

bestow absolution. This was put forth as one of the doctrines of these Tractarian, Puseyite, ritualistic, sacerdotal, sacramentarian Romanists; but no man could get away from the fact that these doctrines which were assailed, were the doctrines of the Church of England. The Prayer Book told them that "no man shall be accounted a lawful minister of the Church, or suffered to exercise any function therein except he hath received episcopal ordination." This awakened the special virulence of the organ of the Church Association. It said: "Great stress has been laid on the rite of ordination"; again, "Apostolic succession has been invoked in order to ascertain who are the true and authorized ministers of these 'holy mysteries'"; and again, "The clerical office is supposed to be twofold—the preaching of the Word and the administration of the sacraments." Well, if anyone would read the Act of Ordination he would see that such was the case.

The *Evangelical Churchman* said: "No apostolic succession is held to be necessary for the office of preaching, but only an apostolic descendant is allowed to dispense the mysteries of the sacraments, because it is believed to be an exclusively priestly office." Again, "It is asserted that to men episcopally ordained and deriving their orders in long succession from the Apostles belongs the power of the keys." That was set forth as one of the terrible heresies of this unnamable party in the Church of England.

He would read to them another quotation: "When God's ministers give you absolution, then you shall esteem as if Christ Himself in His own person did speak and minister to you. He hath given the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and the authority to forgive sins to the ministers of the Church. Let him that is a sinner go to one of them, let him acknowledge and confess his sins, and pray him that he will give him absolution; and when the minister doth so, then I ought steadfastly to believe that my sins are truly forgiven me in heaven." * * * He that doth not obey this counsel, but being either blind or proud, doth despise the same, he shall not find forgiveness of his sins. Wherefore, despise not absolution, for it is the commandment and ordinance of God." Did they think that was good Protestantism? (Loud applause, and cries of "No, no," and "It is Popery.") That, at any rate, was the doctrine of the martyr, Archbishop Cranmer. It was from Archbishop Cranmer's Catechism, translated and adapted from the Lutheran Justus Jonas.

Rev. Dr. O'Meara—It was written when he was a Romish priest.

Rev. Mr. Langtry said it was published in the reign of Edward VI., 1548.

Rev. Mr. Langtry went on to say that the Church of England instructed her people to pray God that a person being baptized should be regenerated, and she instructed the minister, after the child was baptized, to say these words, "Seeing now, beloved brethren, that this child is regenerate." He wanted to call attention to the fact that while these men were pretending to assail the language of Ritualism, they were assailing the language of the Church of England. They were further told, "with the intrusion of a priesthood comes also the mysterious gift which makes baptism wash away sin." He had thought that with the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ came the doctrine that made baptism wash away sins, and St. Peter himself on the day of Pentecost, when the people asked him what they must do to be saved, replied, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the Holy Ghost." Ananias proclaimed the same truth when he went into the house where St. Paul was, and told him to arise and be baptized and wash away his sins. So it was not merely the doctrine of the Prayer Book, but the doctrine of the Bible, that was assailed in these attacks upon what was called Ritualism. The Church Association sneered at the doctrine of baptismal regeneration as "one of the deadly inventions of Ritualism"; but it was the doctrine of the Catholic Church proclaimed with one voice for 1500 years in every land. With regard to another point, the Church instructed every child that the body and blood of Christ were verily and indeed taken and received

by the faithful in the Lord's Supper. The Church Association told them that the belief in the mystical presence in the Sacrament was one of the errors of the Ritualists; the statement that the body and blood of Christ were really given to them in the Holy Communion was announced as "approaching the Roman Litany," whatever that meant. And this was said to be contrary to the preaching of the reformers, though Cranmer was quoted on page six of this same Occasional paper as stating that "Christ is spiritually by grace in His Supper." Without attempting to explain how, he (Mr. Langtry) believed the body and blood of Christ were taken and received in the Lord's Supper. (Voice—"By faith.")

Mr. Langtry—I say by faith as readily as you do. But the Church's doctrine of the presence in the Holy Communion was denounced—as stated in the Prayer Book and in the Bible. Then this Association accused His Lordship of having been very remiss in his diocese, saying that he had not taken care to prevent wolves from getting into the flock. He would like to ask on what these statements were based? He would like to ask if any man was refused a license to preach in this diocese because he belonged to what was called the Low Church party? He thought His Lordship had admitted men belonging to that party whom he would not have admitted had they belonged to the other party. The purpose of the Church Association was announced to be to defend the Church from Ritualism, Rationalism, Romanism, and Sacerdotalism. He would like to know what they had done to carry out that purpose. It was generally known that there were in this city two assemblies of unbelievers and infidels who held meetings every Sunday, one of them numbering 700 or 800 people. What had this Association done to counteract this poison? What had they done to prevent such teaching as was contained in Canon Farrar's book? Were they attempting to meet those evils which were sapping the very foundation of their faith? No. They were helping them forward. In the *Evangelical Churchman*, Coleridge was described as "the founder of the best school of Christian thought—that of Arnold and Maurice." He believed it was understood that Dr. Arnold was the father of the school of Dean Stanley and of Bishop Colenso. But Dr. Arnold was called by this paper "one of the wisest, most learned, and deepest thinkers that have adorned the Church of England." Dean Stanley he did not think they could speak of as a Christian at all. (Oh, oh.) He said that deliberately, for he understood from his own writings that Dean Stanley did not believe either in the inspiration of the Scriptures or in the incarnation of our Lord (hear, hear), and yet he was continually quoted by the standard authority of the Church Association, which had constituted itself upholder and defender of the Gospel amongst them.

Rev. Mr. Sheraton—Where did you see the last quotation in the *Evangelical Churchman*?

Vice-Chancellor Blake—He never saw it.

Rev. Mr. Langtry said the date of the paper was January 24th, 1878.

Rev. Mr. Langtry went on to say that this Association had constituted itself to put down all innovations upon the doctrines and practices of the Church of England. But he would like to know what occasional papers had been issued against the innovations made in the Cathedral last winter upon the established usage and doctrine of the Church of England. In the very teeth of the most solemn declaration a man could make—that he would use all diligence to drive away doctrines contrary to the doctrines of the church of England, one of which was that no man who had not been episcopally ordained should be allowed to minister in the church, they saw dissenting ministers invited to take part in the ministrations of the Church in the Cathedral of this city. He would like to know what "occasional papers" were issued against that.

Vice-Chancellor Blake said nothing of the kind took place. No Dissenter had taken part in the service of the Cathedral.

Rev. J. S. Baker—I was present myself in what is called the Cathedral Church and heard Dr. Ryerson offer an extempore prayer.

Rev. Mr. Langtry said everybody knew that the purest Plymouthism was preached in that Cathedral last winter. He would like to know what

"occasional papers" were issued to preserve the distinctive doctrines of the Church of England. He was told by more than 100 people that in the Cathedral last winter not only baptismal regeneration, but infant baptism, was openly assailed.

Mr. John Gillespie—It never occurred.

Rev. Mr. Langtry said he had not heard it himself, but he would put the statement of over one hundred people against that of Mr. Gillespie. He was looked upon as a strong party man by a good many people. He did not wish to be so regarded. He accepted the doctrines of the Church of England as they were set forth in the Prayer Book, and he desired no liberty beyond what the Prayer Book gave him. He stood there, speaking not for himself alone but for those who were called High Churchmen, and he said that if they accepted the doctrines of the Church of England as set forth in the Prayer Book fairly, and conformed to the usages of the Church, there was no necessity for the existence of the Church Association. That was the position in which they stood. That was the position 99 out of 100 of the clergymen of the diocese occupied to-day. He expressed regret that the Church should be so rent by divisions, and denied that there was one man amongst those with whom he thought who desired to be disloyal to the doctrines of the Church of England. They desired to accept them. Would those on the opposite side accept them? If they would accept them they would have no occasion for the Church Association. He had lived in the hope that they would get over these miserable differences and accusations, and he could say honestly that, though they were told in a public paper that the members of the Church Association were driven to the position they had taken, he, for his part, had labored to bring men of every opinion together. (Hear, hear.) The Church Union was established with that object.

At this point a copy of the *Evangelical Churchman* was handed, amid applause, to Rev. Mr. Langtry, who read from it the statement he had previously quoted with regard to the poet Coleridge. (Voices—"Now deny it.")

Rev. Mr. Langtry said, in conclusion, that if the position which he had indicated was the position of the Church Association, then the union and peace to which he had looked forward for years was a simple impossibility. While assaults were pretended to be made against things which they repudiated as much as those who made them, the real assault was against the very foundation of the Church of England. (Prolonged applause.)

The interruptions during Mr. Langtry's speech were as numerous as they were violent and indecent. A considerable amount of discussion then ensued as to the correctness of Mr. Langtry's statement, as the article endorsing the opinion of Maurice and Colenso—its existence in the paper alluded to having been emphatically denied. When a copy of the paper was produced, and the identical article pointed out, it was contended that not being an editorial, the paper was not responsible for it.

Rev. Mr. Langtry said that after the perusal of this paper he arose with the saddened conviction that if the views of that extract were sought to be endorsed, union was impossible, for the very foundations of the Church were assailed.

Rev. Mr. Kirby said that at every Synod meeting he had heard such denials as had that day been given by the Rev. Mr. Sheraton. He remembered that at one meeting the Bishop of Niagara, then archdeacon, stated that the Church Association had assailed clergymen of the High Church party, and that this statement met with an emphatic denial, until an *Occasional Paper* was produced containing the attack. He wished to know whether the Church Association intended to make it a systematic practice to deny their assertions and statements in Synod, and then reiterate them outside.

A discussion then ensued as to the meaning of the word priest, in the course of which the Rev. Mr. Bates said the word priest was used in the New Testament as of one offering sacrifice. In the 16th verse of the 15th chapter of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans the Apostle spoke of himself as *Hiericus* doing the work of a priest and offering Christian sacrifices in the Church.

Rev. Mr. Sheraton repeated his denial with reference to the words attributed to the *Evangelical*