

which was vacant last September. It is a pity that these returns were not obtainable, as the comparative statement which I subjoin of the work in the several dioceses is left incomplete by their omission.

A few words about the basis of calculation will be necessary to the right estimation of the figures. I had hoped to add two columns showing the "census" population and population "reported by clergy" in each diocese, and to base my table on the latter figures, but the discovery that Fredericton and Algoma had returned the census figures renders this impossible. In the other dioceses the comparison tells a sad tale. Nova Scotia reports only 28,485 out of some 71,056; Ontario, 50,888 out of 80,784; Huron reports 58,699 out of 110,919; Niagara 29,344 out of 47,986; Toronto, 80,189 out of 129,893; and Montreal (estimating population by number of families in the same proportion as the diocese giving both families and souls) reports 35,755 out of 49,424. Out of a total Church population then of 490,012 souls, no less than 206,698, or nearly two-fifths of the whole, are unknown to our clergy. It is nothing less than appalling to find that we only know three out of every five of our members, and should stir every priest, deacon and lay leader in charge of any parish to renewed efforts in visiting, and a more conscientious return of every soul even nominally Church.

As it was impossible to take the "reported" Church population as a fair basis of comparison, and as indeed it would be hardly fair to let such a diocese as Nova Scotia, which does not know much more than one-third of its population, gain in the averages as compared with Montreal, which knows three-fourths, the table below is based on the census figures as nearly as they could be computed. Slight errors there may be, but none I think sufficient to vitiate the fairness of the comparison. The sum total taken for the baptismal, confirmation and contribution columns were those of the three years reported, the average per 1,000 thus found being then divided by three. For the communicants' column the average per 1,000 was formed from the average number per year for three years. The figures were all worked by logarithms and checked in five or six cases by ordinary arithmetic. They may therefore be relied upon as correct.

Diocese	Baptized per 1,000	Confirmed per 1,000	Communi- cants per 1,000	No. of souls per clergyman	Contributions per capita per annum	Census population.
Montreal.....	28	17	199	509	\$2.82	49,424
Ontario	25	17	191	816	1.86	80,784
Niagara	23	17	155	695	1.93	47,986
Fredericton....	21	13	162	553	1.96	43,095
Toronto	25	13	125	764	1.58	129,893
Huron	18	11	110	765	1.46	110,919
Algoma	21	9	96	633	60	16,467
N. Scotia.....	22	14	94	652	79	71,056
Aver. of Prov.	25	14	141	648	\$1.62

One of the most remarkable features of this table is the complete refutation it supplies of the oft repeated claim of the *Evangelical Churchman* that nothing but evangelicalism, by which it understands a position little differing from dissent, can save the Church from the insidious dangers and destructive tendencies of Ritualism. It would appear on the contrary that nothing is more sure to destroy it. Huron knows fewer of her children than any diocese except Nova Scotia; she confirms fewer than any save Algoma; she has fewer communicants than any with the exception of those same two dioceses; her contributions (although her work lies in the "garden of Ontario") hold the

same position, while in the record of baptisms she holds lowest place of all.

On the other hand, Ontario and Niagara both stand high in all respects, though they are led by Montreal in every column. Montreal moreover has the double advantage of a very hard working Bishop, who is not unfair to those who differ in opinion from himself, and a more compact and therefore easily known Church population.

In the Province of Quebec too, the nothingarians mostly return themselves as Roman Catholic, whereas in this province they are credited to the English Church, and this no doubt accounts in part for the excellent position of Montreal. Only in part, however, for it will not fully account for the higher rate of giving, nor would anything but hard work keep up the rate of confirmations and communicants.

Badly, however, as blatant Puritanism results, it is far ahead of the Broad Church Nova Scotia, and but little worse than compromising Toronto. The records of the first named diocese are simply a disgrace to both Bishop and clergy. Allowing for a misprint in the return of communicants in 1890-91 and taking the average of three years as 6,668, she has positively a lower proportion than the missionary diocese of Algoma. Her contributions per head are only nineteen cents better, and her clergy are ignorant of more than four-sevenths of her Church population. The record of confirmations does not show badly, but were we to take the average of the last two years only, it would be worse than Algoma, while last year only 314 souls were confirmed out of a population of 71,000. What is Bishop Courtney about? And what are his priests doing that they do not at all costs secure the confirmation of more of their people?

In good truth confirmation statistics are discouraging enough all round. There must be considerable neglect, and a large leakage of those who are of age for confirmation, when no diocese can average two per cent. of the population, and the feeling of satisfaction at heading the list in Montreal, Ontario and Niagara ought not to blind them to the patent fact that even they fall far short of a respectable standard. None ought to be satisfied with less than 5 per cent. of the gross Church population, and even this is no very high standard. Before we can reach it, however, we must reinforce the Episcopate, and the publication of these figures ought to give no little impetus to the agitation for that object in Ontario and Toronto.

The rate of contributions is also far from satisfactory. Our people need teaching on this subject, both how much to give and how to give it, and an authoritative sanction of "proportionate giving" (let us get that first, the rate will come after), from each diocesan, together with instructions to their clergy to preach on the subject, and the circulation of some good tracts or pastorals, would probably work a great reformation.

In giving full returns, consistent throughout, Ontario is easily first, though Huron only falls short in the matter of Sunday schools. All the rest are more or less incomplete. Niagara makes no return of marriages or burials (which ought to be easy of access), nor of families. She is accompanied in the last named default by Fredericton and Toronto, while Montreal strangely enough gives her number of families, but not the number of souls. I have supposed that the sudden drop of communicants in Nova Scotia from 6,994 in '89, to 3,984 in '90 is a misprint, and also the population of Fredericton in '89, which is given as

about 2,000 fewer than the number of communicants in the same year. "Births" on page 150, number ten, is evidently meant for "burials," and it is strange that N. S. should lose 1,052 families a over 5,000 souls in the middle year of the triennium and regain them exactly in the last year. But these little blunders are only to be expected in a book which is rushed through the press at such railroad speed as this was. We would suggest to the worthy editor, however, that statistics are of no value unless accurate, and that especial care is necessary to prevent the compositors from making nonsense of the most carefully prepared returns. Proofs and *revises* must be demanded and painfully read if the diabolical influence never absent from printers' establishments is to be conquered. We hope, too, that when the next Synod comes round, no diocese will have to make the confession "no record kept," or prove unable to distinguish the amounts for parochial, diocesan and extra diocesan purposes. It should be made clear now what is meant by extra diocesan contributions. Toronto, Ontario and Niagara evidently think it means the sum of Home and Foreign Missions, but Nova Scotia and Huron have a very different standard. None of these errors fortunately interfere with my table, but when they are rectified (as we may hope to see them in '95) it will be possible to make other interesting comparisons.

P. S.—In checking the additions of the tables in the Provincial Journal, I find that Nova Scotia is credited with 80 confirmees, and \$1,000 aggregate contributions more than she is entitled to, and Fredericton with nine confirmees too few. These mistakes make only a fractional difference in the averages. Niagara's contribution tables are simply unintelligible. Not one of the aggregates correspond with the items above them, and in the total she claims aggregate contributions of \$277,467, whereas the items only show \$168,890. There is also a mistake of \$10 in the addition of the parochial collection. Presuming that there must be some foundation for the larger sum, I have not altered her average in the table, but if the lower sum be correct her yearly contributions per head would be only \$1.17 instead of \$1.93. Nova Scotia's average of giving must also be reduced by one cent, making 78 cents per head per year.

THE STORY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND*

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CHURCH.

Theodore called a Synod or meeting of Archbishops at Hertford, on September 24, A.D. 673, at which nine resolutions were passed affecting the welfare and government of the Church, and to which each Bishop present signed his name.

Theodore† began by dividing the kingdoms into ecclesiastical portions of more manageable size,‡ and induced the Bishops to unite under the leadership of Canterbury.

FIRST NATIONAL GATHERING.

This memorable assembly, while it gave expression and consolidation to the idea of ecclesiastical unity, was also the first of all National gatherings for such legislation as should affect the whole land of the English, the pattern and precursor of our own National Parliament.§ Thus

* Canon Bright, *Early Church History*, p. 248.

† Theodore died September 19th, A.D. 690.

‡ In Theodore's time there were 16 dioceses in England, viz.:—1. Canterbury; 2. London; 3. Rochester; 4. York; 5. Dunwich; 6. Lindisfarne; 7. Dorchester (or Winchester); 8. Lichfield; 9. Elmham; 10. Hereford; 11. Hexham; 12. Sidnacester; 13. Worcester; 14. Leicester; 15. Sherborne; 16. Selsey.

§ Green's *History of the English People*, p. 30; also Haddan and Stubbs' *Constitutional History*, i., 163.