

Episcopacy still more deeply that ritualism and sacerdotalism which have been so marked there of late years." Well, we suppose Dr. Liddon will survive these fly-bites of partizan enmity and envy. We are pleased to note that our English exchanges record his return to St. Paul's Cathedral, where, as Canon in Residence, he is delivering the afternoon sermons on the Sundays in July. Doubtless many colonists now visiting England will be glad to avail themselves of the great privilege of hearing one, whom we believe Mr. Spurgeon has declared, the foremost preacher in Europe.

CORRESPONDENCE.

[The name of Correspondent must in all cases be enclosed with letter, but will not be published unless desired. The Editor will not hold himself responsible, however, for any opinions expressed by Correspondents.]

To the Editor of THE CHURCH GUARDIAN:

DEAR SIR,—A good deal has been said of late by correspondents in your paper about the perversity of the recent Synod of the Diocese of Montreal. One thinks it has made itself ridiculous by its stupidity; another thinks it has discredited itself by its intolerance: all agree in saying that its crowning iniquity is the exclusion of Rev. Dr. Norman from its list of representatives in Provincial Synod. Perhaps you will allow me space to present briefly the other side of the question, which may serve to lift from the shoulders of brother Churchmen in the Diocese the charges of folly and fanaticism which it is sought to fasten upon them.

It is well known that many on both sides of the house voted for an exclusive list of delegates. It is not my purpose now to justify or to condemn this. Be it right or wrong, both sides are equally implicated. Under those circumstances, it was inevitable that the list of the stronger side should carry, to the exclusion of almost every name on the other list. Thus, Dr. Norman's non-election is due to the fact that his name was on the list of the weaker side, just as Dean Carmichael's election was due to the fact that his name was on the list of the stronger side. Had Dr. Norman and his friends been elected, Dean Carmichael and his friends would have been rejected. In principle, the one is just as fair or unfair as the other, and it seems childish for the worsted party to call the victorious one oppressors and fanatics, when the same tactics and the same weapons have been used on both sides. When Dr. Norman's name ceases to be placed on the list that excludes every Evangelical clergyman in the Diocese from the Dean downwards, then and not till then will it be time to call into question the tactics of the winning side.

Passing from the question of tactics to that of principle, need the Synod of Montreal feel either shame or contrition over the exclusion of Dr. Norman? The issue fought out by the Synod was the claim of the Montreal Diocesan Theological College to degree-conferring powers, and the Synod, by majorities of nearly three to one, supported the claim. The persistence displayed in opposing the measure at every step of its progress by personal influence, by technical objections as well as by argument, led many to believe that the question would be carried before Provincial Synod. Would it have been an act of judgment on the part of the Synod to send as its representative the very man of all others who could most skilfully introduce and most ably argue the question, and carry most weight with him in opposition to the earnest wish of the Diocese? The question is considered as of vital importance by both sides, and Dr. Norman is opposed to the feeling of the vast majority of the Diocese regarding it. Why, then, should the Diocese empower him to defeat or try to defeat its cherished object? As it is, the question may

come up in Provincial Synod, but it will not be brought up by our representatives; we shall not be weakened by dissension, and the issue presented will be a clear one as between Provincial Synod and the Synod of Montreal.

LENT.

Montreal, July 12th, 1886.

[The writer of the above presents, we presume, the best reasons that can be advanced for the action of the majority of Synod referred to, and whilst admiring his kindliness of tone and outspoken admissions, the letter itself appears to us to condemn the course pursued. Even admitting that two lists (each exclusive) were voted for, the result of the voting on the Dean's motion the previous day showed that there could be no necessity of voting an exclusive ticket on the part of the majority, as they were strong enough to elect a sufficient number of representatives of their views, without totally excluding the others, whilst the same vote, coupled with the oft previously repeated threat and the apparent understanding amongst the majority, showed that to have the least chance of securing even one or two representatives the minority would be obliged, *volens, nolens*, to follow suit and vote only for the exponents of their views. We do not believe, from the result, that this was done by the minority as a body; but there would seem to be some justification for its action if it acted as the writer says; there seems to be little for that of the majority, other than their desire for party victory and the now admitted one that they would not allow the views of the minority to be advocated, by even one single voice, in the great Council of the Church in Canada. That admission seems to indicate at once weakness in the cause itself (on other than purely party grounds), and also a fear on the part of its supporters of open free discussion in the General Assembly of the Church: since even this one man, who admittedly "could most skilfully introduce and most ably argue the question" at issue from the opposition standpoint, must be excluded, and the Church at large be deprived of his wisdom and assistance in other matters. This course so admittedly taken may be noble, courageous and Christian, but somehow we do not see it: it bears the aspect to us of attempted oppression and suppression of a minority, so-called, by weight of mere numbers; but our readers must decide this for themselves.—Ed.]

SIR,—I was sorry to see your compromising comments in THE GUARDIAN of the 7th instant on the Bishop of Ripon's approval of the action of the clergy in the present political contest in England; because, if in England their good advice is deemed proper, where as a rule the candidates are men of probity and position, and where the proportion of the more intelligent of the electors exercises a healthy control, how much more is it desirable amongst us, where the very reverse of these favoring conditions unhappily exists?

It was my good fortune for fifty years of my life to be associated with many of the parochial clergy in England, and I can bear personal testimony to the wholesome effects which on all occasions their counsel exercised, not only on their parishioners, but throughout the neighborhood in which they lived; and I think it safe to affirm that if the clergy in this Province of Quebec had in years past been alike zealous in disseminating sound advice in matters affecting the good government of the

country, we should not have to deplore the low standard of political morality which has so long existed.

In a former communication in which this subject was involved, I ventured the assertion that it was a reasonable assumption that wherever the clergy intimately associated themselves with the occupations and daily life of their congregations, in their worldly affairs, their influence for good in their spiritual ministrations would be the more effectual; and in giving to the people the benefit of their advice and experience as to their franchise duties, the clergy are not necessarily politicians in the ordinary sense; and it is a poor compliment to the cloth to assume that the difficulty of doing enough and not too much, and doing it in the right way, would necessitate (as it seems to have done) their doing nothing.

You say that differing opinions prevail on this subject, and it is not difficult to see the source from whence they come, for the candidates, to whom for the most part the sessional payment is an object, of course hold the opinion that the clergy should be passive, conscious probably that their qualifications are not up to the clerical standard. The electors concur in the opinion from pure indifference, and the clergy possibly from the same cause, and some apprehension of having additional duties imposed on them. The truth is that a mawkish and mischievous piece of sentimentality has taken possession of the public mind, which cannot be upheld by common sense, by a sense of duty, or by any sound and substantial reasoning whatsoever.

JOHN H. CHARNOCK.

Stanstead, 12th July, 1886.

[We do not share our esteemed correspondent's opinion as to the causes for non-interference of the clergy in the Dominion in political matters. As a rule, their influence in times of election is, we think, eagerly sought for. Nor is it a question of qualifications: our representatives even in the local house, as a rule, have a high opinion of themselves, and do not fear comparison, even with the clergy. We cannot think that the latter refrain through fear of additional burdens; it is rather from a desire not to do injury to their ministerial work by becoming involved in the party controversies which generally accompany political contests: and that is why it is difficult to do enough, not too much, and to do it in the right way.—Ed.]

SIR,—On taking up the CHURCH GUARDIAN of July 7, 1886, I was particularly struck with what you say in your "Editorial Notes," page 9, about "clergymen taking part in politics," and I cannot well refrain from giving my own views in reference to that question. As a general rule, I have always held that the less a clergyman had to say about the politics of the day the better, and I beg to say that with little exception I still think it the safer plan. The case in England to which you refer may possibly be the exception to the rule. I see you state that the Bishop of Ripon not only defended the action of clergymen in taking part in the political contest, but contended that it was their duty so to do. This is altogether so different from the position generally taken by Bishops of the Church, that it tends to puzzle and confound. We have, of course, to make allowance for the very high state of party feeling in England just now, to justly appreciate the counsels of an English Bishop on this very important question.

Your own admirable conclusion seems to meet the crisis well, where you say:—"The difficulty consists in doing enough, and not too much, and in doing it in the right way." To this I see no objection.

B.