

A FAMILY QUARREL.

THE quarrels of relatives are always the most bitter and the disputants the hardest to reconcile. He usually gets blows from both sides who steps in to settle a family wrangle. We therefore purpose to make no comment on the most unhappy dispute between the Rev. J. P. LEWIS, rector of Grace Church, Toronto, and his warden, Mr. W. H. HOWLAND, beyond this—that Mr. LEWIS, by most earnest conviction, as evidenced by his services and preaching, is an Evangelical. Well may we wonder and enquire, What next? when such a clergyman is sought to be crushed by drumming out of the party for no reason whatever beyond his manly stand against being made a nonentity in his own church and parish. The Low Church party cannot afford to treat its friends in this high-handed manner, as every true man, of whatever school he may be, must condemn the policy of reducing a clergyman to abject submission to his warden. The statement below reveals what we all along have suspected, that the party have decided systematically to "Boycott" all who are not in their ranks. Poor Mr. LEWIS is a good Mission speaker, he has been asked to speak at meetings all over the diocese, and has gone freely to address High Church congregations. What an offence! It is forgotten that Mr. BLAKE spoke once at St. Luke's, Toronto, but no layman not of his party has ever been asked to speak on the platforms of either Grace Church or any other of the party churches. Well may we plead, "How long, O Lord, how long," will this misery last?

Rev. J. P. Lewis, rector of Grace Church, having lately returned to Toronto after his vacation, an interview was had with him by a *Globe* reporter for the purpose of obtaining a statement of the late troubles at Grace Church. In reply to a question whether he was willing to give his version of the troubles in Grace Church, Rev. J. P. Lewis said:—

There are no troubles in Grace Church. I have a united, loving people, many of whom are liberal to a fault. They have for the last twelve months been subject to a very great strain by Mr. W. H. Howland trying to excite in their minds suspicions, and to kindle in their hearts partisan feelings, and they have stood the strain well, though not one of them knew the real cause of the difference between us. The real cause is this—From the first day I came to the parish until now Mr. Howland and another gentleman who does not belong to the parish have sought to exercise the powers which belong to Bishop and Rector, and to control me and my church for party purposes. For a length of time I gently resisted, but when that would do I stood firm and said, "Hands off." I was appointed one of the directors of the *Evangelical Churchman*, and I accepted office, hoping to change it from a party paper to a good church organ for all our people, and to prevent anonymous correspondence in it which wounded the feelings and divided the ranks of my brethren. At the end of two years I had accomplished little or nothing, so I ceased to act. This gave deep offence. I was willing to co-operate for the maintenance of the Protestant Episcopal Divinity School, so long as the school was a necessity, but when the Lord Bishop had placed Trinity College on a basis which made it acceptable to the Bishop of Algoma, Canon Carmichael, and many others of the most kindly spirits in the Church, I felt that to erect an expensive building and make it a permanent institution would be a great mistake which would waste the funds of our people, prolong strife in the diocese, divide the Church, and possibly end in schism. I never consented to be a trustee, and do not intend to act. This also gave great offence to Mr. Howland. The Bishop desired all his clergy to use the Church of England Sunday School Institutes series of lessons in the Sunday schools. I examined them, found them admirable in substance, and evangelical in spirit. The Synod adopted them and instructed us to use them, and I intended to introduce them in my school. This gave mortal offence, because I preferred the Institute papers to those published by Rev. Mr. Sheraton.

When Rev. Mr. Kerr, my curate, resigned, Mr. Howland wished me to take an evangelical student in his place. I preferred Rev. Dr. McCarroll, because he is an able preacher, and an experienced parish worker. This led to open conflict between us. We met in his office, in his study, and in the church. We

walked for two hours in the Queen's Park, discussing matters warmly. Mr. Howland pressed me to work with him on party lines. He said I could have all the money I wanted for church purposes if I would do so. He intimated that it was about time I should receive an increase of salary. I replied that as far as the Evangelical party would work for Protestant principles and the prosperity of the whole Church I would co-operate most heartily, but no further. Mr. Howland thought he was master of the situation, and as good as told me I must submit or leave the parish. We separated with compressed lips and high heads. All this was private, and very few of my people had any knowledge of it whatever. I left for the seaside for a month about a year since, and when I returned I found that Mr. Howland had proclaimed me a High Churchman. He had gone from house to house and endeavoured to turn my people against me. He invited persons to cottage meetings, and then would hold a private conversation with them and try to rouse their suspicions. He said they would yet see me celebrating Mass with a cross upon my back. A young tree had been planted at the east end of the church, and a gentleman belonging to the congregation took it up and planted it at the north-east corner, Mr. Howland attributed this to me. He said I wanted to build a chancel that I might have all the popery of Holy Trinity, but should never have it while he lived. The tree had been transplanted by the Master of an Orange Lodge, and without my knowledge in any way.

I stood before the altar table when consecrating the elements, and knelt before the table when receiving. Mr. Howland saw Romanism in it, although he had not seen it for two years previous. I received at the end; this was wrong. I consecrated at the end; this was no better. I wish Mr. Howland would tell us, the clergy of the diocese, where we should stand, and where we should kneel if we are not to stand or kneel before the table or at the end of it. Before last Easter I wrote to Mr. Howland, suggesting that we should meet, get down before God, and not separate until we were one for Christian work; and on condition that he would unite heartily with me in the work of the parish, I promised to appoint him as my churchwarden for another year. He acknowledged he had done me injustice, but demanded as one of the conditions of reconciliation that I must dismiss my curate, and take one of two gentlemen, whose names he suggested, students of the Protestant Episcopal Divinity School, who were soon to be ordained, which I declined to do. I stated at our vestry meeting at Easter, that Mr. Howland and I had been writing love-letters to each other: that we had succeeded tolerably well, and that we had now a clean sheet for the coming year. Through the kind offices of Mr. Mackenzie we had become reconciled. This intelligence was received by the vestry joyously, and I appointed Mr. Howland as my churchwarden. All went well until the late Synod, when the party spirit was again aroused, and since that time he and I have had nothing but trouble. I repeat, I have no trouble with my people. My trouble is altogether with Mr. Howland and a few persons with whom, for special reasons, he has great influence, and who have never known the whole facts of the case. I do not blame them, and have nothing but kind feelings towards them.

I thoroughly abhor partyism. It is eating the very heart out of our Church, dividing our forces, wasting our substance, keeping up two theological schools instead of one, publishing two Church papers instead of one, and using half a dozen sets of Sunday-school leaflets, while our people in the diocese of Algoma and in the far West by tens of thousands are starving for the Bread of Life. We should work towards unity, and not towards division. As proof of my sincerity, if Mr. Howland will only throw away his extreme partyism he may be as Protestant as William of Orange, and as evangelical as John Wesley and I will still be delighted to have him as my churchwarden, for aside from party, Mr. Howland is always gentle, kind and liberal, and an attractive and lovable man in every way.

The wearing of the surplice. What objections did Mr. Howland offer to your wearing the surplice at the Wednesday evening meeting?

What I would say is simply this—that when Mr. Howland would deprive me of the privilege of associating with my brethren of the clergy, whether high or low, or prevent me from wearing the surplice at the week evening service in my own church, that it shows that his demands are so unreasonable that they require no refutation whatever.

Plymouthism. What about Plymouthism?

Mr. Howland holds doctrines that are distinctly Plymouth. He may hold them without really being conscious of it. He has stated frequently that if the world is ever to be converted it is to be done by setting aside the Church and the clergy altogether, and the laity simply taking hold of the work and doing it themselves.

How do you account for Mr. Berwick's course?

Mr. Berwick has the instincts and feelings of a gentleman, and if left to himself would never speak an unkind word or do an unjust thing.

Are you in harmony with the Evangelical clergy of the city?

Never did I esteem them more highly or associate with them more intimately than I do at the present time, and I stand ready at the present time to help them or any of my brethren who will work within the just limitations of the Church of England.

Finances and the Church. In what state are the finances of the Church?

If the finances are not entirely satisfactory, the responsibility rests with the churchwardens. While many pews in the church were unlet I had a list of applications for thirty or forty sittings for weeks, and not one of them could be supplied; and persons making applications were turned away from the church with the statement that there were no sittings to be let. Parties also wanted envelopes, and it was three and six months before they have been supplied. The wonder is that, under the circumstances, the finances have held out so well as they have done, and that, notwithstanding all this, the offertory last Sunday was nearly \$52. The collections in but few churches of the city would be larger.

The conversation then came to a close.

THE LATE PATRIARCH OF JERUSALEM, HIEROTHEUS.

THE death of this prelate has already been briefly mentioned. He was born in Chora, in the island of Samoas, about the year 1824; and, having been brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, in due time was ordained a deacon—taking also monastic vows. In 1848, during the Patriarchate of the ever memorable Cyril, he went to Jerusalem, and was there made a member of the Brotherhood of the Holy Sepulchre, and appointed Second Deacon-Monk to the Patriarchal Throne. In 1850, he was sent to Moldavia, as Treasurer of the Most Holy Sepulchre, the Church at Jerusalem having considerable estates near Jassy. The zeal with which he discharged the duties entrusted to him won the esteem of the Brotherhood; and the Patriarch Cyril had him ordained priest, by the hand of the Metropolitan of Moldavia, made him *Proto-synellus*, and entrusted to him the charge of the Monastery of Bournoffsky. Soon after, he was made an Archimandrite, and put in charge of the Monastery of Galata, retaining also, for a considerable time, his duties at Jassy. In February, 1865, he returned to Jerusalem. In July, of that year, the representative of the Holy Sepulchre at Smyrna died, and Hierotheus was sent to be his successor, remaining there ten years, and winning the respect and esteem of those with whom he was brought in contact.

As is well known, difficulty sprang up at Jerusalem, as a result of which Procopius, Cyril's successor in the Patriarchate, resigned his see. The eyes of all were turned upon Hierotheus, as one possessing the wisdom and prudence of which there was so much need. On the 7th of May he was called, by the unanimous vote, in the Church of the Resurrection, of the canonical electors, to the Patriarchal throne, June 15th, he left Smyrna for Jerusalem; and, on the 20th of that month, was consecrated and enthroned in the Holy City.

For nearly seven years he had faithfully discharged the duties of his high office, when, on the 9th of June (May 20th, O.S.), he rode out of the gates of Jerusalem, together with Niphon, Metropolitan of Ptolemais, and Photius, Archimandrite and Patriarchal Secretary, to visit the Theological School of the Holy Cross, whose re-establishment was due to his zeal. Coming to a place where two ways met, the animals on which the Patriarch and his suite rode, were frightened by some beasts of burden coming in the other direction. The Metropolitan of Ptolemais was thrown, but fortunately escaped serious injury. The Patriarch was less fortunate. The animal on which he rode reared; the saddle girth gave way, and Hierotheus was thrown upon the hard stones.

He was carried into the house of a prominent Israelite, Azarias de Bouton, near by, where he received every attention that could be paid; and from there he was taken on a litter, to the Patriarchate, where the best surgical attention was at once called in. As no bones were broken, strong