

of the poor; and there is no trace of cruelty to Lazarus, but his life was without any but a selfish purpose, forgetful of any world but his own. After drawing a graphic picture of Dives and Lazarus, the Bishop declared that a life of selfish forgetfulness was sin; he spoke of the ignorance of the needs of others, of social inhumanity, which was rife in the world. Every man, he said, with a competence, who knows not Lazarus at his door, is a Dives. Bishop Walker spoke of the terrible reality of suffering most manifesting itself to day on the other side of the world. Sad suffering, he said, is not of God's allotment, but of our neglect; selfish enjoyment can harden the heart, even as the dripping snow forms the glacier. The moral judgment of God was to be found recorded with keen irony in the 22nd verse of the same chapter: "It came to pass that the beggar died, . . . the rich man also died, and was buried." After contrasting the two chambers of death as he had contrasted the living surroundings of the two men, in an eloquent peroration he concluded that beyond the grave the good providence is vindicated; the life of holy suffering has its reward and the life of selfish indulgence has its reward.

Dr. Walker was listened to with rapt attention by a large congregation. Gonod's service was well sung. In the enforced absence of Mrs. Temple, Mr. Ross sang "O Lord, God of Abraham" with good effect, the recitative being especially well rendered. This was followed by Wesley's "Blessed be the God and Father," the solo passages being sung by Mrs. Wade and Mrs. L. A. Hamilton. At the voluntary the organist played "The Dead March in Saul," in consequence of Mrs. R. D. Richardson's death. Canon Matheson read the prayers and the Metropolitan of Rupert's Land gave the benediction. There were five other clergy also present.

Correspondence.

All Letters containing personal allusions will appear over the signature of the writer.

We do not hold ourselves responsible for the opinions of our correspondents.

N. B.—If any one has a good thought, or a Christian sentiment, or has facts, or deductions from facts, useful to the Church, and to Churchmen, we would solicit their statement in brief and concise letters in this department.

The Bishop of Ontario on the Winnipeg Conference.

No. III.

SIR,—His Lordship of Ontario having, to his own satisfaction, demolished the whole scheme which the united wisdom and experience of the Winnipeg Conference had evolved, proceeds with becoming modesty to say:—"I do not like to conclude without suggesting a scheme of Church consolidation, which I think would accomplish the object desired," &c. He then proceeds to assume that the object desired, "indeed the only *raison d'être* for the existence of a general Synod, is as a precaution against a possible conflicting legislation by Provinces." Now I would respectfully ask his Lordship, who told him that the real object, the *raison d'être* of a general Synod was "to prevent conflicting legislation." How such an utterly absurd conception of the object of a general Synod can have entered any man's head is to me amazing. Synods are the legislative assemblies of the Church, and a Synod of the whole Church would, one would suppose, be called into being to legislate for the whole Church—to consider and determine what was best to be done by way of enactment, and sometimes, though very rarely, by way of restraint, to promote the efficiency and well-being of the whole body. I should have thought it would have occurred to any one, that an active, organized, energizing body—needing to adapt itself to its ever varying surroundings—would also need some organization by which it could effect that adaptation, and provide for new and unforeseen emergencies. A general "appellate tribunal" would necessarily grow out of this general Synod, as one of its first acts, but it manifestly could not take its place, if the Church in Canada is not going to lie forever in fragments. We do not merely want a legal ecclesiastical appellate tribunal, which can give decision upon the meanings of disputed enactments of past years, or past centuries. We want a legislature that can enact new laws, when needed, and repeal or amend old ones, according to the requirements of the passing years. I pointed out in my first letter that neither Diocesan nor Provincial Synods have any power by the Act of Parliament under which they are acting, to pass canons affecting either doctrine or worship, and yet surely the living Church must have power to deal with such living issues. Have we any Divine assurance that heresies will not arise in the future as they have arisen in the past. Is it not more than probable

that the Church will have to pronounce before long upon new false doctrines about what the Church herself is, about what Holy Scripture is, about what the Sacraments are? And must not the Church have some organ by which she can make these pronouncements? And may we not hope that before long those Pan-Anglican Synods of which I believe the Bishop of Ontario was the real originator—will become the final legislative body with an appellate tribunal, to which, when need requires, questions of this kind may be carried from every Province of the Anglican Communion. I do not intend to discuss the details of the Bishop's appellate tribunal; as a workable scheme, it is ill-considered and absurd. After sketching his plan, the Bishop says: "There would be thus an analogy between the working of this Synod and that of a Supreme Court of secular jurisdiction. As the Supreme Court unifies states and civil provinces by keeping local legislatures within the lines of the Constitution, and thus secure unity of the nation, so our Supreme Synod of appellate jurisdiction might so control the legislation of Provincial Synods as to prevent conflicting canons being enacted by the different Provinces." But are not the Bishop's facts all wrong? Is it not the House of Commons at Ottawa, the Legislature at Washington, the Parliament at Westminster, that controls the legislation of Provinces and States, and prevents their mutually injurious enactments? Supreme secular courts are only asked to interpret the Provincial or State statutes. They cannot annul or disallow them. The Bishop says:—"The Synod," i.e., this appellate tribunal, which he is urging shall have no coercive jurisdiction, "but the Provincial Synods affected shall abide by the decision of the appellate Synod." But suppose they won't shall. Who can make them if there is no coercive jurisdiction. I think, sir, I have given sufficient proof of the truth of the Bishop's words that he had not had time to consider the matter before he wrote about it.

Yours, &c.,
JOHN LANGTRY.

Year Book and Clergy List.

SIR,—I was rather surprised to-day by receiving a circular from a Toronto publisher, stating that he proposes in a few weeks to issue the initial number of "The Year Book and Clergy List of the Church of England in the Dominion." Desiring to have it as complete as possible, he requests me to fill up a slip with certain information.

I do not know whether this gentleman has been authorized to issue "The Year Book of the Church," but it seems fitting that he should state whether he has authority. As far as appears, he has undertaken on his own account to issue "The Year Book." It may be all right, but I hesitate to give the information desired until this point is settled.

According to the report of the last session of the Provincial Synod, that body authorized a committee to prepare and issue "The Year Book of the Church of England." So that any publication claiming to be "The Year Book of the Church" must be issued under the direction of that committee, to be of any authority in the Church.

CLERICUS.

Nov. 27th, 1891.

Ilfracombe Poor.

SIR,—My attention has been called by the members of the Woman's Auxiliary in Toronto, to the fact that Mrs. Greville Harston has appealed publicly for clothing and Christmas gifts, on behalf of the Ilfracombe poor. Will you kindly allow me to inform the readers of your esteemed paper that no one is entitled to make any public appeal for the mission of Ilfracombe, except the Incumbent in charge. The clergyman is the receiver and distributor of all donations sent for the benefit of the mission. This plan has been followed of late by the Auxiliaries, and I trust will be continued in the future, as their help is much required. I have no right to interfere with a Christian lady sending charity to any of her private friends for distribution, as Mrs. Greville Harston did last year, but I am bound to make known the fact that these gifts were not received by me, neither did they in any sense prevent my having to apply to the Woman's Auxiliary to supply gifts for the various Christmas trees of the mission, and clothing for the poor.

L. SINCLAIR.

Incumbent Ilfracombe Mission.

"A Presbyterian Paradise."

SIR,—Will you kindly allow me to call the attention of your readers to the Church in the west, in the Diocese and Province of Rupert's Land.

I will first quote a Presbyterian paper: "Two hundred preaching stations in which successful work was done last summer, are vacant during the present winter. A summer session is to be held in Manitoba Presbyterian College, Winnipeg, to provide mission labourers for the winter's supply." In order

thus, to "push" the work of their Church, "the general assembly shall provide \$1,500 to pay the expenses of increased staff." "The Red River Valley (Manitoba) is becoming, under God's blessing, a Presbyterian Paradise, through this valuable student labour."

The Presbyterians here are intensely aggressive, much to their honour, and are heartily supported by their brethren in the east, with the result that large numbers of our people are lost to us because the Bishop of Rupert's Land has neither the men nor the money.

I cannot set forth the very pressing claims of this diocese, but I feel sure that if the Rev. Canon O'Meara of St. John's College, Winnipeg, will give an account to your readers of the work done by the College and Cathedral staff; the generosity and labours of our noble bishop; the number of "preaching stations" vacant; the many families lost to us because of the few labourers in the vineyard, then, sir, I feel sure that something will be done to "push things" here. By the Synod report I see that "Wycliffe College" gives \$400 a year to the mission work of Rupert's Land. What does "Trinity" do?

The Master says "Go." The needs of the people cry "Come." What will you do?

H. D.

Nov. 27th, 1891.

Lay Preaching.

SIR,—We have here within a radius of some few miles, a vacant mission and a good many mission stations, which during certain seasons are served by Divinity students; hitherto I have been unable to learn by what authority they are sent, and to whom they are responsible, and who has the oversight of them; I believe that some of them, if not all, preach, as well as conduct Divine service. Now I think it desirable that there should be some information on these points, and also as to whether they have the Bishop's license to preach. I append extracts from the canons relating to this matter. The services of these young laymen may be very valuable, under proper restrictions, more especially at the present time, when we have such an insufficient supply of ordained ministers, but they certainly should be appointed by and responsible to the Bishop, and hold his license to perform certain ministerial duties, but the limits of these should be strict and clearly defined, that there might be no encroachment on those of the ordained ministry, of which there seems to be considerable danger.

East Simcoe, Nov. 26, 1891.

R.

Canon VI. of Provincial Synod, page 108, of Canons, etc., of Diocese of Toronto: "No person shall perform the office of Lay Reader except he shall hold the Bishop's license." II. Rules adopted by House of Bishops relating to Divinity students, &c., page 158, sec. 14: "A Candidate" (for ordination) "may be licensed by the Bishop to act as a Lay Reader in his own diocese, and without such license a candidate may not take upon himself such function."

At page 142, sec. 13 (49): "No person whatever, not examined and approved by the Bishop of the Diocese, or not already licensed for a preacher, shall take upon him to expound any Scripture or matter of doctrine; but shall only study to read plainly and aptly the homilies set forth by lawful authority, or such other sermons as may be approved by Bishop or Curate." This last section was adopted, but not confirmed, but is in force, if the Canons of the Province of Canterbury are binding here until altered or amended? except the part in italics.

Notes and Queries.

SIR,—You will oblige many of your readers, who are not able otherwise to obtain the information, by giving the meaning and derivation of the word "Kenosis," which occurs in several late numbers of the CANADIAN CHURCHMAN, in the last instance reference being made to the "Kenosis" controversy in the *Church Times*, which I have not had an opportunity of reading.

Ans.—The word is taken, for theological purposes, from Phil. ii. 7, "made Himself of no reputation—literally—'emptied Himself.'" The controversy recently has turned upon the question: "Of what did He empty Himself, and how far?" The key to the solution seems to be chiefly in the word *form* ("of God, of a servant") and the construction of the whole clause—translating literally—"but taking a slave's form, emptied Himself." That is to say, "He changed His manifestation from the Divine to the lowliest human type." There are some who try to make out that He divested Himself of His divine knowledge; but there is no reference to knowledge—essential intellectual consciousness—in the passage. It is altogether a question of condescension and humiliation as to condition. What He gave up was His eternal glory as God, hiding His Divinity