

ican simplicity can do for a Court of Justice what Protestant simplicity has often done for the House of God.

It seems that we really are to have a Canadian Academy of Letters. The intention of the promoters are unquestionably loyal and good; but will even these good intentions ensure success. That we have *litterateurs* of our own country we may readily grant, but certainly a literary class is yet to be formed among us. When it has in some degree been formed, will it not be time enough to call its choicest spirits for an Academy? All such bodies need constantly outside pressure and outside criticism. The literary class in Canada is not large enough to furnish members for a select Academy while still keeping a larger number to form a free outside literary opinion. The danger is a great one, that the Academy will become what some greater Academies are even now said to be, "an association of prigs for purposes of mutual admiration." By the way, what has become of the School of Art which Halifax in a fervour of exhibition-born artistic enthusiasm, promised herself last summer? OUTIS.

We know our esteemed contributor would be the last to do an intentional injustice either to the Bishop of Nova Scotia or to the newly ordained Deacons, and we therefore beg to set him right as regards an error or two into which he has fallen.

1. It was distinctly understood when the resolution referred to passed the Synod that it did not include Graduates of recognized Theological Colleges or Training Schools:

2. And also, that the young men then just finishing their Theological training at King's College should be allowed to proceed to ordination.

Now for the facts.

Of the eight recently ordained, one is a B. D. of Cambridge, Mass., U. S. A.; two hold the degree of B. A. of "King's"; one is a Graduate of St. Augustine's College, Canterbury; while another is a Graduate of St. John's Theological College, Newfoundland. Of the remaining three one is an undergraduate of King's College, who matriculated well, and stood high in all his classes, but devoted himself for two years after "Responsions" more particularly to Divinity. Of the other two we do not know so much, but understand that they have special qualifications for the Ministry.

Apart from these features of his remarks, we entirely agree with "Outis" criticisms, and we believe his Lordship is endeavouring to carry out faithfully the aims and intentions of the Synod resolutions.

THE ANGLICAN CHURCH IN BRITISH NORTH AMERICA.

SKETCHES OF THE FIRST BISHOPS.

(Continued.)

No. II.

The Right Reverend Robert Stanser, D. D., second Bishop of Nova Scotia.

Dr. Stanser was born in England and graduated at St. John's College, Cambridge. Previous to the death of Bishop Charles Inglis, he was Rector of Saint Paul's Church, Halifax, and Chaplain of the House of Assembly. When Bishop Inglis died the House was in session, and it was unanimously resolved that the British Government be recommended to appoint Dr. Stanser his successor. He was accordingly appointed on 6th May, 1846, and consecrated in England. The health, however, of the new Bishop proved so delicate that, after holding his first visitation and ordaining with extreme difficulty, he returned to England for the winter months. Year after year was spent in the vain hope of his recovery. He saw his Diocese no more. In 1824 he resigned the Bishopric of Nova Scotia.

The Society at home, in consideration of his faithful missionary work for more than thirty years, allowed him a pension of £250, which he held until his death on 23rd December, 1828, in the 69th year of his age.

[I regret very much that the article on Bishop Stanser is so short, but it is the best I can do. In all my researches I find very little mention of him, for the reason that he spent so little of his time in Nova Scotia after being appointed Bishop. I trust to have a better account of the third Bishop, Dr. Jno. Inglis. With him the list of early Bishops in Nova Scotia must close. Afterwards I shall probably take up the Bishops of Quebec.]

THE PROPOSED MARRIAGE BILL.

Churchmen in the Dominion may be interested in reading the following copy of a Petition of the Synod of Clergy in the Diocese of Maritzburg:—

To Her Most Gracious Majesty Victoria, by the Grace of God of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, Queen, Defender of the Faith, &c., &c.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR MAJESTY,

The Humble Petition of William Kenneth Macrorie, Doctor in Divinity, Bishop of the Diocese of Maritzburg in the Province of South Africa:

Respectfully Sheweth,

1. That a Bill for legalizing Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister has passed through the Legislative Council of this Colony of Natal, and awaits your Majesty's approval to become law.

2. That on the 26th day of June, 1879, the Bishop and Clergy of this Diocese, in Synod assembled for the first time subsequently to the passing of the said Bill, did, after solemnly invoking the presence and guidance of the Holy Spirit of God, give diligent consideration to the questions involved in this proposed alteration of the law, and did ultimately come to an unanimous decision embodied in the following resolution:—"That in view of Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister being made legal in this Colony, this Synod declares emphatically that such marriage is uncanonical and contrary to the Word of God; and that, in accordance with Canon 16 of the Provincial Synod, no Clergyman of this Diocese shall join in Matrimony persons standing in this relationship. Further, that the Bishop be requested to direct the Clergy to notify to their people from the Altar the matter of this resolution; and that his Lordship be requested to take such steps as he may deem advisable, humbly to lay before her Majesty the Queen the unanimous voice of this Sacred Synod of Clergy."

3. That, in pursuance of this Act of the Synod, your Petitioner humbly but most earnestly represents to Your Majesty:

i. That the deliberate conclusion unanimously arrived at by a Synod of Clergy that the change now proposed is in opposition to the Canons of the Universal Church and contrary to the Word of God upon which these Canons are based, is in itself entitled to some weight with those upon whom the responsibility of the ultimate decision rests.

ii. That, while no act of the Legislature could possibly release the Clergy from the restrictions laid upon them in this matter by the voice of the Church, both East and West, from the earliest ages to the present time, nor compel them to celebrate marriages within the prohibited degrees, yet the liberty granted and the countenance afforded by the law of the land to such violation of the law of God, would constitute a very heavy grievance to a large number of Your Majesty's loyal subjects in this Colony.

iii. That any relaxation of the laws relating to Marriage, the institution upon which the whole fabric of society is built, must have a most serious effect upon the character of the people.

iv. That, as regards any demand for relaxation, those who are anxious to effect the proposed change are really, Your Petitioner believes, few in number, the majority in the Legislature having shown singularly little interest in the question, and having acquiesced, almost without discussion of the principles, in the views pressed by the few who are personally interested in carrying the measure.

v. That there is thus a risk that the conscientious convictions of those who are on the highest grounds, viz., those of religion and morality, opposed to the change, may be sacrificed to the clamour of a few who carry the unthinking majority with them, and that a mischievous precedent may be created for altering the law for the sake of those who have already transgressed it or state their intention to transgress it.

vi. That the proposed change does not, however, only affect those who desire to avail themselves of it, but the whole community, and every family in it, altering the character of a relationship up to this time held sacred, and depriving it, in the moment when most needed, of that protection, without which its holiest exercise is impossible.

vii. That the change proposed is one which necessarily involves the disturbance of other relationships, for the law which permits marriage with a deceased wife's sister cannot consistently forbid a union with that sister's daughter, who stands one degree more remote in affinity.

4. For these and other considerations which might be adduced in the interests of that domestic happiness and purity, for protection of which Your Majesty's subjects can never look to Your Throne in vain; Your Petitioner humbly prays, in the name of those whom it is his privilege to represent, that Your Majesty will be pleased to withhold your Royal assent from a Bill, whose provisions are fraught with so much danger to the moral well-being and happiness of Your Majesty's dutiful subjects in this Colony.

And Your Petitioner will ever pray.

(Signed) W. KENNETH MARITZBURG.

It is to be hoped that the clergy will exert themselves to secure numerous signed Petitions against the Bill to be presented at the approaching session of our Canadian Parliament.

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.

DIOCESE OF ALGOMA.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIRS,—In the GUARDIAN of Jan. 19, you copy a letter from "Amicus" to the Toronto Mail, referring to the Diocese of Algoma. He speaks of two courses. "Re-absorption into the Diocese of Toronto, (2). The creation of an independent Diocese of Algoma. I say nothing of the 2nd course, as regards the 1st I would like to ask. Is it within the powers of the Provincial Synod who created the Diocese to blot it out of existence? And supposing the Provincial Synod have the power, is it desirable? To my mind such a course looks something very like putting one's hand to the plough, and looking back, and we know what our Saviour says about that. Look at it. Here is the first act which the Church of England in Canada, as an independent Church, performed in fulfilment of the Church's Divine Office of preaching the Gospel to every creature. Now, what must be the effect, if she writes—*failure*—over what she has done, or tried to do? The belittling of her own life. The setting apart of this Diocese and the election of a Bishop may have been premature, yet we cannot afford at the present time, for our own self-respect, for the sake of the work already undertaken and carried on by Bishop Fauquier, for the sake of our life as a Church, we cannot afford to take this backward step. Well what shall we do? Endow the Diocese, says some one. Where is the endowment to come from? I think a careful examination of the state and condition of the several Dioceses will show that it would be difficult at the present time anyway to raise an endowment. But supposing it to be possible to raise an endowment, who is the man most capable of doing it? Looking at the matter on all sides, I think the Bishop.

There are, in my own mind, objections to this, but on the whole it seems the best. For it will not be denied that the Church of England in Canada has never fully realized her duty in reference to, and so has acted with unlimited indifference to the claims of the Diocese of Algoma. I am speaking of what I know, because I have at different times and in different places, speaking at missionary meetings, brought this matter up, and urged it upon people, yet always with the feeling that a good many, both of clergy and laity, rather disapproved of my doing it. I may be mistaken in this, yet I have never heard on the part of the speakers at our missionary meetings, either parochial or diocesan, a whole-hearted appeal for Algoma.

Now, if we believe we have done right in sending a Bishop to the parts called Algoma, surely the lamented death of the gentle, faithful, good Bishop Fauquier need not make us doubt that God's blessing will still rest upon his successor and prosper his work. And endowment or no endowment, I am hopeful enough to think that a strong, level-headed Bishop, with trust in God and trust in man, would soon rouse the Canadian Church to a full sense of her duty. And if not, then we may pray that another Deborah will arise and breathe forth her holy indignation at the selfishness and hollow-heartedness and narrowness of those who will not "come to the help of the Lord against the mighty."

I am sorry to see the name of a gentleman put forward, for however excellent a Bishop he would be, and I am sure there would be no better, yet such suggestions must be very distasteful to him, and then, I think, the nomination of fit and proper persons to be elected Bishop may be safely left with the House of Bishops.

Yours very truly,

Ontario.

W.

CLERICAL CHANGES AND THE BISHOP OF MONTREAL.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIRS,—England and Wales are as a "unit" should have been printed (not "visit") in my former letter.

In the paragraph from *Adamsville*, in your last issue, occurs the following:—"Our Bishop, acting, as it is said, on the rule to appoint no one to any post in the Diocese of whom he has not personal knowledge, finds his field of choice necessarily limited." If all Bishops adopted this rule, would it be well for the Church? Does it not savour of "Home Rule" too much? Certainly it does; and what is more, no Bishop can adhere to such a rule without leaving congregations without pastors; but where does the Bishop get such power? Our's has it not? I advocate most earnestly some power being given to the Bishop; but if a clergyman from England or New York of eminent qualifications were to be elected Rector of St. Paul's on the next vacancy, how would it answer for the Bishop to say "I have no personal knowledge of this gentleman, and you can't have him?" But as a matter of fact, I read in the address of the Bishop referred

to, delivered June 15th, 1881, before his Synod these words: "Nowhere, perhaps, in the Diocese has he (the Bishop) so little voice and so much anxiety as in the conduct of a Synod Rectory. In the exercise of its rights, a congregation requiring a Rector takes everyone into its confidence except the Bishop. It asks the Bishop—almost requires him—to induct a clergyman of whom little is known by the people;" and again, "When the Bishop concurs only because by the letter of the law he cannot help himself." So much for Bishop Bond's supposed "Home Rule"; but the article referred to goes on—"Again, it is said, he will not give any re-appointment to men, who, having once left the Diocese, desire to return," &c. Of course "on dir" is no authority; but supposing this to be true, Bishop Bond is not, I believe, the only one who makes this a general rule. There might be cases when the rule should not be applied. But supposing a clergyman feels he can "do better," as the phrase is, in another Diocese, and goes and spends, say the years between 35 and 55 in another Diocese, (his best days in fact), his health begins to give out, his preaching power no longer serves to fill a church, with \$3,000 or \$4,000 a year income, and he begins to have hints that a younger and more energetic man is needed to fill St. Bonner's, then he turns his thoughts to his original Diocese where the reputation of his 30-year-old work is not quite dead, and comes back to give the fag end of his life to those he deserted for better pay and a greater chance of popularity, and throws himself, may be, upon the "super-annuated fund" of a Diocese to which he refused his best days. Bishops are right to expel such men. Why, until lately it would have been (and in some cases is yet) possible for a man to pay his small widow and orphan premium to the Nova Scotia Fund, go away single, marry out of the Diocese, and come back and throw his widow and orphans on the Diocese they never saw. There are worse cases than these. A King's College student receives the S. P. G. scholarship, gets a nomination, pays no fees, receives, in fact, free education for the work of the ministry in these Dioceses (Maritime), and goes away soon after ordination to seek *better pay*, i. e., more money elsewhere. Is it likely—would it be right—for our Bishops to allow these men to rob the Diocese at the outset, give their prime to other Dioceses that have no lien upon their education, and then foist their broken-down years upon us at the end. Of the honesty of such persons I say nothing; but surely the Diocese that gets the *best* of such men should have to keep the "refuse."

Nova Scotia.

AN OLD HAND.

THE LATE BISHOP OF ALGOMA.

JANUARY 16th, 1882.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

DEAR SIRS,—I feel sure that it must be the wish of all who knew and loved and respected our late revered Diocesan, the Bishop of Algoma, to do honor to his memory now that he is departed from us. His labours were many, his trials great, his faith and patience and love a rebuke to many. Is the work, which, in the face of difficulty, vexation and discouragement, he accomplished for his Divine Master in this wide wilderness to be allowed to fall for the want of sympathetic support? Is this poor Diocese of Algoma, this land of the hardy back-woodman and the swarthy Indians to be left desolate and uncared for, now that its chief pastor has succumbed to the over pressure of work and the depressing influence of sudden trials?

The sad apathetic feeling towards this Missionary Diocese—this child of the Church of Canada—has been too surely shewn by the ominous silence in regard to its future, which has prevailed ever since he, who loved it and cared for it, and sacrificed his life for it, fell dead in the hall of his niece's house. Not a word has been written, not an expression has been offered that would give us, his mourning people, a ray of hope that our late chief pastor's name was to be honoured in a manner in which only it deserve to be honoured, that his services in the missionary field were to be acknowledged as only they deserve to be acknowledged, namely, by the permanent establishment, on a sure and firm basis, of that Diocese with which the name of Fauquier must for ever be linked.

I, his commissary, have the desire in my heart to do much; but what can I do if this terrible state of apathy and unconcern is still to continue.

* I am issuing a circular proposing that the chapel we were about to build in connection with our Indian Homes—and the site of which our Bishop himself chose and dedicated to its holy purpose, should now be erected to the memory of him whom we all loved so well, and to be called "the Bishop Fauquier memorial Chapel." \$3000 is to be the cost, of which \$600 is already received. But this I feel, even if approved of and carried into effect, is but a small tribute to the worth of him who did so great a work in so short a space of time in the face of such great difficulties. His work must stand, we of Algoma say that our Bishop's work must stand. We give our solemn pledge that so far as is in our power, by the grace of God it shall stand. Let those who think with us rally to our help.

I remain yours faithfully,

EDWARD F. WILSON,
Commissary Diocese Algoma.

* Copies of the Circular can be had gratis on application.