

an excellent
od collection

eting at St.
Canon Innes
ng addresses
Westminster,
ister of St.
l with a large
was a good
ese.

This ecclesi-
y, the 25th
y available
to join in
or the young
at the hour
accompanied
d the chapel
ave reciting
then began
98, Hymnal
ing prayers
n was read
d by Prof.
aken part in
nith. Miss
ated at the
the Ladies
ficient choir

d an excel-
ct from Ps.
may be as
a palace."

Chapel by
s the wish
e generous
he labours
der of this
great work
addition of
ives which
ance, aim-
adoption
ho should
ness, posi-
te, as well
learning,
s the more
the result
ose price-
bound our
our Anglo-

the pupils
n the ac-
peaking of
to their
as "our
others of
the hymn
and the

ies of St.
ful bazaar
one side
ided with
ther were
namental,
urnished.
\$172.00
een paid.
nution of
urch was
as. Six
d by L.
able help
hite cloth
hed with
ed mono-
en. The
hite, and
festoons
a fir tree
od's sanc-

tuary. The offerings amounted to \$32.87, and several generous gifts from members of the congregation were sent to the parsonage on Christmas Eve.

A very handsome crimson altar-cloth is the kind gift of Mr. De Carle, and on it the monogram I. H. S. has been beautifully embroidered in gold-colored silk by Mrs. Frank Moberly. Velvet hangings for the pulpit and prayer-desk have also been presented by Mrs. Moberly and Mrs. Clarke, and will replace the Christmas decorations as soon as these are removed. Some other requisites for the chancel have been promised by another lady member of the congregation, and when these are supplied, the furniture of the church will be almost complete.

The Missionary Bishop of Algoma acknowledges with thanks the following sums received during the past month for mission work in this Diocese: Per Rev. G. C. Mackenzie, Kincardine, coll. Church of the Messiah S. S., \$5.41; Miss Barnes' class, do., \$4.00. Per Rev. — Robinson, Brussels: coll. St. John's Church, \$9.47. Per Rev. H. Cooper, Listowell: coll. Christ's Church, \$13.00. Per Rev. W. Pigott, Moorefield: Mrs. Sherloch, \$1.00; Mrs. McGir, \$1.00. Per Sec. Treas. Diocese of Quebec, \$410.34.

Correspondence.

[We have received a communication from a correspondent in reference to the power of the Diocesan Synod to require all its members, lay as well as clerical to be communicants. He thinks the Canon to that effect is *ultra vires*. The letter is too long for insertion, especially as his quotation from the Synod Act of incorporation (32 Vic. cap. 5, sec. 2) is a sufficient refutation of his view of the case. "The said Synod shall consist, of the Bishop.....and of Lay Representatives to be elected according to the constitution of the said Synod after the passing of this Act, or as it may from time to time be altered by the said Synod after the passing of this Act." It is only necessary to add that it would be a step in the wrong direction altogether to repeal the present Canon. The very few cases in which the persons elected have had no opportunity to communicate during the previous year are easily dealt with by the Synod.]

E. D.

THE MISSION BOARD AND THE REV'D E. P. CRAWFORD.

SIR: In your issue of the 17th January your readers are favoured with a letter, headed "The Mission Fund of the Diocese of Ontario," and signed "E. P. Crawford," Brockville. The general tone of that communication—so far as it expresses zeal, earnestness, and anxiety for the welfare of the Church, is just such as might have been expected from one who (*deservedly*) stands high in the estimation of his brethren. The intention, doubtless, of the writer, was to be courteous and just. It may be the misfortune of his position that in *failing to be just* he has become *discourteous*; that by making charges without due attention to facts, and by imputing motives without just warrant, he has cast injurious reflections on many long-trying servants of the Synod, and done not a little to foster, if not create, the very "dissatisfaction" which he seems to deplore.

(1.) He charges the committee with a consciousness of "dissatisfaction" on the part of the missionaries, and of striving to meet it by tampering with the appointed order of the Synod—in other words, of having devised the "two classes" scheme in order to cover the results of their own maladministration. Now, so far is this from being the case that the prevalence of anything like *justifiable* dissatisfaction was never once assumed or admitted by the Board. It was invariably held by them that the principle (*i.e.*, "classification," as laid down by Canon), which regulated their apportionment of the funds, *was a just one*, viz., that aid should be given in proportion to the needs of the several missions. And, so far as data were furnished for their guidance, every effort was made to administer the bounty of the Church according to that principle. It is very possible that some of the parties immediately affected by

the apportionment—viewing the matter from their own peculiar standpoint, may have deemed themselves aggrieved. Each mission would naturally regard itself as having special claims to consideration. And between conflicting claims of this kind it might sometimes be difficult, if not impossible, so to judge as to escape the imputation of partiality. It is enough to say that the Board has ever sought to act *fairly* and for the general interest of the Church. To assume, therefore (as is done by Mr. Crawford), that consciousness of *wrong-doing*, or admission of *wrong suffered* by the missionaries, prompted them to change their course, by the putting forth of a new scheme, is neither courteous nor right. The change, in fact, did not originate with the members of the Board, whether elected or appointed. It is attributable to the Bishop and to him alone. Its merits, or demerits (as the case may be) are due to the Bishop and to him alone. The proposition was made by him, and was supported by such sufficient reasons as (provided the Canon was not violated, as the *legal* members of the Board asserted it would not be) justified the concurrence of a majority of the members. The public may judge, therefore, of the justice of these two lines in Mr. Crawford's letter: "in order to meet it (*i.e.*, the dissatisfaction), "they brought forth the scheme for the increase of the stipends of *certain* missionaries by putting all missions into two classes."

(2.) It is a pity Mr. Crawford is not more guarded. A very little thought would have shown him that a grave accusation was couched in these words. The charge (more than implied) is *favoritism*, and favoritism in such sort as to be equivalent to *injustice*. The "certain" few are intentionally benefited to the disadvantage of all missions." If not, where the ground of complaint? Our friend Mr. Crawford may, perhaps, not be aware that the Bishop's aim in this new scheme, as openly declared by himself, was to cut off all (even seeming) ground for jealousy, and to render even the suspicion of partiality *impossible*. So far as the missions were concerned he would have them *all treated alike*. Whether the Bishop's plan be a judicious one or not—whether in practice it may not create difficulties greater than that which it seeks to remove, is not here the question. The simple fact is that the change introduced by the Bishop (and concurred in by a majority of the Board) was intended for the especial benefit of ALL the missions. It is a poor reflection on the wisdom of the Diocesan, as well as questionable logic, to infer that the correction of an alleged partial administration by a provision which cut off all partiality, justifies a "fear that there will be a still greater falling off this year." Some other ground must be found for it than "the extraordinary action of the Board at the late session of the Synod."

(3.) Mr. Crawford is wrong also in the assertion that the Mission Board (*i.e.*, so far as it was dealing with its own special trust, the Mission Fund) has increased all stipends to \$250 and \$300 respectively. The Board actually made no change whatever in its apportionments; but all allowances under \$250 were made up to \$250—not out of the funds of the Mission Board, but out of a *gratuity* or grant made, at the time, by the Bishop, from another fund (the Sustentation) over which the Committee had no control whatever. Every member of the Board was given distinctly to understand that this Episcopal act was not a session of the Sustentation Fund, or even of the interest of that fund, to the Board. The Bishop asserted his right to be sole trustee, and as such he 'volunteered' the gratuity above referred to for one year. It is true that, to simplify matters, the money so granted was to pass through the hands of the Committee; but it is equally true that it forms no portion of the Mission Fund, and that the accession to the stipends of the missionaries is due, not to the Board but to the action of the Bishop himself. In support of what has been just stated, it may be added that the Bishop became responsible to the Board, "not for any specified sum to be manipulated by them at their discretion, but only for just so much of the interest of the Sustentation Fund as would raise all missionaries' stipends (as apart from local contributions) to the level of \$250 per annum; and further, that this *gratuity* was available solely on the condition that the stipends should be so raised.

How far all this can constitute a grievance perhaps your correspondent will explain.

(4.) Mr. C. is further in error when he states that the Board "promised the interest of the Sustentation Fund," etc. The Board, as is explained above, has no power whatever over the Sustentation Fund. The Synod itself, thus far, has asserted no claim to it. What it may do, or ought to do, is not now under debate. The fund originated in the Bishop, was worked up by him in England and in Canada, and from its inception to this hour 'he alone' has had any control over it. How any body of sane men, to whom all these facts were known, could undertake to promise the interest of a capital 'altogether out of their reach,' is not quite understandable. The Board may possibly consist of very weak and unbusiness-like men, but even the charity of Mr. Crawford will shield them from the supposition that they are so thoroughly fatuous and imbecile as the assertion in his letter would make them out to be.

(5.) Your correspondent is about equally correct where he deals with the referring back (by the Synod) of the Committee's report for amendment. As he represents the case, the committee "ignored the instructions" of the Synod, and thereby succeeded in carrying their scheme, and that they did so on the plea that they had pledged themselves to the missionaries, etc. What are the facts? In the report of the Board as first submitted (and of which Mr. C. complains), the disputed clause ran as follows: "The Bishop having consented to allow the amount" (should be *interest*) "of the Sustentation Fund for one year to be used, resolved that the missions under Class 1 and the missions under Class 2, excepting the mission of Lyn, and the missions in Class 3 and the mission in Class 4, excepting Moulinette, to be placed in Class 4, and that Class 5 remain with the addition of Moulinette." See Journal of Synod, Ap. C., page 1493.) This, then, is the clause in regard to which Mr. C. says the Committee ignored the instructions of the Synod, and thereby acted unfairly and improperly establishing a bad precedent of *independence and unaccountability*.

Will it be believed, Mr. Editor, that the course of the committee was exactly the *reverse* of what is stated by Mr. Crawford, and that in every particular they conformed to the instructions received? *Yet, so it was!*

Judge McDonald moved, seconded by Dr. Henderson, "That the clause" (given above) "be not adopted but be referred back to the Mission Board with an instruction to report at the afternoon session the advisability of the present scheme being retained for the ensuing year."

The Committee retired and reconsidered. Their second report was as follows: "That the Mission Board *withdraws the claim* committed to them for reconsideration, and recommend that the classification scheme as set forth in the Canon be adhered to until altered by authority of Synod; and that the Mission Board further recommend that all the missionaries who, under the proposed change would have derived certain substantial benefits, be allowed these benefits for the current year." This met with *approval and was passed*. And yet, in the face of this, the public are told that the Committee "ignored instructions," "succeeded in carrying a scheme," etc.

There are, sir, several other inaccuracies in the letter of the 17th. But of these enough. The heart grows sick of the misrepresentations which for reasons as yet not patent, are made of the Mission Board. Such attacks on official conduct are sometimes made on grounds anything but unselfish. We have no desire to impute anything so injurious to the writer of the letter here under review. His past has ever been generous. The more reason for regret that now, and on such a subject, he should be found to equally misunderstand the action of his brethren and the language in which their official deeds are recorded.

CHARLES FOREST,

A Member of the M. Board.

Morrisburgh, Jan. 21, 1878.

THE MISSION FUND OF THE DIOCESE OF ONTARIO.

DEAR SIR:—In your issue of Jan. 17th, a correspondent writes, *inter alia*, "it would seem that the Mission Board recognized the existence of