

the reason for which is temporarily withheld from us, but this is not the case with duties universally obligatory. Unless we accept the doctrine of purgatory in all its length and breadth we do not see that much good can be expected to result from praying for the dead. We hope we shall be as earnest in this "duty" as Roman Catholics to say nothing of Anglicans as soon as we are satisfied of the existence of purgatory. Till then the living will monopolize our intercessions.

MODERN EVANGELISTS.

The three representatives of the "Brotherhood of the Mission of St. John the Evangelist" who recently arrived in Boston from England have been decidedly snubbed. Bishop Eastburn would have nothing to do with them, and Bishop Potter showed equal want of appreciation. If these "Evangelist Fathers," as they term themselves, strictly follow the example of the first Evangelists, their mission will consist chiefly in shaking from their sandals the dust of unthankful American cities. Meanwhile their situation is almost as ludicrous and mortifying as that of the members of the Irish Ambulance brigade on their arrival at Havre, or that of the famous commander who performed the grand exploit of marching his troops "up the hill" and then marching them down again. If the troubles of the sea have not constrained the Fathers to add to their many vows one not to re-cross the Atlantic, the wisest thing they can do is to go home at once. If they are too "High" for New York, they must be far too high for any part of this hemisphere. Even the *Church Weekly*, while affected almost to weeping by the rebuff to which "these English gentlemen" of ascetic habits have been subjected, does not see how they could have been treated with more respect. The *Weekly* heartily welcomes them, but hints not obscurely that it was exceedingly stupid of them to come. Such a conflict between truth and politeness is rare and touching.

THE GREEK CHURCH.

As if to counteract the agitation for union between the Reformed Episcopal communions and the Greek Church, the latter has recently opened a mission in New York. The Christian public have thus a good opportunity of seeing how utterly untrustworthy are the representations of those who persist in saying that there is "a great gulf" between the Eastern and Roman Churches, and only a thin partition between the former and the Anglican communion. It is astonishing how ignorant well informed people generally are respecting the doctrines and ceremonies of the Greek Church. We have seen it stated in periodicals of the highest repute that that church has no mass, does not adore the Virgin or saints, eschews pictures, etc., and that its ritual is almost as bare as that of any dissenting body. How far such representations are true our readers may learn for themselves by perusing an extract which we make from a late number of the *Episcopalian*, and which we give in another column.

CHURCH REFORM.

(No. 3)

THE LAITY.

So radical a reformer as Mr. Ryle could not be expected to refrain from condemning the present exclusion of the laity from their rightful position in the Church of England. Those of our readers who have not had opportunity of observing the working of the mother church can have no idea how complete that exclusion is; and such in reading Mr. Ryle's paper on the subject may have thought some of the reverend gentleman's statements unwarrantably strong. After a careful re- perusal of the paper we are convinced that

he has not all overstated the case. The interests of the laity are scarcely more ignored in the British Church, whose priests look down upon their flocks from a superhuman elevation, than they are in the Protestant Church of England. The laity have no place in the Convocations, the ruri-decanal synods, or any other recognized assembly. The clergyman in his cure, the bishop in his see, and the archbishop in his Province are equally independent of lay counsel and control. So far as the parish is concerned, the only laymen who officially cooperate with the clergymen are the churchwardens, whose duties are very limited, and whose influence is correspondingly small. As regards the dioceses, the Synods about which so much has been said of late have not hitherto been so constituted as fairly to represent the laity, they meet by invitation, have no responsibility, and can only deliberate. They in no sense correspond to our diocesan Synods or the conventions of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, both of which are recognized parts of the ecclesiastical machinery. We have little faith in these Synods or Congresses, except as preparing the way for reforms which are sorely needed.

There are, however, many people who view the existing state of things with a measure of satisfaction. The defects in the working of most voluntary bodies are so many, so obvious, and so ruinous that many churchmen who have no extravagant sacerdotal views prefer the present system of lay exclusion. Such will recoil with horror from the changes which Mr. Ryle thinks should be made, and which are certainly startling in their magnitude. He proposes (1) That no conclave or synod of Anglican bishops be held without the presence and assistance of the laity; (2) that no English Convocation be sanctioned without an equal representation of the laity; (3) that no Diocese be governed by a Bishop alone, without the aid of a lay Privy Council; (4) that no ruri-decanal Synod be held without the presence of the laity; (5) that no parochial clergyman attempt the management of his parish or congregation without constantly consulting the laity; (6) that no appointment to a living or cure be made without allowing the laity a voice in the matter; and, lastly, that no system of ecclesiastical discipline be sanctioned which does not give a principal place to the laity.

We do not see any urgent necessity for introducing laymen into every episcopal "conclave or Synod." It would diminish the feeling of weighty responsibility of which the chief pastors of the Church must now be sensible, without ensuring any compensating gain. We have already expressed our opinion of the expediency of constituting a lay Council in each diocese to assist the bishop. Such Councils might be serviceable to some extent so long as the dioceses are of their present dimensions, for the multifarious business which now oppresses an English bishop is enough to drive the wisest and coolest man to distraction, and may account for the alleged timidity of some prelates and the rashness of others. But a wholesale partition of dioceses is included in Mr. Ryle's scheme of reform, and if such division and subdivision as he proposes takes place the duties devolving on each incumbent of a see will be proportionately lightened. Diocesan synods, such as we have, would, we think, be in every way preferable to the "privy council" which Mr. Ryle wishes to see constituted.

If Convocation is not to be a sham and an encumbrance to the Church it can only do so by the admission of the lay element. As it is, Convocation is not regarded with confidence, with respect or even with inter-

rest. We fully agree with what Mr. Ryle has to say in its dispraise.

His suggestions with regard to a clergyman's relation to his flock are rather vague. If he proposes no more than that the former shall consult the wishes of his people, and try to ascertain their views on parochial matters by personal converse, we believe that the majority of clergymen in England do that as it is. If the difficulty of determining who would be entitled to vote were solved, the chief objection to elected parochial councils would be removed. Such councils would be disposed to think be an invaluable aid to clergymen, and efficient safeguards of the rights of parishioners.

On the vexed question of patronage we have little to say. Our experience in Canada has satisfactorily proved that, with the restrictions which are necessary under an episcopal form of Church government, it is safe and advisable to allow congregations the right of choice. How far the adoption of a plan, which so far as it has been applied here has hitherto worked satisfactorily, may be possible in the mother Church is another question, and one beset with innumerable difficulties. That the present system in England, if it may be called a system, is bad cannot be denied by the most obstinate stickler for things as they are.

TESTS.

Too great care cannot be exercised in the selection of men for the Holy Ministry. The appointment of individuals morally or mentally unfit must prove a curse to any church, however orthodox its standards, scriptural its organization, and ample its means. At the present time, when every denomination is complaining of the paucity of candidates for its pastorate, there is a strong inducement to apply less rigorous tests to those who present themselves. This inducement is seconded by the efforts of those who denounce the most reasonable tests as inquisitorial, and who would leave every man free to say and do whatsoever is right in his own eyes. Our American contemporaries have, of late, been taken up with a discussion on the questions propounded by the Evangelical Education Society to candidates for assistance from its funds. The questions to our mind seem reasonable enough, and necessary to a right administration of the fund which the society collects for a specific object. We cannot say as much for some questions to which, according to a correspondent of the *Church Witness*, applicants to the Increase of the Ministry Society are required to give a categorical answer. Imagine a modest young man attempting to frame a reply to the query, "Have you not at least ordinary talents?" The very fact of his presenting himself at all might satisfy his examiners on that point. So with the interrogatory, "Have you not pious dispositions?" Do the managers ever expect to receive a negative reply? If not why ask the question? Such questions might be proposed in a manual for self-examination prepared for the use of young men aspiring to Holy Orders, but to inflict them on actual candidates, whose interests in part depend on their reply, savours about equally of ignorance and cruelty.

LETTER FROM THE METROPOLITAN.

We are glad to learn that the Bishop has addressed the following letter to the Churchwardens of his diocese.

GENTLEMEN,—Feeling that the parochial clergy of the diocese are often sorely straitened to meet the many claims which are made upon their small incomes, I venture to suggest to you the observance of the ancient custom of devoting your offerings once in the year to their benefit.

I would therefore suggest to you the idea of setting apart your offertory on *Christmas Day* to this purpose; and to affix a notice

to this effect on the door of your church on the previous Sunday, (December 18th.)

I am very sure that it will be in accordance with your own feelings to have this opportunity of shewing to him who labours among you "in the Word and Doctrine," that you appreciate his services, and sympathize with him in his trials.

I shall be glad if the suggestion which I have taken the liberty of making, and which prevails in the neighbouring Dioceses, should commend itself to you and to your fellow parishioners. Believe me, Gentlemen, yours faithfully and sincerely,

A. MONTREAL.

Montreal, 1st December, 1870.

QUEBEC CATHEDRAL DIFFICULTY.

We have been requested to publish the following correspondence on the Quebec Cathedral difficulty—the result of an unsuccessful effort made by Mr. John Jones of that city, who, on behalf of a number of prominent members of the congregation, waited on the Rector for the purpose of inducing him if possible to take such steps as would restore peace to his divided flock. These letters followed the interview, and as no reply has been given to Mr. Jones' letter, it is thought advisable to lay the matter before the members of the congregation:—

(Letter No. 1.)

THE RECTORY, Quebec, Nov. 15, 1870.

DEAR SIR,—Allow me to express the satisfaction I derived from your visit this morning, as I entertain the sincere hope that it may lead to that unity of practice in the cathedral, which in one portion of the service is not now observable.

Your visit, you led me to understand, was not of a private character. I am glad I can regard it in this light. This being the case, I think it advisable to state in writing, what I expressed to you in words, and what I am anxious should be conveyed to those who deputed you to call upon me. I wish it to be generally known, that I exceedingly regret the want of uniformity in practice which now exists when the offertory sentences are being read, and that I gladly coincide with those who desire a settlement of the point in question. Fortunately the remedy is a very simple one, and enjoined by our church under our present circumstances; and since I have pointed it out to you, I look for the happiest results. I shall feel obliged by your drawing the attention of the dissatisfied members of the congregation to that clause in the Preface to the Prayer Book, "Concerning the Services of the Church," which I pointed out to you this morning; and my wish is that it should be acted upon in the present difficulty. Had you not promised that this should be done, I should more urgently press its adoption for the resolution of all doubts. As I mentioned to you, it will be necessary for all those who are disaffected either to sign the document asking the Bishop's opinion, or to acquiesce in it, resolving at the same time to adopt whatever course his Lordship may see fit to recommend. God grant that there may soon be that unity amongst us which is a characteristic of Christ's Church, that unity which we should all strive to maintain, and the establishment of which our Saviour Himself sought by prayer.—Believe me, Dear Sir, Yours very faithfully,

GEORGE V. HOUSMAN.

To John Jones, Esq., Quebec.

(Letter No. 2.)

QUEBEC, November 23rd, 1870.

REV. AND DEAR SIR:—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of 15th, respecting the unhappy difference which has for some time disturbed the Cathedral congregation.

I am glad that you have looked upon my visit, and on our conversation, as not of a private character; and I have accordingly submitted your communication to a number of gentlemen with whose concurrence I waited on you, and whose views and opinions respecting it I shall now state to you.

With reference to your proposal that the question at issue should be submitted to the Bishop for his decision, I beg to promise that you are in error in assuming that I concurred in it, though I said if you could suggest no remedy, some such recourse might be necessary; indeed I stated that I did not think the Bishop's name should be mixed up in the matter.

As to the proposal that those gentlemen whom you are pleased neither correctly nor courteously to style "the disaffected," should