

provement in the symptoms, and thoughtful Churchmen are beginning to wonder whether it is not possible to discover and remove the cause or causes of this morbid condition. It is well worth the while of all those who earnestly desire the prosperity and extension of the Church, more than the success of a party, to fill in this quest. For the symptoms themselves indicate not death, but superabundant life—not atrophy but hypertrophy. If the energy now wasted in vain attempts to found new sects or parties, could only be kept within the old channels and directed by the existing organization of the Church, what an impetus might it not give to much of her work?

Do we need this lay help? Do we indeed desire to utilize it? Can we have it? If so, on what terms? These are questions worth considering in another letter.

Yours, R.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND SUNDAY SCHOOL INSTITUTE.

TEACHERS' EXAMINATION.

SIR—As many Sunday School Teachers who think of going up for the above examination, are desirous of information as to the character of the questions, and as to the best text-books to be used in preparing the work, may I ask you to publish the following questions from last year's papers in the Elementary Section.

Holy Scripture, (St. John chaps. 1—x)—1. "What is the object of this Gospel, as indicated in the Introduction?"

2. "Give a short account of the life of St. John."

3. "Enumerate the miracles of our Lord, and the discourses arising therefrom, as recorded in these chapters."

4. "Describe briefly the interview between our Lord and the woman of Samaria, and its results."

5. "What Jewish festivals did our Lord attend as recorded here? What do you know of the origin of these festivals?"

Prayer Book, (Communion Service and the second part of the Church Catechism.)—1. "Enumerate the parts into which the Order of the Administration of the Lord's Supper may be divided."

2. "Give the history and the meaning of the word *Sacrament*, and show that the Holy Communion agrees with the definition of a Sacrament given in the Church Catechism."

3. "Write out the last answer in the Catechism, and give, in a parallel column, quotations from the Communion Service, illustrating each clause."

4. "Give a brief history of the Nicene Creed, and mention the special errors it was designed to controvert."

5. "For what Festivals are there proper Prefaces to? Quote one of them."

6. Write out the Prayer of Humble Access, and specify any Scriptural allusions therein contained."

In answer to many inquiries as to the best text-books for this year's examination, I beg to recommend those named below, in the following order of merit:

Holy Scripture.—1. (good) "The Churchman's Family Bible," (S. P. C. K.) Large paper edition. Part III. St. Luke xvii. 24 to St. John xx. 19. Price in paper 15c.

2. (better) "International Revision Commentary on the New Testament," edited by Dr. Schoff. "St. John," by Dr. Milligan and Dr. Moulton (C. Scribners Sons, N. Y.) Price \$1.50.

3. (still better) S. P. C. K. Commentary on the New Testament. 2 volumes. Price \$1.80.

4. (best) "Cambridge Bible for Schools," edited by the Dean of Peterborough. "St. John's Gospel," by Dr. Plummer, Master of University College, Durham. Price \$1.50.

Prayer Book.—1. (good) S. P. C. K. Prayer Book Commentary. 50c.

2. (better) Proctor & Maclear's Introduction to the Book of Common Prayer. 75c.

3. (much the best) "The Prayer Book, its history, language and contents," by Evan Daniel, M.A. \$2.

The above are Rowsell & Hutchison's prices, except the S. P. C. K. Commentary on the New Testament, which is to be had at the Church Depository, (Synod Offices.)

Yours,

C. R. W. BIGGAR,
Local Secretary Church of England
Sunday School Institute.

THE CLERGY TRUST.

SIR,—In concluding this series of letters on the Clergy Trust, I thank the DOMINION CHURCHMAN for the use of its columns, and am grateful I am not insensible to the assistance received from the moral support accorded me. To maintain my position against a corporate power, which assumes no individual responsibility, and to receive a generous approval, affords satisfactory evidence of the integrity of the con-

tention in which I am engaged. Willful and malignant was the misrepresentation of my course of procedure. Although I exhausted every means to obtain redress for a manifest wrong, before appealing to a civil court, it did not avail. I submit the following circumstance to the Church as evidence of the injustice I received, and calmly await the verdict of Christian men. Although my solicitor had written three letters to the Secretary Treasurer of the Synod, extending from October to the following February, two of which were registered, for the purpose of avoiding the suit, yet he participated in passing a resolution which censured me for "filing a bill in chancery against the Synod without having first brought the matter in question before the properly constituted tribunals of the Church." It was owing to misrepresentation that the Synod passed this resolution of censure, and which was afterwards, by resolution, removed at the Synod of 1884. Respecting the second registered letter, I have not the slightest hesitation in stating my conviction that the signature in the book kept for the receipt of registered letters in the London Post Office, underwent a change of appearance in the case of the said letter. At one time Mr. Reed denied having received this particular letter, but afterwards wrote my solicitor respecting it, and said, "I have not the smallest doubt but that the above registered letter, with other office letters, was duly given me by my wife on my return, and its actual reception by me." The following resolution which is vindictive and untrue, appeared in the London public press at the time. The italics are for the purpose of directing attention, but the words are unchanged: "That whereas the Church of England in this ecclesiastical Province, is empowered by Acts of Parliament to deal with all matters relating to its discipline, organization and administration; and whereas there are properly constituted tribunals for the settlement of all matters in difference between members of our Church, this committee desire to place on record their unqualified disapproval and condemnation of the conduct of the Rev. Joel T. Wright, who, while claiming to be a missionary clergyman of the diocese, and being a recipient of money from our Diocesan Mission fund, has brought public scandal and disgrace on our Church by filing a bill in Chancery against the Synod, wherein he charges the Synod and the members thereof with maladministration of the fund, and by such a proceeding and appeal to the civil courts without first bringing the matters in question before the properly constituted tribunals of our Church. *has shown an entire absence of those principles which should actuate a Christian clergyman, and has acted in a manner which is contrary to the true genius of the Episcopal Church of England in Canada.*"

When the official minutes appeared, the resolution was recorded thus:—"A vote of censure was unanimously passed on the conduct of the Rev. Joel T. Wright in filing a bill in Chancery against the Synod without first having brought the matter in question before the properly constituted tribunals of the Church. Which motion was added to the report of the Standing Committee." It will be seen that the former resolution aggravated the misrepresentation, and I may fairly call upon the Secretary Treasurer, Mr. E. B. Reed, in his official capacity, to state whether the one given to the public through the secular Press, was passed at the Standing Committee or not? If so, by whose authority it was changed in the official minutes? I also leave the following questions, asked upon a former occasion, for Mr. E. B. Reed, the Secretary Treasurer of the Huron Synod, to give such answers as will clear him of complicity, and of sufficient truthfulness to satisfy reasonable Christian men. 1. Did Bishop Hellmuth know that he had received the three letters referred to, or any one of them? 2. Did any official of the Synod know thereof? 3. Did Bishop Hellmuth or any official of the Synod, advise or connive at the withholding of them from the Standing Committee and the Synod? The Clergy Trust was for the "support and maintenance of the clergy," and the annuity of \$200 which I received from it, cannot be said to have been unnecessary, for although I have laboured a quarter of a century in the diocese, save a few months, my stipend has at no time exceeded eight hundred dollars, except for the three years I had the annuity, when it was a thousand dollars, and, being unjustly deprived of the annuity for the "support and maintenance" of my family, no equivalent whatever was given. Mine was not an isolated case, for others were in the same position, and I have contended as much for them as for myself. Truly, the administration of Bishop Hellmuth was a grievous misfortune to the Church at large, and especially to the Huron diocese. Had it been an honest failure it might evoke sympathy, but it was not. Who can, with even the most crude ideas of honesty, fail to see the principle which actuated him in retained for himself a good portion of his own stipend, from the surplus interest of the Clergy Trust, and yet, whilst professing to lament the spiritual destitution of sixty thousand souls in the diocese, quieted his conscience by presuming upon the influ-

ence of a holy office, and despoiling his poorer brethren of two hundred dollars per year from the same source? When honest men review the history of the Church in Huron, during the decade of Bishop Hellmuth's oversight, and consider the financial transactions with which he was associated, and of which he was the guiding spirit, they will set their seal to the testimony of an aged Bishop, who was faithful, truthful and sagacious, in unfolding the real character of the then Archdeacon Hellmuth, in those prophetic words:—"He had known Dr. Hellmuth for many years; that he considered him a designing and deceitful man; and that he had no confidence in his truth or integrity." This was the testimony of the late Bishop Fulford, Metropolitan of Canada, in the year 1862.

The Parsonage,
St. Mary's,
March 23rd, 1886.

Concluded

LAY HELP.

SIR,—In connection with the above subject, I wrote you a letter, which you kindly admitted to your columns, pointing out the great assistance in parish work, which faithful godparents would be, and the manifest blessing to the child. As *Church Bells* may not be very generally read by your readers, may I ask you to insert the following extract from a letter which appeared in a recent number of that paper on the subject of "Sponsors," which very clearly illustrates my point:—"The incumbent, having made arrangements with some or all of the communicant church workers in his parish, is able, in many cases of doubt or necessity, to provide one sponsor for any child, and this sponsor undertakes to keep up an interest in the child's spiritual welfare, in due time bringing it to Sunday School, or by letters or other means proving that the Church of England is a true mother to her children, thus keeping in spirit our own canons and the primitive rule of one sponsor—a deacon or deaconess—according to the sex of the person or infant to be baptized. Might not such a scheme revive, under God's blessing, the meaning of the word "godparent"?"

If every communicant in our parishes would say to his or her parish priest, "I am ready to fill the position of godparent to the first child for whom no sponsor is provided by the parents," and would conscientiously undertake the obligations, what a help to the parents this would be; what a blessing to the child in this age of careless indifference. It should be remembered that a sponsor in no way relieves the parents of a child from their obligations as such, nor does he undertake to care for anything more than the spiritual well being of the child.

CHAS. L. INGLES.

THE SHINGWAWK HYMN BOOK.

SIR,—We think of republishing here, the Sunday School hymn book, issued some years ago at the Shingwauk Home. Would the superintendents of schools presently using the book, kindly say if they desire to continue the use of it, and require any additional copies.

Yours truly,
J. KER McMORINE.
Kingston,
March 30th, 1886.

THE PERMANENT DIACONATE.

SIR,—You deserve the heartiest thanks of all who have the welfare of the Holy Catholic Church at heart, for printing in your issue of the 23rd March, the golden words of Rev. I. Townsend's paper at the Lincoln Diocesan Synod in England, upon the subject of the Grace of Holy Orders, needed for the work of the diaconate, which so many laymen are blindly, zealously and awkwardly trying to do without at the present time.

He says: "There is a daily increasing number of laymen filling up a great need of the Church, and, in fact, doing deacon's work, without either the grace of Orders to aid them, or discipline to regulate their teaching. Would it not be wisdom to return to Scriptural sanction and Catholic rule? Whether their commission, whichever it may be, should be temporary or permanent; whether they should be advanced to a higher or rigidly restricted to the lowest, ought surely to rest with the Bishop in his wisdom and discretion; which if present Act of Parliament restrictions were removed, and deacons permitted to live either by their secular calling or their private resources, ought they, if duly qualified by educational and theological attainments, to be debarr'd by the exaction of a solemn promise from seeking the priesthood also?"

The "Parliamentary restrictions" have been removed in Canada. We have a canon of the Provincial Synod, authorizing admission of laymen to the