

to the new Bishops for the missionary jurisdictions of the P. E. Church in the United States that "It may be that one reason for the high personal and official status of our Missionary Episcopal bench is that those Bishops are elected by BISHOPS. It has often been observed that the men chosen by the House of Bishops have been superior to the average of those selected by a mixed convention of clerics and laics."

[This would seem to be a practical illustration of the unwisdom of the elections as we have them in this Canada of ours. Another argument in favor of this plan is that it would prevent the elected Bishop becoming the virtual slave of the men of his party who may have been most active in furthering his election. Such slavery is not, we fear, an unknown thing.]

The Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette thus speaks of the Archbishop of Dublin's action in attending the "Christian Convention," a body of the same class, we believe, as the Evangelical Alliance:—

We wish we could view with equal equanimity the action which His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin has thought good to take again this year in patronizing the "Christian Convention" in Abbey street, and presiding at one of its meetings. We know His Grace will not think the less of us if we honestly declare, speaking as we know we do for a large number of the Clergy of the Church of Ireland, that we believe His Grace's example to be injurious to those interests of the Church of Ireland which he would cherish and defend. In the eyes of many it is an ecclesiastical irregularity which must put His Grace in a difficult position if called on at any time to rebuke irregularities in any of his clergy. It is hard to draw the line between the "Convention" and any Dissenting place of worship, and difficult to see the grounds on which consistently with His Grace's appearance at the Convention he could censure those of his clergy who chose to preach in a Baptist or Wesleyan chapel, or invited their minister to preach in his church. Toleration is a good thing, but Church principles are also sacred. We have received several letters on the subject, which we cannot see our way to print, but we may say that one Clergyman of moderate Church opinions in the city asks a pertinent question—How can he keep his people from wandering off to dissenting places of worship when the example of the Archbishop is pointed at?

The English Churchman (London, Eng.), one of the organs of the Extreme Evangelical School, has the following wail as to the effect of Church Congresses on its party:—

But what is the effect upon Evangelical men? The question scarcely needs an answer, but we must notice the papers and speeches of the Bishop of Rochester and the Bishop of Exeter, who were once accepted as Evangelical teachers. Their Lordships have certainly recommended new means, and have learned to find satisfaction in surpliced choirs, daily services, beautified churches and a Gospel of a somewhat sacramentarian type. Are we so blind as not to perceive the change which has taken place, and the approximation of such men to the typical High Churchman?

CORRESPONDENCE.

[The name of Correspondent must in all cases be enclosed with letter, but will not be published unless desired. The Editor will not hold himself responsible, however, for any opinions expressed by Correspondents.]

MULTIPLYING PAPERS.

To the Editor of THE CHURCH GUARDIAN:

DEAR SIR,—“Presbyter,” in your paper of 17th, says well, “It is a mistake to direct from

the columns of the CHURCH GUARDIAN any Church news.” A few may say the CHURCH GUARDIAN is “too high,” a few others “not high enough,” again another few, “It is not the paper Canada should have.” But I boldly assert and the general opinion is that for parish use it is the best paper we ever had, and so impartial that high, low, broad or deep, will not have their contributions declined; and if we want a larger paper for church people, let us increase its circulation and then the proprietor will be able to afford to make the CHURCH GUARDIAN larger. Nothing will increase its popularity more than local items, and every parish and mission should have a correspondent, clerical or lay; let such not be afraid of being thought egotistical, but send their baptisms, their marriages, their burials, etc. Parishioners will value the paper and keep the numbers that contain portions of their family record. I find it so.

D. C. M.

To the Editor of the CHURCH GUARDIAN:

SIR,—I have just read a letter signed “Churchman” in your issue of the 10th inst. which, in my humble opinion, has many good points in it, but there is one thing about it which puzzles me, and seems to spoil almost the whole production.

Your correspondent uses such expressions as “All good Churchmen,” “the Church,” “the Church at large,” “one Church as a whole,” “our Dominion Church,” “an offshoot of our Apostolic Church of England,” “the Mother Church,” and so on, all very good and all very well in their way; and if one found any such expressions the conclusion would certainly be that the writer is not only a Churchman, but a good Churchman.

But the writer seems to strive, without any apparent good reason, to burden the United Dominion Church, an offshoot of the Apostolic Church of England, with a thorough-going sectarian name. This member of the Auxiliary, Canadian, Episcopal Church Association would do certain things to place the Episcopal Church of the Dominion in the front rank among Christian Bodies. Now, Sir, if the religious Body to which he refers is really an offshoot of the Apostolic Church of England, she is not also the Episcopal Church of the Dominion. Your correspondent must know that there was but one Church known to Scripture and ancient times; and so if the Body referred to be “an ancient and Scriptural Church,” it is simply a branch of that one Church—the Church.

And if it be such, why seek to saddle it with a name which would represent it to the world as a modern sect? Why not name it after the manner of Scriptural and ancient times, where in the titles simply denoted local Branches of the one Church? I find such titles as “the Church of Ephesus,” “the Church in Sardis,” “the Church of the Cretians,” “the Church of Rome,” “the Church of God which is at Corinth,” etc. The only Apostolic Churches that ever adopted modern sectarian names did so under pressure and in very trying times; but already, as far as this Branch is concerned, there is a wide-spread and growing desire to get rid of one misleading sectarian name. If it is right to learn from an enemy how much more from a friend and sister. Let me say, then, to my brethren across the border, Profit by our mistake, avoid it, and countenance the use of nothing but a SCRIPTURAL title—such a simple one as has been proposed—“THE CHURCH OF CANADA.”

I remain a Member of the P. E. C. in the U. S. A., commonly called an AMERICAN CHURCHMAN.

ST. JOHN'S MISSION, }
MADOC, Ont., Nov. 24th, 1886. }

SIR,—May I call attention to my advertisement for Lay Readers—unless I can get one I must drop four stations out of six, and lose all that has been gained for the Church. Are there

no young men who wish to work for the Church. We hold a Mission in January, I dread its date without any help. Yours, &c.,
VEN. ARCH. DAYKIN.

CHANGE OF NAME.

SIR,—The changing of the long established name of a Church, however, incongruous or incorrect that name may be, is a thing not to be done hastily, nor until a large majority of the members of such Church have learned to deem a change advisable and to acquiesce in it cheerfully. But “change of name,” both in the American and the Canadian Church is “in the air,” and is a question which, once raised, will never rest, until some change is made. “Protestant Episcopal” and “The Church of England and Ireland in Canada” are names which cannot be permanent among Christians who daily say “I believe in . . . the Holy Catholic Church.” It will be well, therefore, during the long vacation between the triennial meetings of our greater synods to discuss the question, and to draw forth what there is to be said either for or against a change.

Perhaps the greatest difficulty in the matter is not so much in making a change as in deciding or agreeing upon the new name which shall be substituted for the old. While it is most important, in fact imperative that the new name shall not be, in the smallest degree, sectarian, it is, on the other hand, very undesirable that it should be pretentious or unjustifiable. Thus “The Catholic Church of America” or of Canada, assumes in an ecclesiastical sense, what our branch of the Church is not, at present; and savours of the arrogance of our Roman brethren who love, notwithstanding their correct and proper title, to swagger as “the Catholics.” On the other hand “The American Church” or “The Canadian Church” assumes, in a national sense, what our branch of the Church is not, as yet. But “The American Catholic Church” and “The Canadian Catholic Church” are names which seem to meet every requirement of Catholicity, while they intrude upon the nomenclature of none of the churches of Christendom. Neither the Presbyterians, the Methodists, the Baptists, the Congregationalists nor any of the smaller sects can complain of our assuming a name which they have deliberately abandoned, while the Roman Catholics have set us the example by adopting and quite recently deciding to adhere to a name which describes what they should be, but are not content to be, a national Church. And here, we arrive at a point of the utmost importance. We all desire to protest, emphatically to protest against the unwarrantable usurpation of the Church and Bishop of Rome. In the zeal of this desire some are terribly afraid to drop the word “Protestant.” But acts are better than words. It is better to be brave or noble than to call oneself “a brave” or “a noble.” It is better to protest by act than to call oneself “a Protestant.” And so, if we wish to maintain the national, as against the Papal idea of the Church, it is far better to adopt national as against such quasi-sectarian names as “Protestant Episcopal” and even “Church of England and Ireland in Canada.” It may be hoped that in the Mother-Country the somewhat questionable titles of “Church of England,” “Church of Ireland,” “Church of Scotland” will in time disappear. If we could have the English, the Irish, the Scottish, the African, the Australian, the New Zealand, the Indian, the American, the Canadian Catholic Church we should girdle the earth with a protest against the arrogant claims of Rome on the one hand, infinitely stronger than calling ourselves “Protestants” in every clime; and on the other hand forming a new bond of union, calculated not only to draw us closer together ourselves, but to induce those separated from us, as Protestants, to return to the fold.

LAY DELEGATE.