

That it is expedient in order to enable the Bishop to make changes when thought desirable for the welfare of the Church, that all future appointments to parishes or missions lapse at the end of five years.

As it had not come up for a hearing on the last afternoon of the meeting, I thought it best to abandon it then, as so many of the delegates had left for home, but it can be brought before the Executive Committee, and come up in time for discussion next year.

The object of this letter is to make you acquainted with my views, and also to elicit yours in return on the motion, either through the press or privately.

Bear in mind that the motion would not affect the present position of any clergyman in the diocese, nor would it mean itinerancy as practised in the Methodist Church, for under it the bishop could re-appoint for the same position, if he considered it best. It would merely enable him to readjust his appointments, which he cannot now do. It will be said, and said truly, that the bishop does now re-appoint clergymen, and some of them at least several times, and what is there to be gained by the change? There would be this, that periodical appointments would not need investigation, as the causes that now lead to re-appointments often do to the detriment of the Church.

Besides periodical appointments would afford the bishop time to weigh well the needs of the Church in each parish and the opportunity for readjustment, which these enforced changes do not.

Life appointments do not secure that permanency it was designed to affect. As the average of a minister's incumbency in parishes and missions in this diocese is about five years, it is evident that the adoption of my motion would raise the average considerable. Under definite term appointments congregations would not be likely to resort to the questionable means they sometimes now adopt to terminate a distasteful connection, but would wait until the term expires, thereby preventing much bitterness and raising the minimum time to five years. That, with the re-appointments to the same parishes where a change would not be desirable, would, I think, in time bring up the average to near ten years; in fact, the only cases in which life appointments secure permanency is in endowed parishes, in some of which the very permanency of the incumbent is the bane of the Church in that parish, and if those endowments cannot be utilized for general Church purposes, would it not be much better if the bishop would make changes for the Church's welfare than that these endowments, which were designed for the expansion of the Church, should be the means of its contraction, as not infrequently now happens?

However suitable life appointments may be for the Church in England, where the most of the people were born in the parish in which they worship, the very reverse of such a state of society here ought to lead to the enquiry whether it is equally suitable for the Church in Canada which is supported by the voluntary offerings of her members, except in those cases above referred to.

Now the transition from life appointments to a definite term would be so gradual that it could not become a disturbing element in the Church, especially so as it involves no question of doctrine or ritual.

The real question is: Shall the bishop be empowered to remove ministers after a five years' incumbency or not? and it seems to me he cannot exercise an efficient episcopal supervision of the Church in his diocese without some such power. Under the present system the bishop is often called upon to make appointments that he had no intimation of six months previous, and consequently he has to do as he can, and not as he would, under a more Methodical system.

If it can be clearly shown that my motion would dampen the zeal of the clergy, engender unkindly feelings between them and their parishioners, or be in any way injurious to the Church's interests, I will drop it at once; but if, on the other hand, it would tend to remove causes of irritation that sometimes arise in parishes, I ask the clergy's assistance to bring about so desirable a result.

I appeal to the laity for support on the ground that, as their responsibility is great, that they are worthy of the consideration which the motion would secure to them, the lack of which has been the source of some apathy among them. Its passage, I verily believe, would cheer some weary clergymen, impart hope to some desponding parishes and cause many a wandering son of the Church to return to his first love. Yours truly,

J. MOTHERSILL,
Lay Delegate.

THE THREE ADVENTS.

SIR,—Permit me to offer through your paper a helping hand to your correspondent F. C.

He will find all the information and much more—that he needs in a small tract on the Millennium, by the late Bishop of Lincoln, (Chs. Wordsworth). This

is a most valuable compendium of the whole literature of the subject.

Revelation v. 10 which F. C. refers to is very misleading—"And we shall reign on the earth," old translation. In the revised version we find the passage thus rendered, which helps to make the idea of the Sacred Writer clear and consistent, "And they reign"—the present tense—"upon the earth."

J. A. MORRIS.

EXPLANATION.

SIR,—In your issue of February 7th you published a letter from one of your Orillia subscribers relative to a letter written by the Rev. W. J. Armitage to the Incumbent of St. James' Church, Orillia, asking if the whole or part of the Epiphany collection here for Foreign Missions could go towards the fund for the support of the Rev. J. Cooper Robinson, of Japan, who is, I believe, the only missionary as yet sent out to labor in foreign fields by the Church of England in Canada.

The following is a quotation from your subscribers' letter:—"It was a lucky thing that the Peoples' Churchwarden was not Wycliffite, or otherwise our collection, some \$35, would have found its way to Japan."

This statement was made by the writer at a time when he was ignorant of the facts as they really are, and as it is erroneous and misleading, though no doubt, not intended to be so, I desire to make this explanation which I would ask you to be kind enough to insert in your paper. The Incumbent having received a letter from Mr. Armitage, showed it to me (the clergyman's warden), and after a few moments consideration we decided that the collection should be sent as heretofore to the Synod office of the Diocese, no notice to the contrary having been given out;—but at the same time we felt that it would have given us pleasure to have sent a portion of it, at least, towards the support of the cause advocated by Mr. Armitage. On the following day the Incumbent read the letter to the People's churchwarden in my presence, and he coincided with us in the opinion we had already found. Since reading your subscriber's letter I have looked up the Canon of the Synod on this subject, and it will be interesting to your readers to know (and possibly beneficial to the cause in which Mr. Armitage is interested) that money subscribed for such objects as Foreign Missions are to be distributed according to the wish of the donors, so that it is in the power of contributors to appropriate their subscriptions to any particular mission in which they are interested.

Yours &c.,

FRANK EVANS.

Orillia, Feb. 22nd, 1889.

The Canon Mr. Evans refers to does not give the Wardens or Incumbent of any Church the right to appropriate an offertory collected in response to a Bishop's Pastoral, according to their private fancy. The Wardens and Incumbent are not the "donors" of the Mission offertory, therefore, the Canon alluded to by Mr. Evans has no reference whatever to them or to the case in question. Those officials are trustees for the congregation, and for the Mission Board, when a Mission offertory is made, and it is a breach of trust for them to divert trust money from the channel the donors desire it to flow in, or to any purpose not specifically in accordance with the Pastoral under which the offertory was made. Suppose the Grand Master of the Masons issued a letter to all the Lodges in his jurisdiction asking a collection for the general benevolent fund, what would be said if some one Master and his Wardens, took up such a collection, and gave it to a private friend? The cases are exactly parallel, and Mr. Evans can get an answer from any Mason in good standing, which may possibly be beneficial to Mr. Armitage to learn.

SIR,—My attention has been called to a letter that appeared in a late issue of your paper, from an Orillia subscriber concerning the Epiphany-tide collection for Foreign Missions. I beg leave to correct a misstatement in the letter, the Epiphany collection at St. John's, Port Hope, was not \$25.50, nor was it given to the Rev. J. C. Robinson Fund. Our collection on that occasion for Foreign Missions was \$72 68, \$25.50 of which the givers themselves appropriated to Mr. Robinson's work. I quite agree with you when you say that neither Rector nor Churchwardens can appropriate the funds collected on that day, but I go farther, and say that neither Rector nor Churchwardens can take money contributed for a special fund and hand it over to another. Your Orillia subscriber should have taken the trouble of examining attentively Mr. Kemp's returns in your contemporary on the

occasion mentioned, and also of finding out what the Rev. Mr. Armitage's request to the Rector of Orillia, really was. Trusting that you will find room to insert this explanation of your hasty correspondent's statement. I remain, Yours truly,

H. J. HAMILTON,

Curate in charge St. John's Church.

THE LAMBETH ENCYCICAL AND THE PRAYER BOOK.

SIR,—It is well said in the Lambeth Encyclical that, "The study of Holy Scripture is a great part of the mental discipline of the Christian, and the Bible itself is the main instrument in all teaching of religion." But the Bishops did not overlook another important line of instruction most sadly neglected. They say, "It would be possible, to a greater extent than is now done, to make sermons in church combine doctrinal and moral efficiency, and, by illustrating the rational of Divine Service, lead on the congregations to the perception of the definite relations between worship, faith, and work—the lessons of the Prayer Book, the Catechism, and the Creeds."

We have not only an historic Church and ministry, and faith, but also an historic worship. It is no extravagant hyperbole to say that there is scarcely a rubric or a paragraph of the Prayer Book, which does not bear the impress of whole ages of history and of conflict, while numberless words have each a most interesting history; and yet whole congregations pass year after year without ever hearing anything of this, or without being brought into intelligent sympathy with the long life of the Catholic Church, or knowing anything of the varied fortunes of our own branch of it. There is no Church that affords such scope for varied instruction as ours, nor any that more requires it. Who does not remember with surprise and shame the poor people of a past generation, saying the priest's part as well as the people's, and showing thereby their unacquaintance with the nature of the service? and who does not note even still the unreadiness of many in the use of the Prayer Book? So neglected is this line of study, that the clergy themselves are sometimes unacquainted with matters of no small consequence by no means difficult or obscure. But I venture to assure them, after a good share of experience, that the people when instructed in the history and meaning of the Church services are interested, pleased, and helped; and it is little wonder, if in the absence of this knowledge, the Church has small hold of them, and they are easily attracted to other quarters, or are easily perturbed by unfair or disloyal representations from within. Besides formalism is the disease of all religion, following it as shadow follows substance, and so without the aid of exact knowledge the service becomes little better than a soporific, or the cantillation of a magical formula. If this is a general danger, a Liturgical worship can certainly claim no exemption.

Our Liturgy is, on every account, justly said to be scriptural. What stores then of sound instruction must be in Canticles and Prayers, representing the very heart of the Gospel! What insight may be thence derived into the character of true prayer, and what a sure guide are they to a Christian's devotion in every part of his life! In the Litany, too, for example, what a synopsis of ethical subjects is presented; while the collects are a body of exact theology, in the best and safest form, the devotional. Then the offices of the Prayer Book leave nothing to be desired in the statement of doctrine, or in matter for fullest instruction and devout suggestion. As for the Psalter, that back-bone of the Daily Prayer, it is most distressing to think of its neglect in the pulpit. The Church's Manual, which the Son of God consecrated by His own use, is honoured by having an occasional text taken from it, and that is all; while the people go on in their unintelligent recital. Its structure, interpretation, and the method of its devotional use are seldom set forth—even the proper Psalms are not fully expounded in their relation to the Christian Mysteries of the Seasons. In a word, for want of teaching, we don't get the good of our Church Service.

What I would suggest is, that we endeavour to have one sermon each month on the Prayer Book. This would not be so frequent as to be monotonous and wearisome, and, indeed would help to a necessary variety in our preaching; while it would keep the subject before the people, and would be frequent enough to secure the necessary amount of attention to the consecutive treatment. Though an occasional break would be a matter of no consequence, this method at least should be observed, I have done this for a quarter of a century, and I hope with advantage. Any good text book on the Prayer Book, will contain the skeleton of such sermons, while old Dean Comber and some later authors will assist in devotionally completing the work, i.e., if the need of any such help is felt.

In my next I hope to send you a specimen of this

sort of work from
of Homilists, St

Port Perry.

THE REN

SIR,—The great early ages of the fathers, were the "golden" illustrations. the fourth century. Church. The in paying him highest order, the flavor of the Reformers were ject of Predest would be content article. Men like and Chrysostom al knowledge men, came with the Reformation then came Kn Rogers, and o and theologian turies, such a row, it has philosopher, great Jeremy St. Chrysostom the gold of the preachers, Bo Warburton s the worst s sermons which If we were most to exte two centuries Harvey, and the Perron Dr. Cox and sent Archb little disgr Newburypor of the "Prin deposited be Church. I the skull ar coffin of this Mr. Whitefie he died of A These were fiant fact, foundly infl epochs of h had received their faculti mitted. Pr of divine ap the most ex are the key diseased mi practical se eating rede to forsake gether the watch, lost saith, "Th believe, and that Bisho "We have of the peop None at all people int our voice, fled." It theology in modern P modern ph much scien lack of the called a b the midnig a sweet s wounded to deprec It is asser times bor Roman v Church fr Reformati which pre cution the fold and own and of heroic advanced effete. T