

native of Worcestershire, England. From a contemporary we learn that in 1853 he left England, under the auspices of the S. P. G., to undertake missionary work among the Indians on the north shores of Lake Huron and Lake Superior. Subsequently in (1856) he was ordained to the diaconate and priesthood by the celebrated first Bishop of Toronto (Dr. Strachan.) He made Garden River (near Sault Ste. Marie) his home. His work among the Indians in that section was continuous until 1871, when he accepted an offer made by the Bishop of Huron (Dr. Cronyn) to take charge of the Church's work among the Six Nation Indians at Kanyungeh. When Canon Chance was at Garden River he was the only missionary of the Church of England in this northern lake region, with the exception of Dr. O'Meara, Government chaplain to the Indians on the Manitoulin Island.

On the forms of notice of assessment used in the municipalities of the Province of Ontario, there is a column with the heading "Religion." Seven years ago the writer was at Sudbury and the local assessor handed to him his notice in which the column mentioned was filled with a "P." The official's notice was drawn to the fact that "P" (meaning "Protestant") was not sufficiently explicit, and asked that it be changed to "Church of England." He refused to make the alteration, and simply laughed at such a request as ridiculous. What did it matter? The writer was a "Protestant," wasn't he? He wasn't a "Catholic," anyway. In another municipality, about a month ago, he saw the assessment form of a ratepayer filled with a "P," when it should again have been "Church of England." The ignorance of the mass is so great, and some officials are so dense, that all who are not (Roman) Catholics are supposed to be properly described as Protestants. Thus they divide all Christians (if not others) into two classes. It is high time that such an error were corrected where it exists. We who are both Catholic and Protestant should no longer consent to be represented, or rather, misrepresented in this manner, but insist upon the column which gives our "religion" being filled up with the words "Church of England." Yes, insist upon it; making an appeal to the Court of Revision, if necessary. For the day is upon us when "Protestant" is popularly inter-

preted to mean only anything that is not "Roman Catholic." Yes! any society or club called religious whether or not it believes that: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God."

FROM the "Flaneur" in the *Toronto Mail and Empire*, Oct. 16, 1897:

The efforts a few ill-advised Anglican ministers are making to introduce more sectarian teaching into our public schools is a movement which cannot be crushed too certainly and too soon. Whether we are in favour of religious teaching in our schools or not, we have been forced to the conclusion that religious teaching is impossible in the public schools; and it is the so-called religious people who are responsible for this condition of things; they all want to teach not religion, but sectarianism. Even so small a matter as reading selected portions of the Bible is objected to by the Roman Catholics, the Secularists, and the Hebrews. Whether we like it or not, if we wish to preserve our public schools we can only do so by making them purely secular schools. In the United States persistent efforts are being made to destroy the national character of the schools by introducing Roman Catholicism; the same thing is being attempted here by introducing Anglicanism. If we desire our schools to be national and efficient, we must steadily resist any attempt to introduce sectarianism of whatever kind and from whatever quarter.

Shame! Why suppress the truth and tell a lie? "More" sectarian teaching? Then it is only a question of degree. In the columns of a leading provincial daily citizens of Canada have reason to expect that writers know a little about the subjects they write of. Vain expectations! Than in the above did ever reader see more confusion? Sometimes "religion" and "sectarianism" seem to be the synonyms; again their meanings are contrary the one to the other. "They all want to teach not religion, but sectarianism." We challenge the truth of the statement. Make it good. "The same thing" (persistent efforts to destroy the national character of the schools) "is being attempted here by introducing Anglicanism." No more false statement was ever penned. Surely an enemy could only have done this—an enemy to the truth, a foe to justice. The Secularist, whom we understand to be the man who is not convinced that there is a God—the man who does not know—must have his prejudice and scruples respected, but the Christian father who believes that a knowledge of the Holy Scripture—the facts stated in the Bible—should be imparted to his child at school must be treated as an enemy endeavoring "to destroy the national character of the schools!" And this in a professedly Christian land! We recommend to *The Mail and Empire* a perusal of the Report of the Committee of the Synod of Toronto

on Voluntary Schools, also Mr. Lawrence Baldwin's "Summary," for which in a future issue we intend to find room. The enemies to the Bible in the schools cannot, it seems, fight fairly. We may as well acknowledge it to ourselves. We should not expect it. It is a mistake, however, to fancy that we are to be "crushed," either "certainly" or "soon." For the honor of our country, the eternal well-being of our children, the glory of God—Father, Son and Holy Ghost—we are in the struggle—there to contend honestly, manfully, fearlessly, until the truth prevails and victory is perched above the banner of the Cross. But *mirabile dictu*, here is another opinion concerning the secular schools. The voice is the voice of experience from Australia and worth hearing. In the course of an address in September last in Sydney, New South Wales, on "Federation," Sir Julian Salomons said, according to "Hansard":

When I was a young man—and no one can doubt my sincerity—I subscribed to the meeting to which I am about to refer, and at which I took the chair, the sum of £100, which I could not afford, in order to make it a success. That meeting was in favour of a national system of education, which should be free, secular, and compulsory. I have ever since been filled with remorse. I live near a great public school, and day after day I see upon the palings of my own and my neighbours' residences—mine I had to pull down and put up a stone wall to prevent it—not once, or twice, but always, forms of language and expressions of indecency and obscenity which would disgrace grown-up men. I myself have made no representation to the head of that school, but I am told by a friend of mine that he has said that his lutes were limited to the boys in the school. It has, however, convinced me of this—that education without religion is like putting a sword into the hand of a savage, and I have come to the conclusion that any one of the branches of the Christian religion, or any great religion analogous to it, although they may differ in their theological forms, is better than no religion. Just as the twig is bent the tree is inclined.

The italics are ours. Dear "Flaneur," read, mark, learn, digest.

Temiscamingue Mission

REV. JAMES HICKLAND, DEACON-IN-CHARGE.

The Bishop of Algoma arrived here by an unexpected boat on Tuesday, the 5th of October, at midnight, bringing with him a parcel of Bibles, etc., for the clergyman to distribute amongst the settlers. We had made arrangements to give his Lordship a right loyal public reception, but the night visit shattered this hope and prevented the external display of our loyalty through the usual formal address and the strewing of the episcopal pathway with native flowers, lilies, etc., which