

NEW WESTMINSTER.

On the morning of Christmas day there was placed for the first time in Holy Trinity Church a handsome brass altar cross, the gift of Dean Stanley of Westminster Abbey, to the Bishop of New Westminster. The cross, which stands about three feet high, is very handsome. It is mounted on a pedestal of oak, made of a portion of a rafter of Henry V.'s chapel in Westminster Abbey, making a friendly link, as it were, between the Abbey of Westminster in the old country, and the cathedral church of New Westminster in this Pacific Province. The cross is handsomely set with agates, and is the result of the joint contributions of the congregations in England over which the Bishop and the Archdeacon presided before coming here,—thus imparting additional interest to this beautiful piece of ecclesiastical furniture. Round the pedestal is the following inscription:—"Presented to the first Bishop of New Westminster by Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, Dean of Westminster, being a portion of a rafter of Westminster Abbey of the date of King Henry V."

Correspondence.

All Letters will appear with the names of the writers in full and we do not hold ourselves responsible for their opinions.

THE HURON CONSTITUTION.

DEAR SIR,—The object which I had in view when I began this correspondence was simply to correct an error. In that correction I met assertions which might have given rise to erroneous notions of our constitution, and of the composition and working of our Standing Committee. Nor have I yielded a single point advanced in my first letter. I have not receded from the position that the Standing Committee is not composed chiefly of dignitaries and rural deans. Nor have I receded from my denial of the assertion that the business of the Committee is all managed by a few of its members there in London, or within easy reach of it, nor admitted undue Episcopal influence. I have continued writing for the sole purpose of meeting uncalled for attacks made upon the diocese of Huron and its administration. If the constitution has been violated, I do not excuse that violation, nor have I in the past attempted to excuse it. Mr. Smith has failed to see that when I said, "if to men of 15 years standing why not to men of one," I simply shewed how his own argument was as strong for the action of the Synod as against it. Not seeing this, he concludes that I am an advocate for that system of levelling, which makes no recognition of long and faithful service. I think length of service ought to be recognized, and that in every diocese after a fair minimum stipend has been fixed, attention ought to be given to this. Think not that my "sympathies for my poorer brethren are petrified." I do not know that I have any poorer brethren in this diocese, so far as clerical income goes, and so if nothing else should lead me to sympathize, "a fellow feeling makes one wondrous kind." I supported the scheme brought forward by Archdeacon Marsh, though I cannot say that the Archdeacon made it very clear that the scheme without modification could be carried out. I am still in favor of such a scheme, or such a modification of it as could be carried out. I favour such a scheme rather than making the surplus commutation a permanent fund for the benefit of the older clergy, because it has in it the promise of fairness both to young and old which the other scheme has not. If you make the Commutation Fund a permanent fund for the benefit of the older clergy and divide it, say at the rate of \$400 a year, to clergy of 15 years standing, there will surely be times when there will be more men of that standing than the fund will pay. Then you have the manifest unfairness that perhaps one out of six ordained and licensed the same day, will be put on the Fund this year, while the remaining five must wait until death carves out a place for them. How much better to have some such progressive scale as that brought forward by Archdeacon Marsh; a scale that will put all who begin their ministry in the Diocese at the same time on an equal footing, whether their names begin with A or Z.

Mr. Smith characterizes my views of the sacred nature of a trust as unsound and unjust. Now if to hold that every trust should be strictly carried out, be an unsound and unjust view, I will grant that my view is both unsound and unjust. But I think that Mr. Smith will agree with me that it is the duty of the Synod and the duty of the Standing Committee to discharge the trusts committed to them. I cannot believe even after all that he and Mr. Tibbs have written that he would seriously urge the Synod to violate the trust laid upon it by the terms of the Macaulay Award, which plainly state that a certain sum should be set apart from the Commutation Fund, and stand forever as a fund from which the Bishop of Huron, for

the time being, should receive a salary of \$1,600, and an Archdeacon of Huron \$400 a year. Talk of the sacredness of a trust after asking the Synod to violate this! Moreover, if your correspondent can shew me in the commutation trust, deed, or bond, a clause asserting that after the life interest of the original commutants expires, the income of the Commutation Fund must be appropriated to the senior clergy, then I will admit that we have been unfaithful to our trust.

Not being able to deny that the report of the voluntary income for the last five years proves that there is no truth in the assertion that the voluntary spirit is being destroyed, or the insinuation, that the confidence of the laity has been shaken, our friend gravely tells us that there has been a marked increase in the income of the Episcopal Fund. If he had the welfare of the Church at heart, he would rejoice at this, but we must not take to ourselves very much credit on account of this great increase, when we remember that in the time of the late Bishop there was a See House, the use of which he enjoyed while the present Bishop lives in his own house.

As for comparing the prosperity of the Diocese under the present Bishop, with its prosperity under the late Bishop, I had no thought of making comparisons either favorable or unfavorable to the former. It was on the whole prosperous under the late Bishop, it is on the whole prosperous now. The Church Society, with Archdeacon Marsh as Secretary, enjoyed the confidence of the laity then; the Synod, with Mr. Reed as Secretary, enjoys the confidence of the laity now. I must, however, take exception to the assertion that there has been a practical decrease as the clergy now have only \$700 a year. We must remember that the minimum income now is \$700 a year and a house, or \$800, nor must we forget that the clergy are not merely led to expect this amount, but actually receive it. Further, we should remember that last year the Committee was able to supplement this amount so as to bring the income up to nearly \$800 and a house. Nearly 15 years ago my ministry began in this diocese, and for the first four years my income never exceeded \$550 a year without a house, and that for two years more after paying house rent it did not reach \$700. Now I know that my experience was not very much worse than that of many clergymen even of longer standing. In this connection it should also be remembered that a large part of the Commutation Fund from the very first was practically a part of the Mission Fund, several of the commutants having charge of parishes which otherwise would have depended on the Mission Fund, and are depended upon it now. Further, it must be remembered that the grants from the English Societies are much smaller now than then. Bearing these facts in mind, there is no foundation for the assertion that there has been practically a decrease. The expenses too will bear comparison with former years. Your correspondents, I doubt not, are well aware that the amount paid from the Commutation Fund and the General Purposes' Fund for the work done now by Mr. Reed, was formerly considerably in excess of the salary now received by Mr. Reed. I am sure your correspondents will acknowledge that the work has not decreased. Here then is a decrease of expense instead of an increase. An honest comparison will shew that the only increase that can be set against this is the difference between the annual expenses of deputations in former years, and the salary and expenses of the missionary agent. This, it is well known, is only an experiment but, I rejoice to say, an experiment which bids fair to be successful, and which, I know very well, is popular with those very clergy who, according to Mr. Smith, are poorer by the amount paid to the Missionary agent. I also justify the Standing Committee and the Synod in faithfully discharging the trust imposed upon them by the award known as the Macaulay Award.

After my expressed willingness to allow Mr. Tibbs' explanation of his mistake about the term "last year," it is quite unnecessary for him to try to shew that the Report for the year ending March 31, 1879, is the report of last year. By his own shewing, he is wrong, for in that report of 1879, which he quoted, are included nine months of 1878, and I might ask how does he call 1878 last year?

What Mr. Tibbs says about the relations subsisting between the state, the Bishop, the Synod, &c., may be very true, but it certainly is not very clear. What I suppose he wishes to convey is the idea that the Synod of Huron and the Standing Committee have handed over trusts to the Bishop which they had no right to delegate. This I deny. The Bishop is a part of the Synod, and has his recognized place and power. We would neither rob him of the one nor curtail the other. The clergy and the laity are parts of the Synod each with their recognized place and power set forth in the constitution. I have seen no evidence that the Bishop is using his influence to encroach upon that place or sap the foundations of that power.

After all that Mr. Tibbs has said in disparagement of the Bishop, it is quite refreshing to find that he looks upon the Bishop's absence in England as a mis-

fortune to the Diocese. Now, I claim that he has a cause for complaint. The Bishop has left in the Diocese a substitute who is both able and willing to meet the demands which the "spiritual interests of the Diocese make upon a Bishop's time and 'qui facit per se.' The consent of the Synod was freely given. The Bishop in his Charge, delivered a very full Synod, entered very fully into the subject of his intended visit to England, and no part of the charge was more heartily applauded than that in which he declared his determination to go to England and to leave no stone unturned to secure the success of the Western University.

Why the popular vote for Bishop should "naturally make supporters and opponents," I am quite at a loss to know. At the election of a Bishop, we pray for the guidance of the Holy Spirit, not upon individual preferences, but upon the Synod as a whole; and a man who votes has any right to do so with the determination that if the man of his preference be elected he will support, and if the other man be elected he will oppose him. Rather should every man vote with the determination to give a loyal and hearty support to the man of the Synod's choice.

Yours truly,

FREEMAN HARDING.

Haysville, Ont., Jan. 15, 1881.

THE MARRIAGE QUESTION.

SIR,—The statement mentioned in a late issue of your paper as contained in the *Globe*, to the effect that the word "wife," in the 18th chapter of Leviticus, does not mean "widow," is the same as has been made use of in other papers published both here and elsewhere. The absurdity of such a statement as would make it appear that the prohibitions there mentioned were directed against adultery, is apparent, when we consider how inconsistent it would be that the penalty for that crime, if committed with a neighbour's wife, should be death, whereas, if committed with a brother's or uncle's wife, would only be that they should be "childless." In keeping with this way of interpreting Scripture, we have had a variety of "views" floated in the newspapers of late, and many have exercised their ingenuity in tracing out arguments in favour of marriage with a deceased wife's sister and brother's widow, who seem to fancy they have discovered more correct interpretations in advance of, and far wiser, than those of their forefathers, and that this age of new fangled doctrines, sectarianism, and infidelity, has developed "a decided majority of sober, truth-seeking and learned men," according to the Rev. W. S. Rainsford's opinion, whose judgments are entitled to more respect than a host of others as learned and holy, who had for so many centuries existed in the Christian Church from the earliest times, and were opposed to them. No doubt the arguments of these modern interpreters have had their influence upon some of the members of the Church, who from indifference to the question as one of no immediate interest to themselves, or from want of the due consideration of it, have failed to comprehend the depth and breadth of that important declaration of our Lord that "they twain shall be one flesh," as a mysterious physiological truth not to be determined by scientific theories, but to be accepted in faith, and by which we recognize a principle of affinity that through the marriage of each pair, according to Divine will, new relations are formed, the circle of human affections was to be extended, and the frame work of society united together by family ties, a principle which, if interfered with, and the significance of that declaration of our Saviour but lightly received, this social order would be broken, and confusion, incest, and divorce would ensue, as too many proofs of it exist in other countries.

I quite agree with a writer in your paper, in believing that the pulpits of our Churches have been too silent in respect to these marriages, and think that every member should be properly informed as to the mind of the Church concerning them, and her attitude towards those who act contrary to her laws, at the same time urging upon them as citizens to protest and petition against the Bill now to be raised again in Parliament, which requires every effort to prevent the passage of. A majority, as has been in other Parliaments, may be ready to inoculate the country with a virus of immorality, and an Archbishop, Bishops, and Priests may be found to condone crime, proving themselves recreant to the laws of the Church and their God, of which they are the ostensible guardians; and men have not been wanting in Synod to make her subservient by an attempt to silence her voice in protest to a corrupt, popular will, which the State has already shewn too much willingness to pander to. But notwithstanding these efforts to subvert the teaching of the Catholic Church both from within and without, our branch of it in Canada as a whole will stand firm to her ancient record, and use her influence upon those around her, and in the use of her powers on the revival of her dormant discipline, as it is so hoped, will correct and place in their

proper position
ward to the
essions, scan
Kingston

THREESCOR
Nearing
Bearing th
To bound
On, th
On, th
On, th
T
W
And the ti
Anchors at

THREESCOR
Are che
The calm
Earth's
Spring
Fruit-
Autum
E
C

And then
Throws o

THREESCOR
The bot
How few
Around
Fathe
Broth
Our lo
T
I

And with
To lead u

THREESCOR
Are rest
But, as be
Before
And j
His n
And
T
M

Melting a
That illu

THREESCOR
Faithfu
Bending t
Of the r
Wake
Burn
Read
I
I

Thou a c
With the

THREESCOR
To mea
How mar
Counti
One
One
One

Faithful
Enter no

It is re
his office
mong a n
was bein
be in a m
ful smile
so cold, g
like a si
ing him c
cret of l
doctor,"
wives, an
kind wor
parting k
me with