

move by leaps and bounds towards change. The Bishop of South Africa, to whom Mr. Darling makes approving reference may, even now, have reason to take a thoughtful review of the title he discarded. The legal aspect of a question must be respected, and he who would inconsiderately substitute sentiment for law, runs a grave risk of coming to serious grief. Whether the example of the Bishop of South Africa should be followed or avoided, is a matter of much interest just now.

The last word has not yet been spoken, but, judging from what has fallen from judicial lips, the safer course would be to leave Mr. Walter Darling's reference to South Africa, as a subject in solution, to await the action of time and the analysis of the judges.

Yours, &c.,

FENNINGS TAYLOR.

Ottawa, Nov. 8, 1880.

THE HURON CONSTITUTION.

SIR,—In a letter which appeared in your last issue, the following "extraordinary" statement was made:—

"I think any unbiassed 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, and 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, Widows' and Orphans' Fund, and the Mission Fund. The divided surplus of 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."

I do not intend to take any part in this controversy. I wish merely to correct the statements that, there was "a decrease, last year, of Diocesan support," &c., and that "the divided surplus arose through the death of several of the commuted clergy," &c.

To show how much the author of this "argument and fact" (!) errs through ignorance, I will refer to official documents. On page 64 of our last Synod Journal you may find the following statement:—

"The income of the past year, derived from the voluntary contributions of the Diocese, amounted to \$18,800.25, an increase of \$1,490.79 over last year's income, and being the largest amount ever yet received since the formation of the Diocese."

On the same page, under the head of "Mission Fund, you will find that there was a "large addition" this year to the Parochial Association and Mission Fund collections, the receipts showing a total increase of \$1,626.76, directly available for Missionary purposes."

With reference to the Widows' and Orphans' Fund, there was a decrease, last year, of \$93.49; this small decrease having been occasioned by the fact that the weather was unfavorable on the days when the offertories were made. These statements from the audited accounts, which also appear on page 64 of the Synod Journal:—"This gratifying result of our labors bespeak most surely a growing interest in the hearts of our people, and affords the more reason for gratitude to God, when we consider the unusual weather that prevailed during the year, and especially during the winter, when the absence of sleighing and the impassable condition of the roads prevented the usual facilities that are afforded for business and commerce, &c."

With reference to the "divided surplus last year, arising through the death of the commuted clergy," your correspondent is again at fault.

The "divided surplus" amounted to about \$2,000, which was distributed amongst the missionary clergy of the Diocese, in accordance with the provisions made in Canon XXIX, viz., that "a priest over five years standing should, in the discretion of the Standing Committee, receive at least \$800 per annum, if the funds will admit of it." How much of the amount thus distributed "arose through the death of several of the commuted clergy," your intelligent readers can ascertain for themselves by consulting the duly audited accounts of our Synod for the past two years.

In 1879 the amount carried to the Mission Fund from the Commutation Fund interest was \$3,816.96. In 1880, the amount from the same source to Mission Fund interest, \$3,974.01, making the additional amount received in 1880, only \$357.06.

Consider further that, in 1880, the salaries of missionaries in our Diocese amounted to \$1,820.22 more than in 1879, and still further that we received \$100 less from the S. P. G. in 1880 than in 1879, and it will be seen that the surplus of \$2,000 which we had in

hand at the close of the last year's accounts, and which we are able to divide for the benefit of our missionaries, could not possibly have arisen from the \$357.06 additional interest which our Mission Fund received last from Commutation Fund interest. It is true several commuted clergymen died during the year 79-80, but only a portion of their annuities came into our Synod funds before the close of the year.

The following fact will throw further light on what disposition is made of accruing interest from the Commutation Fund. Under the excellent provisions of our Huron Constitution, superannuated clergymen are liberally pensioned from this source,—and it is only after these are duly provided for, that any appropriations are made from the Commutation Fund interest. Last year, the amount paid for this purpose was \$3,485.08, an excess of \$823.36 over the pensions of the previous year.

Perhaps it is unnecessary to answer to answer statements so entirely at variance with truth, as I have shown the statements to be—that there was a decrease of Diocesan support in the Huron Diocese, during the past year. It is as foundationless and as false as are all the other statements in the paragraph above quoted. The organization of our Diocese is satisfactory, both in theory and in operation, and your correspondents cannot pen a single sentence against it, without resorting to misrepresentations. The paragraph I have quoted is a fair sample. *Ex uno disce omnes.*

I am, dear Mr. Editor,

Truly yours,

W. F. CAMPBELL.

Nov. 6th, 1880.

RECIPROCITY IN MATTERS ECCLESIASTICAL.

DEAR SIR,—When I returned to my parish, a few days ago, after a short holiday, I read in your issue of the 7th inst., a communication from the Rev. John Gemley, in opposition to the scheme advocated by myself and the Rev. G. J. Low. I will be as brief as possible in my reply, as I propose taking further action in the matter at a more suitable time. I would first express my unqualified approbation of Mr. Low's letter, containing, as it does, unanswerable arguments in favor of the scheme propounded, and with all due respect to Mr. Gemley, I, for my part, am still of the opinion that it is practicable, and, if adopted, would be beneficial.

The prediction that disastrous results would follow the centralization of funds, is not warranted by the facts which I obtain from other ecclesiastical bodies, which administer such funds satisfactorily and successfully.

The *non possumus* objection is derogatory to the administrative powers of the Church, and cannot be allowed by those who have a better acquaintance with her vast resources, in this respect, which are unsurpassed by those of any other denomination.

The Provincial Synod, at its last session, legislated in favor of Algoma Diocese, so that any clergyman might remove to Algoma without suffering loss. We are not satisfied with that legislation; it should have comprehended suitable provision for the devoted clergymen who are now laboring there, and, in case of death, for widows and orphans. But the amount of legislation there effected clearly admits the principle which we are advocating.

I am strongly in favor of endowments and a permanent pastorate; but the voluntary system prevails in this country, and I am of the opinion that itinerancy is inherent in and inseparable from that system. And in country parishes, villages, and small towns, where the population is unsettled and fluctuating, and where the choice and support of the clergy depend solely upon the supreme will of the people, a permanent pastorate is impossible. Itinerancy, to a certain extent, prevails now in every Diocese; and whilst the practice would not, we think, be increased by reciprocity between the Dioceses, such a scheme would secure clergymen from injustice and loss, when compelled by circumstances to remove from one Diocese to another. The distances, in some cases, might not be greater than removing from one parish to another, simply, perhaps, across the boundary line. I would here state, however, that I am strongly opposed to the admission, into this Diocese, of any clergymen for the purpose of occupying government rectories, or prosperous parishes, to the exclusion of faithful men who have borne the burden and heat of the day.

In reference to Mr. Gemley's personal remarks, relating to myself, and the superiority of my prospects in this Diocese, I would reply that, though kindly meant, they would not have been made if he had known all the circumstances. I have sustained a loss, in a pecuniary point of view, and my desire is to save others from a similar experiment.

Yours respectfully,

JAMES CHANCE.

Tyrconnel, Oct. 29, 1880.

THE HURON CONSTITUTION.

DEAR SIR,—I did hope that my last letter on the subject of the Constitution of the Synod of Huron had been written. But Mr. Smith and Mr. Tibbs have both come forward with letters that must not be allowed to go altogether unchallenged.

The first point I shall notice is in Mr. Smith's letter, from which I make the following quotation. "Yet their cruel assailants have not suffered, but have retained their comparative abundance and given up nothing. It is the old story told over again of the poor man's lamb." I call this a simple perversion of my words, and also of the facts. My words were intended to set forth, and did set forth, the fact that the difference of opinion to which I alluded in a former letter, was amongst the clergy themselves; whom Mr. Smith regards as the subject of a cruel wrong and injustice. Some of the clergy thought it wrong, some thought it right, and when the vote was taken, after a full and fair, and I may add, a fearless discussion, it appeared that a very large majority thought it right to discontinue the \$200 a year bonus to the senior clergy. Added to this the fact, that, in that majority, were several who had actually become annuitants, and you have the reason which I gave for objecting to the term robbery.

The next point I shall notice is one in which I admit that verbally Mr. Smith has me. The Bishop was the prime mover. Still, Mr. Smith will admit that the clergy, yes, several of the annuitants, were very prominent in carrying a canon which they could have rejected, and which I believe they would have rejected had they thought it an act of robbery.

Mr. Smith's next paragraph is the chief point to which I wish to refer. In it he puts forward as a full proof of the assertion that the Commutation Fund belongs to the clergy and not to the church, the following quotation from the bond given to the commuted clergy. "And when and as soon as such annual payment to the said A. M. shall cease, the church society shall have and hold the said Commutation money, and all interest and proceeds thereon, upon such trusts for the support and maintenance of the clergy of the said church, within the said Diocese, or such other Dioceses as the said Diocese shall hereafter be divided into." I never denied, or thought of denying, that the Fund was for the support and maintenance of the clergy; but I do maintain that the Fund belongs to the church, whose duty it is to see that the clergy are supported and maintained. And now I ask who are the clergy to whom the church owes this duty? Mr. Smith's contention seems to be that the term "clergy" in this quotation includes only so many of the older men in the Diocese as will annually absorb the surplus interest of the Commutation Fund at the rate of \$200 or \$400 to each. The Synod of Huron, when it passed that "terrible" canon, thought that the term clergy, as used in that same quotation, included the whole of the Diocese excepting those who, from other sources, were sufficiently "supported and maintained." Acting upon this broader and truer interpretation of the Bond, the Synod decreed that the first charge upon the surplus should be the Superannuation of men who were past work, and that any balance left should be carried to the Mission Fund, a fund that is devoted entirely to the maintenance and support of those clergy who have not a sufficient support from other sources. If the word senior were in the Bond, then Mr. Smith might call us robbers. But it is simply "clergy," not senior clergy, whom the Synod, as the successor of the "church society," is bound to support and maintain.

The next point that claims attention is the uncalled for insult to the memory of two departed Bishops of the church. I fail to see how the present constitution of the Diocese of Huron is affected by the charge of misappropriation of funds laid against the late Bishop Strachan, of Toronto, and the late Bishop Cronyn, of Huron. I believe that in using accrued interest of the Commutation Fund to form a part of the capital of the Episcopal Fund, those two men were too honest to do a deliberate wrong, and too clear-headed and cautious to take such a step without looking well to it that there were no legal difficulties in the way.

But even if I admit that it is unjust to use that old surplus as a part of the support of the Bishops, have I not a right to ask that Toronto shall share the blame with Huron? When Toronto, with its more perfect constitution, and its less subservient clergy, makes a raid upon its Episcopal and Archdeacon Fund, and insists upon that portion of it which came originally from the Commutation Fund, shall be divided amongst the older clergy, then they may consistently call upon us to throw the corresponding portion of our Episcopal and Archdeacon's Fund into the Mission Fund. It is quite possible, however, that, in the attempt to do so, both Toronto and Huron will find that Bishops and Archdeacons may justly and legally be included in the term "clergy," both in that Bond which he quotes, and in that grant from the crown which is the origin of the Commutation Fund. When we speak of the clergy of the church of England, we include Bishops, priests, and deacons.