

read in its report for the past year that "The Altar linen used in the Church of the Holy Trinity is washed and ironed at the House; the bread for the celebration of the Holy Communion provided, and Sister Sarah has the care of the Altar which occupies one afternoon each week."

Such "Altar" services they rightly affirm, "can end here in no other results than those which have followed from the like imitations of the Monastic Institutions and Sisterhoods of Rome in England."

One of the Clergy of the same Church of the Holy Trinity they further affirm, has been organizing and abetting another Confraternity, with its Manual of idolatrous teachings and Romish superstitions, specially fostered in connection with the Blessed Sacrament. By another, "The Path of Holiness," another grossly superstitious Romanizing manual, has been placed secretly in the hands of the Sunday-school children. While a-third has been figuring in the extravagancies of the Guild of St. Lawrence, and inculcating the anti-protestant idea of a sacrificing priest, an altar, what one of them openly calls the Mass, praying for the dead, and processions and services of a kind wholly unknown until now, in connection with the Burial Service.

These things being so, as vouched for by such men as Judge Draper, Vice-Chancellor Blake, Prof. Daniel Wilson, and nearly a dozen other men, almost equally eminent, it was surely time for Protestant Churchmen to speak out on the subject; and we hold that the whole Christian Community owe these gentlemen a debt of gratitude for doing so. The Bishop has made a feeble attempt at reply, but facts are proverbially stubborn things. "The end is not yet."

It is really too bad, just when the Bishop of Toronto is re-affirming, with all his might, the indisputable character and virtue of the Apostolical succession to

be obtained through the pressure of the holy hands of the English Primate, to be told that the Archbishop of Canterbury was never baptized. The rumour is, that when in infancy, his life was on one occasion despaired of, and there being no clergyman at hand to administer the ordinance, the nurse gave the child the only baptism he ever received!! This was un-apostolical enough; but worse still, it is now affirmed, on the authority of the Primate's brother, and of the Family Bible, from which the record is taken, that the Archbishop of Canterbury was baptized by a Presbyterian minister in Edinburgh! Could confusion and misfortune further go?

Apropos of this doctrine of Apostolical succession, Dr. Parker, of the Temple pulpit, in London, said recently, at a meeting of the Liberation Society:—

"If, when Sydney Smith was told by his medical adviser to 'take a walk upon an empty stomach,' he naively inquired 'Whose?' then when we are told that the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ find their legitimate successors and descendants in the clergy of the Anglican church, we feel entitled to ask 'Which?' There is such a diversity amongst them that we feel at some loss to indicate the exact limits of the Apostolic lines. Who is the apostolical descendant? Is it the man who is pulling the reredos up, or the man who is pulling the reredos down? Is it the man who is clothed in a coat of many colours, or the man who is seeking a new act of Uniformity by which he will be able in a lawful manner to remit the self-same coat to the region of old clothes? Is it the clergyman whose 'Apology' won the St. Leger? or is it the outraged bishop who remonstrates with him because of his carnal devotion to horseflesh? Which? we only ask—which of these men?"

A pertinent question truly! Then, after thankfully acknowledging that there