

of the Mother Superior above referred to, the following particulars will be of interest:

In 1851, with the sanction and support of the late Vicar of All Saints, the Rev. W. Upton Richards, Miss Byron began her work as Sister of the Poor, and on St. Luke's Day of that year undertook the care of a few incurable women and some orphan children, in a house in Mortimer street, St. Elizabeth's Home, which has now been rebuilt and enlarged, and holds 60 beds for incurables. In 1853 the community, then numbering six Sisters, moved to All Saints' Home, Margaret street, which then became the mother-house, and there under fixed rules and statutes the foundation of the present large community was laid on August 4th, the Bishop of London consenting to act as Visitor, but in consequence of illness, being unable to be present, the Bishop of Oxford (Wilberforce), acted for him, and appoint her Mother Superior. On the Bishop of London's translation to the see of Canterbury, he consented to continue his office of Visitor; which office is still filled by his Grace the present Archbishop. The works, now numbering *thirty-one*, and extending to *Africa, Asia, and America*, still carry on the original intention of the Foundress, in the training of orphans and destitute children, mission work, and the care of the sick in the hospitals.

Notwithstanding continued ill-health, the Mother Superior had been able to direct the work of the Sisterhood, guiding all the different houses with her counsel, and giving sympathy and support to all who came to her for help.

In 1885 her life was almost despaired of, but after months of illness she was again able to take up with renewed vigor the entire work of the community until the Spring of this year, when she had to undergo a severe operation, and after four weeks, an attack of bronchitis coming on, her strength gave way, and a sudden relapse caused her death on August 3rd.

We are glad to know says the *Family Churchman* that we have some Wesleyan readers, and still more glad to hear from them upon questions in which we are mutually interested. This week we have received letters from a well-known Wesleyan (who for several reasons does not wish his name to appear) in the course of which, while declaring his loyalty to the Methodist body, he concurs with us in deploring the separation of Wesleyans from the Church. "No one now believes," he says, "that the Wesleyan body has any *raison d'être* for separation other than *denominational aggrandisement*. Besides, the stream of tendency among Wesleyans as among Churchmen is emphatically towards greater individual liberty, within clearly defined limits, and there is no scope for such a healthy development within the narrow borders of a sect. Men are becoming more and more Christians, less and less sectaries. It will therefore, not be surprising if we should fall back upon the *Church* as the *only true* representative of *historical Christianity*. Only, we stipulate that the Church do also strip itself of sectarianism."

WELL-DIRECTED WEALTH.—To the editor of the *Missionary Review* a correspondent writes, that in the English Indian Colonies he frequently finds both lady and gentlemen missionaries, who not only come out themselves, but leave not their wealth behind them. They bring their money, and use it in the support of themselves and their work. Some of these he finds to be among the best workers in that field. We believe that among them is "A. L. O. E.," the well known authoress. Some are from the best old English families. Some have brought with them half a million dollars each, and all is generously given and spent in the cause. Would that more of our own people might do this here, at home, too. "Tis only noble to be good."

EDITORIAL NOTES.

For such as earnestly desire and are continually praying for visible Unity amongst Church followers (and where is the Churchman who faithfully uses the liturgy of the Church of England, who does not do so) every indication of progress towards this end is cause of thankfulness. We hail therefore with pleasure the announcement made in the secular press that at the late Convention of the Baptist Society, held in Charlottetown, a basis of union between two of the many divisions of this body, *The Baptists*, and the *Free Christian Baptists*, (whatever the distinction may be), had been adopted. We cannot help thinking that the first step towards the recovery of organic unity is the reunion of the multitudinous divisions of the secular bodies themselves; and that, when this has been accomplished to an extent to reduce the number to that of the original main bodies or divisions, the return of these to the great Catholic Church from which on one pretext and another they broke off, will speedily follow. May God speed the day when this shall be; and in the meantime let the prayer for "All conditions of men," and for "Christ's Church Militant here on Earth," be ever more faithfully and earnestly used.

Some persons are disposed to make excuses for these needless "divisions" on the ground of "inherited differences"; that is, that people are born Methodists, Presbyterians, &c., and merely follow without thought in the steps of their parents. Doubtless there is some force in this claim; but, it cannot excuse, unless indeed there be no evidence of there having been for ages but *one unbroken undivided Body*. If the evidence of this fact is conclusive (and the very limited age of the oldest sectarian bodies proves it) then it would seem to be the bounden duty of every rational creature to exercise its God given powers, weigh the evidence, find out and adhere to the Body of which Christ is the Head, and yielding obedience to His wish—that they all may be One, that the world might be convinced—cease by example and influence to perpetuate division and schism. And there is little foundation in these days for any such excuse since attention is being continually drawn to the historical claim of the Church Catholic.

There has been an uneasy feeling in the minds of many a churchman in our various dioceses—especially since the revelation made of the terms of the Gault Trust deed in the Diocese of Montreal, that the teaching given in certain Theological Schools, was not only of the narrowest kind but directly intended to bias the minds of the students in favor of one particular party on school in the Church. This has been denied in times past, but the remarks of our Contemporary, *The Evangelical Churchman*, of Toronto in reference to the late election in Nova Scotia leaves no longer room for doubt. We quite expected that considerable illfeeling would be raised by the refusal of the clergy to accept the Bishop of Algoma, but we were not prepared for so open an avowal of the policy of the party, or for so unblushing, and wicked an attempt to excite and perpetuate party feeling, as that contained in the following extract from the Edi-

torial utterances of our Western friend—(The italics are ours).

"Plainly the evangelical churchmen of Nova Scotia are engaged in an unequal conflict. To some extent they must take to themselves the responsibility of the inequality. Let them learn from their opponents. If they would retrieve lost ground and retain for the Church in Nova Scotia any portion in the heritage of Truth and Freedom which we have in the gospel, they must be up and doing. It will never do to be depressed and inactive for years, and then, in some such crisis as an episcopal election, put forth a spasmodic effort. Only well-considered and sustained work can be successful. The first desideratum is organization, *Meet together, work together; agitate, educate; disseminate evangelical literature, build up a sound and earnest church opinion.* Let there be an Evangelical Union to do this work systematically and thoroughly. It can be done. It will involve self-sacrifice. Its promoters will have to bear obloquy and reproach. They will be taunted as extreme men, disturbers of the peace, no churchmen. From the days of Alexander the copper-smith and the Ephesian Diana down to the present, such cheap cries are a favorite weapon of intimidation. He that heeds them will accomplish little.

The second desideratum is the providing of *theological education in harmony with evangelical principles*. This is vital and essential. So long as the clergy receive their training in seminaries, removed from all the religious thought and activity of 19th century, and are trained in a system of theology essentially opposed to the tenets of evangelical truth, (*sic*), the present divergence between the clerical and lay elements will continue; and all the work accomplished by the evangelical laity be *neutralized and combated by the Church teaching* in the majority of the parishes. The High Church monopoly of theological education is deemed by themselves essential to their position and predominance. Here is the key to the whole position. The High Church party realize this, as their bitter and unabated opposition to Wycliffe College and their tactics in the Provincial Synod show. The same feeling was manifested in one plea urged against the Bishop of Algoma, namely, his connection with the Montreal Diocesan College. Let the evangelical churchmen of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick lay this very seriously to heart."

There is much in this extract worthy of condemnation, but there is one notable inference to be drawn from it; and that is that if our Contemporary is correct, there would seem to be of necessity, incompatibility between evangelical theology as understood and taught to the so-called "evangelical laity" and true "*Church teaching*". We dispute however, the right of our friend to monopolize evangelical truth, and principles. We claim that true *Church teaching* i.e. teaching according to the standards, of the Church of England, as one branch of the Church Catholic—must necessarily be evangelical in the true sense of the word; and we work and strive for this, free from party bias of either or any kind, or broad and true as the Church itself. If the remarks referred to should stir up churchmen throughout this Ecclesiastical Province to more united action for disseminating, not so-called "Evangelical literature," nor ritualistic or High Church literature, but—true sound unmistakable *Church literature*, it will be well;—but let our readers take warning of the efforts made to the contrary.

It is not accurate (as we understood the report of proceedings connected with the election at Halifax), to say that the objection urged against the Bishop of Algoma was "*his connec-*