

that generally ank are already urch is concern- id the synods to Dr. Rigg declares set apart for a duties of a set-

cial service held e deaconess Miss e years resident e bster Diocesan n was delivered an Professor of t apart as dea- now licensed to nd are resident icensed. In the ow resident the leaconess, seven ass, and visitors.

es at the Church ve at least been e with the views e first address owerful one by nitenice; and the Thursday with a inst letting the movements and

ious that diplo- difficulties there, whom the mili- arly related and Yaos of Unango, and either the British arms may the missionaries

largaer, has in- 's College, Lam- interest of a sum- ng education at lewelyn proposes ate son, Mr. W. o be called after some of this fund as may be here- is of St. David's ambridge under year is given to avid's College.

earnest attention undertake to in- s less than are ising non-inter- dge that means h as atmosphere ren; besides, the sm as "religion," children Roman with their re- 's steadfast aim upremacy. Her available public cates of religious -king with Pro- Rock.

will appear on the opinions of our

a Christian senti- om facts, useful would solicit their re in this depart-

om Synod office annuation Fund o be paid over non authorizing lar, and applies diocese, as well as, as stated per 77, but I would be present date? ents that have ne would be led one explanatory absolute neces- working. I am rongly too), that

as it has to a great extent proved unworkable and impracticable, and as it has been tinkered with and amended at every session of the Synod since its formation and adoption, it ought to be entirely recast and followed by something more practicable and workable at next meeting of Synod.

R. A. ROONEY.

World's Fair Parliament of Religions.

SIR,—I think that any one, whatever his opinions or feelings may have been, who reads in the March *Review of Reviews* a sketch of the doings of the World's Fair Parliament of Religions, must be devoutly thankful that our Anglican Patriarch, Archbishop Benson, as the representative of our Communion, refused to recognize, officially, this "Exhibit." The idea, of course, is very picturesque, but the reality is most revolting.

N. C. E.

Increase of the Episcopate.

SIR,—Among the interesting matters discussed in your correspondence columns lately, what has become of the question of the "Increase of the Episcopate?" Can we do nothing to bring pressure to bear on the Bishops before the next Provincial Synod? Is there no way of getting up a monster petition signed by clergy and laity in every parish of Canada, asking their Lordships to withdraw their resolution requiring an endowment of \$40,000 before any new bishop is consecrated? If such a petition were at all unanimous, it could hardly be ignored as was the report of the late committee on "The Aggressive Work of the Church."

RECTOR.

Definite Church Teaching in our Public Schools.

SIR,—Your correspondent "W." points out to us, in your issue of 1st inst., a very real danger that menaces us if we neglect any longer to demand that our children be afforded definite religious teaching as part of their regular education.

It is much to be regretted that so little interest is manifested on this subject, either by clergy or laity, and it is to be hoped that Churchmen, who do recognize its importance, will not let the matter rest until they have created a strong, healthy sentiment in favour of the children of Churchmen being properly instructed in the faith. Agitation in all the Church papers, and at all the meetings of synods, and on every possible occasion, ought soon to create a desire to remedy the evil that now exists, and, when this much has been accomplished, doubtless steps would then be speedily taken to attain to the desired end.

It seems to me that, even if some arrangement could be made by which the clergy were allowed to have Church of England children, attending the public schools, under their teaching for one hour every alternate day, during school hours, it would be a great step in the right direction. Whether we will ever get separate schools is a question, but unless we ask for much we will get nothing.

LIMESTONE.

Mr. Temple's Book.

SIR,—I was pleased to read your review of "The Church in the Prayer Book," Church people will find this book delightful instructive reading. On page 183, Mr. Temple, dealing with ornaments, says: "The altar cross stands in the centre of the re-table, however beautiful, costly, and suggestive its symbolic decoration may be, it should not be a crucifix. Such a symbol may be helpful on Good Friday to realize the stupendous significance of that day, but for ordinary and continual use it is the empty cross that stands for the completed and essential character of our redemption which has yet a living and prevailing high Priest." This is Catholic but not Ritualistic. In the Lord's Prayer in the office of Holy Communion, Mr. Temple says, "It is to be repeated by the priest alone. It . . . is nowhere intended to be ritually used in public without some proper preface. It occurs later under these conditions and with special honour."

In the Gloria in Excelsis he says, "Priest, choristes, and people unite in this glorious enthrust of praise, taking upon their lips the heavenly song with which He was first welcomed whose Presence we have just realized," to be said or sung "all standing."

I have before me a copy of the communion service in the American Church and before the words Holy, holy, holy, there is a rubric, "repeat together."

In the General Thanksgiving. Mr. Temple on page 118 says: "In the English Book our General Thanksgiving appears as one of the occasional thanksgivings and its daily service closes without it, though it is really said there, perhaps nearly as often as with us. It has been sometimes repeated with the minister, like the general confession, though such a practice is entirely without liturgical warrant; and the true usage here is to consider the word "general" as applied to blessings, rather than to us who acknowledge them."

It is on her educated members, that is on those who have studied the Church's system in her Prayer Book, that the Church must depend on aggressive work. Canadian laymen want a handy book covering all points, and Mr. Temple's book is "so far the best published."

D.

Does the Church Permit It?

SIR,—I hope you will kindly permit me to make a few remarks in reply to two letters which appeared in the CHURCHMAN recently, not for the sake of contradiction or fault-finding, but in hopes that some good may come out of it. In the CHURCHMAN of Feb. 15th, a correspondent over the signature of "A Churchman" tells us of what was nearly another Church desecration somewhere near Toronto, which apparently he thinks makes the case stronger against the incumbent at Hespeler. This time it is a Churchwarden, who in the absence of a regularly appointed clergyman, after taking up the collection went inside the communion rails with the money. A person would naturally think that a simple, pious and business-like act, yet a certain person thought he saw a case of Church desecration, and lodged a complaint which brought forth a rebuke; there it is again—the money and plate was all right, but the poor Churchwarden would pollute the sanctity of the place by his presence nearly as bad as a dissenting clergyman would. A Churchwarden is very useful when collecting the clergyman's salary, and is much needed to take up the collections and to do other business belonging to a Church, still he must not go within the rails even on business. And in the CHURCHMAN of Feb. 22nd, another correspondent who signed "One More Churchman," in reply to my feeble effort in upholding the Rev. Mr. Edmonds in his just act of inviting the two ministers within the rails—your correspondent tells us he does not think the proceedings at Hespeler hinged upon the question of these two ministers being admitted within the rails, but as to the rites, according to the usage of the Church of England, for which this part of the church is reserved. Now, after all the blame and bluster, we are informed that it is only the rites and usages of the Church that have been infringed upon. He also informs us that these ministers would have respected the usages of the Church had they not been invited to enter by the very person who from his position as clergyman of the church should not have so lightly infringed upon the rites and usages of his Church, and thus the Church of England is often brought into disrepute by those who are bound to uphold and maintain her teachings and usages. Your correspondent knows right well that the Church gets into disrepute oftener by adding to her rites and usages than by infringements on them. He also appears to hint, because I do not give any encouragement for that simple usage of the Church, that I am not much of a Churchman. Now I consider a person can be a Churchman and Christian, too, without clinging with bigotry to that simple and silly old notion that is in dispute—for my part I prefer the general prosperity of the Church, and think the observance of that simple rite of small importance. Now after the rites and usages of the Church have been guarded with such zealous care down to the present, what is the results in numerous instances? I will give two or three to illustrate; lately I have read an account of a Church service some where in England where the congregation consisted of one person and that person a foreigner, and no doubt but the rites and usages of the Church were well looked after. And about three years ago an American lady correspondent writing from London, England, gave an account of a week day service when the congregation could be counted on her fingers, and we may rest assured that the rites and usages of that Church had been well looked after, the Church being St. Paul's Cathedral. And last summer the discovery was made that in the diocese of Huron about thirty thousand more names were on the assessment rolls than could be accounted for in the Church. Now sir, if these four correspondents, instead of wasting energy on empty nothings, would come down to solid serviceable work and assist in gathering in the scattered members of their several congregations who seldom or never attend church, their work would be commendable. I have read each of the four letters carefully and have failed to find even one line in reference to the congregation, and I say without fear of successful contradiction that it does not matter one iota whether these ministers went inside the rails or not, but it is a serious matter having only part of the congregation attend church. At the last day the Rev. Mr. Edmonds will not be asked if he invited dissenting ministers within the communion rails, and the Churchwarden will not be asked if he went inside the rails with the collection. Therefore, again I congratulate the Rev. Mr. Edmonds for the stand he has taken. This time I will call myself a Church member; having so many Churchmen we would soon get mixed.

A CHURCH MEMBER.

"I was Never Taught that in Canada," or one Cause of Church Leakage.

SIR.—I was invited recently to attend a Methodist supper, and on social grounds accepted, with the following results. I had barely entered the hall where the festival was being held when I was warmly greeted by a number of persons with the flattering announcement, "we used to belong to your Church." "Oh," I replied to one enthusiastic lady, "and to whose Church do you belong now?" "To the Methodist Church." "Indeed, and when did you renounce your membership of my Church?" "Well, I never was really a member, though baptized and brought up in the Episcopal Church in Canada, for you see I was never confirmed." This conversation took place in the midst of a number of persons, some of whom professed to be still Episcopalians, others to have left that particular, and evidently not very well understood, or appreciated form of Christianity. Feeling that it was hardly becoming on my part to enter into explanations of Church teaching at a Methodist social supper, I offered to visit this said lady and have a little talk with her on the morrow respecting the belief of the Church in which she confessed to have been brought up. My offer having been accepted, I started out the next morning on behalf of definite Church teaching. The husband of the lady I was on my way to visit is the son of an English clergyman, and was present during part of our conversation, which took place at the further end of their store, which they use as a sitting-room. There were five persons present when I opened the Prayer Book at the Ordination of Priests of the Anglican Church, and read the commission given to them to remit and retain sins, as this power, as forming part of our Church's teaching, had been totally denied the previous evening. I then referred to Jno. xx. 19-24, and to Matt. xviii. 15-19, enforcing the argument with 2 Cor. v. 18 (the ministry of reconciliation). I did not fail to explain wherein alone the source of the power to remit and to retain sins lay, viz., in God, and that in no sense was it of man, the ministry using this power merely as delegates, in the name and power of God, transmitted to the Church by Christ Himself. Yet by this delegated authority, all duly ordained priests had the power, and had been commanded to remit, or to retain sins; which action, if rightly performed, i. e., presuming it to be a just decision on the part of the priest, accompanied by the right state of mind on the part of the penitent, would be ratified in heaven. All this, however, was most stontly denied on the ground that it had "never been taught in Canada." Alas! my own heart echoed this assertion, knowing that, with few exceptions, Anglican pulpits in Canada, or anywhere else for that matter, either at home, in the colonies, or the United States, were silent on this fundamental teaching of the Catholic Church, except perhaps where it is occasionally stated only to be denied. How often are the laity of our Church told that one great feature of their coming to Church is to confess their sins in order to receive absolution from one who has special power to confer it? I use the expression "to confer it" because in a lame way it is often granted that our priests have power to declare forgiveness; while, at the same time, it is generally lost sight of that they have also the power to withhold it. There is more than a pronouncing either way, there is a personal retention, or remission by the priest, a dispensative power, owing to which he acts in Christ's stead, who conferred upon His Church the power that had been conferred upon Himself (Matt. ix. 6.) Bishop Barry, in his widely used Teachers' Prayer Book, says of the Absolution, "it is God's answer to the Confession." The great Barrow, as quoted by Dr. Luckock, the distinguished Church writer, points out that the Absolution is "dispensative" as well as "declarative." As already stated, the source of this power is of God only, and it can alone be exercised when both priest and penitent are acting in harmony with God. Yet, it has pleased God to commit to men the ministry of reconciliation, seeing, to use the words of Dr. Luckock, "Christ gave to them as it were part of Himself, enabling them to do as He had done when amidst the astonished Jews He said to the sick of the palsy, 'Thy sins be forgiven thee.'" For a careful student, however, it is unnecessary to substantiate what I have said respecting the nature of the ministerial Absolution, by individual Church authorities, interesting and additionally profitable as it may be. I mean, of course, a student of the Prayer Book merely. For such a one, let him compare the power given to priests in their ordination with the absolution in the office for the "visitation of the sick," together with that in the first exhortation in the Communion service; let a careful comparison of these statements be made with the declarations of Scripture already given, and it will be seen at once that the power given by Christ to His disciples to remit and to retain sins, and which He also said was to be a function of the ministry of His Church, is claimed to be possessed by the Anglican branch of the Catholic Church in her official formularies, and yet,