

near over
us of our
an senti
useful to
icit their
depart.

rs that
ishop of
yer for
e in the
united
ing to
Queen's
ght like
r Land
of the

ham.

ing com-
ement"
Church.
yet it
respon-
tracts,
lowness
neaning
extract
who is
he has
come a
school
ad very
Wesley,
ntle on
e cold.
as like
nd the
valley,
ligious
ad wel-
chan-
went to
at had
e voice
e these
O Lord
aw the
g of the
er, and
d stood
verthe-
power
different
political
spring,
a life of
as of
th the
e High
nd with
Tenny-
of the
and its
Church
C.

ees.

writing
Prayer
atter, I
ting his
is just
ster as
angels
ugh, no
t.S. did
tainain
Prayer
cipline
ved and
rticles."
quoted,
l which
r, as it
at the
iocesan
ue as it
of Eng-
ommon
faithful
r Scrip-
ger ex-

ist. But a still further and canonical declaration and legalization exists in this Province of Canada in Canon XIII., which provides that "No alteration or addition shall be made in any part of the Prayer Book, or in the use of the authorized version, unless enacted by one session of the Provincial Synod and confirmed by two-thirds of the House of Bishops and two thirds of each order of the Lower House, with the exception of alterations and additions made by the English convocations and authorized by Parliament, may be accepted for use by one session only without confirmation. Inasmuch as every clergyman has also signed the Declaration of Assent to "the Book of Common Prayer and the ordering of Bishops, priests and deacons," and has thereby promised "in public prayers and administration of the sacraments" to "use the form in the said book prescribed," and has also subscribed to and declared his assent and submission to both provincial and diocesan canons—the evidence of the binding force of the whole Prayer Book, at least within this province, appears to me overwhelming.

CANONUM STUDIOUS.

Separate Schools.

SIR,—In the CANADIAN CHURCHMAN of March 28th last your criticisms under the above heading are to the point. I quite agree with your statement, "Not only are children denied the blessing of definite religious teaching, but they are compelled to read and to be taught things positively untrue and unjust to the position of the Church." Far better for the Church if there was no religion taught in the State schools, than this watered-down State Christianity, which inculcates the idea that all definite Christian teaching is bigotry, unsuited for this progressive age. The latitudinarianism imbibed from the State schools' religious teaching is as incompatible with the doctrines and usages of our Church as it is to the Roman branch of the Catholic Church. The advocates of this socialistic education contend that definite religion can be learned at home or at the Sunday school. I admit that that is possible, but not probable, except in the case of the child of the rich or well-informed parent who can counteract the specious indefinite State religion that environs the child for five days in the week. But with the great majority of the children of the poor and careless, it is safe to say that home or Sunday-school teaching avails but little. As a rule, our clergy do not teach Church history in the Sunday-school, or in any way explain to the young people the distinctive doctrines of the English branch of the Catholic Church. Consequently they grow up to believe what the State religion teaches in the State schools, that the Church of England only dates from Henry the Eighth. Our Church rulers should not have permitted this falsification of Church history without a protest, thereby strengthening the claim of the Roman Church that she is the only Catholic Church, and also tacitly admitting that the Church of England is merely one of the sects. The supineness of our clergy in not defending in the past "the God-given right and duty of parents in having their children taught the truth as they believe it," is now plainly visible in this province, where, in rural parishes, the Church is being wiped out, as the old members are superseded by the young, trained to believe that one Church is as good as another; and the Churchmen of Manitoba, in abetting State schools, are practically providing for the gradual extinction of the Church, except as an exotic which requires a town for its existence. I quote from the Montreal Witness of April 6th: "We have always been ranged against State Churchism, and resent every remnant of it as an infringement of a man's inalienable liberties. The individual's right to think for himself and his family is touched by a State school system" (the italics are mine). The Witness is right in classing State schoolism the same as State Churchism, but, as a matter of fact, it is far worse, as the latter does not encroach on parental rights, which the former does. A State Church is not called a Free Church because the land is burdened by taxation for its support. A State school is called a Free school because the land is burdened by taxation for its support.

ANGLICAN.

Do the Priests' Break Their Vows?

SIR,—In reading over the order for admitting men to the priesthood one is struck with the following condition: "Will you give your faithful diligence so to administer the discipline of Christ as the Church has received the same?" Each priest has registered his vow, "I will do so, the Lord being my helper." What must be the moral character of those who regularly break that vow by going to parlours of private houses and hotels for the solemnization of matrimony? What is the moral character of advice from a Father in God to please the people? What is the moral character of such a speech as this: "My custom is to do as the people wish"? "My custom," instead of, "The discipline of the Church." "My custom," by choice of self-will, in-

stead of "the discipline of the Church, by oath before God." Truly, "This people draw nigh to Me with their lips, but their hearts are far from Me." Why does the Bishop ask such a question, only to turn round and advise the soul to break the oath just taken? We ought to have a new office in the Prayer Book with this question left out, and one inserted to save the truthfulness of men-pleasers: "Will you use faithful diligence to please the people, and administer the sacraments according to the commands of your congregation?" Again, "Will you exercise your ministry to glorify yourself and become popular, to the edification of your own house and personal estate?" The present office for marriage also be changed to suit the hard-hearted and stubborn—"The form of the Mummery of Marriage"—Rubric: "At the day appointed for the Mummery of Matrimony the persons to be married may be in the parlour of a private house or hotel, and the priest shall be there and take great heed not to keep the bride too long on the floor and from the dancing." Then we might expect the Church (sic) to prosper, especially in country missions. Reformation on the same line should be carried out in other offices, to the great comfort and relief of many guilty consciences. And in carrying out this line to just termination, we should accomplish quickly and easily the consummation now costing much prayer and labour—for the line would encircle Jews, Turks, heretics, heathens, schismatics and all their relations in one grand embrace of charity—that wondrous virtue so often used to cloak a multitude of sins and whitewash putrifying sores of moral corruption.

S. D.

Do Without the Mission Grant.

SIR,—It is a disgrace and a shame for wealthy mission congregations to go on for thirty or forty years as fixtures on the Mission Fund. How can they be content to act year by year like paupers asking support from their neighbours? Where does the fault lie? Partly in the smallness and lack of spirit of the people, partly in the laziness of the churchwardens and partly in the timidity and lack of faith of the clergyman. Nor are they altogether to blame. There ought to be better legislation in our synods. Grants should be given to those old standing missions on a sliding scale, with the agreed understanding that the congregations increase their payments to clergymen to correspond with the periodical reductions of the mission grant. As it is, mission congregations look upon the yearly grant as an endowment, and all parties from the clergyman down, taught by a long-continued grant, are aghast at the prospect of doing without it. The clergyman is afraid he will starve, the churchwardens are afraid they can never support the clergyman, and the congregation are afraid they will be obliged to mortgage their properties. What kind of a puny faith have our country congregations? The mission grant positively becomes an incubus. Its real object is frustrated. Brothers, let us be alive to all this. We see three missions lately becoming self-supporting, Eganville in Ontario Diocese, and Arthur and Drayton in Niagara Diocese. Ask any of these clergymen if he regrets the grant is withdrawn. One at any rate will tell you he thanks God he has been enabled to take the proper stand. "Brothers, we are treading where the saints have trod." On the other hand, shall these words deter contributors or likely contributors to the Mission Funds? God forbid. The Mission Fund must open up new fields and increase the number of clergymen. Forward march! Let the Canadian Church arise in the might of her Incarnate Lord and it shall be a triumphant missionary march. "I thirst," saith One on His sacred cross. He thirsts for what we Canadians say, and the answer comes like lightning from heaven itself, "for Canadian souls who are dying, dying, dying."

H. J. LEAKE.

Drayton, May 15th, 1895.

A Rector's Views of Bishop Lightfoot.

We publish this letter at the request of the members of the Deanery of Lennox and Addington:

SIR,—A recent issue of a contemporary contained a declaration of the Churchman's Union, which was concluded with two quotations from the late great Bishop Lightfoot. The first is as follows:

"If the facts do not allow us to unchurch other Christian communities differently organized, they may at least justify our jealous adhesion to a polity derived from this source—then, in parenthesis, as explaining 'this source,' I presume—"Apostolic direction" . . . to which is further added—"If therefore we are wrong, we are content to go wrong with Bishop Lightfoot."

It is not the first time that I have seen this quotation made in your valuable paper as seeming to prove that Bishop Lightfoot did not regard Episcopacy as of the "esse" of the Church, and I venture, therefore, to ask you kindly to add to what the before mentioned "Declaration" has already quoted, some

further extracts in regard to which, I would use the C. K.'s words that "If Bishop Lightfoot is wrong I am content to go wrong with Bishop Lightfoot," because it is a poor cause, whatever it may be, that will not bear to have everything possible said against it, and still be able to carry conviction.

I. Now, the first quotation is from page 232, ed. 1, of his "Essay on the Christian Ministry (p. 234 later ed.).

"It has been said that the institution of an Episcopate must be placed as far back as the closing years of the first century, and that it cannot, without violence to historical testimony, be dissociated from the name of St. John."

II. On page 265, ed. 1 (page 257 later ed.), we have the quotation referred to in the "Declaration" of the C. U.; but let us add the context:

"If the preceding investigation be substantially correct, the three-fold ministry may be traced to Apostolic direction; and short of an express statement, we can possess no better assurance of a Divine appointment, or at least a Divine sanction." Then the following words occur "If the facts, etc."

In his "Preface to the 6th Edition of the Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians," he says, after affirming that he had found the seven short Greek letters of St. Ignatius to be genuine:

While disclaiming any change in my opinions, I desire equally to disclaim the representations of those opinions which have been put forward in some quarters. The object of the Essay was an investigation into the origin of the Christian ministry. The result has been a confirmation of the statement in the English Ordinal: "It is evident unto all men reading the Holy Scriptures and ancient authors, that, from the Apostles' time, there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church, bishops, priests, and deacons." "But I was scrupulously anxious not to overstate the evidence in any case, and it would seem that partial and qualifying statements, prompted by this anxiety, have assumed undue proportions in the minds of some readers who have emphasized them, to the neglect of the general drift of the essay."

III. On October 10, 1882, the learned Bishop preached in St. Mary's Church, Glasgow, before the Representative Council of the Scottish Episcopal Church. Here is an extract from his sermon:

"While you seek unity among yourselves, you will pray likewise that unity may be restored to your Presbyterian brothers. Not insensible to the special blessings which you yourselves enjoy, clinging tenaciously to the three fold ministry as the completeness of the Apostolic ordinance and the historic backbone of the Church, valuing highly all those sanctities of the liturgical office and ecclesiastical season, which, modified from age to age, you have inherited from an almost immemorial past, thanking God, but not thanking Him in any pharisaic spirit, that these, so many and great privileges, are continued to you which others have lost, you will, nevertheless, shrink as from the venom of a serpent's fang, from any mean desire that their division may be perpetuated in the hope of profiting by their troubles. 'Divide et impera' may be a shrewd worldly motto, but coming in contact with spiritual things, it defiles them like pitch. 'Pacifica et impera' is the true watchword of the Christian and the Churchman."

IV. In accordance with the opinion thus variously and repeatedly expressed, we have equally strong assertions in his "Epistles of St. Ignatius," Vol. I. pp. 376 and 377 (1885), but they would require too much of your valuable space to state here. I pass on to

V. The Bishop's sermon before the Church Congress at Wolverhampton, October 8, 1887. Speaking of the isolation of the Church of England on the one hand from the Church of Rome, and, on the other, the Reformed churches of other countries, he says:

"Is she to be blamed because she retained a form of church government which had been handed down in unbroken continuity from the Apostolic times; and thus a line was drawn between her and the Reformed churches of other countries . . . ?"

VI. At the Durham Diocesan Conference, October, 1887, in his inaugural address, referring to the same subject, His Lordship says:

"When I speak of her religious position, I refer alike to polity and doctrine She has retained the form of church government inherited from the Apostolic times She has remained steadfast in the faith of Nicæa. It was this two-fold inheritance of doctrine and polity which I had in view when I spoke of the essentials which could, under no circumstances, be abandoned. Beyond this it seems to me that large concessions might be made. Unity is not uniformity On the other hand, it would be very short-sighted policy—even if it were not traitorous to the truth to transfer with essentials and thus imperil our mediatorial vantage ground, for the sake of snatching an immediate increase of numbers."

VII. Once more—in his address on the re-opening of the Chapel, Auckland Castle, August 1, 1886, his Lordship's words were these:

"We cannot afford to sacrifice any portion of the faith once delivered to the Saints; we cannot surren-