

been purchased and deeded to the diocese, chopped, logged, cleaned up and fenced. The church is frame on stone foundation. Nave, 32 x 17 ft. Apse, 15 x 8 ft. Vestry, 8 x 9 ft. Porch, the same. Roof open, $\frac{3}{4}$ pitch. Walls plastered stone finish. Windows, Gothic, filled with lead coloured lights, chancel and nave, furniture all complete. Entire cost, \$441.62. Local collections and labour, \$186.75. Collected outside, \$134.76. S.P.C.K. grant, \$121 11. No debt. Yet weeding to be done, and within local power. Interior, oil staining. Exterior, painting with vulcanized paint. Estimated cost, \$35.

This mission, embracing the foregoing stations, with Clear Lake, and the Travis settlement, as very hopeful fields, if worked up, is left by the Rev. H. N. Burden, missionary for three years past, and whose health compels him to retire, in a most complete and workable condition. Soon, it is to be hoped, to be again occupied by a missionary who will consolidate and perfect the good work the retiring missionary has so well brought on to its present satisfactory condition. With the temporalities so effectually provided for, space is afforded for a more concentrated attention being given to the more purely spiritual side of the people's requirements, although Mr. Burden has by no means neglected or overlooked this important part of his work. Summarised, the work of Mr. Burden's incumbency may be given as follows: He has built two churches and rebuilt another, and completed the exterior of another. He has made one graveyard by carting soil thereto, and fenced two others. Extended and embellished the Parsonage House, the whole at a total cost of \$2,309 46, with a debt remaining of only \$276, for which he has made himself personally responsible, and which: it is earnestly hoped, the many warm-hearted and liberal friends of Algoma will not suffer him to lose or to wait long for. Mr. Burden left at the end of October. The Rural Dean of Muskoka, Huntsville, will gladly receive contributions to liquidate the \$276 owing, practically speaking, to Mr. Burden, and will acknowledge all sums received in the diocesan organ, *A.M. News*.

The Bishop of Algoma desires to acknowledge, with many thanks, the receipt of \$50 from Mrs. Kings (Treas.) in behalf of the 'Education Committee' of the Women's "Auxiliary Missionary Association" of the Diocese of Huron, in aid of an "Educational Fund."

For the information of Church people generally, the Bishop writes to explain that the objects of his "Educational Fund" is to assist in securing for the children of a few of our Missionaries an education something better than can be obtained in the common schools in their immediate neighborhood. Through the kindness of private individuals, and also of the Woman's Auxiliary, more especially those of Huron and Quebec, ten children (6 girls and 4 boys) have had much excellent educational, as well as social advantages placed within their reach, foundations being thus laid in their young minds, upon which, by God's grace and blessing, we have every reason to believe that the superstructure of useful, honorable, christian lives, will one day be erected.

There are others yet to be provided for—notably among them, a blind boy, nineteen years of age, possessing very marked musical tastes. Persons desiring to aid in this can address the Bishop at 'The Arlington,' Toronto.

ASPEN.—Much regret is felt by priest and people at the departure of the efficient Lay Helper, Mr. G. F. Davidson, for Toronto, where he intends entering upon his studies for the Ministry. His labors of love on this Mission have been many and various; lay reading at St. Michael's and St. Johns; editorial work in connection with parish paper; Sunday School work, etc., etc. The best wishes and prayers

of pastor and parishioners follow him to his new home.

ST. JOHN'S, STANLEYDALE.—This church has now been properly ceiled with matched lumber and we hope in consequence to be a little warmer this winter. Cold we must still be though.

Correspondence.

DID JOHN WESLEY BELIEVE HE HAD POWER TO ORDAIN?

SIR,

I have before me Wesley's Journal, published in his life time, sold at the Foundry. His hands may likely enough have handled this identical copy. Under date of June 20 1746 I find the following which I will give, as I find it, capitals and punctuation included. "I set out for Bristol, On the Road I read over Lord King's Account of the Primitive Church. In spite of the vehement Prejudice of my Education, I was ready to believe That this was a fair and impartial Draught. But if so, it would follow, that Bishops and Presbyters are (essentially) of one Order: and that originally every Christian Congregation was a Church independent on all others!"

I have also before me, 'An Enquiry into the Constitution, Discipline, Unity, and Worship of the Primitive Church, Which flourished within the first Three Hundred Years after Christ faithfully Collected out of the Fathers and extant writings of Those Ages, By Sir Peter King, Lord High Chancellor of England, London 1839.' On page 56, I read, "But now, from the whole We may collect a solid argument for the equality of presbyters with bishops, as to order; for if a presbyter did all a bishop did, what difference was there between them? A bishop preached baptised and confirmed—so did a presbyter; a bishop excommunicated, absolved and ordained, so did a presbyter: the particular acts of their office was the same; the only difference that was between them was in degree; but this proves there was none at all in order. That bishops and presbyters were of the same order, appears from that originally they had one and the same name, each of them being indifferently called bishops or presbyters"

Wesley's view of the matter remained unchanged for 38 years; for in his letter to Dr Coke Mr. Asbury, and our Brethren in North America Sep 10, 1784 (Coke & Moore's Life of Wesley page 327,) he says "Lord King's account of the primitive Church convinced me many years ago, that bishops and presbyters are the same order, and consequently have the same right to ordain. For many years I have been importuned from time to time to exercise this right by ordaining part of our travelling preachers"

I think the above makes it unquestionable that John Wesley believing that presbyters had power to ordain and being himself a presbyter, believed that he had power to ordain.

E. S. ORR.

Cookshire, P. Q., Nov. 16, 1891.

(Our correspondent seems to have missed the

force of that little word, *if* in the quotation from Wesley's Journal, *If* Lord King's account be "a fair and impartial draught." Wesley read this book "*on the road*," as he travelled perhaps on horseback; an occasion not particularly well suited for critical examination of a subject as important as the *Orders* in the Church of Christ. The expressions used in the Journal fall short of conviction. That there could not have been *conviction* is plain too from Wesley's own act in applying in 1763, *seventeen* years after reading King's book, to Erasmus a Bishop of the Greek Church, then in England, to *ordain one of his preachers*, a Mr. Jones: which Erasmus did. If he Wesley really had been *convinced* by King's argument and really *believed* (as our correspondent claims) that he, Wesley, had power to ordain, why did he apply to Erasmus? This conclusively proves that he did *not believe* that he had any such power. And this further appears from the fact that before allowing Erasmus to ordain Jones, Wesley caused enquiries to be made and certified himself that Erasmus *was a true bishop*, and says, he (Wesley) "had abundant unexceptionable credentials as to his, (Erasmus') *Episcopal* character"—he was not satisfied with *presbyterial* authority.

As to his letter to Dr. Coke, it too is based upon the *supposition* that King's account was correct: and in June 1789, *five* years after the letter referred to by our correspondent, Wesley explained this and another letter thus, "When I said 'I believe I am a scriptural Bishop,' I spoke on Lord King's *supposition* that Bishops and Presbyters are essentially one "that is Wesley if really misled for a season by Lord King's argument, in 1789 virtually apologises for his error! using the term *supposition* as to King's argument. He had found it was *not* a fair and impartial draught. And so too *Lord King himself found*. He was we believe when he wrote it of the *mature* age of 22, and a Presbyterian. "Afterwards he (King) was so thoroughly convinced by a pamphlet written by a "clergyman named Selater of the utter fallacy "of all his arguments about Bishops and Priests "being the same order, that he (King) withdrew "and denounced his own book and became a "Churchman"—which is the usual result of a candid Enquiry into the Church's claims.

But again that Mr. Wesley did not really believe that he had power to ordain and did not believe that Bishops and Presbyters are essentially *one* Order is evident from his letter to Mr. Asbury—He writes. "But in one point my dear "brother I am a little afraid both the Doctor " (Coke) and you differ from me. I study to be "*little*: you study to be great. I creep: you "strut along. * * * * * "One instance of this, of your greatness has "given me great concern. How can you, how "dare you suffer yourself to be called Bishop? "I shudder, I start at the thought! Men may "call me a knave, a fool, a rascal, a scoundrel "and I am content but they shall never by my "consent call me Bishop! For my sake, for "God's sake, for the Church's sake, put a full end "to this! Let Presbyterians do what they "please; but let Methodists know their calling "better." Manifestly the horror of usurpation of, and intrusion into any holy office manifested by Wesley in his *Korah* Sermon, continued unimpaired in 1788.—[Ed.]