

And if, as in the past, the duty of this General Board of Managers consists chiefly in preparing two appeals and in dividing the funds raised, not by any direct action on its part, but through diocesan agencies, it would seem quite possible to discharge it by one person, and to save the trouble, fatigue and useless expense consequent upon journeys from the ends of the Dominion. The mere cost to the several members of journeying four times a year to the place of meeting would form in the aggregate a very nice contribution towards Mission work. Again, we think the attendance of members during the last three years will show that the most extreme sections of the Ecclesiastical Province were very seldom represented at its meetings: and it will also show such a change in the *personnel* of the Board from meeting to meeting as renders its decisions uncertain and unsatisfactory. We would strongly urge the amending of the Constitution so as to reduce largely the number of the Central Board; to authorize the employment of a General Paid Secretary, who should be a layman and qualified, to visit the several parts of the Province and make personal appeals in behalf of the work of the Society, and who should be the really responsible head and working officer of the Society; and to make the Corresponding Committees in each diocese the efficient part of the organization.

The relationship of the Society and of the Church at large to the Diocese of Algoma also requires settling. At present there seems to be no limitation—at least that is the pretension—upon the right of the Bishop of that missionary jurisdiction to increase the number of his Clergy to any extent; and it is claimed that the obligation of providing the means for paying their stipends—the amount of which, even, the Board has no voice in determining—attaches to the Board as representing the Church at large. In this there is grave danger at once to the interests of the Church in the other dioceses and to a due response to other missionary demands. As the matter now stands, it is asserted that Algoma clergy are in many instances better paid than those in the older dioceses, and if the contention referred to is correct, they have the security of the Church in the whole Ecclesiastical Province for the payment of their stipends. It would seem only right that the number of the clergy should not be increased without consent of the Board, and after communication had with it in regard to amount of salary, and the means of paying it, including local aid, grants, &c. In this connection, and also in reference to the proposal to give representation in Provincial Synod, the missionary character of the jurisdiction should not be forgotten. Let justice to the fullest extent be done to Algoma, and perfect faith be kept with its Bishop; but this will not be asked, we feel sure, at the cost of injustice to other dioceses or other claims.

The question of Theological Education will probably come up in connection with the Canon on degrees in Divinity, and it is one in the discussion of which party feeling should have no place. It is greatly to be feared that if the standard in some of our colleges is not low, it is not sound—at least we are driven to that conclusion by observation and informa-

tion derived from others touching some who have come out of these schools. There would seem to be grave necessity for an examination into the courses of study pursued, the textbooks used, and the teaching given. We have heard it asserted on good authority that some graduates of these institutions who have received Orders deny the necessity of the same, and openly declare their disbelief, in the validity of Episcopal ordination above any other, or in the doctrine of Apostolical succession. Others deprave the Sacraments, denying, for instance, the efficacy or necessity of Infant Baptism, through want of knowledge and faith in the recipient. Now, if there be one thing more than another essential to the advance of the Church, it is true, sound teaching, free from party bias and narrow prejudices, as broad as the Church itself; and we cannot but feel that some such Canon as that of which notice has been given is sadly needed. We notice that the Canon makes no provision as to the method of appointment of the Board of Examiners further than that it is to be with the concurrence of the Universities and the Theological Colleges named: but we presume it is not intended to give the latter equal voice with the former;—that would hardly seem just:—and the *modus operandi* of nomination and election is not declared. Though the concluding clause of the Canon will undoubtedly create considerable discussion, we sincerely trust that it may not be characterized by any unseemly warmth of feeling; but that calmness in argument and fair unbiassed decision may prevail. We ourselves feel that the provision is one which ought to recommend itself to all as being in the interests of the Church as a whole, and tending to preserve at once the value of the degree, and to prevent the unnecessary and unwise increase of degree conferring bodies. It is only necessary to look across the line to see how necessary such safeguards are.

It is with regret that we find on the list of motions to be brought forward several in reference to alleged extreme Ritual observances. We have a very distinct and painful recollection of the excitement and ill-feeling accompanying the discussion of a like motion in the Fourth Provincial Synod: any renewal of which would be deplorable. We do not believe the practices referred to have extended in any general degree; and as an amendment to the original resolution proposed at the Fourth Synod was carried (see Journal Fourth Synod, p. 56) expressing formally the decision of both Houses on the several practices referred to, we would express the hope that they may not be pressed. There is surely too much real, earnest work to be done in and out of Synod to allow of wasting time over the discussion of such matters; and the more so as decision has already been given by the same Body. We cannot see that the mere formulating of the Resolution into the shape of a Canon would render the action of the Synod any more binding than it now is. Should, however, the motions be persisted in, we trust that the resolution of the House of Bishops in reference thereto, to be found on p. 47 of the Fourth Synod Report, will not be lost sight of, and that the fact that a carping and not over friendly secular press is watching and waiting

for the expected "scenes" consequent upon the discussion of "burning questions" may lead all to be jealous of the honor of the Church. If such matters were discussed with *closed doors*, much less danger of excitement would exist, and the time occupied in settling them would probably be very much shorter.

We also regret to find that it is deemed necessary to seek a formal expression of disapproval in reference to the use of aught but "*wine*" in the Holy Communion. From what we have noticed from time to time in our secular exchanges—and, alas! in so-called Church organs too—we fear that the practice referred to is on the increase, and that many poor, weak souls are being led astray through want of faith and fear of faltering, and that consequently some action is necessary; but is this the right course? is this the right tribunal to appeal to? If it be, we could wish that every member, Clerical and Lay, had had opportunity of reading Dr. Jewett's able and convincing pamphlet, "*Communion Wine*"—a critical examination of Scripture words and Historic Testimony relating to this subject—before voting: for we feel that *without careful examination none can be competent to determine this question*; and that for ordinary mortals the pathway of safety lies in adherence to the unbroken practice and tradition of the Church Catholic. We question the advisability, however, of bringing the matter before an assembly composed as is our Synod: to us it seems rather a matter of discipline coming within the jurisdiction of the Bishops of the Province, and upon which possibly action in their own House might be taken.

THERE are many other matters on the notice paper to which we wish to refer, but space and time forbid. We can but conclude with the hope that careful and patient consideration may be given to all questions submitted; that naught may occur to mar the feeling of brotherly love which should prevail amongst these of the Household of Faith, and that, the Session over, the business finished, the results may be such as will further the interests of our beloved Church, and enable Her more effectually to carry on the great work committed to Her in this portion of the Dominion.

THE TITLE OF THE CHURCH.—The *Family Churchman*, after quoting at length from the letter of the Lord Bishop of Qu'Appelle proposing a change in the name of the Church in Canada, adds:—"In these days of federation and revision of old cleavages, probably the Bishop's suggestion carries with it much sensible logic; but Canadians who wish to retain a loyal connection with their motherland, and whose devotion to the Church of England does not take the form of desiring separation, will be sorry to see the old landmarks go. Our branch of the Church in Canada is as surely the Church of Canada—describe it how you will—as the same Church in this country is the Church of England. If our brethren take pride in the maternal name, why may not they? What difference would any alteration in title make as to their Church's character and work? It would be absurd, of course, to speak of the Church of Ephesus as being the Church of Philadelphia, but so long as Christendom is divided, it is perfectly warrantable, right and desirable to speak of the 'Church of England in Canada.'"