

PARISH MAGAZINE.

We owe an apology to our subscribers for not issuing the Magazine as punctually as hitherto. The delay has been entirely owing to the lack of assistance in procuring advertisements. This work should be done by some of our laymen; but since the departure of Mr. Yorick nobody seemed inclined to take it up. For several months the Rector himself canvassed for advertisements; but it involved altogether too much labor, and labor that was improper besides. We are glad to say that now Messrs. Alex. Abraham, A. McMullen and H. J. Emm have relieved him of the work, and that the Magazine will henceforth be issued regularly as before.

N. B.—The year is again drawing to a close, and we hope that all our subscribers will see to the payment of the annual subscription at once. Upon this depends the issue of our Magazine for another year. As it is the Rector has pledged his credit to one note of \$25 for printing, &c., and there is the English part of the Magazine to be paid for. We hope, therefore, that all will send in to Mr. Thos. Plummer, of the Bank of Montreal, their subscriptions for the current year.

The Diocesan Collections.

We subjoin a list of contributors to our assessment for diocesan purposes. This will serve as a public receipt to all contributors. We are sorry that this list comprises only 132 responses out of 465 circulars which were issued and that the total sum contributed is only about \$150 instead of \$375 which was the amount for which we were assessed and which we should give if we would maintain only the average standard of giving which prevails in the diocese. We are, however, sincerely glad that the 331 families and individuals who have not responded will yet do so. Notwithstanding a trade depression we do not think that so large a proportion are unable to afford even \$1.00 for a whole year as their contribution to evangelistic work in the diocese. Nor do we think that they are unwilling to give. It must be rather thoughtlessness. We heard much under the old system as to the multiplicity of special collections. They were annoying from their frequency—especially so to the church wardens. For there was generally a diminution in the ordinary revenue of the church on the occurrence of every special collection. Still, under the old system we gave last year \$188 and the year before \$208 to diocesan collections. This is far better than \$150 which as yet is our contribution for this year. We cannot rest satisfied with \$150. We shall be ashamed to hold our heads up in synod if this is all we can do. We, with three lay delegates in synod, and a numerical standing second to only two or three churches in the whole diocese, yet fall below financial support which we give to the diocese. We earnestly ask those who have not yet responded to the appeal to do so without delay. If they do not, the only alternative that we can see open to us is to make another appeal personally or otherwise to those who have failed now to respond, and next year either to return to the old plan of having eight separate collections or to try a quarterly appeal, i.e., to take up our assessment by four separate collections or to the present plan is the best theoretically, but if it will not work practically we shall have to adopt another. Once more before concluding we urge all to send in their contributions at once and so prevent the trouble and the expense of another appeal.

List of Subscribers under New Canon, 1894-95.

Richard Abraham, 35c. I. Baker, \$1.25. Wm. Buckingham, \$2. Mrs. Bosbery, \$1. Jas. H. Beaumont, 25c. Victor Burwell, \$1. Wm. Battershall, \$1. D. B. Burritt, \$2. J. L. Bradshaw, \$2. Mrs. Brotherhood, \$3. Charles Casson, \$1. Wm. Casson, 50c. H. W. Copus, \$2. A. F. Clarke, \$2. S. H. Crish, 50c. Alf. Cole, \$1. Thos. Cardwell, 25c. George Carpenter, 50c. Charles Clarke, 50c. John Corrie, \$1. W. H. Dunbar, 25c. Daniel Dempsey, \$1. D. Artis Dempsey, \$1. S. S. Fuller, \$2. James Gordon, \$3. R. T. Harding, \$1. Robert Hesson, \$1. Gilbert Horne, \$1. S. R. Hosson, \$2. Thos. Holliday (Jr.), \$1. John Hillman, 10c. Henry Jezard, \$1. Mrs. G. L. Johnson, 50c. George James, 50c. Joseph Johns, 75c. George Jackson, \$1. H. M. Johnson, \$2. Robert Knott, \$1. A. H. King, \$1.25. Wm. Lucas, \$1. W. Lawrence, \$2. G. W. Lawrence, \$1. Robert Legge, 50c. R. R. Lang, \$1. H. T. Legge, 50c. J. C. Monteith, \$1. Andrew Monteith, \$1. John Moffat, \$1. John Mackin, \$1. D. Matthew, \$1.25. Jas. I. Morrow, \$1. Joseph Mayne, 50c. John Moffat, \$1. John Mackin, \$1. D. Matthew, \$1.25. Jas. I. Moore, \$2.25. Wm. Martin, \$1. Henry Monteith, \$2. Peter McNab, \$1. Robt. McFarlane, \$1. Wm. McEwin, \$1. Wilson McWhinney, \$1. C. F. Neild, \$1. Rd. Peacock, \$1. Robt. McFarlane, \$1. Wm. Reed, \$1. George Stone, 1. J. S. Squire, \$1.50. Jos. Salkeld, \$1. George Shore, 1. Wm. Thistle, \$1. A. Thistle, \$1. John Thistle, \$1. W. R. Tiffin, \$1. Robt. Thistle, \$1. Judge Woods, \$1. Mrs. Westwood, \$50. H. O. Wright, \$1. H. E. Parsons, \$1. G. L. O. Thompson, \$1. Henry Yeandle, \$1. W. C. Young, \$1. Wm. Abraham, \$1. E. J. Burton, \$1. W. J. Butler, 20c. Mrs. A. Bax, 50c. E. K. Barnsdale, \$2. Geo. Cooper, \$1. Wm. Cooke, 25c. Chris. McLellan, \$1. Mrs. Doherty, \$1. Mrs. Dent, \$3. Mrs. Elworthy, \$1. J. Emm, \$50. Mrs. Gurney, \$1. M. Goebler, 50c. Mrs. Jermyms, 50c. Miss Hay, \$1. Thos. Holliday, \$1. Jas. Harvey, \$1. W. J. Keating, \$1. Miss L. Kastner, \$2. E. Sydney Smith, \$3. Miss Macklin, \$1. Mrs. Mitchell, 50c. Ed. Mitchell, 50c. Mrs. Lizzars, \$1. E. J. Lyc, 50c. M. Macfarlane, \$2. Alex. Macdonald, 50c. J. A. McCarthy, \$1. Mrs. McMullen, \$1. John Normabell, \$1. Thos. Oakley, \$1. Miss Roberts, \$1. Mrs. Petrick, 50c. Col. W. Smith, \$2. W. Saunders, 50c. John Sowerby, 50c. Miss Steet, \$2. Miss Sanderson, 50c. Mark Wade, \$1. Thos. J. Wilkins, \$1. John Watson, \$1. Mrs. Williams, \$2. W. H. Moore, 50c. Unknown, 75c. Mrs. Odbert, \$1. P. R. Jarvis, \$1. Mrs. R. Smith, 50c. Mrs. Townsend, 50c. M. O'Boirne, \$1. Two others whose envelopes were lost before marking, \$2.

The W. A. M. A.

The semi-annual meeting of the Women's Auxiliary has also come and gone, and so far as Stratford's part was concerned, it was a complete success. The entertainment given to the delegates was admirable and called forth repeated expressions of appreciation. The missionary meeting in the evening was also in every sense satisfactory. The singing was good, the attendance large, the speeches excellent, and the collection liberal. (\$25.52).