

base of Halifax not of the Propagation Society seems a most unnecessary expense and labor.

Yours truly,

CLERICUS.

### CROSS AND CRUCIFIX.

SIR,—Many good Christians wear a cross as an ornament. All good English Christians love the cross of St. George. Not a few good Christians shudder at a Crucifix and cannot even tolerate a plain cross in a church. They say it is *Popish*! Is Lutheranism *Popish*? We trow not! But German papers of a few weeks ago give accounts of a singular ceremony at Merseberg, in Prussian Saxony. At the re-opening of the fine old cathedral there, after the restoration of the interior, the service was conducted at a temporary altar, the high one the church being without a crucifix. At the close of the ceremony the Crown Prince of the German Empire, who was present, brought a fine new Crucifix from a table in the vestry, and placed it upon the altar with his own hands, remaining for a short time in silent prayer in front of it. This the *Hallasches Zeitung*, from which the report of the proceedings is in the first instance taken, regards as an auspicious omen that His Royal Highness will permit no interference with the orthodox standards of the Prussian establishment after his father's death.

His Imperial Highness is the husband of our Princess Royal and his children *might* (by many deaths) become heirs to the throne of Great Britain.

Is it not strange that prejudice against those who *mis-use* should drive us to *dis-use* the most solemn symbols and signs of our redemption?

QUERIST.

### DEANS AND CANONS.

SIR,—The writer of the article under the above heading in your issue of January 12th is astray. I think it is absurd to have a Cathedral without a Dean, and a Dean without a Cathedral, and monstrous that a man like Canon Norman should be passed over; but as a matter of fact the statement of your writer that "the appointment to Cathedral stalls was never in the English Bishops," is the reverse of fact.

The Queen does not appoint to the Deaneries of St. Asaph, Bangor or Llandaff.

There are two canonries at Canterbury, to which Her Majesty does not appoint, and one at Oxford, while Westminster, Windsor and Worcester are the only chapters in which the Queen appoints to *all* the canonries and two of these have no Bishops.

The Archbishop of Canterbury presents to the Archdeacons of Canterbury and Maidstone, (each endowed with a canonry) and the "ex-preacherships."

The Archbishop of York—to all the Dignities in the Cathedral, except the Deanery.

The Bishop of Bangor—Three Canonries; two Archdeacons, and the Dean.

Bishop of Bath and Wells—Three Archdeacons with Prebends annexed, and all other Prebends and sub-Dean, &c.

Bishop of Carlisle—The four Canonries and two Archdeacons.

Bishop of Chester—All the Canons and both Archdeacons.

Bishop of Chichester—Two Archdeacons and all Prebends but two.

Bishop of Durham—All Canonries and three Archdeacons.

Bishop of Ely—Archdeacons and certain Canonries.

Bishop of Exeter—Twenty-four Prebends; four Archdeacons, &c.

Bishop of Gloucester—Two Archdeacons.

Bishop of Hereford—Two Archdeacons and all Prebends.

Bishop of Lichfield—The Archdeacons; four Canonries; all Prebends.

Bishop of Lincoln—Canonries; Archdeacons and all Prebends but one, which he holds *ex-officio*.

Bishop of Landaff—Deanery, Canonries, Dignities of Cathedral and Archdeacons.

Bishop of London—All Prebends and two Archdeacons, &c.

Bishop of Manchester—Four Canonries; 24 Honorary Canonries, and two Archdeacons.

Bishop of Norwich—Three Archdeacons.

Bishop of Oxford—Three Archdeacons.

Bishop of Peterborough—The Canonries and Archdeacons.

Bishop of Ripon—All Canonries and two Archdeacons, &c.

Bishop of Rochester—The Archdeaconry.

Bishop of St. Asaph—The Dean; two Archdeacons; all Prebends and Canonries.

Bishop of St. Davids—Four Archdeacons; all Prebends but one, &c.

Bishop of Salisbury—Sub-Deanery, &c.; all Prebends and three Archdeacons.

Bishop of Winchester—All Canonries and Archdeacons.

Bishop of Worcester—Two Archdeacons.

So it does not 'appear' undoubted that in the Church of England, the right to nominate Deans and Canons resides solely in the Crown, and I believe it was 'a usurpation,' whereby the Crown claims even those appointments it still possesses.

D. C. M.

### DIOCESE OF ALGOMA.

SIR,—May I be allowed to allude to the appeal of His Lordship the Bishop of Algoma in your issues of December 22nd and January 5th, His Lordship has promised of \$250 a year, for three years, for the stipend of a missionary clergyman, and he wishes to supplement that by other contributions to the amount of \$500, making the sum of \$750 per annum for that clergyman. Far be it from me to say that that is too much, but I submit some remarks for consideration:—

I have it on good authority that clergymen in Algoma—and as it is a missionary diocese I presume all the clergymen are missionaries—receive none of them less than \$700 a year. I have it on equally good authority that clergymen in the older dioceses, doing equally arduous missionary duty, do not get more than half that amount, that many do not receive \$500 a year, and some not \$400.

I do not mention this hoping to withhold from Algoma, but to rouse Churchmen to a sense of fairness, if it be possible to induce them to act upon that principle rather than from sentimentalism.

I know one of the older diocese in which the Synod decided, I believe unanimously, that the stipend of a Deacon in country places should be not less than \$600, and that of a Priest not less than \$800; and the result is, as I have stated above, therefore that synodical decision was worth nearly as much as the paper it was written upon. The lay members of the Synod of this diocese have full liberty to devote all their time, their talents, education, and the wisdom which God has given them, to the accumulation of wealth, and they generally avail themselves of it; Clergymen have no such liberty, they are barred from any other occupation whereby they could make money, except in a few cases of education, and they spend most of their days in ministering to those to whom laymen cannot or will not minister, and much of their nights in praying for and mourning over the ungodliness and indifference which abound.

There are clergymen in the older dioceses who would think themselves rich on \$750 a year; who see bareness in their larder; who

would be unclothed but for the kindness of one and another, who do that, which however kindly it may be put—and it is done very kindly—is an act of charity; and who worse than all, cannot know the blessedness of giving, because they have literally nothing to give, although surrounded by many poor who look to them not only as spiritual guides, but as helpers in poverty, in sickness, in distress.

Let a "Toronto Churchman" look to his own diocese, and let "another Toronto Churchman" remember that it is right to be just before being generous. The mission fund of some of the older dioceses is deeply in debt; the Bishops are worried with anxiety to meet engagements; and missionary clergymen, as truly missionary as any, are fearing continually lest their stipends should be, as without more zeal on the part of lay members they must be, seriously curtailed. Let Toronto and other Churchmen see that while not withholding necessary help from Algoma there is at least as much need for help at home.

PHILECLESIA.

Jan. 12th, 1887.

### THE SOCIETY OF THE TREASURY OF GOD SUNDAY-SCHOOL MONEY-BOXES FOR LENT.

SIR,—This plan has met with great success in the American Church. Last year it was taken up too late to work it properly in Canada. The results, however, were very satisfactory. The boxes were applied to forty-one parishes, only twenty-one Clergymen reported results. The amount collected by them was \$412. The spiritual gain to the children cannot be estimated in dollars.

I shall be glad to send the report to all applicants, and to receive orders for the boxes. Price, \$1 per 100; to the envelopes, 60 cents per 100.

Yours truly,

C. A. B. PODOCK.

60 Bellevue avenue, Toronto Jan. 19, 1887.

### CATHEDRAL FOR HALIFAX.

SIR,—The S. P. G., to which all Colonial Churchmen owe so great a debt that it can never be fully repaid, have issued a circular asking that the centenary collections in England may be applied to the general work of evangelising the world. To what better purpose could they be put? Such a design must draw larger gifts than the local object in which we are so much interested and, therefore, no delegate will be sent home to plead for the memorial to Bishop Inglis consecration for Nova Scotia until next year. But that that delegate may go home with a clear story, let every Canadian Churchman, nay, every Colonial Churchman, give to his utmost, that the English may be willing to help us because we have helped ourselves.

QUIS QUIS.

SIR,—Would you please give your opinion upon the following question:—Is it becoming and right for the congregation to shake hands and carry on conversations in the Church after Divine Service?

A SUBSCRIBER.

[We think not; nothing but exceptional circumstances could, in our opinion, justify such disregard of the reverence due God's House.—Ed.]

A Nova Scotia Rector writes, enclosing the names of five new subscribers, and promising five more, adds: "I wish to add that the tone of Churchmanship in the paper (the CHURCH GUARDIAN) is SIMPLY ADMIRABLE. I am doing my utmost to circulate it." Who will follow this good example?