

bills, and the example of such is encouraging to liberality, especially in our small congregations. There is no unfrequent occurrence to find an offertory collection of say \$10, of which the clergyman gives \$5, and the balance comes from a hundred others, of whom most, if not all, are far better off than their minister. But the parish gains the credit of a generous contribution—a credit which too often is but little discerned. How far this is conducive to the self-righteousness of the parishioners is a question that I cannot now discuss, but there can be no two opinions as to the selfishness of the clergy.

Before concluding, however, I must demur not only to the sneering tone of your correspondent in reference to those of the clergy who prefer to provide for their families, without leaving them to the charity of the Church, but also to the slur which he casts on our laity. While to many of these brethren, liberality to Christ and His Church is still an unknown luxury, like many privileges of the higher Christian civilization. I am bold to affirm that by the vast majority of our laymen of the better sort, it has never been supposed that the W. and O. fund should be sustained by the slender purses of the poorest clergymen. To make the charity wear as respectable a look as possible, with the pretence of a little insurance, they stipulate that these worthy men, whose stipends often do not average the wages of a respectable mechanic, shall pay a trifling sum of \$5 per annum, if they are unable otherwise to make provision for widows and orphans. But it is only for the sake of respectability, and as an indirect and delicate way of knowing who are to be the deserving recipients of the Church's benevolence. In no other light can this small yearly fragment be regarded, and in no other light do our clergy regard it. The W. and O. fund is a charity, and the moment you make it a commercial enterprise, you change its whole nature, and sap the very foundation of the appeal made annually and successfully to the hearts of our liberal laity. It is due to these good brethren to state that since our diocese was formed they have always provided ample funds to meet the claims of widows and orphans left by the clergy, who complied with the simple requirements of the Canon, and we need have no apprehension whatever that our future necessities will be less cared for than those of the past. Yours, Napanee, March 31st, 1887. T. BEDFORD JONES.

THE POSITION OF THE CHURCH TOUCHING SCIENCE.

SIR,—I remember well a few years ago reading Harley's "Lay Sermons," and observing how in one of them he attacks Churchmen for their opposition to knowledge. What a commentary upon this is the following from Hooker, in Book III., chap. viii. 9-10. He says: "There is in the world no kind of knowledge, whereby any part of truth is seen, but we justly account it precious, yea, that principle truth, in comparison whereof all the knowledge is vile, may receive from it some kind of light, whether it be that Egyptian and Chaldean wisdom mathematical, wherewith Moses and Daniel were furnished; that national, moral, and civic wisdom, wherein Solomon excelled all men, (1 Kings iv. 29, 30, or that national and oratorical wisdom of the Grecians, which the Apostle St. Paul brought from Tarsus, or that Judaical, which he learned in Jerusalem, sitting at the feet of Gamaliel: to detract from the dignity thereof were to injure even God himself, who being that light which none can approach unto, hath sent out these lights whereof we are capable, even as so many sparkles resembling in the bright fountain from which they rise. If each one of our young clergy were to study Hooker, we should have a different Churchmanship in Canada from that we have to-day.

I am, sir, yours, X.

P. S.—I believe Hooker is like Butler, the more we read of him the better we understand his drift, although I must confess it, one wants a clear brain and a trained mind to fully comprehend him. If Huxley and his like only knew the Church's classics he would never have been the bitter foe he has been. There is an *imperium in imperio* whether it be the power of arms or of mind, and this latter is held by the *ecclesia Dei*.

THE CHURCH AND THE ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY.

SIR,—May I ask why it is the bishops and clergy of the Church of England in Canada are so slow to try and buy some properties which might, in the future, be turned to such good account? Thousands of dollars are squandered in other ways while no acres are being bought, even in new countries. Rome might well teach us a lesson; but as long as we have this miserable partyism from highest to lowest in office, so long will the Church be that wretched body it is to-day. A golden opportunity is presenting itself now—days, but it seems the bishops have "no money" and the clergy no interest in the matter. Oh! that

the dry bones were shaken and Canada could be aroused. There are thousands to-day who ought to take an interest in that Church which has given them their freedom, but in the blindness of their ignorance they are her foes. Well may Canada hide her face in the Jubilee year of our Queen. I am, Sir, yours, TRAVELLER.

AM I IN A CIVILIZED LAND.

SIR,—In the *Mail* of March 17th, I see where Boston gave Sam Jones \$19,000 for one month's excitement, and from the *DOMINION CHURCHMAN* of the same date, I see that Canada could only spare \$100 for all the Church's missionaries in Labrador. Yet people say we are civilized here. I certainly doubt the truth of this. No such thing would have ever happened in a really civilized country.

ONE WATCHING AND PRAYING.

ARCHBISHOP LYNCH AND LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL.

SIR,—As an Irishman I would like to point out that all land and criminal laws in existence in Ireland affect Protestant and Roman Catholic subjects alike, but it never occurs to a Bishop of the Church of Ireland or a Bishop in the Canadian Church to address a letter to Lord Randolph Churchill on this terrible Irish grievance. The fact is, as we all know, the Irish priesthood and a fair agitation are doing bad work because the Roman Catholic peasantry are so ignorant and insolent they think political agitation is going to make them rich. England is not so foolish as not to know that out of 60,000,000 of people in the United States only about 10,000,000 are Roman Catholics, and therefore anti-English and anti-Irish unless it be towards an Italian Ireland. Wherever Romanism is found it is plainly anti-national. Where would united Italy be if the Pope had his say. Where would France, Germany, England, the United States of America, India, Russia, and all the rest. They would be under a Bishop of Rome as supreme Director, and a lot of uneducated priests, who would never rest until half the country was church property. English intelligence has not to fight against Irish landlordism but against a clerical despotism that brought the neck of monarchs under the foot of a man calling himself Christ's vicar. In Canada to-day you can see hundreds of the most intelligent Frenchmen who cannot speak a word of English, although for more than one century this has been the language of this country and the language of America. They are worse off than the Indians. Will Archbishop Lynch tell us why this is so. If not we can tell him. It is because in Canada Roman Catholicism is anti-Canadian. Ireland's hope rests in the Scriptures of God—Canada's rests in the same. Thank God the "Rose Bible" goes. I am, sir, yours, CANADA FOR CANADIANS.

P. S.—If Canada does not take care we may have the ignorant French Fenians, making a move should England and old France go to war. It is becoming the opinion in England that a secret combination is on foot of a clerical order to crush her. It must fail. We must, nevertheless, never sleep at our posts. As Peter was not "all the apostles" (allowing that Peter founded Rome which we do not allow) so Rome is not "all the churches." The world has had enough of the crafty, money-making, Italian cheat, and like all cheats he must go. If it was not for true Christianity he would be in the Tiber long ago. If ever he comes to it he may thank "his friends." They have made Socialists what they are, and Italian socialism will demolish the Vatican before people are aware of the fact. The Irish priesthood are trying to hound the Protestants out of Ireland, but they themselves will go first. How many millions are shut up in convents, church lands, etc. How many?

WHAT IS TO BE DONE WITH THE INDIANS?

SIR,—The above question was asked lately in a sort of supplement to the "Algoma Missionary News," with much freshness and simplicity, but which has no force or meaning except in reference to the Indians in the North-West, since the vast majority of the Indians in Eastern Canada have already been civilized and Christianized. And in the means so successfully adopted for their elevation and improvement, we have the solution of the problem "What is to be done with the Indians in the North-West? In fact the same policy which has been so successful in the east, was adopted many years ago, to a certain extent in the North-West, and now that the whole vast country is opened up, and the circumstances of the Indians are greatly changed, both the Government and the Church are rising to the emergency, and are preparing to meet more fully the increased necessities of the aborigines. The editor of the "Algoma Missionary News" would do well to bear in mind, when in his

fervent zeal he so strongly denounces or deeply deplores the slowness of the Government and of the Church, that the world was not made in a day, and that the great work of civilizing and Christianizing the heathen, even in the North-West, will occupy more time than the brief position allotted by Providence to any individual. The editor may fancy that he alone is inspired to accomplish that great work, and we could wish him all possible success, but neither the Government nor the Church may be visited with his inspiration, nor feel compelled to yield to his very pressing demands, or to adopt all his plans and suggestions. They may wisely differ from him in the opinion that the Sault Ste. Marie with all its possible lines of steam boats and railways passing through it, would be the most convenient centre for the education of the Indians in the distant North-West. The institutions which he was instrumental in establishing there, and for which he deserves the greatest praise, are ample enough without any enlargement, for the requirements of the Indians in the diocese of Algoma, and they are not really needed for any outside of the diocese, seeing that there are several of that character in the province of Ontario, notably the one at Brantford, and which have been in successful operation for more than half a century. But in the North-West there is great need for the establishment of industrial institutions at Winnipeg, Qu'Appelle, and other convenient centres in that region. It is said that the zealous and energetic Bishop of Qu'Appelle has already commenced the good work there, and in which he should have every encouragement, he certainly will have our sympathy, prayers and aid. The proposition to transfer the institutions at the Sault into the hands of the Government, is a very remarkable one, seeing that it would involve great injustice to the Church of England to which they exclusively belong. Whatever liberty the Bishop of Algoma gave to the chief superintendent in the management of those institutions, he could not and did not give to him the power to hand them over to the Government to make them undenominational. The church could not sanction the proposition, nor would the Government for one moment entertain it. The superintendent may indulge as freely as he chooses, consistently with his position in liberal and generous sentiments towards other denominations, but he must bear in mind the old proverb, "Be just before you are generous." We would unite heartily with him in urging the establishment of Protestant schools in the North-West, for the benefit of the rising and future generations, to make them good Christians, good citizens, and loyal subjects, beyond the possibility of another insurrection, though a second Riel or other rebel and agitator should wickedly strive to effect it.

AMICUS.

Family Reading.

MY CROSS.

BY MRS. BRUCE.

"Alas! my God," I cried in anguish sore,
"I cannot bear my cross, what shall I do?
I cry to Thee for help, and fall the more,
I stumble every step the darkness through."

"And yet it is my cross. Thou gave it me.
And leaving it, I cannot follow Thee—
'The servant as his Lord.' Thou carried Thine,
I cannot follow, if I bear not mine."

"Help me, oh Lord! for all my strength is gone,
I cannot rise beneath this heavy load,
Thy Gospel tells me of a race to run,
And yet I prostrate lie upon the road."

In weak despair I bowed my head and wept,
Until in utter weariness I slept,
And then the loving Lord who pities all,
Sent me an answer to my anguished call.

An angel bent above me where I lay,
I felt him touch my head, I heard him say,
"Oh, child of God, thou bear'st thy burden wrong—
To carry it aright will make thee strong."

"Thy Cross is on Thy back. Like some brute beast
Thou crouchest to the earth beneath Thy load.
Stand up. With willing arms, oh! child of God,
Take up thy cross, and clasp it to thy breast."

"Its touch upon thy heart will give thee strength,
Thou can'st not then forget Christ died for thee,
And never will forsake thee, but at length
Will bring thee where thou may'st His glory see."

"Go on, and closer hold thy precious cross,
All it was given thee for, thou may'st not see,
But they who faithful are, sustain no loss,
And in the end, thy cross shall carry thee."