

Sunday schools, I leave it to be imagined. The fact that presented itself strongly to me at starting was this: here is a place that has been worked for years on dissenting lines by Churchmen with the result, as one might expect, of it remaining dissent. From the first I adopted Church methods, with the result that we have now a thriving Church mission. Our people are as poor and lacking in education as can be found in any "home mission," yet the responses in the prayers were so quickly, correctly, and audibly rendered at a recent confirmation, as to call for commendation from our bishop and rural dean. To the children at our Essonville school, I recently put the question whether they would like to give up the use of the prayer book? The answer came promptly, "Oh! No sir." Every child possesses a prayer book with hymns attached, and a Bible. Suppose I had acted on Mr. Mackenzie's idea, supported as it is by the Bishop of Liverpool—that owing to the lack of good music and fitting surroundings, to hard words and difficult sentences, the service of the Church would be unpopular in country districts; and the book of common prayer as unintelligible to many as the mass. We should still be having dissenting services and our congregation would be dissenters, instead of, as they are, staunch Church people. Good music! Why, sir, we have no music at all except our own voices; and yet we have a surpliced choir, processional and recessional hymns, &c. As for surroundings, we have a beautiful little church where we have the surpliced choir, but at our out-station, where we use the school house for service, the worship is as hearty as at any of our three churches. I venture then to say Mr. Mackenzie is entirely wrong regarding the impropriety of the Church service on account of the lack of music and fitting surroundings. By teaching, explaining and illustrating the beautiful book of common prayer, men, women and children may be made so enthusiastic in its use that neither good music nor fitting surroundings are necessary before you can have a hearty and popular service. But, for the moment, grant that Mr. Mackenzie is correct, and what follows? Then, that in mission work the Church service, which has stood so many attacks and braved so many storms, must be thrown over-board and a dissenting form of worship introduced. Now I mean to say that by this means we would never make Church members. Give up the Church service and you give up the Church itself. I worked as a curate in Liverpool with the Church Army, and its weak feature was the dislike of its members to give up their own mission meeting in order to attend the church. But, further, if we give up the Church service it is a confession that Church methods are not suitable for mission work, and we may as well withdraw and let the better equipped dissenters take the field. Once adopt dissenting forms, and we shall never make the masses understand the difference between Church and Dissent. They don't think, they only see, and seeing no difference, they get to believe there is none. Should a clergyman find himself in a locality where the Church service, do what he will, remains unpopular, it is perfectly clear that as a Churchman his services are not required there, and, consequently, he ought no longer to stay. This happened to myself, and I left the place, but soon found the station where the service was highly appreciated, without music or anything else to attract.

Respecting Mr. Mackenzie's remark regretting the non-use of church buildings for social and other purposes, like the Methodists and other bodies, instead of its being a hindrance to Church work I find it the greatest blessing. When holding service in the school houses, I cannot get the men to give up spitting on the floor, putting their hats on as soon as service is over, and otherwise behaving in a free and easy manner. I have had no trouble, however, in the church; everything is conducted in as reverent and orderly a spirit as in any city church. I tremble to think what would take place if we held social and other meetings in God's house. I consider then that Mr. Mackenzie is wrong in these points, and that he is altogether astray as to the best interests of the Church.

ARTHUR E. WALTHAM.

"Darkest Australia."

SIR,—Permit me to reply to an article in your paper under the above heading. If the very worthy and venerable Dean of Melbourne is a sample of "the condition of theological obscurity," it must be then a very bright and happy country, and one that even "darkest England" and darkest Canada might well imitate. The Dean is a bright scholar, a graduate of one of the three highest colleges in the old land, and is an ornament to his Alma Mater; he has held the office of Dean for nearly half a century with credit to himself and much usefulness to the Church. He has been preaching the glad tidings for nearly seventy years and is still in active service. Of course he is not of the "parti," but that fact is indeed very far from proving that he is unlearned or

that Churchmen there are by any means in theological obscurity; if so, then the fountain head whence it came must be in a very pitiable condition, and the sobriquet given by Mr. Booth to a portion of England in fairness belongs to the whole, and the ball rebounds back on the *Church Times*, which, so unchristianlike, threw it. The Dean is known the world over and is universally beloved. It does not however require a very large amount of erudition to know the points of the compass, and that a table is a quadrilateral figure. The rubric in the Holy Communion Office distinctly and unequivocally defines the position of the priest to be at the North Side; it is one word, not two, "North Side," and there is no room to force between the conventional term "end." I graduated from a High Church institution where Wheatley on the Book of Common Prayer was the text book and authority. The term "standing before the table" is explained to mean, according to the grammatical construction, to refer merely to the ordering of the bread and wine, and not to any continuous position during the prayer of consecration. The American Church, I think, ought to be of some little authority on such matters, though doubtless the *Church Times* may say she too is in "theological obscurity." She then has substituted for "North Side," the term Right Side. Now this of course must mean either North or South: the priest cannot have a side behind or in front of him. No party dreams of admitting it to be the South, and therefore the only point left is the North, which most decidedly is not West, and the East could not be taken, as it would be a physical impossibility, placed as the table is now.

Hoping this communication will not be considered out of order or too lengthy for your columns, in the interests of truth, unity and true religion, I beg to subscribe myself,

ROBERT S. LOCKE.

St. Catharines, 23rd Feb., 1891.

Missions to the Jews—Information Wanted.

SIR,—Some time ago, I sought the information, for many who are interested as well as myself, concerning the local expenses connected with the offerings of Church people on behalf of the Jews. On behalf of the "Parochial Missions to the Jews' Fund," the Rev. Mr. Cayley promptly replied, showing that the expenses in remitting to that fund have been very trifling—in fact, little more than postage. We shall now be glad to hear from the Secretary of the "Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews." It is commonly reported that a very considerable expense is incurred in connection with the last named Society. As the collection for the Jews is taken up on Good Friday, it will be all important that we should have this information before that date. May I request, Mr. Editor, that if the Secretary-Treasurer of the "Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews" is not on your list of subscribers, that you will send him a copy of the CANADIAN CHURCHMAN, marked, in which this letter appears. If that fails to solicit a reply, I shall then send a letter to one of the Toronto dailies.

CHURCHMAN.

Huron Diocese, Feb. 19th, 1891.

[We presume, the Rev. T. S. Ellerby, Sec.-Treasurer of the Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews, will be pleased to give the required information.—Ed. C. C.]

Wesley Anniversary.

SIR,—The 2nd day of March was the hundredth anniversary of the death of Rev. John Wesley. He lived and died a priest in good standing of the Church of England, although the Methodists have dropped his name from their Church, which is no longer Wesleyan, but the Methodist Church of Canada. Being possessed of a complete copy of the works of Wesley, now standard, and corrected by himself for publication about two years before his death, I would like, with your permission, to give some extracts from these works in proof of what I assert. He did his best to preserve the unity of the Church, though without success. It is for those who have rent the seamless garment of Christ to show that they had good reasons for so doing, and that those reasons still continue, before they can justify their schism.

(1744) "At the first meeting of all our preachers in our conference, in June, 1744, I exhorted them to keep to the Church; observing that this was our peculiar glory,—not to form any new sect, but abiding in our own Church, to do to all men all the good we possibly could." Vol. vii., p. 825.

(1758) "In the year 1758, I resolved to bring the matter to a fair issue. So I desired the point to be considered at large, whether it was expedient for the Methodists to leave the Church. The arguments on both sides were discussed for several days; and at length we agreed, without a dissenting voice,

it is by no means expedient that the Methodists should leave the Church of England." Vol. vii., p. 825.

(1789) "I will not leave the Church. I mean unless I see more reason for it than I ever yet saw. I will not leave the Church of England, as by law established, while the breath of God is in my nostrils." Vol. vii., p. 824.

(1789) "I declare once more that I live and die a member of the Church of England; and that none who regard my judgment or advice will ever separate from it." Vol. vii., page 826.

(1788) "But they (the Methodists) have been solicited again and again, from time to time, to separate from it (the Church), and form themselves into a distinct body, independent of all other religious societies. Thirty years ago this was seriously considered among them at a general conference. All the arguments urged on one side and the other were considered at large; and it was determined, without one dissenting voice, that they ought not to separate from the Church." Vol. vii., p. 820.

(1789) "The conference began; about a hundred preachers were present, and never was our Master more eminently present with us. The case of separation from the Church was largely discussed, and we were all unanimous against it." Vol. iv., page 727.

(1789) "Our little conference began at Dublin, and ended Tuesday, 7. On this I observe, (i) I never had forty or fifty such preachers together in Ireland before, all of them, we had reason to hope, alive to God, and earnestly devoted to His service; (ii), I never saw such a number of preachers before so unanimous in all points, particularly as to leaving the Church, which none of them had the least thought of." Vol. iv., page 725.

"Nineteen years ago we considered this question, in our public conference at Leeds, 'Whether the Methodists ought to separate from the Church.' And after a long and candid inquiry, it was determined, *nemine contradicente*, that it was not expedient for them to separate. The reasons were set down at large, and they stand equally good at this day." Vol. ii., page 445.

(1789) Mr. Wesley thus refers to his sermon "On the ministerial office," preached before the conference at Cork, May 4th, 1789, and suppressed in Drew's eleventh edition: "I endeavoured to quench the fire which some had laboured to kindle, among the poor, quiet people about separating from the Church." Vol. ii., page 718.

(1786) "Our conference began: (at Bristol) about eighty preachers attended. . . . On Thursday in the afternoon we permitted any of the society to be present, and weighed what was said about separating from the Church; but we all determined to continue therein, without one dissenting voice; and I doubt not but this determination will stand, at least till I am removed to a better world." Vol. iv., page 640.

(1785) "Finding a report had been spread abroad that I was just going to leave the Church: to satisfy those who were grieved concerning it, I openly declared in the evening that I had now no more thought of separating from the Church than I had forty years ago." Vol. iv., p. 624.

(1786) "I met the classes at Deptford, and was vehemently importuned to order the Sunday service in our room, at the same time with that of the Church. It is easy to see that this would be a formal separation from the Church. We fixed our morning and evening service all over England, at such hours as not to interfere with the Church; with this very design,—that those of the Church, if they chose it, might attend both the one and the other; but to fix it at the same hour, is obliging them to separate either from the Church or us, and this I judge to be not only inexpedient but totally unlawful for me to do so." Vol. iv., page 647.

(1789) "I went over to Deptford; but it seemed I was got into a den of lions. Most of the leading men and the society were mad for separating from the Church. I endeavoured to reason with them; they had neither sense nor even good manners left. At length after meeting the whole society, I told them: 'If you are resolved, you may have your service in Church hours: but remember, from that time you will see my face no more.' This sunk deep; and from that hour I have heard no more of separating from the Church." Vol. iv., page 650.

(1788) "One of the most important points considered at this conference was that of leaving the Church. The sum of a long conversation was, (i) That in a course of fifty years, we had neither premeditatedly nor willingly varied from it in one article either in doctrine or discipline." Vol. iv., page 708.

(Between 1744 and 1789) "I fear when the Methodists leave the Church, God will leave them." Vol. v., page 226.

(1787) "I still think, when the Methodists leave the Church of England God will leave them." Vol. vii., page 591.