

I should not have thus troubled you, did not a wrong appellation serve to confirm a popular error.

Yours faithfully.

F. H. J. BRISTOCKE,  
President of the Church of England Institute.  
St. John, Nov. 24th, 1877.

#### CORRECTION.

MY DEAR SIR:—Will you please allow me to correct a statement that appeared in your issue of the 22nd ult., in the Resume of the week, respecting the Convocation Hall at Trinity College. This, indeed, was not "built chiefly by Mr. Jas. Henderson and family" as you have inadvertently put it, the late Mr. Street having contributed an equal sum, (\$4000), and both donations having been very largely supplemented by the College Corporation.

In making this correction I would refer to what was said by the Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor of the University in their addresses, (printed in another part of your issue), as setting forth a true statement of the case, and as containing, let me add, a grateful and pleasing tribute to the memory of my late Father.

I am, Sir, yours truly,

JAMES HENDERSON.

2 Wellesley Place, Dec. 3, 1877.

#### CHURCHWARDENS.

DEAR SIR:—For some weeks past various communications have appeared in your columns, in reply to, or in comment upon, the letter of "An Anxious Enquirer" in your issue of Nov. 1st.

Happening to be acquainted with all the circumstances of the case, as well as with the local jealousies which are destroying the Parish in question, I think it only fair to all parties to place the facts more clearly before those who know or care anything about the matter.

In the first place, it is very doabtful if the Churchwardens themselves pretend that they had the law on their side in what they did. My impression is, though I am open to correction if wrong, that they simply wished to stop that particular service, and took the readiest means of doing so, knowing that the laity are not amenable to discipline.

Secondly, the Church was not locked simply against an early celebration. On Easter and Ascension Days of this year there have been early celebrations, without any opposition. The real objection was against a particular celebrant, in whose honour, it was affirmed, the service was being held.

It is useless, therefore, as well as annoying to many of the parishoners, for those who know nothing about it to fulminate their wrath against those who wish, they say, to deprive them of the means of grace, &c.\* The matter is bad enough at the best, but will certainly not be mended by letters as far from the real point at issue here, as those which have lately appeared.

Yours, &c.,

X.

#### CHURCH OPENING.

MY DEAR CHURCHMAN.—Your paper of to-day, among many interesting items, gives an account of the opening of, St. James' Church Westminster. It is quite evident that the comparatively small and new congregation have indeed attempted great things, and, I have no doubt, will carry them through. But there are two points in the article that I would notice. We are told that the church is "ecclesiastic in its design and completion." In illustration of this we are told that the church runs north and south." Now I don't think this very ecclesiastical. I am one of them who like churches to be so built, that the requirements of the rubrics can be met; and that, when the priest is directed to stand at the north side of the table, he does not stand at the east side. I do not see why we should, in this matter, innovate upon the pious "use" of our forefathers. The very orientation of the old churches in England is an illustration of the piety and devotion of their

\*Vide "A Constant Communicant" in last week's issue.

founders. In many instances these monuments of bygone days do not stand exactly East and West, but vary, it is found in accordance with the position of the sun at its rising, in the season of the year in which is the commemoration of the Saint to whom they are dedicated. The reason of this is that the night previous to commencing the foundation was spent in a holy vigil upon the ground on which the church was to be built; and, the particular direction of the church was determined by the first appearance of the sun, on the morning of the tutelar saints festal day; which would be, north, or south, or east according as it was in the shortening, or lengthening days of the year. I so like the Eastern position, that I think that any church by so much falls short of a true ecclesiastical character, as this principle is violated.

In the commencement of the article we are told "They offer great sacrifices and rejoice" and are informed that "the sacrifices is not as in the days of Nehemiah of sheep and oxen but sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving." Now I am of opinion that the now-a-days sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving, are in point of economy, a very great improvement upon the sacrifices in the days of Nehemiah: they really cost very little. A choir practices our anthem, often with very great and laudable pains, and 2000 people are found participating in the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving without it costing them at an average ten cents a head. Verily they did not offer bullocks and sheep for if they had done as in the days of Nehemiah it would have been a much more costly sacrifice. "Praise and thanksgiving" often lets conscience off with very little. Yours, &c.,

ECONOMY.

#### AFTER THE CONVENTION.

DEAR SIR.—This week you gave us a portion of a communication "After the Conference." I troubled you with two articles before the Conference; allow me again to occupy your space. Permit me, before I enter upon my subject, to congratulate you upon the interest that your correspondents are manifesting in Church matters, and the importance that the DOMINION CHURCHMAN is assuming as a medium for the interchange of thought throughout our Ecclesiastical Province.

As to the real end of the late gathering, the *Cui bono*, (please let us have the English, "for what good has it been") may well be asked, and different answers may be given. As to a thorough, or even general, description of subjects participated in by the clergy and laity, it has certainly been a failure; but as to the production of some most excellent papers, and the delivering of some admirable addresses, it has been a success. But the object proposed has not been attained. Let me point out a few things illustrative: (1.) There was by no means a general representation of the laity, especially from the country. More particularly there was not the attendance of warm hearted practical superintendents and teachers who give to S. S. Conventions so much of their character and efficiency. As to the Conference, thrown open to all "members" of the Church, while S. S. representatives were so limited it equally failed. (2.) The arrangements of the meetings were not calculated to secure the proposed end. I may here remark that, if we are to have a good Diocesan S. S. Convention in Toronto, the preparation must be made by such assemblies in the respective Rural Deaneries, where teachers may meet, more at home and less abashed, and discuss important and interesting questions. The reading of a paper, occupying nominally twenty minutes, but in many cases more, and then an address occupying the same time, again, nominally, but often more, and sometimes much more, afforded but little time for discussion, and was well calculated to produce the feeling that, instead of being brought together to mutually edify one another, we were, for the most part, collected to exercise our receptivity for the good things, and many were indeed very good, which were prepared for us. A retrospect on the part of those present for us. A retrospect on the part of those present for us. I cannot help thinking that after the reading of the paper, rigidly confined to the allotted time, it would have been better to have thrown the subject, at once, open to the members, limiting all to the ten minutes, even if it might have been thought desirable to say to one and another, privately, "Have the

goodness, if needed, to lead off the discussion on such and such a paper." Telling us that certain persons will speak, at once checks preliminary thought, and throws us into the position of expectant listeners, rather than debaters. As it is, much good would doubtless result from the publication of proceedings, in a form accessible to the members of the Church generally, for the very excellent reports given, at the time, in the daily papers, left, with all their extensive circulation, many unreached and uninformed. Concerning the importance of such meetings, even although we have a Synod, I would like once more to trouble you.

RUSTICUS.

#### RECITING THE ATHANASIAN CREED.

DEAR SIR,—I think "R. S." will find by comparing the words on the title page of Prayer-book "The Psalter on Psalms of David, pointed as they are to be sung or said in Churches," with the order in the rubric that the Athanasian Creed "shall be sung or said," and after observing that, as a matter of fact, the Creed in question is pointed with the dividing colon precisely in the same way as the "Psalter," that the intention is that it should be sung or said in the same manner as the Psalms are sung or said.

D. C. M.

#### ABOUT THOSE "FUNDS."

MR. EDITOR:—Your paper lately has always something about the churchwardens, and their difficulties with the parson. This week an aggrieved churchwarden comes to the front, to know as to "who is the most proper person to solicit funds for the purpose of freeing the parsonage from debt." Now, sir, I admire those words, *the most proper*; and I am sure that the churchwarden's good sense can readily answer the question. It is obvious that it is the parson's duty, and that on the following grounds:—

1. The parsonage was built for the convenience of the parson, and who more fitting to raise the funds for it?

2. The parsonage is in debt, and no clergyman should live in a house when people are not paid for it, therefore the incumbent should immediately go forth and collect the funds.

3. The parsonage is "heavily in debt;" it is therefore to be presumed that it is very comfortable, and, if the parson has the comfort, he ought to be willing to pay for it, or, at least, to go and "solicit funds," that it may be paid for.

4. As to the parson's considering it *infra dig.*, he is bound to *dig*, or anything else that the parish tells him to do! for, does not even St. Paul, a very high Church dignitary, say, "We are your servants," and of course, thus bound to do as told!

5. If he does not go and "beg," for if he cannot *dig*, he ought not to be ashamed to *beg*; it will prevent parishes from building comfortable parsonages, for here they have evidently built one so comfortable that the naughty parson, having nestled down in it, won't turn out, even to beg from the good Christian people "funds" to pay for it. Whereas, had they not built so snug and commodious a dwelling, he would have been glad to go out for a time.

Other reasons I could give, and could extend the application of the principles, for they are very convenient ones.

Yours,

FERRUMY.

#### AGE FOR CONFIRMATION.

DEAR SIR,—In your report of the Hillier confirmation, last week, the writer says, speaking of the candidates, "None were mere children, brought in to swell the number." Although we must regret the absence of the children, all will be glad to know that they were not "brought in" from such an unworthy motive as that which, it is hinted, sometimes influences those who present them. Before the next confirmation in the parish of Hillier, it is to be hoped, that the form of public baptism of infants will be read in the hearing of your correspondent, when he will learn that the Church in her wisdom directs that "this child (presumably while he is yet a child) shall be brought to the Bishop to be confirmed, so soon as he can say the creed, &c." I may add, that our