

## THE ANTI-PAROCIAL SCHISM.

IT has been our unpleasant duty to expose a movement carried on by a number of prominent members of the Church of England in Toronto which was, and yet is, schismatical in character, being a direct attack upon the parish system and interests of the Church. From a letter in our columns a few weeks ago, our friends learnt with a shock of painful surprise, that this new schism was defended by the Principal of Wycliffe College. That this movement alienates our young people from their parish churches, Sunday schools, and clergy; that it causes parish interests grievously to suffer; that it acts like a cancer on the Church, eating out its very life, is deemed by Principal Sheraton as unworthy of notice; the movement is carried on by the supporters of Wycliffe College, and to him that is an ample justification of the wrong and the damage and the scandal which this movement is doing to the Church in Toronto. We have said again and again that if the laymen who are so bent on creating division in the Church were members of the Presbyterian or Methodist bodies, they would be compelled to submit to order and discipline or be expelled. A letter appeared in the *Mail* of the 18th December, signed "A Methodist," which we re-publish in order to show that our condemnation of this movement is shared by all who respect authority and order. We know for a certainty that the writer is a prominent, and very able Wesleyan; he writes as follows:

"Sir,—I desire, as a Methodist, and as one who has some right to speak on behalf of the Methodist Church, to offer a very decided protest against the name and operations of a new society, or church, formed in this city recently by Mr. W. H. Howland and the Hon. S. H. Blake, called "The Toronto Mission Union." I object to the name seriously, which, to me, is dishonest and misleading. Anyone reading it would suppose that two or more of the religious bodies of this city had entered into an agreement to carry on evangelistic and missionary work together, and that this agreement had received the endorsement of the official heads of these bodies—without such agreement and sanction there can be no lawful union. Now, what have Messrs. Blake and Howland done? They have formed a society according to their own peculiar notions as to the proper fitness of things, notions which unfortunately are not in harmony with the doctrines, discipline, or best interests of any religious body, and they have called this society "The Toronto Mission Union," as though they possessed in themselves all the powers and prerogatives of all the conferences and synods in the land. Surely this is presumption unequalled, and they appeal to the members of our churches to support them as though it were a lawful union. This is more than questionable, it is dishonest. If Mr. Howland wished to work up political influences for himself in the city (which he has been trying to do), let him do it openly, and not in the name of religion and on other people's money.

"Again, these gentlemen profess to be labouring for the good of the masses, and especially for the ignorant and destitute poor; but if your readers will visit the mission rooms opened by them they will find these attended by persons in good circumstances, nine-tenths of whom were, up to quite recently, worthy members of our Christian churches. They would be infinitely safer, and better every way if they were attending those churches still. But they have been led away by endless novelties and silly sentimentalities; by free feeds, simpering smiles, and numberless endearing attentions. The bond of sympathy which bound them to faithful and loving pastors has been craftily broken, and these thoughtless ones have left the shelter of their Father's house and gone out, they know not where. Who will baptize their children, comfort them in the hour of sorrow, and bury them when dead—Mr. Howland? No! no! Why then should he come between precious souls and those whom God has called to perform these duties for them? Their ministers are becoming strangers to them. All thoughtful people will say that the course pursued by Mr. Howland is subversive of all order, and in the end must seriously injure the persons whom he is pretending to help.

"Another very serious objection, in my judgment, is that Mr. Howland employs a number of preachers—the language they use shows they are mostly very ignorant men; this is bad enough; but, worse still, we have no guarantee as to their moral fitness. They may be very good, and they may not be so good, but in every case we ought to know. Those who go in and out of the homes of our people, who are permitted to meet freely and confidentially young and unsuspecting girls, ought to be men of known and approved character.

"I would advise our good people to keep to the old paths. Do not become political stepping stones for ambitious and self-seeking, but professedly very modest men. If Mr. Howland wants to preach let him preach to Mr. Blake, and if Mr. Blake wants to preach let him preach to Mr. Howland, and if each succeeds in converting the other, then the legal profession and the business men of the city will be quite willing to subscribe for the continuance and extension of so good a work.

It is needless to add comments upon this able, manly, Christian letter. We ask those churchmen who for certain reasons we can respect, give their support to Wycliffe College, whether they approve of the influence of that institution being thrown into a movement which is a direct attack upon parochial interests? Do you clergy and laity desire that the young people of our churches shall be "led away by novelties and silly sentimentalities; by free feeds and simpering smiles, and the numberless "endearing attentions" of the Treasurer and chief patron of Wycliffe College? Do you desire a schism to prosper? Do you deem it well to let our members be seduced from their attendance at Church and Sunday School in order to attend services and Holy Communion conducted by laymen and dissenters? If you

do not desire this miserable attack on the parish system to prosper, it is your duty to withdraw from those who are thus walking disorderly and bringing evil and shame and damage upon the Church.

## CHRIST OUR PRIEST.

WE proceed to-day to treat of CHRIST's priestly office—"Called of God an high priest after the order of Melchizedek," as distinct from the order of Aaron. It is an office, the functions, privileges, and responsibilities of which were well understood by the House of Israel; and though, as the Epistles to the Hebrews explains, the priesthood of Christ differed essentially from that of Levi, it was because the former is the reality of which the latter was the shadow, but of which it was a true type and illustration.

Under the law, the high priest was the prince of priests. His office was the loftiest among the Jews, as he alone might enter the Holy of Holies, and so he stood nearer to God than any other man of the race. He, as well as Melchizedek, was thus a special type of the Son of God, who is now our great and only High Priest, who has entered within the veil into the presence of God for us. As such he was anointed with the Holy Ghost for the work of man's redemption. He was consecrated the King and Prophet as well as the Priest of His people, that in all things He might have the preeminence. As Priest He made the atonement between God and us. Though He had the authority of priest in the days of His humiliation, He did not enter fully upon the perpetual exercises of this office till He sat down at the right hand of God.

The high priest under the law had not wholly fulfilled his office, on the great day of Atonement, until he had been in the Holy of Holies, to sprinkle the blood of the victim before the mercy-seat. So Christ would not have been a perfect high priest, unless He had entered heaven, "there to appear in the presence of God for us." He pleads before the throne, the true mercy-seat, that blood which He shed upon the cross. As the high priest returned from the Holy of Holies when his work was done, so the Lord Jesus, when He has accomplished the number of His elect, will return to gather them to Himself. The priest under the law burnt incense, and our great High Priest offers up our prayers as incense. Like Melchizedek, He is a blessing—as well as a sacrificing—priest. It is necessary that our great High Priest should be in heaven, as all our spiritual and heavenly blessings are to flow from thence.

The Apostle in the Epistle to the Hebrews opens up Christ's priestly office. It is His priesthood that gives life and power to His offices of Prophet and King; just as under the law the crowned mitre, and the Urim and Thummim, representing the kingly and prophetic office, were placed upon the high priest, who was a type of Christ. In the Book of Revelation we find the Son of Man represented as clothed with the priestly robe and the golden girdle, which we assume to represent