

## Correspondence.

All Letters will appear with the names of the writers in full and we do not hold ourselves responsible for their opinions.

To CORRESPONDENTS.—A quantity of Correspondence and Diocesan matter held over.

### LEAFLETS, &c.

SIR.—Will you permit me to say through your paper that Mrs. G. A. Langstaff, King, Ont., has some copies of the St. Catharines Sunday-school leaflets A and B, from 2nd Sunday in Lent to the present time, and also a large number of copies of the Young Christian Soldier to give away, and that she would be glad to hear from any clergyman or Sunday-school superintendent in a poor mission, who would like to have them.

Your obedient servant,

O. P. FORD.

### TRINITY COLLEGE CONVOCATION.

SIR.—Your account of Trinity College Convocation, as given in your last issue, brings into prominence the noble results of the grand work effected by that great man, the late Provost, in building up Trinity College. I often wonder why you seldom, or never, refer to another institution which owes its origin, and ever growing importance to one of the many excellent and learned men trained under the same first Provost of Trinity. The greatness of great men is best seen in their works. By another institution I have reference to Trinity College school, Port Hope. Why not a word regarding endowment of some kind? As regards its high order of training and educating youths both in secular and Christian knowledge, it stands without a peer in Canada. There is a tone about the youths from Trinity College school you find in none others. Even one boy in a parish trained at Trinity College school, is a perfect God-send, and when I say this I speak from personal experience. And when I laud the system of education and discipline pursued there, I speak in general terms from what I have observed, and in special from what I have seen in the case of my own boy who is pursuing his studies there. It seems to me that an effort should be made to endow the headmastership. I look upon this school as of paramount importance to Canada.

Yours, &c.,

C. P. EMERY.

### ANOTHER WARNING.

#### BEWARE OF THE DECEPTIVE LEAFLETS.

SIR.—In your issue of November 10th, an item of local news from our town was inadvertently but most appropriately connected with a portion of the paragraph relating to the dissatisfaction that prevails in regard to the so-called "Diocesan Leaflet" which is in reality anything but diocesan.

As a member of that committee appointed, not as your correspondent thinks, by the Sunday-school Convention (which was itself arranged for by the committee) but by the Synod, I heartily endorse the explanation made in to-day's issue, November 17, by Rev. Jeffrey Hill. In our parish we have felt a growing dissatisfaction with the matter, and the whole appearance of the leaflets, which have not been what was promised, and as for following Eugene Stock's Notes, we, who use Stock's work itself in preparing the lesson at our teachers' meetings, have been unable to trace generally even a resemblance to those able lessons. One question in the last leaflet for Sunday, November 18th, is really worth quoting:—"Subject, the Feast of Tabernacles. Heading 3: A happy People. Why should the Reformation be especially held in remembrance?" By what process I ask is one to draw a connection intelligible to a Sunday-school scholar or any one else between the Feast of Tabernacles and the Reformation?

I have been pleased to receive from Messrs. Rowsell and Hutchison, an Institute Leaflet, which is what it purports to be, to commence from Advent Sunday, on Vol. I of Stock's Life of Our Lord. And I think you might profitably devote a column of your paper weekly to publishing full extracts from that work.

Please send me some specimen copies of the DOMINION CHURCHMAN, and I will try and secure you some subscribers here; \$1.00 a year ought to attract a good many, and I must certainly congratulate you upon constant improvement in many ways.

I remain yours &c.

The Rectory,  
115e rsoll, November 17, 1881.

EDWARD M. BLAND.

### ROACHE'S POINT.

SIR.—I would with your permission call the attention of your large circle of readers, to one or two facts connected with this now celebrated mission, in addition to those published in your last week's issue. The first is that the mission is now actually closed, and the means of grace consequently inaccessible, for I am for all practical purposes inhibited. We heard a good deal at one time about an effort being made by the Campbell party to provide a minister to take my place: I am sure I wish they had been successful, as anything would be better than our present position: the people will soon lapse back unless something is done, and done quickly.

A small parsonage was completed here under my directions in July last, it is within a stone's throw of the church, and everything that a priest with simple tastes could desire, even if married. The ground was given, and the total cost, including other things, was only \$372. Of this sum the senior churchwarden got together some \$115, I gave another \$50, and \$50 more has been promised by a resident member of the congregation. The summer visitors, although composed entirely of rich Toronto families, contributed at four offertories held in the summer for their special benefit, the magnificent sum of \$14.05—very apt was the remark made in your issue of the 3rd inst., *apropos* of the subject, "Squire and parson often quarrel when the squire's tithes are the living, but he who does not find the stipend should not try to control the stipendiary." My object, however, in writing this not to reflect upon anybody, but rather to appeal to the generous sympathies of your readers to help us to pay off the small debt of one hundred and forty dollars still remaining on the house. A clergyman would then feel that in coming to take the charge of this poor and isolated congregation he had at any rate a house which he could call his own as long as he remained with them, instead of like myself who, during my year's ministrations, have had to move my family no less than three times. Subscriptions will be thankfully received and acknowledged by either of the churchwardens, or if sent to me, will be duly passed on.

Yours, &c.,

Z. H. TURTON.

Roache's Point,  
Nov. 11th, 1881.

### RE LEAFLETS.

DEAR SIR.—Mr. Hill writing to you officially as secretary of the Sunday-school Committee of the diocese of Huron brings rather a serious indictment of disingenuousness in the matter of certain leaflets issued in Toronto. Into the merits of the disagreement between the Huron Committee and Mr. Sheraton I have no desire to enter. But it seems that Mr. Hill, acting as an individual clergyman, and exercising an undoubted right, disappointed with his Canadian experience, has rushed off to New York for his Sunday-school leaflets and Teachers' Assistants. As other of the brethren may be for following him, I should like to enter a mild protest, and to suggest that before any Canadian diocese sends a delegate to this New York committee, the Sunday-school committee should confer together on this side of the line and see if they cannot agree upon some scheme which, if not so "perfect" as Mr. Hill pronounces the American scheme to be, may be based upon the lessons of the Church of England Sunday-school Institute. Separated though we are from our fellow-Churchmen in the different dioceses, it seemed as if of late there were a general agreement that in the matter of Sunday-school teaching at least, we could all unite upon the basis of the Institute publications. And it does seem a pity not to make some effort to attain a larger measure of unity, if not among the Churchmen of to-day, at least among the Churchmen of the coming generation, who are scholars in our Sunday-schools to-day. Mr. Hill perhaps is not aware of the action lately taken by the Sunday-school Committee of this diocese. In default of action elsewhere, we have undertaken the preparation of leaflets for the ensuing year, which, if not perfect, are at least an honest effort to reproduce the substance of the teaching of the Institute lesson notes. The issue for this year is but part of a scheme for the more complete training of our children in the principles of the Church, and teaching of Holy Scripture. We do not regard our leaflets as the best in existence, nor are we wedded to our own scheme. We shall be thankful for the co-operation of the Sunday-school committees of other dioceses in the elaboration of our scheme. We shall welcome suggestions for the improvement of our work.

We have selected for the lessons of 1882 Stock's Life of our Lord, and Kyle's Lessons on the Collects. Every leaflet will contain texts for repetition, a question on the Church Catechism, the Collect for the day, with questions and references, and a Scrip-

ture lesson. The Collect and Scripture lessons will be based strictly on the lines of the two books mentioned. Each lesson will be referred directly to the corresponding lesson notes in the Institute books, and will follow their general plan and outline.

We hope to secure the general support of the clergy in this effort to make more widely known the "admirable publications" of the Institute, and to bring our Sunday-schools into closer union with a Society that has won not only the confidence of our Canadian bishops, but the active support of the ablest bishops and most earnest Churchmen in the mother Church.

The cost of these "Institute Leaflets" we believe to be lower than that of any others in Canada or in the States. Messrs. Rowsell & Hutchison, of Toronto, will supply them at the rate of \$7.00 per annum for 100 copies per week.

Yours truly,

J. D. CAYLEY,

Chairman S. S. Committee Dio. of Toronto.

### TITHES IN THE ENGLISH CHURCH.

SIR.—It would be a great obligation to me if some one of your readers would give an account of the origin and nature of Tithes in the English Church, giving the authorities for his statements. It is a common idea that the tithes are in the nature of a tax imposed by the Government on the people for the support of the Church as a State institution. I have repeatedly met with this opinion, and it has lately been strongly affirmed by a member of my parish. Unfortunately I am not near any library in which I can consult authorities on the subject. I am possibly in error, but I have always held that it is in no proper sense an impost by the Government, but is rather of the nature of a rent-charge, payment of which can of course be enforced by law in the same way as, but no more than, any other dues between individuals. It is a charge connected with land tenure, and is not paid either to the Government or for the Government. I should be glad also to learn the nature and origin of the "extraordinary tithes" of which we have lately heard a good deal. I believe that many others beside myself will be interested in this information, and therefore I ask for it with less hesitation.

Yours faithfully,

A. G. L. TREV.

San Gabriel, California.

### PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL DIVINITY SCHOOL. IS IT EPISCOPAL?

SIR.—Recently in conversation with one of the pupils of St. James's Divinity School I was surprised at a remark which he made, that when he entered that institution he held the opinion that the orders of all religious bodies, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Methodists, &c., were of equal validity and authority, and that the instructions he received there confirmed him in that opinion. I could, at that time, scarcely think that Professors of any nominal Church Institution, no matter how broad or how low their ideas on Church government were, could possibly place on terms of equality with the ancient and Scriptural orders of the Church those which sprang into existence within the last 800 years, but I find that with regard to that institution I was mistaken, since the text books used there on Dogmatic Theology (or at least the leading text book) place the orders of the Church, not on terms of equality with, but in a position very far superior to, that of Presbyterian bodies. On that subject there are nine text books enumerated in the calendar: of these, the works of Bishop Pearson, Bishop Browne, Bishop McIlvaine, Dean Goods, Canon Liddon, and Professor Mozley are relegated to the honour division, that is, they are placed outside the pale, as far as the majority of the pupils are concerned; and the works of only one English Churchman, and one Dutch Presbyterian are reserved for "pass" students. The works of this Dutchman I set down as the leading text book on that subject, because I find in it, and in it only, those extraordinary technical terms which are introduced into the cathedral, and which require definitions to accompany them to make them intelligible to the ordinary class of minds, e. g., Soteriology, which is a medical term, the only definition of which given by Worcester is "a treatise on health, or the science of preserving health, hygiene." I presume that the Professors imagine that the disregard of nervous Anglo-Saxon, and the use of high-sounding Anglicised Greek terms will give simple-minded men a high idea of the immense mass of learning that is concentrated in their body.

Your readers can judge of the Church teaching of the institution, as far as Episcopal orders are concerned, by the following extract from the work of the Dutchman referred to:—