

a society was formed and officers appointed. In choosing a name it was felt that nothing expressed the principles of the society so well as the term "Anti-Treating," and, therefore, that title was chosen. A literary society being already in existence, the two were amalgamated under the name of the "All Saint's Anti-Treating and Literary Society." At the meetings, which are, in this case, held fortnightly, various questions are debated, and occasionally, by way of variety, a short entertainment, consisting of music and readings, is given. I mention this to shew how meetings of such societies, in case no business is on hand, may be made pleasant for those attending them. Already we hear of similar associations being organised outside the city—one of them being spoken of in your last week's Algoma correspondence—and so we feel encouraged to persist in our endeavours to promote the growth of what we feel to be a good thing. Many clergymen of the diocese would, no doubt, be able to organise societies in their parishes by taking a little trouble and speaking to some of their people, and though it is well to have the pastor as president, still, if his duties will not allow of this, there is no reason why laymen, young and old, should not take the matter in hand and bring it speedily to a successful issue. Plenty of fathers, whose sons are about leaving home to push for themselves in town or city, would be very glad to know that their boys were shielded from so common a temptation as that "Come and take a drink;" and although a boy's vows to his God through his church ought to be strong enough to keep him from the snare, yet it may prove useful to have some, as it were, supplementary aids. The dangers of the treating system are so well known, and so widely acknowledged, that it is unnecessary to touch upon them here; so hoping soon to hear of the formation of new kindred societies, I am yours very truly,

C. J. AGAR,

Sec. All Saints A. T. & L. Soc.  
Toronto, March 19th, 1878.

## STIPENDS OF MISSIONARIES.

DEAR MR. EDITOR,—A great many communications have appeared in your columns respecting the Mission Fund of the Diocese of Ontario. Such discussions are on the whole calculated to do some good; but there is a subject of great importance to every missionary in this Diocese which has not yet been touched upon, I refer to the stipends of the missionaries irrespective of the grants from the Mission Fund.

As things exist at present the stipends of the missionaries derivable from their people are very irregularly paid, a great percentage in many cases not paid at all; and the stipends of our missionaries are not so handsome as to make little difference whether they are paid or not. Much anxiety has to be undergone, occasioned by the irregular payment or non-payment of our stipends. The missionary cannot ask for his dues, for if he did, he would be immediately looked upon as one who had more care for his own comfort and pleasure than for the souls under his charge. He has to wait, and patiently wait, until various members of his congregation feel inclined to remit to the church wardens their often small subscriptions towards the support of their pastor, sometimes they will tell you they are too hard up to pay their subscription this year, and proffer a bushel or two of oats or a cord of wood instead. Is it not the case, that the last debt many think of paying is the debt they owe to God and the Church? Now, Mr. Editor, I think this very unsatisfactory state of things could be avoided. Why could not this Diocese adopt the plan in use in the Toronto Diocese, and also in that of Niagara, of having each mission assessed for a certain amount and that amount paid in quarterly or half yearly to the Treasurer of the Diocese and by him paid out to the missionaries? Then the people would feel more bound to meet their payments, and the clergy would feel at liberty to urge them to do so. And in case there might be a deficit from any cause, such deficit could be made up in other ways, or if not, the church should be ordered to be closed, as in the Diocese of Niagara, until such time as the assessment was fully met. The system of the subscription list works far from well in many cases, and little or no efforts are made to

pay arrears of salary. The missionary must do without. Would not things be greatly improved by such a scheme as is briefly sketched above? I think they would. And at the same time much care and anxiety respecting their means of livelihood would be taken off the shoulders of many of the parochial clergy, for now they are utterly unable to tell what will be the amount of their stipend for any one year. Hoping that some one better qualified will take up this matter,

I am, yours truly,

ONTARIO.

## THE METROPOLITAN.

SIR,—If the telegrams are correct which state that Bishop Oxenden is about to resign the office of Metropolitan, permit me to point out that it would be a graceful act to make the *oldest colonial diocese*, the Metropolitan see for the next turn, and an abler administrator cannot be found, I feel sure, than the present admirable bishop who now rules.

NOVA SCOTIA.

## ORTHODOX AND EVANGELICAL.

DEAR SIR,—As a member of the Evangelical party in the Anglican Church, who has always supported your paper on the ground that it is a "church" and not a "party" organ, I must protest against the language of your article in your last issue on "union and re-union" as calculated to create party feeling, and to drive those, evangelicals who like myself, are unwilling to join the church or support a party paper further from their High Church brethren. The passage I complain of is this—"according to their notions (i. e., their notions of dissenting) it would be, to many, like going back to the carnal elements of a lower dispensation to connect themselves either with the *Evangelical* or with the *Orthodox* section of the church." Now is it fair or just to thus stigmatise the Evangelical party as heterodox? I hold every clergyman Orthodox who ex-animo subscribes to the articles, and adheres to the rubric of the Church. I have to learn that I am unorthodox, because I hold and preach Augustinian doctrine, and may not hold as extreme views as to the Sacraments and the Priesthood as others hold. There have always been the two great parties in the church. It has been broad enough to contain an Andrewes and a Beveridge, and is now wide enough to contain a Pusey and a McNeil, a Liddon and a Ryle. I glory in this comprehensiveness—These two parties alike protest against the semi-infidelity of the Latitudinarian or broad party, are heartily agreed on all the *grand fundamentals* of our faith.—To call either party heterodox, would be to reduce our church to the narrow confines of a *sect*. If union between these two great parties is ever to be effected, (and with their union alone will the growing infidelity of the age be checked) it will not be by either party abusing the other. Instead of widening the branch let us acknowledge that which is good in each and so strive to heal it. Let us not be too narrow, if you prefer some doubtful expressions in the formularies, and I prefer to take the articles in their plain and grammatical interpretation, while we both accept both the articles and formularies, let us remember "we are brethren" sons of the same mother, and strive to live in unity. While High and Low Evangelical and Sacramentarian are squabbling, the enemy is gaining ground. The Kingsley, Stanley, Maurice, Hampden, Tait, Colenso and Farrar school taking advantage of our discussion are progressing. Let us unite on the common ground of scriptural truth, and fight against our common foe, and then as loyal churchmen agreed on fundamentals, but differing in circumstantialia, our minor differences will sink into insignificance and we shall be drawn closer together by opposition to our common foe. Yours faithfully,

A COUNTRY CURATE.

[Our friend does not appear to be aware that, some time ago, the terms "orthodox" and "evangelical" were used technically to distinguish the two principal schools of thought in the church. We used them only in that way, in order to avoid as much as possible the objectionable terms, "high" and "low church," not intending to attribute want of orthodoxy to those who style themselves *evangelical*

any more than to attribute the want of Evangelical teaching to the other section. We quite agree with "A Country Curate" as to the fact that Latitudinarianism is the great and the common foe of the church at the present time.—Ed.]

## THE MISSION FUND OF THE DIOCESE OF MONTREAL.

SIR,—The circular letter of the 28th inst., which has been addressed to each clergyman in the diocese by C. J. Bridges, Treasurer of the Mission Fund, has caused alarm and sorrow to many true friends of the Church, and should reproach and shame all who have not given according to their ability. From that circular which I heard read in church last Sunday, I learned three very grave facts:—

1st.—That the Mission Fund is now overdrawn about \$5,200.

2nd.—That the only available income to meet this large deficiency is the draft from the English S. P. G., which will produce about \$1,680—leaving a balance unprovided for of \$3,520,—and that the salaries of the clergy are due on the 1st of April next, which, if the Treasurer could not pay, would increase the debt to \$8,500.

3rd.—That unless the congregations throughout the diocese make an effort and put the Treasurer in funds before the 1st April he will be unable to pay the salaries then due.

This statement, that the Treasurer has been compelled to make, discredits the Church, and disgraces her members before the world; and it is intolerably unjust to the clergy who can barely live on their miserable pittance of salary even when paid to them regularly.

The church has now reached a perilous crisis, from which it is the duty of her members to rescue her promptly, by contributing of the means providence has given to them, and thus enable the Treasurer to pay her Ministers their stipends; and our Bishop and the ruling church body should abandon the present precarious system of paying the clergy, and immediately devise some plan upon a surer and more permanent basis, that would stop this annual chronic deficit and restore confidence in the future. There should be no more trifling with this important subject; the Synod and Executive Committee must cease the shilly-shallying of past years and referring it from one to the other, and instead, take it up earnestly for settlement by wise legislation. No more important question can engage their attention, involving as it does the very existence of our beloved Church in this Diocese, and churchmen who now contribute to rescue her from peril, will have have a right to expect, that those in authority will find some wise solution of the difficulty and adopt precautionary measures for the future. In the meantime as, "In the multitude of Counsellors there is wisdom," would it not be expedient, if any friend has a well considered plan, to communicate it to the Executive Committee for their approval.

I am afraid, past experience demonstrates that missionary meetings and circular letters have utterly failed to induce people to support the Mission Fund. The latest efforts that way, were the missionary meetings held in Montreal city parishes, and although the Bishop preached, and both he and many of our best speakers, Lay and Clerical, advocated the urgent need of this Fund to immediate assistance, the responses was very discouraging. I may say, that financially it was a miserable failure, and now two months later, the Treasurer tells the clergy that the Mission Fund is Insolvent, and that he cannot pay them their stipends when due. If any further evidence is necessary, I refer your readers to the humiliating statement made by the Treasurer in his pamphlet of the 11th of January instant, "that the congregation of St. Martin's Church, which is one of the wealthiest in Montreal, contributed but \$207.44 to the Fund for the year 1876." I know there is much difficulty in devising any plan satisfactory to the church and acceptable to her members, that will secure an adequate support for the clergy, and I have often thought they should teach more prominently that "a system of giving in proportion to the means God has given to them" is required from her members, and that the system of "Giving" should be en-