

of the Holy Trinity in Toronto, claims a somewhat similar title, that of "Assistant Rector."

I should like to ask what authority there is for the assumption of these titles, for they are quite new to me.

The word Rector has, according to the books, several significations, but none of them presuppose any joint tenure of ecclesiastical status. The difference, and the only difference, so far as I know, between a rector and a vicar consists, in England, in the former being the recipient of "Great Tithes," while the latter receives only the "Small Tithes;" so that a rector may be a layman which a vicar cannot be. For example, in a parish of which I had for some years the sole charge in England, as curate, the Vicar received £800 sterling per annum, while the income of the lay-rector, from the great-tithes, amounted to £3000.

The word rector is synonymous with that of parson, a greatly understood term, and a parson is so called "because by his *person* (the original word is *persona*) the church, which is an invisible body, is represented; and he is in himself a body corporate, in order to protect and defend the rights of the church (which he *personates*) by a perpetual succession. And as Lord Coke says, the law had an excellent end therein, viz: that in his *person* the Church might sue for and defend her right. A parson, therefore, is a corporation sole, and has during his life the freehold in himself of the parsonage house, the glebe, the tithe, and other dues."

The above extract refers to a rector as well as to a parson, and how there can by any possibility be a co-rector or an assistant rector I am unable, although always open to conviction if in error, to comprehend. "In my opinion, and in absence of further light on the subject, there are no rectors in Canada, where there are no tithes, save such incumbents as derive their incomes from landed property. Formerly every church was entitled to a house and a glebe, and these were both "comprehended under the name of *manse*."

If I am correct in this opinion I have only to add that I think it is a pity, especially in these days of carping and cavilling, that gentlemen should arrogate to themselves titles to which they can lay no legal claim. B. A.

Peterboro', January 24, 1878.

"ARE THE INCUMBENTS OF OUR MISSIONS MISSIONARIES?"

LETTER NO. III.

DEAR EDITOR,—I have my third letter upon the subject of our Mission Fund with this question, because, I think the Mission Board of this Diocese has been acting throughout on a wrong principle. It had been dealing with places, and not with men. It has missions but no missionaries. A missionary I conceive to be one who is sent out by the Bishop, or by the Synod, (and in this matter surely the Mission Board singly represents the Synod), and he is responsible to those who send him for the due performance of their work, while they are responsible to him for his support. This is at least the theory, though amongst us extraordinarily mixed up in the practice. Now is it not possible to carry out this theory? I believe it is possible, and that it would result in much greater satisfaction to the Diocese, and in a much more satisfactory state of the Funds. But further, it would also, I believe, do away with many of the grievances and difficulties of the clergy. The reform that I would urge upon the Mission Board of this Diocese is the adoption of the system in vogue, I think, in the Dioceses of Toronto, Huron and Quebec.

Let the Mission Board take upon itself the entire burden of supporting the missionaries. In the first place let each mission be obliged to send up quarterly to the Mission Board the amount of money it can raise towards the support of a missionary, and then the Board can supplement that amount from its funds to the extent required for the payment of the missionary's stipend. And if the parish or missions fail to send the amount due, without assigning some good reason, then the Board should, after due notice, withdraw the missionary. The amount that should be paid by each mission to the Board, not to the missionary, might be agreed upon by a local board under

the supervision of the archdeacon, or any other person who could be got to perform the duty. And no mission in arrears should have another missionary sent to it till all arrears have been paid up. This scheme would do away with many things which now vex and harass missionaries, such as the long delays in payment of the stipend, heavy arrears, payment in kind, starving out, &c.

But further I would suggest that in addition to the grants made to the missionaries when in charge of certain missions, there should be also special grants to missionaries of long standing in the Diocese; for instance to missionaries of over five years standing a personal grant of \$50 per annum, to those over ten years \$100 per annum, and to those of over fifteen years standing, \$150 per annum, these grants, however, to cease upon the appointment of any such missionaries to parishes which receive no aid from the Mission Fund, or upon their being put upon the list of commuted clergy; and such grants should be made to them irrespective of the missions in which they may be working, or of the grants made to those missions. This would indeed be a recognition and reward of long service, and would be a great encouragement and incentive to missionaries. And since the income from the Sustentation Fund has been thrown into the hands of the Board, in order to reward faithful missionaries under the present defective scheme, why can it not be given to aid a scheme which would more justly and fairly reward faithful and long service? It can no longer be claimed that the interest of the Sustentation Fund shall be used for the support of certain missions mentioned in the Bishop's original circular, since the Bishop himself has sanctioned, if not actually proposed, the present use of that fund for the purpose of increasing the grants to eighteen missions.

Under such a system it would be possible to raise the stipends of missionaries to a certain fit standard, a thing so often spoken of in Synod, yet never carried into effect. We would also find, I think, that there would be a sensible difference in the returns of the collections made for the different funds, that whereas now there are year after year no returns whatever made from many of the small parishes, or out stations for the different funds, the clergy, being free from all care as to their own stipends, would be more interested in making collections.

I will now singly add that it is with considerable diffidence that I, one of the juniors, have taken upon me to propose so radical a change in the management of affairs, and I have done it through your columns, because, as is very well known, it is hard to get any scheme a thorough discussion during our short sessions of Synod. I am afraid that I must expect the imputation of presumption in thus writing concerning the action of the Mission Board, but if I have erred, it is not from any spirit of fault-finding, but with the desire, in which I know that others share, to see our missionaries receive a more generous and fair support.

Thanking you, Mr. Editor, for your kindness in allowing me the use of your columns. I remain faithfully yours,

E. P. CRAWFORD.

Trinity Church, Brockville, Epiphany, 1878.

"N. B." having received the journal of Synod since my first letter, I note that I have been under a misapprehension with regard to the motion of Judge McDonald referring back the Mission Board report for amendment. I was strongly under the impression that the motion gave instruction to the Board to adopt the classification scheme of the previous year. I have therefore to apologise for having used the expressions I did in my first letter with regard to the passage of the amended report, or rather the unamended report.

E. P. C.

LORD SHAFTESBURY AND THE P. P. C. K.

SIR,—Your article on the recent controversy in English papers about publications of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge is, I fear, liable to create false impressions; and I think you would have done better if you had published the correspondence between the Earl of Shaftesbury and the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the letter to the latter of Mr. Maitland, the author of the

work the earl objects to, than to comment on it without giving your readers a chance of knowing what it has been. You have both exaggerated the claims of the venerable Society, and, unintentionally I presume, dealt a heavy blow at its character for soundness of doctrine. You say, "this Society, we all well understand, is the great Bible Society of the Church." I beg to say that this is not exactly the case: unless the S. P. C. K. is considered in conjunction with the British and Foreign Bible Society, which has for years past furnished the older Society with translations of the Bible into a large number of the languages and dialects of heathen countries. On the other hand you say, "a sentence here and there has certainly appeared in some of the Society's recent publications of a decidedly incautious character, and tending not Romeward but in the direction of the modern German School of free interpretation." Now I really think this is a very serious charge to bring against a Society whose works we have been used to rely upon as secured against all false doctrine by the conservative character of the Bishops who are understood to be responsible for them. And surely such a charge should not be made in your paper without the production of the passages you refer to. Lord Shaftesbury quotes the passages he objects to, and these gave Mr. Maitland the opportunity of shewing that he has misunderstood the whole drift of his book and by taking isolated passages without their context has done a wrong both to the author and to the Venerable Society.

Yours truly,

E. W. BEAVEN.

26th, January 1878.

THE MISSION FUND.

MR. EDITOR.—The letters of the Rev. Messrs. Crawford and Beaven, in your issue of the 24th inst., about the Mission Fund of this Diocese, Ont., are important and we hope will have their intended effect. But before Mr. Beaven's scheme can be matured, which will take time much in advance of the present system; for this year I would humbly suggest that the clergy, which I hope to do myself, undertake, when practicable, the collecting of the parochial funds themselves, or a portion. They have to go round and see their people, expend a little time among them, let them take the card along with them, and the mission fund will be as rich a topic as many by which we have often to introduce ourselves, and our main subject. It is money we need not be ashamed to solicit, any more than to ask for funds for a church or parsonage, and in thus doing explanations can be given, where necessary, and they have often to be repeated, which has been a great deficiency in our young ladies, for the work and machinery of the Diocese. When also the decision—a wise one—arrived at by the Board to have the names of subscribers published in the report,—which by the way, should be out earlier than usual,—can be entered into as a partial stimulus to increased contributions, which perhaps could be heightened, if by the sanction of the proper authority, a report could be promised to every subscriber of not less than a dollar. This hint is no scheme, for that is promised in "No. iii"; but if tried this year in our extremity, may add a few additional dollars to the coppers.

Let those having the power, say, whether on these grounds we can offer a report, which at all events should be more largely circulated, &c., which would be a help to an increased interest in church work, &c., till something better is adopted, let the clergy be the principal collectors; then we may hope our little allowance will not be diminished. But another hint, in its simple form, that may be acted on to our profit. If the clergy of the deputation at their missionary meetings, would in place of the regular sides-men go round with the plates, many a piece of money would be drawn forth, as I can testify to, much in advance of what was intended to have been given.

Yours respectively,

G.

Jan. 26th, 1878.

WANT OF DISCIPLINE IN THE CHURCH.

SIR,—Your correspondent "Churchman" seems to be unnecessarily exercised on this subject judg-