May 8th, 1890.]

nething that shall lience which, like y unless it is hear. t the command of to every creature; cample of St. Paul ed to them, that hey were to stand: entimentalism but rection," and that ist "itching ears" leber Newton, on Master's command ouls, when he selec-"Social Steward. urely social ques. ing himself in the peror of Germany course Mr. Newton racter but Christ. ut Christ-likeness.

LNESS,

ad been "comproificance which has r. Newton did not ning impossible for id define faithful ue to one's word ecisely the thought speaks of the great erless found.' The f faith." Mr. New. ority but the Bible, illy, that authority ed out in the pulpit e Milton is a prime his faithfulness; it will maintain him countrymen, that trust for his nation, nost fidelity to the s countrymen."

further discovered not quite compreot be said upon the too restless to sit one, but who cerof Germany, havels. Whatever he filled with a sense eople, and in utter ndolent enjoyment en times, he is in a something, toiling feverishness which use of this intensity uired of a steward

question, more than oes the reputation most religious men in future generais now." This being iwer rests ought to or in any unreality truth, what social in organ evolved by ction-only this and Nature has secreted ut for my fellows."

for, adds Mr. Newmunity is the prevg of talents and time ower as a ministry then, have we? i's definition is cory opposed to that of "pure religion and But then Apostolic naught when pitted uality and the false rship by the modern e Broad Churchman.

CIATION"

ent form of extreme rather a secret order They are sworn by Roman Catholicism imstances. I quote ich, in some under a Roman Catholic o is, of course, tryindicate the policy

mination of candi-

dates)-Do you regard Romanism as the enemy of

civil and religious liberty? "Question 4—Is it not, in your opinion, unwise

and unsafe to appoint men to a civic, political, or military office in this country who owe allegiance to the Pope of Rome and who have sworn to obey

"Question 7—Are you in favor of putting into office honest and true American patriots who are the best qualified to fill the positions, regardless of political party."

AN IRONCLAD OBLIGATION.

One of the obligations in the oath prescribed at the initiation of members is as follows:-

"I further promise and swear that I will not apply to any Roman Catholic priest for local and general influence, nor to any person or persons who may be governed by the priest or Roman Catholic Church for aid in behalf of myself or friends under any circumstances whatever.

VIRTUOUS INDIGNATION

has filled the breasts of the Romish inhabitants of Newburyport, from whose protests against this order one might imagine that no vows to extirpate heretics had ever been or had ceased to be taken by any of those connected with the Church of Rome or its many orders, clerical and lay. They have resolved that such an association is "banded together for injury to the civil and religious rights of [Roman] Catholics," is "un-American" inasmuch as the society exacts "as a requirement of its membership that to be American patriots they must stand to and abide by the Protestant religion." They brand as a "traitorous body an association, whose ritual proclaims that no Roman Catholic is eligible to civil, political, or military office, and which exacts from its members that they be governed in their future political actions by opposition to the [Roman] Catholic religion; that we, as freemen, will boldly and fearlessly maintain our rights as secured to us by the Constitution of the United States." To hear these people, whose motto is "first Catholic, then American," prate of "freedom of religion as guaranteed by Constitution," of loyalty to that Constitution, and of detestation of all who are traitorous to it, i.e., who object to Romish aggressiveness, one is irresistibly reminded of Horace's admiring query, "Quis tulerit Gracehos de sedilione querentes?" It is still more ridiculous when we find that the root of the whole matter is the refusal of the Newburyport aldermen to grant any liquor licenses to Roman Catholic Irishmen—and for reasons that need not be entered into that is a very good regulation. This made the Romanists very mad, so mad that they called a public meeting to protest against this resolution, at which meeting was witnessed the remarkable and pitiable scene of a priest of the Roman Catholic Church publicly pitching into the powers that be because they refuse to grant liquour licenses to his flock.

CHURCH NOTES.

The first convention of the Association of Working Girls Societies, recently held here, brought out publicly the fact that the daughters of the Bishop of the diocese have, for some time, devoted themselves to the task of catering for the temporal benefit of the working girls in this huge city. They have established "Holiday House," a summer house for them, situated at Miller's Place, on the north shore of Long Island, and have themselves fixed it up. They take personal charge of it during the summer months. It is self-supporting now.

The city mission has received from Miss Mary Coddington, of this city, a donation of \$40,000 with which to start a boys' club, to include cost and endowment.

The Childrens' Fold, shortly to be built on ground given by the Sheltering Arms, at Mount Minturn, will be a \$10,000 cottage. The children, now boarded out in private families, will then be all together.

The Jewish mission down alongside of the Tombs has had the boycott laid on it by the richer Jews removed, and will soon be transferred to larger and more spacious quarters. It succeeded in spite of the boycott.

The Church Club is to admit more members and to be less one-sided.

Probably the greatest stickler for what he insists on as Church law is Bishop Whittle of Virginia. The other day he marched out of a Richmond church because the choir sang a hymn at the close of the service. The singing of such a hymn, he says, is not prescribed in the prayer book. For the same reason he found fault with the altar flowers.

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.

Mediator.

Sir,—In reply to Dr. Carry's last letter I wish to say, 1. That my criticisms were made in full view of the statement, "As Christians we share Christ's annointing and all His offices in some way and to some extent." My desire was to point out the peril attaching to the use of such language, if it extended to the application of the term "Mediator" to the minister of the Gospel as descriptive of his divinely appointed transactions between God and his fellowmen, lest it might be assumed (as history proves it has been assumed) that men might legitimately share with Christ in His function of Mediator as they may undoubtedly share with Him in other respects. 2. That the Puritan ailment from which I am suffering is one of a different kind from that which Dr. Carry attributes to me, viz., "That I must have an express text for everything in religion." I am much more strongly affected with the old Puritanical idea that no one should believe or do anything which the inspired Word forbids. And I have also an inseparable bias towards letting the ancient customs prevail. 3. I hope Dr. Carry will accept the assurance that I have no reason to imagine that he "thinks of aught but fulfilling Christ's will and advancing His glory. WM. HENDERSON.

Evening Communion.

Sir,—I have scrambled from what I consider a death-bed to ask your correspondent "Philadelphus," from Hamilton, Where in the Bible he can find any reference to evening celebrations of the Holy Communion? It was after midnight when Christ and His apostles celebrated. Please put this query in an early issue of your paper.

The first celebration was a morning one. The Communion may be celebrated at any time from mid-night to mid-day, but never from mid-day to mid-night." Refer any doubters to Canon Liddon.

"AN IRISH PRIEST."

Sir,—Your paper of the 24th inst. was not handed to me till late last evening.

The Church of the Ascension, Hamilton.

The character of the strictures it contains upon my letter, which appears in the same issue, not a little surprised me. The article bore evidence of hasty writing, and was probably the result of hasty reading. But, however that may be, I shall content myself with merely requesting that those of your readers who take an interest in the subject under discussion, will compare my statements, one by one, with your version of them, and your comments upon them; and then judge for themselves as to how far you have fulfilled your declared intention of dealing

"fairly and candidly" with them.

Please to insert this in your next number.

Hamilton, 26th April, 1890.

[We are happy to endorse the suggestion of our correspondent, that our readers should take his letter and onr articles point by point. We will ask them at the same time to note that he has not specified the matters in which he charges his Rector with breach of contract; nor has he told us whether he and his friends meant to withhold early morning Communion from those who wished it. ED. C.C.]

Mediation.

SIR,—Since my last letter I lighted upon a longforgotten passage in Jeremy Taylor on the mediation of the Evangelical ministry; and one could hardly expect to find a more thorough Protestant than the English Chrysostom. The passage is to be found in the sermon on "Christian Simplicity, part I.," near the end. It is as follows:—"They (the aposidets, according to the promise of Christ) were presidents in the conduct of souls, princes of God's people, the chief in sufferings, stood nearest the cross, had an elder brother's portion in the kingdom of grace, were the founders of churches, and dispensers of the mysteries of the kingdom, and ministers of the spirit of God, and channels of mighty blessings, under-mediators in the priesthood of their Lord," &c. JOHN CARRY.

"Church Home."

SIR,-In your issue of 13th February, occurs an account of the last annual meeting of the Church Home. I cannot allow it to remain unnoticed, because in it are statements which somewhat mis-

represent the real object of the institution, and would lead the public to infer that the "Home," if not actually founded for indigent ludies, has at least been tending towards that object from an early date. The revered founder of the Church Home, the late Mrs. Fulford, was well known as a friend of the humble poor, and the Act of Incorporation was formed in the interests of the latter, although by its wording it excludes no class. Those ladies who, from the first, were associated with Mrs. Fulford when the good work began in a little wooden shanty at a rent of \$2 or \$3 per month, worked hard and successfully for upwards of 20 years, until a handsome house in University Street was bought and paid for, on which there would have been no indebtedness but for a loss incurred through a certain notary's defalcation. It was after taking possession of this house that a bye-law was passed admitting ladies in reduced circumstances to the privileges of the institution and since then the Home has proved a peaceful and happy resting-place to this deserving class, with comfortable and separate accommodation for the two grades. But a new element has worked its way during the last year or two into the management of the Home, which, being numerically strong, has almost succeeded in silencing both the voices and the votes of the considerable minority who maintain that the Home belongs of right to the humble poor of the Church of England. It is a curious misapprehension for your correspondent to speak of "abolishing all class distinction, so that the Home may in future be devoted to its legitimate purposes, viz., the assistance of ladies in reduced circumstances." Surely if a Ladies' Home to the exclusion of the humbler class be raised on the foundation of the good old Church Home, such an institution should be termed illegitimate. There is a wide-spread feeling with the public who have for so many years contributed generously to the support of Mrs. Fulford's Home, that those persons who are taking so much laudable interest in providing a Ladies' Home, ought to lay their own foundation instead of taking possession of our well establishhed institution, and reminding us of a familiar example in natural history, where a bird named the cuckoo does not build its own nest, but seizes on that of another bird wherein to lay its eggs. Louisa Aspinwall-Howe.

Statistics of Huron Diocese.

SIR,—So far as the diocese of Huron is concerned, full information as to each parish can be obtained from the Synod journal. This diocese collects and publishes annually full statistical information, including all that you ask for in your article "After Easter," in a late issue of the Churchman. In the journal of 1888 it is given in full, and in that of 1889 in a table, but I hope in future it will be published as in 1888, and enable any one at a glance to see the position of the Church in every parish. It will also be of great value in time for the purpose of comparison. If each diocese in Canada would collect and publish annually parochial statistics as Huron now does, and as is universally done in the American Church, we should soon have data by which we could gauge the growth of the Church, and see when we were gaining or losing ground. At its last session the Provincial Synod required tri-ennial reports from the bishops, and I do not see how they can supply them unless an annual collection of statistics is made by the several dioceses.

The following are the statistics for the year ending April 30th, 1889:—Number of families, 11,957: adults not thus included, 2,190; total souls, 54,023; church sittings, 55,560; baptisms, 2,259; confirmations, 729; communicants, 11,924; marriages, 690; burials, 1,004; sunday-school officers and teachers, 17,424; Offerings—Parochial, diocesan and beyond diocese, \$161,726.44.

ALFRED BROWN.

Family Reading.

Devotional Notes on the Sermon on the Mount.

17.—THE SIXTH COMMANDMENT.

S. Matt. v. 21, 22: "Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time. Thou shalt not kill: and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment: but I say unto you, that every one who is angry with his brother (without a cause) shall be in danger of the judgment; and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council; and whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of the hell of fire."

It has been debated at great length whether our Lord is here correcting the Mosaic Law or merely condemning the interpretations put upon it by the Scribes and Pharisees. It seems plain enough from the expressions employed that he had a double