

been made by some who have no other friendship for Lennoxville than that arising from the good work done in the past, and its connection by sanction of the Synod itself with the Diocese of Montreal. Admitting that from other dioceses there may come some who will oppose conferring on local Theological Colleges the power of granting degrees, and who will ably defend the rights of Bishop's College, is that any reason for deliberately excluding all of those in the Diocese of Montreal who might have made known the views of the minority (so-called), and their reasons for opposing on purely *Diocesan* grounds? If the papal theory of infallibility be claimed for the representatives of the great majority, and for their opinions and decisions, then the minority, we suppose, should not be heard; but if not, the old maxim, *audi alteram partem*, remains good. Notwithstanding the clever attempt of our correspondent to escape the inference drawn from his previous letter, we think it stands good, and is supported, too, by this second letter.—ED.]

THE LATE SYNOD AND "LENT."

DEAR SIR,—Your correspondent "Lent's" contribution to this question is valuable. It presents in so far a disclosure from behind the scene, and it formulates the reckless assumptions of those who are scouring the regions of logic or poking among the sediments of brotherly love for some pretence of warrant for their misdoings. The assumption that "both sides of the house voted for an exclusive list of delegates" is the usual legal device of a plea of *manslaughter*, to escape the more dreadful conviction under a charge of *murder*. The evidence can be produced to sustain the true crime. Your note, Mr. Editor, "We do not believe from the result that this was done by a minority as a body," is an unqualified *statement of fact*. The minority, as such, nor any body representing them, neither agreed upon, discussed or issued any "list." Under the audible breathings of threatening and slaughter against all who presumed to exercise the right of private judgment, two or three individuals, as such, to neutralize the obnoxious, ostracising list previously heralded and then in *actual circulation*, hastily made a counter-selection, from which any *independent* mind could select those who might be approved. "Lent's" plea is absolutely *frivolous*, therefore, as referring to an action before maturely *decided* on, and then *actually perpetrated*. "Lent's" acknowledged "list" was fulminated before his now attempted justification was in existence, and its *culpability* is measurable only by its *vindictive intolerance*. It is capable of proof that the minority did not "use the same tactics and weapons" under all the unfair odds which were wielded against them.

When "Lent" passes from "tactics" to "principle," he trips yet more heavily. "Principle" with him is evidently a shuttle-cock. If "principle" had aught to do with the matter, to what depth is "principle" degraded when it becomes the spiteful engine of malevolence in ostracising Dr. Norman and other leading members from the *Executive or Business Committee*, where there could be no ground for the moral cowardice as to Provincial Synod, and which has such little confidence in the justice of its course that the alternative of Synodical destruction is chosen rather than to meet with confidence a brother who with all courtesy and fairness, in the very words of "Lent," is able "skillfully to introduce and ably argue the question." Surely "a majority" which needs such a line of defence is put to perilous shifts, if it hopes for a favorable verdict from any but the most partizan and prejudiced minds.

Yours,

FACT.

SIR,—I have not the pen of a ready writer, but the east wind must have been blowing when "Churchman" wrote his letter in last week's *GUARDIAN*. He asks of what use are our Archdeacons, Deans and Canons?

An Archdeacon's son in England the other day said, "an Archdeacon was a sort of chap that did lots of work for the Bishop." Perhaps if your correspondent were to ask Bishop Baldwin the question he might get an answer. As to Deans, I suppose "Churchman" did not include Rural Deans, who are simply lower corporals. We have but one Dean—one of the oldest and most respected of the Priests in this Diocese. The Canons, with two exceptions are Priests of twenty-five years, upwards, standing and hard work in this Diocese. The youngest Canon is a Priest of sixteen years standing—a gold medalist in classics, Toronto University. I think these facts will answer most of "Churchman's" questions.

As to the (so called) Western University "Churchman" has nearly demolished it with the following adjectives, "absurd, childish, almost idiotic." The possibility is, the Western will survive this attack. There may be large difference of opinion as regards the number of degree conferring institutions; but it might be well to remember that the Western University stands upon a different footing from say the Montreal Theological College, or Wycliffe College in Toronto. The Western is an outgrowth of Huron College (theological). Huron College is not under the shadow of a University. It is the training college for the Diocese of Huron, and in the keen competition and many demands of these days, we are anxious to have our clergy as well fitted as possible for their work. We think University powers will help in this direction. Let it be remembered also that Huron College is not of yesterday. It is more than twenty years old; its Alumni can be found in many Dioceses of Canada, occupying no mean positions, and so it can hardly be wondered that some advance should be attempted. Your correspondent signs himself a "Churchman," let him know then that there are Huron College men who can lay some claim to be Churchmen, who are known as pronounced Churchmen, who have led the way in the dissemination of true Church principles as distinguished from Romanism on the one hand and Puritanism on the other, and who think it better to have Huron College with University powers, supplying clergymen for this Diocese, than that the Diocese should be dependent on Wycliffe Hall—as it very soon would be if you deprive Huron College of University powers. Some of us think it would be better for those who call themselves par excellence Churchmen, to fall in with and help the "Western University," than to be perpetually sneering at it and playing into the hands of those who prefer Wycliffe Hall to Huron College.

I am neither an Archdeacon nor a Canon, but am not ashamed to sign myself a graduate of the Western University, and perhaps a Churchman.

Yours very truly,

ALEPH.

Diocese of Huron, July 15th, 1886.

LIVERPOOL, N.S., July 19th, 1886.

DEAR GUARDIAN,—I made a sad error a short time ago, a few persons succeeded in getting me to refuse to take the fermented sacramental wine. To add to this sin I wrote an article in a paper against the wine. Then my conscience smote me. I learned for the first time what I ought to have known, that no other wine could be used. Bitterly do I regret the past, but it is done now. A life time regret to me it will be. Yet, this is comfort to taste the Supper of the Lord. I trust I have been forgiven, and that I have led none astray. Yours in truth. C.W.

SIR,—Two points in addition to what I wrote in my last may be instructive. First—I have learned the evils of pew-renting in Barbados. To my mind it is a curse. As to funds, it is

not necessary, as the organist, sexton and wine are the chief item of expense. It promotes class feeling where little expected. It keeps the Church from being the Church of the poor as well as the rich. While it secures a certain number who are generally always present, it dampens the ardour of the priest in the praiseworthy object of inducing others to come. It is a grievous burden to have to collect the rents. The law is open, but who will use it? Where the church is too small for the people the rent is properly paid, as a few manage to monopolize the seats. If it be a fashionable congregation, many come from surrounding districts, withdrawing proper revenue from their own and bringing it to another church, depriving the poor in connection with it of the benefit of the chief services. In poor districts, or with ample accommodation, seats are rented, and sometimes paid for. But the bickering, wrangling, pride and neglect, together with ignoring of communicants by putting the church franchise in the hands of pew-holders, has caused me to take a decided stand, which will result in my abolishing pew-renting in my parish.

Second—I have fallen in love with church endowment, or rather its practical equivalent, the system adopted by the government of concurrent endowment. I know the merits of the voluntary system; it is excellent under certain conditions, but failure as to its bright ideal is very well known. *Liberty* to pay undergoes, we all know, not seldom a conversion to *refusal* to pay. A few give a little, some what they can, and others nothing at all. This is very unfair. All alike enjoy the great advantages consequent on increased morality, which decidedly diminishes crime. In a word, civilization depends on the pecuniary support of religion.

I have just awakened to the immense advantage that comes to all from paying the clergy from the public purse. I did not understand it at first; nor do I know, in my ignorance, any other part of the world in which this system is adopted. I know it is not in *England*, as not a penny is there paid by the Government, the salary all coming from the funds of the Church. Of course cases in the civil service are excepted. Here we have concurrent endowment. In other words, practically, a certain amount is required yearly for the support of the clergy. This comes out of the ordinary revenue, and is paid them in monthly instalments. The question of denominationalism is got over by assisting in like manner those in dissent. Thus the State recognizes religion in the same substantial manner as it does education.

Could not Canada do likewise? Even the disgrace of many denominations might be managed by a similar system. Let the Dominion Government appropriate each year—or, for that matter, the Government of each Province—a sum for clerical support. Divide this among the official representatives of the Church and the sects, giving to each a percentage in proportion to the number of adherents. They would subdivide with their clergy. This, assisted if necessary by local effort, would place the position of Christian teaching in a condition that it otherwise cannot attain for many long years. Since I don't think we have any reliable basis for supposing one kind of Christians has more worldly wealth in Canada than another, it would seem none could object to this but infidels, and we can no more listen to them than to the wise-heads in our lunatic asylums. It is superior to Church endowment, as a few centuries hence a heathenish cry may be raised to secularize religious property, that the greed of rapacious robbers may be satisfied; or an investment may appear wisely made, yet years may come, and changes of time and changes of trade may render the same financially worthless.

JAMES LOWRY.

St. Barnabas, Barbados.