

payments to reflect on the injury they may thereby inflict, not only on yourself individually, (who I am sure must have had great difficulties to contend with) but on the welfare of the Church itself.

We may, I think, take it for granted that the general motive in subscribing for a church paper is not so much for our own amusement or benefit but that we think the circulation of such a paper is a help to the cause of true religion and thus tends to strengthen and extend our beloved Church. It likewise keeps us informed of current events within the Church both at home and abroad, information we should, without a Church paper, never receive, and without which the Church must suffer severely.

With all due deference to the clergy I cannot but think they, as a body, make a great mistake in not taking a more active part in helping to circulate the D. C. I am sure they will not in general find its readers their worst parishioners.

I sincerely trust your appeal will be heartily responded to by your subscribers making a cheerful response to your reasonable request, and that they will in future endeavour to pay in advance.

Yours truly,

A SUBSCRIBER.

6th Aug., 1877.

INNOVATIONS.

DEAR MR. EDITOR,—As answer to "An Enquirer" I cannot do better than quote the following from "Wheatly":—

"By the peoples' being directed by this rubric 'to answer Amen at the end of the prayers,' they might easily perceive that they are expected to be silent in the prayers themselves, and to go along with the minister in their minds. For the minister is the appointed intercessor for their prayers and prays in their behalf: inasmuch that the people have nothing more to do, than to attend to what he says, and to declare their assent by an Amen at last, without disturbing those that are near them by muttering over the Collects in a confused manner, as is practised by too many in most congregations, contrary to common sense as well as decency and good manners."

"Churchman" asks, "What next will this change develop itself into?" I answer—extemporary prayer—at least such is my experience, for in attending the Church of St. Peter's—where the repeating the General Thanksgiving with the minister, commenced a few months ago—an extemporary prayer now follows the Doxology after the Sermon, at least it did so on the last two Sundays I was there.

To regular Churchmen the unauthorized introduction of irregularities is very disturbing, and the clergy cannot be too careful in discouraging and avoiding them. The duty of responding and repeating with the minister where directed to do so by the Rubric, should also be more brought before the people, and also be made a special lesson in the Sunday schools. Our children would then take a real interest in the service, and as they grow up will help to restore the services of the Church to something more like what they are intended to be, viz., Common Prayer.

A CHURCHMAN.

IS IT RITUALISM?

DEAR SIR,—This question is asked in your last week's paper in reference to a practice introduced in some of the Toronto churches, of the whole congregation repeating the General Thanksgiving after, or with the clergyman. I should be inclined to reply, that as the gentlemen who are beginning this practice have been accustomed to class all hearty responding in the Church service with such departures as Ritualism, Romanism, and the like, we have a right to return the compliment, and to tell them that as "extremes are very apt to meet," as you, sir, told us some time ago, we are verily afraid they are preparing to topple over into that horror of horrors, the Church of Rome; and also that as all innovations are and must be Popish, this latest innovation of all is the most decided little bit of popery now to be met with, although it may have been introduced by a wild youth lately come from England.

I am yours,

A COUNTRY CHURCHMAN.

THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH—WHICH IS IT?

DEAR MR. EDITOR,—Will you kindly permit me to say a few words in reference to the letters with the above caption nearly completed in your paper. Some time ago I sent a circular to a number of the clergy asking them to subscribe for one or more copies of the work if published in book form at the rate of one copy for forty cents or three for one dollar. In reply some two hundred and fifty were subscribed for, many of the letters containing words of encouragement and praise for which I scarcely dared hope. One of our own Bishops' says: "I have not read all the letters, but if published, I will do what I can to encourage their circulation."

A Bishop of the Church in the United States writes "I shall be greatly obliged if you will send me a copy of your 'Reply' to my address * * * Praying God's blessing on you and your work. I am yours in Christ and His Church."

A publisher writes: "I am just in receipt of a letter from a clergyman asking me if your letters are published in book form and where he can get one."

This from a clergyman in the Diocese of Ontario: "I have read with much interest your letters in the DOMINION CHURCHMAN and I am glad to hear that you contemplate their publication in pamphlet form."

Another in this Diocese (Toronto) writes: "I have received your circular referring to your letters to Prof. Witherow and regret that I am not in a position to take more than one copy. I am however glad to be able to procure that one copy for my own use."

A Rural Dean in the same Diocese says: "Your letters do you much credit."

A clergyman in Nova Scotia writes—"In reply to your circular recently received, I beg to state that I shall be happy to subscribe for three copies of the pamphlet you purpose to publish in answer to Professor Witherow's work, 'The Apostolic Church, which is it?' * * * and may the great Head of the Church in whose cause you are engaged aid and bless your great and important work. So prays your Brother in Christ."

Another from the same place (subscribing for 24 copies) writes—"I trust you will not shorten the work in order to be enabled to sell it cheaper."

And to quote no more: A clergyman of Ontario Diocese writes—"Give the appendices in full even if you give only half the number of copies."

These, with many others, in the same kind and encouraging strain, almost induce me to publish the work at once. However, as I am not in a financial position to go on with the work unless I have enough secured to pay expenses in full, I would beg leave to state that until at least 500 copies are subscribed for I would not consider myself justified in having the letters published.

If the Churchmen of Canada consider these letters a clear reply to Prof. Witherow's work, and are desirous of having them appear in book form, they must subscribe, as the labor and thought expended upon the work is the most I can possibly do myself.

Very respectfully,

T. G. PORTER.

Hillsdale, Aug., 1877.

DIOCESAN SYNOD.

SIR,—The article of July 15th, headed "Is the Diocesan Synod a Failure?" left the impression on my mind that the writer looked on Synods as a human device, which had moreover, proved a failure; that, like a patent medicine, the institution had given promise of curing every ill to which the body ecclesiastical is heir; but, that instead thereof, it had only aggravated old evils, and created new.

I can understand a writer being in this mood with "several circumstances of very recent occurrence" in the Dioceses of Toronto and Montreal before his eyes. But that may not be a safe mood for one writing with a view to the formation of Church opinion. I allow that if those were the only Dioceses with Synods, the matter might be debateable in some such form perhaps as this: Is the Synod of those respective Dioceses, together with their working details—human nature considered—an unmixed good? But I submit that

the question, "Is the Institution known as Diocesan Synods a failure?" cannot be asked. Take for example, two other Dioceses in British North America, those of Nova Scotia and Fredericton, neither of which is unknown to the writer. Ask what they were *without* Synods, and how they have been strengthened and developed by them, as was said and felt at the last session of Synod at Fredericton. To be sure, it was not one of the avowed objects for the modern restoration of Synods, but it cannot be doubted that even in Toronto and Montreal, Synods are useful if in no other way, than for administering rebuke either in the height of debate or the silence of vote to heady, factious, or extreme men.

I submit respectfully, sir, that Synods are Scriptural in idea and apostolical in practice; that they were used by the primitive Church; that the first was held at Jerusalem, and was attended by the "Apostles, and Elders and Brethren;" that the Institution is "calculated to extend her borders;" and to "give efficiency to her ministrations;" to "popularize the government of ecclesiastical communities;" and lastly, that they tend to "interest the masses more fully in church work."

I am, sir, yours, &c.,

C.

MODERATION.

MR. EDITOR,—Some years ago I read a letter written by the late Archdeacon Jeffreys, of Bombay, meeting an objection the moderate-drinking party had to the total abstinence course. The Rev. Divine said: Take into consideration all the good derived from drinking moderately, and then as an offset think over all the evils accruing from the excessive use of intoxicating liquors, and then you must see clearly that the evil far exceeds the good in point of magnitude. Thus far the total abstinence course can be pursued on a thoroughly Christian principle. And in view of this, Mr. Editor, there will be no hesitancy on the part of your thoughtful citizens in voting in favor of the Dunkin Act.

J. B., Malton.

Family Reading.

ONE LIFE ONLY.

CHAPTER XXXII.

A lovely summer morning some few weeks later found Una Dysart walking to and fro on the terrace which skirted the front of the house. She had passed a restless night, as she had too often done since Atherstone's departure; for the very effort she made to hide bitter pain by day, when the eyes of others were upon her, only made her give way to it the more utterly, when in the darkness none could see the burning tears she shed for the hope that was dead, and the love that lived only to wring her unforgetting heart. There was one person whose society in all intercourse with her neighbours she systematically avoided, and that was the clergyman, Mr. Trafford. Her conscience was ill at ease under the concealment of Miss Amherst's letter, and on the few occasions when she had heard him preach, she had been so impressed by his uncompromising rectitude, and the pure and lofty standard he held up before his hearers, that she absolutely dreaded the influence he might acquire over her if she held much intercourse with him. For although Trafford could not of course really know how completely she was sacrificing truth and justice in this respect to the love that dominated her whole being, yet it always seemed to her when she met him as if his clear spiritual eyes could penetrate into the very depths of her soul, and read this secret with all the rest. It was therefore with some annoyance, as well as great surprise, that Una suddenly saw Trafford walking towards her along the avenue at this early hour of the day. She had been thinking sadly how she would have rejoiced in such a sunny morning, before the shadow of Humphrey Atherstone had fallen across her path of life and dimmed all its brightness, as she thought, for ever, and tears trembling on her long eyelashes as Trafford's quick step brought him face to face with her. He looked at her keenly, but he met her hurried