

run, I consider that the northern part should constitute the new diocese. The northern diocese could consist of the counties of Waterloo, Perth, Huron, Bruce, and Grey, with the township of Dufferin, which we have, and a portion of the north of Middlesex and Lambton, including the parishes of Grauton, Lucan, Ailsa Craig, Park Hill, and Forest on that line of railway. From Brant to Essex, including both, would form the other diocese, consisting of nearly eight counties. The whole diocese should raise the new episcopal endowment, but the southern portion—having nearly all the endowments, which, with the assistance of Parliament, may one day be turned into cash for the general work of the Church, should contribute much the larger share. All the funds would of course be divided in due proportion. The northern diocese should still be called the "Diocese of Huron," it being the one bordering on Lake Huron, and having in it the county of Huron. Stratford could be made the See City, it being a fine railroad centre; and when we get the "Huron and Ontario Electric Railroad" built, it will be a great help in episcopal visitations. Then Owen Sound could build his Lordship a nice summer residence, where he could enjoy the fresh breezes from Georgian Bay, and take a few trips by water, combining business and pleasure. Then if we could induce our good Bishop to bid farewell to the malarial Christianity and muddy roads of the southwest, and move up to where the truly Irish welcome of the ever loyal north is the rule and not the exception, we would celebrate the event by a bonfire night of our own. Then the north would have "Home Rule"; and with the confidence of the people secured and held fast, debts and all forms of dishonest dealing would become impossible amongst us. We would do away with useless, and often meaningless, qualifying adjectives, and all be just *Churchmen*,—simple Prayer-Book Churchmen. The south might be called the Diocese of London and Brantford, and, having many advantages, it ought to soon open up every neglected corner for the maintenance of the beautiful services of our beloved Church among the few scattered ones as well as the many. As we believe our Church to be right, let us unitedly, with heart and hand, do what we can to make her the power for God she ought to be, in this and every other country. I commend the above suggestions to the earnest consideration of your readers, believing that the time has come for us, like good men and true, to go boldly forward.

T. LOFTUS ARMSTRONG.

Thanks.

SIR,—May I through the columns of your paper thank the unknown friends who so kindly sent me the *CANADIAN CHURCHMAN* and the *Canadian Church Magazine*. I need hardly say how much their kindness is appreciated. If any of your readers could kindly send me some hymn books and prayer books, either new or second-hand, they would be greatly valued in this poor mission, where the people are able to do very little in Church matters. I am thankful to say that under God's blessing our work is making good progress; most of the people are Indians, and many of them speak English and join most heartily and reverently in the services. During the past winter the people have not been so well off as formerly owing, to the failure of the fall fishing, which is their principal means of livelihood. Possibly some of your readers would like to help on the work. I should be glad to give any particulars that may be required. Hoping that you may be able to afford space for the above in your most valuable paper. St.

REV. C. J. PRITCHARD.

St. John's Mission, Grand Rapids, The Pass P.O., Sask., N.W.T.

Church Entertainments.

SIR,—In your issue of March 19th there appeared a letter from "A Churchman" on this subject, in which the undesirability, not to speak of the unseemliness, of supporting the Church and her services in this way is clearly brought out. Results also are touched upon which cannot but be clearly recognized and understood by all true Church people, and especially, perhaps, by those more directly in touch with the financial aspects of our parishes, our wardens and vestries. "Churchman," however, has not gone far enough in his remarks on "results," and I might, perhaps, carry the thoughts of your many readers a little further on this point. Recently, many, if not all our parishes, have been holding their annual Easter meetings, and what do we find in some (I trust not in many) instances, especially those that are known to be depending largely for revenue from this source? We find, 'tis true, an earnest desire to curtail expenses, and thus make ends meet—a laudable and praiseworthy effort, no doubt, but alas! how is the curtailment effected? Too often it happens that already the items of current expense are cut down to "low water" mark, for we cannot, of course, in many cases forego cushioned pews and other personal comforts and luxuries, and the only possible

reduction of expense, therefore, is in the salary list. Now, sir, when this point is reached, what do we find? The lay officers, choirmaster, organist, sexton, and frequently choir members (of whom the latter at least should rather consider it a privilege to give their services) all have their secular avocations, generally sufficient to enable them to earn a comfortable livelihood, and will not entertain the idea of a reduction, so that the only one who can be so affected is the parish priest, rector, or incumbent, as he may be styled, and should he object, he is immediately thought to be too avaricious, anxious for an over-abundance of the comforts and pleasures of this life, and such like motives. Perhaps I might mention one or two instances of this kind. In one of our large towns one parish has lately reduced this expense one-fourth; other officials, if anything, increased, while in another the stipend has undergone a reduction of one-fifth, neither salaries ever being excessively, if sufficiently, high. Now, Mr. Editor, I ask, how many of the parishioners in any parish, while favouring such reductions in the stipends of their clergy, thereby hampering their efforts in the spiritual work of the parish by increasing the burden of temporal anxiety—how many of the laity, I say, are equally prepared to suffer a similar and even proportionate decrease of their comforts and pleasures for the sake of Christ and the Church, the noblest, grandest, and best heritage of man? Shall we not put forth every effort to bring our people to a fuller realization of their great privileges, and when this is done, there will surely not be the present necessity for practising the various methods now resorted to—methods which being abolished, will give to the members of our Ladies' Aids and similar Church societies more time and opportunity for the true work of her people. But this is a subject well worth consideration of itself. With "Churchman," then, Mr. Editor, I would say it is earnestly to be hoped that an enquiry into the causes of such a state of things as exists will take no insignificant place in the discussions at the meetings of the General Synod in Winnipeg in September next, if not at every Diocesan Synod during the year, and I believe a considerable proportion of these causes will be found to exist as a result of the methods now so general, methods not only the means of driving many from the Church, but of impairing its usefulness, not to speak of a higher aspect of the matter, the insult thereby offered to the Great Founder and Head of the Church Himself. Well, indeed, might the words of St. John (ii. 13 to 17) be applied to the Church people of to-day. Much can be done in bringing about a change by the Church papers of the day, and I trust the voice of the *CANADIAN CHURCHMAN* will not be withheld. Already I believe a movement is on foot among the laity of all persuasions (High, Broad and Low) in one of our dioceses, having for its object the memorializing of the General Synod on this subject, with a view to getting at least an expression of opinion, if nothing further as yet, from the highest Church Council in the land. May God speed them in their laudable efforts, and lead Churchmen in other dioceses to take similar action. Apologizing for encroaching so largely upon your valuable space.

A LAYMAN.

Dean Farrar's Life of Christ.

SIR,—Permit me to make a few observations upon the above book. I ask this permission as I know the *CANADIAN CHURCHMAN* is always on the side of Catholic truth. I ask also this favour as Dean Farrar's *Life of Christ* has been recently recommended, along with the Bible, for proper reading in Passion week, by a clergyman; and has also been recommended by a gentleman who takes an active part in our Sunday-schools, as a fit book for teachers to read when preparing any part of the Gospels for the Sunday lesson. I wonder did those gentlemen who recommend this book to their parishioners, or to the Sunday-school teachers, ever read the account of the healing of the demoniac at Gadara. The evangelists who penned the description of that event, for the future edification of the Church, I was always taught to believe, wrote, inspired and taught by the Holy Ghost; but Dean Farrar thinks otherwise. Here are his words: "There can be little or no difficulty in understanding that the shrieks and gesticulations of a powerful lunatic might strike uncontrollable terror into a herd of swine. We know further that the spasm of deliverance was often attended with fearful convulsions, sometimes perhaps with an effusion of blood, and we know that the sight and smell of human blood produces strange effects in animals. May there not have been something of this kind at work in this singular event?" Is it not allowable here to make a distinction between actual facts, and that which was the mere conjecture and inference of the spectators from whom the three evangelists heard the tale? Now read the account of this miracle in the synoptic Gospels; take this blasphemous nonsense as its exposition, and recommend the book, if you can, to be read by parishioners and Sunday-school teachers.

Again, open page 311—we read Dean Farrar's description and exposition of the Agony in Gethsemane. *He seems to utter heresy, and in the next line to recall what he has said; these are the very words:* "The great drops of anguish which drop from Him in the dreadful struggle, look to them—the disciples, Peter, James and John—like heavy gout of blood" (Luke xxii. 43, 44); the A. V. translates correctly. The force of the particles, *as it were*, falls on the drops, not on the blood, as is evident from the fact of drops having the epithet, and that epithet in the plural, falling down. If the sweat had not been a bloody one the mention of blood might have been altogether omitted, for the word *drops*, or rather *little hills*, even by itself, was sufficient to express thick sweat. The Church prays: "By Thine agony and bloody sweat," etc. Dean Farrar speaks in this very paragraph of the crimson traces of that bitter struggle, and at page 314 uses the words "that sweat of blood." Lastly, turn to page 419. There we have Dean Farrar's exposition of Matthew xxvii. 52, 53. Here it is: "An earthquake shook the earth and split the rocks, and as it rolled away from their places the great stones which closed and covered the cavern sepulchres of the Jews, so it seemed to the imaginations of many, to have disimprisoned the spirits of the dead, and to have filled the air with ghostly visitants, who after Christ had risen, appeared to linger in the Holy City." In a note the poor man says: "Only in some such way as this can I account for the singular and wholly isolated allusion of Matthew xxvii. 52, 53." It is much easier, Dean Farrar, to believe the Scriptures and the words they have spoken, namely, that there was a real apparition. Here are three vital points which in my opinion make the book a most dangerous one for a clergyman to recommend to his flock, or a Sunday-school lecturer to advise Sunday-school teachers to purchase and read. I feel, from your love of Catholic truth, you will publish this warning to all who read or recommend Dean Farrar's book.

FIDES.

Translation and Resignation of Bishops.

SIR,—In your leading articles concerning the election of the Bishop of Niagara to the See of Ottawa, you have taken a very distinct position that the Bishop of Niagara should at once accept and go. I think you somewhat ignore the claims of and justice to Niagara in this matter. The Bishop himself has appealed for advice to the Bishops of the Ecclesiastical Province. At the moment of writing the House has not decided, but I have every reason to believe that the House of Bishops, notwithstanding the readiness with which the Archbishop, at the Synod of Ontario, declared that there would be no two minds as to the opinion of the bishops, will decline to advise the Bishop of Niagara to resign. I desire to point out to you very cogent reasons why the House of Bishops will not advise the Bishop of Niagara, and why also, I believe, if the Bishop does resign Niagara, the House of Bishops will refuse to accept such resignation. The resignation of a See by a bishop is an act which can only be justified on the most assured reasons for the greater good of the Church, and then only by consent of the greater Synod or a great number of bishops. There are two ways in which a bishop may leave his See, by translation or by transmigration. The latter expresses the act of the Bishop going, the former the act of the Bishops sending him. I need hardly say that transmigration is unwarrantable. Resignation is only canonical on such ground as follows:

1. Guilt—When the opportunity may be afforded to resign and so avoid deposition.
2. Sickness, in which case absolute resignation is not usually accepted, but only from active duty in favor of a coadjutor.
3. Ignorance.
4. The perverse rebelliousness of the people.
5. The healing of a schism in the Church.
6. Irregularity.

It certainly is not a canonical ground for resignation that one diocese has coveted the head of its neighbour, or that a bishop desires to transmigrate. In the appointment of a coadjutor in case of sickness it is utterly uncanonical and illegal to appoint with right of succession, thus barring the free choice of clergy and laity. Translations and resignations have always been opposed to the mind of the Church, and to that conception of the relationship of a bishop to his diocese, the disruption of which has at times been declared to be a divorce—a union which is emblematically signified in the West by the wearing of the Episcopal ring, of which we have mention as early as the 6th century.

1. The Apostolic Canons (XIV.) forbid, unless there be *Eulogios aitia*, and guard it thus, that neither the *paroikia* desiring him, nor the Bishop, but many Bishops shall decide the point in the greater assembly.
2. The Council of Nicæa, A.D. 320, Canon XV., the Council of Antioch, A.D. 341, Canon XXI., and

the Cot
it absol
the Bis
3. Th
mit tra
Church
of the
apo po
greater
place.
And
Niagar
more it
Author
surrou
circum
But hi
are fev
been 1
450, as
bishop
ad mui
one de
state.
persect
were, I
They d
East t
Churcl
counse
in one
transla
fred o
any set
to effe
668 to
or four
tional:
1. C
(nolo e
or Her
life, th
for res
2. C
Herefo
is not
Herefo
In tl
cuted l
restore
electe
Bishop
togeth
Archbi
might
conflic
secular
the be
Churcl
know
Churcl
brandi
10th c
age of
and tl
again
1. S
resign
for
perfor
little
patria
assign
doniar
among
Later
accuse
becaus
Nicæa
but ju
equal
Nicæa
least c
in the
dual
right,
the sc
owing
led by
transl
was di
who I
condem
becaus
and w
so wit
on no
people
stance
for O
assem
the pe
that
West.
the E