

money over and above what they give to the mission fund, it should be, I think, plainly and distinctly stated for what their money is required, otherwise they will not give. Surely there would be infinitely more interest aroused and the funds of the society would be infinitely increased, if instead of so much confusion being left on the mind about Domestic this and Foreign that and about paying back complimentary sums to the English Societies, it were put fairly and squarely before our Church people that the Missionary Society of Canada has but two great objects before it, (1) the conversion and training the heathen Indians, (2) the support of missions among the backwoods settlers.

In regard to my own work among the Indian children, my Shingwauk and Wawanosh Homes here in Algoma, my Homes at Elkhorn, and my prospective Homes at Medicine Hat, I may say I am just waiting the opportunity to remove the reproach and stigma which at present seems to rest upon them on account of their independent character, by handing them over to such a society the moment it is prepared to undertake them. It seems to me that events are at present shaping themselves under Almighty God's providence for the taking of some such course. The burden of my Homes for the Indian children has become too heavy for me, the responsibility too great. Our funds, instead of increasing with my increased work, are at present decreasing. My scheme for carrying on Homes for Indian children in three different dioceses, with a local advisory committee at each point, I fear will scarcely work so long as all the responsibility of providing suitable employees, gathering in the pupils, and meeting the expenses, rests with myself. It is too much to expect that the Church at large will have such confidence in an individual as to place in his hands funds sufficient for carrying on so extensive a work; and, for myself, I do not wish it. I am prepared, ready, anxious to give over the whole of my work for Indian children to the Missionary Society of Canada, if it will accept it and make provision for carrying it on. I would take this opportunity of urging that the Board of Domestic and Foreign Missions will prepare itself to take action in this matter when it meets again in October. Let it undertake the entire responsibility of these Homes for Indian children—both mine and any others in the North-west that would wish to place themselves at the same time under its fostering care.

I have made this *bona fide* offer now here openly in the Church papers. I see no probability of being able to carry on my work on its present lines through another winter unless our funds are very largely augmented. So far as I can see, it must be one of three things. Either, (1) the Canadian Missionary Society must take over these Indian Homes. Or, (2) more funds must be placed in my hands to enable me to carry on the work. Or, (3) the Homes must be closed. I hope it will not be the last; I am not at all anxious for the second; nothing I believe could be better both for the Indian cause and for the Church at large than for our Missionary Society to take upon its own shoulders the responsibility and maintenance of this and all other Indian work.

Will not others who with me really care for our poor Indians, make it a special subject of prayer to Almighty God that at the next meeting of the Society in October there may be a great change made not only in the name, but in the spirit and work of our Missionary Society, and that the Indian work which has been so long neglected may be brought to that place in the forefront which surely it has the right to occupy?

EDWARD F. WILSON.

Shingwauk Home, June 14th, 1890.

Notes and Queries.

SIR,—What is the Scotch Church in Canada?

SCOT.

Ans.—It is non-existent. The title is sometimes used, partly in ignorance, and partly in the desire to make controversial capital out of a name. Its only possible equivalent is Presbyterianism, but in Scotland there are at least three strains to this line, and the three ecclesiastical bodies are barely on speaking terms. Each has its own short history, but none of them dates farther back than 1690, when William III. found the heads of Presbyterianism more readily compliant than the Bishops, and adopted its assistance and polity as a convenient move on the political checker-board. Thus its establishment in Scotland was on no religious basis, but wholly and boldly Erastian. Feeling that in union is strength, the three chief Presbyterian bodies of Scotland have come together here under the one legal designation of The Presbyterian Church in Canada, and this possibly sends commissioners or representatives to all the three General Assemblies that meet annually in Edinburgh.

Sunday School Lesson.

7th Sunday after Trinity. July 12, 1891.

THE COMMUNION OFFICE.

We are now come to the most solemn service of the Church. The Office, or Order, for the Administration of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion. It is called "The Lord's Supper," because it was instituted by our Blessed Lord at the Passover Supper, celebrated by Him the eve before His crucifixion. (S. Matt. xxvi. 20, 26-28; St. Mark xiv. 14, 17, 22-24; St. Luke xxii. 13, 19, 20; 1 Cor. xi. 23-26.) It is called the Holy Communion because in this holy rite we are united with our Blessed Lord (1 Cor. x. 16), and also with our fellow Christians (1 Cor. x. 17).

Great controversies have raged for many ages past, and still rage amongst Christians, as to doctrines connected with the Holy Communion. It is neither right nor expedient to enter upon such questions here. Rather let us seek those things that "make for peace."

First, then, as to those facts connected with this service which are admitted by all Christians, with but few and insignificant exceptions. There is no doubt, or at least no reasonable doubt, that our Blessed Lord has commanded it to be observed. Disobedience was the first sin, and it is a sin that still prevents a good many Christians from doing as Christ has commanded them, when He said "Do this in remembrance of me." It will not be a very satisfactory excuse to offer for our disobedience, "that we entertained very orthodox opinions about the doctrine of the Holy Communion," while habitually neglecting to fulfil our Lord's plain command.

2. It is intended as a bond of union between both our Blessed Lord and ourselves, and also between us and our brethren. How wrong therefore it must be to make any differences of opinion as to questions of doctrine concerning the Holy Communion an occasion of bitterness, wrath or unkindness, towards our fellow Christians. For the Church of England, the Holy Communion is celebrated in all our congregations in the same words. In some congregations there may be some differences of ceremonial or more or less singing than in others; in some, hymns may be sung and in others not; but notwithstanding this the service is essentially the same in all, and the private opinions of those who compose the congregations cannot alter it.

3. All who devoutly participate in this Holy Communion, must partake of the same benefits which our Lord intended to confer on His faithful disciples. He will hardly suffer even our misbeliefs, or misappreciation of these benefits, nor our want of understanding how or in what manner they are conferred, to prevent us from receiving them. The Catechism tells us that the benefits conferred are "the strengthening and refreshing of our souls."

4. As to the objects of the Holy Communion. Our Lord has commanded it to be observed "in remembrance of Him." It is, therefore, a solemn memorial of Him. (See *Prayer of Consecration*, "Did institute, etc.") And St. Paul also declares that it is a showing forth of our Lord's death until He come, *i. e.*, until His second coming in great majesty (1 Cor. xi. 26.) It is shown forth before God the Father" (See *Prayer of Consecration*, "Who made there," etc.), and it is also shown forth before men. His all sufficient sacrifice is pleaded before the Father, and men are at the same time reminded of the Atonement our Lord has made upon the cross.

5. St. Paul also declares that it is the Communion of His Body and Blood, *i. e.*, a means whereby we who partake of the Sacrament are brought into union with His most precious Body and Blood, 1 Cor. x. 16; or as the Prayer of Consecration expresses it, we are made "partakers of His most Blessed Body and Blood," and also by reason of our being partakers of the same sacramental food we are also brought into union with each other (1 Cor. x. 17). Under the old Mosaic dispensation they who offered sacrifices, in some instances partook of the sacrifice (Lev. vii. 6, 15.) So it would seem that in the Holy Communion our Blessed Lord is pleased to make us partakers of the all sufficient sacrifice which He has offered once for all, for our redemption. We may not be able to understand how He does this, but it is not necessary that we should.

6. We have the fact that this Holy service has been continuously observed in the Church ever since Apostolic times (see Acts. ii. 42, where it is called "the breaking of bread"), and it is to be continuously observed in the Church until our Lord's second coming to judge the world.

When the murderers of Bishop Patteson laid his body in a canoe, and placed a palm in his dead hands, they little knew they were showing forth one of the most beautiful truths of our faith: that through suffering and death, the kingdom of peace and life is won.

Family Reading.

Seventh Sunday After Trinity.

UPRIGHTNESS.

"A soldier can be known by his firm, regular step, and by his upright bearing."

Do you remember this sentence in our last reading? Well, I believe we shall see that a Christian soldier is known also by his "upright bearing," or "uprightness," whichever you like to call it.

A good many people are, we hope, honest and trustworthy. But for absolute uprightness we want a Christian. For instance, let us think for a few minutes of this one thing—the keeping of promises.

Now promises may be made either about little things or great. They may be about serious and important matters, or very trivial ones. They may be about things that have to do with your whole life, or may be about things that only matter for a single day. Well, that makes but little difference as to the principle concerned—a promise is always a promise, and it ought to be kept.

Yes, a promise is something sacred; I don't think it is too much to say that. Now let us see what sort of promises are easy to keep, and what sort of promises are *not* easy to keep. For the ones that are not easy to keep are the trial, are not they? Ah! it takes a Christian to keep those, as we shall see.

Suppose an uncle of yours said to you one day, that if you would go to his house on such an afternoon he would give you a present. You eagerly promise to do as he asks; and you find it remarkably easy to keep that promise, do you not? But suppose you made another sort of promise, to take a book to a poor lame man a mile off on one particular evening. Suppose it came on to rain, and a capital indoor game was beginning just as it was time to set off; well, it would be rather hard to you to keep that promise, wouldn't it? But that is just the test. A soldier of Christ will keep a promise he has made because he loves uprightness, because he won't go back from his word, even if he has to give up something pleasant in order to keep it.

Take another instance.

Suppose you are asked to a friend's house on such a day, and you accept the invitation. Now accepting an invitation always means making a promise, doesn't it? Well, then, it might happen that after you had promised your friend you are asked to join in a very pleasant excursion on the very same day. You very much prefer the excursion to the quiet party at your friend's house; you call it in your own mind a "slow affair" as the other tempting note lies open before you. Now what is to be done?

Two courses lie open to you. One is to break your first engagement, and accept the pleasant excursion. "It's easily done," you say to yourself. "They won't mind. I really can't lose such a delightful chance just because I promised—" Here you stop short, for that word "promise" is suggestive. A promise must be kept, not broken. Once made, it can't be unmade. You have said you will go to your friend's on Thursday; well then, be resolute, and keep your promise. Never mind losing something pleasant, although no doubt it is a little hard. A promise made is to be kept at all hazards. And you find yourself able to do it, thank God, because you belong to Christ.

Perhaps you say that keeping a promise about an invitation doesn't seem to have much to do with God. But why should it not? If you are strictly upright about the things of the world, you will be strictly upright about the things of God. God cares whether you do right or wrong about the smallest matter. "He that is faithful in that which is least, is faithful also in much."

Here is another instance.

William Brown is looking out for a clerkship in an office. He hears of one that is vacant, offers himself, and is engaged. Now being "engaged," or "making an engagement," means that master and man exchange promises. The master promises so much money. William Brown promises his services. But promises, as we have seen, are not always kept. Almost as soon as he has left the office he hears that another post is vacant, better