

MILTON.—At the request of a member of the church, who formerly lived in the neighborhood and was much respected, the Rev. Mr. Crompton preached in this place and Hornby churches by permission of Rev. Mr. McKenzie, on Sunday, Oct. 10th, and the reply to his appeal that their old friend and his neighbors might be assisted in building themselves a Log Church at Pearcey, was \$44. *Laus Deo.*

The Rev. W. Crompton has gratefully to acknowledge the receipt of \$4 from Mrs. Flood, Dunnville, and \$1 from a "Working Man," towards his Building Fund.

Correspondence.

All Letters will appear with the names of the writers in full

REGENERATION.

SIR.—Having read the Metropolitan's address to the assembled delegates of the Province, I studied with pleasure his allusions to regeneration. You may remember that a minister of the Anglican communion at St. Catharines, who lately seceded from the English Church, found fault with this doctrine. However, His Lordship says it is taught throughout the New Testament, and gives some quotations in proof of his remarks, which, though excellent, are rather general for those who are not versed in theological terms. Many of your readers who hear of regeneration do not know what it is; for their sake I have been convinced that it would be well to notice the following particulars:—For instance, Baptists, who are taught to consider it a foolish and senseless doctrine. How different from the language of our Catechism, in which regeneration is most beautifully, forcibly and yet simply styled, "a New Birth unto righteousness;" for being by nature the children of wrath, (Eph. ii, 1-3), we are hereby made the children of grace. We must now turn to Col. iii, 13, in which verse we read the fact that it is in baptism we rise with Christ. I would here ask, what greater grace can be given unto us, than to raise us up, and make us sit in heavenly places with Christ Jesus. If in baptism we rise with Christ, it is evident we are in baptism made the children of grace. I cannot believe that any man who is unregenerate can rise with Christ; neither do I know of any other means by which a person can rise with Christ, than baptism. Hence, also, I am persuaded that no unbaptized persons, however pious they may appear, can have any spiritual hope of rising with Christ. The doctrine of regeneration thus stands prominently forward among the foremost of our lessons; while as yet our infant tongues can scarcely frame to pronounce a word aright, the doctrine that we are members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven by baptism, is impressed upon our little, listening, attentive ears by parents and careful monitors.

I remain, dear Sir,

Yours, &c.,

WM. MONSON.

Wallacetown, Oct. 25, 1880.

QUERY.

SIR.—When on the cross, Christ said to one of the thieves:—"This day thou shalt be with Me in Paradise," and then, three days after, said to Mary:—"Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to My Father."

Is Paradise an intermediate place between earth and heaven? Will you please explain, and oblige,

Yours respectfully,

G. M. HOBSON.

Blenheim, Ont.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGE.

DEAR SIR.—Mr. Harding conjointly replying states, "I have shown, Mr. Smith has shown, and now Mr. Tibbs comes forward and clearly shows that the Episcopal Archdeacon's Fund was formed soon after this Diocese was set apart from Toronto."

I was at a church meeting when subscriptions were taken to the "Episcopal Fund, establishing provision for, and previous to the election of the late Bishop Cronyn. The Bishops afterwards in their division of communion money, illegally took part of it and put it into the "Episcopal Fund;" this did not change the original source any more than if you were to paint a black man white, he would be a black man still, although some might be deceived by the colored transformation. Who tinkered with this Fund? The Bishops, who, with the Archdeacons, got their communion money besides as clergymen.

If Mr. Harding will turn to the Church Society's report for 1874 (p. 45) he will find a fund headed

"Commutation Fund;" beneath it he will find the commuted and surplus list of those receiving from its funds. Archdeacon Sandys receiving then, as now, \$600 a year independent of the amount as Archdeacon, and I think it will puzzle Mr. Harding to tell what he does for it, independently of being "the personal friend and adviser of the Bishop." Who tinkered with this? Did not the Bishop of Huron, who should have been the chief upholder of the laws of the Synod, instead of the leader in breaking them, by illegally introducing a canon, without the required notice, taking away the surplus money from its original fund? But has that law illegally, passed, been obeyed? Do not the Bishop and Archdeacon receive theirs still? Possibly, as Mr. Harding objects to the term of "robbery," it would be more agreeably defined by comparing it with the act of Saul, who offered the poorer as a sacrifice unto the Lord, but spared the richer to honor himself before men.

Personally I am not acquainted with Mr. Harding, and, therefore, could not question his independence. "To the pure, all things are pure," and therefore he might have been ready to support the legislation introduced by the Bishop, persecuting those who publicly discussed church legislation; dismissal of dignitaries at pleasure; dismissal of clergymen, six months notice or six months' pay; it may have appeared to him "very fair without," but to others it may have appeared "very foul within," and was the natural growth of a constitution that allowed its rights and privileges to be invaded by degrees.

Respecting the Archdeacon's amount of \$380 a year, he states, "When the Synod orders it to use the surplus interests of the Commutation Fund for Superannuation, and then to add the balance to the Mission Fund, it is the duty of the Standing Committee to obey, as it is doing now." Are not the Bishop's and Archdeacon's amounts that they receive from the Commutation money, "interest," and why did not the Standing Committee obey in whole as well as in part, its instructions and do its duty to them as well as to the poorer clergy? No doubt the Synod "if ordered" would be as obedient as the Standing Committee, which, in some things, appear to be very neglectful of its duty, for when Synod intrusts to it, the appointment of the Committee to look after the investment of over \$660,000, they simply hand over that responsibility to the Bishop, and as it is reported that he has gone to England for two years, he hands it over to his Commissary, I presume. The Synod intrusted that duty to the Standing Committee, and it had no right to depute it to another.

It would be very beneficial to the interests of the Church if independent men like Mr. Harding would enter into the illegality and injustice of these and many other things, and he should remember that all the clergymen are not so strong in mind as he is, for some have told me "that they dared not vote according to their conscience for fear if anything occurred in their parishes, they might be turned out on the roadside." I trust Mr. Harding will not say that this is slander, for if he does, he will assuredly be guilty of that offence towards truth.

I think any unbiased reader will admit that Mr. Harding has been fairly beaten in argument and fact by Mr. Smith, as any one will be that defends the idiosyncrasy of the Huron Constitution, because it is indefensible in theory and not much less so in operation, and has brought disgrace upon the Episcopacy, servility upon the clergy, driving lay members from the church and making others totally indifferent to it, destroying the voluntary spirit as is evidenced by the decrease, in such a prosperous year as last year, of Diocesan support, Widow and Orphan's Fund, and the Mission Fund; the divided surplus last year arising through the death of several of the commuted clergy, and this imaginary success will be maintained this year if others likewise follow the course of all flesh.

It is evident that Mr. Harding with his independence does not enter into the question of illegality and injustice, and see that funds are used for "the object intended and no other," which can be expected from those who lay no claim to it, but confess their fear. He is forcing others to look to chancery for that which it is "utterly useless" to look for from the Executive Committee, and it is a farce to say that there is constitutional freedom in the Diocese of Huron. A good constitution would supply justice without these continuous appeals to chancery to enforce it.

I see no of fears of the Diocese of Toronto accepting such a "one man" constitution as that of the Diocese of Huron, they will learn enough from those who have left it, some of very high tone and character, as well as from those, who without giving any reason, simply decline to enter the Diocese of Huron, and the consequence is that the Bishop is on his second trip during the year to get Missionaries, as well as on behalf of the Western University; thus it appears that although, "its admirable constitution" works so well that it has never yet asked her clergy to wait a day for their quarterly grants, "it is not attractive enough to keep up the clergy staff, without importing those whose antecedents we know nothing of and who, not having received their training here,

understand neither the genius of the church nor its people.

In conclusion, I would be glad if Mr. Harding could explain why Bishops want so much power in appointing Committees, and especially such a responsible one as looking after the investments of over \$660,000, and is it fair, when the Bishop, with the heavy responsibility of the spiritual superintendence of a Diocese, to look after, or to the Synod, that appoints the Executive Committee, to choose a committee for that purpose, and might it not be just as well to give the sole power to the Bishop direct, if the Executive does the same?

Yours Truly,

H. TIBBS.

THE CHURCH OF CANADA.

DEAR SIR.—Our Metropolitan, in his opening address to the Provincial Synod, said:—

"I ask your indulgence while I offer a few remarks on the present conjuncture of ecclesiastical affairs in our Canadian Church. By the course of events in England, we have been set free from the ties which were long supposed to connect it with the state in that country, and our present condition is that of an independent church in full communion with our venerable mother."

The italics are mine, and are intended to bring into prominence the points upon which I wish to dwell.

The address has been very highly thought of, and has been read and re-read by thousands throughout the country, and met the hearty approval of the Synod. Yet, in the face of it, they unanimously adopted a committee's report, recommending "that the Church should be known as 'The Church of England in Canada,' and advising the local Synods to get the name legalized by the Local Legislature."

This seems a hasty step and ill-advised. Many American Churchmen deplore the mistake of naming their Church "The Episcopal Church," done hastily, in the heat of political feeling, to its injury. Let us not make the same kind of error.

The Bishop of South Africa, seeing the immense importance of the matter, discarded the title of "The Church of England," and took that of "The Church of South Africa, in communion with the Church of England."

The retention of the name, "The Church of England," to the present time, has been a great injury to us, having, to a great extent, obscured the Catholic doctrines which we profess, dwarfed and belittled the Holy Catholic Church, furthered the misconception that our faith originated at the Reformation and, that we are a mere sect; led people to believe that we are governed from Canterbury, (or worse, Windsor Castle), as the Romans are by the Pope, and has had no little to do with the sluggishness and coldness of our members in the past.

The Church here should be called "The Church of Canada," for, (among many reasons), we are bound to follow the example set before us in the Primitive Church, and not to follow our own devices. When, for instance, in old days, the Church was first established in Antioch, it went by the name of "The Church of (or in) Antioch." Although the founders came from Jerusalem, they had not the presumption to take the honor away from God, and call it "The Church of Jerusalem in Antioch." These men loved Jerusalem as much as we love England. These men suffered more for the Church of Jerusalem than Englishmen ever suffered for the faith in England, yet they didn't let their love for home blind them to their duty to their Church and God.

It is earnestly to be hoped that this matter, before the final resolution comes to be put to the Provincial Synod, will be well ventilated, both in the local Synods, and in the Church press, and that it will be remembered that, however much we love and admire our venerable parent, it is our duty not to follow our own desires, but to do first the will of God, for so we may infer it is when we see the Church spoken of and addressed by the Apostles so many times in the way pointed out in the epistles and gospels.

Yours very sincerely,

WALTER DARLING,

Lay Representative.

Uxbridge, Oct. 18, 1880.

No amount of talent will go unbacked by work. Work is the key to eloquence and knowledge as well as virtue. Without labor, without application, nothing can be done, either in this world or in the next. Application alone makes great men, great saints, heroes, and men of genius.