

make our
1, 5, 10,"
J.

DIocese

certainly
esting the
and for
as some
that he
seem to
interest of
say a few
precedent,
venerals of
the funds

ynod Re-
g thus:
us lately,
t Invest-
mentance
he italics
city for
at aid is
at it was
estion of
d was to
mission-
Society
attention
decrease
quently
eleven
not the
he defi-
B. was
und the
lance it
al year.
of the
"The
formed.
t \$500
monies
d have
to Mis-
Mervin,
R. L.
ease it
sunday
balance
l to the
of the
Synod
hat the
ntation
ce, and
ections
land
Bishop
seem to
st, but
582.70
e Rev.
llected
is to
as not
these
when
The
ess of
ion to
I left
Board
nd in
e add
les as
Board
unds,
at the
est to
was
ount-
terest
rol of
if he
who
be be-
arties

DEAR MR. EDITOR:—There is never time, at Synod, to discuss the report of the Mission Board, so fully as the subject deserves, and the discussion which is now going on in your columns can hardly fail to do good. Allow me to add my contribution to what has already been said.

I cannot agree with the Rev. R. Lewis that the classification scheme was worked well. On the contrary I think it has worked very badly, and that if its promoters had set themselves to work to invent a machine to harass and annoy the Diocese, they could not have succeeded better. I think moreover that the Bishop deserves the gratitude of the missionary clergy in having given it a blow, which will either kill it, or produce such a healthy agitation as must cure it of its many defects.

I would not, however, be understood, in writing this way, to blame those who conceived the idea of classification. The old plan of granting \$200 to every mission, without regard to its poverty or riches, was certainly very unsatisfactory, and when the classification scheme was introduced it naturally commended itself to the good sense of the Synod. It has, however, been tried and found wanting, and yet it would be unjust to condemn it altogether. Its defects seem to be not so much in principle as in practice.

The principle of helping a mission until it attains the position of a self-supporting parish, and of withdrawing help gradually, thus teaching it to trust to its own resources seems to be right and just. The difficulty has always been that the Board does not seem to have exercised its discretionary power of withdrawing grants wisely. Let us take an instance. Two men are ordained and appointed to missions equally strong in resources, equally weak in church feeling and interest. The one stirs up the people, gathers large congregations, builds churches, obtains good collections and subscriptions for the Diocesan Funds, and the people whom he has won to Christ and the Church, in their gratitude begin to contribute liberally to his support. In such a case the Mission Board hearing of his success have said: "The mission is getting strong, and so we will cut down the grant to the missionary."

The other man takes little interest in his work, is careless and discontented, and his mission at the end of two or three years is no better, but perhaps worse than when he went there. In such a

would be satisfied, and the Mission Board being paid from the eleven missions would soon be in a position to free itself from all debt.

Yours,
R. LEWIS.

ONTARIO MISSION FUND.

DEAR SIR.—Whatever dissatisfaction we may feel with the present Mission Board, surely it is not right for us to slacken our efforts in supporting the Mission Fund of which that Board is only the temporary administrator, accountable to Synod, and has to be changed if it neglects its duties. It seems to me that to restore the once flourishing condition of our Mission Fund ought to be our first object, taking precedence of all other considerations whatever.

Allow me to suggest one means for this: Let each clergyman hold a *second* missionary meeting of his own in summer, to supplement the work of the missionary meeting in winter. In 1875, the missionary meeting at Milford, realized \$5. I held a supplementary missionary meeting in the summer and gained \$20 for the Mission Fund, being aided on that occasion by the Rev. T. N. M. Baker, whose addresses produced marked effect. Were this generally done, each clergyman would have the power of *choosing his own speeches*, he could have the help of his clerical neighbors more easily, and his meetings would be independent of the "clerk of the weather," and that other more mysterious personage who ordains our winter deputations arrangements. I believe that the adoption of this simple measure would both act as a most useful mission service in each parish, and would *quadruple* the sum gained at the winter meetings.

C. P. M.

Rectory, Carrying Place.

THE MISSION FUND OF THE DIOCESE OF ONTARIO.

DEAR MR. EDITOR:—There is never time, at Synod, to discuss the report of the Mission Board, so fully as the subject deserves, and the discussion which is now going on in your columns can hardly fail to do good. Allow me to add my contribution to what has already been said.

I cannot agree with the Rev. R. Lewis that the classification scheme was worked well. On the contrary I think it has worked very badly, and that if its promoters had set themselves to work to invent a machine to harass and annoy the Diocese, they could not have succeeded better. I think moreover that the Bishop deserves the gratitude of the missionary clergy in having given it a blow, which will either kill it, or produce such a healthy agitation as must cure it of its many defects.

I would not, however, be understood, in writing this way, to blame those who conceived the idea of classification. The old plan of granting \$200 to every mission, without regard to its poverty or riches, was certainly very unsatisfactory, and when the classification scheme was introduced it naturally commended itself to the good sense of the Synod. It has, however, been tried and found wanting, and yet it would be unjust to condemn it altogether. Its defects seem to be not so much in principle as in practice.

The principle of helping a mission until it attains the position of a self-supporting parish, and of withdrawing help gradually, thus teaching it to trust to its own resources seems to be right and just. The difficulty has always been that the Board does not seem to have exercised its discretionary power of withdrawing grants wisely. Let us take an instance. Two men are ordained and appointed to missions equally strong in resources, equally weak in church feeling and interest. The one stirs up the people, gathers large congregations, builds churches, obtains good collections and subscriptions for the Diocesan Funds, and the people whom he has won to Christ and the Church, in their gratitude begin to contribute liberally to his support. In such a case the Mission Board hearing of his success have said: "The mission is getting strong, and so we will cut down the grant to the missionary."

The other man takes little interest in his work, is careless and discontented, and his mission at the end of two or three years is no better, but perhaps worse than when he went there. In such a

case the Mission Board has said in effect, "poor fellow, he gets very little from the people and so we will continue or increase his grant." Such a policy bears its condemnation on its very front. It is really offering a premium for business and incapacity. Now this illustration becomes stronger if the two men in question have not been labouring the same length of time in the ministry, but the one is a priest of eight or ten years standing, married and with a family, who has always done good and successful work in the Diocese, and the other say a priest of three years who has been signally a failure.

Another defect in the *practice* of classification is that the committee has had no proper basis to work upon. They have had no means of ascertaining the real strength of a mission.

They have acted upon mere rumours which have reached them. I believe firmly that they have acted conscientiously, and as they believed best for the interests of the church, but sometimes hastily and inconsiderately.

Again, there has been a great inconsistency somewhere. They have said, we do not consider *men*, we consider *missions*, and yet they have refused grants to missions on the ground that their missionaries were drawing money from the commutation fund.

Is that acting up to their principle? Besides on what ground are commuted men to receive no grant from the mission fund?

The injustice of such a principle is readily seen if we suppose a case. Two men of equal zeal and ability enter the ministry at the same time. Both go into the mission-field, but one in a few years is placed in charge of a pleasant town parish. At the end of 14 years the latter is receiving say \$800 from endowment and \$600 from his congregation, besides fees and present's which in a town parish make up a considerable item, while the other, who has always laboured faithfully and has endured much hardship, is receiving \$600 from his people and \$200 from the mission fund. In the 15th year they both are placed on the commutation list, and the former has \$400 added to his income of \$1400, making the respectable sum of \$1800, while the poor missionary has only \$200 added to his \$800, for his mission grant is at once withdrawn.

We cannot of course expect we can adopt any system which will do away altogether with inequalities, and the clergy must always remember that they are working for higher rewards than earth can give, and with nobler aims than the increase of their clerical stipends, yet at the same time we should try to manage our business on business principles, and to administer our mission fund to the best interests of the church.

To do this we require some reform, and I cannot help thinking with Mr. Crawford that one of the principles of that reform should be to consider *men* as well as *missions*, to graduate one grant according to years of service in the ministry, and to aim at increasing instead of decreasing the stipends of one missionary clergy.

Yours,
K. L. JONES.

Arnprior, Feb. 8th.

THE VOTE ON THE SUSTENTATION FUND OF THE DIOCESE OF ONTARIO.

MY DEAR SIR: It is sometimes unwise to halloo until one is safe out of the bush! The Rev. R. Lewis, to disparage the watchfulness and consistency of the Mission Boards, quotes from page 1197 of the Synod Journal the following resolution:

"Moved by Rev. C. P. Emery, seconded by Rev. C. Forest, 'That so soon as the Sustentation Fund of the Diocese reaches the sum of \$30,000, the interest to be no longer added to the principal, but be appropriated for missionary purposes under the direction of the Mission Board,' and sarcastically adds, 'the father and step-father of the resolution were present at the time,' (i. e. at the May, 1877, meeting of the committee), 'and sat still while their dear offspring was choked in their presence.' The Rev. gentleman, who without doubt has the Journal at his command, would have shown more prudence, and perhaps less rancour, if he had studied a few pages more of that journal. On page 1278 (the next meeting of

Synod), he would have found this significant entry:

"Moved by the Archdeacon of Kingston, seconded by Rev. W. Lewin, 'That the resolution relating to the interest of the Sustentation Fund (page 1179) *be rescinded, and the following substituted*: That as soon as the Sustentation Fund of the Diocese reaches the sum of \$30,000, the interest may be used for missionary purposes, if necessary, under the direction of the Mission Board.'—*Carried*."

The contention was that the Bishop never contemplated *counting the interest as a factor in making up the \$30,000*. That sum was to be made by *bona fide* subscription. This has never been done. The contention, therefore, now is that the capital sum of \$30,000 has not been attained, and that, consequently, the interest is *not at the command* of the Mission Board. Whether the principal involved in the rescinding resolution be *right or wrong* it is not my purpose here to discuss. I simply state the fact that the resolution quoted by Mr. Lewis was *rescinded*, and that, for given reasons, another was substituted for it, which wholly alters the complexion and bearing of the case.

CHARLES FOREST.

A Member of the M. Board.

Morrisburgh, Feb. 7th, 1878.

PEACE.

SIR,—Your correspondent "M" in your issue of January 31st, did not, perhaps, refresh his memory by recalling the last Sunday services before writing his letter calling for prayers for peace. Before this note reaches you the present state of suspense, will most probably have ended, and the issue will be before the world. Whatever that issue may be, let me courteously remind "M" that the Church daily prays for peace in her usual services, and three times a week with especial emphasis in the Litany.

1. In the versicles—"Give peace in our time, O LORD."

2. Collect for *peace*—that we may be delivered—delivered even from the fear of the "power of any adversaries"—

3. Collect for *Grace*: that we may not run into any kind of danger."

4. Prayer for Queen—"that she may vanquish and overcome *all her enemies*"—which the average mind would suppose would win a very favourable peace.—

5.-6. The second and third collects at Evening Prayer are also in point, for though the former primarily refers to "that Peace which the word cannot give," yet the cessation of war must necessarily be included in this.

7. Litany—"that it may please Thee to give to all nations *Unity Peace and Concord*:"—vide also petitions for Queen,—and last prayer, where without exaggeration we may include war among the "evils."

8. The Lord's Prayer, "*Thy Kingdom come*"—"Thy will be done in earth, as it is in Heaven"—petitions, surely pointing to *peace*—amid wealth of other meaning.

9. If to these he added the prayer of St. Chrysostom which recalls and sums up to the preceding "*desires and petitions*" presenting them, so to speak, *in toto*, we have a daily list of prayers for peace offered by the church to GOD—Am I right in supposing that the special collect provided for peace is intended to be used only after we have actually engaged in the strife?—

"M's" fling at the Bishops is entirely uncalled for, and need not be further noticed. Even leaving out of the question the nine instances given above, and special Prayer "In the time of war and tumults" can surely be used without a special license from the Bishop by any Parish Priest, who considers it appropriate in the present crisis, and who is not "ignorant of the momentous questions at stake."

Yours very truly,
Pax.

Family Reading.

THE PENNANT FAMILY.

CHAPTER XXI.—SICKNESS AT THE CASTLE

When Captain Everard had left Lady Mona with her mother, he hurried away. She said she