

occupies a central place—Rev. John Carter, son of the great musician of that name. The *Living Church* describes him enthusiastically as not only stroke-oar of the College Crew (Pusey House), but stroke-oar of "young Oxford" thought; a democrat, every man's friend, editor of *The Economic Review*, conductor of the Christian Social Union—"the Yankeeist man in Oxford," says this enthusiastic Yankee.

AFTER.

By the time our readers read these lines, our Canadian Synods will have become a thing of the past, and many a member of these bodies will be wondering what he went for—what was the good of it all. Probably 1,000 parishes have poured their clergy and laity to the number of several thousands into temporary camping grounds for a week or so—to talk. But is that all? We trow not. It may seem at first a great waste of time—a remark frequently made by members when other members are trying to express their ideas. The remark itself, however, is its own disproof. It is part of the ideal state of the Christian Church that we should

ALL SPEAK THE SAME THING.

you say, but we don't—at Synods. No, but whatever tends to break down opposing barriers of thought in the direction of unanimity is a clear gain. To be understood we must talk; to reconcile differences we must argue upon reasons. Hence the value of debate. A few wise men publish their wisdom for the good of their brethren; while, perhaps, many unwise ones expose their unwisdom to the wholesome warning of the large class that lies between these two—the class of moderately wise, common-sense folk. This is especially true, of course, of laymen.

LAYMEN CAN LEARN MUCH.

especially those from the country, who have not many opportunities of hearing other opinions than their own discussed. They are dependent to a large extent for information and thought upon Church matters to their local light, their clergyman. When a number of clergymen get together, with a fair sprinkling of zealous and well informed laymen, one's ideas on many subjects must be deepened and varied by a larger and more enlightened view of truth and right. Men are thus enabled to

GET OUT OF COMMON RUTS

of ignorance, prejudice, prepossession. They henceforth move more steadily and solidly upon a broader gauge of thought and judgment. Thus Synods have their value as an educating medium for those members of the Church who have least advantages. The adhesive power of narrow cliques is loosened and weakened by this means; partizan feeling is gradually dissipated. It is true that progress in this direction is slow, and sometimes painfully so; but the work does go on. Those who can compare a Canadian Synod of 1891 with the experience of 80 years ago, can see a great change for the better. There are fewer bitter demagogues in the arena, and they have a much smaller and less subservient following than formerly.

SYNODS HAVE A SOCIAL VALUE.

Men are apt to complain of the great want of quiet and order in such assemblies, but do not perceive the cause. We are persuaded that the cause chiefly responsible for the noise and disorder is the spirit of friendliness; the exuberant delight of old friends meeting and greeting and

comparing notes—friends who never by any chance meet elsewhere from year's end to year's end. Then, too, under cover of this reunion of old friends, many new friendships are formed—to increase the volume of friends, and noisy greetings and eager questionings, and earnest reasonings on the next occasion. All this wears off gradually; so that after the second day of session, real business begins in an atmosphere of comparative quietude and silence.

KNOTTY QUESTIONS ARE LOOSENED.

People are too apt to be impatient at the recurrence of the same old subjects year after year; but they are only accumulating and recording the results of experience. Questions that were burning a few years ago, because of the wide gulf of difference between parties and cliques are now debated with comparative coolness; people find that they have much more in common than they once supposed on both sides; suspicions and jealousies, are proportionately dissipated. Legislation becomes easier.

PATRONAGE.

for instance, is one of those subjects upon which people seem to be gaining unanimity, and in which the knots—with enlarged information and experience—are becoming loosened. At one time the episcopal authority was fiercely and savagely challenged; now people begin to conclude, in spite of early prejudices—well, the Bishop is the best patron after all; the more you interfere with him, the more harm you do, and make him do.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

has received its share of attention. The charms of our admirable school system begin to fade in the blaze of information about its net results. People begin to see that to know more is not so important as to make good use of what you do know. The former is the secular idea, the latter is the religious view, and bound to conquer in the long run—though it may be only in a revolutionary, or at least reactionary way, upon the ruins of the more faulty system.

CONSOLIDATION

is perhaps the greatest landmark of progress for this day in which we live. Men are being drawn into more solid phalanx in a great many ways. Those who live in one locality are becoming more at one in their organizations—more inclined to unite forces into compact line—more disposed to do whatever they can, in common. Modern facilities of communication between distant localities have paved the way for a closing together of those likeminded—almost—no matter where or how far from one another they may live. One day a conference is held in Chicago, another day in London, another in Antwerp. The Church benefits by the same wave of unification. The tendency then is also to simplify, and so execution of work in all branches is facilitated and speeded towards a more rapid consummation of design. It is so with evil designs. It should be so with good ones.

THE NEW EMPIRE.

"When we have accustomed ourselves to contemplate the whole Empire together and call it England, we shall see that here, too, is a United States. Here, too, is a great homogeneous people, one in blood, language, religion, and laws, but dispersed over a boundless space." These words of Professor Seeley give, in a manner, the keynote of perhaps the most important contribu-

**The New Empire: Reflections upon its Origin and Constitution and its relation to the Great Republic.* By O. A. Howland. Toronto: Hart & Co., 1891.

tion to our constitutional history that has yet been given to the press—*The New Empire*, by Mr. Oliver Howland.

The old Empire passed away a century ago, the empire which was ruled by a central authority; and the New Empire, self-governing in all its parts, took its start in the granting of a constitution to Canada by proclamation on the 26th December, 1791. The New Empire, however, is not quite so much of a unit, as yet, as Mr. Howland would like to see it. And yet he declares that the Imperial federation, which many are longing for and working for, is to a certain extent, and in a very real sense, already accomplished. And here, we think, Mr. Howland is right, although he points out various ways in which it may be more perfectly realized.

We have here given, very imperfectly, some notice of the general purpose of this book; but it is not quite easy to give a just idea of its full and varied contents. In the first place we are struck with the completeness of the author's knowledge of the history of the last hundred years or a little more, from the time when the thirteen States south of us cast off their allegiance to Great Britain and Canada held to the mother country, down to the present time.

It may be useful to offer a slight outline of the contents of the book. Chapter one treats of the Fall of the Old Empire; the second, of the Treaty of Partition and its fulfilment. This chapter will be quite an illumination to most Englishmen, who know very little of the way in which the government of the day parted with territory which did not properly belong to the States, and which Canada would have found very useful. The third chapter, on the Constitution of the New Empire, deals with the organization of the American Republic and the development of the English constitution, and treats of the Canadian federation.

This third chapter is not only the longest, but, in our view, the most important of all the sections into which the book is divided. Of special interest to ourselves is the author's lucid and sympathetic treatment of the introduction and development of Constitutional Government in Canada, in which full justice is done to men like Robert Baldwin, Mr. Edward Blake, and Sir John Macdonald. It is pleasant to read the words which Mr. Howland speaks of Mr. Blake, especially as we cannot help thinking that that gentleman has recently had scant justice dealt out to him in consequence of his letter published immediately after the recent Dominion election.

But we think that the author himself will probably regard with most satisfaction the words which he wrote on page 461 and the following pages, on the great man whom the Canadian people are now lamenting, the real author of Canadian federation, Sir John Macdonald. Nothing could be more admirable than the pages which Mr. Howland has dedicated to this great man, which perhaps the subject of them may have read before his lamented removal. It is something, we say, not to be proud of, but certainly to be thankful for, to have written lines of a living man in which neither servility nor detraction could be found, whilst he lived, and in which no line needs to be blotted after he is dead.

We wish we could quote from these pages, but we hope that our readers will make personal acquaintance with them. We would direct special attention to the remarks on the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Here, as elsewhere, the author shows that he is no partisan, and he puts, in the fairest and fullest manner, the two views as to the proper course to be taken in con-