

Ecclesiastical Commissioners, or the Queen Anne's Society, or the Corporation of the Sons of the Clergy. The principal fact is that something ought to be done, and if it is to be done well, it must be done quickly.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY, writing in the *Times*, replying to a correspondent who reproached him and the Church for "not advertising untried schemes of relief," points out that the unemployed are not a wholly new phenomenon, that the formation of new plans and funds for their benefit simply means a transference of the resources of the regular associations and funds, and that the parochial organizations of the clergy and their co-workers afford the most effective safeguard against "overlapping" and fraud. In his opinion the best way of dealing with the present distress is to strengthen the existing means of relief, assistance, and rehabilitation.

FAINT-HEARTEDNESS.

In the lives of nations there are periods when progress is noted. The fashionable name is "centennial celebration"—we are getting sick of them and the material progress dilated on. There are also times when we may note the progress of the Church, and occurrences from which we can judge whether, as a body, we are advancing, retrograding or simply marking time. One event still fresh in our minds is worth careful thought and study. We ask our readers each to think it over.

Three Bishops are added to the roll of Canadian Church history. In one case a Synod selected, in the second the Synod delegated the appointment to the Archbishop of Canterbury, in the third that prelate appointed. Every one is an English clergyman, obscure, but doubtless as estimable personally as ignorant of his diocese and unprepared for the work before him. Such self-abasement on the part of the Canadian Church is probably unique. Uriah Heep liked to be humble and we are also pusillanimous. The Scotchman prayed that he might be given a good conceit of himself; might we not echo the spirit of his orison? If we request people to kick us, the kick will probably come. If we say we are inferior beings we will be thought the best judges. Clergymen ordained in Canada are not allowed to officiate in an English diocese.

We would like to ask our readers, delegates especially, from Quebec to British Columbia,

(1) Do you seriously believe that there is no clergyman fit to be a Bishop in your diocese?

(2) Do you seriously believe that there is no clergyman fit to be a Bishop in Canada?

(3) Do you seriously believe that the best Bishops for Canada are English clergymen who have never been in it and know nothing about it?

The late Bishop Oxenden tells how agreeably surprised he was one morning in his comfortable English home to receive a message informing him he had been elected Bishop of Montreal and Metropolitan of Canada, and how he hunted on the map for Montreal, and in gazetteers for information as to his new sphere of labour. His mistakes are amusing, but on reading these artless confessions one is tempted to ask, How could shrewd sensible business people hope that a man over forty years of age could take root in a new country, understand the people, their needs and hopes, and be able to be the leader of a Church of which he was utterly ignorant? There is another aspect of the question. In Canada there are numbers of clergymen English born, educated, and many ordained there. These men have worked hard,

have made this their home, are Canadians as well as Englishmen. Are these gentlemen to understand that the very fact of such labour and the acquisition of such knowledge is in itself sufficient to prevent their promotion? We venture to say that in Toronto alone there are three English clergymen equal in every way to the three gentlemen selected, and superior to them all in a knowledge and love of this country and its people. But, most serious question of all, what about the native clergy; are they only fit to be hewers of wood and drawers of water? We complain that our best men go to the States; can it be wondered at? Can the Canadian Church ever hope to be the Church of the people until it is self-respecting and Canadian? There are exceptions, of course, but do not these exceptions prove the rule that English prelates in a colony, unconsciously, no doubt, look upon themselves as part of an English garrison, living lives and thinking thoughts quite apart from their people, working conscientiously, but with the hope that sooner or later their term of duty may end and they can return to their home, a quiet rectory, and possibly suffragan honours.

PAPER ON "CHRISTIAN UNITY."

The Rev. Dr. Langtry read the following paper at the meeting of the ministerial association on Jan. 23:

I am quite aware, Mr. Chairman, that anything I may say will be handicapped by the conviction in the minds of not a few of those to whom I speak that it is the utterance of one who is chiefly distinguished for medieval narrow-mindedness and bigotry. I do not intend to detain the Conference with any vindication of my right to a more merciful judgment. I would only ask you in your charity to suspend that judgment for the present, and to think only of the subject which we have come together to consider. In order, however, to facilitate the exercise of that charity towards myself, I ask leave to state that however some of you may think appearances to be against me, the subject of the re-union of the divided, distracted Christendom of to-day has filled my mind and heart for many a year. It is generally supposed that the first corporate action taken with a view to bringing about the restoration of visible union was taken by the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States at its session in October, 1886. Our generous-hearted cousins across the line claim this honour, as they are always ready to claim all honours as exclusively their own. And our brethren in England, with their usual generosity in dealing with colonial possessions, have been only too ready to concede to the Americans the initiation of the movement towards re-union, which has spread throughout the world, and is occupying so large a share of the attention of the thoughtful men of to-day. I beg to say, however, that whatever honour there may be in the initiation of this movement, it belongs not to the United States, but to Canada. The first corporate action taken by any body of Christians in this direction was taken by the Provincial Synod of the Church of England in Canada, in the year 1880. After full and earnest discussion, it adopted the following resolution:

That this Synod having regard to the needs of the mission fields and the present aspect of the Christian world, cannot separate without expressing its strong conviction of the great dangers to which Christianity is exposed throughout the world by its unhappy divisions, and without inviting and entreating Christians everywhere to pray and labour for the restoration of unity to the rent Body of Christ. And, further, this Synod hereby respectfully requests the several Bishops of this ecclesiastical province,

either by themselves or with such assistance as they may call to their aid, to press this matter upon the consideration of the various Christian bodies around us, and to invite communication either with the individual members or representatives of these bodies, with a view to promote agreement in the truth, and the restoration of outward unity to the Church of Christ, that the world may see it and believe.

That resolution was moved by the narrow-minded medievalist who is addressing you, and was seconded by the Rev. Jas. Carmichael, Dean of Montreal. Nothing further was done until the Synod which met early in September, 1886. I had put upon the notice paper the following resolution:

Resolved that a committee be appointed to confer with the representatives of any of the religious bodies, that they may appoint a delegation for this purpose, to ascertain whether any honourable basis of union with such body or bodies can be agreed upon.

I was, however, elected Prolocutor that year and had to ask Dean Carmichael to move it. No one who was present in that Synod will ever forget the intense desire with which that resolution was unanimously adopted, and the fervent emotion with which the whole Synod united in prayer for the attainment of the object of that resolution.

I may mention that I was formally interpolated from the floor of the Synod, before the motion was put, as to what I thought the essentials of a basis of union would be. And it will be found in the reports of our proceedings that I enunciated from the chair the very basis that was adopted by the American Convention, and afterwards by the Lambeth Conference, except that for the "Historic Episcopate," in the fourth condition, I suggested "The Historic Continuity of the Church." In saying this I am not claiming either inspiration or originality, as the question had already been widely discussed among us. The American delegates were present, but whether our action suggested theirs, or whether both proceeded spontaneously, as I trust they did, from the one inspiring spirit, I do not know. I only know that the honour of initiating the movement which has issued in this, and many similar gatherings since, belongs not to the United States but to Canada.

And now, Mr. Chairman, as to the subject which we have met to consider. I think I may assume that we have not come here to engage in debate, or even in discussion; but as Christian men to confer one with another, as to whether we can, under the guidance of God's blessed Spirit, find any way out of the tangle—the evil state in which we find ourselves. That it is an evil state I do not need to prove. No one can reflect on the necessary import of our Lord's prayer, that His followers all might be one, that the world through sight of this Oneness, might be led to believe in Him—no one who remembers that our Lord founded one Church—not many churches—that He, through His apostles, declares it to be one body, one building, one habitation of God through the Spirit, and that He so sternly condemns those divisions and parties in the Church which had a dangerous tendency to frustrate His prayer, defeat His plan, and divide His host into many separated and warring sects—no one who thinks of this, no one who looks out upon the distracted Christendom of to-day, who observes the waste of men, the waste of money, the waste of energy, the feebleness of the testimony, the alienation of brethren, the destruction of charity that is involved, say what we may, in the sectism of the present day—no one who thinks of this, can escape the conclusion that it is a pitiable and shameful thing that men who wor-

ship the on
Lord Jesu
profess to
be arraye
suicidal th
dition wh
is manifes
if not for
cunningly
that has
Gospel.
that is yo
in the onl
open to yo
ation of
answer fin
cannot—s
best but a
our Lord
to the cor
tures dem
age, is on
for indivi
bound tog
one spirit
set of law
her own t
Now, i
torical co
Lord Jes
apostles,
restored.
You w
surmount
at once e
of reachi
as is offe
ernment
byters m
Church a
certainly
opinion.
itself to
difficulty
teaches
the Chu
build a
orderly
it upon
Jesus C
That Cl
tament
organis
appoint
of actio
mode o
perpetu
klesia, l
the Ne
term us
moderr
nation
scribe
visible,
Church
angels
and we
see it.
with t
teen h
is a vi
is easi
this C
the pr
vail ag
end of