

church at 8.30, are at a loss where to spend the rest of the evening. The managers of our places of amusement are wise enough to know they would not get nearly so many people together if they opened an hour earlier. Hoping this letter will provoke discussion.

A CHURCHWOMAN.

The Real Presence.

SIR,—Without waiting for Mr. Whatham's reply, may I be allowed to say that, while definitely rejecting the first interpretation of our Lord's Words, most Catholics will accept neither of the other two absolutely. We maintain a Real Presence, to which worship may be properly directed on account of its reality, without asserting more than that it conveys to our souls the life of the Lord Jesus Christ and a real union with His Blessed Body. When "Ivy" can tell us how the surrendered life of vegetables and animals nourishes our bodily life, it will be time to define the method in which the surrendered life of the Crucified nourishes our souls. In the meantime, I am content to say, with good Queen Bess,

His was the word that spake it,
He took the bread and brake it,
And what His Word doth make it,
That I believe and take it.

A. P. COE.

Inadvertent Statements.

SIR,—It is a matter of regret when well-meaning men make inadvertent statements at variance with facts. Two such appeared in your columns recently. "Churchman" is mistaken when he says that His Grace of Ontario distinctly told Mr. Gibson that "he would not ordain him if he went to Wycliffe College." That pest-hole of conspiracy and false doctrine was never mentioned, except by Mr. Snowden. The Archbishop gave the choice of Trinity or Lennoxville, but wisely ignored Wycliffe. When Wycliffe was mentioned he only said, "I adhere to my former conditions." The other mistake is made by "Rector." Surely whatever rights the Archbishop possesses in regard to choosing his seat either at Ottawa or Kingston, would be voided directly an election of a new Bishop had taken place. If not, the new diocese would elect a Bishop for the old one, which would be unjust and absurd. I suppose the division will be complete when the Synod of the new diocese is first summoned. The Archbishop would then have it in his power to announce that he intended to take his seat at Ottawa, and the old diocese, being thus vacated, it would have to elect. But by allowing election to proceed in the new diocese, the Archbishop would surrender his right to choose. This, at least, is my reading of the canons.

CANONUM STUDIOUS.

Rev. John De Soyres' False Statements.

SIR,—Some one has been good enough to send me a copy of a brochure, by the Rev. John De Soyres, reviewing the Rev. Vernon Staley's well-known manual of the "Catholic Religion." I do not feel called upon to say anything just now about the book in question, nor do I desire to criticize Mr. De Soyres' "examination" of it. But I will ask your permission to say a few words respecting a personal matter which Mr. De Soyres has quite gratuitously dragged into his pamphlet. On the first page of his review I find the following statement: "The book was placed, we are told, by the Bishop of Quebec in the local Book Depository, and only removed upon the earnest protest of the cathedral congregation. No other Bishop, so far as we are aware, has given it his official sanction." Permit me to say that there is not a shadow of foundation in fact for these statements respecting the Bishop of Quebec or for any one of them. It amazes me that a clergyman of Mr. De Soyres' standing should have thought it his duty to make them without first taking steps to ascertain how the facts stood. And I am still more amazed that Mr. De Soyres should think it fair or conformable to the instincts of a gentleman to strike in this needless way at a Bishop of the Church, who by his very position is almost of necessity precluded from striking back. The strangest thing of all is that these tactics are supposed to help on the cause of Evangelical religion.

HENRY ROE, D.D., Archdeacon of Quebec.
Windsor Mills, P.Q., April 17, 1895.

Justice to Rome.

SIR,—I cannot see why anyone should hesitate in allowing every claim which the Church of Rome can lawfully make in regard to the founding of the Church in England. Neither can I see that it appears humiliating to admit the debt we owe to her. She was then a pure, as well as Apostolic branch of the Catholic Church, and the most important See of the West. The errors which have since crept in and separated her from us had not then even been

thought of. Three separate and distinct missions were sent to England by the Bishop of Rome. The first, that of St. Augustine, which for a while promised to spread over the greater part of England, but in the end was driven back, and succeeded in permanently evangelizing only Kent. The second, that of Bisinus, who evangelized Wessex. The third, that of Felix, who, though belonging to the Gallican Church, went to England by permission of the Bishop of Rome, and who evangelized East Anglia. The rest of England owed its Christianity to the old British Church, through its Irish daughter. Then, in regard to the succession of our Orders: the British missionaries brought with them their orders, so that undoubtedly the British Church is one source of our orders. St. Augustine was consecrated Bishop by the Bishop of Arles, making the Gallican Church another source of our orders. Lastly, by the consecration of Theodore as Archbishop of Canterbury by the Bishop of Rome in 668, the Roman succession was mingled with the others in the English orders. Still, though the Roman succession did not touch ours until this late date, we in reality owe more to it than to either of the others—in the first place, because the British succession was from this out looked on with more or less suspicion. Secondly, on account of the introduction of fresh strains of the Roman succession from time to time down to the time of the Reformation. Another debt we owe to the Church at Rome is our organization into a national Church. The division into the two provinces of Canterbury and York was the suggestion of the Bishop of Rome, and it was Theodore, Bishop of Canterbury, who organized the Church in England into one whole. Thus we owe much to the old British Church, and more to the See of Rome. But, as F. J. B. Allnatt says, that does not affect our position in strictly maintaining that such a debt does not imply the right of permanent jurisdiction over us. We have nothing to be afraid of in acknowledging our debts, while we injure ourselves in trying to repudiate them. Moreover, Swift says: "He that calls a man ungrateful sums up all the evil that a man can be guilty of." Surely we don't want to come under such a charge!

W. J. CREIGHTON.

Lex's Vagaries about Endowed Rectories.

SIR,—I attended a vestry meeting at which one of our sensible men asked another, "Have you seen an article in the CANADIAN CHURCHMAN, by Lex?" "I have," was the reply. "Lex regards the retaining of endowments in parishes as a robbing of God, and a stealing from God, and yet immediately advocates what is far more really and truly this very robbing and stealing, by taking away from those parishes the endowments in money which pious parishioners had devoted to the service of God in such parishes for all time to come." "Yes," said another, "Lex would rob Peter to pay Paul." Lex declares that if the endowments were taken away from the rectories, and placed under the control of the Diocesan Synod, the most happy results would follow; the Mission Board would have the much needed funds; the endowments would form the back-bone of all the other funds; a liberal fund would be provided for aged and infirm clergy; and new life and happiness would be brought to many a hard-working missionary. And, more than that, our churches would be filled, and a new era of Church-life and prosperity would be introduced; and all this very desirable and wonderful change for the better simply by disendowing the rectories. If so, if such blessed effects are sure to follow, then by all means let them be disendowed, and the sooner the better. But let us look first at sober facts. In the *Journal of Proceedings* of last year's Synod of Niagara is a record of the revenues of all the endowed rectories and churches—seven or eight in all. The united incomes accruing to the rectories, or other incumbents, amount to an enormous sum, a perfect bonanza; in fact, something over \$800! Only think of it! Over \$800! What a back-bone that is for all the other funds of the diocese! Now, divide the \$800 among the twenty missionaries and see what a prodigious change for the better must at once result in the financial condition of our poor hard-working missionaries! Why, they will actually receive about \$40 a-piece! Surely these \$40 should be to them a rich and unfailing source of life and happiness! If Lex should be favoured yearly with such a bonus would he not be a happy man? But that is not all; the \$40 to each missionary will fill our empty churches! We could not at first see how Lex had gotten such an idea into his head; but we see it now, for he calls "the Mission Fund the Church's life blood." Well, that is, to me, an entirely new doctrine; and like other new doctrines in religion, is very probably false, and should not be "received or believed unless it can be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture." Then Lex speaks of "our empty churches in the centres of population." Our centres of population are such as Toronto, Hamilton, Montreal, Quebec, etc. Now, in these centres our churches are well filled already,

are growing in number, and more are needed. If there be anywhere empty churches there must be something better than the dollar "life blood" to fill them. But what that something better is, or can be, does not seem to occur to the financial mind of Lex, who values even clergymen at so many dollars a-piece—one at \$600, another at \$1,000, and another at \$1,200. Pity the Church whose ministers can be valued by dollars, or whose spiritual growth and happiness are dependent upon the "life-blood dollars." Now let us suppose that the endowments are taken away from the rectories, what will be the effect? Lex says that "he does not know of one endowed parish that is not, or should be, able to support the priest well and fitting to his position." Such a statement proves that Lex does not know much of what he is speaking; for every person acquainted with such parishes could easily mention certain, if not every one of them, that are utterly unable to do what Lex imagines them capable of accomplishing. Take away the endowment from such and they must needs become dependent on the Mission Fund; and where then is the financial advantage? Were the endowments taken away, Lex evidently thinks there would be no "sleepy priests"; and the disendowed parishes would not only become self-supporting, but aggressive in Church work, and inspired with missionary zeal. I am tolerably well acquainted, I think, with every incumbent of an endowed parish in the Diocese of Niagara. More diligent, active, faithful and wide-awake clergymen are not found in any missions or endowed parishes of the Church. When Lex writes again let him be sure of his evidence, and remember that there are even in Church life circumstances which warrant the application of the law known as *lex talionis*.

W. J. M.

Justice to Rome.

SIR,—I have to thank the Rev. W. J. Imlach for having, by his courteous rejoinder to my remarks on his letter, given me an opportunity for setting forth my views on its subject a little more clearly and explicitly than it seems I succeeded in doing at my first attempt. I am thankful for the opportunity, because I have long felt that this was a subject on which we, as English Churchmen, have been too apt to allow our predilections to warp our judgment, even to the extent of compromising our character for justice and fairness. To avoid encroaching on your space further than is absolutely necessary, I will compress the main part (so far as my own share in it is concerned) of my reply to Mr. Imlach within the compass of a few brief propositions, the proof of which my limits will not allow me to touch upon, but which are, of course, open to correction at the hands of your readers.

1. The British Church, as founded possibly in apostolic times, and as represented by delegate Bishops at the early councils, was literally stamped out by the English (or, so-called, Saxon) invasion, except in the mountain regions of the far west. Mr. Jennings says: "In this western region, therefore, was all that remained of British Christianity. Elsewhere the worship of Thor and Odin had utterly exterminated the religion of Christ."

2. This Western, British or Welsh Church, which survived in these remote regions, continued for centuries to be isolated from anything like union with England or the English Church. St. Augustine, by his arrogant behaviour, failed to win it to his allegiance, and the alienation continued under his successors.

3. Hence it came about that on Augustine's arrival in this island there were no Bishops in England, except the Frenchman Luidhard, Queen Bertha's private chaplain, and no Bishops "of England" at all.

4. The Church of England, then, the Church which has come down to us as our beloved mother, was, in 597, yet to be founded. Who founded it? The honour of the great work of converting the English must rest between the Irish or Scotio Mission from Hy on the north and the Roman or Canterbury Mission on the south—the latter being, at all events (so far as records have come to us), the first in the field. On the controversy as to the share belonging to each in this work, time and space forbid me to enter. One thing, however, is clear—namely, that as the Roman Mission was the first in the field, so, when the final settlement arrived, we find the Roman Mission, with its complete array of hierarchy, in possession of the field. And it is to the Roman Mission that we habitually trace the succession of our Bishops. Mr. Imlach asks for testimony from Church historians. Let me refer him to the recent work of Canon Bright, Regius Professor of Church History at Oxford, "Waymarks of Church History": "We may confidently say, with the late Professor Freeman, that it is contrary to all historical fact to speak of the ancient British Church as something out of which the Church of England grew. It is equally unhistorical, we may add, to speak of the Welsh Episcopate as the 'fountain' of the English"