

robbery, as applied to the act of depriving the non-commuted clergy of their annuity. I believe facts fully justify it; for what is robbery? In understand it to be taking from another that which he possesses, by unlawful means. It was unlawful for spring "his" Canon on the Synod of 1875 without giving the lawful notice required by the Constitution. Again, at the Synod of 1876, it was unlawful to declare the Canon carried which professed to place the "surplus" to the Mission Fund, without taking the negative vote. I might write other things about this unrighteous proceeding, and even refer to the member who started the Doxology.

One reason he gives for stating it could hardly be called "robbery" is equally provoking as ludicrous. He wrote, "because there is so much room for difference of opinion upon it." If I remember rightly, there was difference of opinion between the boys and the frogs in the fable, but that did not invalidate the charge brought by the frogs against the boys.

The question is simply, was it just or unjust? I say it was unjust, and a piece of robbery. Some of those who had become recipients, after years of patient endurance and toil, are deficient that amount to provide for their families, and such "tinkering" has been going on, that useful and efficient men of long standing are now debarred the "right" of any aid, and no pittance need be given to them, if they get seven or eight hundred dollars per year from their parishes, although they are expected to be liberal, hospitable, and to present a respectable appearance. No wonder that in such cases, the "stable" forms the connecting link between the study and the pulpit. When struggling clergymen are treated as the non-commuted clergy have been in the matter of the "Surplus Commutation," it makes it very difficult for them to pray, that "the Lord of the harvest would send forth laborers into the harvest." However, the words with which Bishop Hellmuth closed the last Synod, will be very comforting to them in their affliction, that "Ministers, although imperfectly paid, were laboring on with a Christian hope for reward in heaven." Let that suffice.

Mr. Harding states that he is not aware that the Bishop of Huron or Archdeacon Sandys is now, or ever has been, in receipt of any part of the surplus of the Commutation Fund. If he will consult some of the earlier records of the Church Society he will, not only find the episcopal fund which was created by subscription, but also the episcopal and archdeacon's, which came from the Commutation Fund; and as the original commutants are deceased, it is, as a matter of course, "surplus interest." These two funds have been incorporated as one, but they came from different sources. It was to the latter I referred, and had no reference to the six hundred dollars per annum received by Archdeacon Sandys as one of the commuted clergy, but to the three hundred and eighty dollars he receives annually as Archdeacon. He states that this fund is applied conscientiously, religiously and sacredly, and that the Standing Committee might have been charged with lunacy had it challenged the right of the Bishop and Archdeacon to receive it. Not only Mr. Harding, but I imagine many others, will be surprised to read the following extract, taken from the charge of Bishop Hellmuth to the Huron Synod of 1880:—"But for the fact that the 'surplus commutation' money was ultimately thrown again into its legitimate channel, the Mission Fund, for the benefit of the Missionary Clergy, &c." Where is the lunacy now? If, as the Bishop states, the Mission Fund is the legitimate channel for the "surplus commutation" and for the benefit of the Missionary Clergy, how can any of it be used for Episcopal and Archdeaconal purposes? Mr. Harding should be interested to learn that the Commutation Fund, as created by the commuted clergy, is a special trust for the clergy, and cannot lawfully be diverted from its purpose to pay an Archdeacon, as such, or others; neither can it lawfully be applied to a fund which is used for purposes, other than the one set forth in the Trust. Probably the Bishop had reference to this fact, that it belonged to the clergy, and if so, his countenancing any appropriation to Episcopal or Archdeaconal purposes, is altogether unaccountable.

Also, at the Synod of 1877, the Bishop publicly stated, I am told, that the "Archdeacon's" income was Surplus Commutation, and could be dealt with by the Synod, and highly approved of its being divided amongst all the Archdeacons who did the work. He was told that it had been voted to the Mission Fund in 1876, and then the proposition to divide it was "tabled."

I do not hesitate to state my conviction that so large a fund as the Commutation Fund, should not be appropriated annually amongst the clergy by any committee, but should be fixed and proper claims established, as is done in every other Diocese in Ontario.

I have only to add, that the change proposed in the Constitution of this Diocese, will tend to centralize power; specific interests will be jeopardized; a lawful, manly, Christian independence in legislating for

the Church will be to the prejudice of the individual; and, as it cannot be known whether such a centralized power would be for good or evil, it should be carefully avoided. Be assured that this change is proposed with an object. Nip it in the bud, for it is dangerous. It would despoil men of constitutional freedom, their just and lawful inheritance. A few years only would have to intervene, and such manly spirits as Provost Whitaker, and Rev. Mr. Langtry would be unheard and unknown in the Synod. The real question for any Synod to determine is, whether Bishops are to be constitutional rulers, or whether the Church is to be governed by an Oligarchy.

I remain, dear Sir,  
Your obedient servant,

T. SMITH.

Sept. 23, 1880.

#### CHURCH OF ENGLAND SUNDAY SCHOOLS.

SIR,—I have read with much pleasure the articles that from time to time have appeared in your paper under the signature of Wm. Leggo, upon the above subject. Though only a beginner in the work, yet I have already seen enough to convince me a hundred times over that the great crying want of the Church in Canada is distinctive church teaching, and systematic training in her services for the young.

This fact is painfully evident to those who, like myself, have had to take up a new mission. The clergyman finds that often more than half his flock, who have been brought up by their parents to the Church, and who really wish to be churchmen, are yet, from the lack of early training, utterly ignorant of the first principles of churchmanship, while again sundry are absolutely averse to the Church, and will, if they come to church at all, urge all sorts of silly objections against her services, and never, by any chance, take part in them.

How well every country clergyman knows this! How often is he utterly sickened by the dead, listless, sleepy responding of his congregation, or by their irreverent conduct during service as, bookless and silent, they loiter or slouch away the time, as if the whole service were a mere empty form instead of being what it is,—the noblest and sublimest tribute of respect to the Deity ever devised by the wit of man—and assuming the position of bored spectators instead of hearty and zealous participators.

But I forbear enlarging on what every one knows and experiences, viz.: the lack of earnest and intelligent churchmanship. The manifest remedy, then, to this lamentable state of things is to train our children in thorough Church principles through the agency of our Sunday Schools. As Mr. Leggo says, hitherto "they have been a positive disgrace to the Church and an insult to the intelligence of churchmen." Instead of teaching our children the great fundamental duties of churchmen, to enter heartily into the public worship of God, and to be reverent in their demeanor and explaining the rationale of the service, teaching the history of the Church, etc., etc., we have been, to a great extent, borrowing from other and hostile denominations, and not only utterly ignoring but very often half unconsciously combatting our own distinctive doctrines.

I devoutly hope that Mr. Leggo may succeed in setting the ball rolling which will effect a revolution in our present disgraceful Sunday School system—if, indeed, it is worthy of such a name—and heartily concur in the hope expressed by him in his last letter that before another year all our Ontario dioceses may be in possession of one good uniform scheme of Sunday School lessons which may, in God's good providence, be instrumental in building up, as the church of the future, a real living church, thoroughly organized and disciplined for the great work.

Very truly yours,

R. F. DIXON.

The Parsonage, Duart, Ont.

#### SUNDAY SCHOOL CONVENTION

OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE FOUR DIOCESES OF HURON, NIAGARA, TORONTO, AND ONTARIO.

SIR,—In a conversation to-day with a few gentlemen, who take a deep interest in our Church Sunday Schools—one of them being a clergyman from the Diocese of Niagara, it was suggested that a conference of Sunday School representatives from the four Dioceses of Huron, Niagara, Toronto, and Ontario, would do much to promote a thorough Sunday School organization in the Province of Ontario.

I write this letter at the request of these gentlemen. The Diocese of Huron will hold a convention on the 5th prox., for the purpose of organizing. The Diocese of Toronto is moving in the same direction, but I am not aware that anything has been done by Niagara or Ontario. That Diocesan organizations will be found in all these Dioceses there is no doubt. The demand for Sunday School extension and improvement has become so imperative that no Diocese

can possibly defer much longer taking active steps towards organization. The great importance of united action is self-evident. Now, that we are on the threshold of a great movement, no care can be too anxious, no effort too great, in starting out on a solid and broad basis.

The interchange of ideas, which a meeting of Sunday School delegates must necessarily produce, would give an immense impetus to the movement, and the impetus would be in the right direction for the literature of our Schools would be agreed on, the formation of Normal Classes, and the subjects taught to teachers will be settled, a programme of lessons for each of the hundreds of Church Sunday Schools would be suggested; the medal system would be elaborated; depots for Sunday School books and other appliances would be arranged, and doubtless a grand Dominion Association would be the result.

It is therefore very respectfully suggested that His Worship the Bishop of Toronto communicate with the other Dioceses of the Province, and ask them to invite the attendance in Toronto, of delegates, who might be lay clergymen and the Superintendent, or other lay officer of each school, on a day and at a place to be fixed by his Lordship, for the purpose of discussing these subjects, and of framing a plan of general action.

Yours, truly,

WM. LEGGO.

386 Sherbourne Street.

TORONTO, Sept. 24, 1880.

#### VISIT TO MUSKOKA.

DEAR SIR,—I must trouble you with a few lines to give you the result of my visit to Muskoka. I am sorry to say I could only give ten days, as I had to return for the Provincial Show. I went there a very sick woman, as you know; I return almost well. The climate is so exquisite, it passes my powers of description. I can only give its effect on myself—a most delightful tonic. The air is so pure and powerful, that I, who left home unable to sleep night or day, had great difficulty in keeping myself awake. The scenery is more lovely than can be imagined; it is to those who know Hampshire, England, like one long continuation of the New Forest.

I arrived by the boat at Bracebridge, where I met my friend, the Rev. W. Crompton, on the 8th of this month, and at 8 o'clock on the morning of the 9th started on our journey to the real bush, a distance of 24 miles, on a most wonderful machine called a buck-board. Then the beauty of the country began, and every mile it seemed to increase. We drove to Port Sydney, on the edge of Mary Lake, to dine and rest, and there I was so enchanted with the view that I at once bought two lots—that any one in Canada might envy me—and I hope, next year, to put up a small house, for myself and friends to go to for the summer months to gain health, and rest their over-worked brains in that most lonely part of much-abused Muskoka. There is good fishing and shooting. I saw plenty of game myself, but no bears or wolves, and a good steamer leaves every day to take you to the places all round. I saw it. There is an excellent general store and Postoffice in one; at the store I managed to spend nearly twenty dollars to as great an advantage as I could in Toronto. There is a dear little church, nicely fitted up in every way; but the settlers complain that they are very much curtailed in the services of the Church, and that they had Holy Communion much less frequently than they desired.

Yours, &c.,

LOUISA GIRDLESTONE.

#### AN EXPLANATION.

SIR,—In your issue of 9th inst., I spoke of one Professor of the P. E. Divinity School having been excused Greek when examined for Orders. On enquiry I find that it was not Greek but Latin which that Professor was excused, which is even more necessary for the subject he teaches. The Rev. Mr. Stone, whose name was not mentioned by me has assumed that he was referred to in this connection, and that he was said to enjoy the dignity of a bogus degree. As Mr. Stone's name was not used, I cannot see why he should select himself out as being alluded to by me.

JAS. H. WILSON.

#### Family Reading.

So for is charity from impoverishing, that what is given away, like vapors emitted from the earth, returns in showers of blessings into the bosom of the person that gave it, and his offering is not the worse, but infinitely better for it.—Horns.