

iii. With regard to a clergyman who has been in charge of a cure for five or more years, and concerning which a petition has been presented, asking that he be continued in charge; if such petition be granted, no further consideration concerning the transfer of such clergyman shall be held until a petition relating thereto has been presented.

3. The report concerning the transfer of clergy shall be included in the annual report of the Executive Committee, for consideration of synod.

ii. Nothing in these resolutions shall be deemed to interfere with the already existing right of the Bishop to make appointments to parishes and missions.

4. All future appointments to rectories shall be for periods not exceeding five years.

I give the above as a rough draft of intended proposals, realizing that they will, very likely, require remodelling before being pronounced workable or acceptable to synod, trusting that they shall receive due criticism, and be regarded, in some sense, as a basis on which the much desired change may be carried out.

MISSION.

ARE FREE CHURCHES A SUCCESS?

Sir,—A second letter from "N.N.D." on the pew question, which appeared in your last issue, makes it appear as if he were exceedingly anxious to hear the opinion of another, agreeing with him. Is he not working on wrong lines altogether, when he tries to prove the success or non-success of the pew-renting system in the way he does? Were we to take the matter in the same way, we could point out a case of a congregation, which raises its funds by the pew-renting system, and the wardens cannot gather enough to pay the rector an ordinary labourer's wages. The test referred to by "N.N.D.," namely, the proportion that churches give to missions, is hardly a fair one. In one church there may be rich people, in another poor; in another a large congregation of rich, but many of them miserly. Let us look at it from another standpoint. Let the question be which is the more correct thing in the sight of God. Does not the rented-pew system spring from a decidedly selfish motive? Is it not a question of buying a comfort for oneself? The pronoun I figures very much in it, and when a man is filled with an I as big as himself, he needs to be saved from it. For instance, I want a pew for myself. I will pay a high price for the best pew in the church, that I may be seen of men, and I want full control of it, so that I can order any one out of it who may happen to drop in. I want to sit with the upper ten. I shall not allow anyone to sit in my seat for fear he may be looked upon as my friend. Many know of this state of affairs. If we, however, look at it as to which is the more correct thing in the sight of God, will we not rather ask what He would have us do in the matter? Ah, that is it! That is the reverse of selfishness. Did we not foster this getting just what one paid for, a stranger would not have felt it necessary to apologize for getting into a rented pew not long ago. In this case the apology was said to be amiss, as it happened that the party who occupied the pew with the stranger did not own it. Why should there be this feeling of exclusive ownership in the house of God? Why should persons in many cases who own pews attend church in the mornings, only where the pews are rented for the mornings? In these cases the majority of them do not attend the evening service. Why? Is it because they may have to sit with strangers, and so place themselves on their level, and that one attendance suffices to keep the reputation in good order? In God's name, let us do away with everything that fosters such a state of things. Not long ago a pew-holder remarked that he believed that people went to church so that they might be seen in good society, that if they were not seen in church they were not considered anybody. Of course, this was an extreme view. We tried to persuade him such was not the case, but he insisted on his views being correct. In conclusion, why should not a poor person who perhaps in some instances puts nearly his all on the plate, have as much right to the best seat as well as he who happens to be in more com-

fortable circumstances? If riches or slipshod aristocracy could secure a place in heaven, there would be precious little room for the poor. Thanks be to God, heaven is not to be bought and owned by man. "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter heaven."

G.C.

TRANSFER OF THE CLERGY.

Sir,—As the subject of the transfer of the clergy, after a stated period of service in a parish, has been brought before your readers in recent issues, I should like to contribute, briefly, two arguments in favor of the proposed change. 1st. No two men and no two clergymen are exactly alike. Each has one or two points in which his greatest ability is shown. One man excels as a preacher, another as a Sunday-school worker, another as an administrator, another as a pastor, etc. By changing our clergy more frequently than we do, each parish would be built up in different points in turn, instead of having for years a one-sided development. And our clergy would feel more free to make themselves specialists (while not neglecting any of their manifold functions), and this is an age in which specialists do the best work. 2nd. It often happens that a parishioner takes a dislike to a clergyman or has a quarrel with him. It may be the parson's fault, it may be the parishioner's, it may be the fault of neither; that is not the point. Now if the parishioner knows that the rector can remain as long as he likes, he either joins some dissenting body, or he becomes a discontented, and perhaps troublesome thorn in the flesh. I am not justifying him, I am simply stating what is too often the fact. But if he knows that, at a certain time, there will be a change, he says to himself, "Oh well, it won't last much longer anyway," and his feelings do not become embittered. He probably will not think it worth while to make any trouble, and he and the rector, and the parish, and the Church generally, are not injured by the bickering and unseemly wrangling which might otherwise have taken place.

VIATOR.

HISTORICAL NOTE—WELLS' CATHEDRAL.

Sir,—On page 133 of your paper, you speak of Bishop Savarin. This is a mistake, perhaps typographical, for Savary. A similar error, Savaric, often occurs by using a re-translation of the name from the Latin Savaricus, the form in which old writers Latinized the Norman name Savary. The name was derived from an old German and Scandinavian name, Savarich. Two names of the same termination, Heinrich and Friedrich, however, are respectively anglicized into Henry and Frederic, while the Latinized termination is, in all three cases, icus. From a translation of Wendover's Chronicle, (Bohn's Ed.), we learn that Savary, with Nicholas and Herbert, was appointed Archdeacon in 1176, and that Savary, Archdeacon of Northampton, was elected Bishop of Bath in 1192. But we learn that in 1194, Savaric, Bishop of Bath, with others, was delivered by King Richard I. to the Emperor Henry VI., as a hostage for securing to Henry the balance of his ransom; and later Henry sent Savaric, Bishop of Bath, his relative and Chancellor, to Richard, to offer to restore to him his ransom. It seems uncertain of which of the two sovereigns he was relative and Chancellor, but we would presume it to mean Richard's. He was distinguished in his administration by the policy of bringing the monasteries of his diocese into subordination to the See.

Your obedient servant,
NOMINIS UMBRA.

[We are indebted to our correspondent for his interesting letter. He is right in supposing that there was a misprint. Following Canon Bernard, we had written, Savaric. Doubtless our correspondent's explanation of that form is the right one. Ed. C. C.]

—Four things come not back—the spoken word, the sped arrow, the past life, and the neglected opportunity.

ARE FREE CHURCHES A SUCCESS?

Sir,—Your correspondent, "N.N.D.," appears to have a penchant for unearthing what he is pleased to call "fallacies." If he continues to write many more letters on this subject, and will then carefully and thoughtfully peruse them, he will find abundant scope for the exercise of this detective power. If you will kindly allow me a little of your valuable space, I would like to reply, in detail, to some of his arguments, for although to the vast majority of Churchmen this has long ceased to be an open question, yet there are, doubtless, some who would be greatly influenced by the statements of one who claims to have observed the workings of the system for so many years, especially if these statements were permitted to go unchallenged. In another letter, therefore, I will take up his points one by one. In the present I merely wish to draw the attention of your readers to one very important "fallacy," which underlies his whole position. I contend that the question of pews and free seats has nothing whatever to do with the duty, which rests upon all Christians, of contributing in proportion to their means for the support of the Church. To ask a man to take a "sitting" is not the same thing as telling him to give. To pay pew rent is no more giving than to pay 25 cents for admission to a church concert or to buy a doll at a church bazaar. In each case, the person contributing receives something in exchange for his money, and the man who pays pew rent is not, by that payment, giving to God or discharging any part of his duty to the Church, but merely purchasing for himself and family an additional privilege, namely, the right to occupy a particular seat. When he has done this, it is still his duty to give his tithe, or whatever proportion of his income he may have promised to God. How many pew-holders dream of doing this? I will venture to say that most people who pay pew rent regard that money as being at least a partial discharge of their obligations to the Church. And so the result is simply this, that in so far as the pew system is a success (assuming that in some cases it is), it is the deadly foe of Christian giving, for, as a general rule, the clergy never preach about giving until they have to, and if the money can be raised by pew rents or some other indirect bribery, they are spared a most disagreeable task, and the people are not taught their duty at all. Will "N.N.D." pursue his statistic hunting a little farther and find out how many times in a year the duty of giving (apart from special appeals), is directly taught from the pulpit in free and pewed churches respectively?

"ANTI-FALLACY."

British and Foreign.

Bishop Mitchinson, formerly Bishop of the Barbados, is at present assisting the Bishop of Ripon in the work of the diocese.

An anonymous gift of £1,000 from "A Cornishman," towards the building of the nave of Truro Cathedral, has reached the Bishop of Truro.

The C.M.S. has received a telegram from Bishop Tucker, at Mombasa, stating that all was well in Uganda up to February 3rd, so far as the Society's mission was concerned.

The two hundred and forty-fourth festival of the Sons of the Clergy, in aid of the funds of the Corporation, will be celebrated at St. Paul's Cathedral on the 11th of May.

The S.P.C.K. are sending out a chaplain and matron, in charge of a party of single women and young girls, who are going to Canada, under the auspices of the Church Emigration Society.

By the resignation of the Bishop of Calcutta, the number of vacant dioceses is brought up to seven—Bombay, Grahamstown, Mauritius, Victoria (Hong Kong), Madagascar, Osaka, and Calcutta.