

TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS.

We extremely regret that owing to divers causes which, it is needless here to detail, the publication of THE GUARDIAN has been suspended much longer than intended. We found it necessary, owing to dissatisfaction with the arrangement by which the printing, etc. was done at a distance from our editorial and business office in Montreal, to discontinue publication with the number of 28th December, intending to resume within a few weeks thereafter. This, though delayed, we do this week: publishing as formerly in Montreal. We hope by this means to be able to give greater satisfaction to our subscribers and trust that we shall receive their continued support and approval. Credit will be given for three months suspension upon all existing subscriptions continued; and we will assume that subscribers do continue unless advised to the contrary. Should it be that any of them have through the suspension subscribed for any other paper and desire to discontinue we would be obliged by prompt notice and by remittance of any subscription due to 1st January, '93.

We trust that our efforts to improve THE GUARDIAN may meet with the support of churchmen generally. It will in future be printed upon much better paper than formerly and with new type throughout. We also intend, if duly supported, to give from time to time illustrations—portraits, churches, etc.—thus rendering the paper more attractive. We also hope for contributions to our columns from leading clergy of the Dominion and have already the promise of kind assistance in this respect from Very Rev. The Dean of Montreal and Rev. Canon Brigstocke, Fredericton.

We return our sincere thanks to our subscribers, alike for absence of complaint on account of the break in the publication of THE GUARDIAN and their patience in awaiting its reappearance, as for the many expressions given of their hearty approval of its course in the past and of their earnest desire for its continuance.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

Churchmen in Canada have greater interest in the appointment lately made to the See of Norwich, than is usual as to English Bishoprics. This arises from the fact that the Bishop Designate—the Rev. John Sheepshanks, Vicar of St. Margaret's, Anfield, Liverpool,—was some years a missionary in Canada, having come out as Chaplain to Bishop Hill, on the creation of the diocese of Columbia, and thereafter having held the position of Rector of New Westminster, B.C., being instrumental in having erected there the first church on the new territory. He remained in British Columbia from 1839 till 1867, when for family reasons he returned home. On several occasions he has been offered a Colonial Bishopric, but declined, leaving Anfield, where it is said he has done a noble work for the Church. Our exchanges speak of him as a noted master in organization; marvellously successful in educational work, and an assiduous, enthusiastic and devoted parish priest. He is described as an "Evangelical High Churchman"—whatever that peculiar type may be.

We have not learned whether the position of

Metropolitan of the Ecclesiastical Province of Canada has been definitely and finally filled or not. The House of Bishops met early in the year for the purpose of electing a Metropolitan in conformity with the Canon, but it was understood that there was some defect in one of the voting papers, which prevented actual legal completion of the election. We have not learned whether this has been remedied since. If legally remedied, the votes standing as informally cast for the Rt. Rev. the Lord Bishop of Ontario, senior Bishop of the Province, he would be the Metropolitan, but we have seen no formal announcement of the fact. It would seem to be of sufficient interest to our Church at large to be authoritatively declared.

It will be remembered that at the last Provincial Synod when considering the title to be applied to the President of the General Synod, if formed, the term "Archbishop" was suggested but was not approved. It would appear that others than Churchmen are desirous of dignifying their presiding officers by the use of this title. The "Southern Cross," of Port Elizabeth, Africa, says: that at a recent laying of the foundation stone for a Wesleyan Chapel in Port Elizabeth, the Wesleyan minister, in extending a welcome to the President of their Conference, the Rev. J. Scott, spoke of him as their "Archbishop," upon which the editor of the "Southern Cross" remarks:

"Imitation is the sincerest form of flattery. The Wesleyans are welcome to call their President 'Archbishop' if they wish to. We have no objection to the title 'His Grace the Most Reverend J. Scott, Wesleyan Archbishop of South Africa.' Nor have we to the lesser title of 'His Lordship the Right Reverend Theophilus Chubb, B. A., Wesleyan Bishop of the District.' But what would John Wesley have thought of such titles being used by persons whom he called 'Lay Preachers?' How about his famous 'Korah, Dathan, and Abiram' sermon against Wesley leaving the Church and seeking to set up a schismatic priesthood? We pause for a reply."

The use of the term "My Lord" as applied to our Bishops has been objected to at times by members of other religious bodies in this Dominion; and we find like objection taken lately in South Africa on the application of the term to the Bishop of Grahamstown; and there followed an acrimonious correspondence in the papers of that place, the writers pretending that the use of the title was an infringement of the principle of religious equality and an implied insult to ministers of the denominations. The "Southern Cross" replies: The title "My Lord" as applied to a Bishop, has belonged to the Episcopal Office from early days of Christianity—long before any English Bishops had seats in the House of Lords. A Suffragan Bishop in England cannot sit in the House of Lords, and yet the title "My Lord" belongs to a Suffragan Bishop just as much as to any Bishop in the House of Lords. This decision was given officially when the question was raised in England. A fortiori the title belongs to a Diocesan Bishop in the colonies by virtue of his office.

THE CHURCH YEAR.

BY H. D.

Never have I been more impressed with the wisdom which our Church has displayed in the arrangement of her services, so as to fix the attention of her clergy and people upon the seasons and great events of the Gospel history.

We have more recently come through the season of Lent with its varied services and teachings, all of which are intended to prepare mind and heart for the deeply solemn and impressive scenes and events of the closing days of our Saviour's life on earth.

What heart can go through the record of these scenes without being touched and greatly moved by them? Did the world ever witness such meek submission, such patient endurance, such agony of suffering, as those which our Lord and Saviour endured? What does it, what can it all mean? Have we any interest, any personal concern in these things? Our Church would teach her children that with each and every one, young and old, rich and poor, life and death, soul and body, time and eternity are involved, and that nothing in this world can be compared in importance to them, with the life and death of Jesus Christ.

I see not how any clergyman or layman can engage in the appointed services of our Church for Holy Week, for Good Friday, for Easter as well as other events and seasons, and still have any doubt as to the great doctrinal truths which are held up and taught by them.

To me it is amazing that truths and facts so conspicuous and so declared can be ignored, or treated with indifference by any who call themselves Christians.

Let us be truly grateful to God that we have in our Church such a rich inheritance of Gospel truth, and so many provisions for preserving and perpetuating it.—*Parish Visitor, N. Y.*

PRACTICAL HINTS FOR THE USE OF THE PRAYER BOOK.

BY WILLIAM LEVERING DEYRIES.

When a man sets out upon the work of getting the man next to him to use the Prayer Book, he will soon run upon a number of difficulties for which if he would do good service he must be forearmed.

He will soon meet the man who does not believe in prayer at all. "What is the use of prayer?" he says; "All things were arranged and settled to happen just so, long before I was born. My prayers can't avail anything in altering, even in the minutest particular, the course of the world. No; I have no use for your Prayer Book."

Then he will often run across the man who does not believe in forms of prayer. It is easy enough to dispose of a case such as one the writer once had to deal with. "Oh, yes," said this good Baptist, "I have your Prayer Book; I like it in public worship; I often use it in my private devotions; but I should not wish to be obliged, as you are, to use it always in my private prayers, for my own words are most helpful to me then!" Poor man! It did not take long to disabuse his mind of his erroneous impression that our book of public prayer is also our obligatory manual of private devotion. But we often meet more difficult cases than that.

And again it will not be long before that familiar friend of ours turns up who does not believe in going to church, for he thinks a fellow can be just as good if he stays at home. In other words, he does not see the use of public prayer.