

## EDITORIAL NOTES.

VERY differing opinions prevail as to whether the Clergy should take any part in politics, especially in the election contests which from time to time take place. As a general rule the course heretofore pursued of abstaining from anything like extended reference in the pulpit to political matters, and from active interference in elections, is one that will probably recommend itself to most Churchmen. We think, however, that the contest presently going on in the Motherland, involving as it does the integrity of the Empire, and sooner or later the connection between Church and State, might well be regarded as an exception to the general rule, and that the Clergy might interest themselves actively and openly as their conscience dictates. We notice that according to cable reports the Bishop of Ripon, in delivering an address at Leeds, warmly defended the action of Clergymen in taking part in the political contest, and also contended that the clergy had a duty to perform in inculcating a higher conception of public duty than mere partyism. The difficulty, however, consists in doing enough and not too much, and in doing it in the right way.

"OUR MISSION NEWS."—In accordance with the resolution adopted at Quebec, the Board of Domestic and Foreign Missions for the Ecclesiastical Province of Canada, has put forth the first number of a purely Missionary Monthly Magazine, under the above title and under the editorship of its Secretary, Rev. Dr. Mockridge. We understand that this is a *trial* copy, and that the continuance of the venture depends upon the reception given to this number. This is well got up, and contains several cuts, besides a fair amount of Missionary news. Though we doubted, and still doubt the wisdom of the undertaking, we yet feel that if this magazine can be made a means of arousing greater interest in this all important work its publication is most desirable, and we heartily wish it "God-speed."

WE have to return our thanks to several kind friends in Montreal, who have evidenced their interest not alone in the GUARDIAN, but in the dissemination of sound Church information, by handing us sums of money sufficient to cover twenty annual subscriptions, with the request that the paper should be sent free to clergy or others, as we judged best. We have also received encouragement by the acceptance of our club rate of \$16 for twenty-five subscriptions to one address, and we would express the hope that these examples may be followed by many others, in order that the 10,000 subscribers wished for may soon be obtained. We need this number in order to make the GUARDIAN what we wish it to be. Who will help?

The opening of the through route to the Pacific, on Canadian soil, marks another epoch in the history of the Dominion. The dispatch of the first through passenger train, on the evening of the 28th ult., was fittingly marked in Montreal by the attendance of the Volunteers, and the firing of a salute by the Montreal Garrison Artillery, under command of the veteran Colonel A. A. Stevenson.

## 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.]

## LETTER.

To the Editor of THE CHURCH GUARDIAN:

DEAR SIR,—In the account of the meeting of the Rutland Chapter of Chatham, which appeared in the issue of June 23rd, it is stated that at the service on June 7th, addresses were delivered as follows: on "The Sufficiency of Holy Scriptures," by Rev. A. F. Hiltz; and on "Holy Communion," by Rev. D. Forsyth. This is incorrect. It should have been: addresses were delivered as follows—on "The Sufficiency of Holy Scriptures," by Rev. J. H. S. Sweet; on "Confirmation," by Rev. A. F. Hiltz; and on "Holy Communion," by Rev. D. Forsyth. x

DEAR SIR,—As a lay member of the Synod, I cannot refrain from expressing my personal regret and feeling of deep shame at the result of the session just closed. The proceedings clearly show that the spirit of party and intolerance is not yet extinct in some portions at least of this ecclesiastical Province.

From the very outset a determination was evidenced to push through by force of majority and with little or no regard for the rights or opinions of the minority—a certain predetermined conclusion—(showing also a clear desire to take every possible advantage of the heat of feeling created by the impassioned appeal of the Bishop in his charge). The unfortunate and mistaken ruling rejecting an amendment well founded and in order, as well by the rules of Synod itself as by those of the English House of Commons, to which appeal was made, precluded even a change in the construction of the original resolution, and secured approval of a course admittedly incorrect, and so in effect declared by the action of the Private Bills Committee at Quebec. And the rejection of the amendment of the Rector of Montreal, embodying the agreement arrived at in Quebec as to the Trust Deed of the College and the so-called concessions there made, and the registered votes of some of the parties present at the making of these concessions *against* the amendment, give rise to painful doubts as to the sincerity of the offers.

The last point I have to mention is the rejection of every member who openly opposed the application from the Elective Committees of Synod, of which they had long been among the most active members. This caps the climax of partisan zeal and vengeance. I need only mention the name of Dr. Norman, a man known and revered from one end of the Diocese to the other for his Christian virtues, his educational status, his faithful, painstaking and most efficient work as a parish clergyman—his moderation in all things where party differences are concerned, to say nothing of his length of service in the Diocese and his labors as Clerical Secretary of Provincial Synod—nothing more is needed to show the blind fervor with which those who believe in freedom of opinion where that opinion is, as was, I believe, claimed at Quebec, "a unit," have treated the minority who urged their right to that freedom, even though their ideas differed, so long as they acted, thought and spoke in accordance with the rules of Synod and the demands of Christian forbearance and respect for the opinions of others. The result, however, will be, and is, a divided Diocese and much bitter feeling, which, unless a change of tactics is made, will, I fear, but increase from year to year.

With many apologies, Mr. Editor, for trespassing to such an extent on your valuable space,

I am,

A COUNTRY DELEGATE.

SIR,—The *Toronto Mail*, one of the Roman Catholic organs of the Dominion, has informed the public that the Protestant Bishop of Montreal had waited on his *Eminence* the Cardinal, &c., &c. I have read also that some lay member of the Synod of Montreal, has given notice of a motion that the Synod shall do the same.

Will you kindly enlighten me concerning this official recognition of the Pope, and the Pope's legate as the head of the Church.

Before I left England I had an idea that I was a member of the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church that had been planted in England long before Gregory sent Augustine, and that through Augustine, of Canterbury, we had our Apostolic orders from St. John the Apostle; Polycarp, of Ephesus, through the Archbishop of Arles and the Bishop of Lyons in Gaul, and not through the Bishops of Rome.

The Church of Lower Canada is a daughter of the Church of France, as we are the daughter of the Church of England, we are sister churches.—our Mother Church freed herself from the yoke of the Papacy,—the old Catholic Reformation in the National Church of France is proceeding in Communion with her. Yet in Canada I find the Church of England officially recognizing the claims of Rome. I always thought that our Bishops were the overseers of the orthodox Catholic Church of all English speaking people throughout the world, the bulwark of the Reformation, and of the Catholic faith—and that the Italian Church represented by Cardinals and Archbishops, had intruded into the jurisdiction of the Church of the Empire, as they did in 1850 into the jurisdiction of the Mother Church, when Pius IX. sent the Mission that utterly failed to "convert" England.

As probably many Englishmen are getting as mixed up as myself I shall be glad if you will tell me where we stand.

In England I heard and read much about the Society for the Reunion of Christendom, which I always thought was an union of English, Roman and Greek clergy for prayer. Is it the Canadian Church idea of reunion to acknowledge the supremacy of the Pope and his Cardinals? If it is, I object, because when our Church refused to receive our English translation of the Scriptures, our Liturgy, and our Holy Orders from Pius IV., as head of the Church, he excommunicated our Queen, put the nation under interdict and to enforce his decree sent the Spanish Armada—because the decrees of the Council of Trent are still in force in the Italian Church. And they damn us up in heaps, I have just counted twenty separate things for which "let him be accursed." I also object because the Church of Rome is worse now than at the Reformation. The Vatican Council added two new articles to the faith, and set her seal on the past. It is thirty years since I entered the Royal Navy, and an oath was never required of me. But when I took Holy Orders I subscribed to this, and I did it with all my heart.

"I do swear, that I do from my heart abhor, detest, and abjure, as impious and heretical that damnable doctrine and position, that Princes excommunicated by the Pope, or any authority of the See of Rome, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects, or any other whatsoever. And I do declare that no foreign Prince, person, prelate, state, or potentate hath, or ought to have, any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence, or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this realm. So help me God."

As I was ordained in Canada I presume it applies to the Church of the Empire, and not confined to England. I am, &c.,

C. A. B. Pocock,  
Toronto, Trinity Monday, 1886. Deacon.

W. B. SHAW, Esq., is the only person, (Clergy excepted), at present authorized to solicit and receive payment of Subscriptions in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia.