

hard heart who could have seen without emotion the gleam of love in every man's eye, who lifted up a little one, that it might see that its stone was duly laid. Indeed I should not like to say whose hearts felt most near bursting with warm feelings—those of the masons who fixed the stones, those of the men who lifted up the children, or those of the children who brought the stones. With every one it seemed to be a true "work and labour of love." We cannot reach secrets of the heart, but we may feel certain that those little ones were then taught something they will never forget, and it is not beyond the possible to imagine some of them coming with their children's children and pointing with pride to it and saying, "I, grandfather, helped to build it."

Another hymn was then sung lustily and with a good courage, some more prayers said, "Praise God from Whom all blessing flow" sung, and the benediction given. Then came warm congratulations one with another, though few words were spoken for every heart was full to the brim and running over in gratitude for the great and glorious privilege vouchsafed to us, that we should take part in this laying the foundation of the first stone church erected in Muskoka. A bottle was built in the wall under the "corner stone" containing a brief history of the Aspidin Mission, to tell how we were blessed with a stone church—a list of the names of the Bishops of the diocese, officers of the St. Mary's Church, and the names of all the thirty four communicants—together with copies of *The Mail*, *The Globe*, *The Free Grant Gazette*, *The Gravenhurst Banner*, *The Church Times*, *The Church Bell*, *The Banner of Faith*, and *THE DOMINION CHURCHMAN*.

In the evening a "social" was held the under management of the young men communicants connected with "The Guild of the Good Samaritan," for whose use the Clifton Hall has been built. This social was in every way a pronounced success, and there will soon be an unlooked for "surplus." No speeches were allowed, but after "tea" was over, I, and one of my sons, gave one half hour's entertainment by means of some of the splendid "dissolving views" given to myself by friends during my recent visit to England. They were chiefly views of the interior and exterior of English cathedrals, and a few comic ones as a finale. I have promised at a future time (D.V.) to give more, amongst which will be the *deformation*, and *reformation* with the church before, and during the last forty years. The "views" having been seen and duly appreciated, the young folks went into another room of the "hall" and kept up the fun for an hour or two with song, recitation, chats and a good dance. I remained amongst them the whole of the time. We separated shortly after midnight, and I can vouch for the fact that every one seemed to heartily enjoy themselves and were truly happy, and this too, here in the backwoods, where smoking, spitting, bad language and drink of any sort, but "tea" and water, were not permitted to enter within. They met for tea and they had it too. What they did, they did "heartily a. to be Lord and not to man," and I am certain God's blessing rested thereon.

Aspidin P.O., I am, etc.
Muskoka, Canada, WILLIAM CROMPTON.
October 23rd, 1886

ENGLAND.

Death of the Bishop of Manchester.—We sincerely regret the sudden taking off by death of Dr. Fraser, Bishop of Manchester. Although far from our ideal of a bishop, he was a man of high attainments, higher character and still higher aims. He had in him if not zeal for the Church, at least zeal for human welfare in a most excellent sense. His fame as an educational reformer and organizer, will outshine that of his career as a Bishop, although in many points his reign was fruitful of benefits to the Church, which will make the diocese of Manchester long hold his memory in reverence. The deceased had great power of "putting things," hence his sermons were more generally published in the press than any other modern preacher owing to his phraseology being so modern, so unconventional. His worst enemies, and Dr. Fraser had more than one hornet's nest to worry him, never doubted his supreme regard for honour and duty, as they do in the case of his next neighbour, westward. The deceased bishop was born in 1818, and was from his appearance likely to live to a ripe old age. But he had been for many years, for life indeed, a hard worker, and the body succumbed under the strain of mental toil.

Church Congress.—The Plymouth Congress is reported to be one of the most successful ever held. The sermons, papers, and addresses were of unusual excellence, and will produce a most profound and lasting impression upon the people at large in England, who never before were so excited in regard to the Church,

owing to the adherents and dissenters having joined hands for a political attack upon its possessions. That the higher range of dissenters are less rabid and dishonest, we may judge by the marked attention paid the Congress visitors by the non-conformist Mayor of Plymouth and by his co-religionists, whose kindness was memorable. A Congregationalist minister also did himself honour by preaching an excellent sermon in eulogy of the Church, and deprecating hostilities. It is, as we have again and again reiterated, it is only when the Church is kept obscure, when her claims are ignored by her own sons, when Churchmen are ashamed of their mother, then only is dissent a dangerous power. Wherever the Church has shown herself in strength at the Congresses, there the opposing elements have quieted down and overtures of peace been offered. Here alas! there are too many who humble the Church by apologising for separation from dissent, by explaining away all the differences between us, by the Churching the Church, a course which makes our enemies despise us, but Uriah Heap like, there are some Churchmen who like to be despised.

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.

HURON SYNOD.

SIR,—The petition to the Bishop requesting his Lordship to call an early special Synod, to consider the grave difficulties arising from out of the notorious cases of litigation, which so injuriously interfere with the work of the Church in the diocese, has met with such favor as not only approves, but makes it requisite to comply with the lawful desires of the Church. To delay will create suspicion, and provoke such irritation, that temperate means to adjust the difficulties may be superseded by warranted activity. Who will be to blame? Certainly not the petitioners, whose action displays that moderation, which guarantees a most conservative determination to vindicate justice, and investigate grievances. Any inspiration to delay will be attributed to evil counsel, and operate disastrously upon the annual appeal made to parishes for material aid. The strongest confidence is felt in the integrity of his Lordship, which to impair would be the greatest disaster of all. The Church looks for a holy determination to resist improper influence. Why should not immediate notice be given, so as to prevent fear, strengthen confidence, and confirm sanguine hopes?
VIGIL.

THE SYNOD GREETINGS.

SIR,—I have read the Rev. Dr. Carry's letter, which is almost wholly in reply to mine on the above subject. While very sincerely thanking him for having honored me with a reply at all, I cannot admit that it is any answer to my letter. He misapprehends the position I have taken, and then unwittingly wrongs me, (I am quite certain not purposely). Surely, except upon the strange supposition that a man must have the unerring quality of a divine being in order to be a good Catholic, and learned theologian, I have not even so much as hinted that to be in the company of such truly great and good men as St. Augustine, Hooker and Liddon is not to be in the company of good Catholics. Yet at the same time, I am if need be, prepared to demonstrate, if indeed I have not already demonstrated the truth of what I have said with reference to Canon Liddon's words, quoted by Dr. Carry and re-quoted by me. And as to St. Augustine's words which Dr. Carry approvingly quoted as "His kindly and reasonable excuse for those brought up in schism, and which we should not be slow to make," I maintain that such words and what they teach have not the slightest countenance or support either in Holy Scripture or in any authoritative canon or decree or document of the Catholic Church, or in any writing of the primitive and apostolic fathers. If the contrary can be shown, it rests with Dr. Carry to show it. And whether he does so or not, I am if need be, prepared to demonstrate that the words referred to, are contrary to sound reason and common sense, and subversive of the Catholic faith.

Surely, too, I have not in my letter said one word against "the validity of lay baptism," and do not now say a word against it, beyond what the "Holy Catholic Church" has long held, viz: that while it is not invalid, it is nevertheless irregular and very gravely so, as Dr. Carry right well knows it to be, simply because it has no authority whatever in Holy Scripture. And for this very reason all true Catholic Churchmen should most certainly consider any man

as utterly unworthy of the name of Catholic, who knowing or even suspecting that his own baptism was administered by a layman, neglects to be baptised in the hypothetical form of words by a man in holy orders. If Dr. Carry knows any "law of the Church of England, by which our practice must be governed," and more favorable to lay baptism than the above view of the matter, I trust he will be so good as to quote it; and I beg to remind him, that in order to make such law binding upon "Catholic Churchmen," he will have to show that it is in perfect accord with the law of the Catholic Church and not with "Western Christendom," which is no more authority in the matter than is the opinion of the inhabitants of the western hemisphere.

If Dr. Carry's "logic" was and is in all respects of the true and genuine character (and in his case at least, there can be no good reason why it should be otherwise), then I utterly fail to see any wisdom at all in his having "submitted his individual logic to the settled judgment and practice of the Church," (that is to say, of Western Christendom) inasmuch as W. C. is not by any means the Catholic Church. Dr. Carry knows right well the very sad and exceedingly painful circumstances which constrained and literally forced and compelled the Catholic Church, with the very greatest reluctance, as we may well suppose, to accept as valid lay baptism; having no other or better reason for it, than that which was nevertheless sufficient, but not one jot or tittle more than sufficient, viz: that if by reason of the then present distress, she held lay baptism to be invalid, she should have involved herself in a very serious and fatal dilemma, but that is no reason whatever, why she should now be regarded as assenting to lay baptism at all, under any circumstances whatever, other than those which are absolutely unavoidable. Whatever Dr. Carry may mean by the words "Our opinions are free," I hold that in the true and proper sense of the word, they are not free except in cases where nothing better than a mere opinion can be had, and even then we should in every instance yield to the force of reason and the weight of sound argument. I close my answer to the first paragraph of Dr. Carry's letter, by an absolute disavowal of any such position as that of having been or at any time intending to be, a "censurer" of his in any proper sense of the word.

I am in perfect harmony with the sentiments expressed in the 1st and 2nd sentences of the 2nd paragraph, and the two last of the 3rd paragraph. But I must still protest against the relationship which in the 4th sentence of the second paragraph, he assumes exists between "the Church of England" and "non-catholic bodies." And I deny that the "basis" referred to in the remainder of that paragraph is either any proper or sufficient basis upon which to establish such relationship, or to rest very true and genuine sympathy. Dr. Carry says "Take almost any Trinitarian Protestant sect, and what a large mass of Catholic truth do we find there." Do we indeed? I venture to think it is pretty clear to the mind of every "Catholic Churchman" who really understands what the "large mass of Catholic truth" really is, and what are the habits of thought and real ideas of the "Trinitarian Protestant sects" in relation thereto; that if instead of taking "any" of them as Dr. Carry suggests; we take the whole host of them together and first deduct the "Catholic truths" which with very scorn and bitter hatred they unanimously reject altogether; and secondly deduct those which for many a long year past they have travestied, burlesqued and perverted; and thirdly, those which they have from sheer neglect allowed to "slip"; the remainder of Dr. Carry's "large mass of Catholic truths" will be reduced to such very small proportions that he might easily write a list of them on a postage stamp. If he insists it cannot be done, then by all means let him give us as long a list as he possibly can, but let him bear in mind, that even a long list made good, will not save his logic. For if his "large mass of Catholic truths," as held by the sects referred to, and the comparison he has made in their favor as against that other sect almost wholly given to the working out of that system of iniquity known as the Romish system, be a good reason and sound argument sufficient to form the "basis" for sympathy, to which he refers, and establish the relationship which he assumes exists between "the Church of England" and the "sects"; then by parity of reasoning, men who stand convicted of long continued and oft repeated thefts, are to be counted the proper companions if not the peers of perfectly honest men, and well entitled to their sympathy, because of an assumed large mass of honest and legitimate transactions, which they have had in common with those who are not given to thieving at all, and because by comparison, the thefts so practised come a long way short of the violent thieving of notorious highway robbers.

I quite agree with the ideas expressed in the two first sentences of the 3rd paragraph, but I cannot imagine how Dr. Carry could carry [no pun intended] away from my letter, the idea expressed by him in the next sentence. How may I ask him, can it be