

children, if pains be taken with the catechizing equal to those spent on "a pulpit discourse."

To make the children ready in their replies in church, of course previous instruction is needful, and here we are met with the difficulty of "Common Schools." instead of "Schools of the Church." This difficulty could be overcome in places where there are sufficient Churchmen with will and means, in the same way that it is overcome in many Parishes in the United States. The parents of 20 or 25 children agree to sacrifice the amount of their school tax, and employ a teacher of their own, who is a Deacon or Priest.—Twenty children at £2 per quarter each, would be sufficient to raise a fair salary for a gentleman, £160; and the Rector would have an assistant in clerical work, when the teacher was not occupied in school. This double work can be done, for I have done it.

If these means: the Church Day School, and weekly Public catechising, were faithfully used, Sunday Schools in the common acceptation of the word would be rendered needless. But there are many Parishes in which these means cannot at present, be brought into use. Sunday schools (if properly conducted,) are the most useful aids to the Parish Priest. But every Sunday School Teacher should look upon himself simply as an assistant catechist—the clergyman being the principal.

I would suggest that the clergyman should gather all his assistant catechists once in the week, and give them instruction as to what he desires to have taught on the following Lord's day—that they may "all teach the same thing."

As to taking part in a so called Union Sunday School, I can hardly imagine a sane Pastor of any congregation attempting such a thing. Just imagine a poor child in a Union Sunday School!

CLASS I.—Teacher—*Churchman*. Teaching "a member of Church" 'regenerate in Holy Baptism.' Bishops—Priests—and Deacons!

CLASS II.—Teacher—*Baptist*. Teaching Baptism is no saving ordinance—you must be born again after conversion when you are old enough to understand and judge for yourself.

CLASS III.—Teacher—*Methodist*. Teaching our Local Preacher is a better preacher than Mr.—the Rector, and as to ordination—he believes he is called of God, and that is enough.

CLASS IV.—Teacher—*Presbyterian*. Teaching Bishops are a relic of Popery—Prelacy is not to be found in the Bible—the ordination of the Presbytery is all sufficient. What a state of confusion for a child's mind.—*What is truth?*

Your readers will observe how very crude these remarks are. I really have not time to put them in more presentable form, but trust that roughly as they are sent out they may yet serve to draw out more polished articles from more leisurely compositors.

Yours most truly,

A/ D. C. MISSIONARY.

MIDDLE MUSQUODOBOIT. Oct. 30th, 1865.

Rev. Sirs,—What constitutes excommunication in the Church of England? In the Church of Rome it consists in exclusion from Church privileges, such as Baptism, the Sacraments, and Christian Burial, and intercourse with the members of the Church. But there is some offence charged, and some opportunity given of exculpation or repentance of the fault. In the Diocese, however, there is a mode of excommunication that does not require any accusation, does not give any opportunity of explanation or exculpation, without any process or trial, merely by withdrawing Clerical superintendence, and, as far as public worship goes, of Religious Instruction. I know not how this power is exercised in other parts of the Diocese, but I take the opportunity afforded by the Church Chronicle, which I understand is open to communications on subjects in which the Church is interested, to make a plain statement of the position in which the members of our Church are placed in Middle Musquodoboit. And I think it will be apparent that they have in fact been excommunicated and treated as if they were no longer considered as belonging to the Church.