

not clergymen, in this connection, clearly ignore vital distinctions in church government and doctrine, and *practically*—in the most effectual manner possible—teach that the Truth is a matter of indifference, and ordination an empty form? Why, under such circumstances, so much ado in favor of meeting Non-conformists on the same platform for the circulation of the Scriptures, &c.?

It does seem, too, that in every town or city where there are two or more strong congregations, there might be, or might have been, a Church Hospital, as much as a general Protestant one, for each city or county? As a matter of fact, the majority, sometimes a large majority, in most existing hospitals belong to our church. Can we not shew as much love to our sick and needy as the Church of Rome almost everywhere does? If this, however, be deemed for the present impracticable, let us, at all events, try to make the best, as above suggested, of existing institutions; and because we cannot get everything, let us not, therefore, do nothing. "She hath done what she could."

G. JEMMETT.

PAYMENT OF THE MISSIONARIES:

SIR,—A correspondent asks, "How is it that the Mission Board have no power either to enforce the payment of the parish dues from the people, or to withdraw the missionary, and place him where he would be better appreciated?" The Mission Board have the power, as the Mission By-Laws plainly show, but from some mistaken notion as to the expediency of using their power, they neglect to do so, and the missionaries suffer in consequence. The Mission By-Laws, as they at present stand, are thoroughly practical, and it is hard to conceive of any case in which evil would result from their enforcement. The law provides that if any mission neglects to pay the quota set, it has guaranteed, after a certain time has elapsed and due notice been given to the incumbent and churchwardens, the churches in that provision shall be closed. But the matter does not end here; if it did, no doubt great injury would result to the Church. On the contrary, an investigation is immediately to be held as to the reasons for the stoppage of payment on the part of the mission. These reasons must be one or more of the following; (1). Some fault, real or imaginary, in the missionary, which causes the people to be dissatisfied with him; (2). A simple neglect or refusal on the part of the mission to pay their dues, or (3). An inability to do so. If the first of these reasons be given, and be found, upon examination, to be well grounded, the missionary is removed, and another is sent to replace him. If the second reason be adduced, the missionary is removed, and no other is sent in his place, until the people come to a better state of mind, and surely they are not worthy of having a missionary, while they will not pay, as they are able, for his support—and it were far better to remove missionaries to places where they will be appreciated, than to have them to work amongst such people. If the third reason be advanced, then the law provides that special arrangements may be entered into with that mission to suit its means, and no doubt if the result should be a reduction in the stipend of the missionary, he would much prefer a stipend of \$600 or \$700 regularly paid, than a promise of \$800, upon the payment of which he could not depend. But the Mission Board decline to use the power they possess, and thus a mission which has fallen slightly into arrears, and could easily pay its dues, if reminded by those in authority of the necessity of doing so, as the law provides, is allowed to go on, unwarned, until the arrears have accumulated to such an extent that the payment is almost impossible, and until the people have learned to look upon By-Laws, signing of guarantees and all such machinery as simple humbug, and to feel that nobody cares whether they pay their dues or not. If those in authority thus neglect their duty, we need not be surprised at the business following suit, and the missionaries will have to learn that their greatest trials are not owing to the smallness of the contributions to the Mission Fund from the general public, but to the neglect of their own parishes to pay these dues, but, in most cases they would be quite ready to pay, if the proper means were taken to remind them of their duty. Let the

bye-laws be no longer a dead letter, but let them be either enforced, or altogether abolished, in the latter case we shall return to the old and humiliating practice of begging for their daily bread.

D. P.

SIR,—Some of the recent letters upon the condition of the Mission Fund published in your able journal have made us acquainted with a very sad state of affairs. One fact I had noticed before, but now it is more painfully prominent. I refer to the allusion made by a correspondent, that the wealthier clergy do not take the interest they should in that which affects the status and comfort of their poorer but not less worthy brethren. When they are placed above want themselves, are they thereby freed from all duty in respect to others? I think not. Those who are trying to extinguish the debt which hangs over us would have an easier task if they could point as examples in giving, for the emulation of the laity, to generous gifts from some of the richer clergy—for instance, to one whose income, if report speaks true, is much larger than the entire debt of the Mission Board and its total expenditure also.

ONTARIO.

A FUND FOR WIDOWS AND ORPHANS OF THE CHURCH.

SIR,—It may be taken for granted that the father of a family who has nothing to depend on but an annual income barely sufficient to defray his expenses, should, so far as possible, provide that his family be not left without support in case of his death. Indeed this duty of the father of a family is very strongly expressed in the New Testament, for the Holy Ghost there declares that a man who neglects to provide for those of his own house "has denied the faith and is worse than an infidel." And we all know, by reading the Acts of the Apostles, as also the epistles of the New Testament, how careful the Church was in the first age to make provision for the support of the poor widows and orphans not only of the clergy, but also of the laity of the Church's membership. But what a miserable support have some prospective widows and orphans to look forward to now! Surely there is something wrong! We cannot plead poverty, for some tell us that we belong to the wealthiest Church in the world. We may at least believe that we are much wealthier than the Church of the first century, when there were not many rich or noble among its members. We ought therefore to provide for the widows and orphans of our deceased brethren. My remarks at present are merely tentative and in the form of questions.

Why not have one fund for the benefit of all widows and orphans of all deceased clergymen of the Church in Canada? We all belong to the one Church. We glory in its unity. Why should I pay in one diocese to such a fund, and then have no benefit from such payments when I remove into another diocese? No other religious bodies in the country are distracted by such absurd rules. Each has its own fund, no matter what part of the country its preachers may live and die in.

Twice have I subscribed to what might be called "a mutual clerical insurance association for widows and orphans;" that is, I became a member of two such associations. But with my subscriptions ended seemingly all further exertions on the part of these societies to do the work they proposed or even to exist. Why so? I know not, unless they found so few to subscribe, so many of the clergy who needed no such aid for their widows and orphans, or, shall we be obliged to add, so many who neglected to provide for their own house, &c., that no properly formed organization could be hoped for? The rule of such organizations was this: that when a brother clergyman died all the other clerical members should pay four dollars, to be given to the deceased brother's widow. So that if a thousand members so subscribe the poor widow should receive four thousand dollars. Such a rule works well, I am told, in the Church of the United States. But why confine such a society to the clergy? Years ago when I mentioned it to certain good and faithful laymen, they said in effect, "Let us join you in this society; we can help you and you can help us. Why should merely human socie-

ties, such as those of the Freemasons, the Orange-men, the Oddfellows and other fellows, who have been trained to prudence and benevolence in the Church, be allowed to provide for their widows and orphans better than the Church can? The money of such men, in many cases, belongs properly to the Church. The widows and orphans belong to the Church. Let us beware of robbing the Church of her ancient glory as the home of the orphan and widow. Let us beware of giving to human agencies the honor that belongs to Him Who is the Father of the fatherless and the Husband of the widow.

Brother clerics! speak out on this subject. It concerns many of you; in fact, all of you. Brother laymen, you also have something to say on this subject. Say it, for your own sakes, for your clergy's sakes, and for the sakes of the widows and orphans which both you and your clergy may leave behind.

ONE WHO EXPECTS TO DIE.

"HONOUR TO WHOM HONOUR IS DUE."

SIR,—In your last number I notice a remarkable letter by "A City Parson," giving an account of the liberality of the Methodists resident in Toronto, "by way of annual subscriptions to their Mission Fund." If the Methodists mean by their Mission Fund what we mean by our Mission Fund, then we have reason to give them very high honours indeed for their munificent liberality in comparison with our givings for missionary support, and we have reason to humble ourselves in shame and self-contempt before God and man. But is it really true that the Methodists of Toronto contribute \$9,311.51 to the support of men whom we would call missionaries? Does no part of that sum go for the support of resident Methodist preachers in Toronto? Are not all Methodist ministers regarded as missionaries? I do not know that they are among themselves so regarded, but I am told that they are so, and that their so-called missionary contributions are to be reckoned much in the same light as we reckon the stipends of our clergy, who receive no support from our Mission Fund. If this be the truth, then it follows that the Church people, who pay both their pastors' stipends and contributions to our Mission Fund, far exceed the Methodists in liberality. But if, on the other hand, the Methodists pay their pastor's stipends, and contribute over and above such stipends, the handsome sum of between three and four thousand dollars annually to missionaries outside of the city, then let us give all honour due to them, and seek to follow their good example.

ENQUIRER.

THE GENERAL THANKSGIVING

DEAR SIR,—I perceive in a late number of your paper which was handed me, a communication from a clergyman in England, in reference to the way in which the General Thanksgiving should be said, whether, as is the universal custom with us in the States, it should be said by the clergyman alone, the people simply responding "Amen," as in the prayers preceding, or as that writer advocates, it should be said jointly by the minister and the congregation. The arguments used in this letter, in favor of the latter usage, do not seem to me to have much weight, and certainly are not convincing enough, to lead any loyal churchman, at least among us, to think of its adoption. All such innovations are considered here as dangerous, and as causing so much of that spirit of discontent and disloyalty which is found in the so-called Reformed Episcopal Church. And inasmuch as the introduction of this change from the established custom would be productive of disturbance and distraction, it surely is both safer and better to cling to a custom which has the sanction of the church from the days of the Reformation.

To what extent the practice has attained in Canada, I have not the means of knowing, but trust for the sake of that uniformity which now exists in the practices of the sister churches, that it is only local and partial. Should you see fit to give this communication a place in your columns, it may be the means of eliciting the opinions of others, and thereby help to settle the question