

he Bishops of
d by the Arch-
beth, we des-
ed and a safe
ure you of our
r person and
t the rest and
ur health, and
ed vigor from
ate you upon
exists between
tributable in
ese is among
financially of
od's blessing
e Spirit may
you are to be
ered daily to
r safe return
t considerate
characterized

nes, LL.D.,
Canon.
pps, M. A.,
n, Archville.

on,
mon.
self as taken
olly unpre-
ssice to his
y of his ab-
s from his
himself the
was calling
lt, devoted
ning Coun-
t of calling
e English
hat of the
olidation of
its work all
arking that
its history
hat, until,
is diocese
ayers, in
be accor-
ber them.
icipation
commen-
tection.
cluded, all
cordially
a prosper-

Lawrence
n the dioc-
d in this
Howard,
Clemson,
W. J. W.
om Onta-
R. Lewis,
l. A. Jar-
The visit-
ained at
g parish-
Tuesday
Onward
es in the
y Canon
i. Serson
the ser-
rthy of
ous and
es were
l Lewis.
haustive
h," and
evening
Teach-
ning at
lebrated
Forrest,
ectively
lay the
subjects,
the best
pture,"

and "Retreats." In the evening there was again a public service, Mr. Jarvis saying Evensong, and Messrs. Serson and Nisbett reading the Lessons. Addresses were given by Mr. Crawford on "Music, in its relation to Divine Worship," by Archdeacon Howard, on "Conformity to Church Rules, the best safeguard of a churchman's privileges" and by Mr. Muckleston, on the Church Catechism. On Thursday morning the Holy Communion was again celebrated with the same clergy officiating as on Wednesday. After social intercourse during the morning the meeting broke up. Too high praise cannot be given to Mr. and Mrs. Forrest, who exerted themselves so very successfully to make everything pass off pleasantly, nor to Miss Doran and the choir, who so cordially helped at all the services. It was determined to hold the next meeting if possible at Iroquois. The good will and good churchmanship of the congregation were proved by the fact of fifty four of the Laity receiving the Holy Communion on the first day and thirty two on the second day.

TORONTO.

SYNOD OFFICE.—Collections &c., received during the week ending June 15th 1878.

MISSION FUND.—*Special Appeal*.—J. W. G. Whitney, \$100; collected by Mrs. James Henderson, \$14.40; collected by Mrs. Clarkson Jones, \$18.65; Anonymous, per Messrs. J. & E. Henderson, \$50.00; Collected by Mrs. Catto and Miss Webber, \$22.45. *Parochial Collections*.—St. Luke's, Toronto, additional \$7.00; Omemece, additional \$1.00; Emily, St. James's \$10.00; St. John's \$6.00. *July Collection, (1878)*.—St. George's Toronto, \$70.46. *Collection at Synod Service in St. James' Cathedral, Tuesday, June 4th 1878, \$18.87.*

DIVINITY STUDENTS' FUND.

April Collection.—St. Luke's, Toronto, \$22.50; *Book and Tract Fund*.—For library books, Sunday School, St. Mark's, Warsaw, \$10.00.

MEETING OF THE SYNOD.

(Continued.)

Thursday.—Rev. Mr. Mockridge read a letter from the Secretary-Treasurer of the Diocese of Niagara, enclosing a resolution passed by the Synod of that Diocese asking for the co-operation of the several Dioceses in Ontario, in an application to the Provincial Legislature for amendments to the Church Temporalities Act, and that a committee of three be named by the Bishops to communicate with the several Dioceses on the subject and to mature a bill to meet the requirements of the Dioceses.

Rev. Mr. Smithett, moved that the communication be referred to a special committee to be appointed by the Bishop. Carried.

Several notices of motions were given, when the discussion on Col. Boulton's motion was resumed.

After speeches made by Mr. W. Magrath, Col. R. B. Denison, Mr. P. Brown, and Col. Boulton, Rev. John Langtry said that Col. Boulton's remarks with regard to small contributions from St. Philips, need not be supposed to have any party significance, as had been assumed, as St. Luke's which Col. Boulton represented as having given \$80, had given \$800 during the year to the Synod Funds, i. e., nearly three times as much St. James' Cathedral. He then stated that the subject of Col. Boulton's resolution had gradually drifted into another question of great importance. Everybody has felt for a long time that this question of the Church Association had to come up before the Synod, fairly and openly, and he thought it was better that it should be so. The question was, were they going to recognise an Association independent of the Synod as part of the machinery of the Church for the distribution of its funds. With regard to the assessment principle, it had been acted upon for years for the purposes contemplated in the resolution. The mission fund had been assessed on the parishes after they had been notified of the respective amounts required of them by the published lists. The question was whether they were going to be satisfied with a mere theoretical resolution that certain sums were required, or would they take some practical steps towards carrying that reso-

lution into effect? The imposition of a penalty was a principle that had been regularly acted upon by the Church, for they laid down certain conditions which if delegates did not comply with, they had no right to seats in the Synod. For instance they were required to be members and communicants of the Church of England; their parishes must have paid certain sums, else they could not take their seats as delegates. One question before them was whether the Synod should recognize the Church Association, which ignored its authority and control, and refusing to be governed by its committees as a part of the machinery of the diocese. If they were prepared to come under the authority of the Synod he thought they were prepared to recognize them, but instead of that they were setting the Synod at defiance, they were collecting funds in opposition to it, and they found that when even His Lordship made an appeal for certain funds, a counter-appeal was made by the Church Association, and attempts made to get the money which should flow into the proper channels of the church. (Hear, hear, and applause.) When Mr. McGrath got up, and said that he was compelled to withdraw his subscription because his clergyman taught certain things, he ought to name the things he did not consider sound church doctrine, as perhaps he was not the best judge of theological questions.

Rev. Mr. Langtry then asked what was the reason the Church Association assigned for its existence. The reasons were stated very plainly in the document which he held in his hand.

A Voice.—What is it?

The Rev. Mr. Langtry.—The Gospel according to the Church Association; the right title is "The occasional papers of the Church Association."

Mr. McGrath.—Read them all out. (Order.)

Rev. Mr. Langtry said that in that document it was stated that the reason for the existence of the Association was that its members felt they could not contribute to the funds of this Diocese, because the great mass of the clergy taught doctrines which were contrary to the doctrines of the Church of England, and doctrines which were foreign to our Church, and which while building up the church of Rome, would also fill the churches of other denominations. (Cries of "Chair.")

Hon. Vice-Chancellor Blake.—Where do you find that? You can't find it; You are slandering the Association.

Rev. Mr. Langtry.—I appeal to the members of the Church Association themselves to say whether I am slandering them. I ask them if they have not honestly and fairly given that impression.

Hon. Vice-Chancellor Blake.—Never, never, never, never.

Rev. Dr. O'Meara.—We are only responsible for what is written in the book.

Hon. Vice-Chancellor Blake.—No such statement is to be found in the paper.

Rev. Mr. Kirkby.—I rise to say that I think it is a great disgrace to this Synod that any member should use such violent language and express himself in such a violent way as does Vice-Chancellor Blake.

Great interruption took place when Mr. Langtry challenged them to name six men in the Diocese or three in Trinity College.

The interruption being repeated, the Ven. Archdeacon Whitaker deprecated these unseemly proceedings, and thought the observance of the rule that anyone who spoke should address the chair, would go far to prevent them.

Rev. Mr. Langtry went on to say that if all the members of the Church Association knew the evil effects of what they were doing, he did not think they would sanction such proceedings. He had no doubt there were many honest men among them who were frightened that Popery was going to be introduced into the Church; but while they were pretending to assail what they call ritualism, they were assailing the cardinal doctrines of the Church of England itself. He had in his hand the proof of this statement—that on every distinctive doctrine of the Church of England there was a categorical contradiction between the Church Association and the paper which represented its views on the one hand, and the teachings of the Church of England on the other. The Church instructed her people to pray God to sanctify the water to the mystical washing away

of sins. The church told them that the two parts of the Holy Eucharist—were *holy mysteries*—and declared that Christ had instituted and ordained the *holy mysteries* as pledges of His love, and that God has vouchsafed to feed those who have received these *holy mysteries* with the body and blood of His dear Son. The Church Association, in an address in 1873, about those whom they call ritualists, spoke of the last and worst of their offenses to this effect:—"At length a hint is given of some 'ineffable mystery' in the symbols selected by our blessed Lord to signify His body broken and His blood shed." Again, in the *Evangelical Churchman*, of May 16th, 1878, they were told that "with the intrusion of priesthood comes also the mysterious gift which makes baptism wash away sins." They were also told on May 23rd, 1878, that "the sacerdotalists have shrouded the doctrine of the sacraments in a cloud of mystery, and look upon them as instruments by which the grace of God is bestowed in a mysterious manner." He always thought it was not the sacerdotalists but the Church of England that said the sacraments were mysterious, and that they were instruments by which God's grace was conveyed. They were told in the same issue that "Apostolic succession had been invoked in order to discover who are the true and authorized ministers of these holy mysteries"; and if anybody read the article he would see that it sneered at the idea that these were mysteries. Again, the paper said, none but the apostolic descendants are allowed to dispense the sacraments because it is believed to be an exclusively priestly office by the sacerdotalists." He thought it was recognized to be a priestly office by the Church of England. The writer of this article lamented that "even that many of our Evangelical men and staunch Protestants cannot get rid of the notion that the sacraments are mysteries in the sense of being mysterious, and that there is some inexplicable mysterious working in them, of which these visible signs are the material and efficient instruments." He (Mr. Langtry) should hope that the true evangelical and Protestant members of the Church were not to get rid of that notion, even at the dictate of the *Evangelical Churchman*. Then in the teeth of the Church's oft-repeated statements, the writer of this article summed up with the declaration, "There is no mystery at all in the sacraments." He was not going to argue whether that was true or not, but he would ask whether it was the sacerdotalists or ritualists that were being assailed or the Church of England? Then this paper argued at length to prove that the sacraments were mere signs and illustrations of truth, in direct opposition to the 25th article, which said, "They are not mere badges or tokens, but certain sure witnesses and effectual signs of grace, by which God doth work inwardly in us." Then again, they read in the Prayer Book that it was evident to all men reading diligently the Holy Scriptures and ancient authors that there had always been three orders in the ministry—bishops, priests, and deacons. The Church had also a solemn office by which she called men to the diaconate, and afterwards to the priesthood, and pronounced upon them solemn words, which were supposed to confer upon them very great powers. Throughout the Prayer Book the priest was continually spoken of as the only person who was authorized by the Church to perform certain functions in the ministrations of the Church. The priest alone could pronounce absolution, or pronounce the prayer of consecration. Now, he wanted to call their attention to the loyalty of this Church Association, which professed to uphold the standards of the Church of England. They were told in the *Evangelical Churchman* of May 16, 1878, that, "there is nothing in the office of apostles, bishops, presbyters, or deacons to suggest any sacerdotal functions, or any human priesthood." The Church of England said there were priests, and it appointed men to the priesthood, while the Church Association declared that the conception of a human official priesthood is opposed to the entire genius and spirit of Christianity—it is not Christian, but anti-Christian. In the same paper it was asserted that "the very essence of High Churchism is that it believes there is a priesthood." These persons sneered at the notion that the priest alone, because of his sacerdotal powers, had authority to dispense the sacraments, and to