

ott & Co., \$5,
v. Geo. Hallen;

nowledges with
Church, for the
ddress Rev. S.

NT.]
ocese has em-
visit to Eng-
ions in the Al-
s in the north
results. He in-
General Eng-
art for home on

o annual Sun-
ounds of Rose-
l Festival. At
on the grounds
en, with their
) sat down and
es, &c., in the
in picnic style
s have an ex-
a congregation

he writers in full

ANISM 10

etter from the
t would be at-
ion it contains
en and semi-
ore send it to
it a place in

IN FLETCHER.

ounded by him
Tertiaries of
nan Church-
ld, are bound
this mere as-
your issue of
at the ancient
like, and the
in what rela-
od to the An-
e way to ob-
f religious so-
persecution as
of God, John
c efforts. The
a sermon on
him to his
years before

God not only
highway side,
s had ears to
ch of England,
And they ad-
therein, al-
y, for this did
tions, but only
young man,
as a son in
Richards, and
Let it be well
these, namely,
l them wholly
raments. And
e inseparably
tution of the
Neither the
nem so, other-
e services of
In 1744 all
t conference.
ing called to
r sacraments.
was given to
of the work
s this? Did
sacraments, to
design never

entered our minds. It was the farthest from our thoughts, and if any preacher had taken such a step we should have looked upon it as a breach of this rule, and, consequently, as a recantation of our connection. And in doing this you renounce the first principles of Methodism, which was wholly and solely to preach the Gospel. Now, as long as the Methodists keep to this plan, they cannot separate from the Church. And this is our peculiar glory.....With the Methodists it is far otherwise. They are not a sect or party, they do not separate from the religious community to which they at first belonged, they are still members of the Church; such they deserve to live and die. And, I believe, one reason why God is pleased to continue my life so long is to confirm them in their present purpose not to separate from the Church. But notwithstanding this many warm men say, 'Aye, but you do separate;' others are equally warm and say, 'I do not.' I will nakedly declare the truth as it is. I hold all the doctrines of the Church of England. I love her Liturgy. I approve her plan of discipline, and only wish it could be carried into execution. I do not knowingly vary from any rule of the Church, unless in those few instances where I judge there is an absolute necessity. For instance, (1) as there are few clergymen who open their churches to me I am under the necessity of preaching abroad; (2) as I know no form that will suit all occasions, I am often under the necessity of praying extempore; (3) in order to build up the flock of Christ in faith and love I am under the necessity of uniting them together and dividing them into little companies that they may provoke one another to love and good works; (4) that my fellow labourers and I may more effectually assist each other to save our own souls, and those that hear us, I judge it necessary to meet the preachers once a year; (5) in these conferences we fix the stations of all the preachers for the ensuing year. But all this is not separation from the Church. Nevertheless, as the generality even of religious people who do not understand my motive of acting, and who, on the one hand, hear me profess that I will not separate from the Church, and, on the other hand, that I do vary from it in these instances, they will naturally think that I am inconsistent. And they cannot but think so unless they observe my two principles: the one that I dare not separate from the Church, that I believe it would be a sin to do so; the other, that I believe it would be a sin not to vary from it in the points above mentioned. I say, put these two principles together, both of which I have openly and constantly maintained for upwards of fifty years, and inconsistency vanishes away. I have been true to my profession since 1780 to this day. I wish you, who are vulgarly termed Methodists, would seriously consider what has been said, particularly you whom God has commissioned to call sinners to repentance. It does by no means follow that ye are commissioned to baptize or administer the Lord's Supper. Ye never dreamed of this for ten or twenty years after you began to preach. You did not then, like Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, seek the priesthood also. You know 'no man taketh this honor to himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron.' O contain yourselves within your own bounds, be content with preaching the Gospel. I earnestly advise you bide in your place."

The above is one of Wesley's last announcements anent his society. The following is only confirmatory of what has gone before, taken from magazines issued thirty years and more after Wesley's death:—

"Mr. Wesley denied from the beginning that they were Dissenters. 'Do we separate from the Church?' was asked in the Methodist Conference of 1744, and it was answered, 'We conceive not. We hold communion therewith for conscience' sake, by constantly attending the Word preached and the sacraments administered therein. What then do they mean who say, 'You separate from the Church'? We certainly cannot tell."

"In the Conference of 1766 we find the subject again discussed: 'Are we not Dissenters? Answer. —We are irregular, (1) by calling sinners to repentance in all places of God's dominion; (2) by frequently using extempore prayer. Yet we are not Dissenters in the only sense which our law acknowledges. We will not, dare not, separate from the Church. We are not seceders, nor do we bear any resemblance to them. We set out upon quite opposite principles. They laid the very foundations of their work in judging and condemning ourselves. They begin everywhere by showing their hearers how fallen the Church and ministers are; we begin everywhere by showing our hearers how fallen they are themselves."

"July 29, 1788, the forty-fifth Conference was held in London. Mr. Wesley's account of it is:—"One of the most important points considered at this Conference was that respecting the Church. The sum of a long conversation was—(1) that in a course of fifty years we had neither promeditately nor willingly varied from it, either in one article of doctrine or discipline; (2) that we are not yet conscious of varying from it in any point of doctrine; (3) that we have in

a course of years, out of necessity, not choice, slowly and warily varied in some points of discipline by preaching in the fields, by extempore prayer, by employing lay-preachers, by forming and regulating societies, and by holding yearly conferences.' This Conference was held but little more than two years before Mr. Wesley's death.

"In a letter which bears the date of September following he says:—"The question properly refers to an immediate and total separation, such as that of Mr. Ingham's people first, and afterwards that of Lady Huntingdon's, who all agreed to form a separate body without delay, to go to church no more, and to have no more connection with the Church of England than with the Church of Rome. Such a separation I have always declared against, and certainly it will not take place, if ever it does, while I live."

"In a paper which is dated Dec. 11, 1798, about six months before his death says:—"I never had any design of separating from the Church. I have no such design now. I do not believe the Methodists in general design it when I am no more. I do, and will do, all that is in my power to prevent such an event. I declare once more that I live and die a member of the Church of England, and that none who regard my judgment or advice will ever separate from it."

"It is quite unnecessary to multiply quotations here to show that the Methodists did not separate from the Established Church during Mr. Wesley's life" (*The Methodist Magazine*, October, 1820).

"It must not be forgotten that Mr. Wesley regarded the societies of his day as mere appendages to the Church of England, and his 'assistants' and 'helpers' as mere lay preachers, whom he forbade to administer the sacraments and to preach in what were called 'church hours'; and that he would have limited their mission to the single one of awakening sinners and reviving vital godliness in the Church of which he was a minister. The duties of bishops and elders he left to be discharged by others, and discouraged the notion that his lay preachers were competent to act as ministers." (*The Methodist Family*, April, 1873).

"Wesley was such a steadfast adherent of the Establishment that he shunned Dissent as a sin, and forbade his own ministers, though the holiest and most useful men in the land, to administer the sacraments, even to their own spiritual children—souls they had brought to Christ; and forbade also any public worship to be held by his people within those hours of the Sabbath when the churches held Service. This was a sad grievance, and was not removed till after Wesley's death." (*The Methodist*, Feb. 5, 1875).

I need not lengthen this letter, already perhaps too long, for here is conclusive and sufficient testimony as to the relation of Wesleyanism (proper) to the Church.

AN EX-METHODIST.

TORONTO LIBERALITY.

DEAR SIR,—At the Missionary Meeting during Synod, in St. James' School Room, Mr. Darling, of Holy Trinity, made some appropriate remarks concerning the liberality of the Churchmen of Toronto. Allow me to add a few words, confirmatory of Mr. Darling's, although they really need no confirmation. Apart from the general and public subscriptions by which the missionary work of the Church is largely maintained, there is another channel in which their liberality flows very freely. I do not speak of the liberal and exceptionally kind hospitality which, judging by my own experience, is extended to clergymen visiting Toronto, but to the constant drain upon the funds of the friends of the Church for help for the various purposes of the Church in missionary districts. In this way large sums are contributed for the help of needy places, which are never, or very rarely, made public. For myself I can say, and I feel sure other can say the same, that I have frequently been at a loss to express the strong feeling of grateful pleasure for the manner in which I have been received, not by the liberal amount given, but by the very kind and sympathizing interest taken in my object. A statement in a recent number of the DOMINION CHURCHMAN shows one result of my application to the friends of the Church in Toronto, in the shape of a valuable parsonage and glebe for this mission, the property being conveyed to the Incorporated Synod of the Diocese.

In this connection allow me to express the highest approbation, with very grateful feelings, for the work prosecuted, under many difficulties—which I trust are fast passing away—by the Church Woman's Mission Aid, of Toronto. I know that they are doing great good, and they deserve the hearty co-operation of all friends of the missionary work of the Church.

Yours faithfully,

PHILIP HARDING.

Statement of receipts and expenditures connected with the parsonage and glebe for the Mission of

Apsley, Diocese of Toronto, being 114 acres with frame house and outbuildings.
Oct. 1877.

SUBSCRIPTION RECEIVED.

Amount collected by Mrs. Hewon, Hinchcombe, Gloucestershire, England, and remitted to the Bishop, 160.88; Bank interest to January, 1879, 8.12; the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop Bethune, the Ven. Archdeacon Whitaker, and A. P. Pousette, Esq., \$10 each, 30.00; James Henderson, Esq., 25.00; The Rev. J. D. Cayley, and Messrs. C. Robinson, H. Rowsell, Major Leigh, B. Jones, Clarkson Jones, F. Perkins, Ince & Young, Robt. Roddy, Murray & Barwick, John Carter, E. Henderson, A. Boswell, and Hon. W. Cayley, \$5 each, 70.00.

RECEIPTS.

To amount brought over, 294.00; Messrs. J. W. G. Whitney, E. H. Kertland, Judge Wilson, and F. Farncombe, \$4 each, 16.00; Messrs. Beatty, Chadwick & Biggar, and A. McLean Howard, \$3 each, 6.00; Messrs. Geo. Buckland, F. B. Osler, S. H. Harman, P. Paterson, A. Friend, A. Widow, Col. Bernard, B. Morton, G. L. Tizard, I. P. Lockie, Gwatkin & Son, Mrs. Hagarty, R. H. B., and Rev'ds Canon Stennett and Prof. Jones, \$2 each, 30.00; Rev'ds John Langtry and Canon Givins, Mrs. Perram, Mrs. Cumberland, Messrs. Rannie, A. J. B., A. Friend, Geo. A. Mackenzie, I. H. Spencer, A. H. Campbell, J. Young, Col. Donison, John Catto, J. Hallam, and Cash, \$1 each, 15.00; H. Fulford, 50c.; Bank Interest on \$170 to January, 1879, 8.50. February and March, 1880.—Received from sale of pine on the glebe, 24.00. Total, \$394.00.

EXPENDITURES.

October, 1877.—Expenses of collection, 12.53. January, 1879.—Paid purchase money, 100.00; Pousette & Roger, on account of mortgage, 100.00; paid interest on mortgage, 96.00; expenses to Peterborough connected therewith, 8.10; cashing cheque, 25c. Oct. 14.—Balance of interest on mortgage to January, 1876, when the property was acquired, 22.80; Pousette & Roger, getting owner's signature in Guelph and registration, 3.40; collections and repairs of house and outbuildings, 25.00; clearing five acres of land, 50.00; paid on account of back taxes, granted by the Council towards making a road, 7.00; 73 rods new fencing, at 25c., 18.25; a verandah, 24x6, 7.00. Total, \$444.83.

THE LATE BISHOP STEWART.

DEAR EDITOR,—The late Bishop Stewart, in answer to the question, Why he never got married? replied,—"When I took Orders in the Church I thought it my duty to give my whole energies to the service of God, and I determined that I would not divide my allegiance between Christ and a wife and family."

I think it a duty I owe to his memory to record the above facts, more especially in this age of "fashionable religion," worldliness and vanity. Instead of a fashionably furnished house for himself, he supplied the widows and orphan children with cows, clothing, provisions, and a valuable family Prayer Book at his own expense.

Yours truly,

DANIEL PERRY.

HURON CONSTITUTION.

DEAR SIR,—The "Cacoethes Scribendi" seldom attacks me, but an article in the last number of the DOMINION CHURCHMAN has brought on an attack which I cannot resist. I refer to the article on the proposed constitution of the Diocese of Toronto. I do so simply for the purpose of calling your attention, and that of your readers, to the very free and easy way in which you speak of the Standing Committee of the Diocese of Huron. The article says:—"The Standing Committee is composed, as to the clerical element, of the dignitaries and Rural Deans chiefly, if not exclusively." If this were true, it would show the confidence of the Synod in these men, and the belief of the Synod that they were the men best fitted to take charge of the financial affairs of the Diocese. But is it true? I think not. The Bishop is the only dignitary who can claim a seat in the Standing Committee without election by ballot. The other members are chosen, not on account of their "honors or dignity," but on account of their supposed fitness for the position. My Reports for several years were mislaid or lost in the bustle of a removal last winter; but for the purpose of comparison I have the Synod Journal for 1877, a year which returned an unusually large crop of dignitaries. It shows that nineteen out of thirty were dignitaries and Rural Deans. The Clerical Guide shews in the committees of Toronto Synod for the same year the following proportions:—

Executive Committee, six out of ten; Commutation Trust Committee, two out of nine; Endowment,