

helped back on to the social rails. And from that need has grown up piece by piece the magnificent network of social relief institutions in various parts of England which has made the C.A. one of the institutions of which the Church of England is most proud. Last financial year the C.A. provided 655,920 beds for homeless men and lads, 131,347 for shelterless women and girls; nearly 320,000 days work was given to men, 4677 were admitted to training work-aid homes; over 8000 women were admitted to free night shelters in London, about 9000 beds were provided for women at the Night Advice bureau in Marylebone.

The evangelists visit in England 1½ million homes of people annually. The C.A. has its own model housing scheme for giving the poor of London better homes at cheap rentals.

The methods of the C.A. are its own. They are no slavish copy of any other organisation. The Salvation Army has its own tried methods and preferences; the Church Army, in an experience of over 50 years, has followed and developed along its own lines within the fabric of the Church. The work of both is admirable. The difference for us is that the Church Army works with the Church, teaches as the Church teaches, brings those it saves to the Church, does all its good in the name of the Church and not of itself, and never sets itself up as an organisation independent of the Church or at variance with the Church. It does the work of the Church in departments where specialised technique is called for, but on its own approach to its task it is not under the thumb of the Church or any section of it. It prides itself on being the humble maid-servant of all. It believes in the spiritual teaching and the Sacramental life of the Catholic Church as expressed in the Church commonly called the Church of England. That is the main difference between the Church Army and the Salvation Army. Apart from that they are not rivals.

MISSIONS.

The debate on the missionary work of the Church at the recently held General Synod held at Hamilton showed that the Church is alive to

its obligations. The late Bishop Sadlier was praised for his vision and the resoluteness with which he brought it into operation; and it was regarded as a solemn duty to ensure the continuity of the New Zealand Anglican Board of Missions as the one and only missionary agency of the Church of the Province.

It is true that there was a doubtful note expressed; based on the possibility (which had no foundation) of jealousy between the co-ordinated missions. But Major Robinson, secretary of the Melanesian Mission, clarified the position by explaining the appointment of Mr J. Wilson and appraising the very cordial and harmonious relations which existed and deepened between the Melanesian Mission and the Church Missionary Society and the other co-ordinated missions. The visit of the Bishop of Central Tanganyika was commented upon: the Archbishop saying that the Bishop was the finest beggar who didn't beg that he had met. The general feeling was that although the Bishop had taken money out of the country he had given a great impetus to missionary enthusiasm in New Zealand.

The Bishop of Wellington, who has had great experience amongst the many missionary societies in England, expressed pleasure at the harmony which existed in New Zealand in the fact that there was only one missionary agency. Archdeacon Bullock voiced the general feeling of Synod when he said that the N.Z.B.M. must grow in vision and in enterprise. The presence of the Bishop of Polynesia and one of his priests helped the Synod to realise her duty to Polynesia and to give Polynesia direct representation on the Board of Missions executive.

Altogether the interest shown in Melanesia, Church Missionary Society and Polynesia augurs well for increased support in this, the Church's primary work.

CORRESPONDENCE.

(To the Editor).

Sir,

The question of marriages in Lent and, more particularly, in Holy Week, which the Rev. C. G. G. Salt raised in your correspondence column last month, is of importance.

The Bishop's ruling is, as you say in your footnote, clear enough. Nevertheless it would appear from a study of the marriage ceremonies, reported in the daily press as taking place during this season, that clergy are still in ignorance of this ruling.

The failure of Clergy to act upon such a ruling unanimously, not only tends to weaken the authority of the Church, but also to confuse the mind of the laity. It is hardly necessary to add that it places in a very invidious position, those Clergy who are endeavouring to abide by it to carry it out in their parishes.—Yours, etc.,

A. H. R. MORRIS.

The Vicarage,
Waipiro Bay.

Hastings, 16/4/37.

(To the Editor, The Waiapu Church Gazette).

Dear Sir,

As a layman belonging to the Church of England for over fifty years it is painful to read a letter signed by C. G. S. Salt in your April issue. What right has he to criticise the Non-Conformists? Does he know that many Church of England adherents are married to Non-Conformists and find them very much more God-fearing people than many Anglo-Catholics? It makes a layman feel sorry to be connected with our Church.—Yours, etc.,

A. LAYMAN.

SOCIAL SERVICE.

"Your committee wish to express their satisfaction that since last General Synod considerable progress has been made in reference to certain matters which were commended by the 1934 Committee on Social Service to the careful attention of the Church and the Government—namely, the substitution of sustenance grants for the methods of unemployment relief then in vogue, and the reduction of working hours, involving a new adjustment of the relations between work and leisure," states the report of the Sessional Committee on Social Service presented by Bishop West-Watson, of Christchurch, at the General Synod.

"We have considered the report presented by the Central Council on Social Problems set up by Archbishop Averill in accordance with the resolution passed by the 1934