

The Canadian Spectator.

VOL. III.—No. 48.

MONTREAL, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 27, 1880.

\$2.00 PER ANNUM.

CONTENTS:

THE TIMES.
TRADE, FINANCE, STATISTICS.
CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.
METHODISM.
A VIEW OF IRELAND.
RELIGIOUS THOUGHT IN SCOTLAND.
PROFANE LANGUAGE.

THE F. F.'S.
WINDOW GARDENING.
Mlle. BERNHARDT.
BEAUTY'S DAUGHTERS.
MUSICAL.
CHESS.
&c. &c. &c.

BUSINESS NOTICE.

Those of our Subscribers to whom subscription accounts have recently been rendered, would greatly oblige by remitting to this office without further delay; many of these accounts are for arrears, and a prompt remittance from each Subscriber is always a tangible evidence of due appreciation of our efforts, as well as a very NECESSARY ADJUNCT to enable us still further to improve, increase and expand our endeavours to make the SPECTATOR yet more popular in every way. Registered letters, addressed Manager CANADIAN SPECTATOR, Montreal, at our risk.

THE TIMES.

Messrs Thors and de Molinari have left Canada with mingled feelings about us and our country. They have been fairly amazed at the vastness of our territory and its possibilities, at the magnificence of our rivers and lakes and the civilization of the people, but they remember nothing so vividly as Canadian hospitality. They were feasted to their heart's content and more, and are no doubt, glad to get away to let their digestive organs have a chance of getting back to their normal condition.

It is undoubtedly a good thing for the country that the Cr dit Foncier is to be established here; it will help to make money plentiful and consequently cheap, but the gentlemen from Paris have made a great mistake in allowing their Society to fall into the hands of a political party. Sound business cannot well be done if political wire pullers are to have entire control. The Cr dit Foncier will succeed if its affairs are conducted on purely business principles, for its methods are well adapted to the country, but if they are conducted with an eye to politics it will inevitably fail.

Some High Church clergymen in Montreal are reported to be praying for the Rev. Mr. Pelham Dale, now in an English jail for the breaking of English ecclesiastical law. But I am puzzled to know how the said clergy have arrived at the conclusion that Mr. Pelham Dale is a fit subject for their prayers. They are not asking that he may see the error of his ways and obey the law of the land in which he lives, but that heaven may help him to resist the operation of the laws under which he voluntarily placed himself, and under which he voluntarily remains. If Mr. Dale would cut himself free from the Establishment he could wear any kind of millinery; he could dress after any fashion; he could have any sort of table and any number of candles; he could turn to the East to the West, or the North or the South, according to the desire of his own pious heart, and no one would interfere with him for so doing; but as matters stand, he is a servant of the Crown; he is paid by law, and protected by law, and it does seem strange that the Almighty should be asked to support a man in defying the earthly head of the English Church.

It seems to me that the Rev. Mr. Wood and *confr res*—good men that they all are—should rather desire for Mr. Pelham Dale, and those of his way of thinking, that they be blest with a few grains more of common sense, so as to know that a matter of the style of a petticoat for a man cannot, by any process known to men, be exalted or reduced to a principle for which an educated person should suffer even the mildest kind of martyrdom. And then, these imprisonments of clergymen will open the eyes of the English people to the absurdity and harm of compelling the members of a church to worship God according to the terms of an Act of Parliament. While the Episcopal Church is in alliance with the State it must be subject to the laws of the State, and any breach of the laws must be punished. If the laws were altered to suit the Ritualists, a new party making further demands would spring up in a year, and to the making of laws, like to the writing of books, there would be no end. There is only one way out of the difficulty—disestablishment. Meantime the Ritualists can disestablish themselves any day, and be as free as our own much respected and esteemed Mr. Wood.

Toronto Divines are still engaged in the laudable work of trying to promote unity between the different churches. And this is the way they go about it: Archbishop Lynch lectures on unity, begs for it, prays for it. He is grieved as he looks out upon the broken and disorganized masses of Protestants and says: "What has been the cause of all this discussion in faith among those calling themselves Christians? The cause is the old one: pride of intellect, restlessness under the restraint of authority, and unwillingness to submit to the discipline of the Gospel, which was against the flesh." Now, if the Archbishop will take counsel with some one who has a trifle of common sense, he will hear that, when men wish to put away an old quarrel and be on friendly terms again, they do not open negotiations by abusing each other, calling bad names and imputing evil, but they find and point out their mutual agreement and sympathies, and minimise their differences. The Archbishop should call his lecture "insult" and not "unity."

To the Archbishop answers the Rev. John Langtry, a man of good repute, and also desirous of promoting the cause of "unity." But he follows the example of the Archbishop carefully, and after stating that the union of churches is possible, says: "This would, of course, require on the part of Rome the abandonment of her unfounded and absurd pretensions to autocratic and imperial authority over the Christian world, and the correction of those superstitious practices and corruptions of doctrine into which, in the days of her ignorance and pride, she was betrayed." If such sweet wooing as that does not end in marriage, will there be reasonable ground for surprise?

But the following from Mr. Langtry's letter ought to afford all readers genuine amusement:—

"I have further to complain—as I see a writer in the *Mail* has already complained—of what was, I fear, a piece of conscious discourtesy on your Grace's part. You tell your hearers that we of the Church of England together with others whom you name, call ourselves a sect or denomination rather than a Church, and apply to us the sectarian title of Episcopalians. I think your Grace can hardly be ignorant of the fact that we not only never have described ourselves as a sect or denomination, but that we indignantly repudiate the charge that we are one or the other; and, moreover, that we have never applied to ourselves the name Episcopalian, or any other but our ancient name, the Church of England, which we have borne for a thousand years and more, or our still more ancient name of Catholic. And we not only claim, but are able