

to make them rich; but that we are to keep their children while they lie on their backs in the sun, is more than I think we will do. Mr. Wilson is quite right in trying to get Government aid, but this aid must be *Indian money* spent for the good of the Indians. Has Mr. Wilson read Tuttle's "Boy's Book" as to Indians. In almost the title page he will find General Sherman's idea; it is not a bad one. The law of God and nature declares that the "drone" must die. We must "help those who help themselves," but I question very much the righteousness of collecting money from the poor to make other people's children gentlemen because of those people's laziness. That the Indian question is a serious one for Canada and the U. S., no one doubts, but there should be a consensus of opinion obtained before anything is done by the Church. I hope Mr. Wilson will succeed with the government; as Dr. Sutherland well says a good government is responsible for a primary education. Yours,

P.S.—If we do not work in God's way, believing in Genesis, there is little hope of a good work being done.

#### THE BELL COX CASE.

SIR,—I read in your issue of the 26th instant touching the imprisonment of the Rev. J. Bell Cox, "that it is deplorable that any clergyman in England be so injudicious as to create a grave scandal by so open defiance of the law as to get himself into prison for contempt of court." I beg to say that it can not be gathered from the facts of this persecution, that the persecuted priest created any scandal, or put to defiance any law that he was bound to respect, or that any decent churchman does respect or acknowledge as law binding the church. The *Church Times* evidently does not agree with your view of this case, for I read in that paper of the 6th May, "That the prayers of the Church are desired for James Bell Cox, priest, in prison for obedience to the church's law." The court which tried Bell Cox is a creature of the state. The church has never in any way consented thereto, (no more than she did to the six bloody articles of Henry VIII.) It is only Romanists and Dissenters who both love the fable that the Church of England is only a church by act of parliament, could for one moment say, that the church, clergy or laity are morally bound thereby. All churchmen respect and honor the man who, in contending for the church's liberties and rights, has been cast into prison.

I have yet to learn that the man who goes to prison rather than surrender his conscience, and for the Holy Catholic Church, is raising scandal. If Mr. Bell Cox's conduct is scandalous, so is that of the holy army of martyrs. Let the scandal in this matter be on the heads of those who promoted the persecution, allowed it, and will not stay it. Yours faithfully,

C.

#### AGENCIES OUTSIDE THE CHURCH.

SIR,—One gets bewildered with the number of organizations of this progressive age. We have the "Christian Faith Society," "Iron Cross Society," "White Cross Army," "Red Cross Army," "Church Army," "Salvation Army," "Saved Army," "Gospel Purity Association," "Independent Mission Rooms," "Young Men's Christian Associations," "Gospel Temperance Society," "Girls' Friendly Society," "Association for Befriending Young Persons," "Lay Preachers," "Bible Readings in Halls," "Inquiry Meetings," "Railway Mission," "Prisoners' Aid Society," "Gate Mission," "Roughs' Bible Class," "Fathers' Meetings," "Mothers' Meetings," and other more secular agencies, with a number of Guilds, etc.

A very marked feature of christian and benevolent work in the present day is the multitude and variety of agencies organized outside the Church. The great majority of those doing extra ecclesiastical work, but for some reason they seem to prefer to do work outside rather than inside the Church. It is a very significant fact that so many persons are going outside the Church to edify one another to serve Christ. The Sunday service of many of these societies is held usually at the hour of public worship, the consequence being that many persons are absent from the ordinary service. There is no easy and natural passage from mission halls to churches, such as is desirable, and in too many cases people are content to remain in the mission hall. To avoid the appearance of denominationalism they prefer to do all their work in halls, tents, rooms, or in the open air rather than in churches. The crusade of the Salvation Army, is more completely outside the Church than most of the others mentioned. Nowhere does the Army seek co-operation with the Church, though it does appeal to her ministers and people for help in money. The Army has developed into a sect with ordinances and some thing like sacraments. A great deal of work is done outside the Church for special classes. It does not indeed, as a rule, seem advisable to deal with special classes of men, wherever it is possible, the "common

salvation" should be offered to all without regard to class distinctions. Many persons connected with some of the organizations referred to, are beginning to think there is no need of churches or ministers—that they can do the work themselves. But the church is not the offspring of the human brain, but a divine institution appointed by God for the conversion of the world. The Gospel offered through the Church—reaches all the maladies of the human soul—makes the drunkard sober, the impure, pure, reclaims man from all the vices, renovates the whole man, and makes him a new creature in Christ Jesus.

May 30th.

P. TOCQUE.

#### THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN BIBLE SOCIETY.

SIR,—It is on the platform of this society that all members of Christ's Church can meet. There are, however, not a few clergy who think that this is wholly a "dissenting" society. Among the persons present at the current May meeting I see the names of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Gloucester, Rochester, Exeter, Manchester, Bishop of Sydney, Bishops Perry, Ryan, Marsden. Of course, to some, these names have no meaning, but what of that. We are not to be "led by the nose" by everybody, so as to think "Benson" a nonentity. Yours,

L.

#### J. BELL COX.

SIR,—In common with many in Canada, I received the *Church Review*, wherein I am requested to pray for this priest imprisoned "for conscience's sake." As I know St. Margaret's, Liverpool, well, I will give the public my reasons why I do not pray for this man now in prison. I take the position of the *Record* in this matter of J. Bell Cox. I believe it is a huge mistake giving the prominence to such an insignificant church as St. Margaret's this will give to it, and further, I do not think that if such men as J. Bell Cox, and Herring, of St. Paul's, have no more common sense than to act as they have done and are doing, they ought to be simply and solely held in contempt by all who love the Church of England. It is such men as Tooth, Cox, Herring, etc., that are giving power to the liberationists and for ever and a day hindering the Bishops in their work. By all means if these men want a church of their own and filled with the aroma of the "backwoods" Roman Catholic churches, let them have it. If St. Margaret's was let alone people would never know there was such a spot save the two or three hundred who go there and these 'Change men who want something lively. It is a nice thing to have a guard of fifty policemen before St. Paul's. When Hammond went to the next church, St. James's, he found a mighty poor congregation, and when I was there he had seven hundred in the gallery alone. He went out into the yards and houses and "compelled them" to come in. Give Bishop Ryle a dozen more "Hammonds," "Hobsons," "Major Lesters," "Postances," and No. 1 "Herrings," and you will see Liverpool a church city of the right sort. I hope Canadians will follow the advice given in *Our Mission News*, and learn to take *cum grano salis* any information from papers of *Church Times*, or *John Bull*, or *Review* type. The Church does not want all "Bulls." It has enough of them from Rome.

Yours,

NOT ONE WHO DOES NOT KNOW.

P. S.—The Church is to me far dearer than any individual or his conscience, but I believe that putting him into the court or prison is a mistake. Men who know nothing of the case will fly to sympathise with him. I cannot do it. A man who puts a nail in the coffin of the Church of England, be he Calvinist or Ritualist gets no sympathy from me. No trucking with Rome or dissent in this quarter. I am a Churchman or nothing, and this a Churchman of the nineteenth century and not the century of the "cloven-hoof."

#### HURON SURPLUS COMMUTATION FUND.

SIR,—It is desirable that the members of the church should have time, before the synod meets, to consider the proposal that is to be made by the Executive Committee, and recommended by them for adoption in regard to the disposal of the Surplus Commutation Fund.

They prefer a unanimous opinion in favour of recognized and rewarding years of faithful service in the diocese. They propose that the old Mission Fund, and Surplus Commutation Fund, be and continue as one Fund, and that it be not administered separately, —the Surplus Commutation Fund as a Trust Fund, as in other dioceses, and formerly in the Diocese of Huron. A scale is drawn according to seniority; but no grant from the combined Fund is to exceed \$400. The result is that if a senior clergyman is incumbent of a weak parish or mission, he gets little, or in some

cases, no benefit whatever from the disposal of the Surplus Commutation Fund, which goes to increase the salaries of those holding parishes that are stronger, and the people in good circumstances.

The proposed scale is as follows:—Deacons, \$500; Presbyters under 5 years, \$700; 5 to 10 years, \$800; 10 to 15 years, \$900; 15 to 20 years, \$1,000; 20 to 30 years, \$1,100; over 30, (very few indeed), \$1,200. No grant from both Funds to exceed \$400.

There are various causes from which, in the administration of church patronage, a senior, and faithful clergyman spends all his life in missionary work; sometimes, and no fault of his, in a very weak mission.

The Surplus Commutation Fund is worked in every other diocese, and to be so worked in the Diocese of Huron, in view of this fact, and to reward such faithful service; but the proposal that is now to be made Law, in the Diocese, proves the fact I have referred to, and adds to the income,—not of the most needy of those who have long and faithfully served the cause of Christ in the diocese, but of those where need is less, and whose circumstances and surroundings in small, compact, and comfortable parishes, either self supporting, as synod rectories, or nearly so, renders such aid to be to them, a premium and a favour, on account of their advantages,—and that to the prejudice of their brethren where service in the diocese is as long as theirs, and where labours are more onerous!

Such an arrangement is not in the interest of the church when its cause is weak;—that it is not "just and equal" is I think quite clear; also it is not consonant with the religion of Jesus Christ. I will give some illustrations of its prospective application. There are three clergymen in this diocese who are missionaries. All, now, get \$700 a year and a house under the M. F. Canon. One is of 29 years standing, the other two of 25 years standing in the diocese. All, of course, in good standing. One of these missions yields, from the people \$400, and there is no house; one yields \$400, and there is a house; one yields \$600, or \$500 and a house. The effect of the new arrangement is to give the missionary of 26 years, \$800, and a house; and the third or the other missionary of 25 years, \$700, and a house, which he is entitled to at present! all these are, by the scale, entitled to \$1,100 a year; but the \$400 clause derives this altogether from one, and gives a partial increase to the others. Does this reward years of faithful service?

Moreover, the old Surplus Commutation Fund Canon of this diocese, gave \$200 a year from a *Trust Fund*, to benefit the oldest clergy, and in order of seniority as far as the Fund permitted, and it was designed to benefit those who did not benefit from the patronage of the church. I simply leave these facts with your readers, for their consideration. Yours, faithfully,

EDWD. SORTLEY, B.D.

#### SKETCH OF LESSON.

1ST. SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY. JUNE 12TH, 1887  
Shadows of Good Things to Come; The Ark of the Covenant.

Passage to be read.—Exodus xxv. 10-22.

We spoke in our last lesson of the Tabernacle which was set up to be God's dwelling place, where he would meet with Israel. Moses could not enter it at once because the "glory of the Lord filled the Tabernacle," (Ex. xl. 34, 35). Afterward the priests could enter, for the glory did not always fill the tents, which were divided by a veil. Let us see now,

I. *Where the Glory of God rested.* There was one thing behind the veil called "The Ark." It was made of *shittim* (acacia) wood overlaid with gold. There were gold rings at the corners, with staves or rods (also covered with gold) running through them, by which to carry it. It was covered with a lid or covering of pure gold, called the "Mercy Seat," on which were two figures of cherubim of beaten gold, with their faces bent toward the Mercy seat, and their wings overshadowing it. Inside this Ark were the tables of the law (Ex. xl. 20), the "testimony or words which God had given to Israel. It was called the "the Ark of the Testimony," (xl. 3), the "Ark of the Covenant," (Num. x. 38); and the "Ark of the Lord," (Josh. iii. 13). It was over this "Ark," "upon the Mercy seat," that the "Glory of God" rested (Lev. xvi. 2 last clauses).

II. *Why God's Glory rested on the Ark.* God had said when Israel sinned by making the golden calf "I will not go up in the midst of them . . . lest I consume them," (xxxiii. 5). But Moses interceded for them, and God forgave them, and afterward covenanted to go with them (xxxiii. 14, 17; Deut. ix. 19, 25-29). But how could a holy and just God thus dwell with sinful men? God says: "I will appear . . . upon the Mercy seat" (Lev. xvi. 2). And this "Ark" and "Mercy seat" were a symbol or type of the way in which God could forgive them and dwell with them. It was a shadow of the real blessing which was then yet to come.

III. *What the Ark Represented.* The Ark was