

done to get the deputation a hearing. On the day appointed for one of the meetings, a telegram was received from the convener of the deputation as follows: "Cannot leave home to-day, pressure of parochial business." The remaining member of the deputation, although expected to the last moment, failed to make his appearance. The deputation also failed to keep their appointment at the three churches in the vacant parish. At the first meeting the rector addressed the people, who were numerous, and the offertory at the close was in excess of that of the previous year, by \$3, when a full deputation was present, although not half the amount contributed when these meetings were held on a Sunday. The foregoing statement bears out the suggestion made by the Chairman of the Mission Board, that there is a "necessity for making some alterations in the appointing of the deputations for the cities and towns of the diocese." I blame the convener for undertaking what at the last moment was beyond the reach of his powers to perform, and I think those deputed him deserving of censure for not making provision for the performance of his duty during his absence. As the Mission Fund is of the utmost importance towards the maintenance and extension of the Church in the Diocese, such agency should be employed, at least for the cities and towns—or if such agency cannot be obtained within the Diocese, be imported and paid up—as will so present the cause of missions to the members of the Church of England as may enlist their sympathies in the cause, and may establish such a system of campaigns that even the poorest may not be debarred the luxury of giving. If this, or some similar course were adopted, I cannot see anything to hinder the contributions for missions being doubled or trebled. Compare the subscriptions of the Wesleyan Methodists to missions with the offerings of Churchmen for that object, and the comparison will show how wide and how painful is the contrast between them and Churchmen. I have before me the report of the Missionary Society for the last year, from which I glean that the Methodists contributed to missions, in the city of Kingston, during that period, \$2,559.95; whilst in the Cathedral City of the Diocese of Ontario, with a rich endowment, the members of the Church of England contributed only \$652.24 for a like object. The census of 1871 gives the W. Methodist population of Kingston as 1,492; Church of England, 3,635. Take again Belleville—also well endowed—Church of England contributions to missions, 1877, \$188.47 to a population of 1,953, whilst a population of 1,588 W. Methodists gave, in the same year, \$862.73. In the city of Ottawa—here the Church is not endowed—but as being the seat of Government, with the Bishop of the Diocese resident there, better results might be expected. By applying the same rule of judging, we find that in 1877, by a Church population of 4,274, \$808.97 had been contributed; whilst the W. Methodists, numbering 1,091, had given to missions \$940.51. Creditable as these contributions are to the W. Methodists, they are a reproach to Churchmen—which reproach, I maintain, can only be washed away by an alteration in the present method of missionary deputations. Much dissatisfaction also, prevails amongst clergy and laity, at what to them appears an unfair distribution of the Diocesan Mission Fund. I instance the case of the mission of Lanark—this mission extends over ten townships and a part of two—has a population of 3,191 members of the Church of England (I quote from the census book of 1871,) was set off from Perth in 1862, is aided by a grant of \$300 per annum from the Mission Fund—has five churches—but has for the last eight months been vacant. In an extended field of labour such as it is, not less than two missionaries in priest's orders should be constantly employed. At present the Mission Board has made a grant to the mission of \$300—there is no missionary. On the same page of the census book from which I have ascertained the Church population of this Mission, I find that in the county of Prescott there is a Church population of 1,505, to minister to whom, the Mission Board employs three missionaries at an annual cost of Cases, such as these, with other causes that might be mentioned, have combined to bring about the decline of the Mission

Fund of the Diocese of Ontario. As to the complaint of the hard times, such cause has nothing to do with it. The liberality (?) of the donors to the Mission Fund in the past was not so great as to put any great strain on their generosity, to contribute a like amount last year, even supposing them to be in "straightening circumstances." The E. Methodists can show in the city of Kingston during the past year their subscribers of \$150 each to missions, and one of \$100, and many of \$25. In Ottawa they can advertise subscriptions of \$50, \$40, \$20, and so on. When churchmen subscribe to missions in this way perhaps we might accept the plea of "hard times" as a reason for a depleted missionary treasury.

LANARK.

MISSION BOARD AND MISSIONARY DEPUTATIONS OF ONTARIO DIOCESE.

Sir,—One hears, now and again, of people withholding their aid to the missionary work in this Diocese in consequence of their having no confidence in the Mission Board. Such a reason can only arise from ignorance of the fact of the "Board" being elected, every year, by their own representatives, in synod assembled; or from the spirit of covetousness which is ready to grasp any excuse for holding on to money.

Year after year, both in and out of Synod, people have been talking about the miserable incomes of our missionaries; but nothing had ever been done to improve them before last December when the Bishop, at the Mission Board, suggested a plan—to be tried for one year—with the hope that churchmen would be stirred up to increase their annual contributions to the fund, so that their might be a permanent increase of grant, because His Lordship's plan involved somewhat disproportioned grants to a few missions, during the current year, certain persons have made a great noise about it. They do not seem to remember—perhaps they never knew—that neither the Bishop, nor the "Mission Board" consider the plan perfect in all its details. The aim was to do something at once, and we did it.

As to all the talk of a paltry deficiency in the past year of \$300, as though it were peculiar to this Diocese and were not to be found elsewhere:—certain vacant missions uncanvassed—sundry hindrances to deputations in the form of sickness and accident, together with the universal chorus of—"Hard Times"—will sufficiently account for this. Now as regards increasing the Mission Fund, several suggestions have been made, fair enough in theory, but, in every instance, impracticable. The system introduced by our Bishop for raising funds by missionary deputations, collecting cards, and special offertories on two Sundays during the year, is as practicable and suited to our position as can well be.

Has this system been fairly worked? I turn to the report of the last Synod, and referring to the list of collections, find under the returns for Advent and Whitsunday, no less than 184 out stations or missions where no collection was taken up at all. Surely we have an excellent resource here. As regards collecting cards, some imagine that it would be better if men could be persuaded to leave their business and go round soliciting aid; this might answer in a few cases, but very few indeed. At the present time I think that the clergy, as a rule, do their best to appoint the right persons for collectors.

Now as regards deputations, clergymen ought cheerfully to obey the call of their Bishop to go on deputations, and gentlemen thus chosen should be careful to furnish themselves with interesting items relative to the conditions of the mission field and its claims, so that the people may see, that there is a cause.

If two gentlemen be sent on deputation together, then let one confine himself to the motive, inducing men to take an interest in maintaining the Gospel; and let the other dwell on the financial claims.

The meeting should be bright and cheerful; the church well lighted; the service short, consisting of a few Collects, or a Litany, with plenty of appropriate hymns, such as the people can join in. The less a chairman says the better, in fact he ought not to do anything beyond briefly stating the nature of the business bringing the people

together. If any volunteer speakers are present I would strongly advise them to remain silent if they can do nothing beyond rising to tell the audience that really they are unprepared to speak, and thus take up some thirty minutes to make it plainly apparent that their assertion was true.

In this Diocese, as in all dioceses throughout the world, the Church has been making, and is still making steady progress. And the more our people learn to value the blessings of the Gospel, the more they will be ready to further its cause.

Yours, etc.,

C. P. EMERY.

ONTARIO MISSION FUND.

My DEAR SIR,—I must trespass upon your indulgence for a few lines space in your next issue. I desire to say, most distinctly, that there was no intention, in my letter of January 21st, to cast injurious reflection on the unquestioned honor of Mr. Crawford, or to assume that wittingly he had misrepresented or perverted facts. As stated in the opening paragraph, he (Mr. C.) stands 'deservedly' too high in the estimation of his brethren to justify any other than the conclusion there given, viz: that in what he had written his intention was to be "both courteous and just." I questioned, as I still question, the correctness of his judgment as to certain matters, the full particulars of which—I know it may be to the Mission Board—could scarcely be within his knowledge. Nothing more. I regret, therefore, that a false interpretation has been put upon my words, and that he should for a moment, suppose me capable of doing him this wrong. As to the concluding paragraph, the writer of it had in his mind—not Mr. Crawford—but the many attacks made anonymously over his *noms de plume*, on the character of the Mission Board. As there declared, there was "no intention to impute anything so injurious to him," and, for this reason,—his past had ever been generous. Misunderstanding as to facts and records was indeed urged; but only in the form and measure permissible in controversies on public subjects. It is but just to my reverend opponent in this discussion—whose high character as a Christian gentleman we all acknowledge—that this explanation should be made.

Of your other correspondent on the same subject—until his manner of writing be very considerably changed—I shall take no notice whatever.

CHARLES FOREST,

A member of the Mission Board.

Morrisburg, March 2, 1878.

[This subject appears to have been pretty thoroughly ventilated. We presume all has been said upon it that can be said.—Ed.]

Family Reading.

THE PENNANT FAMILY.

CHAPTER XXIV.—CARAD TELLS DAISY.

When David Pennant returned to the farm he sought his son Caradoc. He found him in the old school-room—which he had converted into a temporary surgery—deep in some great medical work. He was seated on a high stool at a rough deal table. The whitewashed walls were lined with coarse shelves covered with coarser geological specimens, while here and there odd volumes of all kinds of literature peeped out from amongst them.

Mr. Pennant startled him from his study by the words, "Carad, the earl won't renew the lease. We are to leave the farm!"

When Caradoc glanced up he saw that his father was much excited. He rose, and placed a chair for him, and begged him to explain, which he did in a few brief strong words. Caradoc was as much overcome by surprise and anger as his father had been; but, seeing his fiery state, he strove for calm.

"There are other farms as good, father, with far better landlords," he said, after a long pause.

"It will kill your grandfather and your mother!" cried the farmer, burying his head in his arms on the long deal table, and sobbing like a child.

Carad put his arm round him, and said, cheerily, "They are stronger than you fancy, father."