

The Church Guardian,

A Weekly Newspaper published in the interests of the
Church of England.

NON-PARTIZAN! INDEPENDENT!
It will be fearless and outspoken on all subjects, but its effort will
always be to speak what it holds to be the truth in love.

EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR:
REV. JOHN D. H. BROWNE, Lock Drawer 29, Halifax, N.S.
ASSOCIATE EDITOR:
REV. EDWYN S. W. PENTREATH, Winnipeg, Manitoba.
LOCAL EDITOR FOR NEW BRUNSWICK:
REV.

Staff of correspondents in every Diocese in the Dominion.

Price, ONE DOLLAR a year in advance; when not paid
in advance, Fifty Cents extra.

The Cheapest Church Weekly in America. Circulation larger
than that of any paper, secular or religious, in the Maritime Provinces,
and double that of any other Church paper in the Dominion.

Address: THE CHURCH GUARDIAN, Lock Drawer 29,
Halifax, N. S.

The Editor may be found between the hours of 9 a.m. and 1 p.m.,
and 2 and 6 p.m., at his office, No. 54 Granville Street, (11-stairs),
directly over the Church of England Institute.

A NEW VOLUME.

We have completed three years of existence and have now begun the fourth under circumstances which lead us to hope for a large and increasing influence in the future. Starting as a new undertaking, altogether as a private venture, without any sustentation fund whatever, but with full faith in our cause, and with large hopes of success, we have reached a circulation far in advance of our highest expectations, and greatly in excess of any previous undertaking of the kind in these Provinces. Not only can we claim a much larger circulation than any of our predecessors enjoyed, but we are able to boast of the largest of any paper—secular or religious—in the Maritime Provinces, and nearly double that of any other religious paper in New Brunswick or Nova Scotia, or of any other Church paper in the whole of Canada.

To be able to present such an exhibit in three years is, of course, very gratifying, but we owe it largely to the warm sympathy and hearty support extended to us by Clergy and Laity, who have dealt lightly with our shortcomings, while speaking kindly of our endeavours to advance the interests of our beloved Church. This we have ever sought to do without the display of party spirit, but hesitating not to uphold the principles and doctrines of the Church of England, and being ready at all times to speak out boldly in defence of what we hold to be the truth.

We have been induced to make the change in the GUARDIAN through the urgent solicitations of many friends, and we trust that our yielding to what seems to be the popular wish, will be the assurance to our patrons that we are anxious to make the paper still more worthy of their confidence and support.

THE LORD BISHOP OF NOVA SCOTIA.

In speaking of the warm friends who have cheered and sustained us in our oftentimes trying labours, we feel in an especial manner under obligations to the Bishop of Nova Scotia, who has ever shown a warm interest in, and sympathy with, our work. We have therefore felt a desire to mark, in a humble way, our appreciation of the Bishop's kindness by identifying the first issue of the new volume of the GUARDIAN with his Lordship. And this we do by presenting our readers with the Bishop's likeness,* and with a brief sketch of his long and most industrious and successful episcopate.

*Much to our regret the woodcut received is so unsatisfactory a likeness of his Lordship that we think it better to defer its publication, awaiting a better one.

On the Feast of the Annunciation, March 25th, 1851, the Rt. Rev. Hibbert Binney, D. D., Fellow, Bursar and Tutor of New College, Oxford, was consecrated by the Archbishop of Canterbury, assisted by three other Prelates, the fourth Bishop of Nova Scotia, in succession to the beloved and lamented Bishop Inglis. At that time there was no fixed income, no Episcopal Endowment, no Parochial nor Diocesan, indeed, no Capital Funds of any kind for any purpose within the Diocese. The Church in Nova Scotia was altogether dependent upon England for the Salaries of her Missionaries, and for the support of her Bishop, although a little while previous to Bishop Inglis' death, the Diocesan Church Society had been organized, and had begun its good work. Owing to this condition of things the See was far from being an attractive one, and the discouragements and opposition which the new Bishop had subsequently to meet and overcome, had they been foreseen, might well have deterred the bravest man from accepting the position.

Thirty-one years have passed away, and the Church to-day everywhere throughout the Diocese shows a marked and gratifying improvement in its material and spiritual condition. The number of the Clergy in that time has nearly doubled; every Church Building has been either restored or enlarged, or new edifices of a more imposing character have taken the place of the old; while the Church population has increased from 36,000 to 60,000. A Church Endowment Fund of \$155,000; a Widows' & Orphans' Fund of \$25,000; a Parish Endowment Fund of \$26,000; a Superannuation Fund of \$20,000; and other Funds amounting to \$20,000 more, have all been raised during the present Episcopate. Such reliable evidences of advancement, the result of indomitable hard work in the face of unforeseen and trying difficulties, prove the Episcopate under review to have been a notable one, and one for which we may well thank God.

We could wish that space permitted us to enlarge upon the work and struggles of the thirty-one years of Bishop Binney's Episcopate, but we must bring our remarks to a close, and this we cannot do better than by a quotation from a speech delivered by his Lordship nineteen years ago, when striving in the face of the most bitter opposition for an Act of Incorporation for a Diocesan Synod, which has since, by its successful working, proved the sagacity of its originator.

It was before a Committee of the House of Assembly, to whom the Bill upon the subject had been referred. Near the conclusion of a particularly able and exhaustive speech in advocacy of the Bill, the Bishop said:—"This is now the twelfth anniversary of my consecration, and I request your permission to speak of myself and close my remarks. I feel that I have a right to-day to take credit for acting for the benefit of the Church in this Province, according to the best of my ability. I came to this country, giving up a great deal in order to do so; for in the matter of emolument I was actually receiving, and I should have continued to receive from offices in the University, more than I could get here. Not only so, but I must, although rather against one's feelings of delicacy, in order to show my motives, say that when I accepted this Bishopric, it was rather uncertain whether provision would be made for any Bishop at all. It is well-known that the income of my predecessor had ceased and not until I came out here was it settled by the Propagation Society that certain funds should be given to the Bishopric. There was another Bishopric vacant about the

same time, one of greater honour than this. I was asked whether I would be inclined to accept that. My answer was simply this: I do not want to leave England except to go to Nova Scotia. As you know well my grandfather was long here, and it is my native land. I had always this country before me, and I often dreamed that I should come back some time. When I was asked if I would labour in Nova Scotia, I put no question as to maintenance, but said I would give up my prospects in England and go out to work for the good of the Church in that country. Now I ask you is it probable that, coming out under such circumstances, I can have any other than the most sincere desire for the benefit of those whom God has committed to my charge. These feelings come back to me on this, the anniversary of my consecration."

After reading such words, and having before us his faithful labours, have not Nova Scotians generally and the Churchmen of the Province in particular, every reason to feel proud of this distinguished prelate, who so loyally and patriotically sacrificed much that he might preach the Gospel of Christ, and be a leader among his brethren in his native land?

THE NEW LAW.

The *Christian Messenger* (Baptist) has constituted itself a champion of the Deceased Wife's Sister's Bill, and in its last number referring to our quotation from the *London Guardian* that "the Church has with one voice declared that the marriages in question are incestuous and forbidden by the law of God, and for a Churchman that is enough," says, "and yet the Queen, the head of the Church of England, has given her sanction to such marriages. It is at least a piece of impertinence to pronounce such judgment, and very foolish to give it currency in this country. Such marriages we regard as pure, and far more reasonable and proper than many celebrated by the dignitaries of that Church."

To say that the Queen is the head of the Church may seem to the editor a fine hit, but in reality she is no more the head of the Church of England than she is the head of the Presbyterians, or, for that matter, of the Methodists or Baptists; and as to her sanctioning such marriages the editor simply deceives his readers when he makes so bold a statement. The Queen we believe has never (certainly not very recently) refused her assent to bills passed by Colonial Parliaments which do not trench upon her royal prerogatives, and have no reference to the constitution, and so she refused not to give her assent to the Australian law. But to say that the Queen has sanctioned such marriages misrepresents her Majesty's action.

That the statement of an historical fact should be to the editor of the *Messenger* an impertinence only shows with what disgust some people hear the truth when it clashes with their own preconceived notions.

What the editor means by the last paragraph of his quotation we do not know, nor do we think he knows himself, unless, indeed, he holds a lawful, scriptural marriage, by a lawfully constituted authority, to be unreasonable and improper. When the writer says in conclusion, "We were not aware that Protestant Churchmen took the voice of the Church as decisive in such matters. We prefer Scripture purity to Church morality," he simply displays more ignorance of the history of the question under discussion, and of the teaching of the Church of England, than a person in his position should. He ought to know that