

the power of numbers; of combined and united action of the parts of the one body; and has forgotten the teaching of history in this connection.

YEARS AGO the much-divided Presbyterian and Methodist bodies awoke to the unwisdom of their divisions, and uniting their several portions into an—at least—outward oneness, at once advanced from insignificant and practically powerless factors in the State into important and controlling elements, wielding an influence and attracting to their fold through their very "bigness" alone. They have verified the truth of the old adage, "Union is strength," and have afforded practical proof of the power that might be exercised by Christianity were the fulfilment of the prayer of our Divine Lord, the Head of The Church, in its fulness of meaning, not prevented by the wicked divisions and differences of those who bear His name, but disobey His will.

FOR YEARS earnest, far-seeing men in our Provincial Synods have striven to remove this cause of inferiority from The Church they love so well. If we mistake not, the first word pointing in this direction was spoken on the platform of the Synod of the Ecclesiastical Province of Canada by one of the delegation from the Province of Rupert's Land—the Rev. E. S. W. Pentreath; but he seemed to dream to those who heard him; and it was several years thereafter ere any effective action was taken, and that ultimately largely through Mr. Charles Jenkins and Mr. W. J. Imlach, delegates from the Diocese of Huron. It is not necessary to follow up the various steps taken which culminated in the Winnipeg Conference—an ever-memorable meeting in the history of The Church in Canada. Its suggestions have been fully accepted by the Province of Rupert's Land, and virtually—since the changes made do not in any material point operate to the annulment of the Winnipeg basis—by the Province of Canada. It is possible that the modifications made may require the concurrence of the sister Province, but that this will not be given is not conceivable in view of the enormous importance of the movement, the divergent interests and the Diocesan prejudices existing here to be met, and the happy conclusion arrived at; leaving the Winnipeg Scheme so little changed and putting no bar in the way of the Provincial system to which the Province of Rupert's Land attached such importance. The modifications accepted by that Province, the General Assembly will then meet in Toronto in September next.

THE importance of that meeting who can estimate? If ever there was a time when earnest supplication should be made by the whole Church for the preventient and assisting grace of God, the Holy Ghost, it is, it appears to us, now. At it will be assembled for the first time in the history of this country the whole or nearly the whole of the Episcopate of that true branch of the Church Catholic planted in this land when it passed into the possession of the British Crown, and only a little over a century ago possessing one solitary *Episcopos*. At it will be the chosen representatives of the

Priesthood from the 20 Dioceses which are now embraced within the jurisdiction over which the first Bishop Inglis presided. At it too will be the chosen men of the Laity, representing the great body of the Church from ocean to ocean—brethren of the one family—many of them meeting each other face to face for the first time, and gathered together for prayerful, well-considered action in the interests of the Church of Christ in this part of His world-wide field. Such a meeting will have—must have—from the mere fact of its composition, a far greater importance than any Provincial Synod or Assembly.

BUT again the purposes of its meeting render it of the gravest importance. Naturally the first and chief business will be the consideration and, we trust, the acceptance without material change of the suggested CONSTITUTION. Just here is where there will be found the need at once of wise and self-restrained action. It is impossible but that delegates, drawn together from such distant portions of the country, and from distinct and independent dioceses, will bring with them more or less of local interests—nay prejudices; and it is possible that some of them may be thought of grave enough importance to be seriously discussed. But we would venture to hope that the force of the well-considered and well-debated action of the Provincial Synods, accepted as it will have been more or less fully by the various Diocesan bodies, will not be overlooked; and that the conclusions arrived at by them may be accepted by the Assembly as fully and as promptly as possible. We venture to hope that every member may be so impressed with the greatness, importance and dignity of the occasion as to have no heart for trifling discussions, *e.g.*, as to the title of the presiding officer, whether Primate or Archbishop, or as to whether the Metropolitans of Provinces shall be styled Archbishops or Metropolitans. Let not the Church be lowered in the eyes of a keenly observing public by such questions or discussions.

ASSUMING the Constitution, with the assignment of powers and subjects contained in the schedule to Art. v., accepted, it will become necessary to draw up and adopt Rules of Order and Procedure, no provision for which is made in the scheme submitted. Possibly the rules already in force in the Provincial Synods might be adapted to this body; and, if so, but little delay would be caused in proceeding to definite determinate action upon any of the matters coming within the jurisdiction of the Synod. Unless, however, it is possible for the members of both Houses to remain together in Toronto for a considerable period (Presbyterians and Methodists occupy several weeks, we believe, in their Assembly), it might be a wiser course to simply perfect the Constitution, Rules and Orders, and appointing Committees to report on the most important and pressing matters for the welfare and extension of The Church, adjourn to meet at some future early day. This course would probably secure more mature and well-considered action. On the other hand, there are subjects which would seem to command immediate attention: *e.g.*, the Missionary and Educational work of the Church,

the adjustment of relations between dioceses as to Clergy and W. and O. Funds, and the transfer of Clergy from one diocese to another. Whatever course may be pursued, it would be advisable in our opinion to eschew all matters upon which there would likely be misunderstanding or determined difference; and one such would be, it seems to us, the question of subdividing or rearranging *Provinces*. Some dioceses (as it is well known) have only yielded assent to the Assembly scheme in consideration of the modification made in the Winnipeg Conference resolutions as to the absolute retention of the Provincial system; and any action tending that way at the first meeting of the Assembly would be, we fear, misunderstood and resented.

THERE would seem to be a practice growing up in regard to the administration of the Holy Communion, when there are a number communicating, which it is difficult to reconcile with the words of the rubric appertaining to the matter; and which is felt by many Communicants as a personal wrong. We refer to the omission of the special and proscribed formula in delivering the bread and wine to each recipient. Some clergy say the words, "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ" once, and then proceed to administer to the whole table of recipients. The rubric is express in its terms: "*Then shall the Minister first receive the Communion in both kinds himself, and then proceed to deliver the same * * * to the people also in order into their hands, all meekly kneeling.*" And when he delivereth the Bread to any one he shall say, "The Body, etc." * * * "And the Minister that delivereth the Cup to any one shall say." These directions can hardly be said to be obeyed when the Priest says the formula once in the presence of a number of Communicants, not at the moment delivering either Bread or Wine to any, and then silently distributing the elements to one after another of twenty or more Communicants. We know that it is felt by some as a *personal* wrong, inclining them to remain away from Communion; and the practice is certainly without rubrical authority.

Dr. Remensnyder, of New York, in an article on "The Great European Cathedrals" in the June *Homiletic Review*, speaks of them as great "moral forces, silent august teachers, whose eloquent lessons are moulding the thought and framing the spirit of the peoples in whose midst they stand." He remarks upon the fact that in continental Europe "these cathedrals are in the hands of Roman Catholics," with but few exceptions, and argues that Romanism should not be allowed "to monopolize this potent instrumentality—art in Christian architecture." He too truly adds, "a great difficulty in the way of Protestantism here lies in its divisions. It takes a united Church to erect a cathedral. One can scarcely form an estimate of the labor and expenditure requisite to this end. . . . It is evident, therefore, that until Protestantism exorcises this fatal evil of schism division and strife, building a half dozen rival churches in every village, it will never be able to erect a cathedral church such as is found in every European city of any size, and which edifices are the glory of Old World." The italics are ours. The testi-