

W. C. Langdon, of Cambridge, and Mr. Nickerson by the Rev. Dr. Malcolm Douglass, of Andover. There were some twenty-five clergymen present, about half of them in surplices and participating in the service, Mr. Abbott reading the gospel. The sermon was delivered by the Rev. C. H. Learoyd, of Taunton, from St. Luke iii. 15, 16, and was extremely vigorous and practical in its tone. The whole service proved of unusual interest.

HARTFORD, CONN.—*Society for the Increase of the Ministry.*—The twenty-second annual report of this society states that the receipts of the association for the year ending September 1st, 1878, from forty dioceses and missionary jurisdictions, were \$21,212.76, and the expenditures \$26,949.14. During the year 115 scholars, from thirty-seven dioceses, received aid from the treasury. Of the receipts New England contributed the largest proportion—\$10,911.11; the Middle States contributed \$7,898.21; the Southern States, \$1,128.44. Of these scholars receiving aid, forty-one were from New England, thirty-three from the Middle States, twenty-four from the Southern States, and seventeen from the Western. The society adopted its first scholars in June, 1859.

The report says:—"In reviewing the work and results of the past year, and considering the present condition of the society, the committee would deprecate any judgment that does not take into account the circumstances of the times, and those obstacles and hindrances that, in common with all other institutions and many departments of private interest, the society has been obliged to encounter and overcome. The society has kept steadily on with faith in God and His Church, and a settled and growing conviction on the part of the members of the committee that such a work is important; that it is vitally necessary to the welfare of the Church and the obligations she owes to the world of the unbelieving, and especially to the large and important portion of it committed to our care in this country."

WEST PHILADELPHIA.—*St. George's Church.*—Nearly \$6,000 has been received in pledges and subscriptions for this church, including \$1,000 from the persons foreclosing the mortgage. Almost \$800 are still needed to free it entirely from debt, and fulfil the conditions upon which the pledges have been given. Unless this balance is secured the subscriptions cannot be collected, and the sheriff's sale, which was postponed, must take place on the 3rd of February.

Church of the Redeemer.—On the morning of the Second Sunday after Christmas, January 5th, the bishop of the diocese consecrated this church for seamen (the Rev. B. H. Latrobe, missionary), to the worship of Almighty God. The instrument of donation was read by Mr. James C. Booth, and the sentence of consecration by the Rev. Mr. Latrobe. The sermon was delivered by the bishop, who also celebrated the Holy Communion.

Correspondence.

NOTICE.—We must remind our correspondents that all letters containing personal allusions, and especially those containing attacks on Diocesan Committees, must be accompanied with the names of the writers, expressly for the purpose of publication.

We are not responsible for opinions expressed by correspondents.

THE MISSIONARIES.

DEAR SIR,—At the missionary meeting held in St. George's school house, I wished very much to ask a question; but as that would have been an unorthodox proceeding on my part, I must, if you allow me, ask it through your paper, and I trust you will publish the answer, if one comes, both for my satisfaction and that of many others. How is it that the Mission Board have no power either to enforce the payment of these parish dues from the people, or to withdraw the missionary, and place him where he would be better appreciated? They cannot surely have the power and not use it, but rather leave the clergymen to suffer, as some of them do. These parishes seem to me like naughty children, and the Mission Board like a weak minded mother, continually threatening punishment, but never giving it, and so the children will not obey or amend. One or two examples of such a punishment as entirely withdrawing a clergyman and all Church privileges from parishes which are able to do their duty in this respect and do not do it, might be sufficient warning to others; at any rate it should be tried.

A CHURCHWOMAN.

THE LATE TORONTO MISSIONARY MEETING.

SIR,—A suggestion was privately made at the meeting held at St. George's School-house on

Thursday last that a subscription, in pursuance of Mr. Blomfield's resolution, should be commenced on the spot. It was thought the suggestion came too late, and accordingly it was not acted on. I think that this is much to be regretted, as a very wholesome impulse would probably have been given to the movement by the immediate subscription of a considerable sum.

We must not, however, be content merely to regret a lost opportunity without doing our utmost to retrieve it. This may be, to a large extent, accomplished, if all who are resolved to subscribe, and have also duly considered how much they ought to give, send in their names to some member of the committee, not waiting to be applied to personally. The old proverb, "*Bis dat qui cito dat*," holds good in this instance; for prompt and liberal offerings will prove a most wholesome example and stimulus to others. We were seasonably reminded by one of the speakers on Thursday of many evangelical precepts and instructions, to which we have long given a tacit assent, but on which we too often do not consent to act. Among these was the well-known declaration of St. Paul, that "God loveth a cheerful giver." If this be so, He surely cannot approve a *reluctant* giver, who yields only to the pressure of importunity, or to the apprehension of forfeiting the good opinion of his fellow-men by refusing his aid when others, less capable than himself, put their hands to the work.

May we not, then, resolve, in this instance, to show ourselves "cheerful givers," trusting that the "love" with which, as we are taught, God regards such must be indeed a priceless over-payment to us, in body, soul and spirit for any little sacrifice which our ready offering may involve.

GEORGE WHITAKER.

Trinity College, January 20th, 1879.

"THE GENERAL THANKSGIVING."

DEAR SIR,—I have had many a friendly argument with my old friend Dr. Jacob J. S. Mountain, when we were next neighbors on Salisbury Plain; and his letter from the Isle of Wight, under the above heading, gives me an opportunity of remarking that I strongly object to the introduction of novelties into the public service of the church: the restoration of ancient practices long disused, is of course a different thing. But the saying of the General Thanksgiving by the congregation, is a novelty (at any rate in the Church of England) I am aware that in the Church of Ireland it is a common practice; I have heard it thus repeated in every church I have attended in Ireland, yet I suspect strongly that it is a comparative novelty even there, inasmuch as it was but *muttered* by a scattering of the people, not joined in a loud audible voice like the General Confession and the Lord's Prayer.

Dr. Mountain is willing to admit the doubt, whether the usage was originally contemplated or not by the compilers of our Prayer Book. Allow me to shew that it certainly was not contemplated. In the first place, as a general rule, when the people are to take an audible part in the service, there is a distinct intimation to that effect either in the words of the Rubric, or by the use of the italic type. The General Confession and the Lord's Prayer have this intimation.

In the verses following, each alternate one is prefaced by the word *Answer*, in italics. To the Canticles and Psalms, the Rubric merely specifies that they shall be said or sung. As the singing (or at any rate saying in a monotone) was no doubt the ordinary custom, the mass of the congregation were not required to take any part in these portions of the service; and yet not forbidden either, the rubric being in the general terms "shall be said or sung."

It will be found, moreover, that in those prayers in which the people are to join audibly, the prayer is broken up into short sentences, terminating generally with either a semicolon or a full stop, and *commencing with a capital letter*. Compare as a proof of this, the General Confession with the absolution immediately following, in the morning or evening service.

As to the expression "General" as applied to the thanksgiving, it refers solely to the subjects of the thanksgiving. We are thanking God for mercies in general, instead of thanking Him for

rain, or for fine weather, or for victory, &c., as in other thanksgivings. The reason why the people say the confession with (or after) the minister is not because it is styled the *general* confession, but simply because it is distinctly specified that they are to do so. If the word "General" had implied that the people were in general to unite in saying it why any need for the distinct order directly afterwards that they are to say it? The same occurs again in the rubric to the general confession in the Communion service. Moreover, the General Thanksgiving is evidently not intended to be said by many together; the sentences are long, and involved: the semicolons or full stops only occur at long intervals, and the characteristic capital letters at the beginning of each sentence for joint repetition are absent.

Your correspondent says, "If we really give humble and hearty thanks for any blessing, our lips can hardly remain closed while we do so." If his argument were correct it would apply with tenfold greater force to the *Special* thanksgiving than to the *General* one. And yet I have never heard anyone advocate the joint repetition of the thanksgiving for rain or for fine weather, &c.; neither does anyone advocate the joint repetition of the thanksgiving after the Lord's Prayer in the Post Communion service.

However, supposing the rubrical difficulties which stand in the way of this usage were surmounted, let me ask your correspondent and others like-minded why they limit the advantages to accrue from joint repetition to this one matter of thanksgiving. Why should not the people repeat the prayers also, which invoke these blessings and mercies upon us? Why should they not join in saying the first, second and third collects, the prayers of intercession which follow, and the beautiful (so-called) prayer of St. Chrysostom? Confession and thanksgiving should not alone be singled out, and petition and intercession omitted from the category of joint utterances in public worship.

Our own individual preferences however should have nothing to do with the mode in which we take our parts, whether as clergymen or laymen, in public worship. It is our duty to conform to the rules laid down for us; otherwise, instead of order prevailing there will be nothing but confusion. Yours truly, ROBERT C. CASWALL.

Fergus, Ont., Jan. 13, '79.

THE REV. JOHN HALLIWELL'S CONTRADICTION.

In the issue of the DOMINION CHURCHMAN of the 26th December, there is a letter signed "John Halliwell" containing a contradiction of one of the many charges made in a pamphlet published by us. One would hardly suppose that it was necessary to state that the *Mission* or *Parish* of Stirling and the *Village* of Sterling do not mean the same thing. The mission of Stirling is defined clearly in the pamphlet referred to, Mr. Halliwell professes to quote from the pamphlet, but the quotation is garbled. The following is the correct version of the charge which he professes to quote and contradict. "During the period of Mr. Stephenson's incumbency, Mr. Halliwell came into the *Parish* and performed official acts, such as marrying, and burying. He continued for a week at a time preaching the gospel of discord, baptizing." Of course, Mr. Halliwell entirely forgot that he continued to reside in Stirling for more than two months after Mr. Stephenson had taken charge of the parish, but we do not charge him with performing "Official" acts in Stirling Village, but we charge him with performing official acts in the mission or parish of Stirling, and we will specify some of them. Did not Mr. Halliwell perform the marriage ceremony for Mr. Kelly's daughter within what is usually considered the precincts of the Parish of Stirling? Did Mr. Halliwell not marry a couple at the Juba Settlement, almost within sight of Stirling? Did Mr. Halliwell not in June 1877 go to Marmora and officiate at the burial of Mr. Hugh Jones, whom Mr. Stephenson attended during his illness, and administered to him the Sacrament? Did not Mr. Halliwell on that occasion remain a week and officiate in the Marmora Church and elsewhere several times? Did he not baptize children on that occasion? Did he not officiate several times and at different places in