

ention God willing, to have a general Conference of all the clergy of Algoma in Parry and sometime next summer. The event will possess a special interest as the first of its kind in the history of the Diocese. But it cannot longer be postponed. The feeling is growing among us that we need two things only, a closer mutual acquaintance among the clergy, and a more effective organization for the details of our missionary work. The session of a Synod is also looming up. The possibility of making the Algoma Missionary a more effective diocesan organ will be discussed. Means will be probably taken looking towards a temporary administration of our "Dows and Orphans" Fund should occasion requiring the formation of a Synod. The Synod passed at the late Provincial Synod, providing for Algoma representation in the Clergy House will doubtless receive attention. This, however, will involve a large amount of preliminary letter writing, and for this I have requested the Rev. W. Crompton, and he has consented to act as my corresponding secretary.

I am now upon a tour in the Diocese of Algoma, (kindly arranged for me by the Rev. Canon Innes,) which began on the 6th, and includes, as printed, to be visited, with the approval, on behalf of Algoma; Galt, Epsom, Woodstock, Simcoe, Port Dover, Stratford, Mitchell, Seaforth, Clinton, and Godfrey, closing with St. Paul's, London, Feb. 1st.

The Treasurer has informed me that our Missionary Stipend Fund was overdrawn on Feb. 1st, by the sum of \$570.

Yours truly but mournfully,

E. ALGOMA.

#### DIocese OF SASKATCHEWAN.

Archdeacon Pinkham, Bishop designate of Saskatchewan, desires gratefully to acknowledge the receipt of \$11.57 from St. Jude's Day-school, Montreal, for Sunday-school in this diocese.

#### TEMPORARY CHURCH OPINION.

The Southern Churchman says:—The connection in which Christ affirms, "He that receiveth me soever He sends receiveth Him," is very motive. He had just told His Apostles of this, but even this fearful fact did not cancel the mission He had given them nor prove it useless. Though Judas had now gone forth to betray Him, yet it was true, and ever would be true, that he who received His messenger receiving His message received Him. Let the messenger of Christ, delivering the message of Christ to his fellows, have good courage. Let the messenger of Christ, with the message of Christ, he has received Christ Him

The same paper adds as to Lent:—A few days and the Lenten season will come. Ought there not to be a preparation for this holy period on the part of all of us? Is it so often the case that members of the Church indulge in an excess of gayety just before Lent, as if it were to make a time taken from worldly pleasure during Lent? Is it to be believed that this kind of fast that is acceptable to God?

The Church Press (New York) enquires:—Would John Wesley be a Methodist? The preachers who belonged to the Wesleyan Church were deeply attached to the Church of England. "Not one proposes or designs separation," wrote John Wesley. For "nineteen years separation was mooted by some of the spirits, but for that time and longer the minds, led by Wesley, resisted all sug-

gestions of the sort, and in 1774 Wesley wrote: "Nineteen years ago we considered the question in a public conference at Leeds, and, after long and candid enquiry, it was determined, without one dissenting voice, that it was not expedient. The reasons stand equally good at this day." After the death of the great and good leader, formal separation, alas, did take place. Were Wesley alive to-day, what would he counsel? Which would be "the church of his choice?" Would John Wesley be a Methodist?

The Church (of Philadelphia) referring to the commemoration of the 4th of February, 1887, as the centenary of the American Episcopate, says:—

Many persons are tempted to say, it is not so remarkable that, a century ago, two Bishops were consecrated for America by the officials of the Church of England. Still more strange is it that the Mother Church did not perform so necessary an act long before. An examination will show that the difficulties to be overcome were not altogether on the other side of the ocean, but that not a few of them presented themselves in America, and in our own Church itself. It is a matter of record that the House of Burgesses, in Virginia, before the revolution passed a vote of thanks to four clergymen of that colony for "the wise and well-timed opposition they had made to the new pernicious project of a few mistaken clergymen for introducing an American Bishop." In the Province of Massachusetts Bay still more decided action was taken. The House of Representatives charged their agent in London, strenuously to oppose the scheme for "the establishment of a Protestant Episcopate in America," as very alarming to a people whose fathers suffered under such an establishment. It is doubtless true that England had less care on account of the religious destitution of the Colonies than she should have had, but it is none the less true that there was strong opposition in America to the establishment of the Episcopate in this country.

When we remember that the Episcopate, excepting as it has put on schismatic forms, has never shown a disposition to impart its gifts until after much consideration, it is indeed a noteworthy circumstance that in 1787, so short a time after the war of the revolution, the dignitaries of the Church of England raised up to a spiritual equality with themselves clergymen from the American States, and perfected the organization of the Church in the same country, that it might henceforth govern itself as an autonomous body, and apply itself to the great work which awaited it. The world does not furnish a nobler field for the Church of Christ than America presents to-day. May we enter upon the second century of our Protestant Episcopate with purposes correspondent to the needs of our land and people.

The Church Record (Conn.), is strongly opposed to the "Leaflet" system for the Sunday-school; it says:

It seems to us that there was more positive knowledge gained of the Scriptures, and a more definite and permanent affection, for the Church developed when the Bible and Prayer Book were the only text books, than has been or can be gained by all the leaflets that were ever issued.

The tendency to-day is to "scrappiness" in thought and knowledge, possession of a series of items rather than broad knowledge, and this tendency is, we are convinced, increased by the leaflet system. Instead of a broad knowledge of the Bible as a whole, a partial acquaintance with a few incidents taken out of their connection is obtained. The children do not respect the leaflet as they would the text book. And comparison is constantly made in the child's mind between the secular and the Sunday-school to the disadvantage of the latter by

the comparison of the books carried to school, and the scrap carried to Church. School is recognized as a place for work, and the Sunday-school as a place to "go to," of which the result is pic-nics, Christmas trees, et hoc genus omne.

We never will command for Christian instruction in the minds of either children or parents, the respect that secular education possesses until we treat the question with more dignity, and by set instruction books with references which require the scholars to cultivate a knowledge of the whole book, and "Search the Scriptures" from end to end. This can never be done by the leaflet system. Thorough knowledge of the Bible and Prayer Book which the need of the age demands, and the intelligence of our people makes possible, can never be so obtained. On the contrary, the dignity of Christian education is being lessened.

#### 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.]

#### DIocese OF ALGOMA.

To the Editor of THE CHURCH GUARDIAN:

SIR,—I see a letter in your issue of January 26th the signature of "Philecclesia," which I very much regret to see. I do hope the writer is not a clergyman. At the outset "Philecclesia" is altogether wrong. All the clergy in Algoma do not receive \$700 a year. I now receive \$400 from the Diocese and this is supplemented by a Government grant of \$200 for an Indian School, and to alone teach the latter is worth to any man \$500 in labor, etc. My next neighbor at Bruce Mines gets the same as I do from the diocese (\$400) and tries to get what he can where he can. Within the past two years I have had one marriage fee, and this amounted to three dollars, and I had to walk over one hundred miles to perform the ceremony. Of course, we are all rich in Algoma and as in some places we pay for goods twice or thrice as much as people do at the front there is a lot of "sentiment" about us. Has the "lover of the Church" ever been to Algoma that he knows so much about the missionary hardships of this and the older dioceses. I am not writing for myself, nor should I have written, but as I have spent five years in Algoma, and all that time could not as much as keep a wife, and as I have to live alone in a parsonage among Indians with not as much as a cat, I think I am as hard put to it as any one, I do not complain, nor should the Church hear from me were it not that I think "Philecclesia" is going to injure God's work. There is no man in Canada sympathises more with the poor clergy in all the dioceses than I do, but I cannot stand to see my own diocese run down. If "Philecclesia" thinks he is going to benefit Toronto or Montreal at the expense of Algoma he is mistaken. In the face of all that is human about us it is only just that the men in the older dioceses should be supported, and we in Algoma pray that they may be; but I, sir, protest in the name of my fellows against such a letter as that of "Philecclesia." If he is a clergyman let him not try again to promote the cause at our expense.

I am, Sir, yours,

C. A. FRENCH.

P.S.—If the Bishop of Algoma cannot support a man entirely, let him not send him where he mentions. I know every foot of ground there, and it would be a crime to send a man in unprovided for. He will at best have hard times of it.

SIR,—In my communication of the 20th ult., in regards to the music of St. Chrysostom's Church, I inadvertently said that the Christmas anthem was taken from the "Creation," when