

families of their lawful and just inheritance. It is a strange way to exemplify a spirit of manly independence by aiding and abetting an act, which is destructive to freedom, and enslaving to the conscience. Mr. Harding's view of the matter will receive but little sympathy, and still less respect from men of judgment and integrity.

His idea of the sacredness of a constitution, is only equalled by his unsound and unjust views respecting the sacred nature of a trust. He justifies taking the proceeds of a special trust, and placing the same to the credit of an entirely different fund which appropriates to purposes foreign to the nature of that trust. The principle here involved, if honest in one case, would be in others, and what sane man does not see the moral anarchy which must ensue. The idea is sufficiently void to awaken painful feelings.

In answer to my question whether the income arising from the Clergy Trust Fund, could be used for Rural Deans, &c., as well as for Archdeacons, he replies, "If to men of fifteen years service in the Diocese, why not to men of one year?" Why in many cases men of 15 years get nothing, whilst the neophyte does. It is not a law governing secular institutions that service rendered is considered as having a superior claim for reward to the mere beginner? Is service given in the Ministry of the Church of less value than in any other institution? Are the clergy who have earned a good degree by years of faithful toil, and who have to bear the burden of increased expenses, entitled to no reward above that of a beginner? No other Diocese places such an estimate upon ministerial labor, but recognises its worth by subsidising insufficient incomes from this very fund. What thoughtful young clergyman entering upon the Ministry, but adjudges it right that after struggling for years, he shall be entitled to something more than when he commenced? How much more will this principle be conceded by men of experience, is evidenced by the application of the fund in every other Diocese. Has Huron Diocese a larger amount of collective wisdom than others? The very thought of such arrogance would be indisputable proof of the existence of a point, like to that of the ancient pharisee. It is but too evident from the tenor of Mr. Harding's letters, that whilst he wishes to convey the idea of intense admiration for the Bishop, his sympathies are at a low ebb, if not altogether petrified, in behalf of his poorer brethren. He might profitably study the excellent letter of Mr. F. L. Stephenson, which appeared in the DOMINION CHURCHMAN of November 25th.

How are men on a stipend of \$700 per year, after years of service, with children to clothe, educate, &c., to maintain a proper position, and do their work as it should be done? Necessity compelled it, self-denying men might bear it with some composure, but at the last Synod of Huron, it was clearly shown by Archdeacon Mace, that the funds were sufficient to give the clergy of a few years standing a larger income, and which Mr. Harding, I understand, then seemed to support, but now applauds the management which keeps good and useful men at an insufficient income, and even that made dependent upon an annual grant from a fund to which the Laity did not contribute. There was great force in the words of Mr. Stephenson, that "men of manly feelings will refuse to take holy orders, or suffer their children to do so." The ranks of the clergy will be recruited from those who for the sake of the office are willing to sneak and fawn, or from amongst those, who, having failed in other pursuits, are too glad to obtain any pittance."

Mr. H. speaks of the prosperity of the Diocese, and gives the financial income from 1873 to 1880. But if he will consider the prosperity of the Diocese during the incumbency of Bishop Cronyn, he will find abundance to satisfy the most sceptical, that the success attending the years he quoted cannot favorably compare with it. Whilst there has been a striking increase in the Episcopal income, there has been a practical decrease in the incomes of the poorer clergy, for they are no better off now with the surplus interest arising from the Commutation Fund, than they were formerly without it, their incomes being now put at \$700 per annum. There is also another increase, which serves to decrease the stipends of the poorer clergy, or to keep them from being augmented, which is to be found in the expenses. Yet Mr. Harding justifies the Bishop receiving from the surplus of the Commutation Fund to make up an income of nearly \$5,000 per year, and an Archdeacon \$380 per annum from the same fund for doing nothing, but not a word in behalf of poorly paid men, who are, to say the last, just as efficient, useful, and ornamental to the Church as the Bishop and Archdeacon, and who, with small incomes, have been dishonestly deprived of a small annuity of \$200 per annum.

Respecting the Bishop, your reverend correspondent writes, "We do not think him infallible." That is an opinion which will be shared by others.

Your Haysville correspondent concludes his letter by wishing Provost Whitaker may remain in the country, to awaken in his ardent admirers a churchly respect for the office of a Bishop. If for no other reason, it is hardly sufficient to retain a man of his cali-

bre, for all Anglicans respect the office. He is needed much more to maintain the sanctity of a Constitution from the rude hands of despoilers, and to train young men for the holy office of the Ministry, in sparing them with a noble and manly Christian independence, which will be the best security for the Church's maintenance of order.

I remain, dear sir,

Your obedient servant,

Dec. 29, 1880.

T. SMITH.

THE HURON CONSTITUTION.

DEAR SIR.—Undoubtedly an unprecedented conflict has arisen in the Diocese of Huron between the Church and the Episcopate, strong in the possession of powers almost despotic; an opposition, confident in its constitutional right and fortified by the justice of constitutional strength in the principles which are acknowledged to be the governing power of the Church, has arisen—an opposition—not opposed to the form of government, but opposed to the invasion of principles and destruction of privileges and duties that are considered conducive to the best interest and welfare of the Church.

In replying to Mr. Harding on the "Huron Constitution," in my letter, in yours of Nov. 4th, 1880, I speak of "last year," and took my statement from the Huron Journal, marked 1879. I cannot see how the months of January, February and March of 1880, in the ordinary meaning of the English language, can be 1879, for it declares the year to commence on the 1st of January, and to end on the 31st of December. He states, "in my ignorance I supposed, until I took up this letter, that 'last year' meant the year that is past," (1879) "and 'this year,' the year now passing," (1880) then how could the months of January, February and March of this passing year, 1880, be the past year, 1879. If I differed from the Reverend gentleman, I should say, or think, that he had "made a mistake," but as I do not differ, I will leave your readers to decide that if Mr. H. had proved that the first three months of this passing year (1880), did not belong to it, but to the past year, (1879) what would have been its weight against my charge that the constitution of the Diocese of Huron had been destroyed by a system that has Bishopized, Archdeaconized, Canonized, Rural-deanized, Chaplainized, terrorized and demoralized; destroying the voluntary spirit, driving lay-members away, making merchandise of the Church, weighing offerings to God by avoir-du-pois weight, heedless of breaking the law, deaf to argument, fearing only the power of the law courts. I do not speak air but truth, and if severe, not less truthful on that account; did justice speak, it would be with more severity. Truth cannot injure truth, because it is the only true foundation of the Church.

Mr. H. states, "my friend takes me to task for violence and misrepresentation," I said, "he had simply made a mistake." *Misrepresentation* is his own addition. I repeat that I cannot see why Church members discussing the constitutional question should misrepresent, either to injure or benefit any one person. Possibly Mr. H. can, but I cannot. If it is not *violence* to say that my statement was "simply untrue" when it was perfectly true, to speak of timid clergymen as "craven," and in a *charitable* peroration to accuse me of defaming "three Bishops of the Church," &c., &c., when I gave undisputed records; if this was not *violence*, then I acknowledge the Reverend gentleman's poetic condemnation.

Mr. H. says, "he is not well versed in the working of Loan Companies," that is very evident. I trust, (although an entire stranger to him) he will allow me at this festive season to express the hope that he is better versed in receiving good interest from increasing capital in some good sound company that is so managed that its Board of Directors will not "correspond" with the "Standing Committee." The former appoints the manager and does not depute to the manager power even to appoint the janitor, but the Standing Committee deposes to the Bishop all the power that was committed to them. As a subscriber to the funds of the Church years before Mr. H. or the Bishop were receivers from them, I should be glad if Mr. H. could tell me why a Bishop should have so much to do with the money: one would have thought the spiritual welfare of the Church would have demanded all his attention. I claim that I have a corporate interest in the funds, with the exception of the Commutation money, at least equal to them. The law of the State has made the Synod the supreme governing body of the Church, and in electing delegates to that Synod, a delegated power is intrusted to them to look after these funds, and the Synod has no right to break that trust, even to the Bishop or to the Executive Committee, they being merely trustees during their tenure of office. If candidates for the Episcopate can see the wisdom and judiciousness of the Synod in discerning the most fitting person for the highest office in the Church, and no elected Bishop could well dispute the wisdom of its choice, then surely it must be equally good in selecting the minor

officers. Mr. H. did not answer my question, "Why do Bishops want so much power?" Our Saviour was an example to Bishops as well as to Laymen, and he did not dismiss even Judas, who he knew was going unjustly to betray him.

Mr. H. has receded, point by point, from his high pedestal of constitutional principles to personal praise and personal condemnation. He reminds me of Wellington's soldiers of whom Napoleon said, "they did not know when they were beaten;" and if Mr. H. will only keep returning to the charge, he will be a very powerful advocate in proving the necessity of the desired reform. If others require teaching, Mr. H. does not, "respect for the office of a Bishop," and in championing its cause, he should remember that whilst the Church recognizes Episcopal authority, it does not recognize Episcopate rule, except through a constitutional form of government, and the occupant who does not gain respect by his upright walk, but only through the official weight of his office will not be esteemed, respected or considered great, even by those feasting upon the spoils.

Mr. Harding speaks of Mr. Smith handing him over "to the tender mercies" of Mr. Tibbs. Judging from his letter, I think he will find me more merciful to him, than he is merciful to himself. As champion on behalf of the constitution, he tacitly admits "one act" being illegal, because it was introduced without due notice and not carried by the required majority. He speaks very lightly of this "one act" which took \$200 a year from the poorer clergy who are busy ministering to their people in their parishes, whilst the Bishop retains his \$1,600 a year from the same source, spending the summer, and returning to spend the winter in England—engaged, it is reported principally about the *Western University*, and seeking *suitable* Missionaries, which the "admirable constitution" fails to attract here. It was this "one act" that virtually gave him the power to dole out the Surplus Commutation money and encouraged him on to introduce the trio resolutions of "curbing the press, dismissal of dignitaries at pleasure, and of clergymen at six months notice or with six months pay." As a subscriber to the Episcopal Fund, I had to work for my money and gave it for the benefit of the Diocese, and think that the Bishop receiving it should be in his Diocese, and not taking summer and winter trips to England, and especially without the consent of his Synod. It destroys confidence, and I think there is just cause and reason for one to complain. Either Mr. H. does not understand the fundamental basis of constitutional government, or if he does, creates an impression too unfavorable to mention. Breaking a Canon of the Church, may appear to him a very trifling affair when done by a Bishop, but if he will turn to "Constitution, Rules, and Canons of the Incorporated Synod of the Diocese of Huron," page 103, he will find the offences for which a Bishop can be, and I suppose ought to be, or it would not be there, tried, and among them the offence of "wilful violation of the constitution or canons of his Synod." As Mr. H. is such an ardent admirer of the constitution, there is a strong claim upon him, not only to defend it from being tampered with, but also to set an example of courage and independence to those timid clergymen, whom he speaks of as "craven." I have pointed out to him the safe-guard, and I trust that his zeal on behalf of the Constitution will not fail. As the popular vote for the Episcopate necessarily makes supporters and opponents, the powers given to the Synod by the law of the land, should be *unalienable*, and the government of the Bishop should be by his moral virtue, not by the official weight of his office. It is opposed to the Episcopal form of government. Yours truly, H. TIBBS.

December 28th 1880.

COPIES OF A PETITION WANTED BY THE CLERGY.

SIR—Notwithstanding all the discussion which now for a long time has been going on concerning the proposed change in the laws concerning Holy Matrimony, is nothing practical to be done? I have certainly understood that the clergy were to be supplied with copies of a petition to the Legislature of the Dominion, but hitherto I have waited in vain for something of the kind. Are we to be left to act individually in the matter? Surely the Church has suffered enough already from that mischievous and thoroughly selfish thing known as Congregationalism, without allowing it to influence her mode of action in protecting against the infamous proposal under consideration. If the members of God's Church in this land will only do half their duty in this matter, the Parliament will be flooded with such influential and numerous signed petitions, that it will not dare to pass a law to legalize incest, even though twice or thrice as many of the eminent men of Canada as have already done so should violate the laws of their country, and then bring their influence to bear to have the laws changed.

Yours truly,

W. WHEATLEY BATES.

St. Silvester's Day, 1880.