

NOT FOR SALE.

A FEW days ago several daily papers received a message from a gentleman, who seems anxious to connect his name in some way or other with a revolution in Canada. The message was to the effect that the Senate Committee on Foreign affairs at Washington had been considering a project for establishing the political union of Canada to the States. The transfer was to be secured by a payment to Canada of the present debt of this Dominion. This message was sent on the 30th Sept., Saturday, but on Sunday night, the 1st October, the papers were requested not to publish the matter so forwarded. To this request two papers turned a deaf ear, so the cat was let out of the bag. Our belief is that the original message was sent as a feeler, and that between its reception and withdrawal, messages had gone from Canada urging the cancellation of this message in the interests of those who were working for the same end by less blunt and less blundering straightforwardness.

The incident created a great sensation. But we cannot see why such surprise was felt, for it has been notorious to those who observe what is passing in the States, by the press, and hearing what is thought in social circles, that for some time past there has been a decided tendency in the States to regard Canada as a Naboth's vineyard, which must be had by purchase, or trickery, or force. The truth seems to be that the idea of any man, or any people, not having a price, is to the Yankee mind incomprehensible. The buying and selling of men and women in open market was a daily thing only a few years ago in the States. Doubtless there is left a strong infusion of the slave dealers' sentiments on this traffic in those Senators who proposed to purchase Canadians at the ridiculously low price of about fifty dollars a head all round!

Apart from the question of being purchased at all, we resent the shocking insult conveyed by these American Senators, and their mouth-piece, Mr. Wiman, that we are only worth the price of an old horse! Why, it is conceded by all writers, that every immigrant who lands on the shores of America is worth, at least, \$1,000 to the country, while we, by these Senators, are rated at only one twentieth of the value of each peasant who comes into the States from Europe! Of course, we are well aware that there are amongst us some few for whom even \$50 would be an excessively high price, some, indeed, in both State and Church, for whose departure the nation and the Church would do well to get rid by paying a heavy fee to the land or the religious society who would take them over. It would be worth a fortune to the Church in Canada, for instance, to be able to foist upon some unwitting victim of our wiles, the little knot of mischief makers who live by strife.

It is, moreover, surprising that a people so valueless should be worth the trouble of taking over. But in this reckoning of \$50 a head for every Canadian, the native wealth of our country is not taken into account, we must not go

into this, or the conclusion might be a demonstration that those who are wishing to buy us, think us, as a lot, wholly valueless, merely thrown in with the chattels as it were.

But once for all so far as we speak for a not inconsiderable section of Canadians, we desire our American neighbours to understand that we are not for sale on any terms.

THE PRACTICAL POINT IN THE PRESENT DISCUSSION OF CHURCH UNITY.*

I HAVE been asked to write a paper, for this occasion, on the question, "What is the practical point in the present discussion on Church Unity?" And I have been limited to fifteen minutes. It is well, perhaps, that I have been thus limited; for it will render it necessary for me to present a few salient points, rather than attempt an exhaustive discussion of any one of them.

It is impossible to write anything on this subject, that will satisfy general expectations, without reference to the Proposal issued by our House of Bishops at the last General Convention. See p. 80 of the *Journal*.

In this Declaration there are four points definitely stated:

1. The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament as the revealed Word of God. 2. The Nicene Creed, as the sufficient statement of the Christian Faith. 3. The two Sacraments—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord—ministered with unfailling use of Christ's words of institution and of the elements ordained by Him. 4. The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration, to the varying needs of the nations and peoples "called of God into the unity of His Church."

I confess that when I first saw this Declaration I was a little sorry that it had not been rather more explicit, on one or two points at least.

Do we propose to receive the Holy Scriptures, as each and every one may choose to interpret them? Or as they were understood and interpreted by the early Fathers and the Church in the first centuries of its existence? *This is what the Reformers of the Church in England proposed to do.* Do we stand by that principle?

It is declared in the Paper referred to that "all duly baptized persons are already members of the Catholic Church." But what do we mean by the "duly" in this connection? I know of no authority—Father or Council—in the first fifteen hundred years of the Church's existence, that regarded baptism administered by laymen in the Church, or Ministers of any order out of it, as making one fully a Christian, or bringing him into the Church, without confirmation—or the "laying on of hands" by some one in the Church. So essential was this regarded that confirmation—as a reception into the Church by competent authority

*A paper read before the Fourth Missionary District at their Spring Convocation, by Dr. W. D. Wilson, in *Church Eclectic*.

that Presbyters were allowed and even directed to administer confirmation, or laying on of hands, in cases where the services of a Bishop could not be had for that purpose,—rather than that one should leave the world without such reception, and the participation in the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, before his departure. Lay baptism, and even heretical and schismatic baptism, was regarded as valid, so far as the mere outward form was concerned, so that that part of the Sacrament need not be repeated. But without confirmation they were not considered "members of the Catholic Church."

Do we propose to insist on Confirmation, not perhaps to complete the outward form of Baptism, but to make it an effectual admission to the Church of Christ—the Holy Catholic Church—and the full complement of the blessings of that relation?

These are certainly grave questions. But I pass them, and come to what is doubtless the main, if not the "practical point," in the whole case.

Our Declaration is (4th), "the Historic Episcopate," *i. e.*, we speak of a "local adaption." But it is not quite certain what that means, or how far it may extend—nor yet—(which is a far more serious question)—how far *we may have any power to "adapt" it to the wants and wishes of those who now regard it as useless, if not unauthorised and anti-Christian.*

Suppose the question with regard to their ordination or reordination is settled, in one way or another, how about their obedience to the Bishops and Laws of the Church? Are they to make the promises that are exacted of our clergy at their ordination? as, "Will you reverently obey your Bishop and other chief Ministers who, according to the Canons of the Church, may have the charge and government over you?"

I was present, not long since, when a Romish Priest was received into our Communion. He was not reordained, but he was required to answer all the questions we put to our priests, when we admit them to Holy Orders. The services seemed to me exceedingly appropriate. But will the preachers in the Protestant denominations make the same promises? Or are they to be required to do so?

Then the question arises with regard to their worship: Suppose that whole congregations of them, Methodists or Presbyterians, come into the Church? Are they to accept our Liturgy and Prayer Book? Will they accept *any* stated Form of Worship, or are they to be allowed to go on as now, with their extempore prayers, or as they please?

Our Dioceses will, of course, become unmanageably large. But we can divide them, and erect, in Central New York, for example, six or seven new sees, as Oswego, Auburn, Elmira, Binghamton, Utica, Watertown, &c. But if we follow the old plan at all, each of the sees must have, and can have, only one Bishop—the presbyters and deacons in it must all be subject to him, and the Liturgy and Worship in each Diocese must be the same for all persons and congregations in it. In the Primitive