

active earnest men in the several dioceses. We should not be behind the denominations in this respect. of home-sold regulations but use

The announcement is made that Canon Liddon has declined the Bishopric of Edinburgh to which he was lately elected. This will be a great disappointment to our fellow Churchmen there. We think we but express the feeling of hundreds of thousands when we say, that his not having been nominated for any of the numerous vacancies which have of late occurred was not only unjust to him, but a serious loss to the whole Anglican Church. What a grand thought it would be for the Canadian Branch of the Church if Dr. Liddon could be induced to pay us a visit, and preach in the chief cities?

The Lord Bishop of Qu'Appelle (Dr. Anson) has addressed a circular letter to his Episcopal brethren in the Dominion, urging a change in the title of the Church in Canada. He suggests that the name should be simply "The Church of Canada," and thinks that as all legal ties that once bound us to the Church of England are undoubtedly dissolved, the continued use of the title "Church of England" is unmeaning. The full title of the Church in this Ecclesiastical Province is "The Church of England in CANADA." We fail to see that this is unmeaning, and would strongly oppose the omission of the words which mark our connection with the "OLD CHURCH" and with "OLD ENGLAND."

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of THE CHURCH GUARDIAN.—A young lady of my parish having observed your extraordinary offer of 25 copies of the CHURCH GUARDIAN for \$15 (in club form), considered that she could not confer a greater benefit upon the Church and its members than by promoting the dissemination of your valuable paper. She, therefore, willingly gave her labor and time and has the gratifying result to announce with the remittance herein that a most powerful missionary agency, through your great liberality, is provided for probably one hundred readers weekly in this little rural community. Heretofore, six copies weekly would comprise the Church periodicals of this parish. Every parish with five parish, or an active member, will surely participate in such an opportunity. Thanking you earnestly for your self-denying enterprise for the welfare of the Church of our Lord, believe me, gratefully, with strengthened renewed a hundred-fold.

A PARISH PRIEST.

Sir,—On my return home from an excursion I naturally turned to my CHURCH GUARDIAN. In the number of June 9th I see an article from you, then on the General Thanksgiving, which entirely covers the right ground, as you justly remark, it is a species of ritualism without the warrant or any liturgical use of any kind of the Church, this singing the General Thanksgiving minister and people together in the same manner in the General Confession. The custom thus grown so general, (yet not adopted, I believe, over the lines), arose doubtless, as you suggest, from a mistaken idea of the word "general." Of course there lacks the rubrical direction for united action, such as precedes the General Confession. And then, as noticed in communications heretofore published on the subject, the printing of the "amen" at the conclusion of the prayer goes to prove that the practice in question is entirely without authority and was never contemplated by the framers of our admirable service. This unwarrantable innovation, on established usage, is said to have been imported by a clergyman who was travelling abroad, and who thought it a nice thing to introduce into this country.

Such is the reason given in these parts for its adoption, and, to say the least, it is a most pronounced as every well and unsatisfactory. Yet from the fact that it does no harm I have thought it best not to disturb the people or their devotions, by attempting to set them right on this matter. So they continue to this day, the practice introduced or sanctioned by my predecessors, although, allow me to add, that my own family consisting of several worshippers never have joined in this practice. "All in his own way."

Another article in the same paper, and same page which also engaged my attention, (not let me say to the exclusion of many other selections), is what you say in reference to the use of Moody and Sankey's hymns in service, and Sunday school. I am glad to know that, as unjustifiable a practice as it is, it is not yet a universal one. The language used by them does not seem at all too strong, or defiant in its feelings. Taking away all solemnity from religious things, these would seem to be no excuse for the adoption of so pernicious a custom. If we were without any standard and appropriate hymns, there might seem to be some reason for the custom; but for Churchmen, who hold in their hands the very best hymns that could be composed, to fly to these erratic compilers, (for whatever their seeming bonquest, they must be so regarded), is strange indeed. Let us who are rightly instructed, and who are resolved to hold fast to the faith, and the truth as it is in Jesus, be ready to flower down every change, even should we be termed "extreme bigoted, or uncharitable," only that we may be faithful, consistent and true.

FROM OUTSIDE.

Sir,—As one of the Church, public to whom every question affecting the interests of the Church at large is a matter of importance, may I say a word about the present position of the Diocese of Montreal? It may be well for some of our brethren there to see themselves as others see them. There are a good many of us who may be quite wrong in our views, most mistaken even, prejudiced if you will, and so forth, but still we have opinions, that we are not ashamed to express, and which have been formed by the consideration of recent events, let me add, with very deep regret. How can it be otherwise when, to our mind, the Diocese of Montreal seems bent on making itself ridiculous: this in many ways, for many years, winding up with the exclusion of some of the best men from the Provincial Synod delegation. The absurdity of a "Dean" without a Cathedral, then, no less than four Archdeacons, and any amount of Canons, so many that even as a joke that notion of an undignified clergyman was possible, all this is, exceedingly, lowering to the respect for real merit. It makes people laugh. It is like child's play. Surely it is time that there was some sensible rule or regulation made by the House of Bishops, if not by the whole Provincial Synod, determining the proportion of dignitaries to the clergy of each Diocese. Few people would grudge an honorary distinction to a clergyman who had faithfully and ably served his Master and the Church for (say) a quarter of a century or more, and by general consent was entitled to his "stick," like Q.C. But to "dignify" juveniles or seniles, whose only claim to a title may be that they are good wire-pullers or useful party men, is well—it makes the dignity despicable. Again, the attempt to obtain University degrees for a little school of Theology, is of a piece with the above. This too makes people laugh. When such English institutions as Gt. Ouse, Lincoln, Wells, St. Augustine's, Canterbury, &c., &c., with a staff of first-class theologians, men of profound learning do not dream of giving university degrees, it does seem the same of absurdity that this should be asked for the little school in Montreal. Certainly, there is nothing like cheek in these days. Outside the

Church of England and in the land of Uncle Sam we are prepared for this. With certain dear dissembling brethren, who are everything while few respectable men in the State, until their position is well secured. But, say the warm thinkers of the whole community for the independent stand taken in this matter. So, too, do the Bishops of the Province who have no doubt most reluctantly and regretfully, felt obliged to oppose their Right Rev. Brother of Montreal, and place the Church's honour and character before their private feelings. This is how we outsiders regard this late degree business. With such an excellent institution as Lennoxville close at hand, with its officers and teachers of reputation, and a character to lose, we think Montreal Diocese may well be content, with her local college, without seeking to be placed on a level, with degree-giving universities such as Lennoxville and McGill. Why say nothing of Oxford or Dublin. Why we can only cry—what next? And yet there is a next. We are all of us deeply concerned in having our best-informed, our most scholarly and experienced men in the Provincial Synod. The whole of the Church in Canada is interested in seeing there educated clergymen guiding the destinies of the young Mother, only some 24 years old. We want men who are in harmony with matured wisdom, and who are familiar with the current literature of the venerable Mother at home. We have not a plethora of such men. And the recent action of the Montreal Synod is certainly no great inducement for such men to come and cast in their lot among us. Nor does it encourage such gentlemen, lay or clerical, to give their time and talents to promoting the interests of the Church. We all know the unfortunate result of introducing party politics into municipal matters. Few respectable men can be induced to seek aldermanic honors in our county towns. Is this to be the case with your Diocesan Synod? Are you going to belittle yourselves by the vulgar party feeling which refuses to recognize the worth and character of such a clergyman as Canon Norman, or that cannot appreciate the just influence his presence would give the Diocese in the Provincial Synod? We outsiders beg to assure our brethren that we know of no other man who can fairly compensate for the loss of Doctor Norman as a Montreal representative. Perhaps our brethren may reply "This is our own affair." Very well. All we can say is, in our humble, or perhaps mistaken, opinion, you are acting ridiculously against your own and the Church's interests. You are setting a very bad example to other dioceses, in letting party feeling exclude men whom your brother Churchmen everywhere respect and would delight to know. For instance, at the next meeting of the Provincial Synod, suppose Dr. Norman were placed in the now vacant Prolocutor's Chair, (and few would be more eligible), would not Montreal Diocese feel it a high compliment? Sir, I know I am representing the feelings and opinions of many in our Ecclesiastical Province, when I write these words of regret, dissatisfaction with the recent conduct of affairs in Montreal. And I beg to end, as I began, by reminding your readers in that Diocese that all Churchmen must feel concerned about what is done there, when the matters touch the general interests of the Church of England. And I shall just add that I begin strongly to share the views, that greater powers of order and discipline should be conferred on the real Central Parliament of our Church, while the powers of the local (I had almost written legislative) Diocesan Synods should be curtailed or subordinated to the supreme authority of the Provincial Synod. The Church of England must act as a united body, as far as possible—and cannot afford to have any of its members making itself ridiculous before the world.

Yours, &c.
June 23rd, 1886. A. K. O.