

OUR SCATTERED CHURCH PEOPLE.

May we say a word of exhortation and encouragement to them? We all, who have church privileges ought to sympathize with them and help them in every way we can, and we do sympathize, certainly. Perhaps we can help, too, by saying "be brave and consistent, cling to the church, do not so far repudiate Her and Her ways as to "join" any other denomination of Christians. It may be necessary and right to worship with others and in a measure, to work with them, to allow your children to attend their Sunday Schools, but at the same time we cannot be true and loyal to the church in which we were baptized and confirmed if we say "we have left the Episcopal church for the Presbyterian or Methodist," for we did not take our vows only for the time when it was easy to be Churchmen, in the large comfortable parish. We took them for all time. Through Christ the Church has done great things for us. Ought we not to be loyal to her in "all time of tribulation," as well as "in all time of prosperity?" It is not easy. People will wonder at it. They will say we are bigoted. It may make us unpopular in some degree. But that is what they say of the church as a whole because she will not allow other ministers to serve in her chancels and preach from her pulpits, and because she has a Prayer-Book service instead of extemporaneous worship. These are a part, at least, of the very things we honor her for. Ought we not then to imitate her and to follow her, as she "protests" against sectarianism, against individual whims in religion? In a word, ought we not remember that she is the same Church, out on the prairie, as in our old homes "back east" and in England? Not only in ways and teachings but the same in her claim on our honor and obedience. Do we say that she does nothing for us, neglects us, sends us no ministers nor worship, nor sacraments? It is only because she cannot, in these days of sectarian divisions and rivalry, do what she would. Only an occasional service or sacraments, only once in a while a visit from Bishop or minister. But she gives us the Prayer-Book. We can have service every Lord's Day if we will. She not only permits but asks us to use it. No godly man or woman who can read plain English, the plainest and most beautiful ever written, need be without a Prayer-Book service. Two people can have it together. Even the lonely Churchman by himself has before him every word of the service that is said in the greatest parish in the land. Do we want to keep our children in the church's fold and way of life and thinking? There is the Catechism. There is the Baptismal Service for a text book. If there is only one Church household in twenty miles around, that household can hear the prayers and praises and Scripture lessons. The children of no family need grow up ignorant of the Church's services and teachings. There is no simpler confession of faith, no catechism half so easy to learn, or to be taught by even the most uncultured layman or woman. Then can we not take a portion of the money we would give or used to give for the support of the clergyman and the parish, and buy with it some good church papers, some thoughtful, earnest books, that will help to keep us loyal to the Lord, and none the less, to the church which

we believe is founded on Him and built according to His plans and not according to the ideas and devices of men. To do all this we do not need to hold our fellow christians in contempt, to sneer or laugh at their ways, to regard them as other than brethren and members of the Holy Catholic Church. The Church counts them all hers, and waits and prays and labors and longs for the time when they shall all be gathered into "one fold under one shepherd." Perhaps they will laugh likewise at her lonely children who claim such things for her. But we will best help her and commend her to our fellow Christians neither by rewarding the laugh with the jibe, or the sneer with the scowl, but by steadfastly clinging to her, owning her openly, explaining her teachings, and refusing to be known as Presbyterians, or Methodists, or Congregationalists, but only as members of the Church." And those of us who are in comfortable churches, with pastoral ministrations and every help, shall we not heartily sympathize, earnestly pray, and when there is need, freely and generously give, to help and encourage these lonely Churchmen?—*Kansas Church Man.*

The Bishop of Ontario on the Winnipeg Conference.

No. III.

STR,—His Lordship of Ontario having, to his own satisfaction, demolished the whole scheme which the united wisdom and experience of the Winnipeg Conference had evolved, proceeds with becoming modesty to say:—"I do not like to conclude without suggesting a scheme of Church consolidation, which I think would accomplish the object desired," &c. He then proceeds to assume that the object desired, "indeed the only *raison d'être* for the existence of a general Synod, is as a precaution against a possible conflicting legislation by Provinces." Now I would respectfully ask his Lordship, who told him that the real object, the *raison d'être* of a general Synod was "to prevent conflicting legislation." How such an utterly absurd conception of the object of a general Synod, can have entered any man's head is to me amazing. Synods are the legislative assemblies of the Church, and a Synod of the whole Church would one would suppose, be called into being to legislate for the whole Church—to consider and determine what was best to be done by way of enactment, and sometimes, though very rarely, by way of restraint, to promote the efficiency and well-being of the whole Body. I should have thought it would have occurred to any one, that an active, organized, energising body—needing to adapt itself to its ever varying surroundings—would also need some organization by which it could effect that adaption, and provide for new and unforeseen emergencies. A general appellate tribunal would necessarily grow out of this general Synod, as one of its first acts, but it manifestly could not take its place, if the Church in Canada is not going to lie forever in fragments. We do not merely want a legal ecclesiastical appellate tribunal, which can give decision upon the meanings of disputed enactments of past years, or past centuries. We want a legislature that can enact new laws, when needed, and repeal or amend old ones, according to the requirements of the passing years. I point-

ed out in my first letter that neither Diocesan nor Provincial Synods have any power by the Act of Parliament under which they are acting, to pass canons affecting either *doctrine* or *worship*, and yet surely the living Church must have power to deal with such living issues. Have we any Divine assurance that heresies will not arise in the future, as they have arisen in the past. Is it not more than probable that the Church will have to pronounce before long upon new false doctrines about what the Church herself is, about what Holy Scripture is, about what the Sacraments are? And must not the Church have some organ by which she can make these pronouncements. And may we not hope that before long those Pan-Anglican Synods, of which I believe the Bishop of Ontario was the real originator—will become the final legislative body with an appellate tribunal—to which, when need requires, questions of this kind may be carried from every Province of the Anglican Communion. I do not intend to discuss the details of the Bishop's appellate tribunal; as a workable scheme, it is ill-considered and absurd. After sketching his plan, the Bishop says: "There would be thus an analogy between the working of this Synod and that of a Supreme Court of secular jurisdiction. As the Supreme Court unifies states and civil provinces by keeping Local Legislatures within the lines of the Constitution, and thus secure unity of the nation, so our Supreme Synod of appellate jurisdiction might so control the legislation of Provincial Synods as to prevent conflicting canons being enacted by the different Provinces," But are not the Bishop's facts all wrong? Is it not the House of Commons at Ottawa, the Legislature at Washington, the Parliament at Westminster that controls the legislation of provinces and states, and prevents their mutually injurious enactments? Supreme secular Courts are only asked to interpret the Provincial or States statutes. They cannot annul or disallow them. The Bishop says:—"The Synod," *i.e.* this appellate tribunal, which he is urging shall have no coercive jurisdiction, "but the Provincial Synods affected shall abide by the decision of the appellate Synod." But suppose the *won't shall*. Who can make them if there is no coercive jurisdiction. I think, sir, I have given sufficient proof of the truth of the Bishop's words that he had not had time to consider the matter before he wrote about it.

Yours, &c.,

JOHN LANGTRY.

LET us learn that we can never be lonely or forsaken in this life. All whom we loved—and all who loved us—whom we love no less, while they love us more, are ever near, because ever in His presence in Whom we live and dwell.

THE Bible, without a spiritual life to interpret it, is like a trellis on which no vine grows—bare, angular, and in the way. The Bible with a spiritual life is like a trellis covered with a luxuriant vine—beautiful, odorous, and heavy with purple clusters shining through the leaves.

I LEAVE God's secrets to Himself. It is happy for me that God makes me of His court and not of His council.—*Bishop Hall.*