must have been the stopping of the bells that interrupted my slumbers; and all this solemn scene had passed before my mind in the short space of a few minutes.

May the lesson I heard in those few minutes never be effaced from my heart! And if this account of them should recall one wandering thought in the house of prayer, or teach any to value more highly and cultivate more carefully the privilege of joining in the public worship of our church, it will not have been written in vain.

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

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.

Church Observer.

"THIS PROTESTANT KINGDOM."—Bill of Rights, 1688.

MONTREAL, 3RD NOVEMBER, 1868.

PERVERSY.

There surely must be a singular perversity or dullness of understanding with some who venture to write upon the subject of the late Synod. We say perversity or dullness of understanding, because we are reluctant to charge upon these writers either designed misrepresentation or ignorance in this behalf. And yet when matters of fact are so plain and so incontrovertible, those who mis-state them are nearly, if not quite, as inexcusable as if they had purposely perverted the truth. One instance of this perversity or strange dullness appears in the *Gazette* of the 30th ult.—a paper at one time noted for its fairness, now for its one-sidedness—copied from a Kingston weekly; and the accuracy of the article may be judged of by the statement we are about to notice.

The writer says "the friends of the Bishop of Rupert's Land placed him in the position of being the only Bishop of British North America whom the House of Bishops declined to nominate." Now this is simply untrue; and it is difficult to persuade one's self that it is not designedly untrue; because, unfortunately for the writer, he found his statement upon what passed at the conference held with the House of Bishops, while it is a matter of notoriety that the name of the Bishop of Rupert's Land had, in the most extraordinary manner, been passed over before that conference. The friends of the Bishop of Rupert's Land had nothing whatever to do with placing him in that position. It was done entirely by the House of Bishops, or rather by a majority of that House; for, before the conference at which the writer says the Bishop's name was mentioned, every Bishop occupying a see in British North America had been nominated with the exception of the Bishop of Rupert's Land; and, besides, the Bishop of Grahamstown had been nominated.

Surely, up to this time, it cannot be pretended that there was any attempt at dictation by any members of the Synod. It has, however, been pretended that at the conference an attempt was made by two clergymen to force upon the attention of the Bishops the names of the Bishop of Rupert's Land and of Dr. Balch; however that may be, we learn from Mr. Huntington's speech before the House, that the action of those two gentlemen was instantly repudiated by the other ten members of the conference,

and apologized for at the time, though we believe the opinion of the two gentlemen in question was elicited by the enquiry of one of the Bishops whether or not a way out of the difficulty could be devised. Surely there was nothing in all this indicating an attempt at dictation.

But the writer may fall back upon the assertion, which in fact he has made, that the Diocesan Synod of Montreal had determined to limit the Bishops to the name or names they had decided upon. Now we are reluctantly compelled again to say this is utterly untrue. Untrue, because they had not decided upon any name or names. Untrue, because they were prepared to vote in favour of the first name presented to them, deemed by them fit for the office.

It is, however, absurd to say that the Synod had even a chance of choice; out of the nine names first sent down, or in the two nominations afterwards made, will any one pretend that there were more than two, at most or even more than one, upon which the Synod could intelligently vote? And yet this is called giving the Synod a choice of election! And because the Synod refused to elect one of these instantly, it is charged with endeavouring to limit the Bishops to a certain name! And when they ask for a fresh nomination, the Synod is told that the House of Bishops require until May to consider and decide as to the names to be submitted!

We cannot but feel that, from the very outset, the House of Bishops—rather, we must say again, the majority of the House of Bishops—treated the Synod of the Diocese of Montreal with singular want of consideration—we do not care to use the stronger expressions which press upon the mind. What sort of treatment was it to tell the Synod the House of Bishops was determined to send down no name but that of a Bishop? What sort of treatment was it to send down a cluster of names for the large majority of which it was obviously absurd to vote; a fact known to the Bishops when they made the nomination? And what sort of treatment was it to set at naught the canon under which they had met, and send the Synod home without having given it the remotest chance of accomplishing its work?

The writer of the article we have been glancing at, evidently inspired by some one, feels, however, that a great injustice has been done to the Bishop of Rupert's Land, and that the church will not acquit therein the majority of the House of Bishops; and, therefore, with a view to shielding those who were delinquent, he adds to the injustice by insinuating concerning the Bishop, "We are not surprised at this; it is the practice of these writers when a Bishop does not please them. We have before had occasion to rebuke the ritualists of this city for the unseemly language which they had used in speaking of Bishops; and this week, in glancing over a ritualist paper published in Toronto, we were shocked by the epithets applied to an old and much respected Bishop; and now the Bishop of Rupert's Land is thus assailed, but assailed in a most cowardly manner, i. e. by insinuation. We are no apologists for the Bishop of Rupert's Land; and many of those who think with us would have voted against him if they had been afforded an opportunity; but compelled by these dastardly attacks, we fearlessly assert that he is above suspicion; that he is so moderate a man that the leading ritualists in the Synod expressed their intention of voting for him should his name be sent down; and that the only tangible charge brought against him is that he had the honesty and manliness, frankly, while paying a high tribute to the late Metropolitan, to say a thing which was well known to all:—that he enjoyed that Prelate's friendship and confidence, although differing upon some theological points. In short, we imagine that the Bishops themselves will admit, at least his equality in talents, learning, administrative ability, zeal and piety; and—without standing the sneer of the Kingston writer—his not inferior qualification, compared with any one of themselves, for the highest office in the Canadian Church by his experience in a most laborious Diocese.

The absurd straight to which the defenders of the Bishops are put, in endeavouring to find an excuse for their action, may be seen in the article we have referred to. It says—"One of the reasons was a reasonable belief that a three years episcopate of Indian territory was not an overwhelming qualification &c." And yet they sent down the name of the Coadjutor Bishop of Newfoundland, who had not even nearly the experience so Christianly sneered at!!!

We are not sure that it is desirable that the Diocese of Montreal should surrender its right of being the Metropolitan see. We perceive, moreover, that there is a growing repugnance in the Diocese to any such idea. And as to the extraordinary scheme of electing one of the Bishops of the Dominion to the Diocese merely to enable the Diocese to get rid of an obnoxious law, we have more respect for the office than to be content to see it thus used; nor do we understand how, in accordance with the canon, one Bishop can hold two sees. Even for

such a purpose there would be a strange process of resigning and electing, surely not compatible with the sacredness of such an office.

LECTURE.—The last lecture of the course advertised, in behalf of the *St. George's Mission School*, was delivered on Thursday evening last in the basement of St. George's Church. Subject:—"Ancient and modern Eloquence." According to the programme, Dr. BALCH should have lectured on that occasion; but domestic affliction caused the absence of that reverend gentleman, and his place was filled by Dr. BANCROFT, who commenced by stating that it was no matter of surprise to find so few orators in the world; and then described what an orator was. To be able to instruct, delight and move an audience, a speaker must have confidence, vigour of style, intellect, a warm heart, and honesty of purpose. It was no wonder that few had come to the standard of a Demosthenes, a Cicero, a Pitt, or a Webster. He described how these men had risen to eminence, that constant study was the main secret of their success. He spoke of Demosthenes, and his great philippics; of Cicero and his telling orations against Catiline; and in later days of Caethan, Burke, Sheridan, Fox, and William Pitt—giving quotations from their greatest speeches. He pointed out the difference between the style of ancient and modern orators. He then referred to pulpit eloquence, to Massillon, Bossuet, Whitfield, Robert Hall, and an American clergyman of later days, and others who qualified themselves to play upon every chord of human feelings, and thus be able to reach the hearts of all. To be an orator a person must have genius and application.

At the close of the lecture Mr. Kellar proposed a vote of thanks to the several Rev. gentlemen who had so kindly assisted the Young Men's Christian Association of St. George's. After some suitable remarks made by Mr. E. Thompson and Rev. Canon Bond, the benediction was pronounced by Rev. Mr. Curran, and the meeting closed.

CORRECTION.—We have been requested to state that the name of the Rev. J. P. OUMOUCLIN was accidentally omitted from the list of *Nays* on the final vote taken upon the motion to receive the Report submitted to the delegates at the last Diocesan Synod convened for the election of Bishop and Metropolitan.

THE LATE BISHOP JEUNE.—In the course of a funeral sermon, preached by the Rev. G. Lege, at the cathedral in Peterborough, he says that the late Bishop Jeune while receiving the last communion before his death, evidently suffering great pain, interrupted the clergyman by saying in a firm clear voice, and with solemn emphasis, nearly as follows:—

"Before I receive the holy communion I wish to make a brief statement. I die in full reliance on the perfect atonement made by our Lord Jesus Christ upon the cross. I die in the unreserved belief of the inspiration of all the canonical books of the Old and New Testament. I die in the faith of the Church of England as taught by the Apostles, Fathers, and Protestant Reformers, and as set forth in her liturgy and Articles. I pray God to preserve her on the one hand from Neologianism; and on the other hand from Ritualism and Romanism."

CAPT. DUGMORE'S ATTACK.—We copy the following correspondence from the *Kingston Daily News* of 23rd inst.:

Kingston, Nov. 23, 1868. Lieut-Colonel Hibbert presents his compliments to the Rev. R. V. Rogers, and begs to express the regret of the officers of the R. C. Rifles that any member of the corps should have been the author of such an unwarranted attack on a clergyman as that which appeared in the *Daily News* over the signature of 'Outsider' in the early part of last week. It is almost needless to observe that Captain Dugmore has no participations amongst his brother officers in the sentiments of the letter above alluded to, the publication of which would never have been permitted had Captain D's intention of writing it been known in the Regiment. If the Rev. Mr. Rogers thinks it desirable to publish this letter, of course he is at liberty to do so.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE DAILY NEWS. Sir—You would oblige me by inserting the above, and thus undo, as far as possible, any mischief which may arise from the attack of Captain Dugmore on my personal and ministerial character.

To Colonel Hibbert and officers of the Royal Canadian Rifles, I take this opportunity of returning my sincere thanks for their kind and honourable sympathy. I will add not even by a single word to the humiliation of Captain Dugmore, beyond expressing the hope that he, too, may see that no zeal for a cause can ever warrant our forgetting the courtesies of life, and that such a weapon as he has used injures self far more than others.

Yours, R. V. ROGERS, M.A., Minister St. James', Kingston. Nov. 23, 1868.

DISTINCTION WITHOUT DIFFERENCE.—Of Rev. Washington Gladden's distinctions in favor of contra-dances as an innocent amusement, *Zion's Herald* well says:—

"He condemns the round or waltz-dance, but approves the square or contra-dance. Yet he knows, or should know, that all dances to-day are the former. No daughter of his can go to a ball of any sort without this wretching of mutual arms about mutual waists, and hot whirling of bodies to hot music in hot rooms, the heating of the passion and the damnation, too often, of the soul. How foolish to approve of what is never practiced. Even the contra-dance is not over modest, as every ob-

server and practitioner knows, but that has given way to these worse substitutes. As well condemn whisky and grove of arack, and then advocate the drinking of spirits, when we know only whisky will be drunk. Mr. Gladden will find that young people of his congregation cannot go balls, of any brevity or modesty, and be true, happy Christians. There are plenty of diversions that can be taken in the name of the Lord Jesus. Stick to them.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—In reply to our correspondent at Newmarket, (J.H.) we beg to say that his offer will be accepted.

To our Tuscarora correspondent, (A. E.) we have to say that nothing is due by him. His request will be complied with.

Correspondence.

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

ST. ALBAN'S CHURCH, NEW YORK.

[To the Editor of the Church Observer.]

DEAR SIR,—On the arrival of a stranger in this city, he often asked whether, among other curiosities, he had seen the famed Church of St. Alban's, the seat of ritualism. Consequently I attended divine service on a recent occasion. The church is a small structure of plain exterior, but highly ornamented within, particularly near the so-called altar. I profess to belong to the Protestant Episcopal body of the United States, and to be subject to its Bishops, yet its ministers or priests, as they love to be called, emulate, as do I fear some few of the clergy in Canada, the name of Protestant.

Mass at St. Alban's talked of! The idea is a strange one to those among whom the belief is general that in Protestant theology the doctrine of the Mass is idolatrous, yet Father Merrill, as he is styled, avowedly celebrates the Mass, and elevates the host to the sounding of the Church bell, and with the other priests, adorns the black mass, while an acolyte, white, with a green stole, green manipule and green chasuble; while the acolytes and choristers are attired in black and white surplices. I am indebted to the *New York World* for the names of most of these mysterious vestments.

On entering the church, the procession of those who were to officiate, with two satin banners, and headed by the cross-bearer, ranged themselves in front of, and facing the altar, bowed reverently and crossed themselves, when the officiating priest placed himself on the top step leading up to the altar, and with his back turned to the congregation, proceeded with the service. Although a churchman of some three score years, I became quite lost in the arrangement of the liturgy, the sermon coming soon where, in the middle; the prayers, I believe however, were strictly those of the prayer book; but so intoned that I could scarcely understand them. Father Merrill preached a very fair Christian discourse; but on commencing, he turned round and bowed reverently to the altar, and crossed himself, uttering the words "Father, Son and Holy Ghost." I did not see any incense, though I am told that it is used. There was an altar and a canopy in the centre, and seven or eight candles on each side. The two centre candles, a little higher than the others, were lit early in the service by an acolyte, and the remainder at a side; while at either end of the altar stood handsome candelabra with numerous gas lights, making with the gilding and variety of brilliant colours, a very gay appearance. It must be confessed that in spite of so much gaudy pageantry, the congregation was particularly decorous, attentive and devout, and would have afforded a good example to many congregations in other places of worship and in other countries.

Another excitement in the Episcopal Church, of somewhat less marked character, exists in Christ Church in this city, served by the Rev. Dr. Ewer, who has lately raised up a host of preaching opponents in all Protestant sects by a course of sermons on "Protestantism a failure." The reverend gentleman, a talented and eloquent man, certainly wants not courage, for he has invoked the hostility of many talented divines, in sermon and writings, for whom he is no match. His church is a splendid one, and has a fabulous sum. It also has an altar and a super-altar with a large gold cross in the centre, but no candles. The service is read (not intoned) by the officiating clergy from side benches ranged in a semi-circle, having the altar in the centre, and the lessons and sermon are read from two small lecterns in the middle of the chancel. The church is gorgeous in ornaments and colours, and avowedly ritualistic in its leanings. I saw two silk banners, in a corner recess, affecting concealment though quite conspicuous, which it is said are only used in Sunday school processions (objectional: to Protestant eyes even then) but a surplised choir is in preparation, and the banners may possibly appear on other occasions. It is but fair to say that Dr. Ewer considers the Roman Catholic faith, as well as Protestantism, a failure; an assertion which is hardly consistent with his text, which spoke only of the latter. This might seem somewhat like an after thought to deprecate the storm which he has raised, and I am told by a member of his congregation, that so much feeling has been caused by the course which he has taken, that forty leading families, hitherto his chief supporters, have abandoned him, and relinquished their pews.

The above are the two great eccentricities in church matters now engaging public attention. The reigning spirit in both are eccentricity and fond of notoriety. I hope that speculation is not concerned. They are neither of them of the highest standing among the clergy; they both, I believe, began in other walks of life, and are not of the requisite calibre to sustain such startling novelties, and I venture to predict that they will fail to lead their flocks where they are unwilling to follow, and that they will cease to be the lions they now are.

Your faithful servt., New York, Nov. 25th, 1868.

THE LATE SYNOD.

[To the Editor of the Church Observer.]

SIR,—I have read with much interest the whole of the proceedings of the Montreal Synod, as given in your issue of the 19th inst., and I would arrive at no other conclusion than that the present unseemly state of things has arisen from the unwise power delegated to the Synod; namely, that of electing, not only their own Bishop, but the Metropolitan also. Had not this two-fold power been vested in that body, the Diocese would not now have found

itself, comparatively speaking, disfranchised; for though the Bishops have exercised their right of nomination in a very injudicious manner—to give it no harsher name—yet it must be conceded that to the House of Bishops should pertain the right of choosing from among themselves their chief head. Montreal cannot long remain without its Diocesan, and steps must be taken to secure to the clergy and lay delegates the right to elect their own Bishop; when, having done so, the Bishop should proceed to the election of the Metropolitan without reference to the Synod, and the mere question of residence must be set aside.

At the time of the installation of the late venerable Bishop Fulford, the confederation of the Provinces had not taken place. Since that time we have enlarged our borders, and I conceive that the right hand of fellowship should be extended to the bishops and clergy of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia; and that those prelates with our own should form the House of Bishops for the Dominion of Canada. If union in strength, then indeed it must be desirable; and inasmuch as the necessity has been acknowledged for the erection of a new diocese that should comprise a portion of the Montreal and Ontario sees, the suggestion may be considered worthy of consideration, whether it would not conduce to the benefit of the church at large to create this new diocese, and to affirm by canon that its prelate should be Metropolitan, seeing that this city is now the acknowledged metropolis of the Dominion of Canada.

OTAWA, Dec. 1st, 1868.

THE ROMISH PRIEST IN A RITUALIST CHURCH.

The ritualists have adopted the word "mass" for their celebration of the communion service. A near-sighted Roman priest, a stranger to Brighton, mistook St. Michael's for the Catholic Church, where he was going to say a low mass. The two churches are near one another, and both of bright red-coloured stone or brick. Attributing the apparent want of holy water at the entrance to the fault of the architect, or to his own near-sightedness, he went up the side aisle catching a glimpse of a vested priest at the "high altar," and entered the sacristy. Here he asked of an attendant if he could say there that morning. The answer was "that he could." Now as the priest was unrobed before putting on the chasuble, &c., which were all spread before him, there entered the sacristy the clergyman fresh from celebrating, attended by a "server," and carrying "paten, chalice and corporal" in an orthodox manner as would the Pope himself. Now as the priest turned to look at this gentleman, in whom he expected to find the Parochius of the Catholic community, his eye lighted upon three university hoods. "Do you wear hoods here?" he inquired. The clergyman answered that such was their custom. "I was told," says the priest, hesitating, "that I could say mass here this morning." "So you can," returns the clergyman, blandly. "But—ahem—is this a Catholic church?" "Yes," was the calm answer. "Ah!" says the priest, "is it the Roman Catholic church?" "Oh!" replies the ritualist meekly, "you must go lower down for that."—*Pall Mall Gazette.*

A subsequent corrective notice confirms the substantial truth of the foregoing:—

The clergyman who officiated at St. Michael's, Brighton, on the occasion, wishes to correct one or two inaccuracies in our account. "What really happened," he says, "was simply this. At the conclusion of our early celebration, upon returning to the sacristy, I saw a stranger there. Thinking him to be a friend of the incumbent's, who was not there himself that morning, I asked him, as matins were about to be said, if he would like to put on a surplice; and as he did not say anything, but appeared to hesitate, I took one down and offered it to him. Whilst doing so, his eye very naturally lighted upon the university hoods worn by the other clergy then present, and he said to me, 'Am I mistaken? is this Father Oldham's church?' To which I replied, 'No; it is the church of St. Michael and All Angels'; and I then directed him the way to the church he was seeking." Our correspondent adds that the holy communion is not called the mass at St. Michael's.

EARTHQUAKES.

Our readers have, of course, seen in the newspapers the sad details of the recent calamity in Peru and Ecuador. It is at present impossible to verify every particular, and further information is anxiously looked for. But it is evident that the catastrophe in its attending circumstances and fearful consequences has seldom been exceeded, if equalled, by any former convulsions.

The *Panama Star* says the news is the most appalling and painful it has ever laid before its readers. Thousands and thousands of lives have been called instantly into eternity; whole cities, towns and villages have been swept away, and ships with their crews have been whirled from their anchorages by the receding sea, and swallowed up. Such a picture of general destruction and desolation, extending for hundreds of miles along the coast and reaching up to the topmost heights of the Andes, can scarcely be imagined. At Iquique the town was completely swept away, and only a mass of ruins remain. The loss of life is very great, but the exact number is unknown. The ports of Mejillones, Pisagua, Arica and Ishchala shared the fate of Iquique. Arequipa is levelled to the ground, not one house being left standing. The magnificent cathedral is only partly standing. Moquegua, near Arequipa, is likewise overthrown. Tacna escaped with the loss of sixty houses. It is stated that a town near Islay, containing five hundred inhabitants, was swept away, and only twenty lives saved. At Chala the sea receded, and a wave rose fifty feet, and returned, spreading into the town a distance of about one thousand feet three successive times. Everything within range was swept away, followed by twelve shocks of earthquake, lasting from three seconds to two minutes, but few lives were lost. In other towns the devastation was equally great. The loss of property is estimated at three million dollars. Arequipa was entirely destroyed. In Encador, the towns of Ibarra, San-Fabio, Auntagni and Imonted are in ruins. Where Cotocachi stood is now a lake. In Ibarra, Otocaval and Cotocachi, the entire populations perished. In Quito the effects were less severe, but all the buildings have been greatly damaged. Several churches, convents and cathedrals were thrown down. The towns adjoining Quito, Perucho, Puellarao and Cachi-Guango have almost entirely disappeared. The number of deaths in Quito was small; but in other towns 20,000 perished. The few left uninjured have been unable to assist those remaining alive or dying under the ruins, and have been obliged to fly from the reach of the dead bodies. In most places the populace deserted