

## SLEEPING PROTESTANT WATCHMEN.

FOR some week's past there have been meetings held, and innumerable sermons preached protesting against the Jesuits. These wily persons have been for some time, and are now showing their hands plainly in the French schools that are aided by the Government of Ontario. The recent debate on this question afforded a specially timely opportunity for the action of the Protestant ministers and laymen who have spoken and preached against the Jesuits.

But these worthy persons seem troubled with a very bad form of long sight, they see clearly enough the evils of Jesuit power in Quebec, but the Jesuit at work in Ontario they do not see! They are very eloquent in denouncing Jesuitism in history but of Jesuitism pulling the political wires in their own city and Province they have nothing to say. Do these Protestants suppose that the Jesuits only work by such methods as are open for all men to watch? Are they waiting for some great national convulsion to arise when they will leave their pulpits and platforms for more practical fields of labor against the enemies of their country? Do they not know that the Jesuit is above all things subtle, plausible, and unobtrusive? Can they not see that the policy manifested in the use of the Papal catechism in our State schools is precisely the form in which Jesuits love to work? That the policy which the Minister of Education supports and defends of keeping up French isolation by the means of French schools in a British Province is exactly the line upon which Jesuits display their influence? Why then did the whole body of Protestant ministers in Ontario, those especially in Toronto, why we ask, did they keep dead silence when the Legislative Assembly was discussing the French School question? These watchdogs of Protestantism bark loud enough at the Quebec Jesuits, why do they turn tail and keep in their kennels when the enemy is at their doors?

The representations made by the Minister of Education as to Welsh schools, and his statements as to the French schools could easily have been proved to be absolutely destitute of truth. The Toronto *Telegram* last week sent special correspondents to enquire into the facts of these schools, and their agents give an emphatic point blank denial of the statements of the Hon. Mr. Ross. The plain fact is that there are a considerable number of schools aided by the Provincial Government, and largely in some cases by the taxes of protestants, in which English is not taught in anything but a nominal sense, but in which Popery undisguised is taught, and French is used as though Ontario were a French province!

By the absolute silence then of the whole of the Protestant ministers while this intensely important question was under discussion, they have lost a providential opportunity of demonstrating their independence of political influences. Had a deputation of some hundred or more Protestant ministers gone down to the

Legislative Asssmbly and firmly protested against the policy of the Government in giving the Jesuits control of so many State Schools, they would have produced a profound effect upon the country, and have demonstrated to the Jesuits that there is reality in the present agitation. The Government would have been compelled to heed their protest, and had they gone fully informed of the facts, they would have put Mr. Ross in a very disagreeable dilemma. But alas! instead of taking such action as would have roused the whole country, profoundly influenced the Legislature, and made the Jesuits feel they had a dangerous foe to meet in Ontario, those who had preached, and written, and spoken so valiantly from their pulpits, and desks, and platforms, staid quietly indoors! They were dumb, out of a craven fear lest a decided protest against the Government of Ontario carrying out the policy of the Jesuits in Ontario Schools should prove disagreeable to certain politicians for whose personal feelings and party interests they have far more regard, than for protestantism or civil duty.

## CONCERNING VISITING.

BY THE REV. G. J. LOW, M.A.

A COMMON complaint against a clergyman is that "he does not visit enough." There are, we fancy, very few parish priests who have not been told so, either by the complainant or by some friendly adviser in the flock. There are few clergyman who on first taking charge of a parish, are not told that the preceding parson "did not visit enough." In fact the complaint is getting somewhat monotonous and stale; the charge is, so vague, so easy to make, so hard to repel. For what is "enough?"

In this matter, we Anglicans would do well to take a lesson from the Presbyterians. With them a thorough understanding is made between the pastor and the flock; that the former should visit every household contributing to the funds of the Church so many times, usually once a year. If he fulfils the contract no blame can be attached to him; the "aggrieved parishioner" cannot trump up this vague indictment, because every visit over and above the stipulated number is a work of supererogation; it was not "nominated in the bond," and there-fore is an act of grace and as such received.

Again, in the Presbyterian system a thorough understanding is arrived at as to the nature and business of such visits. The time of the visit is announced beforehand, the family are then expected to be gathered together—the children are catechized, reading, exhortation, prayer are engaged in—and a stated time is spent in the function.

Now all this may be very formal and business-like, but it has its advantages. The pastor and the people know just what is expected of each party. With us, on the other hand, the pastoral visit is becoming less and less a matter of "form," and more and more a mat-

ter of "ceremony." A call is made to induce some lax member to come to church. The lax member awaits this inducement to come to Church. He does not see why he should go to church until he has been complimented by a visit. By and bye, if this system goes on, the lax member will think he has quite done his duty, if he goes to church once for every visit the pastor pays him. Doubtless many a clergyman has been told, as the writer has been more than once, "Now you have come to see me I will go and hear you."

The evil of this system is beginning to tell. Households arriving in a town take their time to consider which congregation they shall honour with their patronage; and frequently that one is chosen whose pastor has been most prompt or most obsequious in his visits.

Now in healthy contrast to this state of things let us record a fact. When the Marquis of Lorne and the Princess Louise first arrived at the vice-regal residence in Ottawa, that very afternoon an orderly called at the Rectory to enquire respecting the hours of service, etc., in the parish Church. In other words, Her Royal Highness and His Excellency, reported themselves at once to the Rector of the parish as new parishioners. Canadians are fond of copying the manners and customs of the English aristocracy, here is a noble example to follow.

We do not blame the laity for this declension from a better state of things. We blame the clergy, we blame the pernicious rivalry in visiting—the pandering to the vanity—the subservience to the pride and the purse of a new arrival, which the mendicant system of Protestant Christianity, induced by its divisions and schisms, has begotten. Clergy and ministers of all kinds have lent themselves to this, and have grown into drummers and touters for their respective establishments. And it is not alone sectarian rivalries which cause this unseemly competition. Alas! too often in our own communion, in towns where more parishes than one exist, this scandal to religion—for such it is—can be seen. And the man of the world looks on and smiles. He says, "These ministers are very spiritual no doubt; but they run their churches by methods which are of the earth, earthly. They are just as keen about getting the inside track of each other as we worldly-minded merchants or mechanics."

A little book is just now being sold by thousands of copies, entitled "The World of Cant." It is very sarcastic—grossly so—against professors of all sorts of religions, churchmen and dissenters, clergy and lay alike. But it is well for the clergy to read it; it is well to see ourselves as others see us. We may learn from it to recognize one of the causes of that "Decay of Faith," we all lament so much. And it will be well indeed if, as we read these parables and denounce the chief actor therein, conscience acts the part of Nathan with its charge of Thou Art the Man! and arouses us henceforth to affect a higher standard of uprightness and honour. Of all the vices, this one of trickery and over-reaching our neigh-

bour, under Blessed Lord's scorn. If that it was "Can

Perhaps such sentimentality taught that the ninety after the one

Yes, my

just as it should ought to be liberty to

efforts on the quite confident in the mea

fold, without But, unfortunately

taught the and the she consent to

goes ninety after the ni probably t

veighed aw and, if he s rejoicing, h

if the one h astray, offe enough."

basis. We too much. looking aft

runners at his own pa Of cours

of "souls." of "Cant." God, that

are not spe envelope i As conc

able to cor matter. I have to b

imagine t second sig finding ou

sick. The office for any perso

to the mi dialogue Aggrie

to see me Rector. happen?

A. P. about a me." R. "

A. P. day." R. "

ill?" A. P. R. " send for Well; evidently