

ing a number of schedules was approved, of which the most favorable is schedule "A," which includes those parishes which are to receive a grant for ten years; \$200 for the first three years, reduced by \$25 every subsequent year, thus leaving the grant of the tenth year only \$25. To say the least, this is too mechanical an arrangement. For in the course of ten years, some parishes may be much worse off financially than they are now, while others may improve much more rapidly, from removals and other causes. But the great objection to the arrangement is one of principle. It is a heavy blow on this By-law which is working so well; and we think it would have been much better not to reduce the grant but to increase the contribution required from the parish—that increased contribution being added either to the guarantee, or better still, to the parochial collection sent from the parish. Some may imagine that this would practically amount to the same thing. We reply that it would not; for it would lead the parishes to contribute more than formerly to the church's funds. And there are some parishes, both old and new ones, on which the greatest strain ought to be attempted in order to make their parochial contribution to the Mission Fund nearly or quite as large as the grant their clergyman receives from it.

In this way the principle of the By-law would be preserved, its advantages would be extended to the greatest number of parishes and clergymen, and an immense improvement in the regular payment of stipends and, as a consequence, in the efficiency of the Church's work, would be the result. From correspondence we have recently received, we find it is the general impression that if the alterations proposed last year are to be carried out, many of the Church missions in the backwoods of the Diocese of Toronto will collapse. One of our correspondents suggests that: "If the venerable societies, the S. P. G. and the S. P. C. K. would contribute but £100 a year to the Diocese of Toronto, it would give confidence and strength to three backwoods' missions;" and he adds: "The backwoods ought to be the nursery of the Church, continually bringing new blood, and increasing in wealth. Unless something be done, the result will be that these outposts will wither and fall, and the Church will consist of a few plethoric congregations, presided over by 'people-ridden priests,' or the clergy will have to revert to the old practice and injunction—'labouring night and day because they would not be chargeable unto any of you, we preached unto you the Gospel of God.' 'Provide neither silver nor gold, nor brass for your purses, nor scrip for your journey.' As to any application to the Societies our correspondent refers to, the time has doubtless gone by when any application from the Diocese of Toronto either could or would be made to them. We told them long ago, what was an undoubted fact, that we were able, if not willing, to support our own Missions. And there can be no question that our Church population is abundantly wealthy enough for this purpose. We feel inclined to say that, only let our people

contribute as liberally as we find other religious bodies do, and all our claims would be met. On this point, however, we should perhaps have expressed ourselves more strongly, had we not met, a day or two ago, in one of our Toronto dailies the following paragraph, which contains some alarming statements in reference to the denomination referred to:

"At the New York Methodist ministers' meeting, on Monday, Dr. Curry said: 'We are coming to shipwreck. Many of our charities have been abandoned; the old people die out, and the young go elsewhere. We want money. The terrible taxes of the Church weigh on Methodism like a nightmare. There are six churches near where I sleep, in the upper part of the city, that have less than a hundred members each, and all are badly in debt.' Mr. Graves said there were 'at least six churches in Brooklyn that have congregations of less than a hundred, and that it would be a blessing if they could be shut up, for the six efficient ministers were wasting.' Dr. Kettle remarked that 'there is no vital power, no influence on society by Methodism now as there was twenty-five years ago.'"

From this statement we find that we are not by any means alone in the neglect and apathy with which the institutions of religious worship are treated. We derive no comfort, however, from this; and we trust our people will not take example from so untoward a state of things. We have a religious ancestry which can boast of an apostolic origin; we have a system of worship of equal antiquity; and our duties and obligations are so much the greater to extend the advantages we possess as widely as possible, especially among the newly settled parts of our own Dominion.

SPECIAL APPEAL.

APSLEY is a Mission in the Diocese of Toronto, comprising 300 square miles, with a population of about 1,000. "The only certain stipend for the clergyman is about £47, with an unfinished church and no parsonage. There is a property which can be bought and put in repair as a parsonage for £150, and £30 will finish the church," and for these an urgent appeal has been made by the incumbent, the Rev. Philip Harding, to the Church in England. We are rather inclined to fear that the appeal will not meet with the desired success in the Mother Country, for the reason given in another article. It will probably be said there that the Diocese of Toronto is very well able to take care of itself; and we imagine that the allegation cannot well be denied. So much the more necessary is it, therefore, that those among us who have the interest of the Church at heart should bestir themselves, and aid in planting the standard of the Cross in the newly settled districts, where as yet no other standard has been raised.

HOW CAN WE BEST SERVE THE CHURCH?

IT is scarcely credible that any one joining a society organized by human means would not do all in his power to promote its success. If it were a Lodge or a Brotherhood, he would regularly attend its meetings, take an active part in its deliberations, contribute to its funds, and in every way possible would lend his influence, time, and talents

with a view to maintain its *status*. A special gathering called together for the discussion of important matters connected with its welfare and prosperity—a "social" held for the diversion and enjoyment of its members—a pic-nic, or an excursion—all these would receive his best attention. Business would not then interfere with the great object of his desires—family arrangements would be made subservient to pleasure, and even the weather would not baffle him in taking, perhaps, a prominent part in the proceedings inaugurated by the society which he represents, and of which he is a sworn member. Perchance he may be a *churchman*, or professing to be one—we will at least suppose him to be one—ingrafted once in his infancy into the Church of Christ by the regenerating waters of Holy Baptism—taught to follow with lisping lips a mother's recital of child-like prayer—trained from childhood to "go up with his parents to the Temple," for public worship, and finally receiving the rite of confirmation at the hands of his Bishop, at the same time "with his own mouth and consent, openly before the church," ratifying and confirming the vows and promises once made by his godfathers and godmothers in his behalf.

We will suppose all this to have happened. We will take it for granted that such a person, as we have said, is a *churchman*. He, probably, attends the services of the Sunday, and oftentimes is absent, if any thing more exciting engages his attention. The cares of life, the fluctuating success of business, visits from friends, or a feeling of apathy for which no cause can be assigned, may, perhaps, divert his mind from holy things, and by degrees he finds his early training, his solemn vows, his duty as a *churchman*, all vanishing beneath the veil of indifference.

This is but an instance of the state of many, too many amongst us. Hundreds are there who ignore their privileges as churchmen, and forget to ask themselves the question, "How can we best serve the church?" Some may affirm that they "give alms of what they possess" on Sunday; others may point out that, as far as their circumstances permit, they relieve the poor and needy, and contribute to their minister's stipend. But surely they are far from performing their duty. The Pharisees of old did this and more, and still they were reprov'd for their outward appearances.

Professing churchmen are daily standing idle, and saying, "No man hath hired us." The great work of the vineyard is open to them, and however humble the individual, however weak their efforts, the Divine Husbandman has work for all. To inquiring minds, then, as to "how we can best serve the church," we would point out many modes in which they can benefit the church and thereby do honour to God. And these may be summed up under two heads—Internal assistance and External influence.

1. By *internal assistance* we mean those personal acts by which we diffuse life and vitality into the services of the church, and otherwise labour for Her good. What greater pleasure can there be than training the lambs of Christ's flock in Divine truths at the Sunday-school, in unfolding to their young minds the