

SUBSCRIPTIONS RECEIVED SINCE 15th APRIL.

Cobourg.—Miss Tremain, Joseph Nixon, Portsmouth.—Rev. F.W. Dobbs, James Kelly, Robt. Arthurs, Thos. Painter, Henry Connolly, Robt. Blair, Major Straubenzie, Chas. Brass, Robert Preistly, George Sexton, Eli Baden, Chas. George, Mrs. Moyle, Thos. Johnston. Miscellaneous.—Mrs. Warren, Walkerton, R. W. Henneker, Sherbrooke; Mr. Allen, Kingston; W. G. Marsh, Clarksburg; G. Morphy, Toronto; Rev. G. Keyes, Exeter; Rev. I. W. Burke, Prescott; Col. Higginson, Vankleek Hill; William Drumm, St. Johns; Rev. F. Harding, Alymer; Miss Talbot, London; J. Gregory, Wingham; Rev. R. V. Rogers, Vittoria; Robert Kestell, Simcoe; James Campbell, Toronto; Rev. M. Gueronf, Berthier. Montreal subscriptions are not published.

Church Observer.

"One Faith,—One Lord,—One Baptism."

MONTREAL, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 15, 1870.

CONFIRMATIONS

BY THE LORD BISHOP OF MONTREAL. June and July, 1870.

- June 13.—Monday, 9 o'clock, at Laprairie. " 15.—Wednesday, 9 " " Sorel. " 25.—Saturday, 11 " " Chambly. July 7.—Thursday, 2 " " Sutton. " 12.—Tuesday, 2 " " W. Farnham " 17.—Sunday, Morning, " Waterloo. " " " Evening, " Shefford. " 18.—Monday, 2 o'clock, " Iron Hill. " 21.—Thursday, 11 " " Rougenont " " " 6 " " Abbotsford. " 24.—Sunday, Morning, " E. Staunbridge " " " Evening, " Dunham. " 27.—Wednesday, 3 o'clock, " Frelighsburg " 29.—Friday, 3 " " Cowansville " 31.—Sunday, Morning, " Phillipsburg " " " Evening, " Pigeon Hill.

Confirmations will also be held at Bedford and Granby.

DIOCESE OF HURON.

We devote so much of our space this week to the proceedings in the diocese of the Ontario diocese that we are obliged to exclude a large amount of interesting diocesan intelligence. In our next week's issue our friends will have an extended report of the meeting of the Huron Church Society.

PATRONAGE.

A debate on the question of lay patronage was the most interesting feature of the recent session of the Synod of the Ontario diocese. The question came up on a motion by Mr. J. Shannon to repeal canon VI. and substitute the following:—

- 1. Upon a vacancy occurring in any parish, it shall be the duty of the churchwardens to report the same to the bishop, who thereupon shall nominate one or more clergymen for the appointment. 2. A vestry meeting shall be called within [ten] days for the purpose of considering the bishop's nomination, and upon a vote being taken, any of the clergymen so nominated receiving the support of a majority of such vestry, shall be declared duly appointed. 3. In case none of the clergymen so nominated shall be approved by the vestry, the result shall be communicated to the bishop, who may further nominate one or more clergymen to fill the vacancy, and such nominations shall be submitted to the vestry within the time, and voted upon in the manner provided by the second section. 4. Provided, however, that in case the vacancy shall not be filled up by the bishop within the space of [three] calendar months, the appointment shall lapse to the vestry absolutely.

We are not surprised to find that this very moderate proposal was opposed and defeated, but we are astonished at the ground which its opponents took. So broad a question as the relations of bishops and congregations, and an extension of the powers of either, involves important principles of church polity, and, certainly, should not be discussed as a personal matter and decided as such. When Mr. Shannon announced, in our columns, his intention to bring the subject before the Synod, we were glad to assist him by giving publicity to what he and others had to say on the question, because we hoped it would lead to a thorough debating of a subject of vital importance to the church. We naturally supposed that the opponents of the

proposed change would contend that to invest congregations with absolute or partial power to choose their pastors was contrary to the law of God, the spirit of episcopacy, and the interests of the church,—all which, we foresaw, would be stoutly denied and reasoned against by the advocates of the change. What we looked for with considerable interest was a discussion of such questions as—Does the New Testament give specific directions as to the appointment of pastors, or has the matter been left for settlement according to the exigencies of the church? Is lay patronage consistent with the form of church government, which, in its fundamental principles, we hold to be scriptural and apostolic? If lay patronage does not contravene any principle, is it expedient under existing circumstances?—all which questions were fair subjects of debate, and the investigation of them must have been deeply interesting. We never dreamt that a matter of such moment would be discussed on purely personal grounds, and dismissed because the bishop construed the motion which raised it as expressive of want of confidence in him. That this was the case, however, we infer from the report which appears in the Ottawa Times, from which we take the following:—

"After some appropriate remarks from J. B. Lewis, Esq., the meeting was addressed by his lordship the bishop, who said he had expected this trial, and had wished to know what show of reason the movers of the question had for wishing to withdraw the power from their bishop's hands, which they had aided in vesting in him. He did not know in what way he had transgressed his powers, or in what manner he had given dissatisfaction. He would say, on the general question of patronage, that he did not desire it. His situation would be happier without it. It was the great trouble of his office to suit parishes with clergymen. There were four parishes even then without clergymen, and he was at a loss how to find men to fill the situations with satisfaction. Indeed, he would be thankful to any one of those dissatisfied parishes if they could name a clergyman that would suit them, and take the responsibility of his shoulders. He would not accept the responsibility of patronage at all unless it was free and untrammelled. He had a decided objection to the last resolution that had been submitted, proposing to adjourn this motion for another session, and have it remain a vexed question for another term."

If his lordship's remarks have been faithfully reported, we are astonished that the Synod did not at once resolve to relieve him of a duty which he had found so onerous, and which, in some cases, he had found it impossible to discharge. Among some denominations, for a congregation to be for many weeks without a pastor—suitable or unsuitable—is a thing unknown; and in those in which the onus of choosing a minister rests on the congregation, in case of a vacancy, there is generally no scarcity of candidates, or much difficulty in the choice of one who, it is hoped, will prove suitable and efficient. We trust that those who have raised the question in the sister diocese will not be deterred by their recent failure from again introducing it, and that his lordship will be speedily relieved of the responsibility which he finds so irksome.

THE CHURCH HERALD.

The following is the letter from our Barrie correspondent to which we alluded in our last issue:—

"To the Editor of the Church Observer: SIR,—As I perceive you are still receiving contributions in aid of the OBSERVER, may I ask you if a statement that that paper is about to be bought up and absorbed by the Church Herald is true or not? This statement has been openly made by a canvasser for the latter paper in this neighbourhood, who added that the event was to take place about the beginning of July. Upon my saying that this could hardly be the case or we should have been advised of the fact through the columns of the OBSERVER, he replied that we were not intended to learn it, and that it was to be kept a secret till it actually took place; and further, that the Herald was to be supplied instead of the OBSERVER to the subscribers to the latter for the remainder of the year. Can all this possibly be true? And yet the Herald agent made the statement quite positively and authoritatively.

If it is true we should certainly have been informed of the fact through your columns ere now; if it is not, it ought to be contradicted publicly. I have nothing to say against the Herald, (knowing nothing of it,) but I prefer to have the option of subscribing to it or not.

Your obedient servant, A SUPPORTER OF THE OBSERVER. Barrie, June 6, 1870."

Of course we cannot hold our Toronto contemporary responsible for all the statements made by canvassers in its behalf. The ethics of canvassing are not of the highest, and nothing would surprise us less than to learn that the statement originated with an unscrupulous agent who acted in direct contravention of instructions from those whom he represented. If we thought the matter worth investigating—which we do not—and ascertained that the agent merely said what he had been told to say, the Church Herald would stand convicted of a degree of meanness with which we should be loth to see any religious journal charged.

It is a matter of indifference to us how the statement originated, but we cannot allow it to pass without a flat contradiction. Nothing can be farther from the thoughts of the proprietors of the CHURCH OBSERVER than its absorption by the Church Herald or any other paper. A proposal of the kind was made to the proprietors of this paper some months ago, but was declined with such courtesy as they were able to command. We were then given to understand that arrangements had been made by the proprietors of the Church Herald for the absorption of the Kingston organ. In fact the Herald, with a capacity for swallowing contemporaries almost equal to that of Aaron's serpent, was to devour everything in the shape of a Canadian church paper. The Kingston paper has not yet been devoured, and we are in a far better

position than when the gracious offer to consume us was made. Since then the position of our paper has vastly improved, and the additions to the subscription list have been constant, and it is not at all likely that these gratifying results of hard work and long patience should be relinquished for nothing. So remarkably have we grown in public favour that we think it probable that we shall be able, in a very short time, so enlarge to our original size. Moreover, the CHURCH OBSERVER has a mission to fulfil, on which no other religious paper published in Canada seems inclined to enter, and an amalgamation with the Church Herald would be an utter abandonment of it.

THE CONCERT IN ST. JAMES' CHURCH.

It affords us great pleasure to chronicle the failure of the recent attempt to convert the churches of this city into concert rooms. The alarm with which many persons, who believed in the sanctity of the House of God, heard that a musical entertainment was to be given in the Church of St. James the Apostle, was natural—but there is little reason to fear that such apprehensions will be again raised. The following announcement, which appeared in the Daily News of this city, will show what sort of entertainment was contemplated:

"MONTREAL DIOCESAN CHORAL ASSOCIATION.—A society, bearing the above title, has recently been formed, for the improvement of music in our churches. It is under the direction of Dr. Charles Davies, who has been appointed chorus-master; the secretary is Mr. Francis Crispo. The choir of various churches seem to have entered heartily into the plan, in the hope that on some future occasion the united choirs may be enabled to give, at Christ Church Cathedral, oratorios similar to those commonly known as the Gloucester, Hereford, and Worcester festivals. The first festival will be held on Thursday first, at the Church of St. James the Apostle, at eight, P.M. The service will consist of evening prayer, as sung in the English Cathedral. The following are the selections:—Magnificat, in G major single chant; Nunc Dimittis, double chant, Horndale Bennet. The anthem will be taken from the 122d Psalm—'I was glad when they said unto me, etc.' The music for the anthem has been specially composed for the occasion by Dr. Davies. The responses of

Tallis will be used throughout the service. After the service the Rev. Mr. Dumoulin will preach a sermon on 'Praise.' The choir will consist of members of the choirs of Christ Church Cathedral, St. George's Church, St. Mary's, St. Stephen's, St. John the Evangelist, and St. James the Apostle. His lordship the Metropolitan enters very warmly into the movement."

We were rather incredulous as to the statement of his lordship's approbation, and therefore were not surprised to read the following correction in a later edition of the News:—

"MONTREAL DIOCESAN CHORAL ASSOCIATION.—With reference to our notice of this association, we regret that one or two mis-statements were inadvertently made by our correspondent, and especially that which refers to the warm approval of the movement by the Metropolitan."

It is very strange that such a statement should have been made inadvertently.—How very emphatic "our correspondent" must be when he speaks advisedly—when he can be so precise and forcible in his inadvertence? We understand that his lordship deemed the matter one of so much importance that he lost no time in himself correcting the error of the "inadvertent correspondent;" and we are rather pleased than otherwise at this accidental result of the fit of abstraction during which the erroneous statement was made.

The following also appeared in the Daily News of Wednesday last:—

"In reference to an item in yesterday's paper, concerning the Montreal Diocesan Choral Association, we have been requested to state that the choir of Christ Church Cathedral is not connected with the Association."

And the subjoined letter appeared in the Daily Witness of Saturday last:—

"SIR,—In your issue of yesterday I observed a notice of a festival to be held in the church of St. James the Apostle, consisting of a meeting of choirs, St. George's included. I think there must be some mistake, as that choir has nothing whatever to do with it. Your obedient servant, GEORGE F. LE JUEUR, Organist, St. George's Church."

The promoters of the concert must have arranged their plans under an evil star.—With one exception, the choirs whose cooperation was announced, declined to have anything to do with it; the clergyman who it was intimated would preach, was not present; and the secular journals, while noticing the entertainment favourably, refused to recognize its supposed religious character.

DR. JENKINS ON EPISCOPACY.

A friend has called our attention to the fact that on the morning of the publication of Rev. Dr. Jenkins' utterance, on which we last week commented, the Rev. gentleman, at the Synodical breakfast, expressed regret that his words had been misrepresented; and that what he did say was—"We have the same great work to perform in opposing the pride and assumption of Hierarchical Prelacy, whether Roman or Anglican." In an interview since held with the respected moderator of the Kirk of Scotland, we have learnt that his reference was to those ritualistic assumptions by certain extreme men in our church, which are as repugnant to our own views as they possibly can be to those of the Rev. Doctor. At a time when all who love the Saviour are feeling the need of closer union in the conflict with evil, we should deplore the existence of any such misunderstanding.

CHURCH PATRONAGE.

A writer in the last number of the Churchman's Magazine thus sums up the arguments for and against an alteration in the patronage system:—

"After all there lurks behind the popular ebullition of feeling, of which we hear so much, a consciousness that a 'prudent exercise' of the Episcopal office, pure and simple, is the best method after all; so that ministers are not humanly-called to a pastoral charge, but specially sent by the Divine ordinance of episcopal supervision. As long, however, as age and past service seem to entitle a man to a position, which with large emolument, demands the energy of a ripe manhood, not his (though it may have been) so long as the interests of the