

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.

N. B.—If any one has a good thought, or a Christian sentiment, or has facts, or deductions from facts, useful to the Church, and to Churchmen, we would solicit their statement in brief and concise letters in this department.

The Real Presence.

SIR,—Will your correspondent "A.P." kindly consent to enlighten me by some further explanation which will enable us to understand one another more thoroughly. He writes: "Most Catholics will accept neither of the other two (interpretations) absolutely." The word catholic signifies universal, and the Church Catholic, or universal, contains three great branches, the Greek, the Roman and the Anglican. Now the Roman branch absolutely requires all her members to accept the Tridentine decrees and Catechism, from which the creed of Pope Pius IV. is compiled, and which teaches the doctrine of Transubstantiation, while the Anglican Church rejects it.—See XXVII. Article. To which group of Catholics, the Roman or the Anglican, does he refer? The one absolutely affirms it, the other unequivocally rejects it. Nay, more, "A.P." seems to maintain that acts of worship may be paid to the consecrated bread and wine. I hope I do not misrepresent him and hence I ask for information, as I write to interest your readers to stimulate inquiry, and, if possible, throw more light on a most reconlute subject. Having this aim in view, I hope all due allowance will be made, and indulgence given to your well-wisher.

IVY.

The Prayer Book and Shortened Services.

SIR,—A brief word by way of reply to "Canonum Studiosus." My previous letters indicate clearly enough that I am seeking information on the most interesting subject of the adoption of the Prayer Book in Canada. It ought surely to be possible to discuss a subject of this kind without reference to "controversy" etc. I trust it will be kept clear of controversy. The General Synod declaration was before me when I wrote, and I am sure I gave its plain, grammatical meaning. It does not adopt the Prayer Book as a book, but pledges the Church to maintain "the doctrine, sacrament and discipline" set forth therein, and this is in effect what your correspondent's letter shows. I do not find in Canada the same scrupulous care in this matter which the Mother Church has exercised. Canon XIII. does clear up the difficulty, I find. There have been in England numerous deviations from the sealed books, and what I want to know definitely and clearly is the sum total of the book introduced into Canada, and when and in what words it was so introduced. I should be glad if your correspondents on this subject would kindly add their names. A name like Mr. Worrell's carries weight in the absence of the records which may be referred to. I have answered the needlessly personal remarks of "Canonum Studiosus" out of an earnest desire to keep this discussion free from controversy.

T. G. A. WRIGHT.

"Rock" and "To Dip."

SIR,—I desire to state over again I simply contend concerning the word "rock" that, as a symbol in the Bible, it is always applied to the Almighty. I regret Mr. Cayley has not kept to the point, and I venture to say, in his haste to prove me in the wrong, he has proved himself most inconsistent. He reads me a severe lecture for speaking of St. Peter as a "very shifting, unstable stone," and immediately after quotes Prof. George Adam Smith, in his splendid commentary on Isaiah: "He took us men, and He called us, unworthy as we were, His brethren, the sons of God. He took such an one as Simon, shifting and unstable, a quicksand of a man, and He said, 'On this rock I will build My Church.'" To call St. Peter "shifting and unstable" is unpardonable in Mr. Mackenzie, but splendid in Mr. Smith! To devote a column reproving me for taking liberties with St. Peter is simply beside the question, and I must say I am surprised Mr. Cayley should represent me as teaching that our Lord gave Simon the name of Petros to signify his shiftiness and instability. In like manner, the question of "to dip" and "to pour" in baptism should be kept to the Bible and the Prayer Book; these are quite sufficient. Mr. Cayley "challenges" me no less than six times to a controversy showing that immersion is right. And, mark, not from the Bible and Prayer Book; but from "the Fathers," Tertullian, St. Ambrose, St. Cyril, St. Basil, and the history of the Church up to 1274. No, thank you, Mr. Cayley;

I have neither time, inclination nor ability for such a controversy. I have referred him to the Bible and Prayer Book—our authorities—the Fathers at best are only witnesses, and it would certainly be a very profitless one with a gentleman who declares that he "never taught, advocated nor practised immersion." I am perfectly convinced from the Bible that the Anglican Church in "pouring" is Scriptural. I shall leave Mr. C. to prove from the Fathers that he and his Church are inconsistent. As Mr. Cayley has referred to Provost Whittaker, I may be allowed to refer to Provost Body. On a previous occasion, when I took exception to Mr. Cayley's immersion theory in the *Leaflet*, I wrote to Provost Body, who replied that the primitive mode of baptism, before the Church had fonts, was to lead the candidate into the water, and standing knee deep, more or less, to pour the water from the hand or from a shell upon the head. I repeat, the universal mode, almost without exception, in the Church of England, is to pour. I believe it is the same in the Church of Rome; if the Greek Church submerges in baptism it is news to me. If the *Institute Leaflet* teaches that the Church of Christ is built upon Petros the Rock, and that immersion is the right mode for baptism, I, for one, must conscientiously give it up; but I don't believe it has intended, nor will teach, either. Trusting this will end the matter.

G. C. MACKENZIE.

Brantford, 27th May, 1895.

Clerical Unity.

SIR,—I feel bound, by your leave, to write my protest both against some of the statements in the leaderette headed as above which appeared in your issue of May 16th, and more especially against the general tone of the article in question. There is—I say it with pleasure and satisfaction—no such sectional movement amongst the clergy of this diocese as is suggested by your statement that "It is more than probable"—which means that it is certain—that the men ordained in Canada at present working in New Westminster will form themselves into an association against their brethren of English ordination. Such a movement neither exists nor is likely to exist, for there is no reason for it. The only clerical union of the diocese is one formed for theological study and friendly discussion of pastoral work and kindred subjects, and it includes Canadian and English ordained clergy of High, Low and Broad views, and as far as I am aware, there is absolutely no sectional feeling among us. I have noticed of late a tendency in your paper, when the vacancy of the See of New Westminster is spoken of, to raise that most objectionable cry, "Canada for the Canadians," and I think that I am right in connecting it with the latest clerical arrival amongst us, who, indeed, should be the last to take such a line, being himself an Englishman of Canadian orders and of American experience, and, therefore, one who should rather take "Catholicity," and not "sectionalism," as his note. Canadians have, indeed, given a hearty welcome to the three Englishmen who preside over the dioceses of Quebec, Qu'Appelle and Columbia; and rightly so, for they are worthy. Such men as these we want to lead us, and we should not, as true Canadian Churchmen, care whether they be Canadians, Englishmen or Americans. Our great desire is to build up the Church and make her a tower of strength throughout the Dominion, and the very way to hinder the accomplishment of this desire is to stir up and keep alive sectional feeling. In our recent meeting of Synod we honestly attempted to elect the best man we could think of, and we succeeded on the first occasion by electing the Rev. W. H. Binney, who, unfortunately for us, declined the Bishopric from a sense of his own unfitness. On the second occasion we failed as a Synod to elect, the reason lying chiefly in the fact that we had little or no personal acquaintance with the men who were nominated. On this point we are handicapped, inasmuch as we have few opportunities of becoming acquainted with the leading clergy of Eastern Canada. They do not visit us, and we cannot afford to visit them. The clergy of Eastern Canada are practically as far off from us as those of England, and I fail to see any reason why we should give the preference—*ceteris paribus*—to clergy in Canada over clergy in England. True, we are part of the Canadian Church, but we are also part of the great Anglican Communion, and the Archbishop of Canterbury still considers himself Metropolitan of British Columbia, until such time as we have an ecclesiastical province. I have just heard a rumour that a man of Canadian antecedents, though his name is not as yet divulged, has been elected Bishop of New Westminster. If it be so, we must all rejoice that the vacancy is filled, and I trust well filled; but whether his antecedents be Canadian or otherwise, can make no difference as far as I can see, and I hold it perfectly ridiculous to lament that "the Bishopric of New Westminster is lost to Canadians," if the Canadian Church is a great gainer thereby. The true principle in Episcopal elections is to elect a

man who is working in the diocese if you have one who stands pre eminent; and if there be none such, as in our case, to get the best man you know of without respect to nationality. I may add that from my observation a man straight from England can as soon adapt himself to the ways and methods of the people of British Columbia as a man from Eastern Canada. Apologizing for the length of this letter.

H. G. F. CLINTON.

Vancouver, May 24.

Toronto Hospital and Gaol Chaplaincy.

(I.—INTRODUCTORY.)

SIR,—In a recent number of the *Canadian Methodist Magazine*, kindly lent me by the Methodist minister who visits the Toronto General Hospital, I read an interesting article by him concerning his work. It made me feel sorry that I had never supplied you with any account of my own work there and in the City Gaol. I have given reports from time to time to the rectors, but these have not reached the congregations even of the city; and but few of the rectors have been present at the various meetings. To make up for lost time, I will, with your permission, extend what I have to say over three or four numbers of your paper. At the close of the protracted litigation about the St. James' Rectory Lands Fund in 1887, the rectors, who then became participators for the first time in that fund, resolved at once to carry out a long-cherished design of forming a chaplaincy to the Toronto General Hospital and the City Gaol; and a scheme of assessment of themselves was adopted whereby some rectors gave more and others less. But I will not now dwell upon the financial aspect of the subject. These two institutions are not however the only ones demanding the services of a chaplain. It was doubtless intended to begin with these, and eventually deal with others. But since the formation of this chaplaincy several new institutions have been started which require attention, viz., Grace Homoeopathic Hospital, St. Michael's Hospital (in which probably a third of the patients are non-Roman Catholics), the Isolation Hospital (over the Don), the Victoria Sick Children's Hospital (replacing a small one previously existing on Jarvis street), the St. John's Hospital (which in its present location and form is also new), and the nucleus of a new Western Hospital on Euclid Avenue. The Hillcrest Convalescent Home was opened only a few months before the chaplaincy became an accomplished fact. Other institutions previously existing need also to be taken into account, viz., the Central Prison with its 350 inmates, the Parkdale Home for Incurables (demanding the utmost loving care, and receiving a large share of it from the faithful clergy in Parkdale by their voluntary labours), the Mercer Reformatory for Women, the Lunatic Asylum, the House of Industry, the Haven for Women, the Girls' Home, the Boys' Home, the Infants' Home, the Magdalen Home, the Aged Women's Home, the Dovercourt Orphanage, etc., etc. Most of these institutions are cared for by various clergy. Many of them, however, are quite new; and therefore were not taken into consideration when the chaplaincy was formed. They certainly demand attention now. Some large, comprehensive scheme should be considered and adopted, with full provision for adequate support, so that the two or three chaplains necessary may be maintained, and the obvious incidental expenses provided. In the City of Montreal two chaplains are employed, whose salaries (made up from various sources) amount to \$1,400 a year each. Considering how few the Church of England people are there compared to our numbers in Toronto, it is evident that we are greatly under-manned. The rectors, however, certainly did right in starting their chaplaincy project with work at the General Hospital and City Gaol. The former makes up 400 beds, far more than any other institution in the city; the latter has between 140 and 220 inmates, who are more or less accessible to a chaplain; whereas at the Central Prison the inmates are all engaged in manual labour, and have to be sent for from their workshops, with considerable hindrance and delay to their visitor and themselves when a clergyman desires to speak with them. Such intercourse evidently cannot be repeated very frequently. It is true many of the able-bodied men at the Gaol, who are in for petty offences, are also kept at work. But there are always a good many on hand besides these, accused of more serious offences, awaiting trial at the Assizes, who are not permitted to leave their corridors. In writing to a Church paper I need scarcely dwell upon the duties, resting upon us as a community, of providing the ministrations of the Church for those who are sick and in prison. Sickness or sin (or often both combined) have separated these our fellow-Churchmen from the congregation of the faithful. It is our bounden duty to help them, whether they be sick, or maimed, or wounded, like the traveller from Jerusalem to Jericho cared for by the Good Samaritans; or whether they be like the lost sheep wandering over the mountains and need-