

clear arguments? Might it not too often be said, in our local disputes (as was said by the apostle of some of the early converts) "Having swerved, they have turned aside into vain jangling, desiring to be teachers of the law, understanding neither what they say nor whereof they affirm? Now the end of the commandment is charity, out of a pure heart and of a good conscience and of faith unfeigned" (1 Tim. i. 5-7.) Beloved let every man amongst us, whatever be his calling in the church, whether pastor, warden, vestryman or pewholder, consider that his very prominence in the congregation binds him to observe the law of love. Let the layman, as he acts in vestry, bear in mind the old and sick and their needs, the poor and the afflicted and their pressing wants, the young and ignorant and their necessities. Let the layman remember that a clergyman is often more to such as these than he is to the prosperous man in his vigor and social power. Let the layman visit the parish or mission as friend and consoler, before he deals in vestry with a pastor, then he will be in a position to act wisely and to avoid mistakes, which may cause him lifelong regret; and let the pastor be courteous and conciliatory with those of the flock who cannot appreciate the efforts made on their behalf, or who will not understand the course of action. Beloved, be slow to impute motives or imagine affronts. You of the clergy are or ought to be more strong in spirit than those who have not been called to the ministry; and it ought to be your first duty to show an example to the church of those virtues—peace, courtesy, and good will, which are classed amongst the fruits of the spirit. There is verily a fault amongst us, that we hear so much about disorderly vestries, dissatisfied congregations and self-willed clergymen (and even read about these things in the public prints.) I must add that in many cases these troubles arise, in the first instance, from some small misunderstanding, which no one is patient enough, or clear-headed enough, or self-denying enough, to put right. Then magnified by pride or suspicion, extended and distributed by gossip and confirmed by obstinacy the misunderstanding becomes a wide-spread and fatal quarrel. Of course men must differ in opinion; we are not alike in form, taste or habit, but we may and ought to be alike in the exercise of charity, forbearance and Christian courtesy. We ought to be alike in the happy possession of a power of forgiveness, of a noble unselfishness, of a conduct worthy our high calling in Christ Jesus, worthy of those in whom the spirit of God is pleased to dwell. "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption."

You are fully aware that no body of people, as a body, rises mentally and morally above the level of the teacher. Well, many a man placed in the responsible position of pastor to a congregation, is so weighed down by a sense of his responsibility, that health and strength give way and he is ready to cry with the prophet "Now let me die, for I am not better than my fathers." The reason is, the pastor's office is one requiring great experience and sympathy as well as grace, so much more than can possibly be acquired within college walls, or indeed learned at all before years have given patience and strength, that I have tried with more or less success to attach our students and college graduates to some of the older and larger missions, ordaining them to work under older and tried clergymen. It is true the clergy [old and young] like their independence, and do all they can to promote the establishment of isolated and separate missions, while the people on their part prefer the individual services of a clergyman. The motives of all are good. I do not object to the independence which comes of the one, nor the regular services and frequent visitations which result from the other. But I do desire for our young clergymen lessons of obedience: I want them to learn to obey before they are called on to command. I want them to have some experience before they are required to assume responsibility. They are soldiers of the cross, and while they are brave, they must not be rash, while they are loyal and true they must not be headstrong. Our people ought to be served by men experienced in life, experienced in its de-

mands, its failures, its successes. Men able to advise and guide; able to comfort and sustain; such men are not common, and if they were, I have not means at command to induce them to give their services in this diocese.

We have good men amongst us, doing their work unto the Lord, some of them, in the remote corners of our vineyard where their usefulness is not so apparent to the church as it would be in parts more thickly inhabited. And it is my constant regret that these pioneers in our missionary army do not receive remuneration in any way adequate to their services. Indeed I think it right to call your attention to the fact that whereas some bishops can offer their missionary clergy \$800 per annum, our Mission Board contents itself with \$600. This does not seem quite fair to our own men, and it is not surprising that resignations, and removals to other dioceses, are not uncommon. I sorely need help here. I should feel personally benefited by a very frank and deliberate discussion of this matter of clergymen's stipends. Are we to rise or fall as a church? Are we to induce our most capable young men to take orders, [when so disposed] by assuring them of a maintenance? Or are we to comport ourselves so grudgingly that we belittle the office of the priest by the money value we put upon it? A hearty, earnest discussion might lead to more hopeful things, and if it did not result in larger collections it might at least direct a wiser expenditure. You know the proverb "Half a loaf is better than no bread"; but proverbs may deceive; half a loaf diet may end in atrophy.

(Continued on page 12.)

#### DIOCESE OF ONTARIO.

HAMILTON.—The Rev. Dr. Mockridge has been asked to be one of the "selected speakers" at the American Church Congress, to be held in New Haven, in October next.

The Synod resumed on the 11th inst., at three o'clock.

The scrutineers reported the following as the lay representatives to the Provincial Synod: Messrs. J. A. Henderson, A. J. Matheson, R. V. Rogers, R. T. Walkem, J. Reynolds, S. Keifer, H. Hartney, Dr. W. Wilson, Judge Macdonald, Hon. G. A. Kirkpatrick, E. H. Whitmarsh. Substitutes, D. Collins, J. B. McGuire, Judge Carman, E. H. Smythe, D. F. Jones, Judge Sinclair.

Members of Mission Board (lay): J. Reynolds, A. J. Matheson, E. H. Smythe, H. Hartney, Hon. George A. Kirkpatrick, J. B. McGuire, John Wilmot.

Clerical Delegates: Revs. Bogart, Lauder, Burke, Jones, Lewin, E. P. Crawford, Spencer, Baker, Pettit, Nesbitt, Carey and White. Substitutes, Revs. Low, Hannington, Emory, Jones, Lewis and Austin.

The clerical members of the Mission Board are: Revs. Nesbitt, Burke, Baker, White, Crawford, Bogart, Grout and Prime. The Bishop's nominees to the Mission Board were the same as last year.

Mr. R. T. Walkem moved: "That it is expedient that the subject of the appointment of clergymen to, and their removal from, parishes in this Diocese should be considered by the Synod, with the view of giving the laity some voice in such appointment and removal, and that a committee be appointed to consider the matter and report at next session of the Synod."

He said it was fair that the matter should be considered by a committee, and he presented it for the purpose of securing harmony between the three orders, the Bishop, the clergy and the laity. In Huron, Niagara, Toronto, Montreal, Quebec, Fredericton and Nova Scotia dioceses there was a recognized right of consultation with the laity in making appointments. It was the desire of the laity to have a settlement of the question as to their rights in the appointments. In the past there had been collisions because of the appointment of persons who were not desired by the people. This should not be, as it caused scandal to fall upon the Church. He held that all orders

should be responsible for the appointment of clergymen. He was not willing to have popular elections, but elections which were secured through the assistance of Bishop, clergy and laity. The committee suggested to consider the matter consisted of Revs. Messrs. Pettit, Lewis, K. L. Jones, Grout, White, Wright and Hannington; Messrs. Walkem, Gildersleeve, Courbie, McDonale, Reynolds, Dunnet and Dr. Wilson.

Mr. James Reynolds seconded the motion.

Rev. T. Bousfield went in for one understood system of appointment. He intimated that the Bishop had been influenced in not making appointments according to primitive custom. He objected to the introduction of strangers into the Diocese, and supported the appointment of ministers in order of seniority, qualifications being considered.

Mr. C. F. Gildersleeve wanted to know the position of the clergy on the question. The laity were anxious about the question of patronage, and it would be very undesirable if the clergy considered the matter as of no value. If the laity were taken into the clergy's confidence, there would be greater support given to them.

Rev. Canon Pettit pointed out that in the Diocese there was great unity, and it did not exist in other dioceses where the system of consulting the laity obtained.

The vote was taken amidst great interest, the clergy showing eagerness for a vote, and the laity equal eagerness for a discussion. After an attempt at explanations, which was not well received, the roll was called. The clergy, almost as a body, voted nay—59 to 8. The lay vote by parishes was more overwhelmingly on the other side—20 yeas to 2 nays.

The report of the finance committee recommended the same assessment of parishes as that of last year. The additions were St. Peter's, Brockville, \$15; St. Paul's, Brockville, \$8; Cornwall, \$15; Deseronto, \$5; St. James', Kingston, \$12; Christ Church, Ottawa, \$21; St. George's, Ottawa, \$24. The arrears of Lombardy and North Frontenac were struck off. Kingston, St. George's, was advanced to \$50; Belleville, St. Thomas', to \$30; Belleville, Christ Church, \$15; Brockville, Trinity, \$8. The report was then adopted.

The report of the committee on deaths was made. The Bishop was asked to appoint a standing committee, which in future would report on the deaths of members of Synod. The report was adopted.

A canon was passed, appointing meetings of the standing committees of synod in May and November, on or next after the 18th of each month; the Board of Missions to meet on Wednesday of each week aforesaid, and have precedence; special meetings of any committee to be summoned by the Bishop at his discretion, and at such time and place as he shall direct; the mover of resolutions with reference to which any provisional committee has been appointed to be deemed to be the chairman of such committee until other provision were made.

Rev. Rural Dean Lewis withdrew his motion to appoint a committee to consider the question of patronage.

The balance of the afternoon was spent in confirming canons passed at previous sessions.

#### FRIDAY MORNING'S SESSION.

Synod resumed at 10 o'clock.

The reports of the treasurer, registrar, statistical committee and mission boards were presented.

A discussion occurred regarding the grants to missions, particularly that to Eganville. Rev. Mr. Prime spoke of the dissatisfaction felt among the laity regarding the reductions, and which led to a disinclination to subscribe. He suggested that there should be no reductions except after a certain time. This would give encouragement to the clergymen to work up the diocese. Rev. J. J. Bogart said that the missionary board could not make bricks without straw. The board had only a limited amount to bestow and they could not go into debt.

Archdeacon Lauder said that in many parishes no substantial aid had been given to the mission board, and in increasing and helping them they