

CORRESPONDENCE.

[The name of Correspondent must in all cases be enclosed with letter, but will not be published unless desired. The Editor will not hold himself responsible, however, for any opinions expressed by Correspondents.]

"NOVA SCOTIA" VERSUS HALIFAX CATHEDRAL.

To the Editor of THE CHURCH GUARDIAN:

SIR,—I am at a loss to imagine what "Nova Scotia" wants, or what he means.

It seems, as far as I can come at it, that he would like us to collect a sum of money for King's College as a "Centenary Memorial" of the Colonial Episcopate. Well! if that is what he does want does he think that anything like \$250,000 can be got?

Would people give for that? Who would give for a Cathedral, or vice versa?

Why thus mix and meddle.

What can he mean by the action of the Provincial Synod only amounting to "the recommendation of so many clergymen and so many laymen: nothing more." That "nothing more" has a raven croak in it! (See E. A. Poe.)

Why, every act of the Imperial Parliament itself is but the action of so many Commoners and so many Peers.

Why is it "absurd" to hold us bound by extra judicial acts of the Synod? Is this, strictly speaking, extra judicial, or are any acts of the Synod strictly "judicial?" I repeat, I am puzzled.

The Provincial Synod is the *Legislative Body* of the Church in Canada, while in session a message was received by the Lower House that the Upper House desired a joint committee "upon the mode of commemorating the completion of the first century See and of the Church in the Colonies appointing on behalf of the House of Bishops, their Lordships the Metropolitan and the Bishops of Nova Scotia and Quebec. The Lower House coincided and appointed seven clergy and thirteen laymen. This joint-committee reported—*enter alia*, certain religious services and that "the offerings at such services as well as at the central commemoration in Halifax, should be given towards the erection of a MEMORIAL CATHEDRAL IN THE CITY OF HALIFAX, the see of the first Colonial Bishop," then we read "With the consent of the House, the Rev. D. C. Moore moved, seconded by the Rev. Canon Richardson, that the report of the Committee on the Centennial be ADOPTED. —Carried.

What more could the laymen and clergy in conjunction with and at the recommendation of the Bishops do to make the report binding?

Then "Nova Scotia" says, "I fear we are becoming vain? Of what? Are we likely to be made vain by the recollection that the oldest colonial diocese has no Cathedral, while Fredericton and Newfoundland (no richer than we) have solid stone Cathedrals of exquisite design? I do not admire vanity, but least of all when there is nothing on which to base it.

Let us raise, by united, hearty action, a temple to the Great Head of the Church as fitting and handsome as possible, and then, having done our best, let us not be vain but cry,

LAUS DEO.

HALIFAX CATHEDRAL.

SIR,—May I ask the favor of a few words more to make good the position taken in my former letter?

Your correspondent "Nova Scotia" thinks it absurd in me to suppose any one "bound by the extra judicial acts of the Provincial Synod." Let it be granted then that the action of the Synod is merely the recommendation of so many: no other scheme could be put forth with even the semblance of authority. To my mind—and I think most of your readers will be with me—it is infinitely better to accept that which

the Bishops and representative clergy and laity from every diocese of Eastern Canada recommend than to follow the devices and desires of our own hearts.

As to the other point: If it can be shewn that missions have languished and Church work has stood still in proportion as expensive churches have been built, there is cause for apprehension; but I think the contrary can be proved. A church which by its beauty and richness shows forth the self denial and piety of the congregation is almost a sure idea of a people active in good works. It is not to gratify our vanity that we build magnificent houses for God's worship? But, as Mr. Ruskin puts it, "That our gratitude to Him and continual remembrance of Him may have at once their expression and their enduring testimony in the presentation to Him . . . of all treasures of wisdom and beauty; of the thought that invents and the hand that labors, of wealth of wood and weight of stone, of the strength of iron and of the light of Gold."

EUSEBIUS.

11th March, 1887.

SIR,—In the generally excellent sermon of Bishop Stevens, in your late issue, I take exception to one or two points of interpretation. The writer asserts that the "pure offering" of Malachi, typified "prayer" and that the accompanying accessory of "incense" did not mean "material incense," but only "praise." The "pure offering" was the "Mincha" or "fine flour offering"—the sin offering of the poor—and has always been interpreted to signify the Holy Eucharist.

It is difficult to see what authority the Bishop has for asserting that "incense" does not mean "incense." He must be aware that the prophecy has been entirely fulfilled in every branch of the Catholic Church from very early times. Thus all the primitive Liturgies mentioned the offering of incense.

The Vestures of our clergy are a following of the Jewish worship, yet we do not say that the Mosaic Vestments did not typify "material" garments, but foretold merely the righteousness of heart which should dwell in the Christian Priest. If we are to spiritualise in one case, why not in another?

It is often said that such accessories are effete, but is it not strange, in that case, that in St. John's vision of the heavenly worship, incense is again and again mentioned as an accessory. The angel offered the "incense with the prayers of all saints." It was not merely a symbol, but an accessory also. That the Holy Church throughout the world has adopted its use is undeniable. The law authorising its use has never been repealed in our Church, and it forms an accompaniment to solemn services in a number of our churches in England and elsewhere.

CATHOLIC.

SIR,—On the first page of your paper of the 2nd March, at the foot of second column it is said "That the only American Bishop who had preached before the Society (S.P.G.) on its anniversary is the Bishop of Ohio." If this means the only *living* Bishop it is correct. If it includes the departed as well, it is a mistake. The late Bishop McCoskry, of Michigan, preached the anniversary sermon in the year 1852. I mention this for the sake of a little bit of history, i. e., so far as the venerable Society is concerned, connected with that event.

Previously the anniversary sermon had always been printed in the annual report. On this occasion, however, the sermon of the Right Rev. Preacher did not altogether approve itself to some of the members of the venerable Society. Since that time, in consequence of a vote of the Society, no anniversary sermon has ever been printed in the annual report.

Yours, etc.,

T. H. W.

DIOCESE OF SASKATCHEWAN.

SIR,—In your issue of Jan. 12th, last, pages 6 and 7, among some interesting items regarding the several parts of the Province of Rupert's Land, under the heading above written I find the following:—

"There is no doubt but that his (the new Bishop's) administration will be marked by vigour administration and ability, and the adoption of plans which will infuse new life into the Diocese. The Endowment fund for the Episcopate is said to be much less than was generally supposed not exceeding \$58,000. \* \* It is stated that the (late) Bishop knowing he was dying and desiring to die at home, offered the boatmen \$600 if they would take him from Edmonton to Prince Albert in two days. The money was earned, and, we regret to say, taken. Petitions \* \* asking for the appointment of a clergyman resident, in this part of Canada, and one it is understood signed by some persons in Saskatchewan referring to the appointment had been forwarded, &c., &c."

Taking these statements seriatim, the writer of the above if not an enemy of the Bishops Designate, had well bespoken for him comparing the two men a modest possible "administration."

The sum mentioned as the Endowment is incorrect, as the amount actually invested is \$73,000.

I am not aware that the boatmen who brought the late Bishop from Edmonton to Prince Albert (in an open row-boat) made such a demand—none such was granted. Even if they did—or if they demanded \$600 \* it would make no difference—the trip in two days is impossible. Your correspondent's ignorance of Canadian geography need not necessarily follow because the whole article shows he is not ignorant of it. This terrible trip occupied 22 days and only one who has passed over that part of the River in the Autumn season, and therefore at low water can imagine what ill as he was, the first the great Bishop of Saskatchewan suffered. By the generous aid given him by the S.P.G. Society, he was enabled to undertake his work as Bishop. For a very short time before his death, he enjoyed the full interest of the Endowment fund, and it is a sad truth that he was only able to leave an insurance of \$10,000 for his family. No petition regarding his successor was sent from the Saskatchewan so far as I can learn—certainly none from Prince Albert the diocesan seat. The arduous part of the work in this Diocese has been accomplished. It is free from debt with a comfortable income for the successor, who makes no sacrifice in accepting the See.

VERITAS.

Prince Albert, N.W.T.

1st March, 1887.

(We do not think that our former correspondent had any intention of belittling the great work done by the late Bishop, or of misstating the amount of Endowment Fund.—ED.)

SIR,—I have this week been examining six different church papers, and as the result feel impelled to unite and say that the CHURCH GUARDIAN compares favourably with the best of them. I find it both interesting and instructive, and am glad to learn that the circulation is increasing. It must be doing a noble work for the Church in the circle of its readers and the wider the circulation, the greater will be the benefit to the cause of the Church. I am sorry I cannot say the same for all our church papers. I do not sign my name, you would not know me if I did. I simply send my card to show how your work is appreciated by one among many of your.

Toronto, March 16th,

SUBSCRIBER.