doing this. That it may call for a little self-denial that a parishioner giving $10 or $5, or less, may feel he could spend the money otherwise, and that it might even go to some needed object is likely enough—but the members of our Church should know God's word sufficiently to feel that the support of the Ministry of the Gospel, not in a grudging spirit, but in an honourable way, is a first duty that God lays on us—and we shall have little profit in the end in any of our business or any of our gains if we forget what God, the Giver of all our mercies, calls us to. But a Clergyman with a growing family will find it difficult enough in the present state of things to be comfortable with less than £200 a year. Several of our Clergy are not likely to have that at present in money; but I hope they may in other ways receive the assistance of their people, so that they may be encouraged in their work, and be free from the disturbing pressure of worldly cares.

But how is the Diocesan Fund to be able to make such advances? In the first place, the interest of the Endowment Fund that has been formed in the past few years may be devoted to it. This will produce £80. Then I would propose that the Synod set apart this Endowment Fund as entirely an Endowment Fund for the Ministry.

The advantage from this would be that I think it would then come within the rules of the S. P. G., and receive from that society an addition of one-seventh of its amount. The further income of the Diocesan Fund needed at present may, I think, be raised from general subscriptions and the yearly harvest thanksgiving collection. In most Dioceses there is a quarterly collection for such a Fund or at any rate several collections in the year, but I do not propose that we should resort to such collections at present. But it is not enough to elaborate plans, we must endeavour to work them. At the last Synod the management of the Diocesan Fund was left with the Executive Committee. During my absence it was thought advisable to introduce some more members of the Church, and the Executive Committee did this of their own action and called the combined body—the Mission Board. I think it would be well to continue such a Mission Board and to leave with it the management of the Diocesan Fund and the Missionary work of the Church within the Province of Manitoba. The object should be to unite with the Executive Committee a number of the more influential and active members of the Church. I would suggest the preparation every Easter of a list containing all who have given $5 or upwards to the Diocesan Fund in the preceding year—that every such donor have a right to vote for ten of the gentlemen on the list whether clergymen or laymen and that every additional $5 give an additional vote. The ten gentlemen having the largest number of votes willing to act on signing a declaration that they are members of the Church of England, or of the Church of Rupert's Land in communion with the Church of England, could form with the executive committee, the Diocesan Mission Board for the year. A similar arrangement should be made for each parish or mission, only on a more popular basis. At Easter, after the vestry has been elected, the donors of $1 or upwards, towards the clergyman's income, could elect six of the male donors to act along with the vestry as a Parochial Mission Board, to be a committee for communicating with the Diocesan Mission Board, and for raising the minister's stipend.

And now how should the parochial subscriptions be raised? Some may prefer to give a sum at once, and some may prefer to encourage that as far as possible in every case. But I would give the word of warning, that in raising money much depends on encouraging small sums. The Sustentation Fund of the Free Church of Scotland, that has been such a noble success, is manag-