

this Dominion. We now as a Church stand before the world as two distinct organizations, giving an erroneous conception to all who observe us that there is no such body in existence as the Church of England in Canada. As the Synod is to take steps to further union with other religious bodies it would be well first to bring our own Church in Canada into visible unity. That some change will take place in the title of the Church in this country is certain. It is folly to put our heads in the sand and so not see what is coming. We are actually allowing to-day the Methodist body to pose before the country as the recognized representative of its religious organizations. We are in a miserable state of cowardly apathy; we need some strong man to take the initiative in this and other reforms. The Synod hitherto has stood shivering on the brink of the Jordan which must be crossed before we are delivered from our present bondage to the past. We heartily approve of most of the motions of which notice has been given, but they would have been just as relevant to a Synod a thousand years ago. We desire our bishops, clergy, and lay delegates to realize that this is the closing quarter of the nineteenth century. The times are such as to demand recognition of their special modern needs. The Church which looks only behind, and becomes rapt in ecstasy at the prospect is not the Church which will effectively do God's work in the present and future. We are too much given to this enthusiasm over our ancestors' work; we should do better if we praised less and emulated more their deeds. There never would have been a Church of England had men in olden days been as indifferent about visible, organic, national unity as we are. We are in great danger of developing a disease as cancerous in its manifestations as congregationalism—the disease of diocesanism. It is this affliction which is showing its symptoms in the inertness, the defective power of initiating needed changes, which have been so manifest in the past sittings of the Provincial Synod. We are allowing each diocese to set up institutions for itself as though the Church of England as a Church organism did not exist. Our people are being educated with the notion that the Church is a mere phrase, that it means a number of local independent organizations whose only unity consists in a formal recognition every three years of an idea which has no living, practical form. Much has been said of putting the parish clergy on the itinerant system; we shall have to consider whether our bishops should not also exchange dioceses every three or more years. Certainly something must be done to lift the churchmen of Canada of all orders and classes to a higher plane of loyalty to the "One Catholic Church," whose unity they are fast forgetting in their zeal for the narrow interests of the locality and party which cramp and absorb their sympathy.

The motion touching "the reserve forces of the Church" gives an instance in point as to one great defect of this Synod. It has already legislated in regard to these "forces." Why should not reports be required at each session

upon the working of each and of all the legislative acts of the Synod? Resolutions are discussed year after year, they are solemnly passed upon, and then passed into oblivion. The mountain labors and the outcome is an abortion; the mother does not even enquire whether her offspring is living or dead. Another grave question demands treatment. We have laymen placed as legislators for the Church who have practically abandoned attendance upon her sacraments and services, and who spend their Sundays preaching for the sects—yet the Provincial Synod has too little self-respect or too little courage to pass such legislation as would place such offenders under discipline. We have parish churches committed by unscrupulous partisans to the support of institutions over which the Church has no manner of control—institutions which could turn Presbyterian tomorrow without altering their teaching, but for the support of which our churches are utilized. We need such legislation as will prohibit the Churches of Christ being thus prostituted to the purposes of party agitators. Dr. Carry's motion deals with another scandal, a branch of the same tree of evil as the above scandals spring from. Such an audacious act as using syrup concocted at a grocery for wine at Holy Communion would never be dreamt of if party movements had not been so long tolerated. We implore then the Synod to rouse itself into a keen realization of its responsibilities to God and His Church. In this age of unrest, and with the Church set about with so many and great dangers, chiefly arising within her own borders, the great need is to break up all that helps or tends to the concentration of interest in merely narrow, local, either provincial, diocesan, parochial, or party bounds. In view of the constant assertions of our enemies that the Church is in a state of decadence, the Synod would do a good work by arranging for the compiling of Church statistics at periodic intervals, so that we may know what our position really is. If we are in process of being stamped out we ought to know the danger, so as to provide a refuge or stop the waterfloods rising any higher. We trust that the work of the Synod will manifest Divine inspiration and guidance. But the fable of Jupiter and the Waggoner is Christian teaching.

HOME REUNION—THE PRESENT POSITION OF THE QUESTION.

SURELY a consideration of these losses and hindrances to the common cause should stir up in all true believers an earnest desire to rise to the fulfillment of our LORD'S last prayer that we should be One.

St. John's Epistle, to which I have before referred as essentially addressed to the newly-formed Church of CHRIST, is full of exhortations to brotherly love, because of our common belief in the Doctrine of the Trinity, and because our GOD is revealed as a God of Light, of Love, and of Truth.

From this it would appear that there are two essential conditions towards any true reunion of the scattered forces of Christians. Anything falling short of these must rather tend to mis-

lead and hinder the work, while anything that helps forward in any way either of these conditions must in its way be a help to unity.

And first there must be a common belief in the essential and eternal verities—in the great Doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation—because a belief in these, according to St. John, is the "*fons et origo*" of all brotherly love.

There must, then, be a Simple Creed held, understood, lived up to, and taught to others; no Creedless union is possible: but with such a Creed firmly held, there may be again great freedom of individual opinion and speculative thought.

And this brings me to the second essential condition for any real unity—a belief in the reality of the Church or Kingdom or Body of Christ. It is this alone which can prevent individual liberty, in the pride of private judgment, magnifying its own peculiar sides of truth into essential dogmas of affirmation or of denial, which is the "*fons et origo*" of all our schisms, of their ever-increasing divisions, and of fresh articles or tests of Christian belief.

If we accept these two conditions, we must not let our party prejudices hinder the acceptance, as true brothers, of all who hold the common faith and have been baptized into the Holy Name. In times past we have freely called each other names, but we must remember "He only is Antichrist who denieth both the Father and the Son." This at once places all schemes for reunion which would exclude any at the present day who hold the eternal truths, or which would ignore the work of the Church for the first 1,500 years, as quite outside any schemes for permanent Reunion.

Let us now consider how far we have advanced on the road towards the acceptance of these two essential principles of unity.

The Simple Creed is already in existence and is received by all under the Symbols of the Apostles' and Nicene Creed, with the exception of the filioque clause, which, however, right and sound it may be in its teaching, was wrongly placed there as wanting the sanction of the whole Church, and hence became the cause of the first great division of Christendom.

There is also a great desire among many of the Nonconforming Churches for a common simple Creed; or rather for getting rid of those distinctive Shibboleths which in trust-deeds and in other ways have done so much harm in stereotyping certain special beliefs which are not now generally held as essential.

All the sects at home are endeavouring to reunite their scattered forces. And the tirades against the binding tyranny of the various chapel trust-deeds are numerous and strong. The Presbyterians and the Congregationalists, the Congregationalists and the Baptists, are drawing nearer together. These desires for greater unity have been quickened by many mixed motives, some may think thereby to gain a greater vantage ground against the Establishment, others for a Protestant assault against Catholic principles; but the desire to rally all under One LORD, One Faith, One Baptism, lies very deep down, and in whatever form it takes, or for whatever cause it may be