

The home for boys is prospering well; we have forty boys now under our charge, and, in addition to a good plain education and instruction in the Scriptures, they are taught tailoring, tinsmithing, carpentering, bootmaking, printing, and farming.

The Wawanosh home for girls is not yet built, but we hope to commence a part of it this summer, and require about \$2,500 more in order to complete it. A good Christian Lady from England has already been engaged to superintend it, and looks forward with much pleasure to entering upon her missionary work.

In order to carry on the work of these two Homes for Indian Children we require a great deal of help; but God has wonderfully opened our way for us step by step hitherto, and we believe that He will continue to do so. We have no debt, and our necessities have been supplied one by one as they arise.

The funds we require are as follows:

A general fund for carrying on the Shingwauk Home for Boys. A general fund for carrying on the Wawanosh Home for Girls.

For the support of each boy: \$75 per annum if no clothing is supplied; \$62 per annum if all except coats and hats are supplied; \$50 per annum if all clothing is supplied. For the support of each girl: \$75 per annum if no clothing is supplied; \$50 per annum if all clothing is supplied.

PROPOSED SUMMER TOUR. In order to make our work more generally known, I propose, this summer, if God will, to make a quick tour through the Provinces, accompanied by two of our Indian boys, and taking with me a model of the Shingwauk Home; our friends will thus have an opportunity of becoming acquainted with our Home and its surroundings, and will also see live specimens of those whom we take under our care and endeavour to train for a useful Christian life. The two boys who will accompany me are Benjamin Shingwauk of Garden River, aged 10, a nephew of the old Chief "Little Pine," his Indian name being Menesenoons, which means "Little Warrior." Charles Maggrah, of Little Current, aged 12, whose Indian name is Bwahneshing "a bird alighting."

My object in taking these two boys with me is not to make a show of them, but simply to introduce them to their many young white friends who are helping them by their contributions. It seems to me good on the one hand that our Indian boys should see and understand how many kind young friends are at work for them, and on the other hand that these young friends of our's far and wide through Canada should see who the Indian Children are to whom they keep sending help. I want to see the White Children and Indian Children of Canada brought nearer together, for them to feel a mutual interest in and regard for one another. So long as the wild little Indian is running about in the bush with his bow and arrows, or crouching by the fire in his smoky wigwam, he and the white child can have nothing in common, the white child merely looks on the Indian child as an object of curiosity or pity; but now that these Indian children have deserted their wild habits and can read and look out texts in their bibles, and spell and write and do arithmetic, and talk English and play marbles and base ball—surely they begin to have some thing in common with their white brothers and sisters.

The principal centres that I hope to visit, and from which we may travel to places around as far as time will permit, are as follows: and I give the date about the time that we expect to arrive at each place, May 25th. Kingston; June 1st. Montreal; June 8th. Quebec; June 15th. St John, New Brunswick; June 22nd. Toronto; June 29th. Hamilton; July 6th. London; July 8th. return homewards.

I shall depend on the kindness of our friends at each of these centres, to arrange for our movements in the neighbourhood, and we shall be glad to fill up our time as much as possible.

I have only to add, that I do not wish to make this a collecting tour. I would rather not have any special collections either at meetings or in churches. I shall be provided with envelopes which if the clergyman of the parish is willing to make use of after we have left I shall gladly supply to him, but if not, we shall be content with having delivered our message. My main object, which I trust with God's blessing to attain, is the

stirring up of a true prayerful interest on behalf of these poor Indians whom we are endeavouring by God's help to assist.

Yours very truly,

EDWARD F. WILSON

Shingwauk Home

May 1st. 1877.

MARRIAGE CEREMONY.

DEAR SIR,—The wedding of Mr. Woodcock, son of E. Woodcock, Esq., Barrister, Inner Temple, London, England, to Miss M. Wright, of the "Lawn" Dundas, took place on the 3rd, the Rev. Rural Dean Osler, M.A., officiating. The bride's dress was, as brides' dresses usually are, very handsome, four of the brides sisters acted as bridesmaids, two of whom were dressed in ecru and mauve, the other two in ecru and cardinal, these were supplemented by two little nieces of the bride, who looked charming; the groomsmen were the Honourable E. O'Court, Messrs. Wyld, Procter, and Wright. The Church was full, perhaps to take notes which they might find useful hereafter. Mr. Humphrey, the organist of Christ Church, Greenville, played the "Wedding March" with his good taste and execution. The Valley City was, of course, stirred up to a great pitch of excitement which gave vent at an entertainment in the evening, at which a large number of friends assembled. Yours, G,

"MENE, MENE, TEKEL."

DEAR MR. EDITOR,—I have just read, in your issue of the 17th inst., the communication with the above portentous title. I am glad the writer is *incog.*; he may be a friend, as he certainly is a brother clergyman. I, too, shall wear a mask; so neither of us can be personally offended.

I heartily endorse the sentiments of gratitude expressed in the first paragraph. But P. F. H. adds "Would to God such sentiments might prove, in the present instance, something more than an empty sound." Why, they have proved so; nearly all the grants to the various missions having been increased. But perhaps by the phrase "in the present instance" P. F. H. means "in my own case."

The second paragraph is full of words of awful warning. Hand writing on the wall!—Destruction!—Dear me! Why we have been flattering ourselves that the financial circumstances of this Diocese have been exceptionally healthy. All the missions are filled, and their number has been steadily, if slowly, increased. The missionaries have been always punctually paid, and their grants have just now been much increased; and yet the Mission Board has never been one cent in debt! And how do we account for this? Because our resources have been carefully husbanded. In order to occupy all the field committed to their charge, the Mission Board have doled out the funds available in the most economic way; giving some poor missions grants of \$200 or \$300—giving other poor mission clergyman, who draws from the Commutation Fund \$400 or \$500.

Paragraph 3 discusses the affairs of the late Church Society of the Diocese of Toronto. As I had no experience of it, I am not warranted in discussing that matter. But it seems to me the depreciatory remarks of P. F. H. are needless—not to say gratuitous.

Paragraph 4 utters more sad forebodings about "trouble coming" on our "amiable secretary." Solemn and mysterious words! But birds of my feather are too well used to such doleful sounds to be much frightened by them.

Paragraph 5 hints that "some parishes will never be heard from." Does P. F. H. mean that his own is one of them? That he intends, as far as in him lies, to make the Mission Fund suffer—that is, his brother clergymen suffer?

In Paragraph 6 P. F. H. says he is one of the "outsiders" whom the benevolence of the Mission Board has "failed to reach." That means, I suppose, that he receives no aid from it. If so, then, he is either in a large town—in which case he should be ashamed to apply to the Board—or he is in a country parish and yet receives no aid. In that case he is a "commuted" man. Now what does he want? Does he wish that some mission should be closed in order that he may possess the funds given it to keep it alive?—or

that all the missions should be mulcted in their pittance to swell his income?—or that the Mission Board should go into debt year after year for his benefit? Only one of these three courses is available so far as I can see. By his implied threat P. F. H. virtually says to the Mission Board, "Only give me \$200 or \$300 from your funds, and then I will use my influence with my parishioners to get them to return in the way of Parochial collections, say fifty dollars."

Well, my dear P. F. H., my advice is: Be content with your well-earned, and certainly well-secured, life income, and don't grudge your less fortunate brother missionary his "temporary and partial relief"—don't covet your neighbour's poor little ewe lamb, and don't utter such doleful "voices of the night."

My dear sir, yours truly,
OWL.

MY DEAR EDITOR,—Against whom is the writer of the letter (headed 'Mene, Mene, Tekel,' and signed P. F. H.), inveighing so bitterly? And why, if there have been wrongs done, cannot he come forward honestly, over his own signature, and tell the Diocese of Ontario, in plain words, what those wrongs are, and who are the wrong doers?

There is something, Sir, exceedingly discreditable in this system of *striking in the dark*.

The Malay who, in his disgust at men and things in general, runs *amuck*, and stabs indiscriminately friend and foe, is so far manly that he does it openly, and may be met;—but the anonymous assailer of other men's motives and characters,—the outbreather of poisonous suspicions and insinuations, (for which there may be no grounds), stabs under the protecting shelter of a *nom de plume*. Whether his morality rises higher than that of the Malay it is not, perhaps, necessary to determine.

In the letter referred to, it is difficult to discover who, (in chief), are the intended victims of the onslaught.

If the Mission Board—it may fairly be asked 'what have they done amiss or left undone?'

Have they shewn indifference to the obligations of their trust by neglecting to meet, or when met by not dealing faithfully—to the best of their ability—with all the interests committed to their care?

Have they neglected, embezzled or misappropriated the funds? or,

Have they violated any of the requirements and directions of the Canon, enacted by the Synod to control and limit their operations?

From the mention of the old 'Church Society,' of another diocese, it must be inferred that P. F. H. fixes the imputation of *mal practice* on the Committees of the Diocese of Ontario; and he further desires the public to think that Bishop Lewis sympathises with him in the charge. Anything more monstrously ill-founded than the latter assumption has never been conceived. Every word and act of the Bishop have been directly of the opposite character. His Lordship has ever expressed the most perfect confidence in the integrity and fair dealing of his committees, which, perchance, no one knows more fully than P. F. H. himself.

If, however, P. F. H. has knowledge of aught which—even in the remotest degree—could justify the penning of such an insinuation, let him come out boldly with his facts. If he fail to do this, he must be content if the charge of 'mal-practice' (or may be something worse), rest on shoulders other than those of the Mission Board.

With a but partially concealed sneer at the *amiability* of the clerical secretary, the next shaft seems directed against this officer of our Synod.

By implication he is made responsible for the general feeling of 'distrust'; attempt is made to cast suspicion upon his accounts; it is suggested that he had better 'set his house in order,' that, in short, as some sacrifice must be offered up to appease an injured diocese, he must prepare for the doom that awaits him. But mark—no direct charge is made—nothing approaching to even presumptive evidence is offered—nothing but dark insinuation.

Now, what is the real state of the case? No man, in the whole diocese of Ontario, enjoys more thoroughly the confidence of the Synod than does