

involves no very heavy draft on either mind or body. These and other perversions have become, however, so popular that when any effort is made towards a revival of spiritual life, the inert, half-asleep people at once flash into animation, and declare that they will have no new-fangled innovations, that they are content with their forefather's manners and customs in Divine Service (those of Georgian Era) that the innovators are either, as has been said, brainless fools or double-dyed scoundrels, intending to sell the Church to the Pope of Rome. illogical, inconsistent, half-hearted, trying to cheat their consciences by the performance of an empty round of empty rites, neglecting the weightier matters of the law, living without Christ, destitute of heart-religion, etc., etc., to the end of the chapter.

In conclusion, will or would any of the objectors referred to above apply the same course of reasoning, or better still, want of reasoning, to anything else than religion? This question has been partially answered in paragraphs first and second, but let any candid observer of men and things ascertain for himself whether it be not true that fair and honest play is given to everything else except the desire to offer *everything* to God, to worship with both body and mind, and to present, as in both the Church of the past, and in the Church triumphant of the future, the Eternal truths of the Christian religion, symbolized and yet truly Spiritual.

Life of Rev. John Skinner.

A CONTRIBUTOR sends the following:—

The London *Spectator* lately reviewing the Life of Rev. John Skinner, the father of Bishop Skinner, both of them objects of hearty interest to loyal Churchmen, notices "a printer's error." The description of Skinner's poverty immediately after marriage as *res augusta domi* would have tickled the fancy of the author of *The Stipendless Parson*, whose own creed and practice are thus expressed:

"In what little dealings he's forced to transact,
He determines with plainness and candour to act,
And the great point on which his ambition is set,
Is to leave at the last neither riches nor debt."

I was struck many years ago with the immense difference in meaning made by this slight literal change, and expressed it as follows, as a sort of conundrum. So I send it to you as a pendant to the above.

J. C.

Dec., 1883.

All that is grand and rich and great,
All that describes a monarch's state,
His post, his palace, oft his name,
A well-known word will full proclaim.

But,—sad reminder to the wise
On what poor props our glory lies,—
The second letter don't displace;
Invert it—all things change their face!

The poor man's hovel, straits, and pain,
In Latin rise before you plain;
The base man's scanty, niggard mind—
You see what's "small" in it combined.

ERRATA.—In the penultimate paragraph of Rev. Dr. Carry's article "real good" should be "real God."

DR. GRANT'S present position towards Denominational Colleges ought to convince even the most sceptical of the hollowness of the cry invented by himself and other Presbyterians against the Government Grant to King's, Acadia and Mount Allison, a few years ago.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the Church Guardian.

SIR,—Canon Brigstocke, in a letter to the London *Guardian*, complains that the Canadian correspondent of that journal has done scant justice to the Diocese of Fredericton, by stating that in comparison with the rest of the Ecclesiastical Province, in the matter of contributions during the last three years for Domestic and Foreign Missions, that Diocese "made a very fair appearance"; the fact being that "it stood first of all the Canadian Dioceses in the amount contributed for Foreign Missions, and also before some other Dioceses in the amount given to Algoma and the North-West."

It is not worth while going into explanations in England, but with your permission, I should like to say a few words upon this matter which may be read in Canada.

Canon Brigstocke has read hastily the statement he finds fault with. The writer, is speaking, not of the amounts contributed by the various Dioceses as standing on an equal footing, which they do not, and which is the mistake commonly made in comparing them, but of their comparative contributions when the Church population of each is taken into account.

Now, according to the last census returns, the Dioceses, with respect to Church population, stand as follows:—Province of Ontario, 366,539; Province of Quebec, 68,797; Nova Scotia and P. E. Island, which made up the Diocese of Nova Scotia, 67,417; New Brunswick, 46,768; while their contributions for the last three years stand thus—Ontario, for Algoma and N. W., \$18,730, Foreign Missions, \$2,476; Province of Quebec, Algoma and N. W., \$11,261, Foreign Missions, 3,011; Nova Scotia, \$981, Foreign Missions, \$275; New Brunswick, Algoma and N. W., \$3,421, Foreign Missions, \$1,969.

Now, a little figuring will show that the Province of Quebec has contributed, in proportion to Church population, more than eleven times as much as Nova Scotia, more than three times as much as Ontario, and more than twice as much as New Brunswick; while for Foreign Missions it has contributed ten times as much as Nova Scotia, more than four times as much as Ontario, and about in the same proportion as New Brunswick.

It may be thought that this great inequality is partly accounted for by the fact that the Province of Quebec contains the great and wealthy City of Montreal. I think it may be shown, that notwithstanding this, the Church in the Province of Quebec is *far* poorer than in any other Province. However, it cannot be denied that this is true of the Diocese of Quebec. But how will the contributions from this, the smallest in Church population, not much more than one-half of New Brunswick, and the poorest Diocese in the Ecclesiastical Province compare with them from the rest?

I find that for Algoma and the North-West Quebec has contributed during the last three years, in proportion to Church population, thirteen times as much as Nova Scotia, nearly four times as much as Ontario, and between two and three times as much as New Brunswick. For Foreign Missions, Quebec contributed ten times as much as Nova Scotia, more than six times as much as Ontario, and about the same in proportion as New Brunswick.

I think the above figures amply justify the correspondent of the *Guardian* in saying that, while the Missionary spirit has certainly grown in the Church in Canada of late, its growth has been very unequally distributed. Here we find the great Church of Ontario, with its magnificent endowments, and its wealthy people, doing for Algoma and the North West only one-third as much as the Province, only one-fourth as much as the Diocese of Quebec, only one half as much as New Brunswick. Nova Scotia may be left out of the account, as it has done next to nothing, why I do not know. New Brunswick makes "a fair appearance" in this comparison, but nothing more. No one who looks into things will pretend to say that Quebec has

done anything great or splendid; on the contrary, it ought to do a great deal more, and no doubt will do so. But if Quebec, with its poor Church population, the immense pressure of its own home mission work, and *no endowments*, except the small parochial endowments which it has itself and for itself, out of its own deep poverty, created, nearly all of them as yet unavailable, has done what it has done, and has certainly not exceeded its duty, it is clear that there is need, as the correspondent of the *GUARDIAN* says, of a redistribution of "the revival of the missionary spirit" throughout the Ecclesiastical Province.

C. C. L. G.

31st December, 1883.

"The Feast of the Circumcision vs. New Year's Day."

To the Editor of the Church Guardian:

SIR,—Last Sunday, the Sunday after Christmas, the following notice was issued at one or two Churches:—"Tuesday next being New Year's Day, there will be Service at this Church at 10 o'clock, consisting of Morning Prayer, followed by Holy Communion."

On this subject, I wish to say a few words. For my own part, I wish that at the commencement of each *day* Morning Prayer were said by Priest and people at every Parish Church, and the bell tolled as directed by the rubric. Such a custom, if only observed by the Parish Priest and one or two faithful ones, would bring a blessing on the land. Still less do I desire to *lessen* the number of celebrations of the Holy Eucharist; on the contrary, I long for the day when the "Daily Sacrifice" shall again be offered on every Altar; not, as at present, spasmodically, at *most*, on each Lord's Day, shewing thereby that the Church still breathes. But why this singling out of one festival out of all others for a special celebration, and that, too, not the Church's day but the world's, for the name mentioned was not "The Circumcision of our Lord" but "New Year's Day," of which the Church takes no cognizance. Her year commenced more than four weeks ago, when she called her sons and daughters to seek, in penitential observances, to fit themselves for the second coming of the Lord. New Year's Day may do very well for merry greetings and friendly visits, but I do think we had better return to the Church's rule, and live by the teaching of her Book of Common Prayer, which, if fully and faithfully practiced, will in mind leave us little to yearn after outside its teaching.

Yours faithfully,

E. H. S. R.

To the Clergy.

To the Editor of the Church Guardian:

SIR,—I wish to call the attention, especially of the COUNTRY CLERGY, to what I have found as a very easy and desirable road conveyance. I had it built for my own use. It is upon *two wheels*, but built on a new principle, and entirely different from anything hitherto in use either here or in the States. A carriage body, of any desirable size, is balanced on the single axle by an ingenious method (entirely new), *completely avoiding the horse motion, hitherto so unpleasant, and the great drawback to vehicles on two wheels*, while the shafts have no connection with the body, the body itself is moveable on the axle, a *feature hitherto not achieved*. I found it worked so easily for *both the rider and the horse*, that a patent was applied for and obtained in Canada. But it was always *my purpose to give to the clergy of the Church throughout the Dominion the benefit of using the invention, FREE FROM ALL ROYALTY*, if any should wish to use the conveyance. And I wish, by means of this letter, to make this widely known; other Church papers I hope will insert it in their issues. I have used it since the spring, when the horse could trot on the muddy roads with it with greater ease than he could have drawn a waggon walking. I have used it on the slanting sea beach and over the rocks, over cradle