

it not be possible, would it not be advisable, to consider the whole subject in view of this great future which we expect, and to adopt a scheme that would fit in with and encourage the fulfilment of our great hopes?

For instance, the present Provincial Synod of Eastern Canada comprises dioceses in five of the Provinces of Canada—Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward's Island. This arrangement is inconvenient in several respects. It is inconvenient in the matter of expense, especially to the representatives from the Maritime Provinces. It is inconvenient in the matter of legislation, being incapable as a body of applying to the Dominion or to the Provincial legislatures. It is inconvenient also because the position of the Church and her relation to the surrounding populations is so different in these different provinces. Further, the present Provincial Synod is a large body now, and any further extension of its membership would make it cumbersome. The same objections will in time apply to the Provincial Synod of the North-West also. Ought we not to look forward to a great increase of the Episcopate in the near future? Should we not also be seeking to return, and making provision for such a return, to the system of the early Church, in which every city had its bishop not necessarily with an endowment of \$40,000—and when the dioceses were small and in constant direct touch with their bishops. We are practically to-day almost Presbyterian, or Independent congregations, with bishops as occasional visitors.

Might I venture to suggest a scheme recognizing indeed the present system, by making provision for future expansion?

1. The Ecclesiastical Province, so far as, and so soon as possible, to be coterminous with the Civil Province.
2. The Dominion Synod to be the National Synod, representative not of the dioceses, but of the provinces in the Dominion.

3. The Dominion for the present to be divided into three provinces, Eastern, Central and Western.

4. So soon as there shall be five organized dioceses in any civil province, these shall be set off as a separate province, and after the formation of a Provincial Synod, shall be entitled to representation as a province in the Dominion Synod.

We should look forward to the establishment of at least four new dioceses in Ontario within the next ten or fifteen years; one at Ottawa (already agreed to), two in the present diocese of Toronto, and one in Huron. Then Ontario should have her own Provincial Synod. The formation of a Bishopric of Prince Edward's Island (contemplated, I believe), would leave five sees in the Eastern province: Montreal, Quebec, Nova Scotia, Fredericton and Prince Edward's Island (possibly also Newfoundland). With the development of the North-West, new provinces might be formed, and thus the Church would keep pace with the growth of the country.

With much diffidence I present these thoughts for the consideration of my brethren, trusting that God will guide His Church at this great juncture of her history in Canada to lay foundations broad and deep, that she may more effectually accomplish the great work that lies before her, to His glory.

E. P. CRAWFORD.

Hamilton, May 5th, 1892.

#### Primacy of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

SIR,—This Easter season must be accepted as my excuse for being so long in acknowledging Mr. Little's most courteous and instructive letter of the 2nd inst. The information he gives is most satisfactory, and nothing could be more to the point. So long as the Archbishop holds a Primacy that is dependent upon the will of the governing Synod, he can never be dominant; but if he be allowed to slip in Rome-wise and become an essential to any, the smallest portion of the Church in Canada, he interferes with the scheme of consolidation, and may be still more troublesome. From the purely missionary character of the Church in the North-west during the regime of the Hudson Bay Company, and the fact that the chief promoters were the English missionary societies which have the Archbishop as their president, we can easily understand how the Archbishop received at first his Primatial position, and also how, *ex gratia*, he was made Primate even in the new Ecclesiastical Province of Rupert's Land. But we are now laying the foundation of a great constitution, and one of our most valued principles must be the retention of our liberty. Canterbury must not become a second Rome, or gratitude submission. As to how far it is necessary to provide an external court of appeal in the prospect of a collision between the General and Provincial Synods, and how wise to centralise always upon Canterbury, it is not for us here to enquire: but there is another side to both of these questions. And again with respect to the new Bishop of Mackenzie River, I had the assurance of a high authority that the Archbishop in nominating Bishop Reeve was not acting as the Primate,

but as President of the English society that supplies the funds that are required for the support of the clerical and general work of the new diocese. We hope that the diocese will soon be strong enough to elect its own Bishop, and to support him.

JAMES GAMMACK, LL. D.  
East Toronto, April 23rd, 1892.

### Notes and Queries.

SIR,—1. Would confirmation as ministered by the Greek Church be held in the Anglican?

2. Does not (i.) the omission of the "laying on of hands," and (ii.) ministrations by the Priest (not the Bishop) constitute too great a departure from Apostolic order to permit our recognizing the Greek rite as sufficient?

3. Does not the "blow on the cheek" of the modern Roman use fall short of the essential "laying on of hands," thus doing away with the visible sign of the sacrament?

4. Is confirmation by the Priest ever allowed in the Roman Church?

G. F. R.

Ans.—At the Lambeth Conference in 1888 the Bishop of Winchester's committee, consisting of eight Bishops, reported (*inter alia*) their "difficulty as regards the Eastern rite of confirmation, which we can hardly consider equivalent to ours, inasmuch as it omits the imposition of the Bishop's hands, and is usually conferred upon unconscious infants: yet we do not regard this as requiring members of the Orthodox Church to receive our confirmation." This would leave it doubtful, but the ancient Church and words of Scripture never contemplate any other form than laying on of hands.

2. Probably either would invalidate the right.

3. The "blow on the cheek" is a recent invention and cannot be regarded as a "laying on of hands."

4. It is hard to tell, but the Priest would be acting by delegation, and a similar pretence would cover any other episcopal function. In the Lutheran Church the priest confirms, and there is no Bishop, but *officer* and *form* appear to be essentials to the rite according to the Scriptures and ancient usage.

SIR,—In a pamphlet entitled "The Bible and the Bible only the Religion of Protestants," by the late Rev. J. M. Neale, I find this statement: "In 1839 two millions of Roman Catholics, including three Bishops, came over in one day to the Eastern Church, and the late Pope Gregory XVI., in his Allocution to the Cardinals, of Nov. 16th, 1839, spoke of this as one of the heaviest blows which had ever befallen Rome." Dr. Neale unfortunately does not give any reference or authority for this statement, which I should like to verify before making use of it. Can you give me any particulars of the circumstances, neighbourhood, &c., and tell me where I can look the matter up?

ATHENIAN.

Ans.—Dr. Neale refers to the return to the Greek National and Orthodox Church of those in Western Russia who had been forcibly made to submit to Rome in the beginning of the 16th century. Under the influence of Czar Nicholas I. they expressed a wish at the Synod of Polotsk early in 1839 to resume allegiance to the Mother Church, and by Ukase of 17th July, the Czar definitely suppressed the Greek Uniat Church. The Pope in his Allocution bewailed the fact, but the will of Nicholas was too strong a factor. See Kurtz Church History iii. 402: *Biographie Universelle* xxx., p. 501: *Larousse Grand Dict., de xix. siècle* xi., p. 988. The Allocution is a beautiful example of "swearing at large" and futile scolding.

### Sunday School Lesson.

4th Sunday after Easter.

May 15th, 1892

#### THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD.

At this season of the year, when we have so lately been called upon to celebrate our Blessed Lord's Resurrection, it is well to turn our thoughts to the resurrection which one day awaits all mankind who have died or shall die.

First, we may note the variance between the expression of this Article of the Creed in the Baptismal Offices. There the words used are "the resurrection of the flesh." That form is the more correct rendering of the original language of the Creed, and is, therefore, what is meant by "the resurrection of the body." The resurrection, therefore, in which we profess our belief, is not the resurrection of a spiritual body, but the resurrection of the body of flesh, such as we now have.

How Revealed. This doctrine is revealed to us

by the Holy Ghost, "who spake by the prophets," first in the Old Testament, and afterwards more clearly in the New. In the Old Testament the most explicit declarations of this doctrine are to be found in Job xix. 25-26; and Daniel xii. 2, 3. The first of these texts is recited in our Burial Service. There were other passages in the Old Testament from which this doctrine could be gathered; but the full significance of them was not generally seen until our Lord explained them. Even before His coming, some of the Jews had learnt this doctrine from the Old Testament Scriptures—viz., the Pharisees. There was also a sect called the Sadducees, who denied it, but our Lord confirmed the doctrine of the Pharisees, and declared that the Sadducees had erred, because they "knew not the scriptures, nor the power of God." (S. Matt. xxii. 29-32.)

In the New Testament this doctrine is more clearly taught. Our Lord Himself plainly taught it. (S. Matt. xxii. 23-32; S. Mark xii. 26; S. Luke xx. 37; S. John vi. 40). His Apostles made it the constant subject of their preaching (*e.g.*, Acts iv. 2; xvii. 18, 31; xxiii. 6; xxiv. 15, 21); and S. Paul, especially in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, dwells upon it most forcibly (1 Cor. xv. 12, 20-22, 53, and see also Rom. viii. 11); and he declares our Lord's Resurrection to be the pledge and assurance of our own resurrection.

"The power of God." What did our Lord mean when He said that the Sadducees erred, not knowing the power of God? He meant that they denied that the dead would be raised, because they did not realize aright the mighty power of God; and they assumed, because they could not understand how the resurrection was to be effected, that therefore it could not take place. We must be careful not to fall into this mistake of the Sadducees; we must remember that whatever God promises He is able to perform, and that it is no more difficult for Him to raise the dead than it was for Him originally to create man out of the dust of the earth. It is not necessary for us to enter into foolish speculations as to whether or not the bodies which shall rise again will be composed of the identical particles of matter which were laid in the grave. Even in this life the matter of which our bodies is composed is constantly changing, but we continue the same individuals: and although the resurrection body will be a body of flesh such as we now have, yet it will be in one important respect different, for whereas it is now subject to death and decay, it will then be freed from the power of death and corruption, it will have become immortal. Those who are alive at the last day will experience a like change from mortality to immortality instantaneously, or as St. Paul says, "in the twinkling of an eye," (1 Cor. xv. 51, 52; 1 Thess. iv. 16, 17; Phil. iii. 21.)

The Object of the Resurrection of the Flesh. The great object of the resurrection of our bodies is that all mankind may appear before the judgment seat of Christ, not as disembodied spirits, but as living men and women, to receive the things done in the body, according to what we have done in this life, whether it be good or bad. (2 Cor. v. 10.) Therefore the resurrection of the dead will include all who have died, both good and bad (1 Cor. xv. 22; S. John v. 28, 29; S. Matt. xxv. 32, 33; Rom. xiv. 10), for there will be a resurrection to an everlasting life of joy and felicity, and a resurrection to "shame and everlasting contempt." (Dan. xii. 2; 1 Cor. ii. 9.)

The lesson we should learn from this doctrine. Our faith in the resurrection of the flesh should make us continually realize that this life is but the preparation for another life beyond the grave, and that whether this life is to be one of happiness or misery depends on how we live here. This doctrine should therefore deter us from sin, encourage us to holiness of living, and comfort us in all afflictions.

REV. WM. HOLLINSHEAD, Pastor of the Presbyterian church, Sparta, N. J. voluntarily writes strongly in favor of Hood's Sarsaparilla. He says: "Nothing I know of will cleanse the blood, stimulate the liver or clean the stomach like this remedy. I know scores and scores who have been helped or cured by it."

The highest praise has been won by Hood's Pills for their easy, yet efficient, action.