

integrity and truth, as exemplified by the Head of the Church, are her strength and support.

FINANCE.

UNSATISFACTORY FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS.

SIR.—I believe I am not alone in regards the present system, where funds donated for a specific object are wafted from one diocese to another, and from one treasurer to another before reaching their destination as unsatisfactory. Our Indian Homes have suffered and are suffering very much by this arrangement. We have mouths to feed and bodies to clothe, and it is important that the money for the support our Indian Children should come to us in as direct a manner as possible. This month last year we had a balance in hand of \$540, to day with an increased number of pupils and additional expenses our books shew a deficit of \$555. We have no reserve fund to fall back upon, either the contributions to our work must be increased, or we must send some of the children back to their homes. It would be a great pity to do this, as the Indians just seem to be awaking to an appreciation of our work and we have numbers of applications for admission. It is unsatisfactory just at this crisis to know that several considerable amounts which were donated for the benefit of our Homes have never reached us. For the past three months, I have been engaged trying to trace up these missing sums of money and to get them sent on to us. I have got glimpses of them as they travelled about east and west, but they have not found their way to the Shingwauk Home. The amounts missing are as follows:— Church of Ascension Sunday School, Hamilton, sent this spring for support of child, \$50; St. Paul's Sunday School, London, sent last November half year's support of boy, \$37.50; St. Mark's Sunday School, Longueuil, P.Q., sent last spring \$14.91; Church Ascension, Toronto, sent during the past three years, \$90; St. Luke's Sunday School, Halifax, N.S., \$80 sent this year and other similar sums for two years previously towards the support of a girl; by Rev. Canon Norman, Montreal, last year, \$12.

Our institution has been established since 1873; it is a little older than the Diocese of Algoma, and every year our annual report has been published regularly, shewing every donation we have received on the one hand and every item of expenditure on the other. It has only been within the last few years that there has been trouble about getting our funds in, and it is very annoying to me to have complaints made that such and such an amount contributed does not appear in our report. It is impossible to keep accounts correctly under the present system, and so far as I am concerned, I think the sooner we return to the old lines the better.

Saint Ste. Marie,
Sept. 8th. 1885.

EDWARD F. WILSON.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

SIR.—"The finest sermons ever preached, the pure milk of the Word," these expressions were frequently heard with regard to the sermons preached by the late Dean of St. James, why are not those sermons published? Many old members of the flock which the dean had been shepherding with such care, for over forty years, would like to read, and have in their own homes, for quiet edification those precious utterances, which they used to drink in, with such delight, as they came fresh from the warm heart of their late lamented pastor.

X. Y.

SYNOD GREETINGS.

SIR.—I am very glad that the question of fraternization with Dissenters is brought forward for discussion in your columns. First I desire to point out that Dr. Carry has not answered "Inquirers" question and has entirely evaded the point at issue, so well brought out by your other correspondent, "Observer." "Individuals may fraternize with those who differ from them in religious convictions, but for the Synod to acknowledge the fraternity of a Methodist Conference is to nullify its standards."

"Inquirer" asked, how the fraternal, with or without an emphasis, can be reconciled with our Ordination vow to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines, etc., Dr. Carry does not meet this objection at all, but concerns himself with demonstrating a truth, which no one I ever heard of, has called in question, that baptized dissenters are by virtue of their baptism members of the Church. It is no answer then to the objection, that the Synod tacitly recognized the Methodist Society as a branch of the Church of Christ and by implication as having an apostolic ministry, (See Synod Journal, 1885, p. 54), to say, that the Methodists believe in one baptism, that they do not deny ours and we do not repeat

theirs. It wants surely a lawful ministry and valid eucharist to constitute a true Church as well as baptism. Dr. Carry says, "we ought to emphasize the brotherhood, as we zealously denounce the schism." The Synod certainly did the former, but when did it do the latter?

The Donatist schism is not a parallel case. The Donatists were undoubtedly a part of the Catholic Church with valid orders, and valid sacraments, and differed only from the main body of the Church, on a question of discipline, viz.: the re-baptizing of heretics. Then with regard to the quotation from St. Augustine, it was only the communication of an individual prelate to other prelates lawfully consecrated. What we are discussing, is the lawfulness or propriety of the Synod representing the Church in its corporate capacity addressing fraternal greetings to a schismatical body, claiming to be a branch of the Church of Christ. Can Dr. Carry point out from Church history an instance in which a Synod of the Church, thus sent fraternal greetings to the Synod of a separatist body without a lawful ministry or a valid eucharist.

What Dr. Carry says in regard to Canon Liddon's utterances, which he has quoted, has reference to our attitude as individuals to baptized Christians belonging to other religious bodies, that which is objected implies something more, beyond simple recognizing, their baptism, their share in the communion of Saints and their right to bear the Christian name which no one denies.

Your correspondent W. B. remarks that this greeting was sent by the Synod without one dissentient voice, but there was at least one, who did not so consent, in that case, I have no doubt that W. B. would assert—silence denotes consent—well, does not the same principle hold good in regard to the claim put forth in the Methodist communication to the Synod, of being a branch of the Church of Christ, the silence of the Synod respecting it, denoted their acknowledgment of that claim, or at any rate, the evangelical members of the Synod, forming I should say very nearly a majority of the laity and the general public would certainly so understand it.

W. B. calls our attention to the 141st Canon, I am glad he has done so, but I think I can make him regret for his own cause, having referred to these canons, I beg to draw attention to the 10th and 11th Canons headed: "Maintainers of Schismatics," "Maintainers of Conventicals, censured," "Whosoever shall hereafter affirm that such ministers as refuse to subscribe to the form and manner of God's worship in the Church of England, prescribed by the Communion book and their adherents may truly take unto themselves, the name of another church—that there are within this nation other congregations, than such as by the laws of this land are held and allowed, which may rightly challenge to themselves the name of true and lawful churches—let him be excommunicated. Now when the Provincial Synod of Canterbury forbids us to recognize, separatists from the Church, as the Methodists for example—I mean their status as a Church—they having "separated from the communion of saints as approved by the apostles rule in the Church of England," (Canon 9,) and the Toronto Synod calls upon us to accord to them this recognition, I will leave it for W. B. to show how we can possibly comply with both requisitions.

It is the apologists of these Synod greetings that confound two distinct questions—an apostolic ministry and membership with the Catholic Church, so that all that is said by Dr. C. and W. B. about membership, is altogether beside the point. The point is, can it be shewn that the Synod did not mean, what it certainly seems on the face of it to imply, and as it is generally understood to mean, that the Methodist Society is by the fraternal greetings of that Synod, recognized as a true and lawful Church, and by implication, as possessing an apostolic ministry and a valid eucharist.

Can it be shewn that the Methodist Conference understood the Synod message as conveying nothing further, than what W. B. coolly asserts—a friendly greeting sent to a meeting of fellow Christians—was it a message of this character last year of which the Conference, "cherished such delightful recollections," (Synod Journal p. 54), and that this year was "received with the liveliest feelings of satisfaction by the members of the Conference," (Ibid p. 59).

Then regarding what I stated at the outset, that the question raised by this discussion, viz., our attitude towards our separated brethren is a practical question of great importance, I appeal to all of my reverend brethren, who have had any experience in mission work, whether they have not constantly found it to be the case, that the great body of our laity see no difference between the Church and these sects; that they can please God and save their souls as well in one as the other, that very many of them attend dissenting ministrations as often as they do those of the Church, receive sacraments and ordinances at the hand of dissenting preachers, and will leave the

Church upon the most frivolous pretext, or the slightest provocation. Add to this the clergy are continually being called upon by the preachers to give addresses at their socials, etc., endorsing and approving all their acts, and in turn are expected to invite them to church socials and hear them expatiate on their views of unity, we know very well what they are. And our own people expect this fraternization to be carried on and now that these Synod greetings have taken place the schismatical position has been strengthened and the hands of the faithful clergymen of the Church, weakened in his efforts to infuse into the minds of his people feelings of loyalty and devotion to the Church and a hearty zeal for the faith once delivered to the saints. Yours truly,
E. SOWARD,

APPEAL.

SIR.—Will any kind friend of the Church make us a present of an altar cloth and hangings for prayer desk, lectern, and pulpit for St. Mark's Church, Otanabee. The Church people are making an effort to erect a bell spiral and purchase a bell for the above church, but the above articles are very much needed to furnish the church, and will be thankfully received and acknowledged by Henry Softley.

DEACON IN CHARGE.

HURON SYNOD.

SIR.—The letter of "Veritas" is a very good one, respecting a special Synod to consider the litigation of the diocese.

I presume notice has been sent of the intention of carrying the case to the Privy Council, if so, there is no one who has authority to decide whether it shall go there but the Synod, and therefore there is no alternative but to call the Synod together; and the matter is of sufficient gravity to warrant the Bishop doing so.

The Standing Committee cannot act affirmatively or negatively as it has received no instructions concerning the matter, and I should not think his lordship will assume the responsibility, and the attendant consequences. The cause of the litigations is better understood now than previously, and the Synod might, and doubtless would, take such action to settle the matter in some way. At any rate no one can speak the mind of the Synod, but the Synod itself. It would be a grave mistake to involve the diocese in thousands of dollars expense without consulting the representative body as to what should be done.

In fact the diocese will expect to be consulted. The mission fund collections will certainly be small, if laymen do not know whether their contributions are to be used for further litigation, or to go for the purpose for which they are given.

The safety of the Bishop is in consulting the diocese through a specially convened Synod.

A SYNOD MEMBER.

—Things are sadly turned about in these days. Business is self-sacrificing; religion is self-indulgent; there is hardly anything that the business man thinks he can't do; and hardly anything that the religious man thinks he can do. If the two only change places for a twelve month, what a chance it would afford for finding out what Christianity was intended to be!—Living Church.

UNION WITH CHRIST.—Our natural root is Adam; but after our adoption by Baptism into God's family our root is in Christ—"rooted and built up in Him." All that is firm in the rooting we owe to Him. God's favour to us is in Him, as we are united to Him. The growth corresponding with the rooting, begun in grace, will reach up into glory. Peter's rooting was much deeper and firmer after his fall, through his Lord's prayer for him. He could afterwards write, "Rejoice, inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings." There must be firm rooting when a man can rejoice to suffer, even as a martyr. The secret of this strength of root lies in having union with Christ, so that our life in Him is hid with God; and the Spirit knows where to find each one of Christ's lilies to supply the refreshing dew. The dew will get at the lilies though they are surrounded by thorns. Let us labour to grow in the knowledge of God's grace in Christ; in the apprehension of His promises, and the height, length, breadth and depth of His love.—Churchman.