

Correspondence

Letters must be written on one side of the page only, and in all cases the names and addresses of the writers must be communicated to the Editor even though a pseudonym is used for publication. Under no circumstances can anonymous letters be inserted. Correspondents are urged to be as brief as possible, for owing to increasing pressure on our space preference will be given to short communications. Appeals for money cannot as a rule be inserted unless such letters refer to advertisements in the current number of the paper. It is impossible to print in our correspondence columns letters which have already appeared elsewhere. It is of course understood that we are not to be held responsible for the opinions of correspondents.

THE CHURCH IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Sir,—No words of mine can express how grateful I am to the British Columbia Church Aid Society of England for assistance rendered to this diocese. At the same time I am not blind to the danger of repeating in British Columbia the mistake made years ago in Eastern Canada. I enclose a copy of my letter to the General Secretary of this Society in reply to his last suggestion of "linked parishes," which will indicate the line taken in this diocese, and will also answer some very erroneous statements made by correspondents in your paper.

Up to the present this diocese has only received £100 from this Society for the support of clergymen engaged in work among the settlers.

The M.S.C.C. makes no grants towards church sites and buildings, or for an Episcopal Endowment Fund.

We need \$200,000 to erect buildings on the university site at Point Grey for the Anglican Theological College of British Columbia.

There is no very serious danger of our receiving too much from friends either in Canada or England.

Yours faithfully,

F. H. Du Vernet,
Bishop of Caledonia.

Prince Rupert, B.C., March 7th, 1913.

Prince Rupert, B.C.,
March 6th, 1913.

My Dear Canon Perkins,—In regard to your proposal to have "linked parishes" and "our own missionaries" in connection with work among the settlers of this diocese, I feel that, while from the standpoint of those in England it would be most helpful, from the standpoint of the work here it would be most injurious.

Coming from Eastern Canada, I am most anxious to avoid the mistakes made there in the pioneer stage of the Church. It is a well-known fact that the Presbyterians and Methodists give far more liberally than our Church people do. The reason is not hard to find. I well remember how strenuously my father laboured to counteract the idea ingrained among the Church people of his various parishes in Eastern Canada that their clergyman was supported from England, and, therefore, there was no need for them to give anything to the Church. The S.P.G. went on paying the salaries of clergymen in Eastern Canada years after the people were well able to pay, and the effect is seen to-day all over Canada. Our Church people have not learnt to give as they ought.

The most valuable grants so far made to this diocese by the British Columbia Church Aid Society have been for specified objects, such as the Episcopal Endowment Fund, for church sites and buildings, the "Northern Cross," etc. These are all objects for which the pioneer settler could scarcely be held responsible, objects for which outside assistance can be gratefully accepted without stifling the spirit of self-help.

It is true that this diocese receives a grant from the Missionary Society of the Canadian Church, and also a few smaller grants from other societies definitely given towards the salary of "the living agent," but these grants do not go directly to the Mission receiving aid, but into the diocesan treasury. Our diocesan treasurer pays all salaries out of the Mission Fund of the diocese. The Executive of the Synod each year apportion to every parish and mission in the diocese a sum which it is expected to contribute to the Mission Fund of the diocese. If the mission is growing, the amount asked for is increased each year, so that the principle of self-support works out automatically.

The system of "linked parishes" and "our own missionary" would interfere with this automatic progress towards independence. It would encourage in a Mission the very thing we are labouring so earnestly to avoid: the spirit of reliance upon others. It would be necessary to keep ever before the parishioners the fact that they were sup-

ported by a certain parish in England. Whereas now we keep the fact that there is any outside assistance as much in the background as possible, our goal being self-support and the helping of others through our Mission Fund. The true Canadian is naturally self-reliant and independent. All his training makes him so. The greatest curse that fond parents in England are inflicting upon their wandering sons in this country is "the remittance from home." It takes all the snap out of a man.

Instead of doing anything to destroy our national characteristic we should make full use of it in Church work.

The great Societies, like the S.P.G. and the M.S.C.C., have adopted the principle of trusting the Bishop of the diocese and his Executive, but a smaller body cannot be expected to be so broad-minded.

A donation is a donation given outright. The donor does not expect to control it after it is given, but the regular paying of the salary of a man known as "our own missionary" year after year by a certain parish in England creates the feeling not only of personal interest, but proprietorship, and this carries with it a desire to control. Any attempt on the part of a parish in England to manage affairs in a Canadian mission would be most disastrous. We have our vestry, our churchwardens, our lay representative. Every mission is part of a larger whole, the Synod of the diocese. This again is part of the General Synod. No greater mistake could be made than to attempt to transplant an English parish to one of our British Columbia valleys. With our country being flooded with Americans, Swedes, Norwegians, Montenegrins, Japanese, Chinese, etc., we have a tremendous problem to face. Upon us rests the awful responsibility. We need all the help we can get, but we must work out our destiny on our own national lines.

I appreciate most warmly the kindness of your offered help, and can clearly see the value such a system would have in awakening interest in certain parishes in England, but from the standpoint of the future prosperity of this diocese and the growing spirit of self-reliance I do not think it wise to give the names of Missions to be "linked" in the manner suggested. While I doubt not that on the one side it would be "a bond of love," on the other side it would become "a fetter of progress."

With very kind regards,
I remain,

Yours faithfully,

F. H. Du Vernet,
Bishop of Caledonia.

RENDERING THE SERVICES.

Sir,—Your article on "The Key of B Natural" is not exactly to the point. There are three methods of using the service provided in the Rubrics. Saying, which is monotonous—it has a well-defined ecclesiastical history as such; singing, which, of course, is intoning, but also is something more, as witness the rubric of the first Prayer Book: "And (to the end that the people may the better hear) in such places where they do sing, there shall the lessons be sung in a plain tune, after the manner of distinct reading, and likewise the Epistle and Gospel." Here there is a somewhat different sort of usage spoken of, singing "after the manner of distinct reading."

It is evident that the intention of the first Prayer book was to make a real distinction between the singing or saying of the service, which is made, and the rendering with a loud voice of the Divine Scriptures. Reading was reserved for

ALTAR BRASS

Those interested in the purchase of Altar Brass and kindred articles should write for a copy of "Church Furnishings in Brass and Silver," recently issued by

Ecclesiastical Department

Henry Birks & Sons, Limited
MONTREAL

God's Word. Man's word could be said or sung.

I quite agree with you that "G" is too high, but years of experience has convinced me that "F" presents no difficulty, but "E, or E flat," are better; and you are entirely wrong as to the effect of the saying (monotonous) the Confession, etc., for you get a greater volume of sound, more joining in; that is if you have sense enough to find out and use the note natural to the general voice of the congregation.

The present crusade on behalf of a "read" service has originated from a mistaken notion as to the place of the individual in Common Prayer. He is not supposed to be there, except as part of the whole. Hence his confession, etc., is "general," his thanksgiving, etc., likewise, with a clause thrown in to give the individual a greater expression of his thanksgiving, or supplication. I have listened to congregations using the intoned, natural voice in prayer. One bawls out "Amen," accenting the "all," to the utter confusion of the rest; another insists, from his own spiritual feelings, "that there is no health in us; and another is sure he has erred and strayed; and so, like bleating sheep, they baa in a dozen or a hundred tones, and the hope of the reformers of a "Common Prayer," said in common on a proper note, is thrown on one side. For what? To bring our service down to the level of Dissenting worship, which is based on the principle of individualism, whether in the prayer by the minister, which must tickle all ears and hearts, or in the audible interjections, by which in other services the individual expresses his assent to something which affects him. Of course, the Dean of Durham, an Evangelical, and, therefore, an individualist, out of touch as he must be with the spirit of the Reformed Prayer Book, can find no justification for monotony (not even the historical fact that our Saviour monotoned His prayers will have any weight with him).

Let us get away from the modernizers, who want to reduce the Church to the level of the Dissenters in its worship, and make our stand for a general confession, a general absolution, a general prayer for "all sorts," a general thanksgiving, and a whole Book of Common Prayer, in which only the sacred Scriptures shall be read, thus separating them from the rest of the service and making them distinct. You cannot put a new patch on an old garment: make a new Prayer Book, or leave the old one alone as an expression of common worship, sung, said, and read as prescribed.

Geo. Bousfield.

Ottawa.

[It is always interesting to compare notes and to view things from different standpoints; but the above letter makes several assertions which are incapable of justification.

1. It is said two "sayings" is monotonous. This needs absolute proof. The two words are used, for instance, in regard to the Litany, and it would be difficult to argue that "sung or said" means "intoning or monotonous." Surely the words "read" and "say" imply that in ordinary churches intoning the service is not the intention of the Prayer Book; this practice was limited to cathedrals and parish churches. Queen Elizabeth's fifty-third Injunction shows this.

2. Reference is made to the first Prayer Book, but the question is as to the present Prayer Book and its true meaning. It is well known that there are fundamental alterations in rubrics and teaching between the two books.

3. Few congregations monotone, even though the note may be low, unless it is a speaking rather than a singing monotone. It is well known that in most churches, when a clergyman begins the singing monotone, the people do not join at all heartily in those parts which are intended to be repeated by them.

4. The interpretation of the phrase, "Common Prayer," is quite mistaken. Instead of the individual not being expected to be there except as part of the whole, the idea of "Common Prayer" implies the association of every individual present, whether he himself takes part, as in some prayers, or whether the prayers are offered representatively by the clergyman.

5. There is quite another side to the subject of "bleating sheep." Even this is not so objectionable as the attempt to sing the service by one who manifestly cannot do it. Very few clergy are able to keep up the proper note, and still fewer choirs and congregations. Nothing jars so seriously on a musical taste as these discords. Is it not true that the Roman and Greek Churches "sing" in the sense of intoning, but do not monotone? To quote Bishop Montgomery further: "There are times when such voices are in prayer far more effective than in songs, when old and young, musical and unmusical, all take their part. We believe that on special days of Intercession we ought to be able to discover the natural human voice in the service of the Church."