

A little more than a year ago the Board of management of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society requested the Woman's Auxiliary to provide Miss Sherlock's salary and defray the expenses of her journey to Japan, where she is to work as a medical missionary. The appeal was not made in vain: nearly the *whole* amount required, \$900, for the year, had been sent in when the different Diocesan Reports were printed and I have no-doubt all has been paid ere this.

The Board of management at their last meeting urge Woman's Auxiliary to place more money "unappropriated" at their disposal. As an Auxiliary we are forced to the conclusion that we are bound to *follow* as they lead and to help them, not take the work out of their hands. Of the \$44,481, raised within the last three years but \$145, was left entirely to the Board to dispose of as they saw fit; \$1,378, was given undesignated to Domestic Missions, and \$437 undesignated to Foreign Missions, a total of only \$1,960, over which the Board had any control.

It is but natural that we should like *ourselves* to give the money we have had the trouble and labour of collecting and, without doubt, the personal interest awakened in the missionaries with whom we correspond, stimulates the zeal and enthusiasm of the workers. But may not this degenerate into the mere personal feeling for the hardships endured by individual missionaries in whom we are interested or for certain schools or missions which we have pledged ourselves to support, which will *lower* our ideal and narrow our usefulness.

We might perhaps confer with the Board of management in order to see whether it would be possible to arrange some plan of action whereby we might work more *with* them and less independently than we do at present, when they take the initiative, as in the case of Miss Sherlock, we should *follow* and complete the work laid out for us.

We are *now* too much at the mercy of our *feelings*, and he who pleads the most eloquently enlists all our sympathies, and all our money, or very nearly all, is given without any reference to the Board who have every means of knowing, and who *must* know far better than *we* can, where money is most required. I know that I am taking the unpopular side of the question, indeed I acknowledge that I have been myself convinced against my own inclinations, but in a subject so important involving issues so momentous, should we not endeavour to banish so far as possible, the rather childish desire to do as we please with our money, and willingly and gladly give in whatever way is thought to be the best by those who, from their position on the Board, are most

competent to judge that we are but

There is one serious consideration dangerous ground cannot pass it. Diocesan expenses have a

Now I know but this seems a ses only. Show is absolutely necessary at heart, before resist the tempt