

in men's ears so terribly of Popery that only the most extreme High Churchmen dreamed of using it; ordinary Churchmen regarded it as denoting something strange, unhealthy, Jesuitical, un-English. But, fortunately, a name does not frighten men long, if that for which it stands serves a good practical purpose, and answers a real need. The frequency of 'retreats' nowadays, the employment of them being no longer confined to one extreme section of Churchmen, their approval and personal acceptance by some of our Bishops, is the most convincing proof in the world that they do serve such a purpose, and do answer such a need. We do not intend entering here upon any explanation of what 'retreats' are, or of what good they do; but it is a grateful task to call attention to the fact that our Bishops not only sanction them, but join in them themselves along with their clergy. At one time a Bishop was an unapproachable person, who lived in a palace, and saw his clergy only occasionally and in a formal manner. The English Church has suffered from that notion of episcopal dignity, but to-day it is passing, is almost passed away. To-day a Bishop moves frequently and easily up and down amongst his clergy, and when they 'go into retreat,' goes naturally and unassumingly with them.

Church Life:

Every Churchman is under a financial obligation to the Church. He owes it a certain portion of whatever property he is possessed of. How much this portion is he must himself determine. If he is thoroughly sincere and conscientious, he will determine it by seeking that light which will come to him through earnest prayer for the Holy Spirit's guidance. Having determined it, he will see to it that the Church obtain its proper share of his possessions. When he makes his will he will not forget Her. He will remember her just as loyally and lovingly as any other legatee named in that important document. If he has given the matter proper thought, he will realize the force of the truth that he is but the steward of his possessions, the care, management, and disposition of which have been entrusted to his hands for a very brief period of time, and that a strict accounting of his stewardship must finally be rendered. God made clear to Moses this great truth when He announced to him on Mount Sinai that "All the Earth is Mine;" and the Jewish race from the time of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob have been taught to give unto God titles of all they possess. This law is a part of the divine economy, and we as Christians are not absolved from allegiance to it, but should recognize it as of binding force upon us to-day, as always. Not one Christian, however, in a thousand, does this, or even obeys the spirit of the law, or recognizes any obligation to the Church, when he disposes of his worldly goods by will. This is a great oversight, and the Church is thus defrauded of what is rightfully her due.

CORRESPONDENCE.

[The name of Correspondent must in all cases be enclosed with letter, but will not be published unless desired. The Editor will not hold himself responsible, however, for any opinions expressed by Correspondents.]

To the Editor of the Church Guardian:

SIR,—Your issue of the 5th inst. contained a letter over the signature "A Canadian Churchman" which I was in hopes of seeing a reply to in the last number. As however it seems to have escaped the notice of those who are more competent than I am to indicate the policy of the Board of Management of the D. and F. Missionary Society I feel obliged to protest against the inconsiderate criticism of your correspondent. His strictures seem to me to be utterly uncalled for since they have reference to the past, and he expresses by implication his satisfaction at the change which—he assumes—has been inaugurated; and the charge

of faithless inactivity is only calculated to weaken the confidence of Church people at large in the administration of their contributions in aid of Foreign Missions, and thus narrow the limits of the work which "A. C. C." seems to have at heart.

He blames the Board of Management for not having hitherto engaged in Evangelistic work among the heathen in a more direct form, by sending its own Missionary immediately to the Foreign field, and characterizes the past policy of the Board as "a miserable dependence upon the agencies of our Mother Church." Herein consists the faithlessness and inaction of the Board's policy out of which it has been "at length shamed by the sight of men being sent out by private agencies."

These strong expressions are evidently the result of your correspondent's conviction that the only faith-inspired method of discharging its obligations to the Foreign Missionary field is for the Board of Management to accept the services of duly qualified Missionaries and send them forth into heathen lands without the intervention of the S. P. G. or the C. M. S. But your correspondent seems to have overlooked, in his anxiety to see the Canadian Church assume all the duties and privileges of independence, one or two important considerations which fully justify the policy hitherto pursued, and which, with the modification adopted in 1889, I trust will continue to govern the Board for some time longer.

Even in the Western Dioceses of our Ecclesiastical Province it is not so very long since they became completely independent of aid from the S. P. G. in maintaining their own Missionary work; would it not then be more becoming in those more favored districts to evidence for some time yet their sense of the obligations they owe to that Society, the fostering Mother of the Church in Canada, than to seize upon the first opportunity for a display of their independence? And have Church people in Ontario lost confidence in the experience and wisdom and faithfulness of those splendid organizations of the Mother Church, which have extended the Kingdom of Christ into all heathen lands, that they should hesitate to entrust them with their money contributions? I trow not. Though happily independent now of extraneous aid, would it not be a gracious thing to continue the connection with those Societies, not now as the receivers but as the generous givers, returning into their own hands—for purposes they can carry out with better effect than we can—some portion of the gifts they so liberally supplied us with in our time of need?

But the four Eastern Dioceses are still the recipients of aid from the S. P. G.; and for these Dioceses, as represented on the Board of Management, to overlook this fact and take part in virtually establishing an independent Foreign Missionary Society appears to me to be a grave inconsistency. Before taking this step let us at least be in a position to say to our fostering mother, 'We thank you for all you have done for us in the past, but we are now strong enough to support ourselves and don't intend to be a burden to you any longer;' but this we can't say—on the contrary what 'A Canadian Churchman' would have us do would be very much like saying, 'We are sorry we can't get on for some time yet without your nourishing care, continue your gifts and with some portion of them we will equip a missionary of our own who shall be furnished with our own special banner; we want to get some credit for what we are doing; we have the strongest possible desire to show how independent we can be—this desire we feel sure you approve of and will doubtless furnish the means of realizing (in appearance.)'

And is this feeling of independence in a matter of this kind—quite apart from the circumstances I have referred to—altogether a wholesome one? For my part I cannot fully disconnect this desire from feelings and aspirations

which are comparatively ignoble. It seems to savour too much of self, of the wish to exhibit before the world—the Christian world too—our own missionary spirit—our own energy which has led us to make our own venture—to show that we are not behind others. There seems too much haste to thrust ourselves forward—an absence of that humility which seeks to do God's work without ostentation and which has the promise of His Grace.

As to the stimulus to more liberal contributions in aid of Foreign work to be gained by 'the ability to go and say to our people—your own flesh and blood have given themselves to this great work and are looking to you to back them up,' the objection seems to me to be compounded principally of rhetoric—I count it as of little worth as a means of influencing those who give on principle—not as the result of a sentimental appeal—and we all know that upon the former class must depend the permanent support of missions. The personal interest in any particular missionary would probably be confined within narrow bounds. It is an error to suppose that the absence of that direct personal interest has hitherto deprived Foreign missionary work of the aid which was counted upon. The last triennial report of the Board of Management, presented in September 1889, informs us that for the three years preceding that date the sum of \$5,740.98 in excess of the amount asked for had been contributed for Foreign Missions. This one fact would seem to indicate that down to a little over a year ago the policy of entrusting the missionary agencies of the Mother Church with the contributions from our people had not appeared to the Church in Canada as your correspondent implies and completely disposes of his objections.

I may be wrong but it seems to me that 'A Canadian Churchman' is under the impression that the system inaugurated recently in the appointment of Mr. Waller is quite free from any intervention of the great societies at home. If so I wish to point out that he is labouring under a misapprehension. Mr. Waller is the first missionary from Canada, accepted by the Board of Management to labour among the heathen in what is termed the Foreign field. In that sense he is our own missionary, officially approved and commissioned; but he will nevertheless be a missionary of the S. P. G. working entirely under the direction of that Society. He will be paid directly by the S. P. G. out of monies forwarded to the Society by the Board and at the same rate as other missionaries of that Society.

This is the system which was adopted in 1889 after conferences on the subject had been held between the two great societies and some of the Bishops of the Canadian Church in 1888, and a correspondence subsequently carried on. It was approved by the Board of Missions—i. e. the Provincial Synod—and seems to meet admirably the circumstances of the Church as affecting the question at present and for some time to come.

A. A. VON IFFLAND.

MR. WILSON'S INDIAN HOMES.

To the Editor of the Church Guardian:

SIR,—It is very gratifying to me to find how many good friends I have in this work in which I am engaged among the Indian children, as evidenced by the increased contributions both in money or clothing during the last two or three weeks and also by the many kind sympathising letters which I have received. In addition to regular contributions towards the support of Indian children I would like to acknowledge the following: All Saints' Sunday school, Toronto, (special) \$25; St. Jude's, Brantford W. A., \$6; Mrs. Boomer, \$5; the Misses Patterson, \$10; A. Duncan, \$5; Sunday school, Waterloo, P. Q., \$5; Sunday school Waterloo, Ont., \$6; Lord Aberdeen, (for Medicine Hat) \$50; meeting at Thorold, \$9; W. A. Perth, \$20; D., \$1; St. John's Sunday school, Cornwallis, \$6; per Rev. J. C. Cox, \$2; St.