

divided into two parts, the eastern and western end. When it is recollected that the District of Algoma, which for Parliamentary purposes does not include Muskoka, is as large as all the Maritime provinces put together, and I believe the County of Gaspé, in Quebec, thrown in, and that it has for its legislative representation with Muskoka, three members, it certainly ought to warrant the oversight of two Bishops. The eastern end has no touch whatever with the western end. Many of us don't know where the places of the west are, and certainly know nothing of their size and importance nor of their wants. It is utterly impossible on account of its size to hold any diocesan meetings of clergy and laymen, and even to get the clergy together is a very expensive matter, and can only be done once every three years. This should not be. Objection may be raised that want of funds would prevent the division. I do not think this an objection. I do not think that it is necessary for a Bishop to receive a stipend of \$4,000 or \$5,000 before a new diocese could be formed. It was not so in the early history of the Church. The present episcopal stipend of Algoma is, I believe, at least \$4,000. This stipend could be divided in two. The Bishop, say of the eastern or western end, could be also the rector of the leading parish of his proposed diocese, with a curate under him say in Deacon's orders, to take his duty when away on matters relating to his diocese. For example, the town of Port Arthur pays its incumbent \$1,200 per annum and free parsonage. There is no reason why the incumbent, if he were also the Bishop of the diocese, could not have a deacon in training for priest's orders at a stipend of say \$500 per annum, thus leaving \$700 to go towards the episcopal stipend, making same, with the half of the present \$4,000, \$2,700. The endowment fund and all other diocesan funds could also on the proper basis be divided. What would the result be? That instead of the different parts of the diocese suffering as they have from the want of episcopal oversight and visitation (caused solely in the past by the immense territory and work that the present Bishop has had), the different places would be in immediate touch with their overseer. Frequent Visits and Confirmations could be held, and if the Bishop had the true missionary spirit he could then have time to go to places where there was no clergyman occasionally and hold services there, gradually building up the nucleus of a congregation, and the Church would be in time extended, and certainly would thrive better than it has in the past in Algoma. To show the wants of the present diocese (and speaking only for eastern Algoma, I know nothing of western Algoma, although I believe many places are to-day vacant in the western end for want of a clergyman or of the money to pay him), Schrieber is shortly to be without a clergyman, if it is not now. It has its church built and paid for, due largely to the conscientious efforts of the Rev. Mr. Evans, its former missionary. It also has a parsonage built, due to his efforts. There are some 50 communicants there. They can raise towards the stipend nearly \$400 a year, and yet they cannot have a clergyman. This is certainly not encouraging to their past efforts. At Neipigon there is also a church and parsonage built and paid for, and there are places lying between Neipigon and Schrieber, and east of Schrieber, which could be ministered to by the Incumbent at Schrieber, and they would contribute their mite towards the stipend. Then again in the township of Oliver there is a church built and consecrated, but its door is shut now. It has six acres of land in connection therewith and also a cemetery, and a clergyman to-day ready to go to the place if \$400 could be provided from the diocesan monies and the farm people most desirous for him to come. He could also attend to the settlers going into the Slate River valley, but at present, for want

of money apparently, the place is closed. While on this point it might not be amiss to ask whether it is not reasonable that the stipend of the present Bishop, while away at Mentone, (provided he is drawing his stipend as Chaplain of Mentone,) should be relinquished to the diocese for the benefit of its outlying portions? The half year's stipend, \$2,000, would provide for a clergyman each at Oliver and Schrieber for the next three or four years. When the Bishop was away before on leave of absence for a year, he was clearly entitled to his stipend because his rest was necessary and earned by his continued service, but his absence again this winter coupled with the appointment to the Chaplaincy of Mentone, warrants Churchmen to expect that he will not weaken the diocesan monies by also taking his stipend.

Furthermore, should there not be some provision made for episcopal oversight of the diocese, instead of simply leaving the matter in the charge of a commissary? If a parish suffers from the want of an incumbent to perform the priestly offices, does not the whole diocese likewise suffer for the want of the Bishop's oversight and the performance of the episcopal offices? In Port Arthur and Fort William are quite a number of people desiring to be confirmed and from whom the Church would receive benefit by their entry, but yet we have no Bishop and are not likely to have a Bishop of our Diocese able to come to us for—we know not when. This should not be.

I bring the above facts to the attention of the Churchmen in Ontario, because I believe that there are many there who have the welfare of this diocese at heart. In the past Algoma has in a sense been looked upon as in the care of the other churches of Ontario, and because I believe that the Churchmen in the eastern end of Ontario will use their influence and voice to help us to have the diocese placed on a proper basis and relieve the immediate wants of some of its missions, which in part I have outlined above.

Yours truly,

FRANK H. KEEFER.

Port Arthur, Oct. 10, '94.

The Rev. Robert Renison has been appointed by the Bishop to the Incumbency of St. Luke's church, Sault Ste. Marie, and also has been appointed Rural Dean of Algoma. His address hereafter will be Sault Ste. Marie.

The Rev. Rural Dean Llwyd desires to acknowledge with many thanks the following donations to the building fund of All Saints' church, Huntsville, Ont.: L. R., \$3; Judge Savery, \$5; J. N. Poole, \$5; J. F. Roberts, \$1; J. Edgar, \$2; making a total of \$73 towards the \$1,000 asked for by the Bishop in his recent appeal.

Diocese of Rupert's Land.

WINNIPEG.

ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE.—On Saturday Sept. 29th. His Excellency the Governor General and suite visited St. John's College. They were met by His Grace the Primate, Dean Grisdale, Canon O'Meara, and the officers of the College.

After His Excellency had inspected the building, His Grace the Primate read an address, to which the Governor General made a very happy reply, at the close of which he said: "I cannot help saying your Grace, that the pleasure of receiving at your hands this token of kind feeling is enhanced by the fact, that I claim your Grace, not only as a fellow countryman, but that you come from that corner of Scotland which we think has produced so many eminent men. I congratulate Aberdeenshire, and especially the Braes of Coomar, on the production of such a specimen as the Archbishop furnishes in that respect.

Contemporary Church Opinion.

The Anglican Church Chronicle, Honolulu:

On the right conception and reception of the Holy Communion more than anything else depends the unity of the Church of Christ. To be one with Christ is also to be one with each other. But that mystical union betwixt Christ and His Church cannot exist as He would wish it, unless there is unity between the members. The Church in America and various other bodies of Christians are struggling after both union and unity. Though it is the most egregious blot on Christianity that so much disunion and dissension exist, there is little likelihood of any amelioration of those evils, while churchmen themselves . . . hold such different views concerning the Holy Eucharist.

The Family Churchman, London, Eng.,

It seems that in their zeal for reunion the Dean of Bristol and Norwich have stated that they are prepared to accept Nonconformist ministers without "re-ordination." We have the greatest possible respect for Dean Pigou and Dean Lefroy, but they really have no right to give away the Church in this manner. There is no more reason for allowing a Nonconformist to act as a priest or a deacon without being ordained than for allowing a Church layman to do so; the teaching of the Church of England is as plain as it can be on this question, and she regards Episcopal ordination as absolutely necessary to valid orders. Reunion is a thing to be ardently desired and worked for, but it would be dearly bought by a sacrifice of principle; indeed, we have to look forward to something wider than the mere reunion of Christians in England; what we aim at eventually is surely the reunion of Christendom itself. To adopt the suggestion of the Deans of Bristol and Norwich would at once entirely change the position of the Church of England and would destroy her claim to be considered the Catholic Church in this country, and it would, moreover, make the reunion of Christendom for ever impossible except on the basis of unconditional submission to Rome. It is most important that in our right and natural zeal to bring back to the Church those who are at present estranged from her we should avoid rash and ill-considered proposals such as these. The ground is being gradually cleared of obstacles, and in good time we shall come together. But nothing is to be gained by compromising our principles. A firm adherence to the doctrines of the Church coupled with patience and unlimited tolerance is what we need.

The Southern Cross, Port Elizabeth, South Africa:

The reason is not far to seek. English Protestantism is sectarian and political, *first*, and religious *afterwards*. The English Protestant sects are not over fond of one another, but are capable of uniting with eager cordiality in attacking the Church. If political Dissenters can score off the Church, and hamper its progress, they will do so at any cost to the Christian Religion. The violent objection shown by English Dissenters to the teaching of the doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation by the London School Board, prove plainly that they would rather banish religion from the Government schools than have those doctrines taught which they confessedly hold in common with the Church.

In Australia and New Zealand the English emigrants carried their sectarian bitterness with them to a new soil, and found excuses for opposing an unestablished Church as strongly as their co-religionists oppose an Established Church in England. In consequence of this sectarian hatred, religion was utterly banished