

community in about 60,000 and to 228,517

as been sent the bishops throughout

number, 1887. —I am now in regard to communion the summer

1878, it has assemble on session there the various e may have ference will 24, and will

ald in connec- ulars will be

ons from my old as to the ble that we

y weighed by good enough eliminary ar- objects defi- the church's perance, (b) sm. 2. Defi- classes, and mmunion in he Scandina- to the Old Heathen con- dards of Doc- s of Dioceses n.

arrest prayer y be pleased endeavor to ment of His

nd servant in . CANTUAR.

yet told me attend the timate your f the confer- , Deanery, t we should ny bishops nd 1878, the he episcopal swers which endance will en exactly a

ll appear on

to opinions of

LISHMENT.

assert, as a urch endow- represent the public prop- so far as to value of the posed yearly false. There orting. She r. Gladstone ery of the ." Yet that rationist as- an writes: ty, except in y (the people ate of the y, of which r for use or e regulator." nes derived to the public

treasury; it is "legally," historically, practically, absolutely, in every sense, untrue." That is strong language from a legal luminary! 2. The same thing is said of the word *public*, as meaning no more than what is protected and regulated by statute. 3. Lord Selborne goes on to state that, "in the light of *Law and History*, church endowments were not originally state property, and that they never, at any time, became so. Private donors did, indeed, divest themselves of their former rights, but the new title created was for a definite, lawful purpose of their own choosing. *Kings*, too, in this respect differed nothing from private donors. Their gifts were made when kings could hold and grant lands or other property as freely as their subjects, and what they gave, whether to ecclesiastical or lay corporations, could never be resumed, unless legally forfeited. 4. "As to tithes, whatever else may be doubtful, this is quite certain, that they never were the property of or payable to the state." Were the state to undo the only thing it ever did in respect to them; that is, were it to withdraw the civil sanctions for their payment and recovery, they would not lapse to the treasury. The church would simply lose them, except where voluntarily paid. 5. As to the *Parliamentary Grants* for fabrics, before referred to, by which the state gained more than it gave; no claim was thereby established upon them as national property, since the grants were made without right of repayment or reservation. Parliament has never treated any institution as its debtor where money was not expressly given as a loan. Nay, when the annual grant to Maynooth ceased in 1869, a large debt was remitted, and in the case of the *Regium Donum* to the Irish Presbyterians, a large further allowance, at the time of Irish disestablishment, was made for the disappointment of future expectations. It was mere confusion, both of thought and law, to identify the regulative powers of the state with proprietary rights. The former are admitted in all hands, and are indispensable in all cases of trust, whether of church or dissent; the latter have no existence at all. Yours, JOHN CARRY.

Port Perry, Nov. 7, 1887.

HURON FINANCES.

SIR,—The letter of "Vidette" has produced a profound sensation. It had been represented that the financial condition of the Diocese of Huron was much better than any other diocese, and it is but a few years since the Synod of Toronto seriously entertained the idea of adopting the Huron system of a large executive committee to manage its financial affairs. Indeed, the synod actually adopted it, but its constitution wisely providing that the following meeting of synod must confirm the act, the plan was afterwards rejected, and a merciful deliverance vouchsafed the Diocese of Toronto. After the statements made by "Vidette," who deserves the thanks of all loyal churchmen, many will look into the journal of the synod, and I for one. I did not concern myself much about such matters, and partook of the indifference which so largely prevails, and which does so much to foster and aid the evil of centralization referred to by your correspondent. The mission fund has engaged my attention, and at first I thought there must be some mistake, but it is worse than represented. On page 61 of the *Synod Journal* for 1887 the following statement appears: "Total contributions for diocesan missionary work, \$9,039.87"; whilst "Vidette" has put it \$7,458.80; he, however, states it as "available income from the diocese, for diocesan missions." I find that from research that the sum of \$5,606.30 contributed for diocesan mission work is credited to the "general purpose fund," and that \$4,025.73 of that amount is afterwards transferred to the "mission fund account." What became of the \$1,580.57, which is stated as having been contributed for diocesan mission work, and which never reached the mission fund? It is put down as payments for the expenses of the "general purpose fund." Amongst the items is one of \$280.31 for management, which is, that the expense for the work of receiving and paying out \$5,607.30 amounted to \$280.31. When I turn to the "mission fund account," I find another charge for management amounting to \$171.65. The expense for the management of voluntary contributions for missionary work was \$451.96. Surely this requires investigation, for when people subscribed to the "mission fund" they did not expect that \$1,580.57 would be used for the "general purpose fund." It may be said that the "mission fund" entails expense of management, which is true, but \$451.96 is rather a large amount to charge upon \$9,039.87. The fact is, that when contributions are made for diocesan mission work, the whole amount should go to the mission fund. Provision is made for the management of the different trust funds, for under the head of "Synod Expense Account" the following item appears: "Assessment

on the various funds for management, \$2,507.11." When the different funds are assessed for their management, there can be no sufficient plea to take missionary contributions, and apply any portion of them for general purposes. At the synod of 1886 a notice of motion was given by Rev. G. C. Mackenzie—"That henceforth the Parochial Association annual subscriptions be credited to the fund for which they have been contributed, the mission fund," but there it ended. I will look further into the accounts. The Executive Committee has done well to move in the matter, and I hope good will result. As for a synod officer who is paid to serve the synod, being allowed to act as a director of its affairs, by representing the interests of a congregation, which may be at variance with the general welfare of the diocese, is so incongruous, that no properly managed institution would permit it. This must be looked into, and the diocese shall have the benefit of my research.

LAYMAN.

REV. MR. WILSON REPLYS.

SIR,—In reply to the Bishop of Saskatchewan's letter, objecting to my proposed branch home at Banff, and implying that I am leaving my own sphere in Algoma to interfere with the work of missionaries in other dioceses. I have simply to say that the work in which I have been engaged for nineteen years, and in which friends, both in England and in Canada, have so kindly helped me, has never been confined to one diocese. In 1869 I was living in Sarnia, and yet itinerating among the Indians north of Lake Huron and Lake Superior. Ever since our Shingwauk Home was established at Sault Ste. Marie, we have drawn our pupils in large measure from other dioceses, the Indians in Algoma are chiefly Roman Catholics. The Bishops of Rupert's Land and Qu'Appelle have given me every encouragement to prosecute my work within the limits of their dioceses, and all the missionaries working among the Indians from here and the Rockies, and my warm friends are ready to aid me in every way. The great object in trying to establish a small branch home at Banff, as I have said plainly enough, perhaps too plainly in the papers, was to counteract Romish influence. My object is not to promote discord, but unity in our Christian missions. Yours, etc., E. F. WILSON.

Sault Ste. Marie, Ont., Dec. 28, 1887.

SKETCH OF LESSON.

2ND SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY. JAN. 15TH, 1888.

Defeat of the Five Kings.

Passage to be read.—Joshua x. 1-15.

Think of the indignation and alarm in the other cities of Southern Canaan when they heard of the league which the principal cities of Gibeon had made with Israel so soon after Joshua had taken and destroyed both Jericho and Ai.

I. *The Attack on Gibeon.*—So the king of Jerusalem, who seems to have been especially annoyed, sends to the kings of four other cities of the district, inviting them to come and help him to punish those traitors, the Gibeonites. The five kings of the Amorites accordingly gather themselves together, encamp before Gibeon, and make war against it.

II. *The Cry for Help.*—The Gibeonites are now in a great strait. They are, indeed, being punished for making a treaty with the people of the Lord. Their city is besieged, and a siege is a terrible thing. Think of some sieges—the siege of Jerusalem by Titus—of Lucknow, in India—of Paris! What must the besieged do? Look out for some one to help them. But who will help the Gibeonites? They have made enemies of all the tribes of Canaan by their league with Israel. Ah, there is Israel, their new friend. So they send messengers to Joshua, who tell him what is going on, and beg him to come up and help them, and that with all dispatch.

III. *The Divine Helper.*—Immediately Joshua sets forth from Gilgal, and all his men of war with him. But is he not afraid? There are five kings to fight with. No:—for God bids him not fear, and promises him victory. With this assurance he hastens on, and, marching all night, surprises the besiegers in the morning. A great slaughter takes place, and the Canaanites flee before Israel. Joshua pursues, chasing them up the hills to Upper Beth-horon, and then down the other side to Lower Beth-horon. And in this latter part of the battle the Lord Himself fights for Israel; for a great hail storm coming on, more are killed by the hail than are slain by the sword of Israel. In the Book of Jasher it is recorded that the fight continued all day, the light of the sun and of the moon being, perhaps, continued longer than usual, that the rout might be thorough. Thus were the Amorites utterly routed, and the five kings, hiding in a cave, taken and hanged. (v. 26). On that day God

fought for Israel. The battle was one of the grand decisive battles of the world, and one of the most important that Israel ever fought.

DAME EXPERIENCE has convinced many that to use any of the substitutes offered for the only sure-pod and painless corn cure is attended with danger. Get always and use none other than Putnam's Painless Corn Extractor, at druggists.

Family Reading.

PIUS IV AND THE ENGLISH REFORMATION.

The offer of Rome to recognize the reforms made in the English Church, on the one condition that the Bishop of Rome's supremacy should be recognized, is so old an affair, and so often adverted to and substantiated, that it is almost unnecessary to go over the ground again at this late day. But the following article, from the pen of the Rev. Mr. Little, is so excellently to the point that we cannot refrain from giving it entire. Says he:

"I have received so many enquiries in regard to my assertion in Article xxiv that the Bishop of Rome, Pius IV, 'agreed to recognize all the reforms under Elizabeth, if only she would recognize his supremacy,' that it seems best to turn aside from the general argument in order to give a few authorities for the statement.

"It is asserted in almost every history of the Anglican Church that Pius IV agreed to recognize the English Reformation, provided that his own supremacy should be acknowledged. This concession on his part is valuable as showing that our Church had lost nothing which, even in the estimation of Rome, is essential to a true Church.

"Here, in his 'Eighteen Centuries of the Church of England' (page 348) says: 'Pope Paul IV, having died on August 18, 1559, was succeeded by Pius IV. The new Pope sent his nuncio with a letter to the Queen, announcing his approval and willingness to accept the new Prayer Book, as well as the Communion in both kinds, if only the Queen would acknowledge his supremacy.'

"Jennings in his excellent '*Ecclesia Anglicana*' (page 819) says: 'A new Pope, Pius IV, in 1560 addressed to her (Elizabeth) a letter of very different tenor, making overtures for a reconciliation. He offered that, on condition of her adhesion to the See of Rome, the Pope would approve of the Book of Common Prayer, including the Liturgy or Communion Service, and the Ordinal. Although his Holiness complained that many things were omitted from the Prayer Book which ought to be there, he admitted that the book nevertheless contained nothing contrary to truth, while it certainly comprehended all that is necessary for salvation. He was therefore prepared to authorize the book if the Queen would receive it from him and on his authority.'

"Blunt in his historical introduction to the Prayer Book (page 85) says: 'It is worth notice, however, that the Book of Common Prayer as thus revised in 1559 was quietly accepted by the great body of Romanist laity; and also, that the Pope himself saw so little to object to in it that he offered to give the book his full sanction if his authority were recognized by the Queen and the kingdom.' And he quotes Sir Edward Coke as saying that the Pope, Pius IV, 'before the time of his excommunication against Queen Elizabeth denounced, sent his letter unto Her Majesty, in which he did allow the Bible and Book of Divine Service, as it is now used among us, to be authentic and not repugnant to truth. But that therein was contained enough necessary to salvation, though there was not in it so much as might conveniently be, and that he would also allow it unto us without changing any part, so as Her Majesty would acknowledge to receive it from the Pope, and by his allowance, which Her Majesty denying to do so, she was then presently by the same Pope excommunicated. And this is the truth concerning Pope Pius Quartus, as I have faith in God and men. I have oftentimes heard avowed by the late Queen her own words, and I have conferred with some Lords that were of greatest reckoning in the State, who had seen and