

the Guardian puts it), "to keep up a constant effort to Christianize the State."

A Good Example.

We fear that the Bishop of Toronto's remarks made from the pulpit of St. James' Cathedral on Thanksgiving Day are only too well founded on fact. Let us point out what was actually done in one year by a church in the West End of London, and then ask ourselves whether throughout the whole of the Dominion we can show anything like it. It appears from the report of the St. Matthew's church, Bayswater, that the total contributions for the year for all objects amounted to £6,546. Of this large sum, £3,266 was subscribed for parochial purposes, £1,073 for home missions, and £2,206 for foreign missions. These are eloquent figures, and we may seek in vain for any such a record from any church in any of the Canadian dioceses.

A Fitting Memorial.

Bristol has erected a noble memorial, in the shape of a beautiful and elaborate reredos in the cathedral of the city, of the thirty-four years' episcopate of Bishop Ellicott. This memorial was recently dedicated by the Bishop's old personal friend, the Archbishop of York, who, in apt language, bore testimony to the debt which Christendom owes to the aged Bishop for his literary work in compiling his Commentaries on the Epistles of St. Paul, also as chairman of the committee for revising the translation of the New Testament; and lastly, to the valuable service rendered by His Lordship to the student of the Old Testament, by his charge to his clergy on what is called "the Higher Criticism" of the Old Testament Scriptures; charges in which the Bishop calls our Lord's own words into witness for the truth of the Old Testament story. These charges, published together under the title "Christus Comprobator," by the Tract Committee of the S.P.C.K., should remain a memorial of the good Bishop's work for the Church, little less lasting than the reredos in the cathedral.

The Philippines.

At a recent meeting held in St. Louis, Sergeant Peyton, of the Brotherhood of St. Andrew, who had just returned from the Philippines, speaking of the religious condition of the people there, said: "Here are three great tribes, and 60 languages and dialects. The real conqueror of the islands has been the Roman Catholic hierarchy. The Archbishop of Manila was the real Governor-General of the archipelago. For 300 years the people have been gradually Romanized. The churches are always crowded with the natives, even where the conditions are unfavourable, where the army occupies the villages. There are practically no seats in the churches, and the service lasts from one to one and a half hours. I never saw one person leave the church during service. I never saw one speak to another during the service. I believe they are in their ignorance, in their blindness, as deeply religious as it is possible for a simple, child-

like people to be. They have been terribly oppressed by the Church, but with all this oppression there was no deviation from their religion. There is no sectarianism. These people have every one been taught the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments and the Catechism. They have every one in infancy been baptized into the Body of Christ. I do not know that on the earth there is a people so cleanly, so moral, so temperate, and so devout as they are. What they need, in my opinion, is the Bible to remove from them the errors under which they are struggling. In a market, one day, as I stood there, 70 Bibles were sold in three hours. The people are bright, not of any great depth of mind, I should judge, but apt to learn. The omission by Congress to provide sufficient chaplains for the new regiments was an unintentional oversight. There are now only five chaplains to 40,000 men at present in the islands." Our readers will remember, though with rare modesty, Sergeant Peyton does not mention it, that the Brotherhood of St. Andrew did admirable work at Manila before the arrival of the chaplains, by arranging convenient services and other Church privileges for the men, who would have fared badly in regard to these but for the work of the Brotherhood.

ST. JAMES'S RECTORY, TORONTO.

Some weeks ago we felt it our duty, as representing the Churchmen of Canada, to comment upon the extraordinary delay in filling up the vacancy made by the lamented death of Bishop Sullivan. Our remarks on that occasion were somewhat widely misrepresented; and we are, therefore, very anxious to say that we adhere to all that we said on that occasion—to all that we said, not to all that we were represented as saying. So also, we are now giving expression to well considered opinion, and we will ask our readers to note that we are quite ready to be responsible for what we say, but not necessarily for what we may be represented as saying. Now, the first thing we note is the Bishop's final announcement of his determination not to appoint Mr. de Soyres to the rectory of St. James. And here we beg to remark that we have expressed no unfavourable opinion in regard to the appointment of Mr. de Soyres. It was no business of ours to interfere, and we did not interfere. As a proof of our friendly neutrality, we may mention that a sermon of Mr. de Soyres came to our office for review, and was reviewed by us on its own merits and quite favourably. But what we have felt and desired to maintain is this—that the Bishop, while bound by the law of the Church to consult the committee consisting of the churchwardens and the delegates to the Synod, was also bound to make the appointment on his own responsibility. That responsibility he could delegate to no other man or body of men. While, therefore, the Bishop was bound seriously to ascertain the wishes expressed by the committee, he was so far from being bound to comply with their request, that he had no moral right to do so in

opposition to his own convictions. Now, the Bishop being Patron, and not the Committee, the Bishop was bound to obtain all possible information respecting the candidate of the Committee, and, among other things, he found that Mr. de Soyres would not be acceptable to a considerable number of the congregation. Quite early in the course of the negotiations, His Lordship gave the Committee to understand that Mr. de Soyres was not likely to be his choice, and this decision he expressed afterwards in rather stronger terms. Now what did the Committee then do? They did nothing but reiterate their wish that Mr. de Soyres might be appointed. This is certainly one of the most remarkable proceedings that we have ever heard of. Let us remember, these five gentlemen were not the patrons of the rectory of St. James's. They were simply persons whose opinions the Bishop was required to ascertain—the final responsibility of the appointment being with him and not with them. When the Bishop intimated to them that their choice was not his, what did they do? They sent back the one name, which, they had been told, could not be accepted! They thought apparently that they could force the Bishop to do what they wanted in opposition to his own convictions! Is there any other possible interpretation of their conduct? The curtness of the Bishop's final letter has been unfavourably commented upon. The Bishop has been a miracle of patience. The attempt of the Committee to force him was simply an attempt to make him contemptible, and even the Bishop who may have best learnt the lesson of turning the left cheek does not like to be made contemptible. When the Justices of the Peace in England present a candidate for the office of High Sheriff of the County, they send the Queen three names, with a kind of suggestion that the first name on the list is the one they recommend. As a rule, Her Majesty "pricks" the first name. But the Committee of St. James's make no pretence of recognizing the episcopal authority. It is a kind of "your money or your life" process. "This is our candidate, your Lordship, and you will be good enough to appoint him without any hesitation." It is quite astonishing that reasonable men should not see the absurdity and discourtesy of their conduct. We are quite certain that there is not a single member of the Committee who would individually defend such a course of conduct, for "they are all honorable men," but it is only another proof that a Committee will do things which individual members of the Committee would not think of doing. We believe that every clergyman and layman in the diocese of Toronto, who does not wish to see the degradation of his Bishop, will resent most strongly the veiled attempt to coerce him, and, even if they think the Bishop's final reply a trifle abrupt, will yet be more surprised at his patience than at his resentment. Another point deserves notice. According to Church Law, when the Patron does not appoint within six months of a vacancy, the patronage lapses to the Bishop. And on this ground, the Bishop has the right