

REV. CHARLES W. BISHOP, M.A.
CHAIRMAN

WINNIFRED THOMAS, B.A.
SECRETARY

United Church of Canada
Committee on Employed Women Workers in the Church
including the Deaconess Order

135 ST. CLAIR AVENUE WEST
TORONTO 5, ONTARIO

December 23rd., 1926.

Mr. E. H. Morgan,
73 Hillcrest Ave.,
Norwood, Man.

Dear Mr. Morgan:-

I received your letter of December 11th. and am only too happy to tell you of the latest developments in connection with our work.

The recommendations submitted to General Council were approved with a few amendments. I am enclosing a copy of the action of the Council regarding Deaconess Work. According to our recommendation the School now called the "United Church Training School", has been placed under a separate Board of Management which is under the Board of Education.

You will see that we have been fortunate enough to secure as our Chairman, Rev. C. W. Bishop, whose father was for several years Superintendent of Deaconess Work. According to the ruling of the Executive of the General Council, our Committee on Employed Women Workers in the Church did not assume responsibility until October 1st. Since then we have had two meetings and we feel that a good beginning has been made. As you will notice, we are attempting at the present time to arrive at a policy for the immediate administration of the Deaconess Order for which we are responsible until the meeting of the next Council. This policy will be put into operation during these two years. Doubtless our experience with it will be a guide to the permanent administration of the Deaconess Order. The second piece of work which we are attempting is a survey of all employed women in the Church. Our hope is that when we know clearly exactly what the condition is we may be in a better position to make recommendations for the future.

Until the meeting of the next General Council the direction of the Deaconess Order will remain the direct responsibility of this Committee of General Council. I am enclosing a copy of our Minutes which will give you an idea of the method which we are pursuing. Dr. MacKay of Manitoba College is a member of the Committee and was present at our last meeting. I am sure

that he would be glad to meet with you and give you his impressions of the present situation.

We have not yet considered the larger question of the relation of the Deaconess Order to other employed women workers in the Church nor have we yet arrived at any conclusion regarding the question raised by the Commission as to whether a separate Board is necessary for the supervision of this work. We believe that we will be in a better position to consider such questions after the facts sought in our survey have been secured.

In the course of the next two or three months we must give careful consideration to the question of Conference Boards and Deaconess Homes. At present the Toronto Conference Board, which is a strong group and meets every month, is making a careful study of its function and work, and we are hoping that out of this will come some constructive suggestions for the consideration of the Committee. We shall be in correspondence with you regarding these matters.

Our Committee is anxious to be of service to the Church and we shall be very glad indeed to hear from you at any time and to know of any ways in which we can be of help in connection with the work of employed women in the Manitoba Conference.

With best wishes for the New Year, I am

Yours sincerely,

Winifred Thomas
Secretary

T/H.

RECOMMENDATIONS.

An examination of the organization and work of the General Conference Board of the Deaconess Society of the Methodist Church and of the General Assembly's Deaconess Committee and Board of Management of the Presbyterian Missionary and Deaconess Training Home shows that each performed dual functions viz:-

(a) Each was entrusted by the Church with responsibility for the care and direction of the Deaconess Order.

(b) Each was responsible for the conduct of an educational institution, primarily intended for the education and training of missionaries and deaconesses.

We believe that apart from Church Union the time had come for separating these administrative and educational functions. The coming of Union makes it imperative.

We, therefore, recommend:-

A. Re. the Care and Direction of the Deaconess Order.

I. That, whereas, the Methodist and Presbyterian Churches, previous to Union, had each instituted an Order of Deaconesses, and whereas there are now about one hundred deaconesses in the United Church, provision be made for continuing within the United Church of Canada, the Deaconess Orders of the uniting Churches, these to be combined in one Order of which those already connected with the existing Orders shall be members as well as any/who in the future may be designated to the office of deaconesses by the United Church of Canada.

II. (a) That, whereas, there are such far-reaching issues involved, the General Council appoint a committee to study the whole question of the permanent policy re. the scope and supervision of the Deaconess Order, and of the other trained women workers of the United Church, and to report at the next meeting of the Council.

(b) That this Committee in the meantime assume full responsibility for the care and direction of the Deaconess Order as well as giving consideration to the interests of those trained women workers who are not members of the Deaconess Order.

III. In our judgment the work of this Committee is of such a nature as to necessitate representation upon it from each Conference, the existing training centres for women, the W.M.S. and other interested Boards and the Deaconess Order.

B. Re. Unifying of the Training Schools in Toronto.

I. That there be formed and developed out of the present training centres in Toronto, namely the Methodist National Training School and the Presbyterian Missionary and Deaconess Training Home, a Woman's School of Religion under the control of a Board of Management, this Board to be definitely related to the Board of Education of the United Church, the Woman's School of Religion being considered one of the educational centres of the Church for the training of women for such departments of Church Work as may be approved from

time to time by the General Council.

II. That the Board of Management of the Woman's School of Religion be constituted as follows:-

The Moderator of the General Council - ex-officio.

The Principal of the Woman's School of Religion.

A representative of the Board of Education.

Ten members appointed by General Council, preferably five men and five women.

Two representatives from each of the following:-

The Dominion Board of the Woman's Missionary Society.

The Board or Boards of the Theological College or Colleges in Toronto.

The Alumnae of the School.

One representative from each of the following:-

The Board of Home Missions.

The Board of Foreign Missions.

The Board of Social Service.

The Board of Religious Education.

III. The functions of the Board of Management of the Woman's School of Religion shall be:-

(1) Recruiting of students.

(2) Determining, in cooperation with the Board of Education, the standards of admission to the School.

(3) Providing, in consultation with other Boards concerned, courses of study for women preparing for service in the Church as missionaries (home and foreign), social service workers, deaconesses, Religious Education leaders, Sunday School teachers and other types of volunteer workers.

Note. The Woman's School of Religion shall be conducted along the lines of the policy in force in the present training centres namely through cooperation with the theological colleges of the United Church in Toronto, the Social Service Department of Toronto University and the Canadian School of Missions rather than through the building up to any degree of a resident staff of teachers.

United Church of Canada
Committee on Employed Women Workers in the Church
including the Deaconess Order

135 ST. CLAIR AVENUE WEST
TORONTO 5, ONTARIO

April 1st., 1927.

Mr. E. H. Morgan,
73 Hillcrest Ave.,
Norwood, Man.

Dear Mr. Morgan:-

I received your letter and am sorry to know that there has been some uncertainty regarding the procedure in connection with appointments. I wrote Mr. Kenner some days ago and have just received his letter this morning saying that I have made the matter clear to him. We had hoped to send out early in March the letters asking for the requests for next year but pressure of other work made it impossible. You see there are now over 200 such letters to be sent, including those to the deaconesses themselves and the Churches and Boards which employ deaconesses. The task is now practically completed, however, and we are beginning to receive replies.

We decided at the last meeting of our Committee to retain the deaconess year, September 1st. to August 31st. and we, therefore, have still a considerable time in which to make our arrangements for next year. I am enclosing the official letter regarding appointments which has already been sent to all the Churches and Boards in Winnipeg which employ deaconesses.

If the W.M.S. agrees to become responsible for the support of the deaconess at Maclean Mission, the appointment to that position will be made by the W.M.S. in consultation, of course, with those in charge of the Mission. Our Committee will have no part in the making of such an appointment except that we will wish to know what has been decided.

I think perhaps the situation is not quite clear to the Manitoba Board. The new organization has been set up. The General Council last June gave to our Committee on Employed Women Workers in the Church, responsibility for the supervision of the Deaconess Order until the meeting of the next General Council, which means that we will probably be responsible until January 1929, as any new plans for the general oversight of the work recommended at the next General Council, will hardly come into effect until the close of 1928. The question of the support of deaconesses is perhaps what you have in mind. We find that of the 100 or more deaconesses in active service in the United Church, about 25 are in self-supporting congregations, 25 are supported by the W.M.S., 6 by Conference Deaconess Boards and the rest by the Home Mission

Board, the Board of Social Service or such city organizations as the Toronto City Mission and Extension Union. All of these arrangements seem quite satisfactory except the supporting of deaconesses by Conference Deaconess Boards and, as I wrote Mr. Kenner, the W.M.S. has agreed to take over responsibility for those as quickly as their funds permit. As a policy the plan in operation in Hamilton, for example, where four deaconesses are supported by the Hamilton Conference Deaconess Board, will not be continued excepting until such time as the W.M.S. can see its way clear to take over all these workers.

I hesitate to advise you regarding the re-appointment of the Manitoba Conference Deaconess Board. I expect that our Committee at its next meeting, which will be held on the 8th. of April, will pass a recommendation that Conference Deaconess Boards be appointed only by those Conferences which consider that such a Board is necessary. It really rests entirely with the Manitoba Conference to decide whether there is need for a Deaconess Board to supervise the work of deaconesses within the Manitoba Conference. There are only four such Boards at present. In the Montreal Conference the Deaconess Board has charge of the Deaconess Home and supports one deaconess. In Hamilton, there is also a Home and four deaconesses that are employed by the Conference Deaconess Board. In Toronto our work consists largely of the supervision of Barbara House and the Fresh Air Camp. I think it would be well for the present Deaconess Board to review the situation within the Conference and to bring in to the Conference at its next meeting, a report of its work and a recommendation regarding the re-appointment of the Board. Our Toronto Conference Board has given considerable thought during the last two years to its place and function and I think that their general opinion is that the work for which they are responsible should gradually be merged in that of the Toronto City Mission and Extension Union. Our General Council Committee is of the opinion that each Conference must decide just how necessary a Conference Deaconess Board is for the successful work of the deaconesses within the Conference.

I shall be very glad indeed to answer any further questions since we are anxious to keep in close touch with those who are interested in our work throughout the country.

Yours sincerely,

Winifred Thomas
Secretary.

T/H.

1043 Dorchester Ave.,
Winnipeg, Man.
March 15th 1937.

Mrs. E. E. Bayne,
84 Chestnut St.,
Winnipeg.

Dear Mrs. Bayne:

The following resolution was adopted today at a meeting of the Manitoba Conference Deaconess Board. I expect that you are acquainted with the history and circumstances involved; if in doubt about any of them, information may be obtained at first hand from either Mrs. C. W. Gordon or Dr. J. M. Shaver. The resolution is being sent to Miss Buck in Toronto, but we knew your Executive would like to be informed of the action.

The resolution is:

"that this Board as the Women's Missionary Society to pay the salary direct to the two workers of this Board being supported by the Women's Missionary Society; and that this arrangement begin with the next quarter."

The workers are Miss Sherwin and Miss Shaw. If this new arrangement is completed the Board will ask Conference for its discontinuation as its sole duty for some years past has been to act as a channel from the W.M.S. to the workers in the payment of salary. We trust your Executive will recommend the change to Toronto.

Yours sincerely,

Secretary, Man. Conference
Deaconess Board.