

ing (not with prying curiosity, but with kindly interest) into their circumstances of family difficulty, their temporal wants, habits of living, and connections (if among the poor) with their masters and neighbours. Prudent advice may here be given to the heads of families on the management of their expenses, the education and government of their children, family worship and instruction and whatever else makes up their little world. Christian instruction may be grafted upon these particulars, such as could not enter into our pulpit ministrations with sufficient distinctness for practical utility."—*Christian Ministry*, p. 356.

(To be continued.)

Correspondence.

LAY HELP.

(To the Editor of the Church Guardian.)

SIR,—In all the discussions relative to licensed or ordained readers, or even permanent deacons, taken from among the people and appointed to minister to some congregations where help is needed in the missions where they reside, it seems to me that this fact is lost sight of: *the people will not have them.* They want regular clergy or none at all. They care not for one of their neighbours, for one with whom they trade or with whom, perhaps, they labour, to rise and preach on Sunday to them; they will not in any usual numbers attend the ministrations of such. This the clergy have already found, and I believe it is that reason more than anything else that has rendered the canon on the Permanent Diaconate inoperative. Allusion is often made to the institution of local preachers among the Methodists. Doubtless that institution did a great deal for Methodism in England, but the reason of its success there is probably more a social one than ecclesiastical or religious. In this country my observation in town and country leads me to say that "local preachers" are not popular even among the Methodists. Where any of their "fields" or "circuits" or parts thereof are left to "locals," there you will find Methodism dying. It does not strengthen at least by its "locals," as their lay preachers are elliptically called. "Oh, it is only a 'local' we have to day," is an expression I have frequently heard, and heard uttered contemptuously, or at least not very respectfully. I can understand their success in England or anywhere else where the clergy keep themselves apart and aloof from the people, where they have thought more of their birth and breeding as gentlemen than of their "calling and election" as priests of the Most High God. In such places the "masses" will flock around one who can bring religion home to them in tones and words that show sympathy with and an understanding of their wants and ways. Why is it that in the Province of Ontario the Church, notwithstanding her prestige, her priority in the land, her culture and her endowments, has lost, while Methodism and other "isms" have gained? May not the cause be found in this, that with the Upper Canada clergy there has been a "stand-off-I-am better than-you" attitude in their ministrations among the people? Is it not that they have been prone to receive a wealthy parishioner through the front door and relegated the poorer to the back one and the kitchen? Think you not that these people who find the Rector or Incumbent sending them to the back door, and who, when by chance, trade or friendship they find themselves introduced to the Methodist preacher through his front door and, it may be, into his parlor, will not be considerably influenced in his favor and towards his teaching by this act alone? I *know* they are—I do not *think* it. Back stair influence we, the clergy, do not like in the administration of affairs, ecclesiastical or political, neither do our poorer or humbler parishioners like the "back door" policy in favour in some parishes in the West.

WM. ROSS BROWN.

Diocese of Montreal.

MISTAKES OF SCIENTIFIC MEN.

(To the Editor of the Church Guardian.)

SIR,—“When you have a poor cause, abuse your adversary,” is said to be a legal maxim. Does it explain the animus shown in your article under the above heading, August 30th, wherein you use the

terms “sickening pretence,” “self-conceit?” Are you ready to quote from your own reading *ipsissima verba* of recognized authorities among scientific men that call for such animadversion? Have you stopped to distinguish between the data they offer as facts, proved they believe by careful observation, and the deductions drawn from the facts offered? Have you kept in mind that there are writers who out-darwin Darwin, who have taken up science as a profession, and who desire notoriety at any cost, truth or no truth? And have you distinguished their brayings from the deductions or suggested inferences of conscientious seekers after knowledge? Have you forgotten that there have been men who have similarly taken up religion and made the Church a profession for a livelihood or to gain notoriety? If there have been changes in the course of years in the deductions of scientific men, have there not been changes also in religious forms and practices *say* since the days of St. Juniper? What is the object of your editorial? Do you wish your readers to believe that the modest study of science should be discarded because the pathway has not been traversed in straight lines, and to ignore the misdirected zeal of some votaries that have at times swerved aside the course of true religious belief.

If you can lay bare weak points in some “scientific” conclusion, cannot they be matched by the ignorant assumption on the part of teachers nominally Christian? *e.g.* those who point to the shells on Ararat as proof positive of the universality of the deluge, or who in second-hand stage tones thunder out, “He who believes not that Balaam’s ass spoke *with man’s voice* is no Christian, and can never hope for eternal life.”

Would it not be better if religious papers adopted a more moderate tone, advised rather caution in acceptance or rejection of the dicta of modern science, than by the very violence of their denunciations, make it seem that they feared for the very ground of their belief. Man may and does unintentionally err at times when forming deductions based on incomplete data, but science must be the handmaid to true religion, and only the bigot and fanatic can fear the most searching enquiry into nature’s laws.

Yours truly, H. S. POOLE.

CENTRAL BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS.

(To the Editor of the Church Guardian.)

SIR,—An enquiry was made in your paper as to what was being done by the Central Board of Domestic and Foreign Missions. As regards the Central Board of Foreign Missions, we can report that we have suggested a plan for work and have entered into a great deal of correspondence with the different dioceses. We have proposed India as the sphere of work. There the great heathen religions of the world are represented in large numbers; there we are under the protection of our own empire, and there we are training missionaries better fitted for reaching those eastern populations than Europeans. We proposed that the four Dioceses not receiving aid from the S.P.G. should send their contributions through the Central Board to the Metropolitan of India, to be employed as the Church authorities advise, and that reports should be sent to us of their mission work; and that the four Dioceses receiving aid from the S.P.G. should send their contributions through the Central Board to the S.P.G., to be applied by them to their work in India, concerning which also we should receive reports—these reports to be circulated through the Province.

In the Protestant Episcopal Church the Dioceses send their contributions to the Central Board, and the fund is administered by it. In the Church of England it is done by societies. Hitherto in Canada the Dioceses receiving aid from the S.P.G. have sent contributions to it, although many parishes have taken special objects in the mission field. The Dioceses not receiving aid from the S.P.G. have applied their money for foreign missions variously; some include in foreign missions Algoma and the North West.

The Central Board is awaiting the action of the Dioceses. The Foreign Mission work of the Church is most important to its every interest, whether of the Diocese, of the Parish or of the newest Mission.

It appeals to people in our poorest Missions to make every effort to help themselves that the mis-

sion fund of the Church may extend as far as possible; it appeals to the richest Parish and says: “Restrain as much as possible your expenses, that you may do great things in the evangelization of the world”; to the Diocese it says: “Frame all your plans to take part in the work of the Great Catholic Church. There are many of our Missions in which if one-tenth of the income of its members was given they would be self-sustaining”; and the same rule applied to our wealthy city churches would yield a large revenue for the great mission field, and would awaken new life in the Church. We hope that the mind of the Church may be so instructed on the mission work of the world that at the next meeting of the Provincial Synod a more united and decided action may be taken.

Yours truly,

R. LINDSAY,

Chairman of the Central Board
of Foreign Missions.

RELIGIOUS ENTERTAINMENTS, ETC.

(To the Editor of the Church Guardian.)

SIR,—There must be something exceedingly defective in our organization when we are obliged to keep the life in our churches by public entertainments, teas, concerts, oyster suppers, &c. We can scarcely take up a paper without seeing the announcement of some entertainment about to take place for religious purposes, which purposes, in nine cases out of ten, mean supplementing the clergyman’s salary and saving the pockets of Church members by gathering the stray cents of those who do not belong to us—schismatics, infidels or heretics. It is not difficult to select cases where an expenditure of *five-sixths* of the proceeds have been devoted to accommodation, hands, supper, etc., and *one-sixth* for the “good object” for which the affair was promoted. The moral to be drawn from this is one directly opposed to the Scripture rule of giving. Self-denial is one of the great Christian obligations, but here we find a whole community willing to throw themselves into a “get up” ostensibly to benefit religion when it is virtually to satisfy the craving after excitement and the gratification of self-indulgence; and we are gradually drifting from “bad to worse”; we are not only recognizing these entertainments as part of Church machinery, but we are making provision for their permanency by the erection of churches with basement rooms or church halls, devoted exclusively to attractive gatherings to add to the pecuniary resources of the religious community.

There are many good Church people who not only countenance this state of things but ally themselves to it because it adds to the “funds.” But, after all, is it not educating our young people in questionable methods for collecting offerings for God’s Church, and extinguishing that true spirit which should actuate us in all our charities—a love for its object, a self-denial to enable us to afford our help, a laying up in store upon the first day of the week? No one will gainsay the importance of teaching our people the solemn obligation which rests upon them to contribute towards the maintenance of their religion and the true motive for giving. St. Paul’s Epistles furnish the broad principle which should actuate Christians in their gifts. They are Christ’s disciples, children, followers, worshippers, beneficiaries of His outpoured love, and that love should make them give to His service freely, gladly, generously; and that is the spirit we should inculcate in our children.

Unless a great effort is put forth by the clergy to check this growing evil, aided by the efforts of devout members of the Church, we can scarcely look forward to obtaining that stability and firmness in Church principles for which we daily pray, or to a generation to follow us, which will or can appreciate the motive of giving from love. If the principle which actuated King David in his offerings were to furnish the Church’s needs now—not to offer unto God that which costs us nothing—we might entertain just apprehensions as to the Church’s future. But we have ourselves to blame; we too readily acquiesce in any proposition which is calculated to meet the pecuniary demands upon our congregations, and seldom weigh the evil results which must follow a departure from the Bible rule of giving. And yet with these facts constantly