

had no intention of doing this, he should not have promised. If he has promised, he should keep his word.

3. This Church orders her minister to recite the Athanasian Creed, on certain days. He should have read the Church's directions before he was ordained, so he need not have offered himself if it were his intention to promise one thing and perform another.

4. This Church orders that holy baptism (except where necessity forbids) should be celebrated in the churches. Why does the minister, on whose conscience lies the obligation of his ordination, ignore this Church's order. If he is afraid to do his duty, he should have counted the cost before he took an obligation.

5. The same applies to "catechising of the children." To the solemnization of marriage elsewhere than in the churches and by other authority than banns or the license of the bishop.

6. Is the minister afraid to use office for the visitation of the sick—afraid of whom? He should have counted the costs before he presented himself for ordination and made such solemn promises. Let every minister of this Church lay his daily practice and his ordination vow side by side. Perhaps we shall then touch the source of the epidemic which from time to time produces that very loathsome disease known as fouling "one's own nest." Consistency without which there is no moral strength. Do the Roman Catholics suffer from this epidemic? Do the Protestants suffer from this epidemic? I never read the evidence thereof. Perhaps they are at least "consistent."

Nov. 28, 1885.

W.

COMMUNION WINE.

SIR,—Many thanks for your full reply to my query, and for the extensive information given on the subject. Was it the fermented or unfermented juice of the grape that was used by our Lord at the institution of the Eucharist. The information should, I suppose, settle the matter, if there was not some other of an entirely different character. My attention was first drawn to this subject by an article in a respectable London religious journal. A correspondent of the paper had attended a celebration of the Jewish Passover in that city, he inquired what was the liquor that was being freely used, and was informed it was the *unfermented juice* of the grape, and further that this was the article generally used by the Jewish people at this feast, and that they were as careful to exclude fermented liquor as leavened bread, the person presiding, moreover, volunteered the statement, that he had often wondered that Christians should use intoxicating liquor at their communion, as he considered it very improbable that Jesus being a Jew, would use such a thing. I had this information forcibly corroborated in an interview with the Rabbi of the Jewish congregation in this city, the Rev. H. Phillips, he said he had never known, what you say can alone be called "wine" used at the Passover, the unfermented juice of the grape was used and nothing else. It seems, sir, there are to this, as there are to most questions, two sides, and it seems to me that no damage will come to the Church of Christ if His disciples are permitted to use that which they conscientiously prefer. It is quite possible the term "wine" should not be applied to the unfermented juice of the grape.

INQUIRER.

INQUIRER has just as much authority for thinking our Lord used unfermented wine at the Eucharist as he would have for saying the room was lighted by the electric light. There was no such liquid known in those days as a beverage used at feasts of ceremony or social life. "His respectable London journal," and its nameless correspondent, cannot be heard in this case with respect, in the teeth of the testimony we quoted given by Dr. Moore, editor of the *Presbyterian Review*. That scholar appealed to every Rabbi of note in Europe and the States, and to illustrious Hebrew scholars, and their replies were unanimous coming from cities all over Europe and the States, to this effect that not one of them had ever heard or read of an unfermented liquor being at any time used at the Paschal Feast! On the contrary Jewish law and custom is imperative that there must be wine used, and wine is not wine unless fermented. The use of a syrupy concoction which would produce vomiting if used as a beverage, in the place of wine at the Eucharist, is flatly opposed to our Lord's example, to the Apostle's practice, to all historic testimony, and to social decency. It has not a leg to stand upon except modern wilfulness and the eccentricity of men who esteem their pet theory as superior in claims and in authority to God's own example, to God's own Word, to the invariable usage of God's Church since Christ blessed Wine, and gave Wine to His disciples. There are, as "Inquirer" says, two sides to this question, one is God's side, the other is man's side. We prefer the former in spite of the handful of fanatical cranks who invented the unfermented wine theory in the teeth of the Bible, all ancient literature, all history, all expert testimony and common sense.

ED. D. C.

MR. CROMPTON'S VALUABLE WORK RECOGNIZED BY THE S.P.G.

SIR,—As you thought it right to publish my appeal to S. P. G. because of the serious principle involved, may I ask you to be so good as to publish the reply from the secretary which I have just received? He says: "Your appeal has been laid before the standing committee, who, however, feel that they cannot entertain it. The grant to Algoma is a block grant to be administered by the Bishop and diocesan committee, subject only to the Society's by-laws and regulations, none of which are infringed by the action of the diocesan treasurer."

They none the less regret that you should suffer pecuniarily by taking your well earned holiday, and I am to beg your acceptance of £19, 14s., 6d., for which I enclose a bill on our treasurer. This represents the amount to which you were entitled as remuneration for the valuable work you did in England as the Society's representative, but which your generosity declined when Mr. Kemp offered it to you."

I would also wish gratefully to state that a lady at "Como" sent me \$5, accompanied by a most sympathetic letter, and sufficient "Banner of Faith Almanacs," for 1886 to give a copy to each communicant's family. The above generous gifts reduce my claim against Algoma to \$66.99.

"A working man" sends me \$1 to do as I think best with, and I send it to you with the address of a settler, as I think a copy of the *DOMINION CHURCHMAN* going regularly to that house will indeed be a good thing for the Church, as well as show my own gratitude not only for what you have been ever ready to do for myself, but also for the diocese of Algoma when others left it out in the cold.

I am, &c.,

Aspdin, P.O.,

Muskoka, Canada,

December 15th, 1885.

WILLIAM CROMPTON.

A MISSIONARY'S TRIAL.

SIR,—I have read the Rev. Mr. Crompton's letter in your paper, also the Bishop of Algoma's reply. I am astonished that the Bishop would think of treating an old and hard working missionary so ungenerously as to keep back his paltry salary on account of him taking a holiday so well deserved, after so many years of faithful service to the Church in Algoma. The Bishop says the Dominion Government gave him a free passage to England and back, and the S. P. G. Society paid his expenses when in England. If the Dominion Government recognized Mr. Crompton's faithful services, also the S. P. G. Society, I say then, it is a great discredit to the Church in Algoma, that Mr. Crompton should be treated so unkindly by the Bishop of that diocese. I have hitherto tried to do all I could for Algoma in a quiet way, but if that is the Bishop of Algoma's manner of treating his faithful and hard working clergy, I shall not give any further assistance to that diocese. I would ask the Bishop did he not get his expenses paid by the S. P. G. Society when in England? and did he not also get his salary for the time he was absent from his diocese? I would like to ask him if he is not drawing his salary during the winter when he is spending his time in the city of Toronto, and leaving his poor clergy back in the woods to do their work? In conclusion Mr. Editor, I appreciate your manliness in exposing such grave injustice, and I feel proud that the Church in this Dominion has got so able and independent a journal that is not afraid to speak the truth and espouse the cause of those so unjustly treated.

Yours, &c.,

J. P. WALTHAM.

PLAIN FACTS FROM MR. CROMPTON.

SIR,—As "justice to oneself" is to be the order of the day, you will perhaps permit me to tell you and my friends, the public, that I sent you a copy of my appeal to S. P. G. not for publication. I do not mean to enter into any controversy with my Bishop, my forte, if I have one, lies in "work," and not disputations of no profit. But I cannot sit down quietly under any implication of trying to mislead those who have supported me for ten years. I have my Bishop's letter in which he told me that "he could not pay my salary during absence" but giving no reasons whatever for so unusual a step, and my reply was prompt that "I did not look for pay when no work was done, and that I should be doing more for Algoma in England than here in my mission, over and above what I should do for S. P. G." The message I sent to the Treasurer of our diocese I had been told was necessary, and the terms were almost dictated to me as to the dates mentioned, and which the Bishop has emphasized. Having no official intimation from the Treasurer that he was going to take active steps to carry out the Bishop's injustice to me, I could not be expected to say more than I did. So soon as I received the Treasurer's cheque, then I promptly protested. What business was it of his that I should act towards a man who ought only to be Treasurer, as if he were one of the managers of the diocese? The words which the Bishop puts into italics mean from my point of view, not a consent to the Bishop's illegal actions, but notice from myself to the Treasurer that, owing to this action, my salary was due at a certain time. It was then left to the Bishop and myself to settle matters in our own way.

That I suffered no pecuniary loss during absence, was not owing to our Bishop's endeavours. I do not like placing before the public what I am now compelled to do in self-defence. It will scarcely be credited that, instead of giving the usual letter commendatory, which is invariably given to every clergyman of decent standing who means to travel abroad, our Bishop wrote my permission on a half a sheet of note paper, in which he descended to the childishness now adopted by a certain party, and styled me "a presbyter," and put an addendum to this permission which would be a disgrace to any honest man. I refused to take such a document with me, as I had no desire to show it as the production of a bishop of my church. I was going to England with no sort of recommendation whatever, and should have done so too, but on my way a very strong letter from a leading clergyman of Canada, to the Bishops and Clergy of England, and another equally strong letter from D. Spry, Esq., to my brother "Masons" caught me before I set sail. Though not absolutely necessary, I found both useful, for it could not be but that even one's best friends would wonder how I, of all other men from Algoma, could be allowed to go as if I had disgraced myself. But this was not all. One of the first letters I received in England was from the Sec. of S. P. G., in which he told me "the Bishop of Algoma had written to them, marking his letter 'confidential' in which he had said 'he!!' could not allow me to appeal for them." The authorities thought this such an extraordinary step, they wrote to enquire. I did not see this confidential letter but the substance was given me in writing. More than this even. The Bishop wrote "confidential" letters to my own friends, telling them "that I had now everything thing I needed and that there were other men, etc., etc.," evidently meaning my friends to imply, that my assurance to the contrary notwithstanding, I was coming to beg from them, and, if I did so, I should be acting under false pretences. I can say as "James de la Plante, Esq.," said years ago in *Punch*, "Phansy my Pielinks." However, although, very hard to bear, I could afford to laugh at such pitiful treatment. Thank the good God, I had not had a stainless character for over forty years for nothing and before the Bishop of Algoma had thus attempted to insinuate that character away he ought to have remembered what I have done here in the backwoods, who they were who had helped me, and that their help came the readier, because I could give good references in nearly every part of England. The Dominion Government did not give me my passage as an emigration agent, nor did I act in any such capacity. The letter of which I sent you a copy from the Sec. of the S. P. G. will tell how far that Society paid me. Up to time of my last calling upon them my travelling expenses amounted to over £20, but I would only receive £10 because other friends paid the rest. The S. P. G., having requested me now to receive £19, 14s., 6d., is sufficient commentary of the Bishop's action.

I scarcely know how to characterize the latter portion of the Bishop's letter, for I had clearly explained to him that, (a) In taking Priest's Orders I had given up all worldly occupation. (b) The farm is not mine, but belongs to my two sons and has belonged to them for years, as the Township assessment roll will testify. (c) I never trained any one on the farm, all I and my wife have done, is that we gave the safe guards of a clergyman's home whilst young gentlemen were testing how far they would relish "bush" life. I particularly explained to the Bishop that whatever profits accrued over and above cost of "board etc.," (which amounted to the "handsome premium" (?) of \$288 per annum), were spent in building the house I now live in. So far from my having anything to do with the farm, the Bishop can have whatever amount of proof he requires to tell him that I have not been in the stables for nearly two years. If the Bishop really believes what his words imply, that I am acting as farmer here, all I can say is he is grossly neglecting his duty in permitting me to do so. I had an idea that the Bishop could not possibly show his want of knowledge of real bush life more than he did when he laid such lines upon me, as I knew were unworkable and thus compelled me to cease travelling, but his allusion to "grass" brings his want of knowledge out far more. Had he known anything of the "life" he would know that every blade of grass in summer is valuable for "hay" in winter. Fast as Muskoka is progressing, as it is thank God, we have not much pasturage as yet and some of his parsons to whom he is not paying a fair salary, could tell him that "hay"