

UNCALLED FOR PERSONALITY.

IN their reports of the Toronto Synod, both the *Empire* and the *World* alluded to one of the lay Delegates as "an employee of the Ontario government," at a point in the proceedings which made this allusion an offensive personality. The imputation was that the Delegate had forgotten his duty, as such, by using his office to defend the Mowat government. Mr. Dymond, who was referred to, took exception to a resolution on French Schools, on the ground that none existed in the Toronto diocese, and that time could be better spent than discussing outside affairs. The point would have had some force but for the fact that there are French Schools in the Toronto diocese. The speaker will be sure of his facts next time. Being engaged in his profession by the Ontario Government is much to his credit as a young lawyer, and his presence in the Synod is also highly honorable to so young a Churchman. He represents a far more valuable and hopeful type of Delegate than the vast majority of his lay colleagues in Synod. Be they "Grit," or be they "Tory," we rejoice to see such young Churchmen of good education, more than average ability, proved earnestness and determination, taking an active share in the governing body of the Church.

The Toronto Synod stands in grievous need of new blood, especially does it need the presence of laymen, who the year round are actively engaged in Church work. It would have elevated the tone of the Synod by saving it in past years from useless discussions most wasteful of time, had there been a Canon in force restricting lay representation to those engaged in some form of systematic active service for the Church. Mr. Dymond's protest shadowed the line such practical delegates would take. They would keep the Synod down to its proper work by infusing into its proceedings, what is so much missed, a quick, keen, sense of the gravity of such an assembly, of its capacities for usefulness, of its responsibilities for doing better work than financial criticism, or any form of party manoeuvring.

There is a very general impression that our Synods are "played out," that they have outlived their utility and necessity. There is too much reason for such opinions, although it is overlooked that however stale, flat, and unprofitable the proceedings of our Synods may appear to be, they fulfil the very valuable office of a safety valve, and discharge also one or two other functions of a mechanical nature that justify their continuance.

But the Church has nothing to hope from Synods in these days of an inspiring, exalting, directing character. Every parish must work out its own salvation in these regards, and they, when in full activity, will give the Synods what new life may be needed by sending as delegates those laymen who day by day, or week by week devote themselves to spheres of labor in which they do their duty in that state of life.

We hope the political press will avoid sug-

gesting sinister political motives to Synod Delegates. It is very rarely, indeed, the cloven hoof can be recognised beyond all chance of mistake, for the owner of that hoof is too cunning to show it, where its exposure will do him harm. Happily our Synods are made up of Churchmen who represent both parties. They can well be trusted to guard their own political interests in Synod. We trust then our contemporaries will recognise these facts by avoiding political criticisms of our lay delegates, who as members of such an assembly are entitled to public respect.

FOOLISH QUESTIONS.

WE have no desire to depreciate the fame of Job, but we are satisfied of this, that had he been the editor of a newspaper, he would have been often sorely tempted to "answer a fool according to his folly," in words of stinging rebuke. It is really amazing to read the questions asked by persons who profess and call themselves members of the Church of England, who, presumably, being at large, are in their right minds.

One correspondent who declares that he is a faithful follower of the Principal of a certain Divinity School, though what a Churchman is about to have any leader other than the Church, we cannot understand,—writes to us asking, "What difference can it make in divine service whether a layman discharges, what you call priestly functions, or they are left to a priest?" This question shows what the effect is of following a man's erratic opinions instead of the principles of the Church. We commend to his study the story of Korah and his company. This man, who was the first dissenter, and the first who protested against sacerdotalism, asked, virtually the same question as our correspondent. Korah protested that as all the congregation were holy the priests took too much on themselves by keeping in certain functions to their order. The answer was given by the Lord and Ruler of His Church, and that answer was—*death to those rebels.*

But a modern illustration will have more weight with such cavillers than any Biblical teaching. Our correspondent, we happen to know, is a Freemason, he is what is called a "Past-Master, that is, he has filled the Chair of a Masonic Lodge. Now we ask him, Did you, when in the Chair, ever permit an "Entered Apprentice," to open or close the Lodge when duly formed, or discharge any single one of the Master's duties? Would any Lodge of Masons allow any of the rank and file below the Chair to assume control and rule of the Lodge? Yet what possible difference could it make to Lodge business whether the Chair work was done by an "Apprentice," or by one duly appointed and "raised" to the Chair? The Masonic order grants "Orders," according to its Constitution, which are most strictly guarded from intrusion. The very rite by which a Mason is raised to the Chair is not allowed to be even seen by any brother who has not been "ordained" to that dignity. Yet one who has

passed through that experience, who has zealously preserved the exclusive rights and guarded the well-fenced dignities of an Office in a secret society of human origin, asks why the Church of God should be as orderly as a Lodge of Masons? He thinks it most essential most important, to keep a Lodge Chair from the intrusion of one not duly called to fill it. But he thinks that that Divine Lodge, the Church, to be so inferior in organization that its ritual duties may be discharged by any Tom, Dick, or Harry who is brazen enough to push into the work of the priesthood before being called and ordained to that dignity!

The importance of maintaining order is the importance of obedience to a Divine command. That may be a bagatelle to the followers of the Principal whose teaching our correspondent sets up above the Church, but to Churchmen, to Christians of any class, who have any regard for morality, respect for order is a foundation principle.

Having used the Masonic society for one illustration we may be allowed to invite the special attention of members of that order to a certain form of illumination they adopt, when not needed at all to give light save by symbol.

Those clergy who adopt a similar form of illumination for symbolic purposes, will, no doubt, find every Churchman who is a Freemason, a staunch defender of this custom, with which attendance at Lodge makes him so familiar! Those who have seen the light will appreciate the cogency of this allusion.

A HAPPY SOLUTION.

IN a recent editorial we drew attention to the difficulty of settling a scale of distribution for the Toronto rectory fund, and made a reference in that connection to the Commutation Fund. It is gratifying to find that the difficulties have been got over by the Synods in both cases. The attempt to amend the Commutation Fund Canon broke down on account,—as the Bishop pointed out—of the neglect of the committee to provide for cases of undeniable hardship which would arise if the amendment were confirmed. In fact, in order to get at one case of suppressed trickery in a country parish, the Canon was so formed as to create far greater evils in city parishes than they proposed to remedy by it. It was a piece of legislation calculated to work great injury and injustice to those self-denying clergymen who have devoted themselves to the spiritual care of the poorest of the poor members of our Church. Happily, both orders of the Synod, clergy and laity, proved unanimous on the subject of throwing out this stupid amendment. Some Synod committees have not yet learned the lesson of "letting well enough alone."

In regard to the other matter, the Toronto Rectory Surplus—an equally happy solution was reached—by a vote which was practically unanimous. It was decided that, while temporarily making an average division among the Rectors, a scale of discrimination should