

THE CHURCH GUARDIAN.

—: EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR:—

L. H. DAVIDSON, D. C. L., MONTREAL.

— ASSOCIATE EDITOR —

REV. EDWYN S. W. PENTREATH, B.D., WINNIPEG, MAN.

ADDRESS CORRESPONDENCE AND COMMUNICATIONS TO
THE EDITOR, P. O. BOX 504, MONTREAL. EX-
CHANGES TO P. O. BOX 1968. FOR BUSINESS
ANNOUNCEMENTS SEE PAGE 16.

DECISIONS REGARDING NEWSPAPERS.

1. Any person who takes a paper regularly from the Post office, whether directed to his own name or another's, or whether he has subscribed or not, is responsible for payment.

2. If a person orders his paper discontinued he must pay all arrears, or the publisher may continue to send it until payment is made, and then collect the whole amount, *whether the paper is taken from the office or not.*

3. In suits for subscriptions, the suit may be instituted in the place where the paper is published although the subscriber may reside hundreds of miles away.

4. The courts have decided that refusing to take newspapers or periodicals from the Post office, or removing and leaving them uncalled for, is *prima facie* evidence of intentional fraud.

CALENDAR FOR OCTOBER.

OCTOBER	2.—16th Sunday after Trinity.
"	9.—17th Sunday after Trinity.
"	16.—18th Sunday after Trinity. (Notice of St. LUKE.)
"	18.—St. LUKE, Evangelist.
"	23.—19th Sunday after Trinity. (Notice of St. Simon and St. Jude.)
"	28.—St. SIMON and St. JUDE.
"	30.—20th Sunday after Trinity. (Notice of ALL SAINTS.)

EDITORIAL NOTES.

CONSOLIDATION OF THE CHURCH.—Our readers will find two references to this important question in other columns; one entitled "A Criticism from a Western Man," and coming from the diocese of Rupert's Land, and the other a letter from a Provincial Synod Delegate. And first as to the former "The Criticism." We must express our extreme regret at finding the continued existence of the feeling evidenced in this communication. It was very manifest at the Conference which took place in Winnipeg and one member of that body residing in the city of Winnipeg rather bluntly voiced it, in expressing an opinion to the effect that unless the Eastern delegates were ready to assent to the position of the Province of Rupert's Land as to the Provincial Synod matter it was a waste of time to have come. It may be all very well to call attention to the extent territorially and in landed property of the Province of Rupert's Land with its eight dioceses; but to assume right because of such extent in *land* and dioceses numerically to exercise a controlling influence

over the decisions of the Church of England in British North America,—which clearly is implied in the criticism in question,—comports ill with the appeals continually made from the dioceses in the North West for pecuniary assistance from the Church in the East. We do not include in this respect the independent dioceses in British Columbia referred to by the writer. They, so far as we know, did not at the Conference nor have they since taken any such position as that involved in the criticism under consideration. It is very well for the writer to say "The Provincial Synod of Rupert's Land loyally accepted in its entirety the result of the Conference;" but it is a matter of history and undeniable that such acceptance was preceded by very positive statements that the position assumed by Rupert's Land as to the retention of Provincial Synods must be accepted by the other members of the Conference. It is easy to assent to that which falls in entirely with the views and wishes of the party assenting. We can only hope that the criticism in question does not voice the real sentiment of the Province or of the Dioceses in Rupert's Land. If so, it may be found that not only will it have the effect of preventing the Consolidation of the Church, but also may exercise a very serious influence upon the work of the Board of Missions in Eastern Canada in so far as the Domestic Field is concerned; and also would exercise strong influence, we think, in regard to the proposal made at the last Synod to extend the Constitution of the Board and introduce thereto representatives from the Province of Rupert's Land and the independent dioceses.

But is not the territorial pretension a little "bumptious" on the part of our good friends in the West? No one denies "the square miles which belong to that territory, but these unless occupied are of comparatively little weight in the argument. In view of the position assumed by the critic it may not then be amiss to call attention to these facts; (1) That the only diocese in the Ecclesiastical Province having any large body of clergy is that of Rupert's Land, which, according to Whittaker's Almanac for 1892, contains 60 clergy exclusive of the bishop. (2) The Diocese of Qu'Appelle,—probably the next in importance to that of Rupert's Land,—appears from the same list to contain about 18 clergy. (3) The joint dioceses of Saskatchewan and Calgary 26 clergy; whilst (4) Moosonee, Mackenzie River, Selkirk and Athabasca, the remaining of the eight dioceses boasted of by the critic contain, according to the same authority, 17 clergy not including the Bishops. This would make a total of clergy for the Province of Rupert's Land of 124. (5) The independent dioceses of the Pacific Coast contain 44 clergy making a total Clerical strength independently of the Episcopate in the "six times as large" Province, and independent dioceses and "square miles" of 168. (6) According to the latest Living Church Quarterly the number of clergy in the whole of Canada is 1,117. In other words, in the Eastern section of The Church, if consolidated, there will be one Metropolitan, and eight Bishops with 949 clergy; in the West, one Metropolitan, nine Bishops and 168 clergy. What is there, (without any reference to the immense numerical majority of laity in the

Eastern section over those in the Western) in the actual position thus shown of the real strength of the Church in the two Provinces to justify the almost arrogant assertion of the opinion of the West as unchangeable and decisive?

We are convinced that the work of consolidating the Church in British North America will not be advanced by the spirit referred to, nor by a determination to insist upon such claims even though warranted; and we would feign hope that notwithstanding the criticism of a "Western man" a better spirit may prevail in the dioceses and Province of Rupert's Land; and that, recognizing the effort which has been made by many Churchmen in the East, to meet fairly the wishes of those in the West by refraining from any legislation as a basis for such consolidation which would *exclude* the continuance of the Provincial system so tenaciously adhered to by our friends in the West and by many in the East, the action of the Synod of the Ecclesiastical Province of Canada may be concurred in.

Referring next to the letter of our esteemed correspondent "Delegate to P. S." (and which clearly shows the spirit above referred to as influencing Churchmen in the East) we would answer his first inquiry "if any one of them" (that is of the proposals of the scheme of the Provincial Synod) is neglected is the whole scheme wrecked" and in the negative. The Provincial Synod itself, made provision for such an emergency by appointing a special committee whose duty it will be to determine whether, in case any of the proposals made by it are not acceptable, the scheme as a whole has been sufficiently complied with to warrant the formation of a General Synod; and if such committee decide affirmatively then, as we understand it, the Provincial Synod will be bound by its action; and though all its proposals may not have been accepted, the General Synod would go into operation. We do not, however, understand this provision as referring to the Resolution adopted by the Provincial Synod as to the retention or non-retention of the Provincial Synod system. This Resolution we consider to be such an essential in the very basis of the scheme for a General Synod, as to be incapable of being waived or altered by the Committee without return to the Provincial Synod itself, for adoption or assent.

We would answer the second inquiry of our correspondent as to the consequences of any one diocese refusing to accept the scheme, that in our opinion, it would preclude the formation of a General Assembly in the *true sense of that term*. In order that there may be a General Assembly of Synod of the Church of England in Canada we regard it as essential that the whole Church as a Church should assent: and inasmuch as the Diocesan system exists and the dioceses are severally independent one of the other and each has as much a claim to be regarded as a part of the Church of England in Canada as another, the assumption of the title or powers of a General Synod for the whole Church in Canada with one or more dioceses standing out, would not merely be a misnomer but unmeaning and ridiculous. It is true that in this aspect of the case the responsibility of