

make an offering for foreign missions. If it should result in no other contribution but my own, I am determined the opportunity shall be offered (backed up by all the powers of persuasion that facts and loud calls for help can give) for the members of my congregation to commence some work for foreign missions. Think what our good offering, given heartily from all our congregations in the Dominion, would do!

And the result would be just what the result of great missionary work was in England. The home work there during the last forty years has been just as surprising as the foreign work, and a writer in the *London Quarterly Review*, of July, 1879, speaking of the foreign work of the Church of England, as exemplified by the late Bishop Selwyn, and the surprising home work as shewn by that of a man like Dean Hook, says—

"Rome in the pride of its long supremacy may deny vitality to our orders and grace to our sacraments, and may stigmatize our Reformed Church as a mere creature of the secular power; but as long as she can nurture and send forth, equipped for the warfare of salvation, such sons as Hook and Selwyn, can sustain them in all their toils, satisfy all their aspirations, and retain to the last their unswerving loyalty and devoted attachment, so long will she possess a proof of her Divine mission and spiritual vitality, than which even the primitive Church of the Apostles could show no surer evidence of a supernatural Presence in its midst."

And again I say, sir, that it is work which will commend us to the people of this country. We have had a great deal of Apostolic talk. Let us arise and do an Apostolic work.

CHAS. H. MOCKRIDGE.

Rector in charge, Christ Church Cathedral, Hamilton, Feb. 4, 1881.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND SUNDAY SCHOOL INSTITUTE IN MANITOBA.

WINNIPEG, 26th January, 1881.

SIR,—I beg to thank Mr. Ross Brown, a gentleman whose residence even I do not know, for his kindly notice of my exertions in favour of distinctive Church teaching in our Sunday Schools. To my lay mind, the unwillingness of many clergymen who would feel insulted if I were to charge them with lukewarmness, to adopt the literature of the Institute, is simply amazing. Why, I assert—why will any man, clerical or lay, who makes the slightest pretension to the character of a loyal son of the Church, cling to the International Series, a compound of elements, not one of which is distinctively Church of England. Why, I again cry out—why tolerate for a moment that wretched compound of pious platitudes, and milk and water theology, the hymnology of Moody and Sankey, —why, and I pray that my questions may penetrate to every Church Sunday School of the Dominion; why persist, as many clergymen are at this moment doing, in the suicidal policy of excluding from their schools the teaching of the history, purpose, and objects of the Book of Common Prayer. What is the root, the very basis, the true origin, the cause, the very life-blood of most of the divisions in our Church? I hesitate not a moment in declaring it to be ignorance of that great book. Sir, I am now speaking to the clergyman who is reading those words.—Sir, pray answer me these questions—How many heads of families are there in your congregation, who knew that the Church of England was a fully organized Church, that it possessed a Liturgy, and was ruled by Bishops centuries before Roman Catholicism was known? Do not most of them believe that the Church of England was the result, the creation of the Reformation under Luther?—That Henry VIII was its God-father, and the Roman Catholic Church its father? That it broke away from its parent, and in its secession carried with it many of the superstitions and mummeries, as your good people call them, of Romanism? Do they not look upon the Cross as a Roman symbol, on an altar as a Roman fabric, on candles as Roman superstitions, on flowers as Roman follies, or worse; on surpliced choirs as Roman devices,—on choral services as inventions of the devil, on changes of colours in the altar cloth, and fittings of the chancel, pulpit, and reading desk according to the varying seasons of the Christian year, as abominable practices invented by Romish priests for the unholy purpose of seizing on power through the superstitions of the ignorant people? Do they not cling with all the tenacity of a Boer, and the ignorance of a Hottentot, to the belief that a Ritualist in England is a wicked Jesuit in disguise, that what they are pleased to call High-Churchism in Canada is Ritualism in disguise, and that they are both bent on the destruction of the Church? Whence all this Alpine height of ignorance? Where does it come from? You know it is all nonsense! Nonsense, did I say? Ah! it were well if it were but nonsense; but it is a thousand times worse—it is a dreadful ignorance of the very first principles underlying the structure of the Church itself, and like the deadly worm at the root of the vine, is quietly and silently poison-

ing every fibre of its growth. Answer me. Do you believe that if the Book of Common Prayer were properly understood, these hideous errors as to the doctrines, the practices, the forms of worship, the ornaments, and the vestments of the Church of England, would be scattered broadcast over our land? Do you not know that if this were done, the wretched squabbles, the sickening disputes, the village oratory, the parish theology, the tea-table vapidity would cease? Why? Simply because a fair knowledge, even of the Book of Common Prayer, and of its teachings, would prove that the bugbears I have mentioned are born of ignorance, and have no real existence, as constituents inimical to the purity of the Church. What is the remedy? you ask. A very simple one. Teach that book in your Sunday Schools—let it be second only to the Bible; teach it every Sunday. Teach it as carefully, as assiduously, as minutely, as exhaustively as you teach the Catechism. Let it be as familiar to your youth as the A B C, and you will find the next generation better Churchmen than their fathers, merely because they will have a better knowledge of their Church. Don't waste time or energy on the old people, especially if they are Scotch. You can't bend the gnarled oak—though if any impression be made on them, it will be made, not by you, but by their children through your teaching. Let them go, and attend to your Sunday Schools. There is the place where the great battle of the Church must yet be fought out. It is there, and there only, that the legislation will be created, which will prevent in the next, and all future, generations, the shocking, the barbarous, spectacle of three worthy and zealous, though I believe wrong-headed, clergymen standing behind the bars of a prison in free and Christian—(what a solemn mockery of Christianity!)—England. But, besides this revolution, which the full teaching of this Book will create, it would do much more—it would bind with hooks of steel your young people to the Church. I will defy any young man who has been properly taught this Book, ever to leave the Communion of the Church of England, unless, indeed, he be either a rogue or an idiot, and in either case his seducers would be welcome to him. But how is it now? Thousands of our young people have been, and are now being, lost to us, because their Sunday School training was of that milk-and-water, happy-go-easy, go-as-you-please style to which many clergymen are still clinging.

And now I come to a much more pleasant phase of my thoughts. I told you some time ago that a movement was on foot in this Diocese to organize a Diocesan Sunday School Institute, under the authority of a resolution of Synod. This was done to-day, and among the many pleasant meetings I have had with the noble man, who as Metropolitan of this Ecclesiastical Province, and Bishop of Rupert's Land, and with his zealous and exceptionally able clergy, none has been as pleasant as those which this afternoon culminated in the completion of this organization. The Institute has been formed, His Lordship the Bishop being President; the Rev. W. C. Pinkham, of St. James, and Superintendent of Education for the Province, being Secretary, and the writer Treasurer. We did not separate until we had placed in the hands of the Secretary for transmission to England, the funds necessary to make this Institute a member of the Institute. We immediately ordered a sample of the publications from Messrs. Rowell & Hutchinson, of Toronto, and the Sunday Schools of this immense Diocese will, in a few months, be working under one system, in which the literature of the English Institute will alone be used. My dear Mr. Brown, there will be no more emasculation here. A depot will be established in Winnipeg, which will supply all the schools of the country with the publications of the Institute obtained direct from England; and now I claim for His Lordship the Bishop of Rupert's Land, for the Synod of his Diocese, for his admirable clergy, and for this great and rising country, the high honour of being first in the Dominion of Canada, to adopt in all its rich entirety and splendid character the literature of the Church of England Sunday School Institute. There was no hesitation, no faltering, no scheming to mix a foreign and impure element with the unadulterated purity of Church teaching, and no red-tapeism in carrying out the noble plan. Manitoba can now exult in the possession of the only genuine Anglican Cathedral in the Dominion—in a system of education second not even to Ontario, with a richer endowment—in three Colleges, second not even to that of Upper Canada, and to a University, in which the Roman Catholic works with his Protestant brother in peace and harmony. She can exult in a united clergy of the Church of England, who know nothing of the miserable squabbles in Ontario between the so-called High Church and Low Church, and from this day she exults in the establishment in foundations laid broad and deep in a soil of pure-mindedness and noble-heartedness, as rich and generous as that of her illimitable prairies, of a system of Sunday School education, whose productions will yet astonish the feeble visions of the half-hearted Churchmen of Old Canada.

WM. LEGGO.

HURON CONSTITUTION.

SIR.—In condemning a system which has produced such a lamentable state of affairs in the Diocese of Huron, I should be misunderstood, if my words implied that all the evils laid at the door of any one person, as the Church at large is more or less responsible, by aiding, abetting, or encouraging the slightest departure from that which is lawful, just and right.

I think we may look upon the abolition of the Church Society as the first act in this new system. It was then contended against, as some feared that the interest and efficiency of the lay element would much decrease, to the great injury of the Church. I think events and statistics show that they were correct.

The Bishop in his first address (H. I. 1872, p. 28,) states: "I speak from heartfelt conviction, based upon experience, when I say, I believe there is no Diocese, where the bishop, clergy, and laity are more united in heart, work and purpose than in this happy Diocese of Huron." I am afraid his Lordship could not bear the same testimony now, when the law courts are called in to test the question whether legislative illegality can triumph over law, justice, and equity.

His Lordship in the conclusion of that address states: "As far as I am concerned, you may rely upon it, my brethren, that I will endeavour by God's grace, to administer the affairs of the diocese with all the impartiality becoming the sacred office of a Bishop in the Church of God, and that I will, to the utmost extent of my abilities and judgment, manifest on all occasions, and towards all my brethren, that I am not influenced by 'party feelings' or by a 'party spirit.'" (H. I. 1872, p. 25): Here is the limit of a Bishop's impartiality—fidelity to his vows! (H. I. 1872, p. 21.)

Was it no "party feeling" or "party spirit" that illegally took away the \$200 a year from the poorer clergy, and retained to the Bishop and Archdeacon much larger amounts, belonging to the same fund? Was it no "party feeling" or "party spirit" to introduce resolutions to curb the honest opinions of others, and striving for power to dismiss dignitaries at pleasure; and as chairman of a committee appointed by himself to allow Crown rectors to be exempt from dismissal (unlike other clergymen) "by six months' notice or six months' pay." This had to be withdrawn—not through the light of discussion, or moral conviction through argument—but through "signal disapproval" of the Synod, proving the same want of confidence of the laity and clergy to their Bishop, as he has displayed to them, by introducing resolutions, taking the decisions out of the hands of the Board of Triers appointed by the Synod to be the judges of the clergy.

From the following concluding part of a letter publicly addressed to the late Metropolitan, Bishop Fulford, D.D., dated October 9th, 1862, I think we had a right to expect better things; and surely every member of the Church has an equal right, if not far greater justice, to complain of the absolute spirit in our Bishop, as Dean Hellmuth had in the Metropolitan Bishop:—

"I do not hide it, that I am jealous of anything and everything which would interfere with my privileges as a British subject, or my legitimate liberty as a clergyman of the Reformed Church of England. Will your Lordship permit me, in conclusion, for your own sake, and the Church's sake—though your inferior in office—to hope that I shall not unduly trench upon the deference due to Metropolitan authority, if suggesting for grave and humble enquiry, whether it is not possible for the highest ecclesiastical functionary—being fallible—to err at times, in Pastorals or otherwise, by assuming a position and attributes to irresponsibility incompatible with the recognized principles of our Protestant liberty? Did we not live under British protection, might we not well tremble at the recent assumption of such a power by your Lordship? For whose standing or reputation would be safe that incurred your Lordship's displeasure? May not the assumption of such a power in our church be but the germ of that absolutism which, in its full development, would reduce us to the abject condition, where all power is concentrated in one poor mortal, and in which the several parts only perform their functions in absolute subordination to the supreme central will? When such power is attempted to be exercised in this 19th century by an English Colonial Bishop, is it not high time to check so dangerous an encroachment on our liberties? I feel justified, my lord, in saying that the more I think of your unjust and unprecedented feelings against me, the more I am constrained to regret that you should have assumed a spiritual jurisdiction but little short of the most despotic that the Church of Rome arrogated to herself in the most ignorant of the middle ages. If a prelate has it in his power, without even the semblance of a court, a commission, or a Synod, to assail in private, and officially to defame in public, without an iota of evidence, the personal character of a clergyman of another diocese—who enjoys the full confidence and approval of his own Bishop—simply because he has dared to give utterance to opinions not agreeable to the Metropoli-

tan, perh such conse defin safet and r land. Him, light

Oc Su the c of th actio matta be to there cause

I se Janu mitte \$2.50 der v \$1.90 accou the F a larg meet crease only c severi surpl Suste his ad duty c our c By th plus d dress "sur again for th this t bankr have l &c. have l drying suppo and w

In f delega of the the Cl pare v 1880. Droc Subscr \$35.54 ment (\$82.40 \$49.17 years, Assess 924.38, years c of the emplifi sidered plantir own da

Miss for 1877 Surely flunce bered t Fund, i and Or of that

I find four ye ending, be onl amount agent's ance of tem.

Wido \$4,683. Net vol '78, '79, riage fe Each increas cess of and '80, tions to think m the dec decline in paroc