

wisely said, "admitting one's self wrong to-day, is but acknowledging that he is wiser than he was yesterday."

The *Christian Advocate* forcibly remarks:

"If the Church desires the best preaching, let it liberally support its pastors, not because any good man consciously preaches better because he is better paid, but because when he is properly taken care of, he is left without anxiety. But as the Church never can, as a whole, and perhaps never should, give salaries so large as to admit of ministers economizing upon them as one can in business, let all liberally contribute to the annual collection for the support of worn-out ministers and the widows and orphans of such as have died in the ministry. And let those who have means contribute to the funds referred to, that men may feel that, though they give themselves wholly to the Church and its work, there is a provision made by the beneficence of the Church which shall stand between them and the addition to the infirmities of sickness and old age, of that poverty of which the Scripture saith: 'The destruction of the poor is his poverty.'"

"THE HIRED MAN."

The "hired man" is a very useful and necessary member of Society, and far be it from me to underrate his value, or to detract from the dignity and respect which the faithful performance of his engagements may justly entitle him to assume or to demand. But, for all that, I cannot see that it is just or proper, upon any principle of Christian ethics, or any principle of the gospel and Church of Christ, to place a *priest of God*, in his relations to the people of his charge, in the same attitude towards that people as are those of a "hired man" toward his employer. But, I think, very few—very few clergymen, certainly—will doubt that the feeling is far from uncommon among congregations and parochial vestries, which leads Christian people (Christians in name, at least) to regard their spiritual pastors and teachers in almost exactly the light of the hired man. They say to themselves, in effect, not always consciously, perhaps, but the effect is the same, somewhat as follows: *We are the employers. We know what work ought to be done, and how it should be done. We know what sort of men we want. We are to pay the money. What is the use of our paying out our money unless we are pleased? If the man does not please us, we will pay him up to date and let him go. Or if we think proper, we can leave so much UNPAID as seems to us proper, considering the fact that the work does not suit our views. It is folly to expect us to pay for what we don't want. It is a question of hire—a matter of "business."* Everything is done now-a-days on business principles. We are the masters; the *priest is our servant. If he will not submit to these conditions, we will stop his pay. We hold the purse and are "masters of the situation!"*

"And we beseech you, brethren, to know them which labor among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you; and to esteem them very highly in love for their works' sake. And be at peace among yourselves."

"Let the elders (presbyters or priests) that rule well, be counted worthy of double honor; especially they who labor in the word and doctrine. For the Scripture saith 'Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn;' and 'The laborer is worthy of his reward;' 'Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves; for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account.'"

Apparently these are the words of some very

"unbusinesslike" person. They do not sound like the words of a "man of business," speaking in a modern vestry-meeting, at any rate.

In fact, all of them, except, possibly, the last few lines, were spoken by one St. Paul, who was himself a priest and bishop; and perhaps, like other clergymen, a "poor financier." The last passage may have been St. Paul's, or may have been written by Apollos—"preachers" both. They had no idea of the *hired man* theory. "Esteem them very highly in love, for their works' sake." Who thinks of loving his "hired men?" Let the priests "that rule well be accounted worthy of double honor." Hired men ruling? Honors for hired men? "Obey them?" Obey the hired man! "Submit yourselves" to hired men? Whatever this may be it is not "business." And are we to pay these men also? It seems so: "Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn. And the laborer is worthy of his reward." Are the monstrous notions to be crammed down the throats of "men of business," who pay *their own money* for what they want?

After all, is it not clear that men who put "business" first, and their personal likings second, or *vice versa*; that men who think their priest amenable to themselves, FORGETTING HIS DUTY TO GOD, TO THE CHURCH, to *his own conscience*, and to *their souls*—is it not clear, I say, that such men are but ill fitted to rule the Church of God, usurping the place of its lawful bishops and pastors.—C. A. Apple in the *Church Year*.

ACCORDING to the *Living Church Annual and Clergy List Quarterly* for September, 1887, just to hand from the "Young Churchman Co.", (Milwaukee), there are two Metropolitans and 17 Bishops in the Dominion and Newfoundland, and 1017 clergy. We suppose that notwithstanding the praise given us for our moderation and non-partizan attitude we can hardly hope that all the Clergy will become subscribers to and will aid in increasing the circulation of the GUARDIAN. But we think that about two-thirds of them are on our list. If each of these 678 clergy would do as one of their number in a small town in Ontario did, secure 25 additional subscribers, what an impetus it would give to our work! Nearly 18,000 new subscribers! But, if this is too much to hope for, would five new subscribers each not be possible? Even that small number would add nearly 3,500 additional names to our list. We are expending time, money and health in this work, and feel at times that the strain is too great, and need the sympathy and help to a still greater degree if all who desire to see Church teaching and Church principles disseminated through the land. And is there any surer method of achieving this than the weekly visit to the family of a sound Church paper. We notice that our contemporaries in the States ask and obtain this assistance. May we not hope for like favour? and the formation of a club in every parish and mission? Twenty copies to one address for one year for \$16 is surely low enough.

ACCORDING to the Parochial Statistics furnished in the last Synod Report of the Diocese of Niagara—its Church population numbers 22,712, which means at least 4,000 families. Others of the Dioceses will have probably a still larger number—few less. If, therefore, every Church family subscribed for a copy of the GUARDIAN we would have at least 20,000 subscribers in this Ecclesiastical Province alone. We sincerely wish it were so!

ANOTHER test that might be taken is that of Communicants. In the Diocese of Niagara [we take it because the Report is at hand] these number so far as reported, 4,642. Assuming an equally favorable showing in the other 7 Dioceses, there ought to be over 35,000 subscribers to the Church papers, for every communicant might be supposed to have interest enough in the Church to take a Church paper. We are quite sure that the whole circulation of the three general Church papers published in the Dominion is not one half of this number. It is this lack of interest on the part of the Laity of the Church in this and other matters that impedes her progress.

CORRESPONDENCE.

[The name of Correspondent must in all cases be enclosed with letter, but will not be published unless desired. The Editor will not hold himself responsible, however, for any opinions expressed by Correspondents.]

AN OBJECT WORTH LIVING FOR.

To the Editor of the CHURCH GUARDIAN:—

SIR,—I was much pleased by reading an article in your paper last week on this subject signed by Mrs. H. Gratton Guinness. In all our large centres of population there are many energetic, kindly cultivated women, whose light if not exactly hidden under a bushel is at all events much obscured through lack of a sphere in which to shine. I am not alluding to those on whose time and attention society lays its engrossing hand. Society women have a field of their own (useful enough in its way) on which it is not my intention to touch, but I am speaking of those who, for various reasons, do not go into society, and whose amusements consist for the most part in church socials, an evening with a friend, with perhaps an occasional concert. These young women are often liberally endowed by nature; they have leisure and sometimes money at their disposal; but unfortunately for themselves they have very little to do. The internal economy of the household occupies only a small portion of the day. Music art, literature and needle work frequently fail to meet the requirements of the case, and I am sure that these young women (who are generally ladies in the best sense of the word) would gladly listen to any one who would really give them an object worth living for. I know there are obstacles, for it has been truly said that "birds of a feather flock together," and educated and well to do people have a tendency to congregate in streets and rooms in precisely the same way that the less fortunate classes almost invariably do.

In the city in which I live, no two residents could be more than three miles apart, and this distance, although it does not seem much to those accustomed to European capitals, becomes a practical difficulty when the ladies are not good walkers, and the street cars do not run conveniently. Still I think that a few women of organizing ability could devise a plan of utilizing the material lying in our midst. The larger the city, the larger would the number of workers be, and the larger the field of work.

In old London, soup kitchens and penny breakfasts are managed almost exclusively by women of leisure, and they are often made partially self-supporting. In this country we have not the masses of poverty and pauperism they have in England, still we have enough to supply an ample sphere of usefulness for Canadian women of leisure, and I believe that all they need is to be told what to do and how to do it, in order for them to show the plentitude of enterprise and resource that Anglo-Saxons on this continent have so splendidly developed.

ENGLISHWOMAN,