

in his efforts to keep European illicit drink-traders out of the country. They could not trace this to heredity or environment. The surprise was not that there had been failure in mission work, but that failures had been so few. The Bishops of North China and Lahore, and the former Bishop of Waiapu, New Zealand, delivered addresses in the nave of the Cathedral in the afternoon. The proceeds of the collection amounted to more than £87.

“THE MISSIONARY NEEDS OF THE DIOCESE.”

[A Paper Read at a Missionary Conference in Toronto during Synod, June, 1894.]

By W. E. COOPER, S.T.B., Rector of Campbellford and Rural Dean of Northumberland, Diocese of Toronto.

The subject to the consideration of which this paper is to serve as an introduction, is “The Missionary Needs of the Diocese.”

Now, at the outset, it is absolutely necessary to have a clear idea before us all as to what is meant, in the present instance, by the term *Missionary*. What are we to keep strictly before us as our *real* meaning when we speak of the “Missionary Needs of the” *i.e.* of *this* Diocese? What, may it be taken for granted, is the prominent idea in the minds of those who arranged the topics for deliberation this evening?

Now, it cannot be meant that the Diocese is a ground on which no form of Christianity is, as yet found; for there is probably not a square mile of it that is not acquainted with some form or other of the many diversified permutations of what is understood as Christianity in our day. The term “missionary” then, in the present instance, cannot be taken in the ordinary popular sense of the word, as having reference to sending the Gospel to the heathen.

What would be, what is really the meaning of the expression “our missionary needs” in the mouth of, we will say, for example, a *Presbyterian*?

Clearly, if we come down to plain speaking, stripped of all figurative language—of all ambiguity, of all diplomatic covering of his real meaning, the Presbyterian would certainly, when asked for his money for “missionary” work, at once, and only think of efforts to extend Christian doctrine, and Church organisation in the form which he considers to be nearest their Divine appointment. And he would be perfectly right; and, if conscientiously convinced of the truth of his convictions would feel quite justified in so doing, and so contributing. The case would be the same with any other of the persuasions, or denominations of modern Christianity. It may, therefore, be assumed that when an assemblage of members of the Church of England speak of the “Missionary needs of the Diocese.” Each member of that assemblage having an *equal belief at least*, with any member of those persuasions that he is also bent in carrying out the will of the Divine Founder of Christianity; and is at least equally persuaded as is his brother of other persuasions that he himself holds in all sincerity, and perfect certainty, possession of Divine truth and order as laid down by the Great Head of His Mystical Body the Church,—it may be assumed that this question before the minds of an assemblage of churchmen presents itself under *two* forms:

1. How may the order, the teaching, the system of that Divine Society be maintained and extended in that portion of Christ's vineyard and designated as “this diocese”?

2. Seeing that the branch of this Divine Society, called here the Church of England, has

lost almost everywhere, great numbers of those who once professedly belonged to it, how may those lost ones be reclaimed?

Now, whatever opinions be entertained regarding the nature and constitution of the Church of England. Even if to belong to it be only regarded as a mere matter of preference freely exercised, or a mere matter of taste in externals in religion—if the Church here has *any reason for its existence whatever*—taking the very lowest possible view, it must be a matter of shame and reproach to those who are attached to it to find it apparently a failure from whatever cause. Hence, we, its members, are bound to take these two most vital matters into most serious and earnest deliberation.

The only alternative is to sit down and quietly see the members of the Church absorbed into one or several of the religious bodies around it.

Such being the position of the question before us, we cannot do better than enquire whether, and to what extent, the system for organisation and practical work, which is provided in the Church of England, has been carried out, or really had a fair trial? Or have things been regulating and taking care of themselves, as if we had but meagre provision for their efficient carrying to an issue that would have corresponded to their need?

Instead of going into an examination of details of work this paper will rather attempt a sketch of what, as near as the writer can conceive, ought to be aimed at in the life of a diocese. The first question then is, what is our system, and has it had a fair trial?

Our system is Episcopal; government, guidance, help from the head downwards through the whole body. The Bishop is “guide, counsellor and friend in the fullest, deepest sense of every word. We have instances in many bishops of our own day. We need not take extraordinary examples, like that of the sainted Bishop Smythies, recently called to rest by the Great Master, after ten years of marvellous work in Equatorial Africa—the Bishop who traversed on foot more than once or twice the 1,000 miles length of his heathen negro diocese, often at the risk of his own life.

We can come nearer home. Let us take, for one instance, the Most Reverend William Dalrymple Maclagan, now Archbishop of York. He has onerous duties in Parliament, which he discharges with distinction. He is Primate of the Northern Province, having the oversight of nine dioceses besides his own. Under him, in his own diocese are four suffragan bishops, four archdeacons, four canons, 625 beneficed clergy, 250 curates, (876 parochial clergy in all). In three years he visited, personally, every single parish, besides, in many cases, holding confirmations at other times, in addition to these visits.

Again, there is the Right Rev. James Moorhouse, Bishop of Manchester, having in his diocese: one suffragan bishop, three archdeacons, four canons, 518 beneficed clergy, and 370 curates; *i.e.* 888 parochial clergy. This Bishop has also personally visited his diocese, examining its needs parish by parish. He has met his clergy and churchwardens together in all the several Rural deaneries; and then held conferences with his clergy apart, pointing out opportunities for greater efficiency in their ministrations, and bestowing commendation whenever he found opportunity.

Let us imagine then, an ideal diocese, not too large geographical extent. Some may call it an utopian diocese. But let us remember the old adage: “He must aim high who would hit the sun,” *sic itur ad astra*.

As a portion of an Episcopal Church, in the real sense of the word, our ideal diocese would have the Bishop a Father of his diocesan family—the “overseer,” not the “overlooker” of his diocese. In those days of religious unrest, of shaking of the very foundations of the faith, he would have learning of a varied kind. He would be able to direct and correct the studies of his

clergy. They would be able to look up to him as one whom they are assured is superior to themselves in knowledge of every kind, most of all, of course in theological knowledge; more especially would he be capable of pointing out to them the perversions of history that are accountable for the errors, and divisions, and discords of the so-called world of religious thought. He would be able to show them where are the quicksands of the falsely called “liberality” in the opinions of the religionists of the day—quicksands in which the ruler of the kingdom of this world would be glad to see engulfed in the kingdom of the Incarnate God.

He would have a way ready to hand in the organisation of his diocese into Rural deaneries, in all of which it might be customary for the clergy to meet together for mutual help in things of the soul and spirit, and also for discussion of important subjects arranged and carefully studied beforehand. At such meetings the presence of our ideal Bishop would be of untold benefit to all.

As regards the *laity*, he might be, among the various parishes, what the parson should be in the houses of his parish; the Bishop might be known to the laity from constant intercourse, or at least from acquaintance not long intermitted. He would thus get to be consulted with deference, and his expressed opinions and judgment received with respect and obedience. In a word where the *head* was thus living and active the *body* would be proportionately benefited. Then as to the clergy of such a diocese. It would be insisted on, first and foremost of all, that they should be men filled with an overwhelming, overmastering love of our Lord Jesus Christ. Men full of the Holy Ghost, and therefore of power. Men whose hearts were so impressed with a sense of His stupendous love for souls that they would undertake the “cure,” *i.e.* the charge of souls with a dread that would shrink back appalled with the awfulness of its responsibility unless upheld by the assurance of His merciful and Almighty Grace that can be made perfect in their personal weakness.

With the sense of this responsibility they would not rush rashly, or with but scant preparation of heart and head, to their fearful charge. Their time of preparation would, for one thing, be earnestly spent in the endeavor after a fuller acquisition of the sevenfold gifts of the Holy Spirit to prepare them, with the only really efficient preparation, for the work of the ministry—the edifying of the Body of Christ.

Again, realizing also their responsibility as teachers of Divine Truth they would feel how wicked it must be to be ignorant, or even only partially learned in the interpretation of those Holy Scriptures, which are able, through the enlightening guidance of the Holy Ghost, to make them and the flock committed to them, wise unto salvation. They would not be content, moreover, merely to know the Holy Scriptures in their English form. They would have understanding and conviction, to feel keenly how absurdly pretentious it must be to undertake to teach a collection of books, such as forms the Holy Scriptures, from any mere translation however good—they would be students of the Scriptures as they were Divinely given; especially of the New Testament, which has been given to us in a language, the like of which for accuracy of thought and power of giving clearness of expression the world has no equal. But they would know that the acquisition of that language needs deep study, and careful thought, for which they would be amply repaid in the fruit it would produce of carefulness of statement, as well as of intellectual acuteness.

And calling to mind how greatly party bias rules in the world, especially the world of religions, they would never think of taking on trust, no matter from whom, any so-called historical, or *any other* “quotations,” without careful verification for themselves; and least