

tion of Wesleyans from the Church. "No one now believes," he says, "that the Wesleyan body has any *raison d'être* for separation other than denominational aggrandisement. Besides, the stream of tendency among Wesleyans, as among Churchmen, is emphatically toward greater individual liberty, within clearly defined limits, and there is no scope for such a healthy development within the narrow borders of a sect. Men are becoming more and more Christians, less and less sectaries. It will, therefore, not be surprising if we should fall back upon the Church as the only true representative of historical Christianity. Only, we stipulate that the Church do also strip itself of sectarianism."

Mr. George A. Jarvis, of Brooklyn, N. Y., has made endowments for the Church Charity Foundation, aggregating \$15,000, for the Orphan House \$8,000, for the Home of the Aged \$4,000, and for St. John's Hospital \$5,000. This benefaction is in memory of his wife, Mary McLeen Jarvis. He has also placed in the chapel of St. John's Hospital on the Church Charity Foundation, a tablet inscribed to the memory of Mrs. Jarvis.

Among the churches wrecked by the earthquake which has devastated the city of Charleston, St. Philip's and St. Michael's have sustained such injury that their rebuilding will probably be a necessity. The new steeple of the latter, though intact, is out of plumb and consequently dangerous to life. Four great seams rend the building. The hands of the tower clock now indicate the hour of 9.55, probably the time of the first shock, on the evening of August 31st.

A later despatch from Bishop Howe says: "St. Philip's Church and Church Home, both much injured; St. Philip's is the mother church of the diocese, a parish since 1675. St. Michael's Church, a colonial church, built in 1757, damaged very seriously. St. Paul's Church, the largest in the city, built in 1816, very badly damaged, Grace Church badly damaged. St. Luke's, not seriously injured, but needing repair. Calvary Church, a free church for colored people, seriously hurt. St. Timothy chapel needs rebuilding."

Bishop Howe adds that any money sent to him for repairing these churches will be distributed according to his best judgment unless otherwise directed. He thinks that at least \$100,000 is needed.

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.

HOMAGE TO ULTRAMONTANISM.

SIR,—A few weeks ago you dubbed the Papal Ablegate, who recently brought Cardinal Taschereau's Scarlet biretta to Quebec, "a very impudent person," because he invited the Mayor of Toronto to be present at the ceremony. You insisted, and rightly enough, that Canadians care no more for a foreign official such as a Cardinal is, than "for the Pope's footman." But do they not? In theory, perhaps, they do not; in practice, however, it would appear that the representatives of the Canadian Church in the Diocese of Montreal do. At least so we over here judge, considering that we lately read in the public press—the Church journals took care to suppress the fact that the Bishop of Montreal, the Very Rev. Dr. Carmichael, Dean of Christ Church Cathedral in that city, the Ven. Archdeacon Evans, of Iberville, the Reverend Canon Mills, Rector of Trinity Church, and Henderson, Principal of the Theological College, each in the see city, were so fulfilled with a sense of the honour shown by the Pope to the Dominion of Canada in bestowing upon it a cardinal, that they formed part of a long procession to the archiepiscopal palace in Quebec, to congratulate Archbishop Taschereau on his elevation to the purple and the temporal rank of a Prince of the Church—a rank bestowed by an alien and antagonistic power on a subject of Queen Victoria. A Romish paper aptly describes the event as "the most remarkable feature of the Cardinal's reception." The Anglican deputation, it seems, was introduced by the Speaker of the Provincial House of Assembly, and so struck was His Eminence by the sight of these right-reverend, very reverend, venerable and reverend dignitaries dancing attendance on him in his throne-room, that he "immediately descended from the dais on which he was standing and entered into conversation for some minutes with His Lordship of Montreal.

The event was the occasion of an enthusiastic reception for Bishop Bond and the clergymen accompanying him. When His Lordship descended from the reception room, the members of the Council, House of Assembly and (Roman) Catholic clergymen, who thronged the entrance chamber, made a passage for the clergymen of the Church of England, and the Bishop, with the Dean and Canons were the first to enter their names in the visitors' book." It is not probable that the Bishop and these representative clergy of the diocese and city of Montreal were there uninvited. If so, why is the Editor of the DOMINION CHURCHMAN silent as to the impudence of the "Pope's agent at Quebec" in sending such an invitation to those who represented not mere municipal authority, but that of Christ and His Church. The Mayor of Toronto may, or may not be a Churchman—anyway he is a mere civic functionary—of no account in the Church's economy. But Bishop Bond and his accompanying clerics felicitated a prince of the Church in that capacity, and as representing a Power that had excommunicated the Church of England, and would any day willingly see her candlestick taken away—a very different matter. I do not presume to criticize the conduct of the Bishop and his clergy—to their own heavenly Master, Christ, and to their earthly master, the Church of England in Canada, they stand or fall. As Low Churchmen they could probably safely venture on a course which would excite a howl of indignation were High Churchmen to attempt it—not that the latter would be so inconsistent as to do so. But I do and would protest against a Church journal, considering it more impudent on the part of the Papal Ablegate to send an invitation to the mere mayor of a Canadian city, who, apparently, was right-minded enough not to accept it, than to one of the Church's chief officers, who, as a bishop, is bound, with all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away from the Church all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's Word, and both privately and openly to call upon and encourage others to the same.

AN AMERICAN PRIEST.

METHODISM.

SIR,—Whether the numerical preponderance of Methodism is so great as claimed or not, I am satisfied it is very great, and also that in the Diocese of Ontario we are gaining in reality little or no ground.

I quote from Report, 23rd Synod, p. 228, out of a nominal church membership of 80,000, 35,000 are unknown to the clergy. The committee asks, where are the remaining church people—by what means are they to be reached? and so little does anyone value this awful acknowledgment, that not a word on the subject was spoken last Synod.

The Church, so careless of its acknowledged children, is not likely to be aggressive and look for new ones. The truth is, no organized effort is made at all. The ill-paid clergy have districts they cannot do justice to, and hence remain ill-paid—and disheartened—here and there a new mission, which is left to take care of itself; here and there a division—we feel and are isolated from all sympathy and counsel—no one knows the real state of the country, and where remedy might be applied. For want of a better suggestion, I would say, let the clergy and laity ask the Bishop to appoint a commission of an earnest, active layman and a priest of a similar nature; neither of them old men, to thoroughly go through the Diocese; take counsel with the clergy, but all see for themselves in the outlying places how and where new missions are wanted, not simply asking where there are Church people, but where there are no ministrations of the Church. Let them see where parishes might be re-arranged and divided—tabulate and present a report of needs, letting us know the whole truth of our short-comings. Does any one believe that the expense would not, if backed up by a definite appeal by the Bishop, bring in a flood of means and of men for the work? The Church must, indeed, be dead if her members cannot be so moved. Desultory efforts evoke no enthusiasm. A real definite issue does. The mission fund, I believe, would be doubled, as a result. Supply Lay Readers to parishes which need them. Divide others, giving temporary aid to some, indeed to many. Put a young layman, who seeks Holy orders, in new places—give him the pleasure of working up his future parish or mission—let him feel the Diocese cares for him, and give him the knowledge that he will after a fair work, say of 3 or 5 years, be moved up if he feels a new hand could improve his foundation. Indeed, in these cases I believe a change is desirable. Let us, in God's name, if we do believe in the Holy Catholic Church, make a real hearty effort to not simply keep alive her smouldering fires but kindle it into a flame, instead of sitting down under the official report that nearly half our people are left to live without warning—to die without Sacrament. And no one cares enough about it to move the matter in the Church's Assembly. We well deserve every taunt levelled at us. We well

deserve to die out as a body not worth preserving, if we can bear the shame of the confession unmoved. As to the expense of the commission, which probably would require more than two men to do quickly, it should be borne by the Mission Board—it is simply sowing sparingly to reap more abundantly. The very fact of a definite move on would encourage the multitude who feel now no interest in anything beyond the few acres they live in, and are constantly becoming weaker in numbers every year.

I have had a little experience, and am certain there is no district where an active, earnest man, unincumbered, who really has God's work at heart, and is willing to be knocked about a while, cannot live even without a mission grant, but he wants a start of horse and buckboard and a few dollars. I wish I were unmarried, I would offer for such a district at once.

A PRIEST IN ONTARIO DIOCESE.

Notes on the Bible Lessons

FOR SUNDAY SCHOOL TEACHERS, ON THE INSTITUTE LEAFLETS.

Published under authority of the Sunday School Committee of the Toronto Diocese.

Compiled from Rev. J. Watson's "Lessons on the Miracles and Parables of our Lord" and other writers.

OCTOBER 3rd, 1886.

VOL. V. 15th Sunday after Trinity. No. 45

BIBLE LESSON.

"The Labourers in the Vineyard."—St. Matt. xx. 1]

16.

The word "for," with which this lesson opens sends us to the previous chapter for an explanation of the cause which led to the parable before us being spoken. Our Lord was a wonderful teacher, patient, gentle, often tried by the dulness of understanding of His disciples. He never got angry with them, however, but gently corrected them. We read of a young ruler coming to Jesus with an earnest question as to how he could become His disciple, but we find him shrinking from the test. Upon this Peter puts the question to our Lord, verse 27. This question showed that St. Peter had got a wrong idea into his head. The disciples had done what the young ruler was unwilling to do. What, therefore, should be their reward? As if he was calculating so much work, so much reward. Jesus, therefore, speaks this parable to point out the common mistake of many since St. Peter's day, of confounding the free gifts of grace with debts due for work done.

1. *The Vineyard.* At certain times of the year, a vineyard required a great deal of labor, spring and fall, busy times, many hands employed; there must be no idleness or neglect, or serious loss will follow. So in God's Church, the vineyard Jesus had in His mind, there is need of honest, faithful work; no idlers wanted; work for God will not admit of trifling.

2. *The Labourers.* See the owner of the vineyard at daybreak, going to the market place in search of labourers. He engages them at the current wages, viz., a penny, the Roman Denarius, the daily pay of a Roman soldier; considered liberal wages in those days, as money went much farther than now; he sends them to work, comes back at nine o'clock, twelve o'clock, three o'clock, hires all he finds unemployed, and sets them to work. At length, at five o'clock, only an hour before ceasing work, he finds some still idles, and sends them also to the vineyard, promising to give them what is right. What a busy scene the vineyard presents; all doing something, each at the work set him. So in God's vineyard many sorts of work, God looks for industry, diligence, energy in His labourers, Prov. vi. 6; Pet. ii. 14; Eccles. ix. 10. Are we at work? even the young can be employed. None in this land can say they have not been called: baptism is a call, confirmation, too, a fresh call to work. Are we carrying out our pledge? If we are idling or doing our work ill, oh, let us take warning, and be stirred up by this parable to greater zeal in God's service; study to show ourselves approved, that "need not be ashamed," 2 Tim. ii. 15.

3. *The Reckoning.* When the day closed, the owner called his steward and desired him to pay the labourers, beginning with those hired an hour before. To them, as to the others, he gives a full day's wage. This caused great discontent among those who had worked all day. Is there anything unjust in the master's conduct? No, they get exactly what they bargained for, but they complain because he is generous to others. Envy is at work. So the Jews were envious because the Gentiles were admitted to the privileges of the kingdom. Even the apostles were in danger of overestimating their own merits, whereas the reward is so greatly beyond the deserving of anyone, that it behooves all the rather to say "We are unprofitable servants," we have only "done that which it was our duty to do," and no more. Our Lord, in verse 16,