

To these very timely and pertinent questions permit me to add another, viz.: Is it the wish of the Church (Bishop, Clergy, and Laity), of the diocese that the Legislature (supposing it to have the power) should give the Diocesan school authority to confer degrees.

One would think that, in a matter of so much importance, involving as it does the style "Montreal Diocesan" Theological College, the *Montreal Diocesan* Synod would have been consulted, and in a loyal, brotherly manner, its co-operation and sympathy invited. Why this has not been done is, perhaps, not hard to discover.

At the last session of the Provincial Synod, Journal [page 23], the report of a "Committee on Theological Colleges" was read, from which the following is an extract: "The committee wish to put on record their conviction that the multiplication of Theological Colleges . . . is prejudicial to the well-being of the Church, and that this Synod should deprecate strongly the resort on the part of such colleges to the Legislature for degree conferring powers, and should urge upon such bodies to avail themselves for this purpose of the powers already existing in the Universities of the Church." [The italicising is mine.] These excellent and prudent remarks embody the views of a considerable number of the clergy and laity of this diocese, of which number several will probably see to it when the proper time comes, that the "views" are represented in that place where they will be most likely to do good.

Yours faithfully,

CLERICUS.

To the Editor of THE CHURCH GUARDIAN:

DEAR SIR,—I regret to learn that the authorities of the Montreal Theological College are taking steps to obtain from the Provincial Legislature the power to confer degrees in Divinity. I do not entertain a particle of ill-will to the aforesaid College. If the Bishop believes it to be an essential part of his Diocesan machinery, by all means let it exist, and let it be made as efficient as possible. But I deplore the multiplication of small institutions entrusted with the power of granting degrees. I admit that precedents already exist for this step. But other Protestant bodies might fairly plead in excuse that no College connected with their form of faith is established (within anything like convenient distance) with the power of granting degrees. Such excuse cannot be alleged by the Montreal College. There is an Anglican University, dowered with a Royal Charter, within the Province, connected with the Dioceses of Quebec and Montreal, whose Divinity Professor is appointed by the Bishops of the above-named Dioceses, and which has the power to confer degrees in Arts, Divinity, Medicine and Law. Why should candidates not avail themselves of an institution not more than a hundred miles away? This move is a step in the wrong direction. The end to be aimed at is, if possible, a federation of Church Universities, and if that be impracticable, at all events the appointment of a Central Board of Examiners. This would enhance the value of degrees, whereas the increase of institutions with degree-giving powers tends materially to diminish the value of the distinction. Then again it is most desirable that a degree in Arts should precede the Divinity course, in order that the scope of the education should be wide and liberal. I earnestly hope that the plan alluded to may be abandoned, that other counsels may prevail, and that we may hope for a more advanced standard of education for our clergy and for the members of the higher professions.

I am, yours faithfully,

EDUCATOR.

To the Editor of THE CHURCH GUARDIAN:

DEAR SIR,—In reply to "Inquirer," as to the truth of a statement made in a Church (?)

paper, in which it said "that there is no part of an English church described in the Prayer Book as an 'altar,' and that the word should not be used." I may say that the statement, taken literally, is true. The word "Altar" cannot be found in the Prayer Book, but neither can the expression "Communion Table," and yet the latter is frequently used by some who call themselves Church people, and no objection is made to their doing so. If the one may be used, why not the other? Wheatley tells us that for the first three hundred years after Christ the word *Table* is only once used by any writer. In Holy Scripture, *Table* and *Altar* are used synonymously, *vide* Isaiah lxx. 11; Ezek. xxiii. 41; Malachi i. 7, 12; 1 Cor. x. 16, 21. And so *Altar*, being a Scriptural term, has come to be used more frequently, on account of the commemorative sacrifices offered upon it. In the sense that the Communion is a sacrifice, so is the *Table* an *Altar*, and may justly be called so. In the first Prayer Book of Edward VI., our Reformers, recognizing the fitness of the word *Altar*, retained it instead of *Table*, but unfortunately through Puritanical influence it was expunged in 1552. Archbishop Cranmer, in writing to Bishop Gardiner, just before his death, says: "With no less reverence ought he that is baptized to come to the font, than he that receiveth the Communion cometh to the *Altar*," and Latimer, in his last examination, declares "it may be called an *Altar*, and so the Doctors call it in many places." One of the decrees of the Council of 1640 states: "It is and may be called an altar by us in that sense in which the Primitive Church called it an *Altar*, and no other;" and if my memory serves me aright—I have not books here to verify the statement—I believe that during the reigns of George III. and William IV. it was called *Altar* by Act of Parliament. In the office used at the Coronation of her present Majesty, the word *Altar* is used in over forty places.

Surely the custom of the Primitive Church, the opinions of the Reformers, and the consensus of many Divines after them, is reason enough why one may properly make use of the term *Altar*. To explain why it is so called is another matter. But I hope that I have shown, from authorities, that the use of the word *Altar*, although it is not found in the Prayer Book, is justifiable.

Yours very truly,

T. FRASER DRAPER.

Louisbourg, C.B., Feast of the Purification, 1886.

DEAR SIR,—Would it not be well for the learned brother who as "Catholic" has so much to say in your correspondence columns, to enquire into the ecclesiastical history of the Dominion? When he does so, he will perhaps be surprised to learn that the Church in Rupert's Land is a growth from England; that work was begun here almost as soon as it was begun in Upper Canada; that it has never formed part of the Province of Canada; and that when, in 1873, our Provincial system was called into existence, we were as fully within our right, in the step then taken, as our brethren in the east were when they formed their Ecclesiastical Province. Yet, if it were otherwise, does he think that such unbrotherly language as "secessionists," "an ungovernable son who casts off home control and descends even to prodigality," &c., &c., used towards members of Christ's Church whose only crime is that they have tried to rise to the responsibilities of their position, is likely to do any good, or hide from view the plain duty resting upon the Church in the older part of the Dominion to help to provide those of her children who have settled in Manitoba and the Northwest with the means of grace, when they cannot do this fully for themselves?

But it is as well to ask here and now, is it

desirable for the Province of Rupert's Land, with its six Sees, and the three Dioceses in British Columbia (for there would be less reason for their separate existence than there is at present), making together just as many Dioceses as there are now in the Province of Canada, to be absorbed in the latter? Is there not difficulty now in getting representatives from all the Dioceses together, at any rate for meetings of the Board of Missions? Would not this difficulty be increased by the enlargement of the Province? Some of our Bishops in this Province scarcely ever attend our Synods now; it is almost impossible for them to do so. Would the difficulty be overcome by requiring them to go to Toronto or Montreal, instead of coming here?

Yet, do not suppose, Mr. Editor, that the longing for actual union is monopolized by our brethren in Eastern Canada; certainly one who writes under the *nom de plume* "Catholic" should not think so. But who will move in the matter? Who will introduce in your Provincial Synod, at its next meeting, a measure which will not only find favor there, but will commend itself to practical Churchmen here and in British Columbia? Certainly union is desirable; I think it is practicable, yet I do not think it will take the form of a Province conterminous with the Dominion, but rather that of a general Council or Synod, embracing all the Bishops *ex officio*, and a certain number of clerical and lay delegates elected *pro rata* by each of the Provincial Synods. God grant the Anglican Church in Canada the spirit speedily to accomplish this union; but I humbly submit that the first step in that direction is to try to understand each other, to credit each other with a sincere desire to do the Master's work in the Master's spirit, and with the feeling that for all we do we must hereafter render an account.

W. C. P.

Winnipeg, Manitoba, Feb. 13th, 1886.

KING'S COLLEGE RE-ORGANIZATION.

SIR.—There is the right ring to the Bishop of Nova Scotia's reply to the address of the Professors at Windsor. The "life of the College depends" on not only keeping up the present staff, but "augmenting" it. The fatality attaching itself to the University at Windsor is the undue prominence of divinity in the leading influence, and consequently Nova Scotians begin to think that the College is *only* a training ground for parsonettes. Of course it is this and much more. A move was made in the right direction in the selection as Professor of one of the leading names in literary Canada. There is another opportunity, which at the present moment should not be allowed to pass; let the appointment to the leading position command at once, not only the admiration of clerics, but also the approbation of men of learning in all our Universities. In this way alone can our Royal Chartered University hold her position right royally in the eyes of the rising rivals around her. Such men can be found, and New Brunswick found one in her Coadjutor Bishop.

H.

CONSECRATIONS.

SIR,—In Church of England magazines for July, 1845, I find under "Consecrations" the following:

"On Sunday, May 4th, in the Chapel of the Palace of Lambeth, the Very Reverend Thomas Turton, D.D., was consecrated Bishop of Ely; the Rev. James Chapman, M.A., Bishop of Colombo; the Rev. John Medley, Bishop of Fredericton. The Archbishop was assisted by the Bishop of London, Rochester, Lincoln, Hereford, Lichfield, and Bishop Coleridge. The sermon was preached by Professor Currie, of Cambridge."

The above is not uninteresting to us of the Canadian Church.

PRESEBYTER.