

with the deficiency in our B. H. M. fund, and in the W. & O. fund, the great work to which we are called in the North-West should be overlooked, and our "charity," as shown in Missionary enterprise, not only begin, but end at home. "This ought ye to have done and not to leave the other undone." D.C.M.

### AN EDUCATED MINISTRY.

SIR,—The following on a subject which excited great interest at our last Diocesan Synod meeting will I am sure commend itself to a large number of our readers. I take it from "Church Bells."

Yours.

"H."

SIR,—Far be it from me to say that a University training or good birth make a man a gentleman or that either should be considered a *quæ quâ non* for clergyman since some of our most devoted and earnest clergy, whose lives are as shining lights in the Church of Christ, have never had the first advantage; some, too, have risen from the ranks. All I would say is, that the educated laity consider, not so much where a man hails from, or what his position is by birth, but what he is in himself; and if they hear him omitting his aspirates, using bad grammar, or speaking with provincial accent, or if they find him b. trying a manifest ignorance of the usages of society, then they cease to respect him, and his influence is almost nil. Such men might do a vast amount of good among the poor of our large towns as laymen; but surely a clergyman ought to be able to take his position anywhere. He who is really actuated by a single desire to do good will consider which position he can fill to the best advantage.

I quite agree with your correspondent 'A Catechist,' that the best men are not necessarily of high birth and University training, nor wanting from the lists of Theological Colleges. What I mean is, that a clergyman ought to be what is commonly known as an educated gentleman. I cannot understand what your correspondent means when he means that a Christian gentleman and the world's gentleman have little in common, for all right thinking people judge a man by his behaviour, not by his rank, income, or dress; and the truest Christian is the most truly gentle man.

What I wish is to sound a note of warning to those who seem to imagine that the sole qualification for a clergyman is the praiseworthy and most essential desire to do good. In the present state of society this is not enough. The laying on of hands does not change a man's outward nature. And also I would urge that a clergyman, without private means, owes it as a duty to himself and others to remain in a state of celibacy. These considerations ought to be well weighed by those who are struggling to take upon themselves the office of a priest, and lamenting so piteously that they find it so hard so to do. W.

### AN ANSWER WANTED.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIR,—Will any member of the Church of England Fund Committee be good enough to explain through your paper, upon what principle their Committee acted when they made a grant of \$225, per annum to the Parish of Annapolis, whilst Rosette, a portion of that Parish, was receiving \$194, from the S. P. C. K. Also upon what principle they acted in giving a grant, when, unless the people of Annapolis pay almost nothing towards the support of their Minister, his income must have been \$100, per annum before the grant was made.

FAIR PLAY.

### A MARITIME CHURCH CONGRESS

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIR,—Having read your Editorial which appeared in your issue of the 17th February on the subject of a Maritime Church Congress, I venture to make a few remarks thereon.

To my mind the difficulties in the way of holding such a Congress, are by no means confined simply to "taking the initiatory steps for holding the first meeting."

Before taking the initiatory steps, it would be advisable seriously to consider the two following questions with regard to the proposed Church Congress.

- 1st. Is it practicable?
- 2nd. Is it expedient?

With regard to the first question it may be urged, that nothing is harmful to the best interests of a Parish, as the frequent interference with the routine of Parish work caused by the prolonged and repeated absence of the clergyman in charge. The number of calls that are made upon our Clergy and Laity at present to attend various gatherings, is by no means inconsiderable. During the past year we had the Provincial Synod, Diocesan Synod (two sessions in the Diocese of Fredericton,) the consecration of several churches, deanery meetings and various delegations and committee meetings in connection with the D. C. S., not to mention occasional exchanges of duty amongst the clergy. Therefore it appears to me the majority of the Clergy—to say nothing of the Laity—could scarcely afford to have an additional call to absent themselves from Parish work in order to attend a Church Congress such as that proposed, however desirable the objects of said Congress might be.

And now to consider the question in the light of expediency.

I presume the expression employed in your editorial—"Representative Clergy and Laity"—is intended to signify that the proposed Congress shall be open to the clergy and Laity of the various sections of the two Dioceses. But when we commence to consider the great distance some of our clergy and laity represent, and the country parishes would have to travel, not to mention the very considerable trouble and expense such a journey would entail. It is more than doubtful if such a Church Congress would ever be truly "representative." The attendance might reasonably be set down as follows: A comparatively small number of clergy and laity, including the most prominent members of our Diocesan Synods, together with the clergy and laity residing in the vicinity of the place fixed upon for the Congress. I believe the practical result of such a Congress as this would be (at least as far as the Diocese of Fredericton is concerned) to weaken the bond of sympathy that unites our own Synod, whilst it could in no way add to the harmony that at present prevails.

Whilst entertaining grave doubts both as to the practicability and the expediency of a Maritime Church Congress for reasons just stated, the writer has, however, the greatest sympathy with those who would seek to introduce into our own Diocesan Synod the discussion not only of the practical living issues before the Church of England to-day, but also the consideration of the various difficulties that beset us in 'parochial work, and the best mode of overcoming such difficulties. Such discussions would serve a two fold purpose. They would doubtless draw forth from experienced and successful workers in the field of Home Missions, much information, together with practical suggestions that would prove of value to their younger brethren. They would also tend to deepen our Diocesan sympathies, increase the income of our Diocesan Church Society, and as a consequence increase its power for good, and finally promote the spirit alluded to by St. Paul, 1 Cor. xii. 25, 26.

Time for such a discussion as that referred to might be gained in two ways. The first would be to prolong the Session of the Synod, the second to curtail the time devoted to the ordinary business of the Synod. Either course I think would be practicable. With regard to the second plan viz, to curtail the time devoted to business of the Synod, a word may be said. The following caution was given by the Metropolitan to the Provincial Synod at the close of the last session. "One of our chief dangers would seem to arise from legislating too much, rather than from legislating too little." The same caution might be extended to our own Diocesan Synod which is developing a tendency to discuss technicalities and points of order in the most painfully protracted manner. These discussions in many cases are devoid of all practical utility, and only waste precious time that might be better employed. Again what is there to show for all the time that has been spent during the past four Sessions of Diocesan Synod in the discussion of the Fredericton Divinity School, the Church of England Temperance Society, the codification of statutes relating to the Church, etc. I trust that the Synod may be enabled shortly to devise some plan whereby the sessions may become seasons of spiritual refreshment in a far greater degree than is now the case.

W. O. RAYMOND.

Stanley, Feb., 24th. 1881.

### CHRISTIAN UNITY.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIR,—Sympathizing most deeply with your truly Catholic article on "Christian Unity" in your issue of the 17th ult., I write to ask if any steps have been taken either by the Metropolitan or by the Bishop of Nova Scotia, to give effect to the Resolution of the Provincial Synod, which you therein quoted?

These are the words to which I particularly refer: "And further, this Synod hereby requests the several Bishops of this Ecclesiastical Province, either by themselves or with such assistance as they shall call to their aid, to press this subject (the restoration of unity to the rent body of Christ) upon the consideration of the various Christian bodies around us) and to invite communication on this subject, either with the individual members or representatives of those bodies, with a view to promote agreement in the truth, and the restoration of outward unity to the Church of Christ, that the world may see it and believe."

Messrs. Editors you say truly, "What confidence have we for the future of Christianity while jarring Creeds spend their time and strength combatting one another."

Is it not a very alarming (and absurd) state of things, for example, to find in villages of five, six, or eight hundred inhabitants, four or five congregations, and as many places of worship, with a minister over each, when one Church could hold all the people, and one minister could easily do the whole work; with the result that the ministers are scarcely able to subsist, and are positively unable to do justice to their families, if they have any; the churches are poorly attended; and a strong feeling of antagonism exists between the several congregations, more or less open and un concealed, caused by each making every effort to prey upon the others. More than this. Each congregation is obliged to draw largely from the Central Mission Fund, and money which ought to be expended in extending the blessings of the Gospel to new and sparsely settled places, is appropriated to keep up, year after year, this miserable condition of affairs.

Is it any wonder that so much money is needed, (when \$3,000 or \$4,000 is required to do the work of \$1,000), and so small results are shown for the expenditure? And is it surprising, under such circumstances, that so many hesitate to contribute toward supporting, and so many others fail to accept, the Gospel Message of Peace and Good Will?

Would not a Conference of the leading ministers and laymen of the various bodies of Christians with the Bishop and leading members of the Church, make these glaring inconsistencies the more hateful to all thoughtful minds, and lead, if nothing else, to more heartfelt, fervent, and more frequent prayer for the unity of Christendom? It surely is worth trying.

AN EVANGELICAL HIGH CHURCHMAN.

### DRESS OF THE CLERGY.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIR,—Can you or any of your readers inform me what is the proper dress of a clergyman when ministering in Church? Our Prayer Book says distinctly that "such ornaments of the Church, and of the minister thereof, at all times of their ministration, shall be retained, and be in use, as were in this Church of England, by Authority of Parliament, in the Second Year of the Reign of King Edward the Sixth."

The second year of the reign of Edward Sixth was 1548. Does any Act of Parliament of 1548 prescribe ornaments of the Church and clergy? If so, all we have to do is to read up that Act, and we shall know at once what are now the proper vestments of the clergy. I have always been under the impression, however, that the Act of Parliament of 1548 merely authorized "the Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments and other rites and ceremonies of the Church, after the use of the Church of England." Consequently, we are to refer to the Prayer Book thus authorized by Parliament in 1548 to know what are the proper "ornaments" of the clergy when ministering in Church. That Prayer Book, I believe, was not printed till 1549, and is known as the first Prayer Book of Edward the Sixth. I have examined an English reprint of that Prayer Book, edited by Rev. H. B. Walton, and the following are all the directions I have been able to find with

regard to the dress of the clergy during service:

1st. "Whosoever the Bishop shall celebrate the Holy Communion in the Church, or execute any other public ministration, he shall have upon him, besides his *Rochette*, a *Surplice* or *Albe*, and a *Cope* or *Vestment*; and also his *Pastoral Staff* in his hand, or else borne or holden by his Chaplain.

2nd. "When a Priest celebrates the Holy Communion he shall wear a *white Albe*, plain, with *Vestment* or *Cope*; and all Priests and Deacons, when assisting the Priest at celebration of Holy Communion, shall wear *Albes* with *Tunicks*."

3rd. "At Matins and Evensong, Baptisms and Burials, the minister, in 'Parishes, Churches and Chapels,' shall wear a *Surplice*; and in Cathedral Churches and Colleges the Archdeacons, Deans, etc., if graduates, may wear with their *Surplices* such *Hoods* as pertaineth to their several degrees."

4th. "At Ordinations, according to the Ordinal of 1549, those who are to be admitted Deacons are to be presented to the Bishop, 'every one of them having upon him a plain *Albe*.' Then immediately after the Ordination, one of the Deacons, appointed by the Bishop, 'putting on a *Tunicle*,' is to read the Gospel. Candidates for the Priesthood are also to be presented to the Bishop in plain *Albes*. At the consecration of a Bishop, the Bishop elect is to be presented to the Archbishop in 'a *Surplice* and a *Cope*;' and the two Bishops who present him shall also wear *Surplices* and *Copes*, and have 'their *Pastoral Staves* in their hands.'"

If, therefore, the vestments mentioned in the Prayer Book of 1549 were those used "by authority of Parliament" of 1548, they are certainly the vestments which our present Prayer Book orders to "be retained and be in use." I ask, then, what right has a clergyman in a parish Church or Chapel to wear a *Hood*? What right has he to wear a *Stole*? I need not mention the black *Gown*, for that is now going out of fashion; but *Hoods* and *Stoles* are commonly worn.

On the other hand, why do not all our Priests, when celebrating the Holy Communion, wear the prescribed plain white *Albe* with *Vestment* or *Cope*? and why do not those who assist the celebrant wear "Albes with Tunicks?"

I say nothing about our Bishops not complying with the rubric; but, as a humble Priest myself, and one who wishes to obey the directions of the Church when ministering in the Church, I should be very thankful if any one who knows will tell me what are the proper "ornaments of the clergy at all times of their ministration."

I am one who  
Don't Know.

### ABUSE OF THE BISHOPS.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIR,—You are welcome to my sermon, but may I ask you to correct one misprint in it, which, indeed, is not yours, but that of the printed copy you took it from. There are several misprints of your own, but minor ones, which the careful reader will, I think, correct for himself. The one I refer to is this: In the paragraph marked 1. in your 3rd column, for "care of the disease of sin," read *cure*.

I will take this opportunity of saying one or two words on another point. I was much pained to read in a letter in a late number of your paper abuse of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Even of secular governors it is written "thou shalt not speak evil of the ruler of thy people." Some would think that such a text as 2 Peter ii. 10 would make anyone with the least fear of God afraid to utter loud, swelling words against those He has set in authority in His Church. I had hoped, Messrs. Editors, that you would have considered such a letter as the one I refer to unfit for your columns. There is, indeed, such a thing as fair public criticism, from which it cannot be expected, nor is it desirable, that our Bishops should be exempt; but from simple abuse on the part of Churchmen, they should be exempt. The letter I refer to discussed no point of the public conduct of affairs on the part of the Archbishop of Canterbury, but simply pointed a bitter word against him, which the author thought clever. How any persons can persuade themselves that such sneers and taunts, directed against their own fathers in God, are lawful weapons for a Christian, passes my comprehension. I was taught long ago, by such an old-fashioned writer as Robert

Nelson, that no matter how "unworthy" of his position a clergyman may act, it is unlawful for us to condemn him; his character should preserve him from contempt. I could wish you, sirs, would reproduce in your paper that passage in "Walton's Life of Hooker" in which he describes "the character of the times" in which Hooker lived. I think a careful reading of it would check something of the monstrous height of spiritual wickedness to which party spirit in the Church leads men on in our day, in their treatment of their spiritual rulers. It is found on pages 41-48 of the first vol. of "Kemble's Hooker," 1st edition.

In the meantime, I will transcribe a few words from it: "Of this party there were many posset with a high degree of spiritual wickedness, that of opposition to government; so blinded by prejudice and a furious zeal, as to make them neither to hear reason nor to adhere to the ways of peace; men whom pride and self-conceit had made to overvalue their own pitiful wisdom so much as not to be ashamed to hold foolish and unmanly disputes against those men whom they ought to reverence,—who laboured first to find out the faults, and then to 'speak evil of government,' like those that 'perished in the ginsaying of Core.'"

There is no point more clear to my mind than this, that the true way out of the dangers and perplexities which surround the Church of England at this moment is to be found in reverence and obeying our Bishops.

HENRY ROE.

Bishop's College, Lennoxville,  
21st February, 1881.

### RECRUITS FROM ROME.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIR,—Each week I read with very much interest your account of conversions from Rome, and I believe such lists as you publish are admirably adapted to do good service to those poor, timid, half-hearted Anglo-Catholics who seem to fancy that the Latin Communion is having every thing its own way at the other side of the Atlantic. But in publishing such lists one cannot be too careful as to their reliability, for if a single name be printed concerning the conversion of whose owner there is any reasonable room for doubt it tends to discredit the whole affair. For my own part, knowing the character of all our Church papers for the thorough reliability of any printed statement made in their columns, I read the lists of converts with very great pleasure until I came upon the name of Bishop Doyle, meaning, I suppose, James Warren Doyle, at one time Professor in Carlow College, and afterwards Roman Bishop of Kildare, and Leighton. If this be the Bishop Doyle that is meant in your list, I would be most happy to be furnished through the CHURCH GUARDIAN with some sort of proof that he ever left the Roman Communion. As to the Cottlys mentioned no one pretends to doubt that they left Rome, and brought many others with them; but as to J. K. L., (the initials under which Bishop Doyle often wrote) the best man in every way that in recent times has occupied a Roman See in Ireland, the most that was said of his conversion, even by the staunchest Irish Protestants, amounted to a vulgar rumour that on his death-bed he desisted and was refused (of course, by the Romanists around him) the services of a clergyman of the Church of England. This was the common report in my boyhood, in Ireland about fifteen years after Bishop Doyle's death in '34. Of course, something more of the matter may be known now; and, as I said, if any thing amounting to proof that the learned, clever, eloquent, and good "J. K. L." ever left the Roman Communion, and especially if it can be shown that he died in the Anglican Communion, it will be news of very great interest to many others beside myself.

W. WHEATLEY BATES.

The Parsonage, Ivy,  
St. Valentine's Day, '81.

P. S.—Permit me to ask also if the Edward Husband mentioned in your last is the present eloquent preacher at St. Michael's Folkestone, England.

W. W. B.

[We have no personal acquaintance with the converts and know nothing whatever about their conversion. We must refer Mr. Bates to the author of the book for the information he desires.—Eds. C. G.]