

such other of the communicants as he shall then call unto him shall, immediately after the Blessing, reverently eat and drink the same"—a direction not always reverently followed.—Ed.]

SCHISM.

DEAR SIR,—I am tempted to write a few lines to you on "Schism," or rather the schismatical spirit, in hopes of warning some against being seduced by it; and I do not know that I can do so in a better way than by recording part of the history of one or two who have been influenced by it.

I have two in my mind, both brought up in religious bodies cut off by their own act from the Catholic Church; both sought Holy Orders in our branch of the Church; both, after entering upon our ministry, turned their powers towards assimilating our worship to that of the body they had left. I met with a third clergyman, on one occasion, who came from the same neighborhood as one of these, he himself having conformed to the Church of England in Canada, and really conformed. He said to me, "Mr. —, I was brought up in the — faith, and my dear parents, who were holy people, died in that faith. I left it painfully, on conviction that Episcopacy is of Divine origin; and sooner than remain in the Church and preach and act like — (the man referred to), I would go back to the body I left to-morrow."

Of the other of the twain. Why he ever sought Episcopal ordination is a perfect mystery, for his habit is to set at naught the godly admonitions of his "Fathers in God." He fraternizes with Dissenters more than with his own brethren. He goes out of the way to speak against even the Hymn Book of the S. P. C. K., and to denounce Colleges with distinctive Church teaching, having, I presume, some such idea of schism as you hint at in your short notice of the *Evangelical Churchman*, of Toronto. Does it amount to nothing that Priests at their ordination reply affirmatively to the Bishop when he asks them, "in the Name of God and of His Church," "Do you think in your heart that you be truly called, according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the order of this Church of England, to the Order and the Ministry of the Priesthood?" \* \* \* "Will you then give your faithful diligence always so to minister the Doctrine and Sacraments, and the Discipline of Christ, as the Lord has commanded and as this Church and Realm hath received the same," &c. "Will you be ready with all faithful diligence to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's word," &c.

Let me offer a warning, through you, Sir, not to be led away by such as stand up in a brother Priest's pulpit and run down the three orders of the ministry as needless, after giving assent and consent to the declaration:—"It is evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scriptures and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these orders of Ministers in Christ's Church, Bishops, Priests and Deacons; which offices were evermore had in such reverend estimation," &c.

Jesuitry is not, I fear, confined to the Church of Rome. Our Bishops need to be on the watch against candidates for Holy Orders from other religious bodies, lest they only come in for the purpose and in hopes of spreading errors in our Church—errors which they profess to have abandoned.

HONESTAS.

P.S.—The Bishop of Long Island hits these preachers exactly, "puffed up with conceit," he says, and further that the Church expects all in her pulpits "will preach the Gospel, not as they understand it, but as the Church has received the same in Creed and Liturgy—in the

voices of the living, and voices of the dying and dead."—See CHURCH GUARDIAN, Feb. 17.—Page 1.

CHRIST CHURCH CATHEDRAL.

SIR,—Will your correspondent "Churchman" oblige me by defining in *extenso* the meaning of the following passage in his letter of Feb. 17th:—

"Both in his capacity as Parish Priest, and in his equally important Diocesan capacity as Cathedral Rector (which entails upon him special responsibility.)"

The words in italics are they upon which I seek light. What is his "Diocesan capacity," and what his "special responsibility."

ANOTHER CHURCHMAN.

THE "EVANGELICAL CHURCHMAN."

SIR,—Has your "Evangelical" contemporary, of Toronto, changed hands? I see that the names of the Directors are no longer published, as formerly, and that no clue is given to the present editorship of the paper. It is also a suspicious fact that the old motto, "Pro Christo et Ecclesia," was discarded with the New Year. Probably it was felt to be too glaringly inconsistent with the new-fangled definition of schism, and the repudiation of the Church doctrine of Apostolic succession which have recently appeared in its columns. The further elimination of the title "Churchman" would seem only rational.

Yours, &c.,

AN OLD READER OF THE

"EVANGELICAL CHURCHMAN."

Montreal, Feb. 19th, 1886.

MISSION OF IRELAND.

SIR,—In your issue of the 10th inst., I noticed an abstract from the Report of the Diocesan Board of Missions. In justice to the Mission of Ireland, kindly permit me to correct an error which appeared in the statement. The incorrect report reads, "It has increased its assessment from \$350 to \$540." The fact is, the assessment has been increased from \$350 to \$530. As your paper is in circulation throughout the mission, I venture to make this correction in order to avoid misapprehension.

Yours, R. HEWTON,  
Incumbent.

DEAR SIR,—Your correspondent "Churchman," in a late issue, uses the following language:—"It is well known that the present Rector of Christ Church Cathedral and of the Parish of Montreal (as his title runs)," &c., Now, Sir, I am aware that the Letters Patent invest the Incumbent of the cure referred to with the title "Rector of the Parsonage or Rectory and Parish Church of Montreal." I am also aware the said "Parish Church" was afterwards invested with the title of "Christ Church Cathedral," but the information I seek is this: When and how was the title "Rector of the Parsonage or Rectory and Parish Church of Montreal" changed to your correspondent's version of "Rector of Christ Church Cathedral," &c.? Were the original Letters Patent cancelled or altered, or by what authority was such change made?

I do not dispute the title; I only seek light.

HONEST ENQUIRER.

Montreal, Feb. 25th, 1886.

THE SOCIETY OF THE TREASURY OF GOD.

LENTEN SUNDAY-SCHOOL OFFERINGS.

SIR,—Bishop Morris, of Oregon, writing in the *Spirit of Missions* for January, states that the children's Lenten offering has been a great

success in the American Church. Last year it amounted to \$15,000. It was started by Mr. Marston, a layman of Pennsylvania, and for several years the Lenten offerings of that poor missionary jurisdiction stood next to those of the great Diocese of Pennsylvania. The Bishop writes: "All you ask is that for the six Sundays of Lent the children's offerings be devoted to Domestic and Foreign Missions. The shortness of the time is an advantage. The interest of the children can be kept up for that time, while it could not for twelve months."

Following the lead of the American Church, this Society will furnish boxes suitable for the purpose, at 70c. per hundred, including postage.

It is hoped that what the children find printed on these boxes will lead them to become tithe payers, and that many will enroll themselves members of this Society, the fee for which is ten cents.

Yours faithfully,

C. A. B. POCOCK,

Hon. Organizing Sec.

Toronto, Septuagesima, 1886.

SIR,—Anent the action of the Archbishop of Dublin in *re* Evangelical Alliance, it occurs to me that unless our leaders lend themselves to efforts towards reunion, how can it ever come about? Therefore, the laity should be willing to accept action in an Archbishop, on account of its object, which would not be warranted by the ordinary individual of rank and file in the Church militant.

Yours faithfully,

T. H. EVERETT.

Cote St. Antoine.

P.S.—It is the Report of the *Third* Synod of the Diocese of Montreal required. Perhaps some one has a copy not in use. E.

DIOCESAN THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE.

DEAR SIR,—Permit me to add to what has already appeared in your columns in reference to the intended application by this institution for power to grant degrees, the following remarks:—

It is asserted and objected—

(a.) That the Church of England, for the whole or its parts, in the Province of Quebec, is unwarranted in demanding powers from the Provincial Legislature which are already, by Royal Charter, and by Act 34 Vic., cap. 48, conveyed to that religious body, and by express legislative proviso (16 Vic., cap. 60) to the Bishop of the Diocese of Montreal, in conjunction with the other Anglican Bishop of the Province—his Lordship of Quebec.

(b.) That the Synod of the Diocese of Montreal, possessed of jurisdiction and seized of full control over matters, persons and things under consideration (19 and 20 Vic., cap. 121), has in no way been apprised of the proposed action on the part of the Montreal Diocesan Theological College, which action affects that Synod's position and privilege, and bears intimate concern to the whole body of adherents of said Church in said Diocese.

(c.) That the Synod of the Diocese of Montreal has committed itself in no way to the said self-styled Diocesan College as to its constitution or educational standard which, by strain of Episcopal authority, acting with a compact of individuals, and without Synodical sanction, has been created in said city and Diocese.

(d.) That the constitution of the Montreal Diocesan Theological College provides for no consistent or Churchly administration, the Episcopate being toyed with as a cipher. The Board of Governors consist of the Bishop (without any official control other than the nomination of one clerical member annually to complete the number of five clerical members of the Board), with ten Lay Members elected by twos annually by the subscribers in general