

Missionary Children.

SIR,—With your kind permission I should like to answer a few objections made by Mrs. Chance, of Tyrconnell, on the subject of the "education of our missionaries' children." I am not, strictly speaking, a missionary's wife, though laboring for many years with my husband in a country parish, I, too, may speak feelingly on the subject. Mrs. Chance proposes sending "duly qualified lady missionaries" to assist in the education of the missionary's children as well as the Indians. This would hardly answer, as one capable of training the clergyman's family would require a very much higher salary, and, in most cases, would be very much in the way in a small house where there is perhaps hardly room enough for the family, and, in my experience, governesses do not, in every case, add to the comfort of a household. It is evidently not the intention to train the children for missionaries. We hope in some cases, perhaps in many, they will take up the work. There are doubtless "scores of clergymen" whose means are as narrow as those of our missionaries, but they live within the reach of good schools combined with other advantages of civilized life. I fail to see where, or in what way, the "course intended to be adopted" falls short of the "true ideal" or runs not on the lines of "God's appointment." We do not propose to educate these children in order that they may "lay up for their parents," but that they may be better able to support themselves, and so lighten the home burden. I quite agree with Mrs. Chance on one point, we should pay our missionaries better, but, until that is accomplished, let us do what we can to help them in their noble, self-denying lives. "Doctors, lawyers, and others," if not successful in one place, can move to another, but a clergyman could not do so without deserting his post. Do our missionaries "object to become objects of charity?" if Mrs. Chance means in the highest sense of the term, "objects of love," I feel sure they could not. "Second-hand" clothing, or, in other words, clothes that have been worn, are sent in our boxes to the North-West, but in good repair, and not expressly for the missionary or his family. I confess to feeling warmly interested in this educational movement, and, having watched its progress from the first, through the Church papers, I cannot understand why Mrs. Chance opposes, as strongly as she does, what seems to me so excellent a work in connection with our auxiliary; one with which every other diocese is warmly in accord, and to which (although I have Mrs. Chance's paper before me) there appears to be but little real opposition in the diocese of Huron. So that until we can deal with the ministers of Christ as "He appointed," and give them their "full hire," let us do all in our power to relieve their minds of one anxiety that must ever press heavily on them; only let us not, through want of unity of action, delay that which might be done "while it is day, for the night cometh when no man can work."

A COUNTRY CLERGYMAN'S WIFE.

Shortened Services.

SIR,—Referring to your contention in an article on "Shortened Services," in the CANADIAN CHURCHMAN of yesterday, that the collects for the Queen and the Royal Family and the collect "for the Bishops and Clergy," ought, in the matter of their occasional use or disuse, to stand or fall together; will you permit me to point out an important distinction:

The collects for the Queen and the Royal Family are intercessions for specified individual members of the Church, whereas the collect "for the Bishops and Clergy" (better described in our Prayer Book as "A Prayer for the Clergy and People") is an intercession for the whole body of worshipping Christians, and, as such, of course includes both the Queen and her subjects.

This, in itself, is an important distinction; but probably the real reason why the collect for Clergy and People is often retained, when the two preceding intercessions are omitted, is, that in the collect in question, our Prayer Book furnishes us with our only authorized daily morning and evening intercession on behalf of the parish—or at least of so many of the members, both clerical and lay, of each parish as are accustomed to meet together habitually for the worship of God.

T. C. STREET MACKLEM.

Toronto, May 23rd, 1890.

The Prayer for Clergy and People.

SIR,—I hope I shall not be over presumptuous if I venture to controvert your position with reference to the omission of the State Prayers and use of the above prayer in shortening Matins and Evensong. It is true we are to pray "First for Kings;" but we are not taught to pray just as often for kings as we do for those who are in other positions around us, whether in Church or State. Having prayed "First for Kings" in the "Preces" we are at liberty to pray twenty times for our Bishop, if we choose, so far as Holy Scripture instructs us. Again, the stress laid

upon praying "First for Kings" was based upon the fact that the kings of those days *were kings*. Supreme autocratic power was vested in them. Even as late as the days when such a superabundance of prayers for the King (or Queen) was forced into our Prayer Book, the King was a good deal of an autocrat; although, indeed, he claimed a good deal more power than circumstances proved that he really possessed. But we live in days of a decidedly "limited monarchy." Our beloved Queen has far more influence for good than an autocrat, it is true; but it may be said that her influence and her kingly powers are in inverse proportion. There is, therefore, no reason why we should pray for her so very often *qua* Queen. She is included in the "all sorts and conditions of men" for whom we pray in various prayers. On the other hand, our Bishops, curates, and congregations are only specifically prayed for, in this relationship, if I remember rightly, in this one prayer "for the Clergy and People;" although, indeed, in more general terms, we pray for them in the Preces.

ROBERT C. CASWALL.

558 Ontario St., Queen's Birthday, 1890.

Questions to Sponsors.

SIR,—One of the best teachers I ever had used to say that one never understood a subject until he had found it bristling with difficulties. Your correspondent *Missionary*, of April 24th, has evidently not made himself master of the Baptismal Service. His explanation is a popular notion which any one could have given, but the difficulty lies far deeper and the question is therefore worth considering. The point is, Are the questions put to the child, or to each several member of the whole Company of Sponsors? Up to the last revision of the Prayer Book, they were unquestionably to the child. "Then shall the Priest demand of the child these questions following: N. 'Dost thou,' etc., (Edward VI., *First Book*). In their wisdom or otherwise the revisers of 1661 inserted the phrase "in the name of this child," and thus did what they could by the stroke of their pen to change their character of the service and the relative position of the different parties towards it, but leaving the rest of the service untouched they only introduced confusion into the whole spirit and motive of the service. In their still more mature wisdom the American compilers of their Prayer Book, while retaining in its essentials, the English condition, that "this infant must also faithfully for his part, promise by you that are his sureties, etc.," gives the new and awkward form of rubric. "The Minister shall then demand of the Sponsors as follows: The questions being considered as addressed to them severally, and the answers to be made accordingly. I demand therefore, Dost thou, in the name of this child, etc." This gives a still further scheme of development or degradation: The insertion of the phrase is wholly unliturgical, and it would be curious to know how or why the revisers of 1661 resorted to it, as it could scarcely have been done with a full knowledge of the historical position.

JAMES GAMMACK, LL.D.

Education of the Children of Missionaries.

SIR,—Except to record, from time to time, the marked and rapid progress of the effort to help our Missionaries in the education of their children, I had hoped never to have had occasion to ask the courteous Editors of our Church papers, to grant me space in their columns, but the time has come when I must seek this further concession at their hands, lest silence should imply acquiescence in views I do not share, or a disheartenment I do not feel, although there certainly might be some excuse for it, should still another delay await the educational movement in our Diocese such as is, with solemn portent, foreshadowed in the closing sentence of the statement published and *officially signed* by the officers of our Board. If we must have bars and boundaries they should be immovable and well defined; if we must have rules, as of course we must, they should be binding upon all alike, no one of them to be enforced or laid aside at will, so that there may be no question of the Board of Management or any Committee under it "for exceeding its powers." If work accepted to-day be as likely to be rejected to-morrow, what encouragement is there to undertake anything at all? and, when these methods are used in regard to work cordially entered upon in other Dioceses, and accepted by the Board of Missions itself. What effect must they have upon personal efforts, and in the quenching of that individual zeal for Missions which it is one of the objects of our Association to promote? I can only hope that the deterring sentence to which I have alluded above may have emanated from a meeting as informal as those others which were condemned as "out of order," and may therefore have no very depressing influence upon the counsels of our Educational Committee, when we met in June, if meet we may, and if "Committee," we dare assume ourselves to be!—As it seems that the effort on behalf of the first Missionary Child is to be only half reco-

gnised by our Auxiliary, and that the funds raised on her behalf are only "not refused." I am obliged to ask those friends who have already helped us or who intend to do so in future, to send in their contributions to our Treasurer with *her name* distinctly stated—by doing which their money can be put to its distinctive use and not run the risk of lying in company with the \$30, so ingloriously awaiting its fate in helpless inactivity for still another year! A word before I close in friendly remonstrance with our Tyrconnell Sister, whose paper read at our Annual Meeting and since published and circulated, embodies the sentiments of those who like herself desire to oppose our helping our Missionaries in a way which they themselves most heartily desire. So cordially am I "at one" with her in regard to sending lady Missioners wherever and whenever we can do so, and so thoroughly am I in accord with her views as to the need for increasing the stipends of our *Missionaries*, that I am ready to *second her in every effort she may make* for both these admirable objects, with this proviso, that if I am to follow her lead she will promise not to confuse one fund with the other, and to remember that the pulling down of one building does not always result in the building up of another, that we must be content with a step by step growth, and to lend a helping hand just how and where we can *under existing circumstances*, leaving larger issues humanely in the hands of the Board of Missions itself, whose duty it is to grapple with them, and Spiritually to the Great Head of the Church the God and Father of us all. And further, I would implore her not to impute to our self denying Missionaries a Spiritual pride of which they are incapable, but rather to allow that their reading of that cruelly mis-used word "Charity" is "Love" and that gifts offered to them in whatever shape they may or by whom sent, are received as tokens of love and sympathy, as if direct from the Giver of all Good Himself. Thanking you once more gratefully for your renewed kindness.

H. A. BOOMER,

Convener Educational Committee, Huron W.A.M.A.

Family Reading.

Devotional Notes on the Sermon on the Mount.

No. 21—THE LAW OF RETALIATION.

S. Matt. v. 38-42: "Ye have heard that it was said, An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth; but I say unto you, Resist not him that is evil; but whosoever smiteth thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man would go to law with thee to take away thy coat, let him have thy cloke also. And whosoever shall compel thee to go one mile, go with him twain. Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away."

It has sometimes been said that a principal aim of the Sermon on the Mount was to correct the Law of Moses, to put forward and illustrate principles which were not enunciated in the earlier economy. According to this view the God of the Old Testament was a harsh, vindictive Being, whilst the God of the New Testament is a God of love. It is quite clear that such opinions are totally incompatible with the teaching of Christ. According to His own declaration, He is come not to destroy the Law, but to fulfil it.

And this is quite clear, even in regard to the principle of retaliation, from the Old Testament Scriptures themselves. Indeed there is a double error in the judgments to which we have referred, the error of making the older economy mere vindictive, and the error of supposing that the Law of Retaliation is unknown to the new. It is the old mistake of imagining that love is a kind of weak amiability; that, where there is wrath or retribution, there cannot be love; and, where there is love, there must be something like unbridled license. Neither of these theories is true, whether we go for evidence to the Old Testament or to the New.

"Life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe," this way the principle of the Hebrew Code (Exodus XXI., 24), as indeed it is a principle which lies at the basis of all law. Whenever law is broken, there must be compensation. The principle runs through all government and all life. It is the law of nature and the law of God. "Whatsoever a man sows, that shall he also reap." There are many different ways in which the law takes effect. It may be by the clumsy machinery of human arrangements or by