

the diocese of Toronto
 expense of unity,
 ergy successfully to

mac, and who think
 h the experience of
 eak to men who are
 th the spirit of our
 correct abuses and to
 ook for the old land-

undivided; in another
 rises many branches.
 separates into boughs,
 es spread into num-
 n the theory of the
 order; the Church
 es; the provincial
 o disregard any one
 er of nature, and to
 ch of Christ. The
 national churches in
 dioceses in their di-
 assemblies. All these
 f the Church. The
 d it is difficult fully
 e want thereof. To
 are impediments and
 e of regret to every
 r removal when pos-
 sibility of action and of
 r great aim to pre-
 ses of British North
 pe our course in our

separate dioceses, that no great obstacles may be found in the way when the time for united action shall arrive.

But besides her deliberative assemblies, there are many other objects in which the separate dioceses of a provincial Church may unite and act in concert. And as reason suggests, so experience proves that united action, where possible, is always the most efficient. If each of the English dioceses had its own Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, its own Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, its own Missionary Society, and its own Bible Society, would the Church of England ever have accomplished, to the extent in which she has done so, the mighty ends for which the Almighty has entrusted her with power, influence and wealth? And so in the United States,—vast as is the country, distant as are the dioceses from each other, diverse as are the interests of its various sections,—yet the Church, besides sending her representatives from all parts to the General Convention, maintains one general Board of Missions, one general Theological Seminary, one general Sunday School Union.

Upper Canada has hitherto all been comprised in one diocese; that diocese is now divided by the consecration of a Bishop for the Western portion. And already, I hear, it is proposed by some among us, to break loose from every tie that binds us to our fellow-churchmen in the remaining portion, to own no fellowship with them, to unite in no common objects, to have no common interests, to be altogether separate, isolated, independent!

Especially, it is asserted, we must have a Church Society of our own! Whence, I would ask, arises the necessity for this? What are the advantages to be derived from a separate organization? The disadvantages are plain and manifest. Each body, and especially that of the new diocese, would be so weak, that it would be a mockery to pretend to carry out the many and important objects which the constitution of the Church Society proposes. In the whole new diocese of Huron there are not, I believe, twenty-five incorporated lay members, and the subscriptions of the clerical members are wholly appropriated to the Widows' and Orphans' Fund. The entire contribution of the diocese to the General