

those whose limited incomes, under the best of circumstances, would barely be sufficient for their wants and claims. I feel sure the members of the Church in your Parish only need to be reminded of their privilege in respect of this matter to respond in a liberal and becoming manner; thereby testifying their gratitude to their Heavenly Father for a Gospel fully and faithfully preached, and encouraging their pastor to more earnest efforts on their behalf by this substantial expression of their appreciation and good will.

Commending you and your families to the loving and gracious care of Him who, as at this season, helped us with the precious and priceless gift of His only beloved Son, and desiring for the members of the Church in your Parish the manifold gifts of the Holy Ghost, I am, my dear brethren, your affectionate friend and Bishop,

I. HURON.

Chapter House, London, Ont., Dec., 1876.

PETERSVILLE.—The Sacrament of the Holy Communion was administered in the new church on Advent Sunday. It was the first invitation given within its walls to "draw near with faith and take this Holy Sacrament to your comfort." The service was peculiarly solemn. It seemed as if all felt that a new life had commenced in the members assembled. There were twenty-nine communicants, and, while some had only a few months previously been admitted to full Communion of the church "by the laying on of hands," the old man of more than fourscore years and ten knelt beside his daughter and granddaughter. The Rev. Canon Innes, who had preached at morning service in St. Paul's, and officiated and preached in the afternoon at St. George's, officiated again at evening service, administering the Sacrament and preaching. Taking for his text the words of the Prophet Amos; "By whom shall Jacob arise?" he portrayed the Church in England before the awakening, and her present life of zeal and earnestness. To the question of Amos applied to her—"By whom shall the Church of England arise?" there can be but one answer—By the fiat of him who said in the beginning Let there be light, and there was light. The preacher told "in words that burn" of the revival of the Church of England in England, and of the preparatory measures taken by those having authority in the Church, the months of prayer and communion, and then the Mission Services throughout the great metropolis, where minor differences and separating lines that should never have existed, and names and badges were all forgotten, and every day the churches were crowded, and the glad tidings proclaimed to the thousands and tens of thousands whose eyes and ears were opened in answer to the prayers of this faithful servant to Him who had visited his people and by whom they had now arisen.

The Church and Sunday School of St. George's are flourishing. The congregation now numbers about one hundred and fifty.

Correspondence.

The Editor is not responsible for the opinions expressed by correspondents.

To the Editor of the DOMINION CHURCHMAN.

W. AND O. FUND.

SIR,—The statements of amounts at which the City Parishes have been assessed for the W. and O. Fund, and the returns made, as published in last week's CHURCHMAN, manifest an indifference to this most

worthy cause, on the part of many of these Parishes, which is most disgraceful. On what principle, it may reasonably be asked, is the assessment based? for we find that seven of these City Parishes, and some of them containing many wealthy members, are assessed at the small sum of *seventeen dollars*, while many town and country Parishes not representing a tithe of their wealth are assessed at far larger amounts. But small as the amount is, only *three* out of the seven have returned the assessment—but mark! not one cent more—and three others of the seven have sent into the Synod office the sum of ONE DOLLAR each. What an amount of preaching, exhorting, begging and collecting must have been done to achieve this magnificent result—about a *quarter of a cent* to each family. Alas! the poor widow and orphan! hopeless is their case, if they have to depend on such Christians (?) as these: they ask bread and they receive a stone—a chip from the flinty hearts who mock at their destitution. And these are the people to whom we are to entrust (in a worldly sense) the care of those whom we love, when the time of our departure has come! We have indeed need of faith in our Heavenly Father—the God of the fatherless and the widow—"for vain is the help of man." Yours &c., CLERICUS.

December, 7th 1876.

THE WIDOWS' AND ORPHANS' FUND.

To the Editor of The DOMINION CHURCHMAN.

DEAR SIR,—I notice in your last issue, a return of the recent collections for the above fund made in twenty of our city churches, and I must say, I feel grieved, and as a churchman, somewhat humiliated to see how far short of the assessed amount the actual return exhibits, (with two honorable exceptions.) I would fain hope that this return is not a finality, but that it may be supplemented by additions. To think that such a fund as the one in question should be allowed to languish, and that the intended recipients of the proceeds should suffer—which they necessarily must, if the required amount be not forthcoming—is simply disgraceful to us; that the widows and orphans of those who have labored for the good of souls, and who have died in harness—should from the default of churchmen, in the consequent withdrawal of the promised pension, which in a majority of cases is their *main* if not *only* dependence, would be cruel: it would be, to say the least—a breach of contract, if not a reflection affecting our honesty.

Can nothing be done to bring the people to a sense of their duty in this matter, or are we to advertise to the world—that we are so poor—or so indifferent to our obligations, as to allow a gross injustice to be done to those, whose only alternative is *submission*, which involves privation and hardship, to those who have a strong claim upon us to shield them from such a calamity? And what a cheerless prospect is thereby held out to those who now labor in the Lord's vineyard, and who may have to leave a widow and orphans "to fatten on this moor" of a Diocese—taking the "return" to which I allude as a criterion of the faithfulness with which we discharge our obligations! Yours faithfully,

Toronto, 2nd December, 1876. J. H.

To the Editor of The DOMINION CHURCHMAN.

SIR,—I would like to ask why your paper is so barren of correspondence? There is no portion of a news-paper read with more avidity. And why, when any correspondent has ventured to ask a question through your columns, relative to some point of theology or ritual, has no one taken the trouble to answer it? And when no one

else does so, why does not the editor himself suggest the answer? As an instance in point: some one asked, "Was it a custom in our church to give the Communion before breakfast?" At first sight one smiles at the simplicity of the question, and considers it not worthy of notice; for the asker has only to make an inquiry of his own pastor, and he will probably hear from him a reply in the affirmative. He will be told that it is an ancient and, pretty nigh, universal custom to partake of the Holy Communion fasting, where it can be done, and therefore where it is convenient an early hour is desirable for various reasons. But while his pastor may thus inform him, or he may soon learn for himself—a few lines from the editor appended to the correspondent's letter might have answered every purpose. Besides, what is a church paper for, but to educate, and assist the clergy in educating the people in these matters?

W. R. B.

THE SURPLICE QUESTION.

To the Editor of the DOMINION CHURCHMAN.

A little breeze has sprung up in certain ecclesiastical circles in Montreal, relative to the use, in some churches, of the Surplice instead of the Black Gown in preaching. One would have thought that no strife would arise about such a question at the present day. But it seems otherwise. There are those in Montreal who are so far behind in their education on church matters as to say that the surplice is the badge of Ritualism, and the black gown of Protestantism. Perhaps the latter is the badge of Protestantism, if it has any at all. But one would suppose that orange or scarlet would have that rank in the eyes of those at least who are in opposition to the surplice. The *Montreal Witness* mentions as the leaders in this opposition, T. R. Johnson and Mr. Savage. The former has made himself notorious in Synod as a rider of a favorite hobby, viz: the revision of the Prayer Book, after the model set by Lord James Butler. He has also tried to form a schism in Montreal. He it was who introduced one of the Bishops of the so-called Reformed Episcopal Church to a Montreal audience. "If to such a man," to cite the words of a lay delegate, "Dean Bond and the clergy concerned, succumb on this question, they have belittled themselves." But, it has been said by one of the party interviewed, the request to have the surplice worn, has come from the Bishop, who desires the co-operation of the Churches against a certain very ritualistic Church in the city. Here the cat is out of the bag. Now every one knows what church is meant, viz: The Church of St. John the Evangelist, and whose minister is Rev. E. Wood, and perhaps a little item of history in connection with this Church will not be inopportune at the present time. Some years ago, before the decision was rendered in England on the Vestment question, T. B. Johnson visited this church as a spy and to gather evidence as to whether the Vestments were worn. He found they were. He made a report to the Bishop. The Bishop, ever ready to listen to single complaints, at once requested their discontinuance. The Pope's reply was, in substance, that the decision then about to be made in England on the matter would be obeyed by the pastor. As soon as that decision, which pronounced the surplice, and *it alone* as the ministerial vestment, was rendered, the Incumbent obeyed; never wearing at any time the stole or scarf. This was an example of obedience followed by no one else either High or Low. And this is an instance of obedience overlooked by the Bishop and others. The judgment, obeyed so literally, prohibited the Black Gown. Every body