

change of scene—a change of surroundings—is one of the best things in a holiday. It takes one out of a rut—takes the mind out of the channel in which it has been working along monotonously for months, and brightens one up generally. Work is good, but monotonous work has a stupefying effect. Specialists tell us that monotony produces more mental disease than excitement. The popular theory is that excitement unbalances the mind. So it does sometimes, but for one person whose mind is unbalanced by excitement perhaps five are unbalanced by monotonous, treadmill labour. Hence a change is an essential part of a good holiday. And the change should be as great as possible. A city man should go to a quiet place in the country. A man who lives in a very quiet country place should most decidedly go to a centre where there is some excitement. Chicago or New York are the places for a man who suffers from the monotony of his home. He may not like the roar and rush of Broadway, but it will do him good all the same. Everybody who has gone to the bottom of this subject knows that a thorough change of surroundings is one of the main things in a good holiday. This is the principle reason why going to the Old Country does many people so much good. The sail across the Atlantic is a thorough change. Everything on the other side is different from what a Canadian has been used to on this side. The change is complete and the happy tourist comes home ascribing all the benefit he received to the climate. The climate, except in so far as it was a change of climate, had very little to do with it. The thorough change was the main thing.

A fourth essential thing in a good holiday is pleasant company. Down at the seaside you often see a lone, solitary, sad-looking man walking on the beach alone, sitting on the verandah alone, taking his bath alone, taking his walks alone, taking his meals alone—in fact living alone among hundreds. Perhaps he is an invalid in search of health. Possibly he is a clergyman who thinks it would be a sin to associate with the other tourists. Perchance he is a philosopher dealing with the absolute and infinite, and cannot come down to the level of ordinary mortals. Whoever he is, and whatever he is, he is spoiling his holiday. How many times have we all felt in a summer hotel, or on board a steamboat, that it would be a great thing to have some genial, companionable soul to speak to. Lonesomeness has spoiled many a holiday—marred many a trip. The remedy is to travel in small parties. Our American neighbors know how to manage these things better than we do. Catch a live Yankee taking holidays alone. He knows better than to spend his money in that way. Our neighbors usually travel in parties, and if one should happen to be alone he strikes up a social talk with some body in an hour. About the best informed, genial, companionable fellow tourist one ever meets is a first-class American citizen. The value of a holiday may be more than doubled by good company. A holiday does one very little good if he has to try to put in the time. The right way is to have a genial, sprightly, little party of friends and then the time goes in itself. Of course one-half the party should be ladies. Half-a-dozen men going away together for a holiday are—well, we were going to make some observations, but we simply remark that half-a-dozen men going away for a holiday are the better for having their wives, or sisters, or cousins, or some other female relatives with them. The presence of ladies is absolutely essential to a good holiday.

We might mention some other things which, if not essential, are very desirable, but this paper is long enough. If our friends have a holiday and all the things mentioned, they should be thankful.

APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION.

Let us clearly understand the term, "Apostolic Succession." Nothing is gained by spiritualizing the expression and then uttering pious platitudes about it. Whatever the doctrine means, it is, and has been, held by as broad-minded, learned, godly and charitable men as ever breathed. It may be an error, but it deserves to be treated with respect, and should be met with facts and arguments, not with denunciation or ridicule. The phrase may mean, subjectively, a succession of men holding apostolic doctrine and exhibiting the piety that is in harmony with it, or, objectively, a succession of officials, now called "bishops," invested by the apostles with their rank and authority, so as to succeed them in the oversight of the churches; or, it may mean an authority to perform certain functions, bestowed originally by Christ himself upon the apostles, and transmitted to those whom they set apart for the purpose, namely presbyters, these, in turn, entrusting their successors with the status they had received and the prerogatives belonging to it. The first we might call the mystical view; the second is the high Anglican; and the third, that of the Westminster standards and the Reformed churches generally.

We pass by the first, the subjective, or mystical view, because no one disputes the propriety of using the words in that sense. When we say, "that apostolic man, George Leslie McKay," no one suspects us of holding any special ecclesiastical dogma regarding the ministry. All who know of the man and his work, whether prelate or presbyter, will say "Amen" to the title. That "the genuine apostolic succession is enjoyed by all who love God and do His commandments," is true in the sense intended, but does not refute the doctrine with which we are dealing. Let us "come to grips," as soon as possible, with the real controversy.

The view that the bishops of the Anglican church sit in the apostles' seats and derive their official authority by "actual" descent from them, in an unbroken succession of duly consecrated prelates, is held by many in that communion, but the acceptance of it is not insisted upon as a condition of union. This opinion is, naturally, very obnoxious to Presbyterians and is utterly repudiated by them. No loyal son of the Reformed Church of Scotland could enter into any alliance which required him to subscribe to a doctrine which declared the glorious church of his fathers to be no part of the Church Catholic. But, however prevalent this error, as we conceive it to be, may be in the Anglican church in Canada, and it is not nearly so prevalent as has been represented, it is nowhere, and never has been, regarded as binding upon the consciences of all Anglicans. Notice the following facts in regard to it.

1. It has never been formulated in any official document. It is simply a private opinion and open to discussion without reflecting upon the loyalty of either supporters or opponents.

2. It was not held by any one of note in the church of England at the time of the Reformation; it is studiously avoided in the canons and articles of religion; it was long disregarded in practice; it was not publically advocated until near the close of the 16th century, when it raised a storm of indignant opposition; and not until 1662 were exclusive episcopal prerogatives conferred, in the ordinal, at the consecration of bishops.

3. It is more than doubtful whether the doctrine of the "Apostolic Succession" is held by anything like a majority of episcopal clergymen.

4. Some years ago, the exact date has escaped me, a general council of bishops in communion with the Church of England was held at Lambeth. Bishops from the United States and all parts of the British Empire were present. The subject of the re-union of the churches engaged much of the attention of this thoroughly representative gathering, and the result arrived at was formulated in what is popularly known as "the Lambeth Quadrilateral." The minimum which the assembled Anglican bishops declared could be accepted as a basis of negotiations with other communions was contained in four articles, one of which was, "the preservation of the historic episcopate." The use of the word "historic" is significant. They do not ask others to declare the episcopate scriptural, or apostolic, or necessary to the legitimacy of a church and the validity of its orders, but only that it is of historic value. It is so interwoven with the whole life of their church that it would be impossible to carry all their people with them were they to propose to relinquish it.

The Church of England in Canada does not ask those with whom she may unite to sacrifice conscience or self-respect, or believe the traditions of their own church by accepting the doctrine of "apostolic succession." She asks only that episcopacy be recognized and retained on the ground of its historic associations. Surely then the fact that some in her communion, be they many or few, hold the opinion in question, ought not to prevent us from coming into conference with her on the subject of union, believing that in it no insuperable barrier exists to closer relations.

With your permission, Mr. Editor, I will next discuss the subject of the episcopate and its relation to union. Thanking you for your courtesy in opening your columns to the consideration of this important subject, I remain, yours sincerely,

PACIFICUS.

THE CENSUS OF 1901.

Editor Dominion Presbyterian:

A question raised by Principal Gordon, in the union debate, at the late General Assembly, and which was replied to effectively by Mr. James McQueen, one of the elders, has light thrown upon it by the revelations of the last decennial census. The figures show that in the ten years, from 1891 to 1901, the Presbyterians of the Dominion increased 11.51 per cent, while the Methodists increased only 8.15 per cent. From this it may be inferred that Presbyterianism, not Methodism, is the aggressive force among the Protestants of Canada.

ONLOOKER.

The Unrest in India is explained and its origin and significance pointed out by a native Indian writer, Ameer Ali, in an article which The Living Age for July 20 reprints from The Nineteenth Century.

In referring to the removal of Rev. A. L. Howard, M.A., from Cayuga to Kemptville, The Haldimand Advocate says: "During his four years' pastorate in Cayuga, Knox church has grown and prospered. It was largely owing to his untiring efforts that the new and beautiful church was erected in 1904, the first year he was in charge. Since then the debt has been reduced each year and the church has continued to prosper. He leaves it in a state of spiritual and financial advancement, which reflects most creditably upon himself, his elders and the whole congregation."