

A man has recently buried his wife in the consecrated Churchyard adjoining one of our Churches in this county, and he wishes to secure two plots adjoining his wife's grave, for his own burial in due time, and that of another member of the family. He thinks he could probably depend upon the adjacent plots being left vacant, but nevertheless he wants to be sure of them. How can he secure them?

Yours truly,

ROBERT C. CASWALL.

Fergus, March 31, 1880.

QUALIFICATION OF ELECTORS OF REPRESENTATIVES TO SYNOD.

DEAR SIR.—Before beginning the subject on which I purpose writing, I must do myself the pleasure of congratulating you on the excellent working of your rule that "all letters will appear with the names of the writers in full," and I have been confirmed in my opinion by the very marked difference between your correspondence columns and those of the other (so-called) Church papers; as a fair sample I would instance the thoroughly convincing letter of Mr. Whitcombe on the 55th Canon in your issue of the 18th instant, in contrast with the choice effusion improperly signed "Evangelical" in that paper of the same date, the writer of which after indulging in a certain amount of personal abuse, endeavors, though I should say unsuccessfully, to prove his views on the prayer before the sermon question, by the same Canons.

But my object in writing is to make a few remarks on another subject.

The Executive Committee of the Synod, having adopted a report in favor of making communicants the sole electors of Representatives, an official of the Diocesan Synod, although a member of that Committee has thought it desirable to bring the matter and his views on the same before the public, and after stating some of those views in opposition to the proposed alteration of, brings forward a certain line of argument derived from his reading of the Synod Acts of 1857 and 1858, and of the declaration of the British North American Bishops in the matter of Church membership, to endeavor to prove his case. It would take up too much room to reproduce his argument here; but he sums up thus:—"I hold therefore, that the proposed Canon to exclude all members of our congregations, who are not communicants, from the right to attend the Easter meetings and vote for delegates to the Synod, is not only contrary to the whole spirit and intention of our Church Legislation in parliament and in Synod for 30 years, but is *ultra vires*. It is stated that the statutes give the Synod full powers to pass the proposed Canon of disfranchisement, but I deny that the statutes cited give the Synod power to deprive the laity of the rights which they have uninterruptedly enjoyed with great advantage to the Church for nearly 25 years, and which the Act of 1858 was expressly formed to secure to them."

Now let us refer to an Act not "cited" by him. The Synod of Toronto Incorporation Act of 1869, Sec. 2 reads thus:—"The Synod shall consist of the Bishop of the said Diocese, and of Lay Representatives to be elected according to the constitution of the said Synod, as the same exists at the time of the passing of this Act, or as it may from time to time be altered by the said Synod, after the passing of this Act." This seems to settle the question of the "spirit and intention of our Church Legislation in parliament for 30 years," and the inference that we have the power is so very strong, that I should think we must interpret the Act of 1857 as giving the power, and the Legislature evidently thus understood it. That the Synod did so as well is also evident, for we find that in 1870 (the year after), when our present constitution was adopted, the parties entitled to vote are, "All Laymen within the cure of 21 years of age or upwards, who shall annually sign a declaration in the form following,—"I, ———, solemnly declare that I am a member of the ——— Church ——— and that I am an habitual worshipper with this congregation, and have not voted as a member of any other congregation within the year." Now this is a very different qualification from that named in the Act of 1858, which is as follows:—"All Laymen within such parish, mission, or cure, or belonging to such congregation, of the full age of 21 years, who shall declare themselves in writing at such meetings to be members of the Church—and to belong to no other religious denomination, shall have the right of voting;" which anyone must see is far less restrictive than even the one in present use; and consequently the proposed Canon is also not "contrary to the spirit and intention of the Church Legislation in Synod for 30 years."

I should almost imagine that the writer of the letter fancied himself in his educational chair, freely

interpreting the School Laws for the benefit of some rural Board of Trustees.

Very sincerely,

BASIL R. ROWE.

Orillia, Easter Monday.

"MY GOD, MY GOD, WHY HAST THOU FORSAKEN ME."—St. Matt. xxvii., 46.

SIR,—I have read with pleasure the different letters in the columns of your paper discussing the Holy Communion—evening, morning, and mid-day. These letters, if nothing more, certainly show much thought and careful reading on the part of many of the clergy.

With your permission I will offer a different subject in the above heading to those who feel inclined to investigate the matter. In the course of my Lenten reading I have been led to think of those words of our blessed Lord, uttered on the Cross, and I find among commentators a diversity of opinion concerning them. "Forsaken me." The difference of opinion is on these words or the idea conveyed by them. Wordsworth seems in favour of the separation between Father and Son, but he offers no illustration, except that it was felt to show the humanity of Christ and for our encouragement. This seems well enough as far as it reaches, but it does not touch the vital point in my mind. Meyer strikes bolder in the following "Feeling of being forsaken by God." He says this feeling was caused by the intensity of Christ's sufferings. De Wette offers a similar suggestion. Olshausen says, "Actual momentary abandonment by God." Lange says the separation was apparent only. In some degree all admit the possibility of a separation between Father and Son at that awful hour of atonement, but I have found no satisfactory reason given for that separation. I think there can be no doubt that something in the way of withdrawal from Christ by the Father must have taken place, judging from the cry, and the words of the crucified Son of God. Nor do I see how Christ could have been the sacrifice for sin without it. How could the mere death of His humanity on the cross have satisfied the Divine justice against sin? "The wages of sin is death." Christ had no sin of His own to answer for, but He took upon Him our sins, and He must pay the just penalty of them as the sacrifice to God. "The wages of sin is death." Death temporally and also death spiritually—and finally death eternal. What is death? Natural death is the separation of body and soul. Spiritual death is the separation of the spirit from God. Eternal death is the separation of body and soul eternally from God. We know without doubt that Christ died the natural death. His body was taken down dead from the cross—the soul was gone. But must he not have tasted spiritual death? I think so. And He tasted it before the natural death, as God, that He might show to us that he suffered the full penalty of sin—viz., separation from God. And the awful experience of such a separation made Him cry out, "Eli, Eli, Lama Sabbachthani." I do not see how we can understand the words, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" otherwise than spirit being separated from spirit. That unfathomableness of spiritual loneliness which no human mind can grasp, was felt by Christ for the first time, and the cry that no human words can express burst from His lips: Spirit from spirit, Father from Son. But the cry, "My God," &c., as a prayer was answered, and victory was near. He soon was able to say, "It is finished," and His work was completed.

I merely offer these remarks as suggestive, and would be very glad to hear from thinking minds on this subject.

J. W. GARLAND.

South Stukely, March 15, 1880.

TRANSFER OF THE DEAD.

DEAR SIR,—I do not wish to open a discussion, or broach any theory, orthodox or otherwise, with reference to the state of the departed in another world, but to the rest of their bodies in this world. Have any of the clergy ever had any cases wherein persons have desired to transfer the bodies of their dead kindred from one cemetery to another; as, for instance, from the consecrated Church ground to the unconsecrated ground of Methodist, Adventist, or such like? Cases where to give liberty was to give way to sectarian animosity, and not to give way would be to cause bitterness? I have had two such occasions, and supposing that others might find themselves in the same difficulties, I think it well to ask the clergy; are they aware that there is an act in the Statutes of Canada that will help them very much in taking the burden of responsibility of refusing, from their minds, to some extent? I do not know the chapter or the volume; but the spirit of the act is that no corpse can be taken up for transference to another cemetery without an order from one of Her Majesty's judges. That order to be given at the discretion of the judge, upon application being made and the case considered. It will be observed that the law steps in and takes all liberty of

refusing or even consenting from the clergyman. He is but the custodian of the body in the meanwhile. And this act applies to all creeds and all cemeteries. And it is worth while for us to bring the act to bear; for there are some people who expect the utmost pains from a clergyman in burying their dead—preaching sermons, offering up prayers at the house or the grave, &c., yet do not scruple when their fancy leads them, to expect the utmost readiness from the same clergyman to see the Church ground disturbed and disfigured, (as it necessarily is in such cases,) and perhaps his feelings hurt in addition.

WM. ROSS BROWN.

JOHN WESLEY AND THE CHURCH.

Church people and Methodists will read with equal interest the following original letter from John Wesley. Mr. Henry J. Mills found it among his father's papers. The Miss Bishop, to whom the letter is written, was the second wife of Mr. H. J. Mills' grandfather, who was a member of the Society of Friends, and it would appear that Miss Bishop, who was a Methodist before her marriage, consulted John Wesley about the step she was about to take. Hence probably the religious and doctrinal character of the communication:—

London, October 10th, 1778.

MY DEAR MISS BISHOP,—I am not unwilling to write to you, even upon a tender subject, because you will weigh the matter fairly. And if you have a little prepossession (which, who has not), yet you are willing to give it up to reason.

"The original Methodists were all of the Church of England, and the more awakened they were, the more zealously they adhered to it, in every point, both of doctrine and discipline. Hence we inserted in the very first Rules of our Society, 'They that leave the Church leave us.' And this we did, not as a point of prudence, but a point of conscience. We believe it utterly unlawful to separate from the Church, unless sinful terms of communion were imposed; just as did Mr. Philip Hervey, and most of those holy men that were contemporary with him."

"But the ministers of it do not preach the gospel. Neither do the Independent or Anabaptist ministers. Calvinism is not the gospel; nay, it is further from it than most of the sermons I hear at Church. These are very frequently unevangelical; but those are anti-evangelical. They are (to say no more) equally wrong, and they are far more dangerously wrong. Few of the Methodists are now in danger of imbibing error from the Church ministers; but they are in danger of imbibing the grand error—Calvinism from the Dissenting ministers. Perhaps thousands have done it already; most of whom have drawn back to perdition. I see more instances of this than anyone can do; and on this ground also exhort all who would keep to the Methodists and from Calvinism—Go to the Church and not to the meeting."

"But to speak freely, I myself find more life in the Church prayers than in the formal extemporary prayers of Dissenters. Nay, I find more profit in sermons on either good tempers or good works, than in what are vulgarly called Gospel sermons. That term is now become a mere cant word. I wish none of our society would use it. It has no determinate meaning. Let but a pert, self-sufficient animal, that has neither sense nor grace, bawl out something about Christ and His Blood, or justification by faith, and his hearers cry out, 'What a fine Gospel sermon!' Surely the Methodists have not so learnt Christ. We know no Gospel without salvation from sin."

"There is a Romish error which many Protestants sanction unawares. It is an avowed doctrine of the Romish Church that 'the pure intention of the minister is essential to the validity of the Sacraments.' If so, we ought not to attend the ministrations of an unholly man; but in flat opposition to this, our Church teaches, in the 28th Article, that 'the unworthiness of the minister does not hinder the validity of the sacraments.' Although, therefore, there are many disagreeable circumstances, yet I advise all our friends to keep to the Church. God has surely raised us up for the Church chiefly that a little leaven may leaven the whole lump."

"I wish you would seriously consider that little tract, 'Reasons against a Separation from the Church of England.' Those reasons were never answered yet, and I believe they never will be."

"I am glad you have undertaken that labor of love, and I trust it will increase both your spiritual and bodily health."

"I am, my dear Miss Bishop,

Yours very affectionately,

J. WESLEY."

A FRAGRANT REMEDY.—The latest expedient for keeping flies out of the house is the cultivation of geraniums or mignonette in the windows. It is said to be very effectual.

BISHOP

In ze
learning
ornament
pointed
Charles
tion, his
questere
he was l
Carberry
enahire,
allowed
keep a
his fami
tion tha
fervent
composit
tensive k
sion, and
have rem
ters in t

At th

Bishop I

Connor.

bishop b

tudes; b

accepts

the ince

uncertain

word by

gaged, w

those gr

"Blessed

theirs is

was tum

vice; "S

lay aside

soul, and

On the

1687, at

tacked b

ing ten

emplary

one of th

possessed

18th of th

In thus

late, by a

age of fif

sight, do

father ap

however,

many oth

"

And ju

If the de

their ete

equally "

cloud or i

vant is no

and the s

already

Olivet, an

He is rise

I

Did, with

shrou

The Sun

—He'll

When e

To speak

Our souls

That w

May sin

The sho

days' fever

tabernacle

him low o

thus easil

usefulness

of Christ,

signed to

that neith

lect, nor

earnestne

learning,

of the un

than the

pointed fo

learned, "

the Judgm

fore, "e

lights bur

for their I

shall come