

stronger than he: also provided with formidable tasks, horns, teeth and claws. Yet the command he is to rule over and subdue them. Now, the Scripture tells us that man was wise above all the creatures God had made. We are told that wisdom is the pupil of experience. The first man certainly had not experience as a teacher. Could he have appeared on the earth otherwise than as a matured and fully-developed animal, led and taught by his Creator till such time as he could care for himself? Nor may we suppose that he would be left entirely without subsequent care and teaching. Note, also, that this race is always associated with the serpent, which has always been the emblem of wisdom. In my next paper I purpose taking an advanced position, as shown in the remaining chapters of Genesis.

BELIEVER.

THE PRAYER FOR THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL.

Sir,—Whoever composed this prayer must have been an Erastian, consciously or unconsciously, of the worst type, for in it we are made to pray that "he (the Governor-General) may use his delegated power to Thy glory, to the public good, and to the advancement of his own salvation!" In the Diocese of Huron, and perhaps in some other dioceses, this last clause has been wisely eliminated from the prayer, and ought to be everywhere, for the absurdity is potent to almost everyone. Those who have reconciled themselves to its use, could only do so by some subtle process of ratiocination, by which a meaning is extracted from it which is not on the face of it. The plain sense of the passage as it stands, is that by Divine Grace the Governor-General may be empowered through the Queen's commission to save his soul. Bathos could go no further. What, of course, was meant to be said, was that "he may faithfully and wisely use his delegated power so that he may not, through failure of duty, endanger or fall short of his salvation." It is, no doubt, the sins of unfaithfulness, rashness, and folly in a Governor-General that are deprecated in this prayer, and this ought to be set forth in the prayer exactly, so as not to distract men's minds by an absurdity in the prayers, and so cause them to make reflections other than devotional. This communication is not meant in a captious spirit, but is intended to direct the minds of those in authority to a widespread agreement with the objection herein made, in the hope that steps may be taken to have the prayer remodelled, or, at any rate, to get the omission of the objectionable clause duly authorized.

OBSERVER.

BISHOPS SHOULD LIVE ON THE FREE-WILL OFFERINGS.

Sir,—From the standpoint of an "Observer" one is generally supposed to be able to take a calm, dispassionate view of a question, but perhaps the person so designating himself in a late issue of The Churchman does not consider there is much in a name. After such phrases as "Chuck full of humour," "slapped at your head," "gorging himself with mud pies," "generous laity have kicked them out," etc., the criticism of Mr. Armstrong's English is amusing. But the really funny part is about the wisdom of Bishops. After informing us "they are as wise, or nearly as wise as Mr. Armstrong," also that "the Canadian Church has for years been struggling to get the best men for Bishops," he actually asserts that "the Bishop who ordained Mr. Armstrong has much to answer for." Surely it might have penetrated even the head of a mere looker-on, that perhaps the Bishop was as wise, or nearly as wise as Mr. "Observer." However, the question at issue is often lost sight of in this kind of criticism. That question is, whether Bishops would not get on as well, and the Church a great deal better, if they lived, as many clergy do, on free-will offerings, instead of large endowments. Work which might be carried on is at a standstill because of this waiting for large endowments. "Observer" has apparently two objections. First, endowments enable Bishops to speak their minds. Did anyone ever hear a Bishop, endowed or other-

wise, speak his mind, except perhaps, some poor curate. The oracle at Delphi was never more careful in its pronouncements than our modern Bishops. Not that it matters very much; they have other useful occupations. The second objection springs from the "all-abounding godlessness of the laity." There should be good work for a chapter of the St. Andrew's Brotherhood where "Observer" has met this experience. If it be true it is an argument for an immediate extension of the episcopate, and an aggressive forward movement of the whole Church. Let me repeat, if the work of the Church had depended in the beginning, as it is largely made to depend now, on the raising of big endowments, it would have made as little progress then as it does now. Our Bishops may be wise, far-seeing, careful; our grey-headed clergy may have been toiling for Christ, while we were gorging ourselves with mud pies, but if they confess "the godlessness of the laity is all abounding," it is a confession of failure, and we cannot be blamed for wanting to try some different methods. We want more Bishops, we want better discipline, we want constant visitation, to confirm what has been built up, and we want the right men. In this, as in other affairs of life, other issues hide the great one at stake. A man may have served long, have an income of his own, be a suitable Churchman, have relations of influence, be an ornament to the House of Bishops, and yet care for none of the things which extend the Church's influence. But if a man has learnt to rule his own house well, will take care of the Church of God, has a good report from them which are without, and will be in very truth a father-in-God to the younger clergy, preventing the wheels of their enthusiasm carrying them to ruin, he will as willingly live on the free-will offerings of those who have learnt to love his character and high-mindedness, as on the largest endowment that could be raised.

JAIRUS.

ON WHAT SHOULD BISHOPS LIVE?

Sir,—St. Paul says: "Let him that is taught in the word communicate unto him that teacheth in all good things," and, "They which preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel." This is the position "Jairus" takes at the head of his letter, and I do not see how it can be seriously wrong. I did put his position in the form of a question, so that it might be left the more open for discussion. By reading his letter through, I do not find him opposed to anything but large endowments. In our weak country parishes the offerings of the people have to be augmented to the amount of two or three hundred dollars to make livings for the incumbents. This may be said to pay them for attending to the poor, and the careless. Should most parishes have similar small endowments, such would be good for them, for they would not be sufficient to make the wrong kind of men either seek or retain the positions, and they could give the more liberally for work outside. I believe the episcopate should be similarly endowed, and that large endowments are as much a mistake there as they are in parishes. An endowment, that would yield about a thousand dollars to the Bishop's stipend ought to be sufficient in a place like Saskatchewan. This would leave him living "for the most part" on the free-will offerings of the people, as they would need to make up about twice that amount; and he would not be deprived of his share of the "good things." Let us compare with Holy Scripture the position of those who insist on the large endowments. Christ says: "If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed," etc. They substitute: "If ye have \$40,000 endowment," and until that is in hand no mountain, or even tree, can be removed. And the Holy Ghost saith: "If a man desire the office of a Bishop, he desireth a good work;" they say that he desireth a certain large endowment, or that he must have it whether he desires it or not. I will now take up and answer the criticisms of your unknown correspondent. The effort to place me in antagonism to our good Bishops, either individually or collectively, is very unfair. Nor have I said anything against the endowment of any of their sees. Some of them made noble sacrifices in becoming Bishops. It is the principle of mak-

ing the matter of money the sole consideration, in the extension of the episcopate, that I contend against. The Episcopal Church, in the United States, may get credit for knowing something, and it acts differently. There is a widespread error that the clergy must be very different from the laity. But as this great difference does not exist in reality, the deception is often kept up by cant. The same error would make a yawning chasm between the priest and the Bishop. This great chasm is not merely imaginary in our Church in the Old Country. And in the Roman Church, what a difference exists between a common priest and "the Bishop of Rome." I said, in opposition to all this, and much more: "Human nature in Bishops is not very different from what it is in priests." And so, if the Church would choose for Bishop any clergyman who was before conspicuous, merely because he had a well-endowed parish, it would not find him doing much better in the higher office, and on the other hand, the man whose work as a priest is blessed of God, will not be likely to fail as a Bishop. The whole ministry exists for the Church, and not the Church for the ministry. Our own printing in this diocese is not so near perfection that any of us need make such a fuss, because a printer in your office, to whom we pay nothing, made the mistake of omitting the final "s" from the word "Bishops." So much for my syntax, and the rest. Then I am called to account for using the word "choose";—let us see with how much reason. In the Ember weeks we pray that we may "faithfully and wisely make choice of fit persons to serve in the sacred ministry." In the Bishop's oath of obedience, we find: "I, N. chosen Bishop," and in the prayer following reference is made to Christ continuing "the whole night in prayer, before He did choose and send forth His twelve Apostles." I could have used the word "elect," but not so well. This word is degraded in politics, and also in the Huron Synod, where it is associated with italics, tickets, and teas. The vast majority of your readers know that Bishops are chosen from the priesthood, and I believe I was right in assuming so much. I think our own beloved Bishop, who twice ordained me, need not be deprived of even "boldness in the day of judgment," on that account. As to what is "intelligible English," very much depends on who is judge. The less your correspondent says about the spirit of any communication the better; and spirit is a very difficult thing to handle. If "playing to the galleries" means looking after the interests of the common people, I am guilty of the charge. And let me say, that the Christianity which ignores them is not that of Christ, for "the common people heard Him gladly." Some clergymen are unfortunately "kicked out," but in this respect they fare no worse than did Christ and His Apostles. Some make deliverances, and keep out of sight, others cease to deliver for various reasons; but it will take more than this deliverance from some great unknown, including his bad advice to a good Bishop, and a few sneers and jeers from others, to consign me to the abyss. Armstrong is an old and honourable name. It is not unknown in literature and the learned professions. There are Armstrong guns, and I know no valid reason why there may not be also "Armstrong Bishops." There are many generous laymen in the Church, and they often pay well for all they get. The Diocese of Toronto can well raise a few hundred dollars for its Widows' and Orphans' Fund. Only some of the congregations therein are to blame. That diocese has too much centralization. When a man's blood does not freely circulate to his hands and his feet, what wonder if he be a cripple? The extension of the Episcopate would be the increasing of a counter-acting force, and therefore it is to be desired. If the Church, there and elsewhere, is to expect God's richest blessing, the best thing it can do, with regard to the clergy and their families, is to make up and pay over to the proper persons all those balances which were honestly earned, during, say, the last quarter of a century. Let justice be done, before generosity, even to new sees, be largely exercised. Sensible men should not build a house without having some reasonable prospect as to how the expense was to be met. This refers to our See House, and may also be applied to the building of expensive churches. It is not through any