

## Correspondence.

The columns of THE CHURCH GUARDIAN will be freely open to all who may wish to use them, no matter what the writer's views or opinions may be; but objectionable personal language, or doctrines contrary to the well understood teaching of the Church will not be admitted.

## BROTHERHOOD.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

Sirs,—"X. Y. Z." from P.E. I. has my best thanks for so cordially endorsing my views with regard to those whom he, perhaps, not inaptly designated "cheeky," amongst our younger brethren. As he never has met with such, I hope he never may, they are not agreeable.

To take sweet council together and walk in the House of God as friends," is one of the great privileges of the brotherhood of the ministry of the Gospel of Christ; and while the older doubtless can aid the younger greatly by their experience, the younger more than repay their elders by the infusion of zeal, freshness, and energy which they naturally possess, from the very fact of youth.

I can candidly say that nothing does me more good in the way of keeping up my work than intercourse with a nice, fresh, good, healthy young clergyman, all fire for the Master's work. But such are not of the "cheeky" order! X. Y. Z. justly asks, "What are the Bishops to do when the upper classes decline the ministry?" Of course they must take what they can get, or leave some places without a clergyman.

The question then becomes, "Can anyone do anything to help the Bishops in the dilemma, or rather out of it?"

I think both clergy and laity could. The clergy by exalting and extolling the joys and privileges of the Lord's work, and making light of the temporal troubles and trials which often accompany it. Mold it up to youths and parents as (which indeed it is) the noblest, most blessed, and most delightful work that mortal man can undertake; and they can use a vast amount of influence to induce boys thus to think. Moreover, they can try and teach their people that a heavenly crown is, out of all comparison, to be desired before earthly dollars: for the "love of money" is the root of this evil, without doubt. Parents and boys would be willing enough "to fill the order" if there was "any money in it." Bank clerks, dry-goods clerks, and even coal miners would strike for the wages some of our clergy are content with.

But then their treasure is where their heart is; their hopes are for "white raiment" hereafter; they dig for the "pearl of great price." This leads to the way the laity may help.

Our Metropolitan says: "A single evening party, a single wedding breakfast, a single dress, costs more than a subscription (to Home Missions) doubled, trebled, perhaps tenfold."

Here is the secret. There is no money in the work of the ministry, because many of the laity lavish on self—the purple and fine linen; the sumptuous fare—and let the ministry beg at the door like Lazarus, for crumbs and old clothes.

These thoughts have followed from X. Y. Z.'s excellent communication, although not exactly on the subject of my heading. "Let us go back to our mittens," as the French say.

"X. Y. Z." pleads that his brother Presbyterian should accept the younger as his equal. He has no need to plead with many of us, we are ready, with open arms, but I cannot say that of all. Some of the elders are "starchy," and if such happen to live in a city are apt to patronize the "country missionary," though may be some of the latter have been city clergy, and have gone into the rough places, while their patronizers have looked for "a soft thing."

I remember some years ago a Canadian Bishop held a visitation. A country clergyman, now at rest, then well up in years, and a little deaf, went near the altar to a seat, in order the better to hear his Bishop's charge, but was informed that the "first seats" were reserved for the city clergy. Now the city clergy can see and hear their Bishop any day; the man from the backwoods valued the privilege and took his seat in spite of the rebuff.

Besides, most city clergy have been country clergy, and I don't see (for one) that they have acquired any fresh dignity because they have left salt junk to live near a good market.

Some of the city clergy, God bless them,

are the very souls of good brotherhood, and are beloved by society.

FRATER.

## HALIFAX C. OF E. INSTITUTE.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

Sirs,—Knowing the interest you take in all matters that concern the young men of the Church in the city, and the earnest efforts you are making to bring the Church of England Institute into its proper position, so that it may be a centre for Christian instruction, as it is now a place where young men may meet and spend their evenings in innocent recreation, free from all evil surroundings, and where they may also meet their spiritual advisors as friends, I ask indulgence for a small space in your paper to bring its objects more fully before the Halifax clergy, to impress upon them the responsibility they have in promoting its higher objects, which, if carried out successfully, will be a great strength to the Church. One noticeable feature in our Christian work, and one that must be felt by every clergyman, is the want of young men helpers. Every superintendent will tell you that his Sunday School is not as successful as it might be if he had more young men teachers; and it is plain to every Church-goer that at our confirmations there are five female candidates to one male. Consequently, when all Christians should be present to take part in the Sacred Feast, the young men are conspicuous by their absence.

Now, there must be a cause for this. Some will say young men are not as easily reached; others, that their temptations are greater; others that it is the fact of their having to go from home, perhaps abroad, to earn their living, thus losing the guiding hand of a father or mother. Yes, these reasons are all true, and I might quote reason after reason, and the more facts of this kind that can be brought forward, only go to prove the greater need that exists for their being looked after. I do not ask you, reverend gentlemen, to forsake your older parishioners, or your young ladies, but I do crave some of your time for the young men. You admit that the temptations of young men are greater, therefore should your exertions be the more earnest to save them. And now I come to the opportunities which the Institute offers. Come among us and extend your hand to those that are thrown adrift, without even a mother's influence to guide them. Provide seats in your Churches, not up stairs, but good ones, that won't make one feel as if he were only in God's House by sufferance. Do you know that there are numbers of young Churchmen in the city that have never been spoken to by a clergyman of our Church!

Yes, it is so, and the trouble in the past has been the need of a place where all might meet together as Churchmen. The Institute now fills a long felt want, and I trust that the opportunities thus afforded to the clergy will be gratefully accepted and fully used to the permanent welfare of their lay brethren, and to the one great object of the Church—the Glory of God.

A YOUNG MEMBER OF THE INSTITUTE.

## THE DEAN OF WESTMINSTER AND HIS CRITICS.

By Mr. Robert H. Lawrence, Fenchurch House, Fenchurch-street, E. C., London, G. B.

Stanley, forbear! nor stain thy glorious pile, Where sleep the famous heroes of our isle, Dim not its lustre with thy base alloy, Nor turn our pity from the hapless boy. The tear that pity gives is his, forsooth— Who would not mourn our death in early youth?

But that is all—for, mingled with our grief, One mighty thought reigns dominant and chief:

"'Twas sorrowful!—but that one death—no more— Has saved his country from a sea of gore! What deed, what generous thought, were his to gain

A niche of honour in thy wondrous fane? One wild ambition only filled his breast, One dreadful hope before the world contest— Like sire, like son, the hope—and that alone— To wade through slaughter to a bloodstained throne!"

Sirs,—The above is the prize composition from the *Weekly Dispatch*, a paper which though no friend to the Church is yet utterly disgusted at the Dean's determined erastianism. What, with the exclusion of American Bishops at the time of the Pan-Anglican Council, and the admission of a monument to young Buonaparte; what, with the false assertion that the American Church was rent in twain by the war between North and South; what, with his determined upholding of "Colenso," and admission of "schismatic teachers" to lecture in our Abbey—truly, Churchmen at home may pray for an alteration in the state

of things which makes such a "Dean of Westminster" possible!

WATCHMAN.

## DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

Sirs, I was at first disposed to feel displeased that you as *Guardian* of the Church should admit such a letter as that of "Plebs"; but having read that letter a second time I became convinced of your wisdom. For it is the sort of advocacy M. Girouard's Bill is to get, it won't help it much with thinking people.

1. "Plebs" says:—"The proof advanced of opinion amongst the most learned men of England, is great as to there being no prohibition in the Scriptures to the marriage." This is merely a dictum of "Plebs." I and thousands of others think just the opposite, and the most learned Hebrew scholar of England is with us.

2. "Plebs" seems to doubt that marriage with a deceased wife's sister is against the law of the land, and asks where is it?

If it be not against the law of the land, what is the need, and what the object of M. Girouard's Bill?

3. The Law of the Church of England is sneered at because "Plebs" chooses to assert that there is no Church of England out of England. That is true if he add:—"By law established," but if he will kindly look at the Church Acts passed by the Provincial Parliament of Nova Scotia, he will find, "The Church of England within the Province of Nova Scotia," is our legal title. As to American law, we not only have nothing to do with it, but it cannot be taken en bloc—each State being at liberty to make its own laws, and the minds of the leading men in the Protestant Episcopal Church are against such marriages, as far as I can ascertain.

Your other correspondent "D." gives a supposed case to which I can give a real case somewhat parallel.

About 35 years ago I was on a visit to my father, in England, and amongst his flock I became acquainted with a Mr. R. He had married a Miss B., consumption took her, and he took Miss B. (No. 2) she too fell a victim to decline, and Mr. R. took Miss B. (No. 3.) then he took young Mr. B. into business partnership, then he became bankrupt, the father of his three wives and his partner being the detaining creditor. And he was the active secretary for promoting the repeal of the law against marrying a deceased wife's sister!!! I quite agree with your London correspondent, and would (for the children's sake) advocate the repeal of the law to prevent one from marrying their "grandmother."

Yours,

WATCHMAN.

[P.S.—The declaration of the Church in Canada runs thus:—"We desire the Church in the Province (of Canada) to continue as it has been, an integral portion of the United Church of England and Ireland. As members of that Church, we," &c. Of course we are not accountable for the severance of the Union betwixt the Churches of England and Ireland.]

## WHAT ARE THE PRESBYTERIANS DOING?

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

Sirs,—The above question occurred to me on reading, in an English paper, an account of the meeting held in London on the 25th ult., and of which it is to be hoped that you may see fit to publish an abstract. I saw in it a speech of the Convener of a Marriage Law Committee of the General Assembly of the Established Church of Scotland, which shews that the old spirit is still alive there, and that Scotchmen in their native land are thoroughly sound upon the subject of marriages prohibited in the Word of God, within certain degrees of affinity as well as of consanguinity. He said that "he stood there as the representative of the Church and people of Scotland. He rejoiced to add that the Free Church shared with the Establishment in the intensity of its convictions, and that the Episcopal Church was with them to a man." This was in opposition to the Bill for legalizing marriage with a deceased wife's sister. What would he have said to our Bill for legalizing marriage with a deceased brother's wife?

Mew is it then that, in this new world, the Scotchmen, professing to cherish the faith of their fathers, differ so widely from the people of the old country, that they are tamely submitting to the action of a party who are treating with contempt their Confession of Faith, and endeavoring to involve them, together with the other inhabitants of the Dominion, in the guilt of sanctioning what they profess to believe to be condemned by the Word of

God? We had a right to expect the Scotch Presbyterians throughout the Dominion to unite with us in a vigorous, determined opposition to the Bill now before Parliament, but I am not aware that they have made any sign. Can you, sirs, furnish any explanation of this strange phenomenon, of this extraordinary declension from the earnest and steadfast adherence to their tenets, not only of their forefathers, but also of their brethren in their native land, as testified by the authoritative speech to which I have referred?

I am, sirs,

AN ADHERENT OF THE OLD FAITH.

## THE MARRIAGE BILL.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

Sirs,—Your correspondent "Plebs" writes fairly, on the whole, in defence of the Sister's Marriage Bill, but the tendency of his remarks is to obscure the points at issue. Permit me, therefore, to comment on some of the assertions contained in his letter:

1. It is quite true that the Table of Forbidden Degrees at the end of the Prayer Book is not in the "Sealed Book" of Common Prayer, but it is also true that it sets forth what is undoubtedly the law of England and the law of Scotland, and that this human law is based upon the written Word of God, and the universal practice of the early ages of Christianity. Few men possess such a profound knowledge of Christian antiquity as Bishop Wordsworth, and he says that "not a single iota of testimony in favor of such marriages can be cited from any Christian writer of any note for fourteen centuries after Christ."

2. "Plebs" observes that Lev. xviii. 18 limits the contracting of such marriages to the lifetime of the first wife. But, because a man may not take his wife's sister to wife while his wife is alive, it by no means follows that he may take his wife's sister to wife when his wife is dead. As Hooker says, "It is a mistake to suppose that a thing denied with special circumstances doth impart an opposite affirmation when once that circumstance has expired."

From the code, taken as a whole, it is clear by logical influence that such marriages are unlawful.

3. By marriage husband and wife become one flesh. My wife's sister becomes my sister.

4. In the extreme case that was put to our Lord of the woman and the seven brothers, a difficulty was raised concerning the resurrection, and our Lord's remarks were therefore limited to the doctrine in question. But in speaking specially of marriage, He has expressly laid down the law for His people, "They two shall be one flesh."

5. Because God for special reasons under the Mosaic economy was pleased to dispense with His own law, and even to change the prohibition into a command, it is not to be supposed that we can dispense with it.

6. "Plebs" asserts that such marriages are common even in England. He is in error here. Thank God, public opinion as well as human and divine law is against them, and long may it continue to be so. It has been shown that they are even less common than forms of incest.

I am not aware that the clergy "want to shake any canons in the face of the laity, with the terrors of excommunication." But in those days of liberty, "Plebs" will hardly deny that a voluntary society is at liberty to lay down its own rules for membership. Such a society, at least, is the Church in the eyes of the State. One of its rules forbids incest, and a man living in that state practically excommunicates himself. Should this unhappy Bill become law in the Dominion, and "the people may love to have it so," it will then become incumbent upon the clergy to set forth the Divine law of marriage, and the consequences of violating it, with greater particularity than it has hitherto been necessary to do.

Let me add, in conclusion, that I think an opportunity should be afforded to the women of these Provinces for expressing their opinions on the subject. It concerns them as deeply as, perhaps even more deeply, than it concerns men. I am inclined to think that many Presbyterians would be at one with us in this matter.

J. D.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

Sirs,—I am often, in my parochial visitations, made painfully aware of the dense ignorance of Scripture History which prevails, notwithstanding the wide circulation of the Bible, and I am intensely anxious to save the rising generation in my mission from this "blackness of darkness" which makes it so hard to do anything, in a religious sense, with so many of their elders. I would be glad, therefore, to hear of some good, sound Church book, telling Scripture History in a manner adapted to the minds of young children. I want something like the "Peep of Day Se-

ries," which, if only its theology were a little more Churchly in some points, would be the very thing needed, and I shall circulate some of the books of this series if I cannot get better, in the hope that only what is good will take root. Can any one help me to do better? Of course cheapness is desirable, with a view to wide circulation. A description in your columns of some good books of this kind would be acceptable, I am sure, to more than myself.

Yours faithfully,

A MISSIONARY.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

Sirs, Your paper has undoubtedly caused a sort of revival in Church interest. Would not the following idea, carried out be interesting?

Suppose every priest in Nova Scotia sent you the number of communicants at Easter, from every parish at which he celebrated, with the name of the Parish. From some parishes the return could not be obtained for two or three weeks after Easter, especially where one priest had charge of two or more churches. It would be but little trouble for the Clergy to send the interesting item on a post card to you.

W.

The above is a good suggestion, and we hope to see it carried out (Eds.)

## OUR AGED CLERGY.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

DEAR SIR,—Some months ago you seemed anxious to obtain the names of all those clergymen in the Dominion who, having been in Holy Orders half a century and upwards, still survived, and no doubt you have supposed the list exhausted. The name of one worthy veteran, however, yet remains to be added thereto—the Rev. Robert Vashon Rogers—and it is my privilege to give it to you, with a few particulars of his ministerial life: Mr. Rogers was ordained Deacon April 1st, 1827, by Dr. Ryder, Bishop of Litchfield and Coventry. Dr. Harecourt, Archbishop of York, gave him the Curacy of Hest, or Hesse, mother Church of Hull, and three years later ordained him Priest in the Parish Church of Bishopthorpe. From Hest he removed to Laycock, near Bath, Wills, as sole Curate to the Rev. James Paley, son of the author of the Evidences (in this pulpit Bishop Jewel preached his last sermon.) At the expiration of his engagement here he came to America and served as a Missionary under Bishop Chase, in Ohio, and at Circleville, in that Diocese, built a Church. In the spring of 1836, being laid very low by the Asiatic cholera, whilst attending Synod in Cincinnati, he came North for his health, and meeting with Sir John Colborne (afterwards Lord Selkirk), he was by him persuaded to seek an appointment in the Diocese of Quebec, which then comprehended from Gaspe to Chatham; and acting upon his advice, he was by Dr. Stuart, Bishop of Quebec, appointed first Rector of Richmond. Sickened overtaking his family there, and losing an only son, he moved to Kingston, and became Master of the Grammar School and supply at the Provincial Penitentiary for the Chaplain, Rev. W. M. Herchmer, about to visit England. On Mr. Herchmer's return he occupied the Parish of Carrying-Place for six months, when his health again failing him, he was advised to return to England. Here he took temporary duty till 1843, when he came back, and was appointed Chaplain of the Provincial Penitentiary and Missionary of the S. P. G. in Portsmouth, and to the east side of Barrie street, Kingston. Here his ministry was very successful, so much so that in one year from the laying of the cornerstone, St. James' Church (of which the Rev. Rural Dean Kirkpatrick is now Rector) stood ready for occupation, and was consecrated by Dr. Strachan, Bishop of Toronto. Having previously resigned the Chaplaincy of the Prov. Penitentiary, in 1869 he resigned St. James' and went into the Diocese of Huron, where he labored in the Mission of Vittoria and Port Ryerse, building in the latter place, during his incumbency, a Church. Under Bishop Strachan Mr. Rogers was Rural Dean of the Midland District, under Bishop Hellmuth, R. D. of St. Thomas.

I close this sketch in the words of my venerable friend: "Having now reached a period of upwards of 70 years, with more than a ministry of 50 years, I returned to Kingston in 1874, with the leave of the Bishop of Huron. I am living in Kingston, and doing what my Ministerial Brethren and the Bishop of Ontario permit, with *mens Sana in corpore Sano*, in my 77th year of age and 54th of ministry. To God be all the praise!"

Yours faithfully,

C. H. M. BAKER.