

accepted, with proper spirit, by the gentlemen whom he has assailed. It throws, however, a grave suspicion over the reliability of other statements in his letter, as yet neither withdrawn nor vindicated. The certificate of a writer, under his own hand, that he deals with Diocesan matters, *without knowledge of the facts*, is little calculated to inspire confidence. It may provoke suspicion, and, if so, the penalty paid by the writer is Nemesis enough.

His second letter, headed "The Scheme of the Mission Board" (like the first), is based on an utterly erroneous supposition, viz., that the Board had at their disposal, and unduly manipulated the interest of the Sustentation Fund. As the Rev. E. P. C. puts the case, the Board—indifferent to all the inequalities of local need and to the claims of justice as indicated by them—by an arbitrary act, lavished the funds of the Church, in equal measure, upon rich and poor, drawing no distinction whatever between comparatively wealthy and struggling missions. The facts, given in my letter of the 31st ultimo, show how groundless this supposition is and how *unwarranted* the conclusions deduced from it. The superstructure, therefore, of Mr. Crawford must needs fall when the foundations give way. And the subject might (while we await another P.S.) be altogether dismissed were it not that pointed reference has been made to certain missions and to the *absence of all principle* in the appointment of missionaries, as if some fault attached to the Board. If Mr. Crawford had carefully sought for the facts, before he assumed the office of censor, he would have discovered that all the missions were carefully graduated, that grants were made strictly on the basis of such graduation (see report of Classifying Committee), and more, that due caution had been used in the cases of the very missions which he particularizes, in order that the distribution might be equitable and the poorer sections suffer no wrong. In the first instance cited (Carleton Place), the order of the Board was that support from the fund should not exceed \$100. All the mission asked for was \$150. But, after careful inquiry made, \$150 was allowed for one year, it being understood that a certain local endowment, not presently available, would, before the year expired, become productive, and thus release the Board altogether from any claim on the part of that parish. This was simply an act of justice to the parties immediately interested, and was readily accorded. The other case, Hillier and Wellington—confessedly "one of the oldest and best missions in the Diocese"—was treated with equal fairness. Under ordinary circumstances Hillier should be self-supporting. But it is not under ordinary circumstances. Important Church works, involving heavy liability, press sorely on the people; and the effort honestly to meet this liability limits very seriously (not the will, but) the ability of the mission to do justice to the missionary. For this reason a grant of \$100 (not \$250) was made—the said grant to be discontinued as soon as the present oppressive burden was removed. The case of Elizabethtown, as reference to the records of the Board will show, is equally misstated by your correspondent. Here, as in the other cases, the action of the Board was cautious, and guided by strict regard to the very principles of justice which the Rev. E. P. C. recommends.

How all these arrangements of the Board were rendered futile, and rich and poor brought to one level (\$250) my former letter has sufficiently explained.

One only other point in Mr. Crawford's second letter remains to be considered, viz., the want of principle and system in the appointment and support of missionaries. Surely your correspondent need not be reminded that the office of a committee is not to legislate for the Church, but simply to carry out the instructions which the Church imposes on them. The Mission Board are the servants of the Synod, under the limitations of Canon xvi. By that Canon their every act is regulated. That canon makes the mission, not the missionary, the special object of their consideration. And as long as the canon remains unchanged, the needs of the people, not the personal claims of the clergyman, must constitute the basis of their action. As to the principle of appointment, i. e., as to whether an old or a young clergyman is the fitter agent in certain fields, it may—

as the judgment of your correspondent seems to indicate—he wholly wrong, practically; but what have the Mission Board to do with the matter? The rectifying of such wrong, if it exists (of which one may be more than doubtful), lies with the Bishop, not with the Board. The Bishop alone has power to define limits and to decide who shall occupy them. This right is inherent in his office. Mr. C. would not wish it otherwise. With what show of reason, therefore, a Committee of Synod can be censured and exposed to public reproach, for not invading Episcopal functions, is somewhat difficult to understand.

CHARLES FOREST,
A Member of the M. Board.

Morrisburg, Feb. 4, 1878.

"EXPERIENCES."

SIR:—The subject of "Individual experiences" has lately been brought markedly before me; and in the course of reading I have met with the following "notes" which, I think, bear on the same matter.

On the text "Strive to enter in at the strait gate," I find it said—"The original word here rendered 'strive,' is a very significant and forcible metaphor borrowed from those who wrestled or contended in the Olympic Games." It implies strictly "to strive as in an agony," and shews that the Christian conflict is a severe one, requiring courage, and above all *perseverance*. Several similar allusions are found in St. Paul's Epistles. The necessity of continued *perseverance* has ever been insisted on by the Church; and none but those who practise it can become holy in the sight of God, (See Col. i., 22, 23; Heb. iii. 6, 14; x. 38, 39). As a consequence of this doctrine, our own Church also holds, in opposition to the "sensible experiences," contended for by Sutarians, that a positive assurance of eternal salvation is not the privilege of the Christian. He may experience an inward testimony of his continuance in the state of regeneration, and be filled with "all joy and peace in believing;" he may possess, what the Scriptures plainly allow of, "a full assurance of faith," Heb. x. 22; and a "full assurance of hope," Heb. vi. 11, but not in a full salvation, which they nowhere promise. The passage is also opposed to the dogma of Calvin, for if men must, as it were, force a passage through the narrow gate of life, then none can be excluded by God's absolute decree, fixing the number of the elect and precluding the efforts of those who are willing to attain to it.—Forster.

Again, "Many be called, but few chosen." From this, and some process of the same class, has been drawn the dogma of the election of a peculiar number of men to eternal life, without any regard to qualification. The rejection of others, deduced from the same, seems to follow as a necessary consequence. "Many persons," writes Calvin, "acknowledge election in such a way as to deny that any one is reprobated, but with extreme absurdity and childish weakness; seeing that election itself could not stand unless it was opposed to reprobation; when God passes by, He reprobates." Such views appear to annul, as it were, the conditions of the Gospel Covenant, to divest God of His attributes, and man of his faculties. They impose terms of salvation even easier than those of the Church of Rome; for, to many, the seal of election has proved as favorite a sanction of unrepented sins as ever did indulgences. Scripture plainly declares that God is "no respecter of persons;" and all those passages which are cited, relative to predestination, and election, are, when fairly taken with their context, applicable only to the situation of nations; they relate, as here, to God's designs of calling the Gentile world to the knowledge of the Messiah. As the Jews were called the elect under the old covenant, so are Christians under the new. With this key a plain coherent sense may be found to all the entwisted passages without asserting antecedent and special decrees as to particular persons. We are all "called" by God, whether the call be obeyed or not; but it is our part, and our alone, to be "chosen." The subject should make all seriously consider, that it is not enough to be within the visible Church of God, resting unhurt with the possession of Church privileges, but we

must individually "give all diligence to make our calling and election sure," 2 St. Pet. i. 5, 10.

Yours, etc., J.

Diocese of Niagara, Feb., 1878.

SUSTENTATION FUND OF THE DIOCESE OF ONTARIO.

MR. EDITOR.—The Bishop of Ontario certainly deserves a great deal of credit for suggesting the establishment of a Sustentation Fund—and for issuing a circular on its behalf—but, as some persons have run away with the idea that he collected the whole amount \$32,000 and seem to think that his claim to dispose of the interest of the fund is a reasonable one, I wish to say a few words, lest this should be drawn into a precedent, and we should next year have the Conveners of deputation claiming a right to dispose of the funds they collect.

If the reader will turn to page 221, Synod Report, he will find the Bishop speaking thus: "Here I must observe that the Board has lately, at my suggestion, established a Permanent Investment fund, to provide for the partial maintenance of those Missionaries, eleven in number, (the italics are mine) who are now aided by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, when that aid is withdrawn." The reader will observe that it was the Board established the fund at the suggestion of his Lordship, that the object of the fund was to make provision for the support of eleven missionaries paid by the S. P. G., as soon as that Society withdrew its grant. Now I wish to call attention to this fact, that the Society did gradually decrease its grant from \$2,000 to \$722.46 consequently the grant was not sufficient to pay the eleven Missionaries, and the Mission Fund (not the Sustentation Fund) had to make good the deficiency, and this at a time when the M. B. was handing over yearly to the Sustentation fund the Whitsunday collection and half of any balance it might have on hand at the close of the fiscal year. Let us hear now what the Chairman of the Mission Board has to say, page 256. "The nucleus of such a fund was indeed already formed. The Bishop has appropriated to this object \$500 of Commercial Bank stock, a balance of monies collected while in England. To this fund have also been added the \$1,200 bequeathed to Missionary operations by the late Jastus S. Mervin, Esq., also a donation of \$25 from the Rev. R. L. Stephenson." In order to its further increase it was resolved by the Board "That the Whitsunday collection of each year, and the half of the balance at the end of the fiscal year shall be added to the investment fund." This is the substance of the resolution. Now I have gone over all the Synod Reports from the beginning, and I find that the Mission Board contributed to the Sustentation fund by Whitsunday collections, half balance, and Mr. Mervin's bequest \$5,857.63. The collections taken up for the fund amount to \$708.41; land sold yielded \$1,851.63. Collected by the Bishop in England \$500. The S. P. G. do not seem to have given the \$5,000 we were led to expect, but \$3,205.37. The subscription amount to \$7,582.70 of this amount \$2,000 was collected by the Rev. F. Stannage, the balance I suppose was collected by the Bishop and the late Archdeacon. It is to be regretted that a list of the subscribers was not printed in Synod Report. The interest on these sums amounts to \$12,564.33; these figures when added together amount to \$31,719.58. The Sustentation fund is at present \$378 in access of this, but as my object has been to call attention to the chief sources of the Sustentation fund I left many small items unnoticed. The Mission Board began to contribute to the Sustentation fund in 1865, and contributed in all \$5,857.14; if we add interest it would raise it to say \$8,000, besides as the S. P. G. withdrew its grant the Mission Board made good the deficiency out of its own funds, when it might in all fairness have claimed that the Sustentation fund should contribute its interest to that object. Thus the interest of the S. F. was added to principal from year to year till it amounted to \$32,000, \$12,564.33 of which was interest saved; and now the Bishop claims the control of the interest of the Sustentation fund, and if he did so in the interest of the eleven missions who had a grant from the S. P. G., and on whose behalf the fund was raised, I believe that all parties